



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

DESCHUTES COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

5:30 PM, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2023

Barnes Sawyer Rooms - Deschutes Services Bldg - 1300 NW Wall St - Bend

(541) 388-6575 | www.deschutes.org

AGENDA

MEETING FORMAT

The Planning Commission will conduct this meeting in person, electronically, and by phone.

Members of the public may view the Planning Commission meeting in real time via the Public Meeting Portal at www.deschutes.org/meetings.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom. Using Zoom is free of charge. To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, copy this link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87981966697?pwd=OGxJQjA5eWxDQjJhZjZ4OWhIUWcvZz09>

Passcode: 540482

Using this option may require you to download the Zoom app to your device.

Members of the public can access the meeting via telephone, dial: 1-312-626-6799. When prompted, enter the following Webinar ID: 879 8196 6697 and Passcode: 540482. Written comments can also be provided for the public comment section to planning@deschutes.org by 5:00 p.m. on February 23. They will be entered into the record.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 9

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

IV. ACTION ITEMS

- [1.](#) Public Hearing: Destination Resort Amendments - *Tarik Rawlings, Associate Planner*

V. PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

VI. ADJOURN



Deschutes County encourages persons with disabilities to participate in all programs and activities. This event/location is accessible to people with disabilities. If you need accommodations to make participation possible, please call (541) 617-4747.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Deschutes County Planning Commission

FROM: Tarik Rawlings, Associate Planner
Will Groves, Planning Manager

DATE: February 16, 2023

SUBJECT: Public Hearing: Destination Resort Amendments

The Deschutes County Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on February 23, 2023, to consider applicant-initiated legislative text amendments to Deschutes County's Destination Resort (DR) Combining Zone (file no. 247-22-000835-TA). The hearing will be held at the Barnes and Sawyer Room, Deschutes Service Center, 1300 Wall Street, Bend.

Attached to this memorandum are the proposed text amendments, findings, and original application materials which have not changed since the Planning Commission work session. Within the proposed amendments, added language is shown in **bold underline**. The public hearing will be conducted in-person, electronically, and by phone.

The record is available for inspection on the project website:

<https://www.deschutescounty.gov/cd/page/247-22-000835-ta-destination-resort-text-amendment>

I. BACKGROUND

In October 2022, the applicant Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW), applied for a legislative amendment to Deschutes County's Destination Resort (DR) Combining Zone. The proposed amendments would add language from Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.455(1)(a), which would limit residential uses to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort at any new Destination Resort allowed within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary population of at least 100,000. This proposed amendment would only apply to newly proposed Destination Resorts and would not apply to existing or approved Destination Resorts. The applicable language from ORS 197.455(1)(a) is provided below:

- (1) *A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:*

- (a) *Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.*

Staff notes that this restriction does not automatically come into effect because of updated population information being published. In LUBA 2022-011, the Land Use Board of Appeals found:

We adhere to and reiterate our conclusion in *Gould Golf* the limitations on resort siting in ORS 197.455(1) apply at the time that a county adopts maps identifying lands eligible for siting destination resorts. After a county has adopted such maps, the limitations in ORS 197.455(1) do not apply to specific applications for destination resorts.

Accordingly, an amendment to local code would be required to bring the population-based limitation into effect.

Staff submitted a 35-day Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on January 11, 2023. Agency notice was sent to relevant agency partners on January 18, 2023, and several agency comments were received. Notice of the proposal was sent to all property owners within Deschutes County who are within the DR Zone on January 23, 2023. The Notice explained the scope of the proposal, provided a project-specific website related to the application, and gave meeting information for the public hearing scheduled on February 23, 2023¹. One public comment was received outlining concerns with the proposed amendments and encouraging the Planning Commission to deny the application². Additionally, printed notice was published in the Bend Bulletin newspaper on February 7, 2023³. Staff presented the proposed amendments to the Planning Commission at a work session on February 9, 2023⁴.

II. PROPOSAL

Staff has provided the applicant's proposed amendments to DCC Sections 18.113 and 19.106 in **Attachment 1**. The applicant, in this case COLW, has provided findings (included as **Attachment 2**) which summarizes the amendments and provides analysis of the Statewide Planning Goals, applicable policies of the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan, and relevant state law. **Attachment 3** includes the original application materials submitted by the applicant.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION

Planning Commissioners conducted a work session on February 9, 2023. At that time, Commissioners raised questions about the number of noticed properties, with DR-zoning, that would qualify for a Destination Resort based on a minimum acreage of 160 acres⁵. Staff responded that, based on analysis of the county's DR-zoned properties, there were approximately 34 total property owners/entities within the

¹ <https://www.deschutescounty.gov/cd/page/247-22-000835-ta-destination-resort-text-amendment>

² Public comment received by Kenneth Katzaroff (Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt) on February 8, 2023

³ Based on email confirmation with Bend Bulletin's Inside Sales Executive, Julius Black dated January 23, 2023

⁴ <https://www.deschutes.org/bc-pc/page/planning-commission-33>

⁵ DCC 18.113.060(B), DCC 19.106.060(B)

DR Combining Zone with at least 160 acres of contiguous area and within a singular ownership entity. Of these 34 total properties, approximately 5 are associated with existing Destination Resorts (Eagle Crest, Thornburgh, Caldera Springs, Pronghorn (Juniper Reserve), and Tetherow), approximately 9 are associated with public lands (Deschutes County, Bend Parks and Recreation Department, US Forest Service, Oregon State, and Bureau of Land Management), approximately 2 are associated with irrigation districts (Three Sisters Irrigation District, and Central Oregon Irrigation District), and approximately 18 are associated with private ownership entities⁶. A map showing the 29 properties/ownership entities with at least 160 contiguous acres is included as **Attachment 4**, with a corresponding table showing the individual tax lots and ownership information associated with each of the 29 properties/ownership entities included as **Attachment 5**.

IV. NEXT STEPS

At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission may:

- Continue the hearing to a date certain;
- Close the hearing and leave the written record open to a date certain;
- Close the hearing and set a date for deliberations; or
- Close the hearing and commence deliberations.

Attachments:

1. Proposed Text Amendments – DCC Chapters 18.113 and 19.106
2. Proposed Findings
3. Applicant’s Application Materials
4. Map of DR-Zoned Properties (160 acres or greater)
5. Ownership Data for DR-Zoned Properties (160 acres or greater)

⁶ This spatial analysis was derived from Deschutes County’s Property Information Website, dial.deschutes.org and subsequent GIS analysis

Destination Resort (DR) Combining Zone Text Amendments

File No: 247-22-000835-TA

Applicant: Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW)



PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING
February 23, 2023

Hearing Procedure

The Commission's recommendation on this application will be based upon the record, the staff report, and the testimony and evidence presented at this hearing and following the hearing, if the record should be left open.

HEARING ORDER – The hearing will be conducted in the following order:

1. Staff will provide a brief report
2. Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW), as the applicant, will present testimony and evidence
3. Interested persons and agencies will present testimony and evidence
4. Closing remarks from Staff



Notices & Record Materials

Project Website and Full Record

<https://www.deschutescounty.gov/cd/page/247-22-000835-ta-destination-resort-text-amendment>



Hybrid Hearing

- **In Person – Fill out blue sign-up sheet and submit to Board Secretary**
- **Before starting testimony provide:**
 - **First and Last Name**
 - **Mailing Address**
- **3-minute limit per party**



Remote Participants

- To testify remotely you must attend using Zoom
- Chairman Debone will request that all Zoom participants use the “raise hand” feature to notify the Board that you would like to testify

- ***Computer / Smart Device***

- ❖ ***Press the Raise Hand button***



- ***Raise Hand (Dial-in)***

- ❖ ***Enter *9 on your keypad***



Hearing Procedures

- Written testimony can be submitted to staff
 - ❖ In-person - Hand to staff
 - ❖ Remote - Email to staff: Tarik.Rawlings@deschutes.org
- Orderly & respectful hearing
- Commissioner disclosures



Staff Report

Proposal

- Changes to 18.113 – Destination Resort Zone (DR)
- Changes to 19.106 – Destination Resorts
- Add language from ORS 197.455(1)(a) limiting the types of destination resorts allowed within 24 air miles of Urban Growth Boundaries with populations of at least 100,000



Background

- ORS 197.455 outlines state requirements for siting destination resorts, including the following language:

(1) A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:

(a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.



Background

- Applicant-initiated amendment (COLW)
- DLCD notification sent 1/11/23
- Notice sent to relevant agency partners 1/18/23
- Individual notice sent to all property owners affected by the DR Combining Zone 1/23/23
- Notice of Public Hearing published in Bend Bulletin 2/7/23



Proposed Amendments

- Title 18, DCC Chapter 18.113 – Destination Resorts Zone
 - Sections 18.113.030, .060
- Title 19, DCC Chapter 19.106 – Destination Resorts
 - Sections 19.106.030, .060



Work Session

- Noticed Properties (DR-Zoned)
 - ~34 total properties/owners with at least 160 acres and within a singular ownership entity
 - ~18 are private owners
 - 9 are public entities (Federal, State, County, Parks)
 - 5 are existing Destination Resorts
 - 2 are Irrigation Districts (COID, TSID)



Public Comments

- Several general inquiries
- One written comment in opposition
 - Kenneth Katzaroff – recommendation of denial
- One written comment seeking clarifying language
 - Corinne Celko – Juniper Preserve (formerly Pronghorn)
- Over 90 written comments in support



Next Steps

Options to move forward:

- Continue the hearing to a date and time certain;
- Close the hearing and leave the written record open to a date certain;
- Close the hearing and set a date for deliberations; or
- Close the hearing and commence deliberations.



Questions?

Tarik Rawlings, Associate Planner

541-317-3148

Tarik.Rawlings@deschutes.org





ATTACHMENT 1 - PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS

- FILE NUMBER:** 247-22-000835-TA
- APPLICANT:** Central Oregon LandWatch
2843 NW Lolo Drive Suite 200
Bend, OR 97703
- PROPERTY:** N/A
- OWNER:**
- REQUEST:** The applicant, Central Oregon LandWatch, has applied for a legislative text amendment to Deschutes County's Destination Resort (DR) Combining Zone to add language from Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.455(1)(a), which would limit residential uses to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort at any new Destination Resort within 24 air miles of certain urban growth boundaries.
- STAFF CONTACT:** Tarik Rawlings, Associate Planner
Phone: 541-317-3148
Email: tarik.rawlings@deschutes.org
- RECORD:** Record items can be viewed and downloaded from:
<https://www.deschutes.org/cd/page/247-22-000835-ta-destination-resort-text-amendment>
- Record items can be viewed and downloaded from:
www.buildingpermits.oregon.gov

I. APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

Deschutes County Code (DCC)

Title 18, Deschutes County Zoning Ordinance:

Chapter 18.113, Destination Resorts Zone (DR)

Title 19, Bend Urban Growth Boundary Zoning Ordinance:

Chapter 19.106, Destination Resorts

Title 22, Deschutes County Development Procedures Ordinance

Title 23, Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)

Chapter 197 — Comprehensive Land Use Planning I

Section 455 - Siting of destination resorts; sites from which destination resort excluded

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)

OAR 660, Division 15, Statewide Planning Goals

II. **PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS:**

The proposed text amendments are also detailed in the referenced applicant's burden of proof materials, included as an attachment. Below are the proposed changes with additional text identified by **bold underline**.

Title 18, County Zoning:

Chapter 18.113 Destination Resorts Zone; DR

Section 18.113.030 Uses in Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of, and are intended to serve persons at, the destination resort pursuant to DCC 18.113.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

- A. Visitor-oriented accommodations designed to provide for the needs of visitors to the resort:
 1. Overnight lodging, including lodges, hotels, motels, bed and breakfast facilities, time share units and similar transient lodging facilities;
 2. Convention and conference facilities and meeting rooms;
 3. Retreat centers;
 4. Restaurants, lounges and similar eating and drinking establishments; and
 5. Other similar visitor-oriented accommodations consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- B. Developed recreational facilities designed to provide for the needs of visitors and residents of the resort;
 1. Golf courses and clubhouses;
 2. Indoor and outdoor swimming pools;
 3. Indoor and outdoor tennis courts;
 4. Physical fitness facilities;
 5. Equestrian facilities;
 6. Wildlife observation shelters;
 7. Walkways, bike paths, jogging paths, equestrian trails;
 8. Other similar recreational facilities consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- C. Residential accommodations:

1. Single-family dwellings;
 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
 3. Condominiums;
 4. Townhouses;
 5. Living quarters for employees;
 6. Time-share projects.
 7. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**
- D. Commercial services and specialty shops designed to provide for the visitors to the resort:
1. Specialty shops, including but not limited to delis, clothing stores, bookstores, gift shops and specialty food shops;
 2. Barber shops/beauty salons;
 3. Automobile service stations limited to fuel sales, incidental parts sales and minor repairs;
 4. Craft and art studios and galleries;
 5. Real estate offices;
 6. Convenience stores;
 7. Other similar commercial services which provide for the needs of resort visitors and are consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- E. Uses permitted in open space areas generally include only those uses that, except as specified herein, do not alter the existing or natural landscape of the proposed open space areas. No improvements, development or other alteration of the natural or existing landscape shall be allowed in open space areas, except as necessary for development of golf course fairways and greens, hiking and bike trails, lakes and ponds and primitive picnic facilities including park benches and picnic tables. Where farming activities would be consistent with identified preexisting open space uses, irrigation equipment and associated pumping facilities shall be allowed.
- F. Facilities necessary for public safety and utility service within the destination resort.
- G. Other similar uses permitted in the underlying zone consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113.030.
- H. Accessory Uses in Destination Resorts:
1. The following accessory uses shall be permitted provided they are ancillary to the destination resort and consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8:
 - a. Transportation-related facilities excluding airports;
 - b. Emergency medical facilities;
 - c. Storage structures and areas;
 - d. Kennels as a service for resort visitors only;
 - e. Recycling and garbage collection facilities;
 - f. Other similar accessory uses consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- I. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**

Section 18.113.060 Standards for Destination Resorts

The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

- A. The destination resort shall, in the first phase, provide for and include as part of the CMP the following minimum requirements:
 1. At least 150 separate rentable units for visitor oriented overnight lodging as follows:
 - a. The first 50 overnight lodging units must be constructed prior to the closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
 - b. The resort may elect to phase in the remaining 100 overnight lodging units as follows:
 - 1) At least 50 of the remaining 100 required overnight lodging units shall be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurance within 5 years of the closure of sale of individual lots or units, and;
 - 2) The remaining 50 required overnight lodging units shall be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurance within 10 years of the closure of sale of individual lots or units.
 - 3) If the developer of a resort guarantees a portion of the overnight lodging units required under subsection 18.113.060(A)(1)(b) through surety bonding or other equivalent financial assurance, the overnight lodging units must be constructed within 4 years of the date of execution of the surety bond or other equivalent financial assurance.
 - 4) The 2.5:1 accommodation ratio required by DCC 18.113.060(D)(2) must be maintained at all times.
 - c. If a resort does not chose to phase the overnight lodging units as described in 18.113.060(A)(1)(b), then the required 150 units of overnight lodging must be constructed prior to the closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
 2. Visitor oriented eating establishments for at least 100 persons and meeting rooms which provide seating for at least 100 persons.
 3. The aggregate cost of developing the overnight lodging facilities, developed recreational facilities, and the eating establishments and meeting rooms shall be at least \$ 7,000,000 (in 1993 dollars).
 4. At least \$ 2,333,333 of the \$7,000,000 (in 1993 dollars) total minimum investment required by DCC 18.113.060(A)(3) shall be spent on developed recreational facilities.
 5. The facilities and accommodations required by DCC 18.113.060(A)(2) through (4) must be constructed or financially assured pursuant to DCC 18.113.110 prior to closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots or as allowed by DCC 18.113.060(A)(1).
- B. All destination resorts shall have a minimum of 160 contiguous acres of land. Acreage split by public roads or rivers or streams shall count toward the acreage limit, provided

that the CMP demonstrates that the isolated acreage will be operated or managed in a manner that will be integral to the remainder of the resort.

- C. All destination resorts shall have direct access onto a state or County arterial or collector roadway, as designated by the Comprehensive Plan.
- D. A destination resort shall, cumulatively and for each phase, meet the following minimum requirements:
 - 1. The resort shall have a minimum of 50 percent of the total acreage of the development dedicated to permanent open space, excluding yards, streets and parking areas. Portions of individual residential lots and landscape area requirements for developed recreational facilities, visitor oriented accommodations or multi family or commercial uses established by DCC 18.124.070 shall not be considered open space;
 - 2. Individually owned residential units that do not meet the definition of overnight lodging in DCC 18.04.030 shall not exceed two and one-half such units for each unit of visitor oriented overnight lodging. Individually owned units shall be considered visitor oriented lodging if they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 38 weeks per calendar year through one or more central reservation and check in service(s) operated by the destination resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010.
 - a. The ratio applies to destination resorts which were previously approved under a different standard.
- E. Phasing. A destination resort authorized pursuant to DCC 18.113.060 may be developed in phases. If a proposed resort is to be developed in phases, each phase shall be as described in the CMP. Each individual phase shall meet the following requirements:
 - 1. Each phase, together with previously completed phases, if any, shall be capable of operating in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
 - 2. The first phase and each subsequent phase of the destination resort shall cumulatively meet the minimum requirements of DCC 18.113.060 and DCC 18.113.070.
 - 3. Each phase may include two or more distinct noncontiguous areas within the destination resort.
- F. Destination resorts shall not exceed a density of one and one-half dwelling units per acre including residential dwelling units and excluding visitor oriented overnight lodging.
- G. Dimensional Standards:
 - 1. The minimum lot area, width, lot coverage, frontage and yard requirements and building heights otherwise applying to structures in underlying zones and the provisions of DCC 18.116 relating to solar access shall not apply within a destination resort. These standards shall be determined by the Planning Director or Hearings Body at the time of the CMP. In determining these standards, the Planning Director or Hearings Body shall find that the minimum specified in the CMP are adequate to satisfy the intent of the comprehensive plan relating to solar access, fire protection, vehicle access, visual management within landscape management corridors and to protect resources identified by LCDC Goal 5 which are identified in the Comprehensive Plan. At a minimum, a 100-foot setback shall

be maintained from all streams and rivers. Rimrock setbacks shall be as provided in DCC Title 18. No lot for a single family residence shall exceed an overall project average of 22,000 square feet in size.

2. Exterior setbacks.
 - a. Except as otherwise specified herein, all development (including structures, site-obscuring fences of over three feet in height and changes to the natural topography of the land) shall be setback from exterior property lines as follows:
 - 1) Three hundred fifty feet for commercial development including all associated parking areas;
 - 2) Two hundred fifty feet for multi family development and visitor oriented accommodations (except for single family residences) including all associated parking areas;
 - 3) One hundred fifty feet for above grade development other than that listed in DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(1) and (2);
 - 4) One hundred feet for roads;
 - 5) Fifty feet for golf courses; and
 - 6) Fifty feet for jogging trails and bike paths where they abut private developed lots and no setback for where they abut public roads and public lands.
 - b. Notwithstanding DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(3), above grade development other than that listed in DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(1) and (2) shall be set back 250 feet in circumstances where state highways coincide with exterior property lines.
 - c. The setbacks of DCC 18.113.060 shall not apply to entry roadways and signs.
- H. Floodplain requirements. The floodplain zone (FP) requirements of DCC 18.96 shall apply to all developed portions of a destination resort in an FP Zone in addition to any applicable criteria of DCC 18.113. Except for floodplain areas which have been granted an exception to LCDC goals 3 and 4, floodplain zones shall not be considered part of a destination resort when determining compliance with the following standards;
 1. One hundred sixty acre minimum site;
 2. Density of development;
 3. Open space requirements.

A conservation easement as described in DCC Title 18 shall be conveyed to the County for all areas within a floodplain which are part of a destination resort.
- I. The Landscape Management Combining Zone (LM) requirements of DCC 18.84 shall apply to destination resorts where applicable.
- J. Excavation, grading and fill and removal within the bed and banks of a stream or river or in a wetland shall be a separate conditional use subject to all pertinent requirements of DCC Title 18.
- K. Time share units not included in the overnight lodging calculations shall be subject to approval under the conditional use criteria set forth in DCC 18.128. Time share units identified as part of the destination resort's overnight lodging units shall not be subject to the time share conditional use criteria of DCC 18.128.

- L. The overnight lodging criteria shall be met, including the 150-unit minimum and the 2-1/2 to 1 ratio set forth in DCC 18.113.060(D)(2).
1. Failure of the approved destination resort to comply with the requirements in DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) through (6) will result in the County declining to accept or process any further land use actions associated with any part of the resort and the County shall not issue any permits associated with any lots or site plans on any part of the resort until proof is provided to the County of compliance with those conditions.
 2. Each resort shall compile, and maintain, in perpetuity, a registry of all overnight lodging units.
 - a. The list shall identify each individually-owned unit that is counted as overnight lodging.
 - b. At all times, at least one entity shall be responsible for maintaining the registry and fulfilling the reporting requirements of DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) through (6).
 - c. Initially, the resort management shall be responsible for compiling and maintaining the registry.
 - d. As a resort develops, the developer shall transfer responsibility for maintaining the registry to the homeowner association(s). The terms and timing of this transfer shall be specified in the Conditions, Covenants & Restrictions (CC&Rs).
 - e. Resort management shall notify the County prior to assigning the registry to a homeowner association.
 - f. Each resort shall maintain records documenting its rental program related to overnight lodging units at a convenient location in Deschutes County, with those records accessible to the County upon 72 hour notice from the County.
 - g. As used in this section, "resort management" includes, but is not limited to, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors in interest, assignees other than a home owners association.
 3. An annual report shall be submitted to the Planning Division by the resort management or home owners association(s) each February 1, documenting all of the following as of December 31 of the previous year:
 - a. The minimum of 150 permanent units of overnight lodging have been constructed or that the resort is not yet required to have constructed the 150 units;
 - b. The number of individually-owned residential platted lots and the number of overnight-lodging units;
 - c. The ratio between the individually-owned residential platted lots and the overnight lodging units;
 - d. For resorts for which the conceptual master plan was originally approved on or after January 1, 2001, the following information on each individually-owned residential unit counted as overnight lodging.
 - 1) Who the owner or owners have been over the last year;
 - 2) How many nights out of the year the unit was available for rent;

- 3) How many nights out of the year the unit was rented out as an overnight lodging facility under DCC 18.113;
 - 4) Documentation showing that these units were available for rental as required.
- e. For resorts for which the conceptual master plan was originally approved before January 1, 2001, the following information on each individually owned residential unit counted as overnight lodging. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Deschutes County Code, these resorts may count units that are not deed-restricted and/or do not utilize a central check-in system operated by the resort so long as such units meet the Oregon statutory definition of overnight lodgings in Eastern Oregon
- 1) For those units directly managed by the resort developer or operator.
 - a) Who the owner or owners have been over the last year;
 - b) How many nights out of the year the unit was available for rent;
 - c) How many nights out of the year the unit was rented out as an overnight lodging facility under DCC 18.113;
 - d) Documentation showing that these units were available for rent as required.
 - 2) For all other units.
 - a) Address of the unit;
 - b) Name of the unit owner(s);
 - c) Schedule of rental availability for the prior year. The schedule of rental availability shall be based upon monthly printouts of the availability calendars posted on-line by the unit owner or the unit owner's agent.
- f. This information shall be public record subject to the non-disclosure provisions in ORS Chapter 192.
4. To facilitate rental to the general public of the overnight lodging units, each resort shall set up and maintain in perpetuity a telephone reservation system..
 5. Any outside property managers renting required overnight lodging units shall be required to cooperate with the provisions of this code and to annually provide rental information on any required overnight lodging units they represent to the central office as described in DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) and (3).
 6. Before approval of each final plat, all the following shall be provided:
 - a. Documentation demonstrating compliance with the 2-1/2 to 1 ratio as defined in DCC 18.113.060(D)(2);
 - b. Documentation on all individually-owned residential units counted as overnight lodging, including all of the following:
 - 1) Designation on the plat of any individually-owned units that are going to be counted as overnight lodging;
 - 2) Deed restrictions requiring the individually-owned residential units designated as overnight lodging units to be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-

- in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010;
- 3) An irrevocable provision in the resort Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions ("CC&Rs) requiring the individually-owned residential units designated as overnight lodging units to be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010;
 - 4) A provision in the resort CC&R's that all property owners within the resort recognize that failure to meet the conditions in DCC 18.113.060(L)(6)(b)(3) is a violation of Deschutes County Code and subject to code enforcement proceedings by the County;
 - 5) Inclusion of language in any rental contract between the owner of an individually-owned residential unit designated as an overnight lodging unit and any central reservation and check in service or real estate property manager requiring that such unit be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010, and that failure to meet the conditions in DCC 18.113.060(L)(6)(b)(5) is a violation of Deschutes County Code and subject to code enforcement proceedings by the County.
7. Compliance Fee.
- a. In the event that a resort that was originally approved before January 1, 2001 fails to report compliance with the 2.5:1 ratio in a calendar year as reported in accordance with 18.113.060(L)(3)(e), the remedy shall be that such resort shall pay a compliance fee due not later than April 15 of the year following the year in which the shortfall occurred.
 - b. The compliance fee will be calculated as follows:
 - 1) First, by calculating the average per unit transient lodging tax paid by the resort the prior calendar year by dividing the total amount paid by the resort in transient lodging taxes for the prior calendar year by the sum of the number of overnight units managed by the resort for which the resort paid transient lodging taxes that same year and the number of timeshare units;
 - 2) Second, by multiplying that average per unit transient lodging tax amount by the number of additional overnight lodging units that would have been necessary to comply with the 2.5:1 ratio for the applicable calendar year.
 - c. If the Resort were to apply to create more residential lots, the Resort may not apply the compliance fee to meet the 2.5:1 ratio of individually-owned residential units to overnight lodging units per DCC 18.113.060(D)(2) and will have to demonstrate compliance per the new reporting methods or construct more overnight lodging units in order to comply with the 2.5:1 ratio.

M. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.

Title 19, Bend Urban Growth Boundary Zoning Ordinance:

Chapter 19.106 Destination Resorts

Section 19.106.030 Uses in Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of and are intended to serve persons at the destination resort pursuant to DCC 19.106.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

- A. Visitor-oriented accommodations designed to provide for the needs of visitors to the resort:
 1. Overnight lodging, including lodges, hotels, motels, bed and breakfast facilities, time share units and similar transient lodging facilities;
 2. Convention and conference facilities and meeting rooms;
 3. Retreat centers;
 4. Restaurants, lounges and similar eating and drinking establishments; or
 5. Other similar visitor-oriented accommodations consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- B. Developed recreational facilities designed to provide for the needs of visitors and residents of the resort including:
 1. Golf courses and clubhouses;
 2. Indoor and outdoor swimming pools;
 3. Indoor and outdoor tennis courts;
 4. Physical fitness facilities;
 5. Equestrian facilities;
 6. Wildlife observation shelters;
 7. Walkways, bike paths, jogging paths, equestrian trails; or
 8. Other similar recreational facilities consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- C. Residential accommodations:
 1. Single-family dwellings;
 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
 3. Condominiums;
 4. Townhouses;
 5. Living quarters for employees; or
 6. Time share projects.
 7. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**
- D. Commercial services and specialty shops designed to provide for the visitors to the resort:

1. Specialty shops including, but not limited to delis, clothing stores, book stores, gift shops and specialty food shops;
 2. Barber shops and beauty salons;
 3. Automobile service stations limited to fuel sales, incidental parts sales and minor repairs;
 4. Craft and art studios and galleries;
 5. Real estate offices;
 6. Convenience stores; or
 7. Other similar commercial services which provide for the needs of resort visitors and are consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- E. Uses permitted in open space areas generally include only those uses that, except as specified herein, do not alter the existing or natural landscape of the proposed open space areas. No improvements, development or other alteration of the natural or existing landscape shall be allowed in open space areas, except as necessary for development of golf course fairways and greens, hiking and bike trails, lakes and ponds and primitive picnic facilities including park benches and picnic tables. Where farming activities would be consistent with identified pre-existing open space uses, irrigation equipment and associated pumping facilities shall be allowed.
- F. Facilities necessary for public safety and utility service within the destination resort.
- G. Other similar uses permitted in the underlying zone consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106.020.
- H. Accessory uses in destination resorts:
1. The following accessory uses shall be permitted provided they are ancillary to the destination resort and consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8:
 - a. Transportation-related facilities excluding airports;
 - b. Emergency medical facilities;
 - c. Storage structures and areas;
 - d. Kennels as a service for resort visitors only;
 - e. Recycling and garbage collection facilities; or
 - f. Other similar accessory uses are consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- I. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**

Section 19.106.060 Standards For Destination Resorts

The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

- A. The destination resort shall, in the first phase, provide for and include as part of the CMP the following minimum requirements:
1. At least 150 separate rentable units for visitor-oriented lodging;
 2. Visitor-oriented eating establishments for at least 100 persons and meeting rooms which provide eating for at least 100 persons;

3. At least \$7 million shall be spent on improvements for on-site developed recreational facilities and visitor-oriented accommodations exclusive of costs for land, sewer and water facilities and roads. Not less than one-third of this amount shall be spent on developed recreational facilities. The spending minimums provided for are stated in 1993 dollars; and
 4. The facilities and accommodations required by this DCC 19.106.060 must be physically provided or financially assured pursuant to DCC 19.106.110 prior to closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
- B. All destination resorts shall have a minimum of 160 contiguous acres of land. Acreage split by public roads or rivers or streams shall count toward the acreage limit, provided that the CMP demonstrates that the isolated acreage will be operated or managed in a manner that will be integral to the remainder of the resort.
- C. All destination resorts shall have direct access onto a state, county, or city arterial or collector roadway, as designated by the Bend Urban Area General Plan.
- D. A destination resort shall, cumulatively and for each phase, meet the following minimum requirements:
1. The resort shall have a minimum of 50 percent of the total acreage of the development dedicated to permanent open space, excluding yards, streets and parking areas. Portions of individual residential lots and landscape area requirements for developed recreational facilities, visitor-oriented accommodations or multi-family or commercial uses established by DCC 19.76.080 shall not be considered open space; and
 2. Individually-owned residential units shall not exceed two and one-half such units for each unit of visitor-oriented overnight lodging constructed or financially assured within the resort. Individually-owned units shall be considered visitor-oriented lodging if they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 45 weeks per calendar year through one or more central reservation and check-in service(s).
- E. Phasing. A destination resort authorized pursuant to DCC 19.106.060 may be developed in phases. If a proposed resort is to be developed in phases, each phase shall be as described in the CMP. Each individual phase shall meet the following requirements:
1. Each phase, together with previously completed phases, if any, shall be capable of operating in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8;
 2. The first phase and each subsequent phase of the destination resort shall cumulatively meet the minimum requirements of DCC 19.106.060 and DCC 19.76.070, and;
 3. Each phase may include two or more distinct non-contiguous areas within the destination resort.
- F. Dimensional standards:
1. The minimum lot area, width, lot coverage, frontage and yard requirements and building heights otherwise applying to structures in underlying zones and the provisions of DCC 19.88.210 relating to solar access shall not apply within a destination resort. These standards shall be determined by the Planning Director or Hearings Body at the time of the CMP. In determining these standards, the

Planning Director or Hearings Body shall find that the minimum specified in the CMP are adequate to satisfy the intent of the Bend Urban Area General Plan relating to solar access, fire protection, vehicle access, and to protect resources identified by LCDC Goal 5 which are identified in the Bend Urban Area General Plan. At a minimum, a 100 foot setback shall be maintained from all streams and rivers. No lot for a single-family residence shall exceed an overall project average of 22,000 square feet in size.

2. Exterior setbacks and buffers.
 - a. A destination resort shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of buffers between the resort and adjacent land uses, including natural vegetation and where appropriate, fences, berms, landscaped areas, and other similar types of buffers.
 - b. Exterior setbacks shall also be provided to ensure that improvements and activities are located to minimize adverse effects of the resort on uses on surrounding lands.
- G. Floodplain requirements. The Flood Plain Zone (FP) requirements of DCC 19.72 shall apply to all developed portions of a destination resort in an FP Zone in addition to any applicable criteria of DCC 19.106. Except for flood plain areas which have been granted an exception to LCDC goals 3 and 4, Flood Plain Zones shall not be considered part of a destination resort when determining compliance with the following standards;
 1. One hundred sixty acre minimum site;
 2. Open space requirements.

A conservation easement as described in DCC Title 19 shall be conveyed to the County for all areas within a flood plain which are part of a destination resort.
- H. Excavation, grading and fill and removal within the bed and banks of a stream or river or in a wetland shall be a separate conditional use subject to all pertinent requirements of DCC Title 19.
- I. Time share units not included in the overnight lodging calculations shall be subject to approval under the conditional use criteria set forth in DCC 19.100. Time share units identified as part of the destination resort's overnight lodging units shall not be subject to the time share conditional use criteria of DCC 19.100.
- J. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. All other standards of this section continue to apply.**

Attachment 2: Proposed Findings 247-22-000835-TA

FINDINGS

I. PROPOSAL

In October 2022, the applicant Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW), applied for a legislative amendment to Deschutes County's Destination Resort (DR) Combining Zone. The proposed amendments would add language from Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.455(1)(a), which would limit residential uses to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort at any new Destination Resort allowed within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary population of at least 100,000. This proposed amendment would only apply to newly proposed Destination Resorts and would not apply to existing or approved Destination Resorts. The applicable language from ORS 197.455(1)(a) is provided below:

(1) A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:

(a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.

The County's spatial analysis of the distribution of DR-Zoned properties within Deschutes County indicates that most of the DR-Zoned properties are within 24 air miles of the City of Bend's urban growth boundary¹. The only DR-Zoned properties outside of the 24-air mile buffer (approximately 20 parcels) appear to be located west and southwest of the City of La Pine's urban growth boundary, predominantly along the Little Deschutes River corridor and range in size from approximately 1 acre to approximately 5 acres.

II. BACKGROUND

Recently, the City of Bend's population exceeded 100,000 individuals². Staff notes that the restriction outlined in ORS 197.455(1)(a) does not automatically come into effect because of updated population information being published. In LUBA 2022-011, the Land Use Board of Appeals found:

We adhere to and reiterate our conclusion in *Gould Golf* the limitations on resort siting in ORS 197.455(1) apply at the time that a county adopts maps identifying lands eligible for siting destination resorts. After a county has adopted such maps, the limitations in ORS 197.455(1) do not apply to specific applications for destination resorts.

¹ <https://dial.deschutes.org/Real/InteractiveMap>

² <https://www.pdx.edu/population-research/population-estimate-reports>

Accordingly, an amendment to local code would be required to bring the population-based limitation into effect.

Notice of the proposal was sent to all property owners within Deschutes County who are encumbered by the DR Zoning District on January 23, 2023. The Notice explained the scope of the proposal, provided a project-specific website related to the application, and gave meeting information for the upcoming public hearing on February 23, 2023³. Agency notice was sent to relevant agency partners on January 18, 2023, and several agency comments were received. County staff notified the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) about the proposal on January 11, 2023 through DLCD's online PAPA submittal⁴. Additionally, printed notice was published in the Bend Bulletin newspaper on February 7, 2023⁵.

III. REVIEW CRITERIA

Deschutes County lacks specific criteria in DCC Titles 18, 19, 22, or 23 for reviewing a legislative text amendment. Because the proposal is applicant-initiated, the applicant (COLW) bears the responsibility for justifying that the amendments are consistent with Statewide Planning Goals and the existing Comprehensive Plan. The applicant has provided the following responses to relevant criteria (also outlined in the applicant's application materials, attached):

IV. FINDINGS

CHAPTER 18.136, AMENDMENTS

Section 18.136.010 Amendments

DCC Title 18 may be amended as set forth in DCC 18.136. The procedures for text or legislative map changes shall be as set forth in DCC 22.12. A request by a property owner for a quasi-judicial map amendment shall be accomplished by filing an application on forms provided by the Planning Department and shall be subject to applicable procedures of DCC Title 22.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

The applicant proposes amendments to DCC Title 18 as set forth in DCC 18.136 and will follow procedures for text changes as set forth in DCC 22.12. Because the proposed amendments would apply to the many properties within 24 air miles of the City of Bend UGB, the request is for a legislative text amendment and not a quasi-judicial amendment.

Determining whether a land use decision is legislative or quasi-judicial requires an inquiry into three factors: "(1) Whether the process is bound to result in a decision, (2) preexisting criteria, and

³ <https://www.deschutescounty.gov/cd/page/247-22-000835-ta-destination-resort-text-amendment>

⁴ https://db.lcd.state.or.us/PAPA_Online/Account/Login?ReturnUrl=%2fPAPA_Online

⁵ Based on email confirmation with Bend Bulletin's Inside Sales Executive, Julius Black dated January 23, 2023

(3) closely circumscribed factual situation or a relatively small number of persons.” Heitsch v. City of Salem, 65 Or LUBA 187, 193 (2012) (citing Strawberry Hill 4 – Wheelers v. Board of Comm’ns of Benton County, 287 Or 591, 601 P2d 769 (1977). The third factor asks whether “the land use consequences are disproportionately concentrated on a relatively small pool of persons, as opposed to a larger region or the general population.” Van Dyke v. Yamhill County, __Or LUBA__, slip op. at 4, LUBA No. 2018-061 (December 20, 2018).

This application requests a legislative amendment. As to the first factor, this request is likely, although not bound, to result in a decision as to whether to amend the DCC as proposed herein. There are no statutory timelines under which the County must make a decision on a legislative text amendment application. Both the second and third factors clearly indicate that the proposed amendments are legislative. The County lacks preexisting criteria for text amendments, as opposed to specific standards and criteria applicable to quasi-judicial map amendments found at DCC 18.136.020. Most instructive is the third factor. The amendments involve a large number of circumscribed factual situation pertaining to one or a handful of properties. The land use consequences of the proposed amendments would be proportionately distributed on a large pool of people across this large region of Deschutes County.

Staff agrees that the subject application constitutes a legislative text amendment and is not quasi-judicial in nature.

The applicant for a quasi-judicial rezoning must establish that the public interest is best served by rezoning the property. Factors to be demonstrated by the applicant are:

- A. That the change conforms with the Comprehensive Plan, and the change is consistent with the plan's introductory statement and goals.***
- B. That the change in classification for the subject property is consistent with the purpose and intent of the proposed zone classification.***
- C. That changing the zoning will presently serve the public health, safety and welfare considering the following factors:***
 - 1. The availability and efficiency of providing necessary public services and facilities.***
 - 2. The impacts on surrounding land use will be consistent with the specific goals and policies contained within the Comprehensive Plan.***
- D. That there has been a change in circumstances since the property was last zoned, or a mistake was made in the zoning of the property in question.***

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

As discussed above in the response to DCC 18.136.010, the proposed amendments are legislative and not quasi-judicial, and this section does not apply.

Staff agrees that the subject application constitutes a legislative text amendment and is not quasi-judicial in nature.

Section 18.136.030 Resolution Of Intent To Rezone

- A. *If from the facts presented and findings and the report and recommendations of the Hearing Officer, as required by this Section, the County Commission determines that the public health, safety, welfare and convenience will be best served by a proposed change of zone, the County Commission may indicate its general approval in principal of the proposed rezoning by the adoption of a "resolution of intent to rezone." This resolution shall include any conditions, stipulations or limitations which the County Commission may feel necessary to require in the public interest as a prerequisite to final action, including those provisions that the County Commission may feel necessary to prevent speculative holding of property after rezoning. Such a resolution shall not be used to justify "spot zoning" or to create unauthorized zoning categories by excluding uses otherwise permitted in the proposed zoning.***
- B. *The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in the resolution on the part of the applicant shall make such a resolution a binding commitment on the Board of County Commissioners. Upon completion of compliance action by the applicant, the Board shall, by ordinance, effect such rezoning. The failure of the applicant to substantially meet any or all conditions, stipulations or limitations contained in a resolution of intent, including any time limit placed in the resolution, shall render the resolution null and void automatically and without notice, unless an extension is granted by the Board.***
- C. *Content of Site Plan. Where a site plan is required pursuant to Chapter 19.92, it shall include location of existing and proposed buildings, structures, accesses, off street parking and loading spaces and landscaping; existing and proposed topography; mechanical roof facilities, if subject property is so oriented as to become part of the view from adjacent properties; architectural perspective, layout and all elevations drawn without exaggerations, except where noted, including locations, area and design of signs and all landscaping.***

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

This section applies to quasi-judicial rezoning of property. As discussed above in the response to DCC 18.136.010, the proposed amendments are legislative and not quasi-judicial, and they do not propose rezoning any property. This section does not apply.

Staff agrees with the applicant's statement.

Section 18.136.040 Record of Amendments

All amendments to the text or map of DCC Title 18 shall be filed with the County Clerk.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

Upon adoption, the proposed amendments will be filed with the County Clerk.

Staff agrees that, if adopted, the proposed amendment will be filed with the County Clerk.

CHAPTER 19.116, AMENDMENTS, APPEALS AND PROCEDURES

Section 19.116.010 Amendments

DCC Title 19 may be amended by changing the boundaries of zones or by changing any other provisions thereof subject to the provisions of DCC 19.116.

- A. Text changes and legislative map changes may be proposed by the Board of County Commissioners on its own motion, by the motion of the Planning Commission, upon payment of a fee, by the application of a member of the public. Such changes shall be made pursuant to DCC 22.12 and ORS 215.110 and 215.060.***
- B. Any proposed quasi-judicial map amendment or change shall be handled in accordance with the applicable provisions of DCC Title 22.***

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments to DCC Title 19 are being made by the application of a member of the public as allowed by DCC 19.116.010(A). The amendments are proposed pursuant to DCC 22.12 Legislative Procedures, addressed below. The amendments are made pursuant to ORS 215.110, which provides that a planning commission and governing body may recommend and enact ordinances intended to implement the comprehensive plan. The Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan (DCCP), at Section 3.9 Destination Resort Policies, includes Policy 3.9.3(a)(1):

"Policy 3.9.3 Mapping for destination resort siting.

- a. To assure that resort development does not conflict with the objectives of other Statewide Planning Goals, destination resorts shall pursuant to Goal 8 not be sited in Deschutes County in the following areas:*
 - 1. within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;"*

The proposed amendments are made pursuant to ORS 215.110 and will implement DCCP Policy 3.9.3(a)(1). The amendments are also made pursuant to ORS 215.060, which provides that a county shall conduct one or more public hearings on actions on the comprehensive plan. Public hearings on the proposed amendments will be held by both the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

Staff confirms that the subject application appears to comply with the amendment process outlined above.

Section 19.116.020 Standards For Zone Change

The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall in all cases establish:

- A. That the change conforms with the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the change is consistent with the plan's intent to promote an orderly pattern and sequence of growth.***
- B. That the change will not interfere with existing development, development potential or value of other land in the vicinity of the proposed action.***
- C. That the change in classification for the subject property is consistent with the purpose and intent of the proposed zone classification.***
- D. That the change will result in the orderly and efficient extension or provision of public services. Also, that the change is consistent with the County's policy for provision of public facilities.***
- E. That there is proof of a change of circumstance or a mistake in the original zoning.***

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

No zone change is proposed as part of this application. This section is inapplicable.

Staff agrees with the applicant's statement.

Section 19.116.030 Record of Amendments

The signed copy of each amendment to the text of Title 19, including the legal description of all lands rezoned legislatively or quasi-judicially, shall be maintained on file in the office of the County Clerk. A record of such amendments shall be maintained in a form convenient for the use of the public by the Planning Director, including a map showing the area and date of all amendments hereto. The County Clerk shall keep the map of DCC Title 19 as originally enacted. Every five years after the enactment hereof, a map showing the cumulative amendments hereto for that period shall be filed with the County Clerk. In case of inconsistencies, the controlling record shall be first the original map filed with the County Clerk, and its five-year updates, if any. The Planning Director's map shall control as to map amendments not shown on the original for changes less than five years old.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

A signed copy of these amendments will be provided to the County Clerk. No lands will be rezoned by this application and the zoning map for Title 19 will not be amended.

Staff agrees with the applicant's statement.

Section 19.116.040 Resolution of Intent to Rezone

If, from the facts presented and findings and the report and recommendations of the Hearings Officer, as required by DCC 19.116.040, the County Commission determines that the public health, safety, welfare and convenience will be best served by a proposed change of zone, the County Commission may indicate its general approval in principal of the proposed rezoning by the adoption of a "resolution of intent to rezone." This resolution shall include any conditions, stipulations or limitations which the County Commission may feel necessary to require in the public interest as a prerequisite to final action, including those provisions which the County Commission may feel necessary to prevent speculative holding of property after rezoning. The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in said resolution, on the part of the applicant, shall make such a resolution a binding commitment on the County Commission. Such a resolution shall not be used to justify spot zoning or create unauthorized zoning categories by excluding uses otherwise permitted in the proposed zoning. Upon completion of compliance action by the applicant, the County Commission shall, by ordinance, effect such rezoning. The failure of the applicant to substantially meet any or all conditions, stipulations or limitations contained in a resolution of intent, including the time limit placed in the resolution, shall render said resolution null and void automatically and without notice, unless an extension is granted by the County Commission upon recommendation of the Hearings Officer.

- A. Content of Site Plan. Where a site plan is required pursuant to DCC 19.92, it shall include location of existing and proposed buildings, structures, accesses, off-street parking and loading spaces and landscaping; existing and proposed topography; mechanical roof facilities, if subject property is so oriented as to become part of the view from adjacent properties; architectural perspective, layout and all elevations drawn without exaggerations, except where noted, including locations, area and design of signs and all landscaping.***
- B. Resolution on Intent Binding. The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in the resolutions of intent on the part of the applicant shall make the resolution binding on the County Commission. Upon compliance with the resolution by the applicant, the County Commission shall, by ordinance, effect such reclassification.***

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these criteria in their submitted application materials:

No zone change is proposed as part of this application. This section is inapplicable.

Staff agrees with the applicant's statement.

CHAPTER 22.12, LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURES

Section 22.12.010.

Hearing Required

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by both the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners, and will include public hearings.

Staff agrees that this criterion will be met because a public hearing will be held before the Deschutes County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

Section 22.12.020, Notice

Notice

A. Published Notice

- 1. Notice of a legislative change shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county at least 10 days prior to each public hearing.**
- 2. The notice shall state the time and place of the hearing and contain a statement describing the general subject matter of the ordinance under consideration.**

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

This criterion will be met with notice to be published in the Bend Bulletin newspaper for the Planning Commission public hearing, and the Board of County Commissioners' public hearing.

Staff agrees that this criterion will be met by notice being published in *The Bend Bulletin* newspaper.

B. Posted Notice. Notice shall be posted at the discretion of the Planning Director and where necessary to comply with ORS 203.045.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Notice will be posted if determined to be necessary by the Planning Director.

Posted notice is only required under ORS 203.045(5)(a) under specific circumstances described in that section. No such posting is required in this case.

C. Individual notice. Individual notice to property owners, as defined in DCC 22.08.010(A), shall be provided at the discretion of the Planning Director, except as required by ORS 215.503.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Individual notice will be sent if determined to be necessary by the Planning Director. Given the proposed legislative amendments do not apply to any specific property, no individual notices are anticipated. The applicant conferred with County staff as to whether notice to affected property owners pursuant to ORS 215.203, also known as "Measure 56 notice," need be provided. Staff agreed in an email dated October 19, 2022 that this proposal "will not require Measure 56 notice as the proposed addition of language referencing state law is not a "change to the zoning" that would require M56 notice." Exhibit F

Ultimately, County staff (in coordination with County administration and legal counsel) found that the proposal would require individual notice pursuant to ORS 215.503 to provide ample public notice to affected properties and property owners about the subject proposal. The proposed amendments are legislative and do not apply to any specific property. In compliance with ORS 215.503, notice was sent to individual property owners who may be affected by the proposed amendments.

D. Media notice. Copies of the notice of hearing shall be transmitted to other newspapers published in Deschutes County.

FINDING: Notice was provided to the County public information official for wider media distribution. This criterion has been met.

Section 22.12.030 Initiation of Legislative Changes.

A legislative change may be initiated by application of individuals upon payment of required fees as well as by the Board of County Commissioners.

FINDING: The application was initiated by Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW), and the Deschutes County Planning Division has received the required fees. This criterion has been met.

Section 22.12.040. Hearings Body

A. The following shall serve as hearings or review body for legislative changes in this order:

- 1. The Planning Commission.***
- 2. The Board of County Commissioners.***

B. Any legislative change initiated by the Board of County Commissioners shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to action being taken by the Board of Commissioners.

FINDING: This criterion will be met because a public hearing will be held before the Deschutes County Planning Commission and subsequently the Board of County Commissioners.

Section 22.12.050 Final Decision

All legislative changes shall be adopted by ordinance

FINDING: The proposed legislative changes included in file no. 247-22-000835-TA will be implemented by ordinances if approved and adopted by the Board. This criterion will be met.

Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement: The amendments do not propose any changes to the County's citizen involvement program. Notice of the proposed amendments were provided to the *Bulletin* for each public hearing.

Goal 2: Land Use Planning: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goals, policies, and processes related to this application are included in the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan, Title 23 and Deschutes County Code, Title 19 and Title 22. Compliance with these processes, policies, and regulations are documented within this application. Goal 2 is met.

Staff notes that an Oregon Land Conservation and Development Department 35-day notice was initiated on January 11, 2023. Public hearings before both the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners will be held. This Findings document provides the applicant's basis for the proposed amendments.

Goal 3: Agricultural Lands: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goal 3 is to "preserve and maintain agricultural lands." No lands will be rezoned as part of this application. Some lands in the DRZ are designated Agriculture and zoned Exclusive Farm Use pursuant to Goal 3. The proposed amendments would reduce the amount of nonfarm residential development allowed on EFU land by ensuring certain lands in the DRZ conform with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 3 is met.

Adverse impacts to farming practices are not anticipated under these amendments and no such impacts have been identified in the record. The proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 3.

Goal 4: Forest Lands: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goal 4 is "to conserve forest lands[.]" No lands will be rezoned as part of this application. Some lands in the DRZ are designated Forest and zoned F1 or F2 pursuant to Goal 4. The proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development allowed on Forest zoned land by ensuring certain lands in the DRZ conform with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 4 is met.

Adverse impacts to forests and forest practices are not anticipated under these amendments and no such impacts have been identified in the record. The proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 4.

Goal 5: Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Similar to the previous two goals, the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development allowed on certain lands in the DRZ, ensuring conformance with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Some lands in the DRZ include inventoried Goal 5 resources, including mineral and aggregate resources, scenic views, riparian areas, floodplains, and wildlife habitat. The effect of the proposed amendments would be to provide greater protection for these resources, as the amount of potential residential development (a conflicting use) on certain lands in the DRZ would be reduced. In any event, the proposed amendments do not create or amend a Goal 5 resource list or and land use regulation adopted to protect a Goal 5 resource, they do not allow new uses that could be conflicting uses with a Goal 5 resource, and they do not amend an acknowledged UGB. OAR 660-023-0250(3). Goal 5 is met.

Goal 5 is to protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historical areas and open spaces. OAR 660-023-0250(3) states that local governments are not required to apply Goal 5 in consideration of a PAPA unless the PAPA affects a Goal 5 resource. The proposed amendment is not seeking to change any requirements in the Wildlife Area overlay zone which protects inventoried wildlife resources. This zone protects scenic resources through additional aesthetic requirements. The code provision will remain unchanged. Staff finds that the amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 5.

Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resources Quality: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments will likely not impact the quality of the air, water and land resources. If anything, the reduced potential for residential development on certain lands in the DRZ will benefit the quality of associated air, water, and land resources by reducing the potential for solid waste, water waste, noise and thermal pollution, air pollution, and industry-related contaminants on those resources. Goal 6 is met.

The proposed text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan policies or implementing regulations for compliance with Goal 6. Staff finds that the proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 6.

Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

To the extent that lands in the DRZ are in areas subject to natural disasters and hazards, the proposed amendments mitigate that risk by reducing the potential for residential development on certain lands in the DRZ, in accordance with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 7 is met.

The proposed text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan or implementing regulations regarding natural disasters and hazards. Staff finds that the proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 7.

Goal 8: Recreational Needs: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments are specifically intended to implement Goal 8, as described in the response to Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3, Resource Management, Section 3.9 Destination Resorts, Goal 1, above. Goal 8 is met.

The text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan or implementing regulations regarding recreational needs. Staff finds that the proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 8.

Goal 9: Economic Development: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goal 9 is only applicable to urban areas and therefore is not applicable here. Port of St. Helens v. Land Conservation & Development Comm'n, 165 Or App 487, 996 P2d 1014 (2000), rev den, 330 Or 363 (2000).

Goal 9 and its implementing regulations focus on economic analysis and economic development planning required in urban Comprehensive Plans to ensure there is adequate land available to realize economic growth and development opportunities. The proposed amendments apply to rural lands and do not propose to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Compliance is met.

Goal 10: Housing: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goal 10 is "to provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state" on "buildable lands for residential use." "Buildable lands" are defined in statute as "lands in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available and necessary for residential uses." ORS 197.295(1). "Buildable Lands" are described in administrative rule as "residentially designated land within the urban growth boundary, including both vacant and developed land likely to be redeveloped, that is suitable, available and necessary for residential uses." OAR 660-008-0005(2). The proposed amendments largely do not affect lands in urban and urbanizable areas inside urban growth boundaries, making Goal 10 inapplicable to the majority of lands in the DRZ that the proposed amendments would affect.

A small portion of lands inside the south and west portion of the City of Bend UGB, and in the north portion of the City of La Pine UGB, are also in the County's DRZ. To the extent that that these are "buildable lands for residential use" to which Goal 10 applies, the proposed amendments comply with Goal 10. The City of Bend, upon amending its UGB in 2016, adopted policies and Goal

10 findings into its comprehensive plan. One of those policies, at City of Bend Comprehensive Plan Policy 5-57 states that "Properties that are eligible for destination resort development will lose that eligibility upon inclusion into the UGB." Exhibit D (Chapter 5 of the Bend Comprehensive Plan, Housing). Therefore, any lands inside the City of Bend UGB are already ineligible for siting of destination resorts, and the proposed amendments do not affect the City's Goal 10 compliance. The proposed amendments also will not affect the City of La Pine's compliance with Goal 10. The La Pine comprehensive plan reports that, as of 2018, its UGB contains about "1284.4-acres of vacant or re-developable land to respond to a calculation of about 182 – acres of need." Exhibit E at 134-135 (La Pine Comprehensive Plan). The City's Goal 10 Housing policies and goals do not rely on destination resort development to meet the Goal. Additionally, ORS 197.445(7) requires a site of at least 20 acres for a destination resort, and the land zoned DRZ in the City of La Pine UGB is less than 20 acres. Goal 10 is met.

Adverse impacts to residential housing in the County are not anticipated under these amendments and no such impacts have been identified in the record. The proposed amendments appear to be consistent with Goal 10.

Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services: The proposed text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan or implementing regulations regarding public facilities and services.

Goal 12: Transportation: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

By restricting certain residential uses in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, the proposed amendments will reduce impacts to transportation facilities by lessening potential new trip generation in the rural county. This reduces the likelihood that transportation facilities could be significantly affected in Deschutes County. Goal 12 is met.

Goal 12 is to provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system. The proposed text amendments will not change the functional classification of any existing or planned transportation facility or standards implementing a functional classification system. Compliance with Goal 12 is met.

Goal 13: Energy Conservation: The proposed text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan or implementing regulations regarding energy conservation. Therefore, compliance with Goal 13 is established.

Goal 14: Urbanization: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

Goal 14 concerns the provision of urban and rural land uses to ensure efficient use of land and livable communities. The proposed amendments do not amend an urban growth boundary. Although Goal 8 allows urban land uses on rural land in destination resorts in certain circumstances, the proposed amendments are intended to ensure the DCC complies with Goal 8 and ORS 197.455, which limit the type of resort development that is allowed on certain lands near

certain urban growth boundaries. The effect of the amendments will be to promote Goal 14's distinction between urban and rural levels of development, pursuant to Goal 8 and statute. Goal 14 is met.

The proposed text amendments do not propose to change the County's Plan or implementing regulations regarding urbanization. Therefore, compliance with Goal 14 is established.

Goals 15 through 19 are not applicable to the proposed text amendments because the County does not contain these types of lands.

Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan

Chapter 1, Comprehensive Planning: The applicant did not provide a direct response to this criterion in their submitted burden of proof. This chapter sets the Goals and Policies of how the County will involve the community and conduct land use planning. As described above, the proposed regulations will be discussed at work sessions with the Board of County Commissioners, as well as to the Planning Commission, which is the County's official committee for public involvement. Both will conduct separate public hearings.

Section 1.3, Land Use Planning Policies. The applicant did not provide a direct response to this criterion in their submitted burden of proof. Goal 1 of this section is to "maintain an open and public land use process in which decisions are based on the objective evaluation of facts." Staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board will review the proposed text amendments.

Chapter 3, Resource Management

Section 3.9 Destination Resorts Goals and Policies

Goal 1: To provide for development of destination resorts in the County consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 8 in a manner that will be compatible with farm and forest uses, existing rural development, and in a manner that will maintain important natural features, such as habitat or threatened or endangered species, streams, rivers and significant wetlands.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this criterion in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments are specifically intended to provide for the development of destination resorts in Deschutes County consistent with Goal 8. Exhibit C. Goal 8 includes the same language as ORS 197.455(1)(a):

"Eligible Areas

(1) Destination resorts allowed under the provisions of this goal must be sited on lands mapped as eligible by the affected county. A map adopted by a county may not allow

destination resorts approved under the provisions of this goal to be sited in any of the following areas:

(a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;"

The Oregon legislature in adopting ORS 197.455(1)(a), and LCDC in adopting Goal 8, have decided that resorts within 24 air miles of certain urban growth boundaries are limited to residential uses only necessary for staff and management of a resort. The proposed amendments would ensure that destination resorts on lands mapped as eligible by Deschutes County, but a resort that includes residential uses for people other than staff and management of a resort could not be sited within 24 air miles of the Bend urban growth boundary.

Goal 2: To provide a process for the siting of destination resorts on rural lands that have been mapped by Deschutes County as eligible for this purpose.

Goal 3: To provide for the siting of destination resort facilities that enhances and diversifies the recreational opportunities and economy of Deschutes County.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to these goals in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments will not change the existing process for siting of destination resorts described in these two goals. The amendments also will not change the map of lands determined to be eligible by Deschutes County. What will change is the type of destination resort that could be sited through the County's existing process, in order to comply with Goal 8 and ORS 197.455(1)(a). Consistent with state law, recreational facilities will still be allowed in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, providing for continued enhancement and diversification of recreational opportunities.

Goal 4: To provide for development of destination resorts consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 12 in a manner that will ensure the resorts are supported by adequate transportation facilities.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this goal in their submitted application materials:

By restricting certain residential uses in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, the proposed amendments will reduce impacts to transportation facilities by lessening potential new trip generation in the rural county. This reduces the likelihood that transportation facilities could be significantly affected in Deschutes County, consistent with Goal 12.

Staff notes that there is no indication that the proposed amendments would result in adverse impacts to transportation facilities and no evidence in the record indicating the potential for such impacts. This goal appears to be met for the purposes of the subject application.

Policy 3.9.1: Destination resorts shall only be allowed within areas shown on the “Deschutes County Destination Resort Map” and when the resort complies with the requirements of Goal 8, ORS 197.435 to 197.457 and Deschutes County Code 18.113.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this policy in their submitted application materials:

Destination resorts will continue to only be allowed within areas shown on the “Deschutes County Destination Resort Map”. The proposed changes to the DCC will ensure that any such resorts comply with the requirements of Goal 8 and ORS 197.435 to 197.457. Goal 8 and ORS 197.455(1)(a) include the language limiting destination resorts with 24 air miles of certain UGBs that this proposed code amendment would implement.

Policy 3.9.2: Applications to amend the map will be collected and will be processed concurrently no sooner than 30 months from the date the map was previously adopted or amended.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this policy in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments are not an application to amend the Deschutes County Destination Resort Map. This policy is inapplicable.

Staff concurs that the subject application is for a legislative text amendment, and not for a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Policy 3.9.3: Mapping for destination resort siting

a. To assure that resort development does not conflict with the objectives of other Statewide Planning Goals, destination resorts shall pursuant to Goal 8 not be sited in Deschutes County in the following areas:

1). Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response to this policy in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments are intended specifically to implement and conform the Deschutes County Code to this comprehensive plan section. Upon adoption of the proposed amendments, destination resorts shall, pursuant to Goal 8, not be sited in Deschutes County within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. The proposed amendments comply with this policy.

Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.455

ORS 197.455(1)

A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:

- (a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response in their submitted application materials:

Similar to the response to Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.9.3, above, the proposed amendments are intended specifically to implement and conform the Deschutes County Code to this statute. Upon adoption of the proposed amendments, destination resorts may not be allowed to be sited in Deschutes County within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. The proposed amendments comply with this statute.

Staff concurs that the proposed amendment language is derived directly from ORS 197.455(1)(a) and would limit the residential uses allowed for newly-proposed destination resorts within 24 air miles of the City of Bend's Urban Growth Boundary.

- (b) (A) On a site with 50 or more contiguous acres of unique or prime farmland identified and mapped by the United States Natural Resources Conservation Service, or its predecessor agency.
 (B) On a site within three miles of a high value crop area unless the resort complies with the requirements of ORS 197.445 (6) in which case the resort may not be closer to a high value crop area than one-half mile for each 25 unites of overnight lodging or fraction thereof.
 (c) On predominantly Cubic Foot Site Class 1 or 2 forestlands as determined by the State Forestry Department, which are not subject to an approved goal exception.
 (d) In the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area as defined by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act, P.L. 99-663.
 (e) In an especially sensitive big game habitat area:
 (A) As determined by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife in July 1984, and in additional especially sensitive big game habitat areas designated by a county in an acknowledged comprehensive plan; or
 (B) If the State Fish and Wildlife Commission amends the 1984 determination with respect to an entire county and the county amends its comprehensive plan to reflect the commission's subsequent determination, as designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.
 (f) On a site which the lands are predominantly classified as being in Fire Regime Condition Class 3, unless the county approves a wildfire protection plan that demonstrates the site can be developed without being at a high overall risk of fire.

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response in their submitted application materials:

The proposed amendments will not affect Deschutes County's compliance with the remaining sections of ORS 197.455(1), making these criteria inapplicable.

ORS 197.455(2)

In carrying out subsection (1) of this section, a county shall adopt, as part of its comprehensive plan, a map consisting of eligible lands within the county. The map must be based on reasonably available information and may be amended pursuant to ORS 197.610 (Submission of proposed comprehensive plan or land use regulation changes to Department of Land Conservation and Development) to 197.625 (Acknowledgment of comprehensive plan or land use regulation changes), but not more frequently than once every 30 months. The county shall develop a process for collecting and processing concurrently all map amendments made within a 30-month planning period. A map adopted pursuant to this section shall be the sole basis for determining whether tracts of land are eligible for destination resort siting pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site).

FINDING: The applicant offers the following response in their submitted application materials:

Deschutes County's existing map of lands eligible for destination resorts will not be amended as part of this application. This criterion is inapplicable.

Staff concurs that the subject application is for a legislative text amendment, and not for a Comprehensive Plan amendment.



Land Use Application

Item #IV.1.

DESCH

117 NW Lafayette Avenue
PO Box 6005
Bend, OR 97703
541-388-6575

Code Change - Minor

247-22-000835-TA

www.deschutes.org/cd

cdd-webmaster@deschutes.org

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Type of Application: Code Change - Minor

Description of Work: Text Amendment 18.113 and 19.106

LOCATION INFORMATION

Property Address:

117 Nw Lafayette Ave, Bend, OR 97703

Parcel:

171232AC03600 - Primary

Owner:

DESCHUTES COUNTY

Address:

PO BOX 6005
BEND OR 97708-6005

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant:

Central Oregon Landwatch

Business Name:

Central Oregon Landwatch

Address:

City:

State:

Zip

APPLICATION FEES

Fee Description

Minor Code Changes

Quantity

1.00 Qty

Amount

\$6,660.00

Total Fees:

\$6,660.00



Transaction Receipt
Record ID: 247-22-000835-TA
IVR Number: 247012358270

Deschutes County Item #IV.1.1
 Office: Bend
 117 NW Lafayette Ave
 PO Box 6005
 Bend, OR 97708
 541-388-6575
 cdd-webmaster@deschutes.org

Receipt Number: 493512
Receipt Date: 10/21/22

www.deschutes.org/cd

Worksite address: 117 NW LAFAYETTE AVE, BEND, OR 97703

Parcel: 171232AC03600

Fees Paid

| Transaction date | Units | Description | Account code | Fee amount | Paid amount |
|------------------|----------|--------------------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| 10/21/22 | 1.00 Qty | Minor Code Changes | 2956150 341301 | \$6,660.00 | \$6,660.00 |

Payment Method: Check number: 0834 Payer: Central Oregon LandWatch Payment Amount: \$6,660.00

Cashier: Rachel Vickers

Receipt Total: \$6,660.00



247-22-000835-TA

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PLAN/ZONE/TEXT AMENDMENT

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| ZONE MAP AMENDMENT: _____ FEE: _____ | PLAN MAP AMENDMENT: _____ FEE: _____ | TEXT AMENDMENT: <u>X</u> FEE: _____ |
|---|---|--|

Applicant's Name (print): Central Oregon LandWatch Phone: (541) 647-2930
Mailing Address: 2843 NW Lolo Drive Suite 200 City/State/Zip: Bend, Oregon 97703
Property Owner's Name (if different): _____ Phone: (____) _____
Mailing Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____
Property Description: Township n/a Range n/a Section n/a Tax Lot n/a
Lot of Record? (state reason): n/a
Current Zoning: n/a Proposed Zoning: n/a
Current Plan Designation: n/a Proposed Designation: n/a
Applicable State Goals: Goals 1-14 Exception Proposed? Yes X No
Size of Affected Area: n/a Acres

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS APPLICATION:

1. Complete this application form including the appropriate signatures. If color exhibits are submitted, black and white copies with captions or shading delineating the color areas shall also be provided.
2. Include a detailed statement describing the proposal and how it meets all requirements of the appropriate State rules and statutes, and County codes and Comprehensive Plan policies. Text amendment applications must include the proposed language and the basis for the change.
3. If multiple properties are involved in this application, then identify each property on a separate page and follow with the property owners' signatures.
4. Submit the correct application fee.
5. Submit a copy of the current deed(s) for the property(ies).

A PRE-APPLICATION APPOINTMENT IS REQUIRED FOR ALL AMENDMENTS

Applicant's Signature: Rory Isbell Date: 10/21/22
Property Owner's Signature (if different)*: _____ Date: _____
Agent's Name (if applicable): Rory Isbell Phone: (541) 647-2930
Mailing Address: 2843 NW Lolo Drive Suite 200 City/State/Zip: Bend, Oregon 97703

***If this application is not signed by the property owner, a letter authorizing signature by the applicant must be attached. By signing this application, the applicant understands and agrees that Deschutes County may require a deposit for hearings officers' fees prior to the application being deemed complete; and if the application is heard by a hearings officer, the applicant will be responsible for the actual costs of the hearings officer.**

**APPLICANT'S WRITTEN NARRATIVE
TEXT AMENDMENT TO DESTINATION RESORTS ZONE – DRZ**

APPLICANT: Central Oregon LandWatch
2843 NW Lolo Drive, Suite 200
Bend, Oregon 97703
(541) 647-2930

ATTORNEY: Rory Isbell
Staff Attorney
Central Oregon LandWatch
2843 NW Lolo Drive, Suite 200
Bend, Oregon 97703
(541) 647-2930

SUBJECT PROPERTY: Destination Resort Zone

ZONING: Destination Resort Zone – DRZ

REQUEST: Make certain amendments to Deschutes County’s DRZ to comply with ORS 197.455(1)(a), which limits the type of destination resort allowed within 24 air miles of certain urban growth boundaries.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES:

Title 18, County Zoning

Title 19, Bend Urban Growth Boundary Zoning Ordinance

Title 22, Deschutes County Development Procedures Ordinance

Title 23, Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan

ORS 197.455

OAR 660, Division 15, the Statewide Planning Goals

BASIC FINDINGS:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO DCC 18.113: The applicant proposes the following amendments to the text of DCC Chapter 18.113. The proposed changes would not remove any text, and would add the following text indicated in **bold**:

“18.113.030 Uses In Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of and are intended to serve persons at the destination resort pursuant to DCC 19.106.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

[...]

C. Residential accommodations:

- 1. Single-family dwellings;
- 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
- 3. Condominiums;
- 4. Townhouses;
- 5. Living quarters for employees;
- 6. Time-share projects.
- 7. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.”**

[...]

I. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.”

“DCC 18.113.060 Standards for Destination Resorts

The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

[...]

M. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. All other standards of this section continue to apply.”

In addition to these changes to DCC Chapter 18.113, identical amendments would be made to DCC Chapter 19.106 Destination Resorts for the Bend Urban Growth Boundary Zoning Ordinance:

“19.106.030 Uses In Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of and are intended to serve persons at the destination resort pursuant to DCC 19.106.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

[...]

C. Residential accommodations:

- 1. Single-family dwellings;
- 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
- 3. Condominiums;
- 4. Townhouses;
- 5. Living quarters for employees;
- 6. Time-share projects.

7. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.”

[...]

I. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.”

“DCC 19.106.060 Standards for Destination Resorts

The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

[...]

J. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. All other standards of this section continue to apply.”

These proposed amendments are also included at **Exhibit F**. The purpose of these proposed changes to DCC 18.113 and DCC 19.106 is to conform the DCC to state law. The Oregon Revised Statutes, at ORS 197.455(1)(a), limit the siting of destination resorts within 24 air miles of certain urban growth boundaries:

“(1) A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:

- (a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.”

The population of the City of Bend has surpassed 100,000 people. This is confirmed by applicant’s **Exhibit A** and **Exhibit B**. Exhibit A is the Portland State University Population Research Center’s “2021 Annual Oregon Population Report Tables,” which at page 10 shows a City of Bend population of 100,922 in the year 2021. Exhibit B is the U.S. Census “Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021,” which shows a 2021 estimate for “Bend city, Oregon” of 102,059. These population data reflect population inside the Bend city limits. The Bend UGB includes a larger geographic area than the city limits and has a greater population. To illustrate, Figure 1 below is a map image taken from Deschutes County’s Dial website. The blue hash area is the Bend UGB, while the solid green area is the Bend city limits:



Figure 1. Bend UGB and Bend city limits.

The change in factual circumstances wherein the City of Bend population now exceeds 100,000 results in a disparity between the DCC and ORS 197.455. The DCC currently does not reflect the statute's limitation on the type of destination resort that may be sited in Deschutes County now that ORS 197.455(1)(a) is relevant to Deschutes County. The proposed amendments would conform the DCC to ORS 197.455(1)(a) by recognizing the statute's limitation on the type of destination resort that may be sited within 24 air miles of the City of Bend's UGB.

CONCLUSIONARY FINDINGS:

A. COMPLIANCE WITH DCC CHAPTER 18 COUNTY ZONING

18.136.010 Amendments

DCC Title 18 may be amended as set forth in DCC 18.136. The procedures for text or legislative map changes shall be as set forth in DCC 22.12. A request by a property owner for a quasi judicial map amendment shall be accomplished by filing an application on forms provided by the Planning Department and shall be subject to applicable procedures of DCC Title 22.

RESPONSE: The applicant proposes amendments to DCC Title 18 as set forth in DCC 18.136 and will follow procedures for text changes as set forth in DCC 22.12. Because the proposed amendments would apply to the many properties within 24 air miles of the City of Bend UGB, the request is for a legislative text amendment and not a quasi-judicial map amendment.

Determining whether a land use decision is legislative or quasi-judicial requires an inquiry into three factors: “(1) [Whether] the process is bound to result in a decision, (2) preexisting criteria, and (3) closely circumscribed factual situation or a relatively small number of persons.” *Heitsch v. City of Salem*, 65 Or LUBA 187, 193 (2012) (citing *Strawberry Hill 4 -Wheelers v. Board of Comm’rs of Benton County*, 287 Or 591, 601 P2d 769 (1977)). The third factor asks whether “the land use consequences are disproportionately concentrated on a relatively small pool of persons, as opposed to a larger region or the general population.” *Van Dyke v. Yamhill County*, ___ Or LUBA ___, slip op. at 4, LUBA No. 2018-061 (December 20, 2018).

This application requests a legislative amendment. As to the first factor, this request is likely, although not bound, to result in a decision as to whether to amend the DCC as proposed herein. There are no statutory timelines under which the County must make a decision on a legislative text amendment application. Both the second and third factors clearly indicate that the proposed amendments are legislative. The County lacks preexisting criteria for text amendments, as opposed to specific standards and criteria applicable to quasi-judicial map amendments found at DCC 18.136.020. Most instructive is the third factor. The amendments involve a large number of persons on the thousands of properties within 24 air miles of the City of Bend UGB, and lack a circumscribed factual situation pertaining to one or a handful of properties. The land use consequences of the proposed amendments would be proportionately distributed on a large pool of people across this large region of Deschutes County.

18.136.020 Rezoning Standards

The applicant for a quasi-judicial rezoning must establish that the public interest is best served by rezoning the property. Factors to be demonstrated by the applicant are:

- 1. That the change conforms with the Comprehensive Plan, and the change is consistent with the plan's introductory statement and goals.**
- 2. That the change in classification for the subject property is consistent with the purpose and intent of the proposed zone classification.**
- 3. That changing the zoning will presently serve the public health, safety and welfare considering the following factors:**
 - 1. The availability and efficiency of providing necessary public services and facilities.**
 - 2. The impacts on surrounding land use will be consistent with the specific goals and policies contained within the Comprehensive Plan.**

4. **That there has been a change in circumstances since the property was last zoned, or a mistake was made in the zoning of the property in question.**

RESPONSE: As discussed above in the response to DCC 18.136.010, the proposed amendments are legislative and not quasi-judicial, and this section does not apply.

18.136.030 Resolution Of Intent To Rezone

1. **If from the facts presented and findings and the report and recommendations of the Hearing Officer, as required by this Section, the County Commission determines that the public health, safety, welfare and convenience will be best served by a proposed change of zone, the County Commission may indicate its general approval in principal of the proposed rezoning by the adoption of a "resolution of intent to rezone." This resolution shall include any conditions, stipulations or limitations which the County Commission may feel necessary to require in the public interest as a prerequisite to final action, including those provisions that the County Commission may feel necessary to prevent speculative holding of property after rezoning. Such a resolution shall not be used to justify "spot zoning" or to create unauthorized zoning categories by excluding uses otherwise permitted in the proposed zoning.**
2. **The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in the resolution on the part of the applicant shall make such a resolution a binding commitment on the Board of County Commissioners. Upon completion of compliance action by the applicant, the Board shall, by ordinance, effect such rezoning. The failure of the applicant to substantially meet any or all conditions, stipulations or limitations contained in a resolution of intent, including any time limit placed in the resolution, shall render the resolution null and void automatically and without notice, unless an extension is granted by the Board.**
3. **Content of Site Plan. Where a site plan is required pursuant to Chapter 19.92, it shall include location of existing and proposed buildings, structures, accesses, off street parking and loading spaces and landscaping; existing and proposed topography; mechanical roof facilities, if subject property is so oriented as to become part of the view from adjacent properties; architectural perspective, layout and all elevations drawn without exaggerations, except where noted, including locations, area and design of signs and all landscaping.**

RESPONSE: This section applies to quasi-judicial rezoning of property. As discussed above in the response to DCC 18.136.010, the proposed amendments are legislative and not quasi-judicial, and they do not propose rezoning any property. This section does not apply.

18.136.040 Record Of Amendments

All amendments to the text or map of DCC Title 18 shall be filed with the County Clerk.

RESPONSE: Upon adoption, the proposed amendments will be filed with the County Clerk.

B. COMPLIANCE WITH DCC CHAPTER 19 TITLE 19, BEND URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY ZONING ORDINANCE

19.116.010 Amendments

DCC Title 19 may be amended by changing the boundaries of zones or by changing any other provisions thereof subject to the provisions of DCC 19.116.

- A. Text changes and legislative map changes may be proposed by the Board of County Commissioners on its own motion, by the motion of the Planning Commission, upon payment of a fee, by the application of a member of the public. Such changes shall be made pursuant to DCC 22.12 and ORS 215.110 and 215.060.**
- B. Any proposed quasi-judicial map amendment or change shall be handled in accordance with the applicable provisions of DCC Title 22.**

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments to DCC Title 19 are being made by the application of a member of the public as allowed by DCC 19.116.010(A). The amendments are proposed pursuant to DCC 22.12 Legislative Procedures, addressed below. The amendments are made pursuant to ORS 215.110, which provides that a planning commission and governing body may recommend and enact ordinances intended to implement the comprehensive plan. The Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan (DCCP), at Section 3.9 Destination Resort Policies, includes Policy 3.9.3(a)(1):

“Policy 3.9.3 Mapping for destination resort siting.

- a. To assure that resort development does not conflict with the objectives of other Statewide Planning Goals, destination resorts shall pursuant to Goal 8 not be sited in Deschutes County in the following areas:
 - 1. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;”

The proposed amendments are made pursuant to ORS 215.110 and will implement DCCP Policy 3.9.3(a)(1). The amendments are also made pursuant to ORS 215.060, which provides that a county shall conduct one or more public hearings on actions on the comprehensive plan. Public hearings on the proposed amendments will be held by both the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

19.116.020 Standards For Zone Change

The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall in all cases establish:

- 1. That the change conforms with the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the change is consistent with the plan's intent to promote an orderly pattern and sequence of growth.**
- 2. That the change will not interfere with existing development, development potential or value of other land in the vicinity of the proposed action.**

3. That the change in classification for the subject property is consistent with the purpose and intent of the proposed zone classification.
4. That the change will result in the orderly and efficient extension or provision of public services. Also, that the change is consistent with the County's policy for provision of public facilities.
5. That there is proof of a change of circumstance or a mistake in the original zoning.

RESPONSE: No zone change is proposed as part of this application. This section is inapplicable.

19.116.030 Record Of Amendments

The signed copy of each amendment to the text of Title 19, including the legal description of all lands rezoned legislatively or quasi-judicially, shall be maintained on file in the office of the County Clerk. A record of such amendments shall be maintained in a form convenient for the use of the public by the Planning Director, including a map showing the area and date of all amendments hereto. The County Clerk shall keep the map of DCC Title 19 as originally enacted. Every five years after the enactment hereof, a map showing the cumulative amendments hereto for that period shall be filed with the County Clerk. In case of inconsistencies, the controlling record shall be first the original map filed with the County Clerk, and its five-year updates, if any. The Planning Director's map shall control as to map amendments not shown on the original for changes less than five years old.

RESPONSE: A signed copy of these amendments will be provided to the County Clerk. No lands will be rezoned by this application and the zoning map for Title 19 will not be amended.

19.116.040 Resolution Of Intent To Rezone

If, from the facts presented and findings and the report and recommendations of the Hearings Officer, as required by DCC 19.116.040, the County Commission determines that the public health, safety, welfare and convenience will be best served by a proposed change of zone, the County Commission may indicate its general approval in principal of the proposed rezoning by the adoption of a "resolution of intent to rezone." This resolution shall include any conditions, stipulations or limitations which the County Commission may feel necessary to require in the public interest as a prerequisite to final action, including those provisions which the County Commission may feel necessary to prevent speculative holding of property after rezoning. The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in said resolution, on the part of the applicant, shall make such a resolution a binding commitment on the County Commission. Such a resolution shall not be used to justify spot zoning or create unauthorized zoning categories by excluding uses otherwise permitted in the proposed zoning. Upon completion of compliance action by the applicant, the County Commission shall, by ordinance, effect such rezoning. The failure of the applicant to substantially meet any or all conditions, stipulations or limitations contained in a resolution of intent, including the time limit placed in the resolution, shall render said resolution null and void

automatically and without notice, unless an extension is granted by the County Commission upon recommendation of the Hearings Officer.

A. Content of Site Plan. Where a site plan is required pursuant to DCC 19.92, it shall include location of existing and proposed buildings, structures, accesses, off-street parking and loading spaces and landscaping; existing and proposed topography; mechanical roof facilities, if subject property is so oriented as to become part of the view from adjacent properties; architectural perspective, layout and all elevations drawn without exaggerations, except where noted, including locations, area and design of signs and all landscaping.

B. Resolution on Intent Binding. The fulfillment of all conditions, stipulations and limitations contained in the resolutions of intent on the part of the applicant shall make the resolution binding on the County Commission. Upon compliance with the resolution by the applicant, the County Commission shall, by ordinance, effect such reclassification.

RESPONSE: No zone change is proposed as part of this application. This section is inapplicable.

C. COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 22, DESCHUTES COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES ORDINANCE

Chapter 2212 Legislative Procedures

22.12.010 Hearing Required

No legislative change shall be adopted without review by the Planning Commission and a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners. Public hearings before the Planning Commission shall be set at the discretion of the Planning Director, unless otherwise required by state law.

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will be reviewed by both the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners, and will include public hearings.

22.12.020 Notice

A. Published Notice.

1. Notice of a legislative change shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county at least 10 days prior to each public hearing.
2. The notice shall state the time and place of the hearing and contain a statement describing the general subject matter of the ordinance under consideration.

RESPONSE: This criterion will be met with notice to be published in the Bend Bulletin newspaper for the Planning Commission public hearing, and the Board of County Commissioners' public hearing.

B. Posted Notice. Notice shall be posted at the discretion of the Planning Director and where necessary to comply with ORS 203.045.

RESPONSE: Notice will be posted if determined to be necessary by the Planning Director.

- C. Individual Notice. Individual notice to property owners, as defined in DCC 22.08.010(A), shall be provided at the discretion of the Planning Director, except as required by ORS 215.503.**

RESPONSE: Individual notice will be sent if determined to be necessary by the Planning Director. Given the proposed legislative amendments do not apply to any specific property, no individual notices are anticipated. The applicant conferred with County staff as to whether notice to affected property owners pursuant to ORS 215.203, also known as “Measure 56 notice,” need be provided. Staff agreed in an email dated October 19, 2022 that this proposal “will not require Measure 56 notice as the proposed addition of language referencing state law is not a “change to the zoning” that would require M56 notice.” **Exhibit F.**

- D. Media Notice. Copies of the notice of hearing shall be transmitted to other newspapers published in Deschutes County.**

RESPONSE: Notice of the proposed legislative changes will be published in a newspaper

22.12.030 Initiation Of Legislative Changes

A legislative change may be initiated by application of individuals upon payment of required fees as well as by the Board of Commissioners or the Planning Commission.

RESPONSE: The applicant, an individual 501(c)(3) organization, initiated the proposed legislative changes including payment of required fees.

22.12.040 Hearings Body

- 1. The following shall serve as hearings or review body for legislative changes in this order:

 - 1. The Planning Commission.**
 - 2. The Board of County Commissioners.****
- 2. Any legislative change initiated by the Board of County Commissioners shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to action being taken by the Board of Commissioners.**

RESPONSE: The proposed legislative changes will be reviewed by both the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

22.12.050 Final Decision

All legislative changes shall be adopted by ordinance.

RESPONSE: The proposed legislative changes will be adopted by ordinance.

22.12.060 Corrections

The County's comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances, subdivision ordinance, and development procedures ordinance may be corrected by order of the Board of County Commissioners to cure editorial and clerical errors.

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments are not to correct editorial or clerical errors and will be adopted by ordinance and not by order.

D. COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 23, DESCHUTES COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Chapter 3, Resource Management

Section 3.9 Destination Resorts

Goals and Policies

Goal 1 To provide for development of destination resorts in the County consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 8 in a manner that will be compatible with farm and forest uses, existing rural development, and in a manner that will maintain important natural features, such as habitat of threatened or endangered species, streams, rivers and significant wetlands.

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments are specifically intended to provide for the development of destination resorts in Deschutes County consistent with Goal 8. **Exhibit C.** Goal 8 includes the same language as ORS 197.455(1)(a):

“Eligible Areas

(1) Destination resorts allowed under the provisions of this goal must be sited on lands mapped as eligible by the affected county. A map adopted by a county may not allow destination resorts approved under the provisions of this goal to be sited in any of the following areas:

(a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;”

The Oregon legislature in adopting ORS 197.455(1)(a), and LCDC in adopting Goal 8, have decided that resorts within 24 air miles of certain urban growth boundaries are limited to residential uses only necessary for staff and management of a resort. The proposed amendments would ensure that destination resorts on lands mapped as eligible by Deschutes County comply with Goal 8. Resorts could still be sited on lands mapped as eligible by Deschutes County, but a resort that includes residential uses for people other than staff and management of a resort could not be sited within 24 air miles of the Bend urban growth boundary.

Goal 2 To provide a process for the siting of destination resorts on rural lands that have been mapped by Deschutes County as eligible for this purpose.

Goal 3 To provide for the siting of destination resort facilities that enhances and diversifies the recreational opportunities and economy of Deschutes County.

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will not change the existing process for siting of destination resorts described in these two goals. The amendments also will not change the map of lands determined to be eligible by Deschutes County. What will change is the type of destination resort that could be sited through the County's existing process, in order to comply with Goal 8 and ORS 197.455(1)(a). Consistent with state law, recreational facilities will still be allowed in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, providing for continued enhancement and diversification of recreational opportunities.

Goal 4 To provide for development of destination resorts consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 12 in a manner that will ensure the resorts are supported by adequate transportation facilities.

RESPONSE: By restricting certain residential uses in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, the proposed amendments will reduce impacts to transportation facilities by lessening potential new trip generation in the rural county. This reduces the likelihood that transportation facilities could be significantly affected in Deschutes County, consistent with Goal 12.

Policy 3.9.1 Destination resorts shall only be allowed within areas shown on the "Deschutes County Destination Resort Map" and when the resort complies with the requirements of Goal 8, ORS 197.435 to 197.467, and Deschutes County Code 18.113.

RESPONSE: Destination resorts will continue to only be allowed within areas shown on the "Deschutes County Destination Resort Map." The proposed changes to the DCC will ensure that any such resorts comply with the requirements of Goal 8 and ORS 197.435 to 197.457. Goal 8 and ORS 197.455(1)(a) include the language limiting destination resorts with 24 air miles of certain UGBs that this proposed code amendment would implement.

Policy 3.9.2 Applications to amend the map will be collected and will be processed concurrently no sooner than 30 months from the date the map was previously adopted or amended.

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments are not an application to amend the Deschutes County Destination Resort Map. This policy is inapplicable.

Policy 3.9.3 Mapping for destination resort siting.
a. To assure that resort development does not conflict with the objectives of other Statewide Planning Goals, destination resorts shall pursuant to Goal 8 not be sited in Deschutes County in the following areas:

1. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments are intended specifically to implement and conform the Deschutes County Code to this comprehensive plan section. Upon adoption of the proposed amendments, destination resorts shall, pursuant to Goal 8, not be sited in Deschutes County within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. The proposed amendments comply with this policy.

E. COMPLIANCE WITH ORS 197.455

ORS 197.455(1)

A destination resort may be sited only on lands mapped as eligible for destination resort siting by the affected county. The county may not allow destination resorts approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site) to be sited in any of the following areas:

- (a) **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**

RESPONSE: Similar to the response to Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.9.3, above the proposed amendments are intended specifically to implement and conform the Deschutes County Code to this statute. Upon adoption of the proposed amendments, destination resorts may not be allowed to be sited in Deschutes County within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. The proposed amendments comply with this statute.

- (b) (A) **On a site with 50 or more contiguous acres of unique or prime farmland identified and mapped by the United States Natural Resources Conservation Service, or its predecessor agency.**
(B) **On a site within three miles of a high value crop area unless the resort complies with the requirements of [ORS 197.445 \(Destination resort criteria\)](#) (6) in which case the resort may not be closer to a high value crop area than one-half mile for each 25 units of overnight lodging or fraction thereof.**
- (c) **On predominantly Cubic Foot Site Class 1 or 2 forestlands as determined by the State Forestry Department, which are not subject to an approved goal exception.**
- (d) **In the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area as defined by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act, P.L. 99-663.**

- (e) **In an especially sensitive big game habitat area:**
 - (A) **As determined by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife in July 1984, and in additional especially sensitive big game habitat areas designated by a county in an acknowledged comprehensive plan; or**
 - (B) **If the State Fish and Wildlife Commission amends the 1984 determination with respect to an entire county and the county amends its comprehensive plan to reflect the commission's subsequent determination, as designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.**
- (f) **On a site in which the lands are predominantly classified as being in Fire Regime Condition Class 3, unless the county approves a wildfire protection plan that demonstrates the site can be developed without being at a high overall risk of fire.**

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will not affect Deschutes County's compliance with the remaining sections of ORS 197.455(1), making these criteria inapplicable.

ORS 197.455(2)

In carrying out subsection (1) of this section, a county shall adopt, as part of its comprehensive plan, a map consisting of eligible lands within the county. The map must be based on reasonably available information and may be amended pursuant to ORS 197.610 (Submission of proposed comprehensive plan or land use regulation changes to Department of Land Conservation and Development) to 197.625 (Acknowledgment of comprehensive plan or land use regulation changes), but not more frequently than once every 30 months. The county shall develop a process for collecting and processing concurrently all map amendments made within a 30-month planning period. A map adopted pursuant to this section shall be the sole basis for determining whether tracts of land are eligible for destination resort siting pursuant to ORS 197.435 (Definitions for ORS 197.435 to 197.467) to 197.467 (Conservation easement to protect resource site).

RESPONSE: Deschutes County's existing map of lands eligible lands for destination resorts will not be amended as part of this application. This criterion is inapplicable.

F. COMPLIANCE WITH OAR 660, DIVISION 15, THE STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS

Goal 1 Citizen Involvement

RESPONSE: Deschutes County Planning Division will provide notice of the application to the public through notice of the public hearings in the "Bend Bulletin" newspaper. The public hearings on this application will provide the opportunity for any resident to participate in the land use process. Goal 1 is met.

Goal 2 Land Use Planning

RESPONSE: Goals, policies, and processes related to this application are included in the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan, Title 23, and Deschutes County Code, Title 19 and Title 22. Compliance with these processes, policies, and regulations are documented within this application. Goal 2 is met.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands

RESPONSE: Goal 3 is “to preserve and maintain agricultural lands.” No lands will be rezoned as part of this application. Some lands in the DRZ are designated Agriculture and zoned Exclusive Farm Use pursuant to Goal 3. The proposed amendments would reduce the amount of nonfarm residential development allowed on EFU land by ensuring certain lands in the DRZ conform with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 3 is met.

Goal 4 Forest Lands

RESPONSE: Goal 4 is “to conserve forest lands[.]” No lands will be rezoned as part of this application. Some lands in the DRZ are designated Forest and zoned F1 or F2 pursuant to Goal 4. The proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development allowed on Forest zoned land by ensuring certain lands in the DRZ conform with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 4 is met.

Goal 5 Open Spaces, Scenic and History Areas and Natural Resources

RESPONSE: Similar to the previous two goals, the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development allowed on certain lands in the DRZ, ensuring conformance with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Some lands in the DRZ include inventoried Goal 5 resources, including mineral and aggregate resources, scenic views, riparian areas, floodplains, and wildlife habitat. The effect of the proposed amendments would be to provide greater protection for these resources, as the amount of potential residential development (a conflicting use) on certain lands in the DRZ would be reduced. In any event, the proposed amendments do not create or amend a Goal 5 resource list or and land use regulation adopted to protect a Goal 5 resource, they do not allow new uses that could be conflicting uses with a Goal 5 resource, and they do not amend an acknowledged UGB. OAR 660-023-0250(3). Goal 5 is met.

Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resources Quality

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will likely not impact the quality of the air, water and land resources. If anything, the reduced potential for residential development on certain lands in the DRZ will benefit the quality of associated air, water, and land resources by reducing the potential for solid waste, water waste, noise and thermal pollution, air pollution, and industry-related contaminants on those resources. Goal 6 is met.

Goal 7 Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards

RESPONSE: To the extent that lands in the DRZ are in areas subject to natural disasters and hazards, the proposed amendments mitigate that risk by reducing the potential for residential development on certain lands in the DRZ, in accordance with ORS 197.455(1) and Goal 8. Goal 7 is met.

Goal 8 Recreational Needs

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments are specifically intended to implement Goal 8, as described in the response to Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3, Resource Management, Section 3.9 Destination Resorts, Goal 1, above. Goal 8 is met.

Goal 9 Economy of the State

RESPONSE: Goal 9 is only applicable to urban areas and therefore is not applicable here. *Port of St. Helens v. Land Conservation & Development Comm'n*, 165 Or App 487, 996 P2d 1014 (2000), *rev den*, 330 Or 363 (2000).

Goal 10 Housing

RESPONSE: Goal 10 is “to provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state” on “buildable lands for residential use.” “Buildable lands” are defined in statute as “lands in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available and necessary for residential uses.” ORS 197.295(1). “Buildable Lands” are described in administrative rule as “residentially designated land within the urban growth boundary, including both vacant and developed land likely to be redeveloped, that is suitable, available and necessary for residential uses.” OAR 660-008-0005(2). The proposed amendments largely do not affect lands in urban and urbanizable areas inside urban growth boundaries, making Goal 10 inapplicable to the majority of lands in the DRZ that the proposed amendments would affect.

A small portion of lands inside the south and west portions of the City of Bend UGB, and in the north portion of the City of La Pine UGB, are also in the County’s DRZ. To the extent that that these are “buildable lands for residential use” to which Goal 10 applies, the proposed amendments comply with Goal 10. The City of Bend, upon amending its UGB in 2016, adopted policies and Goal 10 findings into its comprehensive plan. One of those policies, at City of Bend Comprehensive Plan Policy 5-57 states that “Properties that are eligible for destination resort development will lose that eligibility upon inclusion into the UGB.” **Exhibit D** (Chapter 5 of the Bend Comprehensive Plan, Housing). Therefore, any lands inside the City of Bend UGB are already ineligible for siting of destination resorts, and the proposed amendments do not affect the City’s Goal 10 compliance. The proposed amendments also will not affect the City of La Pine’s compliance with Goal 10. The La Pine comprehensive plan reports that, as of 2018, its UGB contains about “1284.4-acres of vacant or re-developable land to respond to a calculation of about 182 – acres of need.” **Exhibit E** at 134-135 (La Pine Comprehensive Plan). The City’s Goal 10 Housing policies and goals do not rely on destination resort development to meet the Goal. Additionally, ORS 197.445(7) requires a site of at least 20 acres for a destination resort, and the land zoned DRZ in the City of La Pine UGB is less than 20 acres. Goal 10 is met.

Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will have no adverse effect on the provision of public facilities and services. Goal 11 is met.

Goal 12 Transportation

RESPONSE: By restricting certain residential uses in destination resorts within 24 air miles of the Bend UGB, the proposed amendments will reduce impacts to transportation facilities by lessening potential new trip generation in the rural county. This reduces the likelihood that transportation facilities could be significantly affected in Deschutes County. Goal 12 is met.

Goal 13 Energy Conservation

RESPONSE: The proposed amendments will have no impact on energy conservation. Goal 13 is met.

Goal 14 Urbanization

RESPONSE: Goal 14 concerns the provision of urban and rural land uses to ensure efficient use of land and livable communities. The proposed amendments do not amend an urban growth boundary. Although Goal 8 allows urban land uses on rural land in destination resorts in certain circumstances, the proposed amendments are intended to ensure the DCC complies with Goal 8 and ORS 197.455, which limit the type of resort development that is allowed on certain lands near certain urban growth boundaries. The effect of the amendments will be to promote Goal 14's distinction between urban and rural levels of development, pursuant to Goal 8 and statute. Goal 14 is met.

Goals 15 through 19

RESPONSE: Goals 15 through 19 do not apply (Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway; Goal 16 Estuarine Resources; Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands; Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes; and Goal 19 Ocean Resources).

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A Portland State University Population Research Center’s “2021 Annual Oregon Population Report Tables”

- Exhibit B U.S. Census “Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021”

- Exhibit C Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 8

- Exhibit D City of Bend Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5 Housing

- Exhibit E City of La Pine Comprehensive Plan

- Exhibit F Proposed amendments to DCC

- Exhibit G Email from County staff re: Measure 56 Notice

Exhibit A - Portland State University Population Research Center's
"2021 Annual Oregon Population Report Tables"



Population Research Center
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

2021 ANNUAL OREGON POPULATION REPORT TABLES

The population data in the 2021 annual report tables were compiled by the Population Research Center, Portland State University, 4/15/2022.

The tables in this workbook present the 2021 population estimates produced by the Population Research Center, Portland State University. The July 1 estimates of total population for counties and cities and towns were certified December 15, 2021.

Some tables include the U.S. Census Bureau's decennial Census counts and historical population estimates produced by our Center, and other tables include calculations of change since Census 2020. Also included are population estimates for broad age groups and 5-year age groups; the estimates for broad age groups were certified December 31, 2021.

Contents of Sheets:

Sheet Name

Table Name and description

Table 1:

Annual Population and Components of Population Change for Oregon: 1960-2021; July 1 Population Estimates and April Census Counts.

Annual populations, population change and the components of population change (births, deaths, natural increase, and net migration) are reported for Oregon.

Table 2:

Population Estimates of Oregon by Area type and Specific Metropolitan Areas: 2000 to 2021.

Population estimates are aggregated for incorporated and unincorporated, metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in Oregon. Populations are also reported for each of Oregon's eight Metropolitan Statistical Areas, as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 3:

Components of Population Change for Oregon's Counties: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021.

Populations are reported for Oregon and the 36 counties; population change and the components of population change from 2010 to 2020 are also included.

Table 4:

Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2020-July 1, 2021; and Census Counts 2000-2020.

Annual population estimates from 2020-2021 are reported along with April 1 Census counts from 2000-2020. Sub-county population estimates are grouped by county; cities that are split between counties are reported in parts respective to their county location. Population estimates for the county unincorporated areas are also reported.

- Table 5:** **Populations for Incorporated Cities Located in More than One County.**
Annual population estimates for 2020-2021, and 2010 and 2020 Census counts, for city parts by county are reported in this table.
- Table 6:** **Rank of Incorporated Cities and Towns by July 1, 2021 Population Size.**
This table displays the rank order of Oregon's incorporated cities and towns by 2021 population size, largest to smallest.
- Table 7:** **Alphabetical Listing of Oregon's Incorporated Cities and Towns with Populations for July 1, 2021 and Census 2020, and Change since Census 2020.**
Population estimates for 2021 and Census counts for 2020 are reported, along with numerical and percentage change during the time period.
- Table 8:** **Population Added to Incorporated Cities Due to Annexations: April 1, 2020 - July 1, 2021.**
This table is a listing of Oregon's cities and towns in alphabetical order with the numbers of persons they have annexed since Census 2020.
- Table 9:** **Population Estimates by Age and Sex for Oregon and Its Counties: July 1, 2021.**
Population estimates for Oregon's counties by 5-year age group are reported in three tables: 1) total population; 2) male population; and 3) female population. Population estimates for ages 15-19 are split into 15-17 and 18-19 age groups.
- Table 10:** **Population Estimates by Broad Age Group (<18 Years, 18-64 Years, & over 64 Years)**
Population Estimates for ages 0-17 years, 18-64 years, and 65 years and older are reported in this table for Oregon and its counties.

Contact information *

askprc@pdx.edu; 503-725-3922

Table 1. Population and Components of Population Change for Oregon: 1960 to 2021
July 1 Population Estimates and April 1 Census Counts
 Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| Date | Population | Population Change | Births | Deaths | Natural Increase | Net Migration |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| April 1, 1960 | 1,768,687 | | | | | |
| July 1, 1961 | 1,798,000 | 29,313 | 31,660 | 14,060 | 17,600 | 11,713 |
| July 1, 1962 | 1,828,000 | 30,000 | 36,535 | 16,735 | 19,800 | 10,200 |
| July 1, 1963 | 1,856,000 | 28,000 | 32,971 | 16,171 | 16,800 | 11,200 |
| July 1, 1964 | 1,884,000 | 28,000 | 32,687 | 17,287 | 15,400 | 12,600 |
| July 1, 1965 | 1,912,000 | 28,000 | 32,585 | 17,785 | 14,800 | 13,200 |
| July 1, 1966 | 1,947,200 | 35,200 | 31,210 | 17,710 | 13,500 | 21,700 |
| July 1, 1967 | 1,980,000 | 32,800 | 30,711 | 18,211 | 12,500 | 20,300 |
| July 1, 1968 | 2,018,900 | 38,900 | 32,464 | 19,364 | 13,100 | 25,800 |
| July 1, 1969 | 2,057,000 | 38,100 | 34,423 | 20,123 | 14,300 | 23,800 |
| April 1, 1970 | 2,091,533 | 34,533 | 25,755 | 14,657 | 11,099 | 23,434 |
| July 1, 1970 | 2,099,150 | 7,617 | 8,838 | 4,883 | 3,956 | 3,661 |
| July 1, 1971 | 2,129,900 | 30,750 | 34,349 | 19,809 | 14,540 | 16,210 |
| July 1, 1972 | 2,167,000 | 37,100 | 31,332 | 19,532 | 11,800 | 25,300 |
| July 1, 1973 | 2,217,600 | 50,600 | 30,939 | 20,439 | 10,500 | 40,100 |
| July 1, 1974 | 2,271,900 | 54,300 | 31,123 | 20,223 | 10,900 | 43,400 |
| July 1, 1975 | 2,326,200 | 54,300 | 32,934 | 20,234 | 12,700 | 41,600 |
| July 1, 1976 | 2,386,700 | 60,500 | 33,613 | 20,013 | 13,600 | 46,900 |
| July 1, 1977 | 2,451,900 | 65,200 | 37,546 | 21,246 | 16,300 | 48,900 |
| July 1, 1978 | 2,521,900 | 70,000 | 37,231 | 20,131 | 17,100 | 52,900 |
| July 1, 1979 | 2,584,300 | 62,400 | 41,271 | 21,471 | 19,800 | 42,600 |
| April 1, 1980 | 2,633,156 | 48,856 | 31,555 | 15,951 | 15,604 | 33,252 |
| July 1, 1980 | 2,639,915 | 6,759 | 10,773 | 5,439 | 5,334 | 1,425 |
| July 1, 1981 | 2,660,735 | 20,820 | 42,052 | 21,675 | 20,377 | 444 |
| July 1, 1982 | 2,656,185 | -4,550 | 42,261 | 21,548 | 20,713 | -25,263 |
| July 1, 1983 | 2,635,000 | -21,185 | 40,378 | 22,039 | 18,339 | -39,524 |
| July 1, 1984 | 2,660,000 | 25,000 | 39,611 | 22,702 | 16,909 | 8,091 |
| July 1, 1985 | 2,675,800 | 15,800 | 39,296 | 23,531 | 15,765 | 35 |
| July 1, 1986 | 2,661,500 | -14,300 | 39,332 | 23,403 | 15,929 | -30,229 |
| July 1, 1987 | 2,690,000 | 28,500 | 38,702 | 23,695 | 15,007 | 13,493 |
| July 1, 1988 | 2,741,000 | 51,000 | 39,120 | 24,752 | 14,368 | 36,632 |
| July 1, 1989 | 2,791,000 | 50,000 | 40,648 | 24,705 | 15,943 | 34,057 |
| April 1, 1990 | 2,842,321 | 51,321 | 31,319 | 18,608 | 12,711 | 38,610 |
| July 1, 1990 | 2,847,000 | 4,679 | 10,708 | 6,268 | 4,439 | 240 |
| July 1, 1991 | 2,927,800 | 80,800 | 42,644 | 25,004 | 17,640 | 63,160 |

| Date | Population | Population Change | Births | Deaths | Natural Increase | Net Migration |
|----------------------|------------|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| July 1, 1992 | 2,990,610 | 62,810 | 42,427 | 25,166 | 17,261 | 45,549 |
| July 1, 1993 | 3,059,110 | 68,500 | 41,442 | 26,543 | 14,899 | 53,601 |
| July 1, 1994 | 3,119,940 | 60,830 | 41,487 | 27,564 | 13,923 | 46,907 |
| July 1, 1995 | 3,182,690 | 62,750 | 42,426 | 27,552 | 14,874 | 47,876 |
| July 1, 1996 | 3,245,100 | 62,410 | 43,196 | 28,768 | 14,428 | 47,982 |
| July 1, 1997 | 3,302,140 | 57,040 | 43,625 | 29,201 | 14,424 | 42,616 |
| July 1, 1998 | 3,350,080 | 47,940 | 44,696 | 28,705 | 15,991 | 31,949 |
| July 1, 1999 | 3,393,410 | 43,330 | 45,188 | 29,848 | 15,340 | 27,990 |
| April 1, 2000 | 3,421,436 | 28,026 | 33,805 | 21,827 | 11,978 | 16,048 |
| July 1, 2000 | 3,431,085 | 9,649 | 11,729 | 7,082 | 4,647 | 5,002 |
| July 1, 2001 | 3,470,385 | 39,300 | 45,536 | 29,934 | 15,602 | 23,698 |
| July 1, 2002 | 3,502,588 | 32,203 | 44,995 | 30,828 | 14,167 | 18,036 |
| July 1, 2003 | 3,538,591 | 36,003 | 45,686 | 30,604 | 15,082 | 20,921 |
| July 1, 2004 | 3,578,895 | 40,303 | 45,599 | 30,721 | 14,878 | 25,425 |
| July 1, 2005 | 3,626,938 | 48,043 | 45,892 | 30,717 | 15,175 | 32,868 |
| July 1, 2006 | 3,685,206 | 58,268 | 46,946 | 30,771 | 16,175 | 42,093 |
| July 1, 2007 | 3,739,359 | 54,153 | 49,404 | 31,394 | 18,010 | 36,143 |
| July 1, 2008 | 3,784,182 | 44,823 | 49,658 | 32,008 | 17,650 | 27,173 |
| July 1, 2009 | 3,815,775 | 31,593 | 47,958 | 31,382 | 16,576 | 15,017 |
| April 1, 2010 | 3,831,074 | 15,299 | 34,364 | 23,879 | 10,485 | 4,814 |
| 4/1/2020* | 4,237,256 | 406,182 | 444,249 | 348,189 | 96,060 | 310,122 |
| July 1, 2020rev | 4,243,851 | 6,595 | 10,292 | 9,516 | 776 | 5,819 |
| July 1, 2021** | 4,266,620 | 22,769 | 39,623 | 41,833 | -2,210 | 24,979 |

* Figures are for the period between April 1, 2010 and April 1, 2020.

** Preliminary

Note: Estimates for July 1, 2000-July 1, 2009 are revised estimates that incorporate Census 2010 (they represent the pattern of migration in the originally certified estimates during the decade and are adjusted to be consistent with Census 2010). Estimates for July 1, 2011-July 1, 2019 are under revision to be consistent with Census 2020

Table 2. Population Estimates of Oregon by Area Type and Specific Metropolitan Areas: 2010 to 2021

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| Area Type | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Date | State | Incorporated | Un- incorporated | Metropolitan* | Non- metropolitan |
| April 1, 2010 | 3,831,074 | 2,669,922 | 1,161,152 | 2,978,551 | 852,523 |
| April 1, 2020 | 4,237,256 | 2,991,490 | 1,245,766 | 3,547,232 | 690,024 |
| July 1, 2020rev | 4,243,851 | 2,999,115 | 1,244,736 | 3,552,531 | 691,320 |
| July 1, 2021 | 4,266,620 | 3,023,403 | 1,243,217 | 3,571,405 | 695,215 |

| Metropolitan Areas | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Date | Portland- Vancouver- Hillsboro | Eugene- Springfield | Medford | Salem | Corvallis | Bend-Redmond | Albany | Grants Pass |
| April 1, 2010 | 2,226,009 | 351,715 | 203,206 | 390,738 | 85,579 | 157,733 | | |
| April 1, 2020 | 2,512,427 | 382,971 | 223,259 | 433,353 | 95,184 | 198,253 | 128,610 | 88,090 |
| July 1, 2020rev | 2,517,410 | 383,181 | 223,521 | 434,110 | 95,316 | 199,259 | 128,929 | 88,204 |
| July 1, 2021 | 2,539,633 | 382,647 | 223,827 | 436,098 | 93,976 | 203,390 | 130,440 | 88,728 |

Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA MSA consists of Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah, Washington, and Yamhill Counties in Oregon and Clark and Skamania Counties in Washington. It was renamed by the Census Bureau in Feb. 2013 from Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton MSA. July 1 populations for Clark and Skamania counties were estimated by PRC by extrapolating Washington State Office of Financial Management's April 1 estimates to July 1.

Eugene-Springfield MSA consists of Lane County.

Medford MSA consists of Jackson County.

Salem MSA consists of Marion and Polk Counties.

Corvallis MSA consists of Benton County.

Bend-Redmond MSA consists of Deschutes County. Bend-Redmond MSA was renamed in Feb. 2013 by the Census Bureau from Bend MSA.

Albany MSA consists of Linn County; it was designated as an MSA in Feb. 2013 by the Census Bureau.

Grants Pass MSA consists of Josephine County. It was designated as an MSA in Feb. 2013 by the Census Bureau.

*The Sum of Oregon Metropolitan Areas excluding Clark and Skamania Counties in Washington State.

Table 3. Components of Population Change for Oregon and its Counties: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| | July 1, 2021 Estimate | April 1, 2020 Census | Numeric Change April 2020 to July 2021 | Percent Change April 2020 to July 2021 | Average Annual Change since Census | Births* 2020-21 | Deaths* 2020-21 | Natural Increase 2020-21 | Net Migration 2020-21 |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| OREGON | 4,266,620 | 4,237,256 | 29,364 | 0.7% | 0.6% | 49,915 | 51,318 | -1,403 | 30,767 |
| BAKER | 16,860 | 16,668 | 192 | 1.2% | 0.9% | 200 | 306 | -106 | 298 |
| BENTON | 93,976 | 95,184 | -1,208 | -1.3% | -1.0% | 780 | 797 | -17 | -1,191 |
| CLACKAMAS | 425,316 | 421,401 | 3,915 | 0.9% | 0.7% | 4,705 | 4,719 | -14 | 3,929 |
| CLATSOP | 41,428 | 41,072 | 356 | 0.9% | 0.7% | 460 | 568 | -108 | 464 |
| COLUMBIA | 53,014 | 52,589 | 425 | 0.8% | 0.6% | 609 | 685 | -76 | 501 |
| COOS | 65,154 | 64,929 | 225 | 0.3% | 0.3% | 694 | 1,253 | -559 | 784 |
| CROOK | 25,482 | 24,738 | 744 | 3.0% | 2.4% | 284 | 341 | -57 | 801 |
| CURRY | 23,662 | 23,446 | 216 | 0.9% | 0.7% | 190 | 598 | -408 | 624 |
| DESCHUTES | 203,390 | 198,253 | 5,137 | 2.6% | 2.1% | 2,254 | 2,076 | 178 | 4,959 |
| DOUGLAS | 111,694 | 111,201 | 493 | 0.4% | 0.4% | 1,288 | 2,208 | -920 | 1,413 |
| GILLIAM | 2,039 | 1,995 | 44 | 2.2% | 1.8% | 24 | 29 | -5 | 49 |
| GRANT | 7,226 | 7,233 | -7 | -0.1% | -0.1% | 83 | 128 | -45 | 38 |
| HARNEY | 7,537 | 7,495 | 42 | 0.6% | 0.4% | 99 | 124 | -25 | 67 |
| HOOD RIVER | 23,888 | 23,977 | -89 | -0.4% | -0.3% | 271 | 244 | 27 | -116 |
| JACKSON | 223,827 | 223,259 | 568 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 2,668 | 3,301 | -633 | 1,201 |
| JEFFERSON | 24,889 | 24,502 | 387 | 1.6% | 1.3% | 329 | 393 | -64 | 451 |
| JOSEPHINE | 88,728 | 88,090 | 638 | 0.7% | 0.6% | 1,012 | 1,710 | -698 | 1,336 |
| KLAMATH | 69,822 | 69,413 | 409 | 0.6% | 0.5% | 924 | 1,200 | -276 | 685 |
| LAKE | 8,177 | 8,160 | 17 | 0.2% | 0.2% | 103 | 154 | -51 | 68 |
| LANE | 382,647 | 382,971 | -324 | -0.1% | -0.1% | 3,799 | 5,117 | -1,318 | 994 |
| LINCOLN | 50,903 | 50,395 | 508 | 1.0% | 0.8% | 462 | 888 | -426 | 934 |
| LINN | 130,440 | 128,610 | 1,830 | 1.4% | 1.1% | 1,841 | 1,880 | -39 | 1,869 |
| MALHEUR | 31,995 | 31,571 | 424 | 1.3% | 1.1% | 484 | 498 | -14 | 438 |
| MARION | 347,182 | 345,920 | 1,262 | 0.4% | 0.3% | 4,780 | 4,044 | 736 | 526 |
| MORROW | 12,635 | 12,186 | 449 | 3.7% | 2.9% | 222 | 137 | 85 | 364 |
| MULTNOMAH | 820,672 | 815,428 | 5,244 | 0.6% | 0.5% | 9,302 | 8,275 | 1,027 | 4,217 |
| POLK | 88,916 | 87,433 | 1,483 | 1.7% | 1.4% | 1,053 | 986 | 67 | 1,416 |
| SHERMAN | 1,908 | 1,870 | 38 | 2.0% | 1.6% | 33 | 28 | 5 | 33 |
| TILLAMOOK | 27,628 | 27,390 | 238 | 0.9% | 0.7% | 311 | 465 | -154 | 392 |
| UMATILLA | 80,523 | 80,075 | 448 | 0.6% | 0.4% | 1,148 | 1,031 | 117 | 331 |
| UNION | 26,295 | 26,196 | 99 | 0.4% | 0.3% | 321 | 390 | -69 | 168 |
| WALLOWA | 7,433 | 7,391 | 42 | 0.6% | 0.5% | 73 | 99 | -26 | 68 |
| WASCO | 26,581 | 26,670 | -89 | -0.3% | -0.3% | 331 | 436 | -105 | 16 |
| WASHINGTON | 605,036 | 600,372 | 4,664 | 0.8% | 0.6% | 7,479 | 4,848 | 2,631 | 2,033 |
| WHEELER | 1,456 | 1,451 | 5 | 0.3% | 0.3% | 10 | 23 | -13 | 18 |
| YAMHILL | 108,261 | 107,722 | 539 | 0.5% | 0.4% | 1,289 | 1,339 | -50 | 589 |

**Table 4. Populations for Oregon and Its Counties and Incorporated Cities:
July 1, 2020 - July 1, 2021 estimates; Census Counts 2000-2020**

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| OREGON | 4,266,620 | 4243851 | 4,237,256 | 3,831,074 | 3,421,436 |
| BAKER | 16,860 | 16,721 | 16,668 | 16,134 | 16,741 |
| Baker City | 10,178 | 10,133 | 10,099 | 9,828 | 9,860 |
| Greenhorn | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Haines | 376 | 374 | 373 | 416 | 426 |
| Halfway | 352 | 352 | 351 | 288 | 337 |
| Huntington | 503 | 503 | 502 | 440 | 515 |
| Richland | 165 | 165 | 165 | 156 | 147 |
| Sumpter | 205 | 205 | 204 | 204 | 171 |
| Unity | 40 | 40 | 40 | 71 | 131 |
| Unincorporated | 5,038 | 4,946 | 4,931 | 4,731 | 5,154 |
| BENTON | 93,976 | 95,316 | 95,184 | 85,579 | 78,153 |
| Adair Village | 1,318 | 1,092 | 994 | 840 | 536 |
| Albany (part)* | 9,322 | 9,095 | 9,117 | 6,463 | 5,104 |
| Corvallis | 57,601 | 60,070 | 59,922 | 54,462 | 49,322 |
| Monroe | 654 | 647 | 647 | 617 | 607 |
| Philomath | 5,682 | 5,355 | 5,350 | 4,584 | 3,838 |
| Unincorporated | 19,399 | 19,057 | 19,154 | 18,613 | 18,746 |
| CLACKAMAS | 425,316 | 422,185 | 421,401 | 375,992 | 338,391 |
| Barlow | 133 | 133 | 133 | 135 | 140 |
| Canby | 18,754 | 18,220 | 18,171 | 15,829 | 12,790 |
| Estacada | 5,014 | 4,437 | 4,356 | 2,695 | 2,371 |
| Gladstone | 12,033 | 12,018 | 12,017 | 11,497 | 11,438 |
| Happy Valley | 25,738 | 23,987 | 23,733 | 13,903 | 4,519 |
| Johnson City | 537 | 539 | 539 | 566 | 634 |
| Lake Oswego (part)* | 38,211 | 38,147 | 38,107 | 34,066 | 32,989 |
| Milwaukie | 21,235 | 21,225 | 21,119 | 20,291 | 20,490 |
| Molalla | 10,207 | 10,229 | 10,228 | 8,108 | 5,647 |
| Oregon City | 37,737 | 37,637 | 37,572 | 31,859 | 25,754 |
| Portland (part)* | 841 | 843 | 843 | 744 | 747 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Rivergrove (part)* | 502 | 495 | 495 | 257 | 287 |
| Sandy | 12,869 | 12,669 | 12,612 | 9,570 | 5,385 |
| Tualatin (part)* | 3,149 | 3,156 | 3,156 | 2,862 | 2,664 |
| West Linn | 27,452 | 27,407 | 27,373 | 25,109 | 22,261 |
| Wilsonville (part)* | 25,044 | 24,600 | 24,522 | 17,371 | 13,987 |
| Unincorporated | 185,860 | 186,443 | 186,425 | 170,591 | 176,288 |
| CLATSOP | 41,428 | 41,137 | 41,072 | 37,039 | 35,630 |
| Astoria | 10,197 | 10,184 | 10,181 | 9,477 | 9,813 |
| Cannon Beach | 1,498 | 1,489 | 1,489 | 1,690 | 1,588 |
| Gearhart | 1,872 | 1,837 | 1,793 | 1,462 | 995 |
| Seaside | 7,157 | 7,121 | 7,115 | 6,457 | 5,900 |
| Warrenton | 6,352 | 6,288 | 6,277 | 4,989 | 4,096 |
| Unincorporated | 14,352 | 14,218 | 14,217 | 12,964 | 13,238 |
| COLUMBIA | 53,014 | 52,748 | 52,589 | 49,351 | 43,560 |
| Clatskanie | 1,725 | 1,718 | 1,716 | 1,737 | 1,528 |
| Columbia City | 1,957 | 1,949 | 1,949 | 1,946 | 1,571 |
| Prescott | 83 | 82 | 82 | 55 | 72 |
| Rainier | 1,913 | 1,911 | 1,911 | 1,895 | 1,687 |
| St. Helens | 14,560 | 14,118 | 13,817 | 12,883 | 10,019 |
| Scappoose | 8,016 | 8,014 | 8,010 | 6,592 | 4,976 |
| Vernonia | 2,403 | 2,375 | 2,374 | 2,151 | 2,228 |
| Unincorporated | 22,357 | 22,581 | 22,730 | 22,092 | 21,479 |
| COOS | 65,154 | 64,958 | 64,929 | 63,043 | 62,788 |
| Bandon | 3,470 | 3,384 | 3,321 | 3,066 | 2,833 |
| Coos Bay | 16,005 | 15,985 | 15,985 | 15,967 | 15,372 |
| Coquille | 4,018 | 4,015 | 4,015 | 3,866 | 4,184 |
| Lakeside | 1,906 | 1,904 | 1,904 | 1,699 | 1,421 |
| Myrtle Point | 2,479 | 2,475 | 2,475 | 2,514 | 2,451 |
| North Bend | 10,375 | 10,317 | 10,317 | 9,695 | 9,544 |
| Powers | 712 | 711 | 710 | 689 | 734 |
| Unincorporated | 26,189 | 26,167 | 26,202 | 25,547 | 26,249 |
| CROOK | 25,482 | 24,866 | 24,738 | 20,978 | 19,184 |
| Prineville | 11,042 | 10,794 | 10,736 | 9,253 | 7,358 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Unincorporated | 14,440 | 14,072 | 14,002 | 11,725 | 11,826 |
| CURRY | 23,662 | 23,510 | 23,446 | 22,364 | 21,137 |
| Brookings | 6,809 | 6,760 | 6,744 | 6,336 | 5,447 |
| Gold Beach | 2,375 | 2,356 | 2,341 | 2,253 | 1,897 |
| Port Orford | 1,156 | 1,149 | 1,146 | 1,133 | 1,153 |
| Unincorporated | 13,322 | 13,245 | 13,215 | 12,642 | 12,640 |
| DESCHUTES | 203,390 | 199,259 | 198,253 | 157,733 | 115,367 |
| Bend | 100,922 | 99,453 | 99,178 | 76,639 | 52,029 |
| La Pine | 2,654 | 2,547 | 2,512 | 1,653 | not incorporated yet |
| Redmond | 36,122 | 33,784 | 33,274 | 26,215 | 13,481 |
| Sisters | 3,286 | 3,099 | 3,064 | 2,038 | 959 |
| Unincorporated | 60,406 | 60,376 | 60,225 | 51,188 | 48,898 |
| DOUGLAS | 111,694 | 111,214 | 111,201 | 107,667 | 100,399 |
| Canyonville | 1,649 | 1,640 | 1,640 | 1,884 | 1,293 |
| Drain | 1,174 | 1,174 | 1,172 | 1,151 | 1,021 |
| Elkton | 182 | 185 | 183 | 195 | 147 |
| Glendale | 860 | 860 | 858 | 874 | 855 |
| Myrtle Creek | 3,501 | 3,481 | 3,481 | 3,439 | 3,419 |
| Oakland | 932 | 932 | 934 | 927 | 954 |
| Reedsport | 4,311 | 4,307 | 4,310 | 4,154 | 4,378 |
| Riddle | 1,214 | 1,214 | 1,214 | 1,185 | 1,014 |
| Roseburg | 23,701 | 23,684 | 23,683 | 21,181 | 20,017 |
| Sutherlin | 8,909 | 8,534 | 8,524 | 7,810 | 6,669 |
| Winston | 5,700 | 5,636 | 5,625 | 5,379 | 4,613 |
| Yoncalla | 1,036 | 1,025 | 1,021 | 1,047 | 1,052 |
| Unincorporated | 58,525 | 58,542 | 58,556 | 58,441 | 54,967 |
| GILLIAM | 2,039 | 1,995 | 1,995 | 1,871 | 1,915 |
| Arlington | 650 | 632 | 628 | 586 | 524 |
| Condon | 722 | 709 | 711 | 682 | 759 |
| Lonerock | 25 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 24 |
| Unincorporated | 642 | 629 | 631 | 582 | 608 |
| GRANT | 7,226 | 7,239 | 7,233 | 7,445 | 7,935 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Canyon City | 666 | 664 | 660 | 703 | 669 |
| Dayville | 134 | 132 | 132 | 149 | 138 |
| Granite | 32 | 32 | 32 | 38 | 24 |
| John Day | 1,664 | 1,664 | 1,664 | 1,744 | 1,821 |
| Long Creek | 173 | 173 | 173 | 197 | 228 |
| Monument | 115 | 115 | 115 | 128 | 151 |
| Mt. Vernon | 548 | 548 | 548 | 527 | 595 |
| Prairie City | 841 | 841 | 841 | 909 | 1,080 |
| Seneca | 165 | 165 | 165 | 199 | 223 |
| Unincorporated | 2,888 | 2,905 | 2,903 | 2,851 | 3,006 |
| HARNEY | 7,537 | 7,497 | 7,495 | 7,422 | 7,609 |
| Burns | 2,745 | 2,730 | 2,730 | 2,806 | 3,064 |
| Hines | 1,661 | 1,652 | 1,645 | 1,563 | 1,623 |
| Unincorporated | 3,131 | 3,115 | 3,120 | 3,053 | 2,922 |
| HOOD RIVER | 23,888 | 23,949 | 23,977 | 22,346 | 20,411 |
| Cascade Locks | 1,398 | 1,387 | 1,379 | 1,144 | 1,115 |
| Hood River | 8,259 | 8,321 | 8,313 | 7,167 | 5,831 |
| Unincorporated | 14,231 | 14,241 | 14,285 | 14,035 | 13,465 |
| JACKSON | 223,827 | 223,521 | 223,259 | 203,206 | 181,273 |
| Ashland | 21,554 | 21,474 | 21,360 | 20,078 | 19,522 |
| Butte Falls | 451 | 443 | 443 | 423 | 439 |
| Central Point | 19,702 | 19,228 | 18,997 | 17,169 | 12,493 |
| Eagle Point | 9,854 | 9,708 | 9,686 | 8,469 | 4,797 |
| Gold Hill | 1,360 | 1,336 | 1,335 | 1,220 | 1,073 |
| Jacksonville | 3,080 | 3,029 | 3,020 | 2,785 | 2,235 |
| Medford | 87,353 | 86,123 | 85,824 | 74,907 | 63,687 |
| Phoenix | 4,096 | 4,478 | 4,475 | 4,538 | 4,060 |
| Rogue River | 2,435 | 2,411 | 2,407 | 2,131 | 1,851 |
| Shady Cove | 3,095 | 3,089 | 3,081 | 2,904 | 2,307 |
| Talent | 5,737 | 6,293 | 6,282 | 6,066 | 5,589 |
| Unincorporated | 65,110 | 65,909 | 66,349 | 62,516 | 63,220 |
| JEFFERSON | 24,889 | 24,553 | 24,502 | 21,720 | 19,009 |
| Culver | 1,636 | 1,602 | 1,602 | 1,357 | 802 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Madras | 7,717 | 7,561 | 7,456 | 6,046 | 5,078 |
| Metolius | 981 | 978 | 978 | 710 | 729 |
| Unincorporated | 14,555 | 14,412 | 14,466 | 13,607 | 12,400 |
| JOSEPHINE | 88,728 | 88,204 | 88,090 | 82,713 | 75,726 |
| Cave Junction | 2,149 | 2,086 | 2,071 | 1,883 | 1,363 |
| Grants Pass | 39,475 | 39,237 | 39,189 | 34,533 | 23,003 |
| Unincorporated | 47,104 | 46,881 | 46,830 | 46,297 | 51,360 |
| KLAMATH | 69,822 | 69,512 | 69,413 | 66,380 | 63,775 |
| Bonanza | 404 | 404 | 404 | 415 | 415 |
| Chiloquin | 767 | 767 | 767 | 734 | 715 |
| Klamath Falls | 22,022 | 21,834 | 21,813 | 20,840 | 19,460 |
| Malin | 731 | 731 | 731 | 805 | 640 |
| Merrill | 821 | 821 | 821 | 844 | 897 |
| Unincorporated | 45,077 | 44,955 | 44,877 | 42,742 | 41,648 |
| LAKE | 8,177 | 8,165 | 8,160 | 7,895 | 7,422 |
| Lakeview | 2,428 | 2,420 | 2,418 | 2,294 | 2,474 |
| Paisley | 244 | 248 | 250 | 243 | 247 |
| Unincorporated | 5,505 | 5,497 | 5,492 | 5,358 | 4,701 |
| LANE | 382,647 | 383,181 | 382,971 | 351,715 | 322,977 |
| Coburg | 1,322 | 1,314 | 1,306 | 1,035 | 969 |
| Cottage Grove | 10,792 | 10,586 | 10,574 | 9,686 | 8,445 |
| Creswell | 5,684 | 5,644 | 5,641 | 5,031 | 3,579 |
| Dunes City | 1,454 | 1,430 | 1,428 | 1,303 | 1,241 |
| Eugene | 175,626 | 176,870 | 176,654 | 156,185 | 137,893 |
| Florence | 9,600 | 9,424 | 9,396 | 8,466 | 7,263 |
| Junction City | 7,032 | 6,789 | 6,787 | 5,392 | 4,721 |
| Lowell | 1,211 | 1,197 | 1,196 | 1,045 | 880 |
| Oakridge | 3,238 | 3,208 | 3,206 | 3,205 | 3,172 |
| Springfield | 62,352 | 61,881 | 61,851 | 59,403 | 52,864 |
| Veneta | 5,271 | 5,217 | 5,214 | 4,561 | 2,762 |
| Westfir | 260 | 259 | 259 | 253 | 280 |
| Unincorporated | 98,805 | 99,362 | 99,459 | 96,150 | 98,908 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| LINCOLN | 50,903 | 50,387 | 50,395 | 46,034 | 44,479 |
| Depoe Bay | 1,559 | 1,526 | 1,515 | 1,398 | 1,174 |
| Lincoln City | 10,067 | 9,912 | 9,815 | 7,930 | 7,437 |
| Newport | 10,591 | 10,268 | 10,256 | 9,989 | 9,532 |
| Siletz | 1,249 | 1,235 | 1,230 | 1,212 | 1,133 |
| Toledo | 3,611 | 3,568 | 3,546 | 3,465 | 3,472 |
| Waldport | 2,321 | 2,263 | 2,249 | 2,033 | 2,050 |
| Yachats | 1,010 | 998 | 994 | 690 | 617 |
| Unincorporated | 20,495 | 20,617 | 20,790 | 19,317 | 19,064 |
| LINN | 130,440 | 128,929 | 128,610 | 116,672 | 103,069 |
| Albany (part)* | 47,877 | 47,385 | 47,355 | 43,695 | 35,748 |
| Brownsville | 1,705 | 1,699 | 1,694 | 1,668 | 1,449 |
| Gates (part)* | 43 | 46 | 46 | 40 | 42 |
| Halsey | 959 | 962 | 962 | 904 | 724 |
| Harrisburg | 3,658 | 3,655 | 3,652 | 3,567 | 2,795 |
| Idanha (part)* | 71 | 71 | 71 | 57 | 85 |
| Lebanon | 19,122 | 18,559 | 18,447 | 15,518 | 12,950 |
| Lyons | 1,207 | 1,207 | 1,202 | 1,161 | 1,008 |
| Mill City (part)* | 1,649 | 1,641 | 1,617 | 1,531 | 1,225 |
| Millersburg | 3,093 | 2,924 | 2,919 | 1,329 | 651 |
| Scio | 959 | 956 | 956 | 838 | 695 |
| Sodaville | 360 | 360 | 360 | 308 | 290 |
| Sweet Home | 9,893 | 9,853 | 9,828 | 8,925 | 8,016 |
| Tangent | 1,231 | 1,231 | 1,231 | 1,164 | 933 |
| Waterloo | 222 | 222 | 222 | 229 | 239 |
| Unincorporated | 38,391 | 38,158 | 38,048 | 35,738 | 36,219 |
| MALHEUR | 31,995 | 31,626 | 31,571 | 31,313 | 31,615 |
| Adrian | 159 | 157 | 157 | 177 | 147 |
| Jordan Valley | 131 | 130 | 130 | 181 | 239 |
| Nyssa | 3,276 | 3,233 | 3,198 | 3,267 | 3,163 |
| Ontario | 11,816 | 11,657 | 11,645 | 11,366 | 10,985 |
| Vale | 1,914 | 1,895 | 1,894 | 1,874 | 1,976 |
| Unincorporated | 14,699 | 14,554 | 14,547 | 14,448 | 15,105 |
| MARION | 347,182 | 346,194 | 345,920 | 315,335 | 284,838 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Aumsville | 4,237 | 4,234 | 4,234 | 3,584 | 3,003 |
| Aurora | 1,133 | 1,133 | 1,133 | 918 | 655 |
| Detroit | 141 | 203 | 203 | 202 | 262 |
| Donald | 1,012 | 1,009 | 1,009 | 979 | 625 |
| Gates (part)* | 427 | 502 | 502 | 431 | 429 |
| Gervais | 2,596 | 2,591 | 2,595 | 2,464 | 2,009 |
| Hubbard | 3,478 | 3,478 | 3,426 | 3,173 | 2,483 |
| Idanha (part)* | 85 | 85 | 85 | 77 | 147 |
| Jefferson | 3,339 | 3,330 | 3,327 | 3,098 | 2,487 |
| Keizer | 39,458 | 39,381 | 39,376 | 36,478 | 32,203 |
| Mill City (part)* | 363 | 359 | 354 | 324 | 312 |
| Mt. Angel | 3,418 | 3,407 | 3,392 | 3,286 | 3,121 |
| St. Paul | 434 | 434 | 434 | 421 | 354 |
| Salem (part)* | 147,482 | 146,302 | 146,139 | 130,398 | 119,040 |
| Scotts Mills | 431 | 427 | 419 | 357 | 312 |
| Silverton | 10,591 | 10,501 | 10,484 | 9,222 | 7,414 |
| Stayton | 8,265 | 8,244 | 8,244 | 7,644 | 6,816 |
| Sublimity | 3,106 | 2,982 | 2,967 | 2,681 | 2,148 |
| Turner | 2,866 | 2,522 | 2,454 | 1,854 | 1,199 |
| Woodburn | 26,250 | 26,024 | 26,013 | 24,080 | 20,100 |
| Unincorporated | 88,070 | 89,046 | 89,130 | 83,664 | 79,719 |
| MORROW | 12,635 | 12,217 | 12,186 | 11,173 | 10,995 |
| Boardman | 4,338 | 3,900 | 3,828 | 3,220 | 2,855 |
| Heppner | 1,187 | 1,187 | 1,187 | 1,291 | 1,395 |
| lone | 339 | 337 | 337 | 329 | 321 |
| Irrigon | 2,037 | 2,013 | 2,011 | 1,826 | 1,702 |
| Lexington | 238 | 238 | 238 | 238 | 263 |
| Unincorporated | 4,496 | 4,542 | 4,585 | 4,269 | 4,459 |
| MULTNOMAH | 820,672 | 816,310 | 815,428 | 735,334 | 660,486 |
| Fairview | 10,446 | 10,430 | 10,424 | 8,920 | 7,561 |
| Gresham | 114,361 | 114,310 | 114,247 | 105,594 | 90,205 |
| Lake Oswego (part)* | 2,587 | 2,621 | 2,621 | 2,544 | 2,274 |
| Maywood Park | 829 | 829 | 829 | 752 | 777 |
| Portland (part)* | 656,298 | 651,054 | 650,019 | 581,485 | 526,986 |
| Troutdale | 16,319 | 16,292 | 16,300 | 15,962 | 13,777 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Wood Village | 4,478 | 4,389 | 4,387 | 3,878 | 2,860 |
| Unincorporated | 15,354 | 16,385 | 16,601 | 16,199 | 16,046 |
| POLK | 88,916 | 87,916 | 87,433 | 75,403 | 62,380 |
| Dallas | 17,320 | 16,909 | 16,854 | 14,583 | 12,459 |
| Falls City | 1,064 | 1,052 | 1,051 | 947 | 966 |
| Independence | 10,081 | 9,860 | 9,828 | 8,590 | 6,035 |
| Monmouth | 11,142 | 11,142 | 11,110 | 9,534 | 7,741 |
| Salem (part)* | 30,212 | 29,913 | 29,396 | 24,239 | 17,884 |
| Willamina (part)* | 924 | 924 | 924 | 845 | 716 |
| Unincorporated | 18,173 | 18,116 | 18,270 | 16,665 | 16,579 |
| SHERMAN | 1,908 | 1,875 | 1,870 | 1,765 | 1,934 |
| Grass Valley | 151 | 149 | 149 | 164 | 171 |
| Moro | 374 | 368 | 367 | 324 | 337 |
| Rufus | 273 | 269 | 268 | 249 | 268 |
| Wasco | 424 | 418 | 417 | 410 | 381 |
| Unincorporated | 686 | 671 | 669 | 618 | 777 |
| TILLAMOOK | 27,628 | 27,447 | 27,390 | 25,250 | 24,262 |
| Bay City | 1,424 | 1,402 | 1,389 | 1,286 | 1,149 |
| Garibaldi | 831 | 831 | 830 | 779 | 899 |
| Manzanita | 609 | 605 | 603 | 598 | 564 |
| Nehalem | 276 | 273 | 270 | 271 | 203 |
| Rockaway Beach | 1,476 | 1,459 | 1,441 | 1,312 | 1,267 |
| Tillamook | 5,338 | 5,209 | 5,204 | 4,935 | 4,352 |
| Wheeler | 422 | 422 | 422 | 414 | 391 |
| Unincorporated | 17,252 | 17,246 | 17,231 | 15,655 | 15,437 |
| UMATILLA | 80,523 | 80,229 | 80,075 | 75,889 | 70,548 |
| Adams | 393 | 389 | 389 | 350 | 297 |
| Athena | 1,212 | 1,211 | 1,209 | 1,126 | 1,221 |
| Echo | 657 | 632 | 632 | 699 | 650 |
| Helix | 194 | 194 | 194 | 184 | 183 |
| Hermiston | 19,696 | 19,510 | 19,354 | 16,745 | 13,154 |
| Milton-Freewater | 7,145 | 7,200 | 7,151 | 7,050 | 6,470 |
| Pendleton | 17,169 | 17,125 | 17,107 | 16,612 | 16,354 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Pilot Rock | 1,328 | 1,328 | 1,328 | 1,502 | 1,532 |
| Stanfield | 2,201 | 2,156 | 2,144 | 2,043 | 1,979 |
| Ukiah** | 219 | 219 | 159 | 186 | 255 |
| Umatilla | 7,520 | 7,396 | 7,363 | 6,906 | 4,978 |
| Weston | 706 | 706 | 706 | 667 | 717 |
| Unincorporated | 22,083 | 22,163 | 22,339 | 21,819 | 22,758 |
| UNION | 26,295 | 26,729 | 26,196 | 25,748 | 24,530 |
| Cove | 627 | 620 | 620 | 552 | 594 |
| Elgin | 1,717 | 1,717 | 1,717 | 1,711 | 1,654 |
| Imbler | 249 | 246 | 245 | 306 | 284 |
| Island City | 1,144 | 1,144 | 1,144 | 989 | 916 |
| La Grande | 13,087 | 13,583 | 13,026 | 13,082 | 12,327 |
| North Powder | 504 | 504 | 504 | 439 | 489 |
| Summerville | 119 | 119 | 119 | 135 | 117 |
| Union | 2,153 | 2,150 | 2,152 | 2,121 | 1,926 |
| Unincorporated | 6,695 | 6,646 | 6,669 | 6,413 | 6,223 |
| WALLOWA | 7,433 | 7,401 | 7,391 | 7,008 | 7,226 |
| Enterprise | 2,080 | 2,061 | 2,052 | 1,940 | 1,895 |
| Joseph | 1,158 | 1,154 | 1,154 | 1,081 | 1,054 |
| Lostine | 242 | 241 | 241 | 213 | 263 |
| Wallowa | 799 | 796 | 796 | 808 | 869 |
| Unincorporated | 3,154 | 3,149 | 3,148 | 2,966 | 3,145 |
| WASCO | 26,581 | 26,642 | 26,670 | 25,213 | 23,791 |
| Antelope | 37 | 37 | 37 | 46 | 59 |
| Dufur | 608 | 632 | 632 | 604 | 588 |
| Maupin | 427 | 427 | 427 | 418 | 411 |
| Mosier | 468 | 468 | 468 | 433 | 410 |
| Shaniko | 30 | 30 | 30 | 36 | 26 |
| The Dalles | 16,047 | 16,032 | 16,010 | 13,620 | 12,156 |
| Unincorporated | 8,964 | 9,016 | 9,066 | 10,056 | 10,141 |
| WASHINGTON | 605,036 | 600,895 | 600,372 | 529,710 | 445,342 |
| Banks | 1,834 | 1,837 | 1,837 | 1,777 | 1,286 |
| Beaverton | 97,318 | 97,525 | 97,494 | 89,803 | 76,129 |

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |
| Cornelius | 13,498 | 12,771 | 12,694 | 11,869 | 9,652 |
| Durham | 1,950 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,351 | 1,382 |
| Forest Grove | 26,242 | 26,296 | 26,225 | 21,083 | 17,708 |
| Gaston (part)* | 670 | 670 | 670 | 637 | 600 |
| Hillsboro | 108,154 | 106,455 | 106,447 | 91,611 | 70,186 |
| King City | 5,184 | 5,184 | 5,184 | 3,111 | 1,949 |
| Lake Oswego (part)* | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 15 |
| North Plains | 3,446 | 3,441 | 3,441 | 1,947 | 1,605 |
| Portland (part)* | 1,634 | 1,640 | 1,641 | 1,547 | 1,388 |
| Rivergrove (part)* | 50 | 50 | 50 | 32 | 37 |
| Sherwood | 20,496 | 20,450 | 20,450 | 18,194 | 11,791 |
| Tigard | 55,854 | 54,653 | 54,539 | 48,035 | 41,223 |
| Tualatin (part)* | 24,761 | 24,786 | 24,786 | 23,192 | 20,127 |
| Wilsonville (part)* | 2,142 | 2,142 | 2,142 | 2,138 | 4 |
| Unincorporated | 241,800 | 241,048 | 240,825 | 213,374 | 190,260 |
| WHEELER | 1,456 | 1,451 | 1,451 | 1,441 | 1,547 |
| Fossil | 449 | 447 | 447 | 473 | 469 |
| Mitchell | 138 | 138 | 138 | 130 | 170 |
| Spray | 140 | 140 | 139 | 160 | 140 |
| Unincorporated | 729 | 726 | 727 | 678 | 768 |
| YAMHILL | 108,261 | 107,873 | 107,722 | 99,193 | 84,992 |
| Amity | 1,809 | 1,763 | 1,757 | 1,614 | 1,478 |
| Carlton | 2,270 | 2,223 | 2,220 | 2,007 | 1,514 |
| Dayton | 2,698 | 2,678 | 2,678 | 2,534 | 2,119 |
| Dundee | 3,243 | 3,238 | 3,238 | 3,162 | 2,598 |
| Gaston (part)* | 6 | 6 | 6 | | |
| Lafayette | 4,446 | 4,428 | 4,423 | 3,742 | 2,586 |
| McMinnville | 34,251 | 34,410 | 34,319 | 32,187 | 26,499 |
| Newberg | 25,376 | 25,157 | 25,138 | 22,068 | 18,064 |
| Sheridan | 6,377 | 6,426 | 6,429 | 6,127 | 5,561 |
| Willamina (part)* | 1,324 | 1,324 | 1,315 | 1,180 | 1,128 |
| Yamhill | 1,221 | 1,180 | 1,147 | 1,024 | 794 |
| Unincorporated | 25,240 | 25,040 | 25,052 | 23,548 | 22,651 |

*City is located and has population in more than one county.

| County and Cities | July 1 Population Estimates | | April 1 Census Population | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------|---------------------------|------|------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 | 2000 |

*** This city conducted a local enumeration after Census 2020.*

Table 5. Population Estimates for Incorporated Cities Located in Mo
Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| City by County | Jul1st Population Estimate | | Census Population, April 1 | Census Population, April 1 |
|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | 2021 | 2020rev | 2020 | 2010 |
| Albany | 57,199 | 56,480 | 56,472 | 50,158 |
| in Benton | 9,322 | 9,095 | 9,117 | 6,463 |
| in Linn | 47,877 | 47,385 | 47,355 | 43,695 |
| Gaston | 676 | 676 | 676 | |
| in Washington | 670 | 670 | 670 | |
| in Yamhill | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| Gates | 470 | 548 | 548 | 471 |
| in Linn | 43 | 46 | 46 | 40 |
| in Marion | 427 | 502 | 502 | 431 |
| Idanha | 156 | 156 | 156 | 134 |
| in Linn | 71 | 71 | 71 | 57 |
| in Marion | 85 | 85 | 85 | 77 |
| Lake Oswego | 40,801 | 40,771 | 40,731 | 36,619 |
| in Clackamas | 38,211 | 38,147 | 38,107 | 34,066 |
| in Multnomah | 2,587 | 2,621 | 2,621 | 2,544 |
| in Washington | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Mill City | 2,012 | 2,000 | 1,971 | 1,855 |
| in Linn | 1,649 | 1,641 | 1,617 | 1,531 |
| in Marion | 363 | 359 | 354 | 324 |
| Portland | 658,773 | 653,537 | 652,503 | 583,776 |
| in Clackamas | 841 | 843 | 843 | 744 |
| in Multnomah | 656,298 | 651,054 | 650,019 | 581,485 |
| in Washington | 1,634 | 1,640 | 1,641 | 1,547 |
| Rivergrove | 552 | 545 | 545 | 289 |
| in Clackamas | 502 | 495 | 495 | 257 |
| in Washington | 50 | 50 | 50 | 32 |
| Salem | 177,694 | 176,215 | 175,535 | 154,637 |
| in Marion | 147,482 | 146,302 | 146,139 | 130,398 |
| in Polk | 30,212 | 29,913 | 29,396 | 24,239 |
| Tualatin | 27,910 | 27,942 | 27,942 | 26,054 |
| in Clackamas | 3,149 | 3,156 | 3,156 | 2,862 |
| in Washington | 24,761 | 24,786 | 24,786 | 23,192 |
| Willamina | 2,248 | 2,248 | 2,239 | 2,025 |
| in Polk | 924 | 924 | 924 | 845 |
| in Yamhill | 1,324 | 1,324 | 1,315 | 1,180 |
| Wilsonville | 27,186 | 26,742 | 26,664 | 19,509 |
| in Clackamas | 25,044 | 24,600 | 24,522 | 17,371 |
| in Washington | 2,142 | 2,142 | 2,142 | 2,138 |

Table 6. Rank of Incorporated Cities by July 1, 2021 Population Size

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| City | Population | City | Population | City | Population | City | Population | City | Population |
|---------------|------------|------------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| Portland | 658,773 | Fairview | 10,446 | Shady Cove | 3,095 | Riddle | 1,214 | Wheeler | 422 |
| Salem | 177,694 | North Bend | 10,375 | Millersburg | 3,093 | Athens | 1,212 | Bonanza | 404 |
| Eugene | 175,626 | Molalla | 10,207 | Jacksonville | 3,080 | Lowell | 1,211 | Adams | 393 |
| Gresham | 114,361 | Astoria | 10,197 | Turner | 2,866 | Lyons | 1,207 | Haines | 376 |
| Hillsboro | 108,154 | Baker City | 10,178 | Burns | 2,745 | Heppner | 1,187 | Moro | 374 |
| Bend | 100,922 | Independence | 10,081 | Dayton | 2,698 | Drain | 1,174 | Sodaville | 360 |
| Beaverton | 97,318 | Lincoln City | 10,067 | La Pine | 2,654 | Joseph | 1,158 | Halfway | 352 |
| Medford | 87,353 | Sweet Home | 9,893 | Gervais | 2,596 | Port Orford | 1,156 | Ione | 339 |
| Springfield | 62,352 | Eagle Point | 9,854 | Myrtle Point | 2,479 | Island City | 1,144 | Nehalem | 276 |
| Corvallis | 57,601 | Florence | 9,600 | Rogue River | 2,435 | Aurora | 1,133 | Rufus | 273 |
| Albany | 57,199 | Sutherlin | 8,909 | Lakeview | 2,428 | Falls City | 1,064 | Westfir | 260 |
| Tigard | 55,854 | Stayton | 8,265 | Vernonia | 2,403 | Yoncalla | 1,036 | Imbler | 249 |
| Lake Oswego | 40,801 | Hood River | 8,259 | Gold Beach | 2,375 | Donald | 1,012 | Paisley | 244 |
| Grants Pass | 39,475 | Scappoose | 8,016 | Waldport | 2,321 | Yachats | 1,010 | Lostine | 242 |
| Keizer | 39,458 | Madras | 7,717 | Carlton | 2,270 | Metolius | 981 | Lexington | 238 |
| Oregon City | 37,737 | Umatilla | 7,520 | Willamina | 2,248 | Halsey | 959 | Waterloo | 222 |
| Redmond | 36,122 | Seaside | 7,157 | Stanfield | 2,201 | Scio | 959 | Ukiah* | 219 |
| McMinnville | 34,251 | Milton-Freewater | 7,145 | Union | 2,153 | Oakland | 932 | Sumpter | 205 |
| Tualatin | 27,910 | Junction City | 7,032 | Cave Junction | 2,149 | Glendale | 860 | Helix | 194 |
| West Linn | 27,452 | Brookings | 6,809 | Enterprise | 2,080 | Prairie City | 841 | Elkton | 182 |
| Wilsonville | 27,186 | Sheridan | 6,377 | Irrigon | 2,037 | Garibaldi | 831 | Long Creek | 173 |
| Woodburn | 26,250 | Warrenton | 6,352 | Mill City | 2,012 | Maywood Park | 829 | Richland | 165 |
| Forest Grove | 26,242 | Talent | 5,737 | Columbia City | 1,957 | Merrill | 821 | Seneca | 165 |
| Happy Valley | 25,738 | Winston | 5,700 | Durham | 1,950 | Wallowa | 799 | Adrian | 159 |
| Newberg | 25,376 | Creswell | 5,684 | Vale | 1,914 | Chiloquin | 767 | Idanha | 156 |
| Roseburg | 23,701 | Philomath | 5,682 | Rainier | 1,913 | Malin | 731 | Grass Valley | 151 |
| Klamath Falls | 22,022 | Tillamook | 5,338 | Lakeside | 1,906 | Condon | 722 | Detroit | 141 |
| Ashland | 21,554 | Veneta | 5,271 | Gearhart | 1,872 | Powers | 712 | Spray | 140 |
| Milwaukie | 21,235 | King City | 5,184 | Banks | 1,834 | Weston | 706 | Mitchell | 138 |
| Sherwood | 20,496 | Estacada | 5,014 | Amity | 1,809 | Gaston | 676 | Dayville | 134 |
| Central Point | 19,702 | Wood Village | 4,478 | Clatskanie | 1,725 | Canyon City | 666 | Barlow | 133 |
| Hermiston | 19,696 | Lafayette | 4,446 | Elgin | 1,717 | Echo | 657 | Jordan Valley | 131 |
| Lebanon | 19,122 | Boardman | 4,338 | Brownsville | 1,705 | Monroe | 654 | Summerville | 119 |
| Canby | 18,754 | Reedsport | 4,311 | John Day | 1,664 | Arlington | 650 | Monument | 115 |
| Dallas | 17,320 | Aumsville | 4,237 | Hines | 1,661 | Cove | 627 | Prescott | 83 |
| Pendleton | 17,169 | Phoenix | 4,096 | Canyonville | 1,649 | Manzanita | 609 | Unity | 40 |
| Troutdale | 16,319 | Coquille | 4,018 | Culver | 1,636 | Dufur | 608 | Antelope | 37 |
| The Dalles | 16,047 | Harrisburg | 3,658 | Depoe Bay | 1,559 | Rivergrove | 552 | Granite | 32 |
| Coos Bay | 16,005 | Toledo | 3,611 | Cannon Beach | 1,498 | Mt. Vernon | 548 | Shaniko | 30 |
| St. Helens | 14,560 | Myrtle Creek | 3,501 | Rockaway Beach | 1,476 | Johnson City | 537 | Lonerock | 25 |
| Cornelius | 13,498 | Hubbard | 3,478 | Dunes City | 1,454 | North Powder | 504 | Greenhorn | 3 |
| La Grande | 13,087 | Bandon | 3,470 | Bay City | 1,424 | Huntington | 503 | | |
| Sandy | 12,869 | North Plains | 3,446 | Cascade Locks | 1,398 | Gates | 470 | | |
| Gladstone | 12,033 | Mt. Angel | 3,418 | Gold Hill | 1,360 | Mosier | 468 | | |
| Ontario | 11,816 | Jefferson | 3,339 | Pilot Rock | 1,328 | Butte Falls | 451 | | |
| Monmouth | 11,142 | Sisters | 3,286 | Coburg | 1,322 | Fossil | 449 | | |
| Prineville | 11,042 | Nyssa | 3,276 | Adair Village | 1,318 | St. Paul | 434 | | |
| Cottage Grove | 10,792 | Dundee | 3,243 | Siletz | 1,249 | Scotts Mills | 431 | | |
| Newport | 10,591 | Oakridge | 3,238 | Tangent | 1,231 | Maupin | 427 | | |
| Silverton | 10,591 | Sublimity | 3,106 | Yamhill | 1,221 | Wasco | 424 | | |

*This city conducted a local enumeration after Census 2020.

**Table 7. Alphabetical Listing of Incorporated Cities with Population for July 1, 2021
Census 2020 Population and Change since Census 2020.**

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| City | Estimate July 1, 2021 | Census April 1, 2020 | Change 2020-2021 | Percent Change 2020-2021 | City | Estimate July 1, 2021 | Census April 1, 2020 | Change 2020-2021 | Percent Change 2020-2021 |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Adair Village | 1,318 | 994 | 324 | 32.6% | Estacada | 5,014 | 4,356 | 658 | 15.1% |
| Adams | 393 | 389 | 4 | 1.0% | Eugene | 175,626 | 176,654 | -1,028 | -0.6% |
| Adrian | 159 | 157 | 2 | 1.3% | Fairview | 10,446 | 10,424 | 22 | 0.2% |
| Albany | 57,199 | 56,472 | 727 | 1.3% | Falls City | 1,064 | 1,051 | 13 | 1.2% |
| Amity | 1,809 | 1,757 | 52 | 3.0% | Florence | 9,600 | 9,396 | 204 | 2.2% |
| Antelope | 37 | 37 | 0 | 0.0% | Forest Grove | 26,242 | 26,225 | 17 | 0.1% |
| Arlington | 650 | 628 | 22 | 3.5% | Fossil | 449 | 447 | 2 | 0.4% |
| Ashland | 21,554 | 21,360 | 194 | 0.9% | Garibaldi | 831 | 830 | 1 | 0.1% |
| Astoria | 10,197 | 10,181 | 16 | 0.2% | Gaston | 676 | 676 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Athena | 1,212 | 1,209 | 3 | 0.2% | Gates | 470 | 548 | -78 | -14.2% |
| Aumsville | 4,237 | 4,234 | 3 | 0.1% | Gearhart | 1,872 | 1,793 | 79 | 4.4% |
| Aurora | 1,133 | 1,133 | 0 | 0.0% | Gervais | 2,596 | 2,595 | 1 | 0.0% |
| Baker City | 10,178 | 10,099 | 79 | 0.8% | Gladstone | 12,033 | 12,017 | 16 | 0.1% |
| Bandon | 3,470 | 3,321 | 149 | 4.5% | Glendale | 860 | 858 | 2 | 0.2% |
| Banks | 1,834 | 1,837 | -3 | -0.2% | Gold Beach | 2,375 | 2,341 | 34 | 1.5% |
| Barlow | 133 | 133 | 0 | 0.0% | Gold Hill | 1,360 | 1,335 | 25 | 1.9% |
| Bay City | 1,424 | 1,389 | 35 | 2.5% | Granite | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Beaverton | 97,318 | 97,494 | -176 | -0.2% | Grants Pass | 39,475 | 39,189 | 286 | 0.7% |
| Bend | 100,922 | 99,178 | 1,744 | 1.8% | Grass Valley | 151 | 149 | 2 | 1.3% |
| Boardman | 4,338 | 3,828 | 510 | 13.3% | Greenhorn | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Bonanza | 404 | 404 | 0 | 0.0% | Gresham | 114,361 | 114,247 | 114 | 0.1% |
| Brookings | 6,809 | 6,744 | 65 | 1.0% | Haines | 376 | 373 | 3 | 0.8% |
| Brownsville | 1,705 | 1,694 | 11 | 0.6% | Halfway | 352 | 351 | 1 | 0.3% |
| Burns | 2,745 | 2,730 | 15 | 0.5% | Halsey | 959 | 962 | -3 | -0.3% |
| Butte Falls | 451 | 443 | 8 | 1.8% | Happy Valley | 25,738 | 23,733 | 2,005 | 8.4% |
| Canby | 18,754 | 18,171 | 583 | 3.2% | Harrisburg | 3,658 | 3,652 | 6 | 0.2% |
| Cannon Beach | 1,498 | 1,489 | 9 | 0.6% | Helix | 194 | 194 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Canyon City | 666 | 660 | 6 | 0.9% | Heppner | 1,187 | 1,187 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Canyonville | 1,649 | 1,640 | 9 | 0.5% | Hermiston | 19,696 | 19,354 | 342 | 1.8% |
| Carlton | 2,270 | 2,220 | 50 | 2.3% | Hillsboro | 108,154 | 106,447 | 1,707 | 1.6% |
| Cascade Locks | 1,398 | 1,379 | 19 | 1.4% | Hines | 1,661 | 1,645 | 16 | 1.0% |
| Cave Junction | 2,149 | 2,071 | 78 | 3.8% | Hood River | 8,259 | 8,313 | -54 | -0.6% |
| Central Point | 19,702 | 18,997 | 705 | 3.7% | Hubbard | 3,478 | 3,426 | 52 | 1.5% |
| Chiloquin | 767 | 767 | 0 | 0.0% | Huntington | 503 | 502 | 1 | 0.2% |
| Clatskanie | 1,725 | 1,716 | 9 | 0.5% | Idanha | 156 | 156 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Coburg | 1,322 | 1,306 | 16 | 1.2% | Imbler | 249 | 245 | 4 | 1.6% |
| Columbia City | 1,957 | 1,949 | 8 | 0.4% | Independence | 10,081 | 9,828 | 253 | 2.6% |
| Condon | 722 | 711 | 11 | 1.5% | Ione | 339 | 337 | 2 | 0.6% |
| Coos Bay | 16,005 | 15,985 | 20 | 0.1% | Irrigon | 2,037 | 2,011 | 26 | 1.3% |
| Coquille | 4,018 | 4,015 | 3 | 0.1% | Island City | 1,144 | 1,144 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cornelius | 13,498 | 12,694 | 804 | 6.3% | Jacksonville | 3,080 | 3,020 | 60 | 2.0% |
| Corvallis | 57,601 | 59,922 | -2,321 | -3.9% | Jefferson | 3,339 | 3,327 | 12 | 0.4% |
| Cottage Grove | 10,792 | 10,574 | 218 | 2.1% | John Day | 1,664 | 1,664 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cove | 627 | 620 | 7 | 1.1% | Johnson City | 537 | 539 | -2 | -0.4% |
| Creswell | 5,684 | 5,641 | 43 | 0.8% | Jordan Valley | 131 | 130 | 1 | 0.8% |
| Culver | 1,636 | 1,602 | 34 | 2.1% | Joseph | 1,158 | 1,154 | 4 | 0.3% |
| Dallas | 17,320 | 16,854 | 466 | 2.8% | Junction City | 7,032 | 6,787 | 245 | 3.6% |
| Dayton | 2,698 | 2,678 | 20 | 0.7% | Keizer | 39,458 | 39,376 | 82 | 0.2% |
| Dayville | 134 | 132 | 2 | 1.5% | King City | 5,184 | 5,184 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Depoe Bay | 1,559 | 1,515 | 44 | 2.9% | Klamath Falls | 22,022 | 21,813 | 209 | 1.0% |
| Detroit | 141 | 203 | -62 | -30.5% | La Grande | 13,087 | 13,026 | 61 | 0.5% |
| Donald | 1,012 | 1,009 | 3 | 0.3% | La Pine | 2,654 | 2,512 | 142 | 5.7% |
| Drain | 1,174 | 1,172 | 2 | 0.2% | Lafayette | 4,446 | 4,423 | 23 | 0.5% |
| Dufur | 608 | 632 | -24 | -3.8% | Lake Oswego | 40,801 | 40,731 | 70 | 0.2% |
| Dundee | 3,243 | 3,238 | 5 | 0.2% | Lakeside | 1,906 | 1,904 | 2 | 0.1% |
| Dunes City | 1,454 | 1,428 | 26 | 1.8% | Lakeview | 2,428 | 2,418 | 10 | 0.4% |
| Durham | 1,950 | 1,944 | 6 | 0.3% | Lebanon | 19,122 | 18,447 | 675 | 3.7% |
| Eagle Point | 9,854 | 9,686 | 168 | 1.7% | Lexington | 238 | 238 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Echo | 657 | 632 | 25 | 4.0% | Lincoln City | 10,067 | 9,815 | 252 | 2.6% |
| Elgin | 1,717 | 1,717 | 0 | 0.0% | Lonerock | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Elkton | 182 | 183 | -1 | -0.5% | Long Creek | 173 | 173 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Enterprise | 2,080 | 2,052 | 28 | 1.4% | Lostine | 242 | 241 | 1 | 0.4% |
| Lowell | 1,211 | 1,196 | 15 | 1.3% | Sandy | 12,869 | 12,612 | 257 | 2.0% |
| Lyons | 1,207 | 1,202 | 5 | 0.4% | Scappoose | 8,016 | 8,010 | 6 | 0.1% |

**Table 7. Alphabetical Listing of Incorporated Cities with Population for July 1, 2021
Census 2020 Population and Change since Census 2020.**

Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| City | Estimate July 1, 2021 | Census April 1, 2020 | Change 2020-2021 | Percent Change 2020-2021 | City | Estimate July 1, 2021 | Census April 1, 2020 | Change 2020-2021 | Percent Change 2020-2021 |
|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Madras | 7,717 | 7,456 | 261 | 3.5% | Scio | 959 | 956 | 3 | 0.3% |
| Malin | 731 | 731 | 0 | 0.0% | Scotts Mills | 431 | 419 | 12 | 2.9% |
| Manzanita | 609 | 603 | 6 | 1.0% | Seaside | 7,157 | 7,115 | 42 | 0.6% |
| Maupin | 427 | 427 | 0 | 0.0% | Seneca | 165 | 165 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Maywood Park | 829 | 829 | 0 | 0.0% | Shady Cove | 3,095 | 3,081 | 14 | 0.5% |
| McMinnville | 34,251 | 34,319 | -68 | -0.2% | Shaniko | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medford | 87,353 | 85,824 | 1,529 | 1.8% | Sheridan | 6,377 | 6,429 | -52 | -0.8% |
| Merrill | 821 | 821 | 0 | 0.0% | Sherwood | 20,496 | 20,450 | 46 | 0.2% |
| Metolius | 981 | 978 | 3 | 0.3% | Siletz | 1,249 | 1,230 | 19 | 1.5% |
| Mill City | 2,012 | 1,971 | 41 | 2.1% | Silverton | 10,591 | 10,484 | 107 | 1.0% |
| Millersburg | 3,093 | 2,919 | 174 | 6.0% | Sisters | 3,286 | 3,064 | 222 | 7.2% |
| Milton-Freewater | 7,145 | 7,151 | -6 | -0.1% | Sodaville | 360 | 360 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Milwaukie | 21,235 | 21,119 | 116 | 0.5% | Spray | 140 | 139 | 1 | 0.7% |
| Mitchell | 138 | 138 | 0 | 0.0% | Springfield | 62,352 | 61,851 | 501 | 0.8% |
| Molalla | 10,207 | 10,228 | -21 | -0.2% | St. Helens | 14,560 | 13,817 | 743 | 5.4% |
| Monmouth | 11,142 | 11,110 | 32 | 0.3% | St. Paul | 434 | 434 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Monroe | 654 | 647 | 7 | 1.1% | Stanfield | 2,201 | 2,144 | 57 | 2.7% |
| Monument | 115 | 115 | 0 | 0.0% | Stayton | 8,265 | 8,244 | 21 | 0.3% |
| Moro | 374 | 367 | 7 | 1.9% | Sublimity | 3,106 | 2,967 | 139 | 4.7% |
| Mosier | 468 | 468 | 0 | 0.0% | Summerville | 119 | 119 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mt. Angel | 3,418 | 3,392 | 26 | 0.8% | Sumpter | 205 | 204 | 1 | 0.5% |
| Mt. Vernon | 548 | 548 | 0 | 0.0% | Sutherlin | 8,909 | 8,524 | 385 | 4.5% |
| Myrtle Creek | 3,501 | 3,481 | 20 | 0.6% | Sweet Home | 9,893 | 9,828 | 65 | 0.7% |
| Myrtle Point | 2,479 | 2,475 | 4 | 0.2% | Talent | 5,737 | 6,282 | -545 | -8.7% |
| Nehalem | 276 | 270 | 6 | 2.2% | Tangent | 1,231 | 1,231 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Newberg | 25,376 | 25,138 | 238 | 0.9% | The Dalles | 16,047 | 16,010 | 37 | 0.2% |
| Newport | 10,591 | 10,256 | 335 | 3.3% | Tigard | 55,854 | 54,539 | 1,315 | 2.4% |
| North Bend | 10,375 | 10,317 | 58 | 0.6% | Tillamook | 5,338 | 5,204 | 134 | 2.6% |
| North Plains | 3,446 | 3,441 | 5 | 0.1% | Toledo | 3,611 | 3,546 | 65 | 1.8% |
| North Powder | 504 | 504 | 0 | 0.0% | Troutdale | 16,319 | 16,300 | 19 | 0.1% |
| Nyssa | 3,276 | 3,198 | 78 | 2.4% | Tualatin | 27,910 | 27,942 | -32 | -0.1% |
| Oakland | 932 | 934 | -2 | -0.2% | Turner | 2,866 | 2,454 | 412 | 16.8% |
| Oakridge | 3,238 | 3,206 | 32 | 1.0% | Ukiah* | 219 | 159 | 60 | 37.7% |
| Ontario | 11,816 | 11,645 | 171 | 1.5% | Umatilla | 7,520 | 7,363 | 157 | 2.1% |
| Oregon City | 37,737 | 37,572 | 165 | 0.4% | Union | 2,153 | 2,152 | 1 | 0.0% |
| Paisley | 244 | 250 | -6 | -2.4% | Unity | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Pendleton | 17,169 | 17,107 | 62 | 0.4% | Vale | 1,914 | 1,894 | 20 | 1.1% |
| Philomath | 5,682 | 5,350 | 332 | 6.2% | Veneta | 5,271 | 5,214 | 57 | 1.1% |
| Phoenix | 4,096 | 4,475 | -379 | -8.5% | Vernonia | 2,403 | 2,374 | 29 | 1.2% |
| Pilot Rock | 1,328 | 1,328 | 0 | 0.0% | Waldport | 2,321 | 2,249 | 72 | 3.2% |
| Port Orford | 1,156 | 1,146 | 10 | 0.9% | Wallowa | 799 | 796 | 3 | 0.4% |
| Portland | 658,773 | 652,503 | 6,270 | 1.0% | Warrenton | 6,352 | 6,277 | 75 | 1.2% |
| Powers | 712 | 710 | 2 | 0.3% | Wasco | 424 | 417 | 7 | 1.7% |
| Prairie City | 841 | 841 | 0 | 0.0% | Waterloo | 222 | 222 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Prescott | 83 | 82 | 1 | 1.2% | West Linn | 27,452 | 27,373 | 79 | 0.3% |
| Prineville | 11,042 | 10,736 | 306 | 2.9% | Westfir | 260 | 259 | 1 | 0.4% |
| Rainier | 1,913 | 1,911 | 2 | 0.1% | Weston | 706 | 706 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Redmond | 36,122 | 33,274 | 2,848 | 8.6% | Wheeler | 422 | 422 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Reedsport | 4,311 | 4,310 | 1 | 0.0% | Willamina | 2,248 | 2,239 | 9 | 0.4% |
| Richland | 165 | 165 | 0 | 0.0% | Wilsonville | 27,186 | 26,664 | 522 | 2.0% |
| Riddle | 1,214 | 1,214 | 0 | 0.0% | Winston | 5,700 | 5,625 | 75 | 1.3% |
| Rivergrove | 552 | 545 | 7 | 1.3% | Wood Village | 4,478 | 4,387 | 91 | 2.1% |
| Rockaway Beach | 1,476 | 1,441 | 35 | 2.4% | Woodburn | 26,250 | 26,013 | 237 | 0.9% |
| Rogue River | 2,435 | 2,407 | 28 | 1.2% | Yachats | 1,010 | 994 | 16 | 1.6% |
| Roseburg | 23,701 | 23,683 | 18 | 0.1% | Yamhill | 1,221 | 1,147 | 74 | 6.5% |
| Rufus | 273 | 268 | 5 | 1.9% | Yoncalla | 1,036 | 1,021 | 15 | 1.5% |
| Salem | 177,694 | 175,535 | 2,159 | 1.2% | | | | | |

*This city conducted a local enumeration after Census 2020.

Table 8. Population Added to Incorporated Cities Due to Annexations: A1

Compiled by Population Research Center, PSU. April 2022.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| Adair Village | Depoe Bay | Independence | Myrtle Creek | 16 | Springfield | |
| Adams | Detroit | Ione | Myrtle Point | | St. Helens | |
| Adrian | Donald | Irrigon | Nehalem | | St. Paul | |
| Albany | Drain | Island City | Newberg | | Stanfield | |
| Amity | Dufur | Jacksonville | Newport | | Stayton | |
| Antelope | Dundee | Jefferson | North Bend | | Sublimity | |
| Arlington | Dunes City | John Day | North Plains | | Summerville | |
| Ashland | Durham | Johnson City | North Powder | | Sumpter | |
| Astoria | Eagle Point | Jordan Valley | Nyssa | | Sutherlin | |
| Athena | Echo | Joseph | Oakland | | Sweet Home | |
| Aumsville | Elgin | Junction City | 2 | Oakridge | Talent | |
| Aurora | Elkton | Keizer | Ontario | | Tangent | |
| Baker City | Enterprise | King City | Oregon City | | The Dalles | |
| Bandon | Estacada | 3 | Klamath Falls | Paisley | Tigard | |
| Banks | Eugene | 5 | La Grande | Pendleton | Tillamook | |
| Barlow | Fairview | 2 | La Pine | Philomath | Toledo | |
| Bay City | Falls City | Lafayette | Phoenix | | Troutdale | |
| Beaverton | Florence | Lake Oswego | 10 | Pilot Rock | Tualatin | |
| Bend | Forest Grove | Lakeside | Port Orford | | Turner | |
| Boardman | Fossil | Lakeview | Portland | | Ukiah | |
| Bonanza | Garibaldi | Lebanon | 12 | Powers | Umatilla | |
| Brookings | 7 | Gaston | Lexington | Prairie City | Union | |
| Brownsville | Gates | Lincoln City | Prescott | | Unity | |
| Burns | Gearhart | Lonerock | Prineville | | Vale | |
| Butte Falls | Gervais | Long Creek | Rainier | | Veneta | |
| Canby | Gladstone | Lostine | Redmond | | Vernonia | |
| Cannon Beach | Glendale | Lowell | Reedsport | | Waldport | |
| Canyon City | Gold Beach | Lyons | Richland | | Wallowa | |
| Canyonville | Gold Hill | Madras | Riddle | | Warrenton | |
| Carlton | Granite | Malin | Rivergrove | | Wasco | |
| Cascade Locks | Grants Pass | Manzanita | Rockaway Beach | | Waterloo | |
| Cave Junction | Granite | Maupin | Rogue River | | West Linn | |
| Central Point | 2 | Grass Valley | Maywood Park | Roseburg | Westfir | |
| Chiloquin | Greenhorn | McMinnville | Rufus | | Weston | |
| Clatskanie | Gresham | Medford | 7 | Salem | 1 | Wheeler |
| Coburg | Haines | Merrill | Sandy | | Willamina | |
| Columbia City | Halfway | Metolius | Scappoose | 6 | Wilsonville | |
| Condon | Halsey | Mill City | Scio | | Winston | |
| Coos Bay | Happy Valley | Millersburg | Scotts Mills | | Wood Village | |
| Coquille | Harrisburg | Milton-Freewater | Seaside | | Woodburn | |
| Cornelius | Helix | Milwaukie | 2 | Seneca | Yachats | |
| Corvallis | Hepner | Mitchell | Shady Cove | | Yamhill | |
| Cottage Grove | Hermiston | 8 | Molalla | Shaniko | Yoncalla | |
| Cove | Hillsboro | Monmouth | Sheridan | | | |
| Creswell | 2 | Hines | Monroe | Sherwood | | |
| Culver | Hood River | Monument | Siletz | | | |
| Dallas | Hubbard | Moro | Silverton | | | |
| Damascus | Huntington | Mosier | Sisters | | | |
| Dayton | Idanha | Mt. Angel | Sodaville | | | |
| Dayville | Imbler | Mt. Vernon | Spray | | | |

Table 9. Population by Age and Sex for Oregon and Its Counties: July 1, 2021
 Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| | | Total Population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| Age Group | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-17 | 18-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85+ | Total |
| OREGON | 222,165 | 243,930 | 247,129 | 147,803 | 97,392 | 263,691 | 298,471 | 306,170 | 302,915 | 283,103 | 263,768 | 254,905 | 259,017 | 266,807 | 258,895 | 220,023 | 150,311 | 93,190 | 86,933 | 4,266,620 |
| BAKER | 840 | 983 | 947 | 525 | 291 | 684 | 846 | 925 | 993 | 885 | 841 | 925 | 1,115 | 1,345 | 1,395 | 1,274 | 891 | 614 | 542 | 16,860 |
| BENTON | 3,642 | 3,988 | 4,393 | 2,736 | 6,253 | 16,162 | 7,290 | 5,767 | 5,527 | 5,036 | 4,967 | 4,837 | 5,051 | 5,603 | 4,155 | 3,413 | 2,303 | 1,450 | 1,401 | 93,976 |
| CLACKAMAS | 22,099 | 25,478 | 26,924 | 16,394 | 8,330 | 22,210 | 24,919 | 26,380 | 29,525 | 28,867 | 27,640 | 27,164 | 27,868 | 27,793 | 26,638 | 22,727 | 15,485 | 9,695 | 9,179 | 425,316 |
| CLATSOP | 2,043 | 2,262 | 2,231 | 1,283 | 848 | 2,231 | 2,264 | 2,444 | 2,612 | 2,570 | 2,227 | 2,313 | 2,771 | 3,082 | 3,428 | 2,983 | 1,881 | 1,068 | 886 | 41,428 |
| COLUMBIA | 2,627 | 2,937 | 3,179 | 1,884 | 1,038 | 2,612 | 2,971 | 3,304 | 3,408 | 3,420 | 3,243 | 3,641 | 3,807 | 3,940 | 3,589 | 3,062 | 2,008 | 1,251 | 1,093 | 53,014 |
| COOS | 3,048 | 3,341 | 3,406 | 1,997 | 1,078 | 2,990 | 3,492 | 3,586 | 3,651 | 3,529 | 3,477 | 3,590 | 4,509 | 5,239 | 5,655 | 4,965 | 3,487 | 2,289 | 1,827 | 65,154 |
| CROOK | 1,326 | 1,344 | 1,464 | 794 | 432 | 1,110 | 1,245 | 1,462 | 1,433 | 1,448 | 1,452 | 1,455 | 1,775 | 2,020 | 2,132 | 1,955 | 1,279 | 779 | 578 | 25,482 |
| CURRY | 869 | 931 | 955 | 540 | 297 | 760 | 989 | 1,089 | 1,061 | 1,064 | 1,099 | 1,307 | 1,845 | 2,266 | 2,663 | 2,366 | 1,676 | 1,053 | 833 | 23,662 |
| DESCHUTES | 10,394 | 11,570 | 12,045 | 7,215 | 3,633 | 9,536 | 12,700 | 13,513 | 14,071 | 13,313 | 12,767 | 12,223 | 12,395 | 14,151 | 14,594 | 12,384 | 8,279 | 4,734 | 3,872 | 203,390 |
| DOUGLAS | 5,487 | 6,084 | 6,006 | 3,703 | 1,959 | 5,072 | 6,056 | 6,309 | 6,145 | 6,162 | 5,784 | 6,351 | 7,462 | 8,486 | 8,999 | 8,096 | 6,050 | 3,823 | 3,661 | 111,694 |
| GILLIAM | 89 | 125 | 126 | 62 | 40 | 87 | 89 | 105 | 120 | 121 | 111 | 101 | 152 | 202 | 153 | 134 | 84 | 70 | 66 | 2,039 |
| GRANT | 328 | 364 | 365 | 210 | 129 | 305 | 363 | 434 | 430 | 430 | 407 | 392 | 548 | 621 | 524 | 471 | 392 | 238 | 274 | 7,226 |
| HARNEY | 409 | 448 | 469 | 264 | 155 | 371 | 409 | 475 | 489 | 472 | 398 | 440 | 502 | 604 | 500 | 424 | 317 | 210 | 182 | 7,537 |
| HOOD RIVER | 1,408 | 1,578 | 1,526 | 996 | 593 | 1,351 | 1,469 | 1,530 | 1,629 | 1,622 | 1,497 | 1,531 | 1,506 | 1,551 | 1,361 | 1,051 | 752 | 445 | 493 | 23,888 |
| JACKSON | 11,532 | 13,043 | 12,946 | 7,457 | 4,479 | 11,536 | 13,618 | 14,135 | 14,346 | 13,457 | 12,446 | 12,751 | 13,860 | 15,289 | 15,991 | 14,426 | 10,231 | 6,317 | 5,966 | 223,827 |
| JEFFERSON | 1,528 | 1,658 | 1,587 | 910 | 494 | 1,361 | 1,584 | 1,607 | 1,536 | 1,362 | 1,411 | 1,405 | 1,599 | 1,684 | 1,649 | 1,466 | 1,000 | 633 | 416 | 24,889 |
| JOSEPHINE | 3,975 | 4,508 | 4,653 | 2,908 | 1,468 | 4,078 | 4,902 | 5,034 | 5,043 | 4,970 | 4,773 | 5,118 | 6,051 | 6,954 | 7,110 | 6,657 | 4,737 | 3,058 | 2,730 | 88,728 |
| KLAMATH | 4,046 | 4,368 | 4,123 | 2,467 | 1,560 | 3,845 | 4,465 | 4,328 | 4,083 | 3,810 | 3,779 | 3,812 | 4,424 | 4,838 | 5,193 | 4,423 | 2,980 | 1,808 | 1,470 | 69,822 |
| LAKE | 394 | 477 | 460 | 259 | 157 | 353 | 439 | 443 | 471 | 518 | 541 | 471 | 582 | 646 | 624 | 528 | 362 | 242 | 209 | 8,177 |
| LANE | 17,401 | 19,368 | 19,482 | 12,006 | 11,820 | 34,587 | 26,193 | 24,241 | 24,193 | 23,262 | 21,360 | 21,148 | 22,692 | 24,494 | 25,534 | 22,079 | 14,948 | 9,320 | 8,519 | 382,647 |
| LINCOLN | 1,957 | 2,287 | 2,343 | 1,447 | 873 | 2,093 | 2,295 | 2,365 | 2,705 | 2,742 | 2,592 | 2,951 | 3,617 | 4,668 | 5,360 | 4,641 | 2,992 | 1,657 | 1,320 | 50,903 |
| LINN | 7,711 | 7,928 | 8,134 | 4,781 | 2,621 | 7,322 | 8,842 | 8,942 | 8,451 | 7,867 | 7,459 | 7,608 | 8,314 | 8,541 | 8,255 | 7,041 | 4,963 | 3,053 | 2,606 | 130,440 |
| MALHEUR | 1,979 | 2,180 | 2,184 | 1,281 | 901 | 2,265 | 2,369 | 2,083 | 2,079 | 1,946 | 1,902 | 1,766 | 1,768 | 1,767 | 1,694 | 1,415 | 1,101 | 655 | 661 | 31,995 |
| MARION | 21,762 | 23,154 | 23,826 | 13,968 | 8,656 | 22,300 | 24,824 | 24,230 | 23,328 | 22,040 | 20,380 | 19,950 | 20,130 | 20,256 | 18,564 | 15,397 | 10,879 | 6,949 | 6,589 | 347,182 |
| MORROW | 900 | 966 | 985 | 598 | 359 | 812 | 735 | 690 | 751 | 674 | 741 | 680 | 674 | 859 | 717 | 630 | 402 | 269 | 194 | 12,635 |
| MULTNOMAH | 40,315 | 42,100 | 40,769 | 24,016 | 16,062 | 47,186 | 72,650 | 78,130 | 72,831 | 65,161 | 58,204 | 52,214 | 46,894 | 43,885 | 41,100 | 33,077 | 20,951 | 12,635 | 12,492 | 820,672 |
| POLK | 4,988 | 5,687 | 5,846 | 3,571 | 2,902 | 7,755 | 5,691 | 5,234 | 5,619 | 5,255 | 4,878 | 4,693 | 4,835 | 4,962 | 5,092 | 4,508 | 3,415 | 2,075 | 1,909 | 88,916 |
| SHERMAN | 112 | 102 | 99 | 50 | 33 | 73 | 107 | 119 | 121 | 112 | 105 | 98 | 139 | 159 | 133 | 112 | 89 | 69 | 75 | 1,908 |
| TILLAMOOK | 1,209 | 1,370 | 1,488 | 880 | 479 | 1,122 | 1,447 | 1,522 | 1,621 | 1,461 | 1,505 | 1,597 | 1,846 | 2,333 | 2,554 | 2,219 | 1,443 | 854 | 678 | 27,628 |
| UMATILLA | 5,045 | 5,704 | 5,730 | 3,480 | 1,879 | 5,155 | 5,780 | 5,640 | 5,247 | 5,011 | 4,677 | 4,538 | 4,639 | 4,483 | 4,301 | 3,457 | 2,520 | 1,649 | 1,588 | 80,523 |
| UNION | 1,386 | 1,680 | 1,709 | 988 | 879 | 2,080 | 1,535 | 1,495 | 1,582 | 1,423 | 1,348 | 1,267 | 1,439 | 1,643 | 1,719 | 1,487 | 1,049 | 741 | 847 | 26,295 |
| WALLOWA | 367 | 376 | 429 | 234 | 107 | 241 | 285 | 405 | 437 | 411 | 353 | 390 | 487 | 614 | 758 | 588 | 408 | 277 | 266 | 7,433 |
| WASCO | 1,538 | 1,611 | 1,569 | 917 | 509 | 1,383 | 1,800 | 1,812 | 1,779 | 1,523 | 1,460 | 1,479 | 1,628 | 1,848 | 1,805 | 1,539 | 1,018 | 671 | 692 | 26,581 |
| WASHINGTON | 33,603 | 37,483 | 37,987 | 22,845 | 12,834 | 35,398 | 47,053 | 49,193 | 48,385 | 44,044 | 41,451 | 38,003 | 35,440 | 32,935 | 28,482 | 23,570 | 16,027 | 10,029 | 10,275 | 605,036 |
| WHEELER | 69 | 55 | 59 | 44 | 20 | 64 | 48 | 78 | 73 | 60 | 74 | 74 | 126 | 140 | 138 | 108 | 103 | 64 | 59 | 1,456 |
| YAMHILL | 5,741 | 6,389 | 6,685 | 4,094 | 3,227 | 7,204 | 6,709 | 7,122 | 7,139 | 7,053 | 6,418 | 6,623 | 6,527 | 6,910 | 6,335 | 5,353 | 3,808 | 2,443 | 2,482 | 108,261 |

Table 9. Population by Age and Sex for Oregon and Its Counties: July 1, 2021
 Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| Male Population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| Age Group | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-17 | 18-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85+ | Total |
| OREGON | 113,728 | 125,189 | 126,346 | 75,892 | 49,801 | 134,287 | 152,432 | 155,956 | 152,997 | 142,990 | 133,539 | 127,304 | 126,912 | 127,369 | 122,106 | 103,459 | 69,578 | 41,673 | 33,508 | 2,115,062 |
| BAKER | 439 | 517 | 489 | 284 | 161 | 380 | 464 | 472 | 524 | 460 | 433 | 448 | 564 | 627 | 686 | 631 | 445 | 325 | 239 | 8,590 |
| BENTON | 1,862 | 2,053 | 2,226 | 1,394 | 3,149 | 8,599 | 3,927 | 2,932 | 2,761 | 2,537 | 2,412 | 2,399 | 2,398 | 2,559 | 1,992 | 1,649 | 1,064 | 660 | 560 | 47,132 |
| CLACKAMAS | 11,336 | 13,216 | 13,699 | 8,372 | 4,408 | 11,499 | 12,802 | 13,164 | 14,697 | 14,261 | 13,960 | 13,474 | 13,686 | 13,398 | 12,624 | 10,589 | 7,123 | 4,269 | 3,442 | 210,019 |
| CLATSOP | 1,058 | 1,165 | 1,097 | 645 | 431 | 1,149 | 1,171 | 1,261 | 1,247 | 1,286 | 1,119 | 1,157 | 1,348 | 1,462 | 1,614 | 1,461 | 907 | 500 | 352 | 20,431 |
| COLUMBIA | 1,322 | 1,477 | 1,629 | 964 | 537 | 1,419 | 1,517 | 1,674 | 1,732 | 1,725 | 1,636 | 1,848 | 1,877 | 1,944 | 1,752 | 1,460 | 972 | 575 | 421 | 26,481 |
| COOS | 1,532 | 1,735 | 1,723 | 1,014 | 532 | 1,534 | 1,803 | 1,836 | 1,862 | 1,758 | 1,712 | 1,752 | 2,141 | 2,437 | 2,697 | 2,391 | 1,690 | 1,106 | 828 | 32,080 |
| CROOK | 629 | 680 | 740 | 417 | 231 | 557 | 618 | 739 | 739 | 716 | 735 | 698 | 831 | 986 | 1,008 | 983 | 636 | 388 | 286 | 12,614 |
| CURRY | 452 | 467 | 520 | 278 | 155 | 433 | 512 | 568 | 531 | 512 | 528 | 622 | 843 | 1,041 | 1,275 | 1,172 | 839 | 511 | 366 | 11,626 |
| DESCHUTES | 5,360 | 5,890 | 6,257 | 3,748 | 1,915 | 4,823 | 6,589 | 6,846 | 7,059 | 6,677 | 6,475 | 6,015 | 5,898 | 6,631 | 6,787 | 6,003 | 4,006 | 2,311 | 1,530 | 100,820 |
| DOUGLAS | 2,767 | 3,105 | 3,061 | 1,891 | 1,082 | 2,638 | 3,058 | 3,167 | 3,023 | 3,148 | 2,896 | 3,101 | 3,557 | 4,003 | 4,296 | 4,003 | 2,950 | 1,802 | 1,498 | 55,045 |
| GILLIAM | 49 | 63 | 66 | 32 | 19 | 53 | 46 | 54 | 64 | 57 | 44 | 52 | 74 | 109 | 75 | 75 | 39 | 34 | 22 | 1,025 |
| GRANT | 164 | 201 | 180 | 117 | 64 | 155 | 193 | 212 | 215 | 232 | 212 | 165 | 280 | 299 | 269 | 237 | 207 | 116 | 119 | 3,635 |
| HARNEY | 217 | 249 | 248 | 162 | 106 | 221 | 213 | 230 | 253 | 245 | 189 | 200 | 236 | 302 | 254 | 202 | 163 | 94 | 78 | 3,863 |
| HOOD RIVER | 723 | 786 | 749 | 525 | 318 | 745 | 762 | 788 | 785 | 792 | 776 | 753 | 762 | 773 | 703 | 542 | 355 | 196 | 159 | 11,990 |
| JACKSON | 5,914 | 6,769 | 6,668 | 3,806 | 2,276 | 5,810 | 6,886 | 7,010 | 7,151 | 6,625 | 6,184 | 6,331 | 6,667 | 7,155 | 7,419 | 6,749 | 4,712 | 2,820 | 2,360 | 109,314 |
| JEFFERSON | 788 | 893 | 818 | 464 | 263 | 735 | 884 | 865 | 852 | 722 | 731 | 733 | 798 | 824 | 821 | 741 | 491 | 306 | 185 | 12,914 |
| JOSEPHINE | 2,001 | 2,276 | 2,351 | 1,526 | 804 | 2,117 | 2,535 | 2,518 | 2,566 | 2,425 | 2,388 | 2,445 | 2,861 | 3,200 | 3,252 | 3,139 | 2,195 | 1,398 | 1,130 | 43,128 |
| KLAMATH | 2,082 | 2,202 | 2,109 | 1,297 | 856 | 1,982 | 2,293 | 2,197 | 2,045 | 1,942 | 1,949 | 1,879 | 2,135 | 2,300 | 2,503 | 2,209 | 1,467 | 859 | 548 | 34,854 |
| LAKE | 189 | 256 | 201 | 140 | 87 | 189 | 248 | 256 | 265 | 295 | 301 | 274 | 309 | 308 | 340 | 275 | 203 | 123 | 106 | 4,366 |
| LANE | 8,952 | 10,039 | 9,955 | 6,151 | 5,808 | 17,161 | 13,527 | 12,404 | 12,106 | 11,704 | 10,668 | 10,525 | 10,837 | 11,427 | 11,853 | 10,350 | 6,913 | 4,136 | 3,325 | 187,841 |
| LINCOLN | 1,047 | 1,208 | 1,174 | 727 | 499 | 1,099 | 1,175 | 1,149 | 1,337 | 1,282 | 1,291 | 1,395 | 1,648 | 2,109 | 2,482 | 2,129 | 1,440 | 786 | 544 | 24,520 |
| LINN | 3,949 | 3,941 | 4,245 | 2,451 | 1,362 | 3,707 | 4,515 | 4,481 | 4,188 | 3,973 | 3,721 | 3,783 | 4,020 | 4,108 | 3,988 | 3,344 | 2,369 | 1,356 | 1,028 | 64,528 |
| MALHEUR | 1,012 | 1,077 | 1,104 | 665 | 462 | 1,357 | 1,455 | 1,235 | 1,228 | 1,139 | 1,147 | 1,001 | 941 | 930 | 866 | 685 | 527 | 289 | 286 | 17,405 |
| MARION | 11,042 | 11,940 | 12,208 | 7,203 | 4,517 | 11,560 | 12,891 | 12,495 | 11,954 | 11,298 | 10,392 | 10,011 | 9,986 | 9,624 | 8,609 | 7,057 | 4,839 | 3,058 | 2,505 | 173,187 |
| MORROW | 446 | 498 | 528 | 297 | 195 | 442 | 382 | 342 | 363 | 328 | 372 | 336 | 349 | 438 | 335 | 313 | 201 | 128 | 93 | 6,386 |
| MULTNOMAH | 20,605 | 21,600 | 20,782 | 12,225 | 7,959 | 23,202 | 35,574 | 39,311 | 36,631 | 32,985 | 29,704 | 26,508 | 23,611 | 21,363 | 19,380 | 15,232 | 9,368 | 5,276 | 4,318 | 405,634 |
| POLK | 2,501 | 2,851 | 2,998 | 1,823 | 1,348 | 3,864 | 2,943 | 2,636 | 2,788 | 2,572 | 2,428 | 2,317 | 2,329 | 2,371 | 2,286 | 2,164 | 1,538 | 948 | 777 | 43,485 |
| SHERMAN | 52 | 52 | 42 | 25 | 16 | 41 | 49 | 58 | 53 | 64 | 61 | 52 | 71 | 87 | 68 | 62 | 47 | 28 | 36 | 963 |
| TILLAMOOK | 626 | 734 | 781 | 471 | 276 | 643 | 749 | 774 | 822 | 744 | 760 | 797 | 932 | 1,101 | 1,253 | 1,079 | 664 | 428 | 304 | 13,935 |
| UMATILLA | 2,583 | 2,888 | 2,995 | 1,738 | 1,013 | 2,917 | 3,288 | 3,120 | 2,870 | 2,706 | 2,482 | 2,384 | 2,418 | 2,244 | 2,162 | 1,677 | 1,184 | 779 | 625 | 42,074 |
| UNION | 749 | 845 | 886 | 509 | 454 | 1,039 | 799 | 752 | 800 | 736 | 653 | 647 | 679 | 764 | 845 | 741 | 490 | 356 | 300 | 13,043 |
| WALLOWA | 162 | 196 | 226 | 121 | 61 | 103 | 138 | 188 | 208 | 210 | 194 | 171 | 222 | 295 | 370 | 304 | 198 | 147 | 117 | 3,631 |
| WASCO | 820 | 874 | 778 | 507 | 278 | 700 | 943 | 910 | 937 | 767 | 753 | 716 | 778 | 888 | 911 | 739 | 501 | 299 | 265 | 13,366 |
| WASHINGTON | 17,306 | 19,211 | 19,365 | 11,753 | 6,610 | 17,717 | 23,918 | 25,564 | 24,586 | 22,442 | 20,828 | 18,964 | 17,497 | 15,868 | 13,259 | 10,481 | 7,018 | 4,174 | 3,777 | 300,338 |
| WHEELER | 34 | 24 | 25 | 30 | 12 | 36 | 29 | 39 | 35 | 31 | 46 | 32 | 54 | 70 | 67 | 52 | 55 | 22 | 26 | 720 |
| YAMHILL | 2,955 | 3,214 | 3,422 | 2,119 | 1,539 | 3,660 | 3,535 | 3,709 | 3,721 | 3,595 | 3,359 | 3,322 | 3,278 | 3,326 | 3,005 | 2,538 | 1,761 | 1,068 | 955 | 54,081 |

Table 9. Population by Age and Sex for Oregon and Its Counties: July 1, 2021
 Prepared by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022.

| Female Population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| Age Group | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-17 | 18-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85+ | Total |
| OREGON | 108,438 | 118,741 | 120,784 | 71,911 | 47,591 | 129,404 | 146,039 | 150,215 | 149,919 | 140,113 | 130,229 | 127,601 | 132,106 | 139,438 | 136,790 | 116,564 | 80,733 | 51,518 | 53,426 | 2,151,558 |
| BAKER | 401 | 466 | 459 | 240.867 | 129.337 | 303 | 382 | 454 | 469 | 425 | 407 | 477 | 551 | 718 | 709 | 643 | 446 | 289 | 303 | 8,270 |
| BENTON | 1,780 | 1,935 | 2,167 | 1342.67 | 3104.35 | 7,563 | 3,363 | 2,835 | 2,765 | 2,499 | 2,556 | 2,438 | 2,654 | 3,044 | 2,163 | 1,764 | 1,239 | 790 | 842 | 46,844 |
| CLACKAMAS | 10,763 | 12,262 | 13,224 | 8021.73 | 3921.93 | 10,710 | 12,117 | 13,216 | 14,828 | 14,607 | 13,681 | 13,690 | 14,182 | 14,395 | 14,014 | 12,138 | 8,362 | 5,426 | 5,737 | 215,297 |
| CLATSOP | 985 | 1,098 | 1,134 | 638.118 | 416.284 | 1,081 | 1,093 | 1,184 | 1,365 | 1,284 | 1,109 | 1,156 | 1,423 | 1,620 | 1,814 | 1,522 | 974 | 568 | 534 | 20,997 |
| COLUMBIA | 1,305 | 1,460 | 1,550 | 920.698 | 501.326 | 1,194 | 1,454 | 1,629 | 1,676 | 1,695 | 1,606 | 1,793 | 1,930 | 1,996 | 1,837 | 1,602 | 1,036 | 676 | 672 | 26,533 |
| COOS | 1,517 | 1,606 | 1,683 | 982.91 | 545.928 | 1,457 | 1,689 | 1,750 | 1,789 | 1,771 | 1,765 | 1,838 | 2,368 | 2,802 | 2,958 | 2,574 | 1,797 | 1,183 | 1,000 | 33,074 |
| CROOK | 697 | 665 | 724 | 377.13 | 200.967 | 553 | 627 | 723 | 693 | 733 | 717 | 757 | 944 | 1,035 | 1,123 | 971 | 643 | 391 | 293 | 12,868 |
| CURRY | 416 | 464 | 435 | 261.64 | 142.154 | 326 | 477 | 521 | 531 | 552 | 571 | 685 | 1,002 | 1,225 | 1,388 | 1,193 | 836 | 543 | 468 | 12,036 |
| DESCHUTES | 5,034 | 5,680 | 5,788 | 3466.66 | 1718.42 | 4,713 | 6,111 | 6,667 | 7,012 | 6,637 | 6,292 | 6,208 | 6,497 | 7,520 | 7,807 | 6,381 | 4,273 | 2,423 | 2,342 | 102,570 |
| DOUGLAS | 2,719 | 2,979 | 2,946 | 1812.39 | 876.578 | 2,433 | 2,998 | 3,142 | 3,122 | 3,014 | 2,888 | 3,250 | 3,905 | 4,483 | 4,703 | 4,093 | 3,100 | 2,021 | 2,164 | 56,649 |
| GILLIAM | 40 | 63 | 60 | 30.5997 | 20.9908 | 34 | 43 | 50 | 56 | 64 | 67 | 50 | 78 | 93 | 78 | 60 | 45 | 36 | 44 | 1,014 |
| GRANT | 164 | 163 | 184 | 93.8222 | 65.4739 | 150 | 170 | 222 | 215 | 198 | 195 | 227 | 269 | 322 | 255 | 234 | 185 | 123 | 155 | 3,591 |
| HARNEY | 192 | 199 | 221 | 101.772 | 48.7419 | 150 | 196 | 245 | 237 | 227 | 208 | 240 | 266 | 301 | 246 | 222 | 155 | 116 | 104 | 3,674 |
| HOOD RIVER | 685 | 793 | 777 | 470.572 | 275.167 | 606 | 707 | 742 | 843 | 830 | 721 | 778 | 745 | 779 | 658 | 509 | 397 | 249 | 334 | 11,898 |
| JACKSON | 5,618 | 6,275 | 6,278 | 3651.03 | 2203.01 | 5,725 | 6,731 | 7,125 | 7,196 | 6,832 | 6,262 | 6,420 | 7,193 | 8,133 | 8,572 | 7,677 | 5,519 | 3,497 | 3,607 | 114,513 |
| JEFFERSON | 739 | 766 | 769 | 446.306 | 231.061 | 627 | 699 | 742 | 685 | 640 | 679 | 671 | 801 | 860 | 828 | 725 | 509 | 327 | 231 | 11,975 |
| JOSEPHINE | 1,974 | 2,233 | 2,302 | 1381.18 | 663.401 | 1,961 | 2,367 | 2,515 | 2,477 | 2,545 | 2,386 | 2,674 | 3,191 | 3,754 | 3,858 | 3,518 | 2,542 | 1,660 | 1,600 | 45,600 |
| KLAMATH | 1,964 | 2,165 | 2,014 | 1170.29 | 703.374 | 1,863 | 2,172 | 2,132 | 2,037 | 1,868 | 1,830 | 1,933 | 2,289 | 2,538 | 2,690 | 2,215 | 1,512 | 950 | 922 | 34,968 |
| LAKE | 205 | 221 | 259 | 119.14 | 69.9859 | 163 | 191 | 188 | 206 | 223 | 240 | 197 | 273 | 337 | 284 | 253 | 159 | 119 | 103 | 3,811 |
| LANE | 8,449 | 9,329 | 9,528 | 5854.38 | 6012.09 | 17,426 | 12,666 | 11,837 | 12,086 | 11,558 | 10,692 | 10,623 | 11,855 | 13,066 | 13,681 | 11,729 | 8,035 | 5,184 | 5,194 | 194,806 |
| LINCOLN | 910 | 1,079 | 1,170 | 719.721 | 374.274 | 994 | 1,120 | 1,215 | 1,368 | 1,460 | 1,301 | 1,556 | 1,969 | 2,559 | 2,878 | 2,512 | 1,552 | 871 | 775 | 26,383 |
| LINN | 3,762 | 3,987 | 3,889 | 2329.43 | 1258.71 | 3,615 | 4,327 | 4,461 | 4,263 | 3,894 | 3,739 | 3,825 | 4,294 | 4,433 | 4,268 | 3,697 | 2,594 | 1,698 | 1,579 | 65,912 |
| MALHEUR | 967 | 1,102 | 1,080 | 615.289 | 438.314 | 908 | 914 | 848 | 851 | 807 | 755 | 765 | 826 | 838 | 829 | 731 | 574 | 366 | 375 | 14,590 |
| MARION | 10,720 | 11,214 | 11,618 | 6765.39 | 4138.93 | 10,740 | 11,933 | 11,735 | 11,374 | 10,743 | 9,989 | 9,939 | 10,144 | 10,632 | 9,955 | 8,340 | 6,040 | 3,891 | 4,083 | 173,995 |
| MORROW | 454 | 469 | 457 | 300.323 | 164.2 | 370 | 353 | 349 | 388 | 346 | 369 | 344 | 325 | 421 | 381 | 316 | 201 | 141 | 101 | 6,249 |
| MULTNOMAH | 19,710 | 20,500 | 19,987 | 11791.1 | 8103.06 | 23,985 | 37,076 | 38,818 | 36,200 | 32,176 | 28,500 | 25,706 | 23,283 | 22,522 | 21,720 | 17,844 | 11,583 | 7,359 | 8,174 | 415,038 |
| POLK | 2,487 | 2,836 | 2,848 | 1748.11 | 1553.72 | 3,891 | 2,748 | 2,598 | 2,831 | 2,683 | 2,450 | 2,376 | 2,505 | 2,592 | 2,806 | 2,344 | 1,877 | 1,127 | 1,132 | 45,431 |
| SHERMAN | 60 | 51 | 57 | 24.7774 | 16.2709 | 32 | 58 | 62 | 68 | 48 | 45 | 45 | 68 | 71 | 66 | 50 | 43 | 41 | 40 | 945 |
| TILLAMOOK | 583 | 636 | 706 | 409.188 | 203.437 | 478 | 699 | 748 | 800 | 718 | 745 | 800 | 915 | 1,232 | 1,301 | 1,139 | 780 | 426 | 374 | 13,693 |
| UMATILLA | 2,462 | 2,816 | 2,735 | 1742 | 865.76 | 2,238 | 2,491 | 2,520 | 2,377 | 2,305 | 2,195 | 2,154 | 2,221 | 2,239 | 2,138 | 1,779 | 1,337 | 870 | 963 | 38,449 |
| UNION | 637 | 835 | 822 | 478.805 | 425.648 | 1,040 | 736 | 742 | 782 | 688 | 695 | 620 | 760 | 879 | 875 | 745 | 559 | 385 | 547 | 13,252 |
| WALLOWA | 205 | 180 | 202 | 112.605 | 46.4329 | 138 | 147 | 217 | 229 | 201 | 159 | 219 | 265 | 319 | 388 | 283 | 209 | 131 | 150 | 3,802 |
| WASCO | 718 | 737 | 791 | 409.981 | 230.95 | 683 | 857 | 902 | 842 | 756 | 706 | 763 | 850 | 960 | 894 | 799 | 516 | 372 | 427 | 13,215 |
| WASHINGTON | 16,297 | 18,272 | 18,622 | 11092.4 | 6224.14 | 17,681 | 23,135 | 23,628 | 23,800 | 21,602 | 20,623 | 19,039 | 17,943 | 17,067 | 15,222 | 13,089 | 9,008 | 5,855 | 6,498 | 304,698 |
| WHEELER | 34 | 31 | 34 | 13.5508 | 7.76419 | 28 | 19 | 38 | 38 | 29 | 28 | 42 | 73 | 70 | 72 | 56 | 48 | 42 | 33 | 736 |
| YAMHILL | 2,785 | 3,176 | 3,263 | 1974.89 | 1688.82 | 3,544 | 3,173 | 3,412 | 3,418 | 3,457 | 3,059 | 3,301 | 3,249 | 3,584 | 3,330 | 2,815 | 2,047 | 1,374 | 1,527 | 54,180 |

Table 10. Population by Age Groups (less than 18 Years, 18-64 Years, and 65 Years and Older for Oregon and Its Counties: July 1, 2021

Compiled by Population Research Center, PSU, April 2022

| | Ages 0-17 | | Ages 18-64 | | Ages 65 and over | | Total |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | Population | % of Total Population | Population | % of Total Population | Population | % of Total Population | Total Population |
| OREGON | 861,028 | 20.2% | 2,596,239 | 60.9% | 809,353 | 19.0% | 4,266,620 |
| Counties | | | | | | | |
| BAKER | 3,295 | 19.5% | 8,848 | 52.5% | 4,716 | 28.0% | 16,860 |
| BENTON | 14,760 | 15.7% | 66,493 | 70.8% | 12,723 | 13.5% | 93,976 |
| CLACKAMAS | 90,895 | 21.4% | 250,697 | 58.9% | 83,724 | 19.7% | 425,316 |
| CLATSOP | 7,819 | 18.9% | 23,363 | 56.4% | 10,247 | 24.7% | 41,428 |
| COLUMBIA | 10,628 | 20.0% | 31,383 | 59.2% | 11,004 | 20.8% | 53,014 |
| COOS | 11,792 | 18.1% | 35,139 | 53.9% | 18,223 | 28.0% | 65,154 |
| CROOK | 4,928 | 19.3% | 13,832 | 54.3% | 6,722 | 26.4% | 25,482 |
| CURRY | 3,294 | 13.9% | 11,777 | 49.8% | 8,591 | 36.3% | 23,662 |
| DESCHUTES | 41,224 | 20.3% | 118,302 | 58.2% | 43,864 | 21.6% | 203,390 |
| DOUGLAS | 21,280 | 19.1% | 59,785 | 53.5% | 30,629 | 27.4% | 111,694 |
| GILLIAM | 403 | 19.8% | 1,128 | 55.3% | 508 | 24.9% | 2,039 |
| GRANT | 1,267 | 17.5% | 4,060 | 56.2% | 1,899 | 26.3% | 7,226 |
| HARNEY | 1,590 | 21.1% | 4,314 | 57.2% | 1,633 | 21.7% | 7,537 |
| HOOD RIVER | 5,507 | 23.1% | 14,279 | 59.8% | 4,102 | 17.2% | 23,888 |
| JACKSON | 44,978 | 20.1% | 125,917 | 56.3% | 52,932 | 23.6% | 223,827 |
| JEFFERSON | 5,683 | 22.8% | 14,043 | 56.4% | 5,164 | 20.7% | 24,889 |
| JOSEPHINE | 16,044 | 18.1% | 48,392 | 54.5% | 24,293 | 27.4% | 88,728 |
| KLAMATH | 15,005 | 21.5% | 38,943 | 55.8% | 15,874 | 22.7% | 69,822 |
| LAKE | 1,591 | 19.5% | 4,621 | 56.5% | 1,965 | 24.0% | 8,177 |
| LANE | 68,257 | 17.8% | 233,989 | 61.2% | 80,401 | 21.0% | 382,647 |
| LINCOLN | 8,034 | 15.8% | 26,899 | 52.8% | 15,970 | 31.4% | 50,903 |
| LINN | 28,554 | 21.9% | 75,967 | 58.2% | 25,920 | 19.9% | 130,440 |
| MALHEUR | 7,623 | 23.8% | 18,846 | 58.9% | 5,526 | 17.3% | 31,995 |
| MARION | 82,711 | 23.8% | 206,094 | 59.4% | 58,377 | 16.8% | 347,182 |
| MORROW | 3,449 | 27.3% | 6,975 | 55.2% | 2,210 | 17.5% | 12,635 |
| MULTNOMAH | 147,200 | 17.9% | 553,217 | 67.4% | 120,255 | 14.7% | 820,672 |
| POLK | 20,093 | 22.6% | 51,824 | 58.3% | 16,999 | 19.1% | 88,916 |
| SHERMAN | 363 | 19.0% | 1,066 | 55.9% | 480 | 25.1% | 1,908 |
| TILLAMOOK | 4,947 | 17.9% | 14,934 | 54.1% | 7,748 | 28.0% | 27,628 |
| UMATILLA | 19,960 | 24.8% | 47,049 | 58.4% | 13,514 | 16.8% | 80,523 |
| UNION | 5,762 | 21.9% | 14,690 | 55.9% | 5,843 | 22.2% | 26,295 |
| WALLOWA | 1,406 | 18.9% | 3,730 | 50.2% | 2,297 | 30.9% | 7,433 |
| WASCO | 5,635 | 21.2% | 15,221 | 57.3% | 5,725 | 21.5% | 26,581 |
| WASHINGTON | 131,918 | 21.8% | 384,736 | 63.6% | 88,382 | 14.6% | 605,036 |
| WHEELER | 227 | 15.6% | 756 | 51.9% | 473 | 32.5% | 1,456 |
| YAMHILL | 22,909 | 21.2% | 64,931 | 60.0% | 20,421 | 18.9% | 108,261 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 1 | New York city, New York | 8,804,190 | 8,772,978 | 8,467,513 |
| 2 | Los Angeles city, California | 3,893,986 | 3,889,834 | 3,849,297 |
| 3 | Chicago city, Illinois | 2,747,231 | 2,741,730 | 2,696,555 |
| 4 | Houston city, Texas | 2,302,792 | 2,300,027 | 2,288,250 |
| 5 | Phoenix city, Arizona | 1,607,739 | 1,611,345 | 1,624,569 |
| 6 | Philadelphia city, Pennsylvania | 1,603,797 | 1,601,005 | 1,576,251 |
| 7 | San Antonio city, Texas | 1,434,270 | 1,438,227 | 1,451,853 |
| 8 | San Diego city, California | 1,385,922 | 1,385,394 | 1,381,611 |
| 9 | Dallas city, Texas | 1,304,442 | 1,303,234 | 1,288,457 |
| 10 | San Jose city, California | 1,014,545 | 1,010,908 | 983,489 |
| 11 | Austin city, Texas | 959,549 | 963,121 | 964,177 |
| 12 | Jacksonville city, Florida | 949,577 | 950,463 | 954,614 |
| 13 | Fort Worth city, Texas | 918,377 | 922,592 | 935,508 |
| 14 | Columbus city, Ohio | 905,672 | 905,860 | 906,528 |
| 15 | Indianapolis city (balance), Indiana | 887,752 | 887,382 | 882,039 |
| 16 | Charlotte city, North Carolina | 874,541 | 876,747 | 879,709 |
| 17 | San Francisco city, California | 873,965 | 870,014 | 815,201 |
| 18 | Seattle city, Washington | 735,157 | 738,172 | 733,919 |
| 19 | Denver city, Colorado | 715,522 | 717,630 | 711,463 |
| 20 | Oklahoma City city, Oklahoma | 681,387 | 682,760 | 687,725 |
| 21 | Nashville-Davidson metropolitan government (b | 689,504 | 689,248 | 678,851 |
| 22 | El Paso city, Texas | 678,587 | 678,598 | 678,415 |
| 23 | Washington city, District of Columbia | 689,545 | 690,093 | 670,050 |
| 24 | Boston city, Massachusetts | 676,216 | 674,272 | 654,776 |
| 25 | Las Vegas city, Nevada | 641,825 | 643,292 | 646,790 |
| 26 | Portland city, Oregon | 652,089 | 652,388 | 641,162 |
| 27 | Detroit city, Michigan | 639,614 | 638,176 | 632,464 |
| 28 | Louisville/Jefferson County metro government (l | 632,689 | 632,037 | 628,594 |
| 29 | Memphis city, Tennessee | 632,207 | 631,326 | 628,127 |
| 30 | Baltimore city, Maryland | 585,708 | 583,132 | 576,498 |

Exhibit B - U.S. Census "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021" Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021"

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 31 | Milwaukee city, Wisconsin | 577,235 | 576,301 | 569,330 |
| 32 | Albuquerque city, New Mexico | 564,563 | 564,648 | 562,599 |
| 33 | Fresno city, California | 542,161 | 542,159 | 544,510 |
| 34 | Tucson city, Arizona | 541,349 | 541,859 | 543,242 |
| 35 | Sacramento city, California | 522,754 | 523,416 | 525,041 |
| 36 | Mesa city, Arizona | 504,500 | 505,860 | 509,475 |
| 37 | Kansas City city, Missouri | 507,969 | 507,932 | 508,394 |
| 38 | Atlanta city, Georgia | 498,602 | 499,586 | 496,461 |
| 39 | Omaha city, Nebraska | 490,627 | 491,168 | 487,300 |
| 40 | Colorado Springs city, Colorado | 479,260 | 480,213 | 483,956 |
| 41 | Raleigh city, North Carolina | 467,592 | 467,425 | 469,124 |
| 42 | Virginia Beach city, Virginia | 459,470 | 459,373 | 457,672 |
| 43 | Long Beach city, California | 466,302 | 464,759 | 456,062 |
| 44 | Miami city, Florida | 442,265 | 441,889 | 439,890 |
| 45 | Oakland city, California | 439,349 | 439,341 | 433,823 |
| 46 | Minneapolis city, Minnesota | 428,403 | 429,014 | 425,336 |
| 47 | Tulsa city, Oklahoma | 412,458 | 412,629 | 411,401 |
| 48 | Bakersfield city, California | 402,907 | 403,401 | 407,615 |
| 49 | Wichita city, Kansas | 397,070 | 397,117 | 395,699 |
| 50 | Arlington city, Texas | 394,218 | 393,985 | 392,786 |
| 51 | Aurora city, Colorado | 386,241 | 386,580 | 389,347 |
| 52 | Tampa city, Florida | 382,769 | 383,980 | 387,050 |
| 53 | New Orleans city, Louisiana | 383,997 | 383,282 | 376,971 |
| 54 | Cleveland city, Ohio | 373,091 | 372,032 | 367,991 |
| 55 | Anaheim city, California | 347,015 | 347,089 | 345,940 |
| 56 | Urban Honolulu CDP, Hawaii | 350,943 | 349,800 | 345,510 |
| 57 | Henderson city, Nevada | 317,521 | 319,055 | 322,178 |
| 58 | Stockton city, California | 320,759 | 320,745 | 322,120 |
| 59 | Lexington-Fayette urban county, Kentucky | 322,570 | 322,403 | 321,793 |
| 60 | Corpus Christi city, Texas | 317,929 | 317,852 | 317,773 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 61 | Riverside city, California | 314,347 | 314,655 | 317,261 |
| 62 | Santa Ana city, California | 310,538 | 309,888 | 309,441 |
| 63 | Orlando city, Florida | 307,674 | 307,603 | 309,154 |
| 64 | Irvine city, California | 305,313 | 306,389 | 309,031 |
| 65 | Cincinnati city, Ohio | 310,242 | 310,113 | 308,935 |
| 66 | Newark city, New Jersey | 310,876 | 310,350 | 307,220 |
| 67 | St. Paul city, Minnesota | 311,448 | 310,942 | 307,193 |
| 68 | Pittsburgh city, Pennsylvania | 303,160 | 302,777 | 300,431 |
| 69 | Greensboro city, North Carolina | 297,899 | 297,808 | 298,263 |
| 70 | St. Louis city, Missouri | 301,578 | 300,528 | 293,310 |
| 71 | Lincoln city, Nebraska | 291,114 | 291,383 | 292,657 |
| 72 | Plano city, Texas | 285,900 | 286,668 | 288,253 |
| 73 | Anchorage municipality, Alaska | 291,247 | 290,637 | 288,121 |
| 74 | Durham city, North Carolina | 283,547 | 284,400 | 285,527 |
| 75 | Jersey City city, New Jersey | 292,412 | 291,927 | 283,927 |
| 76 | Chandler city, Arizona | 276,330 | 277,556 | 279,458 |
| 77 | Chula Vista city, California | 276,025 | 276,466 | 277,220 |
| 78 | Buffalo city, New York | 278,302 | 277,908 | 276,807 |
| 79 | North Las Vegas city, Nevada | 262,678 | 264,216 | 274,133 |
| 80 | Gilbert town, Arizona | 268,302 | 269,206 | 273,136 |
| 81 | Madison city, Wisconsin | 268,414 | 268,846 | 269,196 |
| 82 | Reno city, Nevada | 263,436 | 264,116 | 268,851 |
| 83 | Toledo city, Ohio | 270,726 | 270,041 | 268,508 |
| 84 | Fort Wayne city, Indiana | 263,852 | 264,169 | 265,974 |
| 85 | Lubbock city, Texas | 257,180 | 257,882 | 260,993 |
| 86 | St. Petersburg city, Florida | 258,277 | 258,658 | 258,201 |
| 87 | Laredo city, Texas | 255,181 | 255,336 | 256,153 |
| 88 | Irving city, Texas | 256,793 | 256,873 | 254,198 |
| 89 | Chesapeake city, Virginia | 249,422 | 249,679 | 251,269 |
| 90 | Winston-Salem city, North Carolina | 249,443 | 249,349 | 250,320 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 91 | Glendale city, Arizona | 248,345 | 248,797 | 249,630 |
| 92 | Scottsdale city, Arizona | 241,488 | 241,933 | 242,753 |
| 93 | Garland city, Texas | 246,132 | 245,478 | 242,035 |
| 94 | Boise City city, Idaho | 235,670 | 235,829 | 237,446 |
| 95 | Norfolk city, Virginia | 238,005 | 237,591 | 235,089 |
| 96 | Spokane city, Washington | 228,831 | 228,850 | 229,071 |
| 97 | Fremont city, California | 232,084 | 231,673 | 227,514 |
| 98 | Richmond city, Virginia | 226,610 | 226,670 | 226,604 |
| 99 | Santa Clarita city, California | 229,213 | 228,487 | 224,593 |
| 100 | San Bernardino city, California | 221,898 | 221,784 | 222,203 |
| 101 | Baton Rouge city, Louisiana | 225,128 | 224,480 | 222,185 |
| 102 | Hialeah city, Florida | 223,017 | 222,153 | 220,490 |
| 103 | Tacoma city, Washington | 219,025 | 219,383 | 219,205 |
| 104 | Modesto city, California | 218,471 | 218,459 | 218,771 |
| 105 | Port St. Lucie city, Florida | 204,913 | 206,752 | 217,523 |
| 106 | Huntsville city, Alabama | 214,372 | 215,043 | 216,963 |
| 107 | Des Moines city, Iowa | 214,137 | 213,699 | 212,031 |
| 108 | Moreno Valley city, California | 208,865 | 209,213 | 211,600 |
| 109 | Fontana city, California | 208,766 | 208,810 | 210,761 |
| 110 | Frisco city, Texas | 200,675 | 202,786 | 210,719 |
| 111 | Rochester city, New York | 211,233 | 210,943 | 210,606 |
| 112 | Yonkers city, New York | 211,237 | 210,970 | 209,530 |
| 113 | Fayetteville city, North Carolina | 208,871 | 208,576 | 208,778 |
| 114 | Worcester city, Massachusetts | 206,601 | 206,242 | 205,918 |
| 115 | Columbus city, Georgia | 206,922 | 206,960 | 205,617 |
| 116 | Cape Coral city, Florida | 194,979 | 196,290 | 204,510 |
| 117 | McKinney city, Texas | 195,057 | 197,122 | 202,690 |
| 118 | Little Rock city, Arkansas | 202,514 | 202,484 | 201,998 |
| 119 | Oxnard city, California | 202,185 | 202,242 | 201,879 |
| 120 | Amarillo city, Texas | 200,904 | 200,897 | 201,234 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 121 | Augusta-Richmond County consolidated govern | 202,123 | 201,850 | 201,196 |
| 122 | Salt Lake City city, Utah | 198,746 | 199,587 | 200,478 |
| 123 | Montgomery city, Alabama | 200,567 | 200,006 | 198,665 |
| 124 | Birmingham city, Alabama | 200,763 | 200,133 | 197,575 |
| 125 | Grand Rapids city, Michigan | 198,487 | 198,173 | 197,416 |
| 126 | Grand Prairie city, Texas | 196,272 | 196,331 | 197,347 |
| 127 | Overland Park city, Kansas | 197,295 | 197,587 | 197,106 |
| 128 | Tallahassee city, Florida | 196,068 | 196,342 | 197,102 |
| 129 | Huntington Beach city, California | 199,140 | 198,707 | 196,652 |
| 130 | Sioux Falls city, South Dakota | 192,683 | 193,233 | 196,528 |
| 131 | Peoria city, Arizona | 191,052 | 191,985 | 194,917 |
| 132 | Knoxville city, Tennessee | 190,011 | 190,594 | 192,648 |
| 133 | Glendale city, California | 196,841 | 196,208 | 192,366 |
| 134 | Vancouver city, Washington | 190,810 | 191,071 | 192,169 |
| 135 | Providence city, Rhode Island | 190,284 | 190,101 | 189,692 |
| 136 | Akron city, Ohio | 190,534 | 190,164 | 189,347 |
| 137 | Brownsville city, Texas | 186,611 | 186,762 | 187,831 |
| 138 | Mobile city, Alabama | 186,833 | 186,411 | 184,952 |
| 139 | Newport News city, Virginia | 186,247 | 185,916 | 184,587 |
| 140 | Tempe city, Arizona | 179,765 | 180,823 | 184,118 |
| 141 | Shreveport city, Louisiana | 187,993 | 187,338 | 184,021 |
| 142 | Chattanooga city, Tennessee | 181,234 | 181,624 | 182,113 |
| 143 | Fort Lauderdale city, Florida | 182,817 | 182,789 | 181,668 |
| 144 | Aurora city, Illinois | 180,688 | 180,355 | 179,266 |
| 145 | Elk Grove city, California | 177,145 | 177,632 | 178,997 |
| 146 | Ontario city, California | 175,518 | 175,945 | 177,963 |
| 147 | Salem city, Oregon | 175,432 | 175,806 | 177,723 |
| 148 | Cary town, North Carolina | 174,754 | 175,389 | 176,987 |
| 149 | Santa Rosa city, California | 178,155 | 177,882 | 176,938 |
| 150 | Rancho Cucamonga city, California | 174,628 | 174,572 | 175,142 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 151 | Eugene city, Oregon | 174,753 | 174,802 | 175,096 |
| 152 | Oceanside city, California | 174,352 | 174,128 | 172,982 |
| 153 | Clarksville city, Tennessee | 166,634 | 167,258 | 170,957 |
| 154 | Garden Grove city, California | 172,144 | 171,829 | 170,488 |
| 155 | Lancaster city, California | 173,305 | 172,862 | 170,150 |
| 156 | Springfield city, Missouri | 169,767 | 169,626 | 169,724 |
| 157 | Pembroke Pines city, Florida | 171,163 | 170,981 | 169,391 |
| 158 | Fort Collins city, Colorado | 168,972 | 169,032 | 168,538 |
| 159 | Palmdale city, California | 169,913 | 169,279 | 165,761 |
| 160 | Salinas city, California | 163,687 | 163,397 | 162,791 |
| 161 | Hayward city, California | 163,635 | 163,269 | 159,827 |
| 162 | Corona city, California | 157,265 | 157,570 | 159,743 |
| 163 | Paterson city, New Jersey | 159,674 | 159,419 | 157,794 |
| 164 | Murfreesboro city, Tennessee | 152,437 | 153,342 | 157,519 |
| 165 | Macon-Bibb County, Georgia | 157,346 | 157,104 | 156,762 |
| 166 | Lakewood city, Colorado | 155,944 | 156,143 | 156,605 |
| 167 | Killeen city, Texas | 152,570 | 153,044 | 156,261 |
| 168 | Springfield city, Massachusetts | 155,913 | 155,556 | 154,789 |
| 169 | Alexandria city, Virginia | 159,467 | 159,097 | 154,706 |
| 170 | Kansas City city, Kansas | 156,602 | 156,241 | 154,545 |
| 171 | Sunnyvale city, California | 156,291 | 155,860 | 152,258 |
| 172 | Hollywood city, Florida | 153,061 | 152,705 | 152,131 |
| 173 | Roseville city, California | 147,817 | 148,435 | 151,901 |
| 174 | Charleston city, South Carolina | 150,522 | 150,903 | 151,612 |
| 175 | Escondido city, California | 151,271 | 151,260 | 150,665 |
| 176 | Joliet city, Illinois | 150,352 | 150,199 | 150,372 |
| 177 | Jackson city, Mississippi | 153,643 | 152,846 | 149,761 |
| 178 | Bellevue city, Washington | 152,045 | 151,839 | 149,440 |
| 179 | Surprise city, Arizona | 143,261 | 144,412 | 149,191 |
| 180 | Naperville city, Illinois | 149,427 | 149,279 | 149,104 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 181 | Pasadena city, Texas | 151,955 | 151,347 | 148,626 |
| 182 | Pomona city, California | 151,554 | 151,128 | 148,338 |
| 183 | Bridgeport city, Connecticut | 148,692 | 148,271 | 148,333 |
| 184 | Denton city, Texas | 141,123 | 142,302 | 148,146 |
| 185 | Rockford city, Illinois | 149,009 | 148,719 | 147,711 |
| 186 | Mesquite city, Texas | 150,308 | 149,680 | 147,691 |
| 187 | Savannah city, Georgia | 148,095 | 147,701 | 147,088 |
| 188 | Syracuse city, New York | 147,363 | 147,033 | 146,103 |
| 189 | McAllen city, Texas | 142,242 | 142,347 | 143,920 |
| 190 | Torrance city, California | 147,323 | 146,769 | 143,600 |
| 191 | Olathe city, Kansas | 141,238 | 141,400 | 143,014 |
| 192 | Visalia city, California | 141,561 | 141,828 | 142,978 |
| 193 | Thornton city, Colorado | 141,935 | 142,166 | 142,610 |
| 194 | Fullerton city, California | 143,367 | 143,173 | 141,874 |
| 195 | Gainesville city, Florida | 139,835 | 139,929 | 140,398 |
| 196 | Waco city, Texas | 137,948 | 138,289 | 139,594 |
| 197 | West Valley City city, Utah | 140,571 | 140,209 | 139,110 |
| 198 | Warren city, Michigan | 139,407 | 139,129 | 138,130 |
| 199 | Hampton city, Virginia | 137,148 | 137,131 | 137,746 |
| 200 | Dayton city, Ohio | 138,310 | 138,060 | 137,571 |
| 201 | Columbia city, South Carolina | 137,300 | 137,314 | 137,541 |
| 202 | Orange city, California | 138,992 | 138,680 | 137,264 |
| 203 | Cedar Rapids city, Iowa | 137,664 | 137,581 | 136,467 |
| 204 | Stamford city, Connecticut | 135,445 | 135,685 | 136,309 |
| 205 | Victorville city, California | 134,550 | 134,742 | 135,950 |
| 206 | Pasadena city, California | 138,679 | 138,196 | 135,732 |
| 207 | Elizabeth city, New Jersey | 137,316 | 136,848 | 135,407 |
| 208 | New Haven city, Connecticut | 133,924 | 133,966 | 135,081 |
| 209 | Miramar city, Florida | 134,676 | 134,373 | 135,077 |
| 210 | Kent city, Washington | 136,750 | 136,628 | 134,835 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 211 | Sterling Heights city, Michigan | 134,348 | 134,151 | 133,269 |
| 212 | Carrollton city, Texas | 133,348 | 133,409 | 133,251 |
| 213 | Coral Springs city, Florida | 134,366 | 134,027 | 132,822 |
| 214 | Midland city, Texas | 132,448 | 132,720 | 131,325 |
| 215 | Norman city, Oklahoma | 127,224 | 127,321 | 128,097 |
| 216 | Athens-Clarke County unified government (balance) | 127,320 | 127,141 | 127,358 |
| 217 | Santa Clara city, California | 127,452 | 127,426 | 127,151 |
| 218 | Columbia city, Missouri | 125,691 | 125,852 | 126,853 |
| 219 | Fargo city, North Dakota | 125,830 | 125,853 | 126,748 |
| 220 | Pearland city, Texas | 125,944 | 126,086 | 125,990 |
| 221 | Simi Valley city, California | 126,487 | 126,366 | 125,975 |
| 222 | Meridian city, Idaho | 118,099 | 119,729 | 125,963 |
| 222 | Topeka city, Kansas | 126,515 | 126,269 | 125,963 |
| 224 | Allentown city, Pennsylvania | 126,092 | 125,971 | 125,944 |
| 225 | Thousand Oaks city, California | 126,926 | 126,652 | 125,754 |
| 226 | Abilene city, Texas | 124,797 | 124,954 | 125,070 |
| 227 | Vallejo city, California | 126,035 | 125,839 | 124,886 |
| 228 | Concord city, California | 125,389 | 125,176 | 124,074 |
| 229 | Round Rock city, Texas | 119,519 | 120,498 | 123,876 |
| 230 | Arvada city, Colorado | 124,539 | 124,478 | 123,436 |
| 231 | Clovis city, California | 120,254 | 120,674 | 122,989 |
| 232 | Palm Bay city, Florida | 119,874 | 120,181 | 122,942 |
| 233 | Independence city, Missouri | 123,028 | 122,927 | 122,088 |
| 234 | Lafayette city, Louisiana | 122,018 | 121,996 | 121,771 |
| 235 | Ann Arbor city, Michigan | 122,830 | 122,531 | 121,536 |
| 236 | Rochester city, Minnesota | 121,244 | 121,396 | 121,465 |
| 237 | Hartford city, Connecticut | 121,219 | 120,957 | 120,576 |
| 238 | College Station city, Texas | 118,180 | 118,441 | 120,019 |
| 239 | Fairfield city, California | 119,793 | 119,827 | 119,705 |
| 240 | Wilmington city, North Carolina | 115,955 | 116,146 | 117,643 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 241 | North Charleston city, South Carolina | 115,113 | 115,771 | 117,472 |
| 242 | Billings city, Montana | 117,077 | 117,026 | 117,445 |
| 243 | West Palm Beach city, Florida | 117,151 | 117,179 | 117,286 |
| 244 | Berkeley city, California | 119,693 | 119,463 | 117,145 |
| 245 | Cambridge city, Massachusetts | 117,779 | 117,699 | 117,090 |
| 246 | Clearwater city, Florida | 117,227 | 117,046 | 116,674 |
| 247 | West Jordan city, Utah | 117,190 | 117,186 | 116,541 |
| 248 | Evansville city, Indiana | 117,298 | 117,258 | 116,486 |
| 249 | Richardson city, Texas | 117,973 | 117,792 | 116,382 |
| 250 | Broken Arrow city, Oklahoma | 113,730 | 114,024 | 116,330 |
| 251 | Richmond city, California | 116,287 | 116,238 | 115,639 |
| 252 | League City city, Texas | 114,426 | 114,686 | 115,595 |
| 253 | Manchester city, New Hampshire | 115,555 | 115,354 | 115,462 |
| 254 | Lakeland city, Florida | 111,881 | 112,558 | 115,425 |
| 255 | Carlsbad city, California | 114,972 | 115,073 | 115,302 |
| 256 | Antioch city, California | 115,360 | 115,252 | 114,794 |
| 257 | Westminster city, Colorado | 116,375 | 116,304 | 114,561 |
| 258 | High Point city, North Carolina | 113,887 | 113,892 | 114,086 |
| 259 | Provo city, Utah | 114,189 | 114,048 | 114,084 |
| 260 | Lowell city, Massachusetts | 115,441 | 115,264 | 113,994 |
| 261 | Elgin city, Illinois | 114,809 | 114,621 | 113,911 |
| 262 | Waterbury city, Connecticut | 114,446 | 114,159 | 113,811 |
| 263 | Springfield city, Illinois | 114,461 | 114,245 | 113,394 |
| 264 | Gresham city, Oregon | 114,507 | 114,637 | 113,103 |
| 265 | Murrieta city, California | 111,050 | 111,351 | 112,991 |
| 266 | Lewisville city, Texas | 111,676 | 112,336 | 112,944 |
| 267 | Las Cruces city, New Mexico | 111,507 | 111,738 | 112,914 |
| 268 | Lansing city, Michigan | 112,954 | 112,796 | 112,684 |
| 269 | Beaumont city, Texas | 114,586 | 114,239 | 112,556 |
| 270 | Odessa city, Texas | 114,368 | 114,852 | 112,483 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 271 | Pueblo city, Colorado | 111,925 | 112,119 | 112,368 |
| 272 | Peoria city, Illinois | 113,173 | 112,792 | 111,666 |
| 273 | Downey city, California | 114,558 | 114,118 | 111,645 |
| 274 | Pompano Beach city, Florida | 112,117 | 111,966 | 111,348 |
| 275 | Miami Gardens city, Florida | 111,579 | 111,085 | 110,867 |
| 276 | Temecula city, California | 110,130 | 110,086 | 110,846 |
| 277 | Everett city, Washington | 110,723 | 110,930 | 110,812 |
| 278 | Costa Mesa city, California | 111,915 | 111,723 | 110,750 |
| 279 | San Buenaventura (Ventura) city, California | 110,600 | 110,413 | 109,925 |
| 280 | Sparks city, Nevada | 108,772 | 109,121 | 109,796 |
| 281 | Santa Maria city, California | 109,903 | 109,904 | 109,711 |
| 282 | Sugar Land city, Texas | 111,046 | 110,775 | 109,373 |
| 283 | Greeley city, Colorado | 108,935 | 109,388 | 109,323 |
| 284 | South Fulton city, Georgia | 107,524 | 107,623 | 108,575 |
| 285 | Dearborn city, Michigan | 109,910 | 109,657 | 108,420 |
| 286 | Concord city, North Carolina | 105,186 | 105,769 | 107,697 |
| 287 | Tyler city, Texas | 105,735 | 105,976 | 107,192 |
| 288 | Sandy Springs city, Georgia | 108,134 | 108,172 | 107,180 |
| 289 | West Covina city, California | 109,772 | 109,345 | 107,017 |
| 290 | Green Bay city, Wisconsin | 107,300 | 107,114 | 107,015 |
| 291 | Centennial city, Colorado | 108,353 | 108,095 | 106,966 |
| 292 | Jurupa Valley city, California | 105,107 | 105,306 | 106,941 |
| 293 | El Monte city, California | 109,554 | 109,166 | 106,907 |
| 294 | Allen city, Texas | 104,786 | 105,628 | 106,874 |
| 295 | Hillsboro city, Oregon | 106,448 | 106,922 | 106,633 |
| 296 | Menifee city, California | 102,654 | 103,227 | 106,401 |
| 297 | Nampa city, Idaho | 100,252 | 101,124 | 106,186 |
| 298 | Spokane Valley city, Washington | 103,317 | 103,778 | 105,905 |
| 299 | Rio Rancho city, New Mexico | 103,977 | 104,257 | 105,834 |
| 300 | Brockton city, Massachusetts | 105,652 | 105,579 | 105,446 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 301 | El Cajon city, California | 106,286 | 106,176 | 105,432 |
| 302 | Burbank city, California | 107,563 | 107,320 | 105,401 |
| 303 | Inglewood city, California | 107,961 | 107,534 | 105,181 |
| 304 | Renton city, Washington | 106,966 | 106,763 | 105,179 |
| 305 | Davie town, Florida | 105,719 | 105,553 | 104,882 |
| 306 | Rialto city, California | 104,216 | 104,199 | 104,394 |
| 307 | Boulder city, Colorado | 105,414 | 105,262 | 104,175 |
| 308 | South Bend city, Indiana | 103,675 | 103,527 | 103,353 |
| 309 | Vacaville city, California | 102,675 | 102,672 | 103,078 |
| 310 | Wichita Falls city, Texas | 102,498 | 102,640 | 102,988 |
| 311 | Lee's Summit city, Missouri | 101,160 | 101,600 | 102,781 |
| 312 | Edinburg city, Texas | 99,678 | 100,039 | 102,483 |
| 313 | Chico city, California | 102,849 | 102,177 | 102,338 |
| 314 | San Mateo city, California | 105,674 | 105,308 | 102,200 |
| 315 | Bend city, Oregon | 99,126 | 99,533 | 102,059 |
| 316 | Goodyear city, Arizona | 95,003 | 96,534 | 101,733 |
| 317 | Buckeye city, Arizona | 91,154 | 93,314 | 101,315 |
| 318 | Daly City city, California | 104,940 | 104,571 | 101,243 |
| 319 | Fishers city, Indiana | 99,053 | 99,451 | 101,171 |
| 320 | Quincy city, Massachusetts | 101,685 | 101,606 | 101,119 |
| 321 | Davenport city, Iowa | 101,728 | 101,584 | 101,009 |
| 322 | Hesperia city, California | 100,038 | 100,200 | 100,971 |
| 323 | New Bedford city, Massachusetts | 101,044 | 100,970 | 100,941 |
| 324 | Lynn city, Massachusetts | 101,238 | 101,118 | 100,843 |
| 325 | Carmel city, Indiana | 99,777 | 99,892 | 100,777 |
| 326 | Longmont city, Colorado | 100,119 | 100,359 | 100,758 |
| 327 | Tuscaloosa city, Alabama | 99,706 | 99,960 | 100,618 |
| 328 | Norwalk city, California | 102,910 | 102,532 | 100,373 |
| 329 | St. George city, Utah | 95,284 | 95,927 | 99,958 |
| 330 | San Angelo city, Texas | 100,006 | 100,093 | 99,667 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 331 | Kenosha city, Wisconsin | 99,882 | 99,733 | 99,286 |
| 332 | Federal Way city, Washington | 101,131 | 101,019 | 99,037 |
| 333 | Roanoke city, Virginia | 100,011 | 99,875 | 98,865 |
| 334 | New Braunfels city, Texas | 90,136 | 91,319 | 98,857 |
| 335 | Vista city, California | 98,484 | 98,508 | 98,655 |
| 336 | Albany city, New York | 99,345 | 99,133 | 98,617 |
| 337 | Beaverton city, Oregon | 97,521 | 97,447 | 98,216 |
| 338 | Orem city, Utah | 98,070 | 98,294 | 97,861 |
| 339 | Portsmouth city, Virginia | 97,915 | 98,015 | 97,840 |
| 340 | Yuma city, Arizona | 95,814 | 96,034 | 97,093 |
| 341 | Yakima city, Washington | 96,873 | 96,890 | 96,578 |
| 342 | Suffolk city, Virginia | 94,324 | 94,685 | 96,194 |
| 343 | Sunrise city, Florida | 97,313 | 97,035 | 96,021 |
| 344 | Boca Raton city, Florida | 96,358 | 96,241 | 95,787 |
| 345 | Deltona city, Florida | 94,158 | 94,438 | 95,782 |
| 346 | Tracy city, California | 93,356 | 93,590 | 95,387 |
| 347 | Edmond city, Oklahoma | 94,498 | 94,740 | 95,341 |
| 348 | Lawrence city, Kansas | 94,909 | 94,933 | 95,256 |
| 349 | Fayetteville city, Arkansas | 93,582 | 94,020 | 95,230 |
| 350 | Sandy city, Utah | 97,430 | 97,039 | 95,050 |
| 351 | San Marcos city, California | 94,914 | 94,973 | 94,926 |
| 352 | Reading city, Pennsylvania | 95,097 | 94,981 | 94,844 |
| 353 | Livonia city, Michigan | 95,531 | 95,336 | 94,422 |
| 354 | Conroe city, Texas | 89,148 | 90,358 | 94,400 |
| 355 | Asheville city, North Carolina | 94,539 | 94,406 | 94,067 |
| 356 | Erie city, Pennsylvania | 94,823 | 94,639 | 93,999 |
| 357 | Fall River city, Massachusetts | 93,938 | 93,885 | 93,884 |
| 358 | Palm Coast city, Florida | 89,310 | 89,748 | 93,833 |
| 359 | O'Fallon city, Missouri | 91,390 | 91,643 | 93,644 |
| 360 | Compton city, California | 95,959 | 95,611 | 93,597 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 361 | Carson city, California | 95,367 | 95,074 | 93,535 |
| 362 | Redding city, California | 93,559 | 93,393 | 93,462 |
| 363 | Plantation city, Florida | 91,736 | 91,969 | 92,986 |
| 364 | Chino city, California | 90,989 | 91,367 | 92,975 |
| 365 | Hoover city, Alabama | 92,651 | 92,687 | 92,589 |
| 366 | Roswell city, Georgia | 92,892 | 92,989 | 92,530 |
| 367 | Mission Viejo city, California | 93,759 | 93,528 | 92,449 |
| 368 | Mount Pleasant town, South Carolina | 90,668 | 90,871 | 92,398 |
| 369 | Bellingham city, Washington | 91,231 | 91,570 | 92,289 |
| 370 | Fort Myers city, Florida | 85,525 | 86,354 | 92,245 |
| 371 | Kirkland city, Washington | 92,247 | 92,755 | 92,107 |
| 372 | Norwalk city, Connecticut | 91,143 | 90,975 | 91,194 |
| 373 | South Gate city, California | 92,971 | 92,634 | 91,154 |
| 374 | Nashua city, New Hampshire | 91,405 | 91,221 | 91,124 |
| 375 | Santa Monica city, California | 93,028 | 92,711 | 91,105 |
| 376 | Lawton city, Oklahoma | 90,537 | 90,517 | 91,055 |
| 377 | Avondale city, Arizona | 89,490 | 89,670 | 90,564 |
| 378 | Trenton city, New Jersey | 90,857 | 90,662 | 90,457 |
| 379 | Hemet city, California | 89,855 | 89,830 | 90,436 |
| 380 | Indio city, California | 89,127 | 89,243 | 90,416 |
| 381 | Westminster city, California | 91,089 | 90,906 | 90,195 |
| 382 | Fort Smith city, Arkansas | 89,177 | 89,141 | 89,576 |
| 383 | Clifton city, New Jersey | 90,222 | 90,031 | 89,367 |
| 384 | Merced city, California | 86,141 | 86,515 | 89,308 |
| 385 | Bloomington city, Minnesota | 90,012 | 89,854 | 89,298 |
| 386 | Champaign city, Illinois | 88,421 | 88,418 | 89,114 |
| 387 | San Leandro city, California | 91,675 | 91,338 | 88,868 |
| 388 | Greenville city, North Carolina | 87,882 | 88,098 | 88,728 |
| 389 | Waukegan city, Illinois | 89,361 | 89,158 | 88,614 |
| 390 | Lawrence city, Massachusetts | 89,152 | 89,024 | 88,508 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 391 | Santa Barbara city, California | 88,730 | 88,695 | 88,255 |
| 392 | Santa Fe city, New Mexico | 87,497 | 87,684 | 88,193 |
| 393 | Springdale city, Arkansas | 87,441 | 87,390 | 87,609 |
| 394 | Newton city, Massachusetts | 88,787 | 88,624 | 87,453 |
| 395 | Citrus Heights city, California | 88,018 | 87,911 | 87,402 |
| 396 | San Ramon city, California | 86,426 | 86,669 | 86,947 |
| 397 | Bryan city, Texas | 85,461 | 85,810 | 86,866 |
| 398 | Troy city, Michigan | 87,316 | 87,125 | 86,836 |
| 399 | Livermore city, California | 88,614 | 88,487 | 86,803 |
| 400 | Ogden city, Utah | 86,830 | 86,726 | 86,798 |
| 401 | Danbury city, Connecticut | 86,550 | 86,356 | 86,759 |
| 402 | Duluth city, Minnesota | 86,645 | 86,601 | 86,372 |
| 403 | Medford city, Oregon | 85,828 | 85,861 | 86,367 |
| 404 | Deerfield Beach city, Florida | 86,873 | 86,716 | 86,339 |
| 405 | Mission city, Texas | 85,868 | 85,870 | 86,223 |
| 406 | Hawthorne city, California | 88,255 | 87,938 | 86,091 |
| 407 | Manteca city, California | 83,678 | 83,948 | 85,792 |
| 408 | Lake Forest city, California | 86,070 | 86,005 | 85,742 |
| 409 | Auburn city, Washington | 87,351 | 87,143 | 85,699 |
| 410 | Sioux City city, Iowa | 85,731 | 85,654 | 85,617 |
| 411 | Franklin city, Tennessee | 83,347 | 83,887 | 85,469 |
| 412 | Temple city, Texas | 81,938 | 82,454 | 85,416 |
| 413 | Whittier city, California | 87,383 | 87,045 | 85,311 |
| 414 | Melbourne city, Florida | 84,313 | 84,373 | 85,064 |
| 415 | Newport Beach city, California | 85,411 | 85,333 | 84,792 |
| 416 | Brooklyn Park city, Minnesota | 86,688 | 86,411 | 84,526 |
| 417 | Westland city, Michigan | 85,433 | 85,274 | 84,515 |
| 418 | Kennewick city, Washington | 83,943 | 83,922 | 84,488 |
| 419 | Farmington Hills city, Michigan | 83,991 | 83,781 | 83,292 |
| 420 | Layton city, Utah | 81,759 | 81,967 | 83,291 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 421 | Cicero town, Illinois | 85,180 | 84,864 | 83,161 |
| 422 | Buena Park city, California | 84,173 | 83,968 | 83,011 |
| 422 | Warwick city, Rhode Island | 82,976 | 82,960 | 83,011 |
| 424 | Cranston city, Rhode Island | 82,935 | 82,833 | 82,566 |
| 425 | Baytown city, Texas | 83,698 | 83,495 | 82,480 |
| 426 | Largo city, Florida | 82,632 | 82,515 | 82,341 |
| 427 | Johns Creek city, Georgia | 82,499 | 82,591 | 82,065 |
| 428 | Longview city, Texas | 81,760 | 81,713 | 81,762 |
| 429 | Redwood City city, California | 84,234 | 84,180 | 81,643 |
| 430 | New Rochelle city, New York | 79,996 | 80,559 | 81,587 |
| 431 | Mountain View city, California | 82,592 | 82,455 | 81,516 |
| 432 | Warner Robins city, Georgia | 80,324 | 80,494 | 81,446 |
| 433 | Folsom city, California | 79,036 | 79,475 | 81,224 |
| 434 | Alhambra city, California | 83,001 | 82,748 | 81,211 |
| 435 | Gastonia city, North Carolina | 80,367 | 80,392 | 81,161 |
| 436 | Lake Charles city, Louisiana | 85,434 | 85,352 | 81,097 |
| 437 | Miami Beach city, Florida | 82,826 | 82,345 | 80,671 |
| 438 | Flint city, Michigan | 81,381 | 81,201 | 80,628 |
| 439 | Lakewood city, California | 82,727 | 82,403 | 80,611 |
| 440 | Homestead city, Florida | 80,697 | 80,423 | 80,528 |
| 441 | Rancho Cordova city, California | 79,666 | 79,790 | 80,413 |
| 442 | South Jordan city, Utah | 77,661 | 78,082 | 80,139 |
| 443 | Boynton Beach city, Florida | 80,401 | 80,631 | 80,089 |
| 444 | North Port city, Florida | 75,175 | 75,816 | 80,021 |
| 445 | Parma city, Ohio | 81,047 | 80,824 | 79,982 |
| 446 | Lehi city, Utah | 76,107 | 77,000 | 79,978 |
| 447 | Bloomington city, Indiana | 79,912 | 79,801 | 79,968 |
| 448 | Perris city, California | 78,786 | 78,897 | 79,835 |
| 449 | Plymouth city, Minnesota | 81,181 | 81,091 | 79,828 |
| 450 | Somerville city, Massachusetts | 81,054 | 80,842 | 79,815 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 451 | Pharr city, Texas | 79,779 | 79,836 | 79,697 |
| 452 | Frederick city, Maryland | 78,062 | 78,215 | 79,588 |
| 453 | Kissimmee city, Florida | 79,242 | 79,158 | 79,436 |
| 454 | Tustin city, California | 80,142 | 80,023 | 79,430 |
| 455 | Jonesboro city, Arkansas | 78,524 | 78,787 | 79,324 |
| 456 | Upland city, California | 79,110 | 79,118 | 79,274 |
| 457 | Milpitas city, California | 80,275 | 80,363 | 79,066 |
| 458 | Lynchburg city, Virginia | 79,009 | 78,871 | 79,009 |
| 459 | Pasco city, Washington | 77,579 | 77,856 | 78,871 |
| 460 | Napa city, California | 79,276 | 79,051 | 78,818 |
| 461 | Cedar Park city, Texas | 77,646 | 78,038 | 78,693 |
| 462 | Chino Hills city, California | 78,573 | 78,544 | 78,665 |
| 463 | Auburn city, Alabama | 76,000 | 76,429 | 78,564 |
| 464 | Bloomington city, Illinois | 78,273 | 78,226 | 78,283 |
| 465 | Pleasanton city, California | 80,421 | 80,201 | 78,252 |
| 466 | Evanston city, Illinois | 79,035 | 78,796 | 77,517 |
| 467 | Bellflower city, California | 79,298 | 79,019 | 77,408 |
| 468 | Flower Mound town, Texas | 75,859 | 76,330 | 77,243 |
| 469 | Loveland city, Colorado | 76,677 | 76,622 | 77,194 |
| 470 | Racine city, Wisconsin | 77,775 | 77,578 | 77,127 |
| 471 | Schaumburg village, Illinois | 78,691 | 78,443 | 77,082 |
| 472 | Woodbury city, Minnesota | 75,163 | 75,479 | 76,990 |
| 473 | Flagstaff city, Arizona | 76,781 | 76,960 | 76,989 |
| 474 | Hammond city, Indiana | 77,754 | 77,607 | 76,984 |
| 475 | Wyoming city, Michigan | 76,574 | 76,772 | 76,749 |
| 476 | Pittsburg city, California | 76,439 | 76,600 | 76,544 |
| 477 | Alameda city, California | 78,611 | 78,333 | 76,362 |
| 478 | Redmond city, Washington | 73,375 | 73,422 | 76,354 |
| 479 | Castle Rock town, Colorado | 73,012 | 73,700 | 76,353 |
| 480 | Apple Valley town, California | 75,913 | 75,929 | 76,224 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 481 | Rapid City city, South Dakota | 74,194 | 74,350 | 76,184 |
| 482 | Rochester Hills city, Michigan | 76,293 | 76,135 | 76,028 |
| 483 | Arlington Heights village, Illinois | 77,595 | 77,377 | 76,000 |
| 484 | Doral city, Florida | 75,803 | 76,094 | 75,966 |
| 485 | Southfield city, Michigan | 76,579 | 76,367 | 75,898 |
| 486 | Scranton city, Pennsylvania | 76,110 | 75,950 | 75,874 |
| 487 | Bethlehem city, Pennsylvania | 75,710 | 75,629 | 75,624 |
| 488 | Georgetown city, Texas | 66,964 | 68,227 | 75,420 |
| 489 | Pawtucket city, Rhode Island | 75,842 | 75,721 | 75,387 |
| 490 | Broomfield city, Colorado | 74,112 | 74,513 | 75,325 |
| 491 | Appleton city, Wisconsin | 75,315 | 75,300 | 74,854 |
| 492 | Missouri City city, Texas | 74,244 | 74,380 | 74,850 |
| 493 | Missoula city, Montana | 73,746 | 73,949 | 74,822 |
| 494 | Iowa City city, Iowa | 74,373 | 74,443 | 74,596 |
| 495 | Daytona Beach city, Florida | 71,681 | 71,838 | 74,437 |
| 496 | Mansfield city, Texas | 72,654 | 72,778 | 74,368 |
| 497 | Bismarck city, North Dakota | 73,651 | 73,675 | 74,138 |
| 498 | Rock Hill city, South Carolina | 73,905 | 74,157 | 74,102 |
| 499 | New Britain city, Connecticut | 74,217 | 74,062 | 73,841 |
| 500 | Bolingbrook village, Illinois | 73,956 | 73,831 | 73,597 |
| 501 | Bowling Green city, Kentucky | 72,524 | 72,642 | 73,529 |
| 502 | Lauderhill city, Florida | 74,495 | 74,271 | 73,458 |
| 503 | Redlands city, California | 73,004 | 73,023 | 73,288 |
| 504 | Kalamazoo city, Michigan | 73,808 | 73,707 | 73,257 |
| 505 | Rocklin city, California | 71,571 | 71,801 | 72,975 |
| 506 | Jacksonville city, North Carolina | 73,339 | 73,183 | 72,876 |
| 507 | Lakeville city, Minnesota | 69,654 | 70,175 | 72,812 |
| 508 | Turlock city, California | 72,645 | 72,611 | 72,682 |
| 509 | Mount Vernon city, New York | 73,693 | 73,483 | 72,581 |
| 510 | Gulfport city, Mississippi | 72,961 | 72,837 | 72,105 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 511 | Greenville city, South Carolina | 70,633 | 70,899 | 72,095 |
| 512 | Harlingen city, Texas | 71,802 | 71,803 | 71,925 |
| 513 | Camden city, New Jersey | 72,001 | 71,976 | 71,773 |
| 514 | Dublin city, California | 72,142 | 72,312 | 71,674 |
| 515 | St. Joseph city, Missouri | 72,456 | 72,293 | 71,602 |
| 516 | Lake Elsinore city, California | 70,366 | 70,415 | 71,563 |
| 517 | Tamarac city, Florida | 71,891 | 71,842 | 71,541 |
| 518 | Eastvale city, California | 69,849 | 70,023 | 71,375 |
| 519 | Johnson City city, Tennessee | 70,588 | 70,576 | 71,278 |
| 520 | Framingham city, Massachusetts | 72,342 | 72,162 | 71,265 |
| 521 | Waukesha city, Wisconsin | 71,405 | 71,365 | 71,256 |
| 522 | Dothan city, Alabama | 71,182 | 71,154 | 71,175 |
| 523 | Marysville city, Washington | 70,683 | 70,894 | 71,144 |
| 524 | Rogers city, Arkansas | 69,753 | 70,123 | 71,112 |
| 525 | Blaine city, Minnesota | 70,293 | 70,505 | 70,935 |
| 526 | Noblesville city, Indiana | 69,517 | 69,800 | 70,926 |
| 527 | Camarillo city, California | 70,797 | 70,844 | 70,858 |
| 528 | Lafayette city, Indiana | 70,906 | 70,809 | 70,835 |
| 529 | St. Charles city, Missouri | 70,384 | 70,562 | 70,820 |
| 530 | Wilmington city, Delaware | 70,941 | 70,875 | 70,750 |
| 531 | Tulare city, California | 68,880 | 69,197 | 70,733 |
| 532 | Maple Grove city, Minnesota | 70,509 | 70,518 | 70,726 |
| 533 | Baldwin Park city, California | 72,323 | 72,082 | 70,629 |
| 534 | Canton city, Ohio | 70,947 | 70,784 | 70,426 |
| 535 | Ankeny city, Iowa | 67,892 | 68,316 | 70,287 |
| 536 | North Richland Hills city, Texas | 69,968 | 70,310 | 70,209 |
| 537 | West Des Moines city, Iowa | 68,717 | 68,895 | 69,792 |
| 538 | Redondo Beach city, California | 71,520 | 71,261 | 69,781 |
| 539 | Walnut Creek city, California | 70,078 | 69,974 | 69,695 |
| 540 | Decatur city, Illinois | 70,765 | 70,514 | 69,646 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 541 | Passaic city, New Jersey | 70,466 | 70,316 | 69,633 |
| 542 | Yuba City city, California | 70,101 | 69,952 | 69,536 |
| 543 | Eau Claire city, Wisconsin | 69,291 | 69,313 | 69,441 |
| 544 | Bayonne city, New Jersey | 71,555 | 71,546 | 69,211 |
| 545 | Gaithersburg city, Maryland | 69,657 | 69,522 | 69,101 |
| 546 | Albany city, Georgia | 69,832 | 69,486 | 69,048 |
| 547 | East Orange city, New Jersey | 69,725 | 69,577 | 68,903 |
| 548 | St. Cloud city, Minnesota | 68,774 | 68,711 | 68,818 |
| 549 | Union City city, California | 70,650 | 70,460 | 68,681 |
| 550 | Eagan city, Minnesota | 68,905 | 68,766 | 68,642 |
| 551 | San Marcos city, Texas | 67,290 | 67,701 | 68,580 |
| 552 | Gary city, Indiana | 68,982 | 68,853 | 68,325 |
| 553 | Portland city, Maine | 68,402 | 68,427 | 68,313 |
| 554 | Jackson city, Tennessee | 68,211 | 68,169 | 68,114 |
| 555 | Yorba Linda city, California | 68,460 | 68,431 | 67,989 |
| 556 | Madera city, California | 66,316 | 66,523 | 67,944 |
| 557 | Shawnee city, Kansas | 67,340 | 67,405 | 67,511 |
| 558 | Haverhill city, Massachusetts | 67,764 | 67,690 | 67,361 |
| 559 | Weston city, Florida | 68,094 | 67,928 | 67,312 |
| 560 | Rockville city, Maryland | 67,101 | 67,357 | 67,139 |
| 561 | Leander city, Texas | 59,345 | 60,965 | 67,124 |
| 562 | Lodi city, California | 66,409 | 66,471 | 67,021 |
| 563 | Schenectady city, New York | 67,000 | 66,879 | 66,990 |
| 564 | Grand Junction city, Colorado | 65,733 | 65,822 | 66,964 |
| 565 | Waterloo city, Iowa | 67,453 | 67,381 | 66,941 |
| 566 | Idaho Falls city, Idaho | 65,413 | 65,657 | 66,898 |
| 567 | Pflugerville city, Texas | 65,678 | 65,964 | 66,884 |
| 568 | Davis city, California | 66,796 | 66,659 | 66,799 |
| 569 | Palo Alto city, California | 68,724 | 68,486 | 66,680 |
| 570 | Sammamish city, Washington | 67,600 | 67,534 | 66,630 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 571 | Oshkosh city, Wisconsin | 66,777 | 66,693 | 66,607 |
| 572 | Delray Beach city, Florida | 66,911 | 66,839 | 66,573 |
| 573 | Novi city, Michigan | 66,252 | 66,186 | 66,560 |
| 574 | Ames city, Iowa | 65,955 | 65,999 | 66,424 |
| 575 | Skokie village, Illinois | 67,775 | 67,682 | 66,422 |
| 576 | Queen Creek town, Arizona | 59,590 | 60,942 | 66,346 |
| 577 | Palatine village, Illinois | 67,771 | 67,588 | 66,321 |
| 578 | Alpharetta city, Georgia | 65,852 | 65,968 | 66,127 |
| 579 | Janesville city, Wisconsin | 65,631 | 65,643 | 65,942 |
| 580 | Union City city, New Jersey | 68,512 | 68,087 | 65,638 |
| 581 | Lynwood city, California | 67,139 | 66,897 | 65,505 |
| 582 | Lorain city, Ohio | 65,340 | 65,324 | 65,430 |
| 583 | Victoria city, Texas | 65,643 | 65,590 | 65,377 |
| 584 | Kenner city, Louisiana | 66,474 | 66,323 | 65,364 |
| 585 | Muncie city, Indiana | 65,382 | 65,241 | 65,292 |
| 586 | Conway city, Arkansas | 63,656 | 63,783 | 65,121 |
| 587 | Malden city, Massachusetts | 66,353 | 66,114 | 65,074 |
| 588 | Cheyenne city, Wyoming | 65,096 | 65,161 | 65,051 |
| 589 | Greenwood city, Indiana | 63,903 | 64,035 | 64,918 |
| 590 | Brentwood city, California | 64,355 | 64,499 | 64,870 |
| 591 | Utica city, New York | 65,263 | 65,102 | 64,501 |
| 592 | Commerce City city, Colorado | 62,477 | 62,793 | 64,287 |
| 593 | South San Francisco city, California | 66,119 | 66,128 | 64,251 |
| 594 | Laguna Niguel city, California | 64,519 | 64,359 | 64,239 |
| 595 | North Little Rock city, Arkansas | 64,633 | 64,665 | 64,162 |
| 596 | Millcreek city, Utah | 63,899 | 63,637 | 64,110 |
| 597 | Ocala city, Florida | 63,455 | 63,600 | 64,096 |
| 598 | Waltham city, Massachusetts | 64,994 | 64,817 | 64,015 |
| 599 | Burnsville city, Minnesota | 64,352 | 64,530 | 63,943 |
| 600 | San Clemente city, California | 64,409 | 64,346 | 63,896 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 601 | Bellevue city, Nebraska | 64,208 | 64,301 | 63,737 |
| 602 | Rowlett city, Texas | 62,543 | 62,743 | 63,671 |
| 603 | Caldwell city, Idaho | 59,985 | 60,482 | 63,629 |
| 604 | Port Orange city, Florida | 62,872 | 62,940 | 63,486 |
| 605 | Moore city, Oklahoma | 63,308 | 63,503 | 63,462 |
| 606 | Coon Rapids city, Minnesota | 63,660 | 63,590 | 63,385 |
| 607 | Lakewood city, Washington | 63,666 | 63,619 | 63,331 |
| 608 | Eden Prairie city, Minnesota | 64,375 | 64,335 | 63,161 |
| 609 | Hamilton city, Ohio | 63,386 | 63,361 | 62,947 |
| 610 | Apex town, North Carolina | 58,797 | 59,945 | 62,911 |
| 611 | Bossier City city, Louisiana | 62,722 | 62,653 | 62,865 |
| 612 | Porterville city, California | 62,607 | 62,619 | 62,742 |
| 613 | Maricopa city, Arizona | 58,442 | 59,133 | 62,720 |
| 614 | La Habra city, California | 63,200 | 63,140 | 62,609 |
| 615 | Taylor city, Michigan | 63,384 | 63,252 | 62,573 |
| 616 | Dearborn Heights city, Michigan | 63,257 | 63,120 | 62,451 |
| 617 | Council Bluffs city, Iowa | 62,701 | 62,625 | 62,415 |
| 618 | Hendersonville city, Tennessee | 61,756 | 62,040 | 62,257 |
| 619 | Springfield city, Oregon | 62,360 | 62,295 | 62,256 |
| 620 | Medford city, Massachusetts | 59,662 | 60,425 | 62,098 |
| 621 | St. Cloud city, Florida | 58,973 | 59,404 | 62,043 |
| 622 | Santa Cruz city, California | 62,341 | 62,251 | 61,950 |
| 623 | Richland city, Washington | 60,538 | 60,798 | 61,929 |
| 624 | Huntersville town, North Carolina | 61,403 | 61,574 | 61,839 |
| 625 | Encinitas city, California | 62,082 | 62,037 | 61,762 |
| 626 | Marietta city, Georgia | 60,969 | 60,940 | 61,497 |
| 627 | Wellington village, Florida | 61,854 | 61,779 | 61,448 |
| 628 | Woodland city, California | 60,852 | 60,917 | 61,398 |
| 629 | Montebello city, California | 62,771 | 62,527 | 61,204 |
| 630 | Vineland city, New Jersey | 61,305 | 61,202 | 61,156 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 631 | Chapel Hill town, North Carolina | 61,326 | 61,272 | 61,128 |
| 632 | Pontiac city, Michigan | 61,572 | 61,390 | 60,984 |
| 633 | Jupiter town, Florida | 61,100 | 61,048 | 60,802 |
| 634 | San Rafael city, California | 61,287 | 61,154 | 60,769 |
| 635 | Pico Rivera city, California | 62,215 | 61,995 | 60,764 |
| 636 | La Mesa city, California | 61,191 | 61,111 | 60,721 |
| 637 | Sanford city, Florida | 60,795 | 60,760 | 60,681 |
| 638 | Bristol city, Connecticut | 60,783 | 60,665 | 60,661 |
| 639 | Meriden city, Connecticut | 60,859 | 60,703 | 60,517 |
| 640 | Euless city, Texas | 61,089 | 61,105 | 60,500 |
| 641 | Great Falls city, Montana | 60,506 | 60,420 | 60,403 |
| 642 | Parker town, Colorado | 58,477 | 58,800 | 60,313 |
| 643 | Youngstown city, Ohio | 60,774 | 60,598 | 60,270 |
| 644 | Owensboro city, Kentucky | 60,205 | 60,183 | 60,011 |
| 645 | Corvallis city, Oregon | 59,696 | 59,697 | 59,864 |
| 646 | Stonecrest city, Georgia | 59,148 | 59,181 | 59,863 |
| 647 | Santee city, California | 60,075 | 60,057 | 59,703 |
| 648 | Gardena city, California | 61,069 | 60,892 | 59,702 |
| 649 | Kokomo city, Indiana | 59,609 | 59,606 | 59,691 |
| 650 | Monterey Park city, California | 61,259 | 61,012 | 59,667 |
| 651 | Taunton city, Massachusetts | 59,359 | 59,428 | 59,600 |
| 652 | White Plains city, New York | 59,555 | 59,564 | 59,526 |
| 653 | West Allis city, Wisconsin | 60,330 | 60,223 | 59,484 |
| 654 | Des Plaines city, Illinois | 60,681 | 60,511 | 59,459 |
| 655 | Palm Beach Gardens city, Florida | 59,218 | 59,253 | 59,449 |
| 656 | Blue Springs city, Missouri | 58,648 | 58,774 | 59,430 |
| 657 | Petaluma city, California | 59,713 | 59,678 | 59,403 |
| 658 | Wylie city, Texas | 57,602 | 57,930 | 59,394 |
| 659 | Taylorsville city, Utah | 60,552 | 60,449 | 59,242 |
| 660 | North Miami city, Florida | 60,250 | 59,965 | 59,229 |

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 661 | Dubuque city, Iowa | 59,639 | 59,565 | 59,119 |
| 662 | Revere city, Massachusetts | 61,878 | 61,565 | 59,075 |
| 663 | Carson City, Nevada | 58,639 | 58,677 | 58,993 |
| 664 | Burlington city, North Carolina | 57,346 | 57,593 | 58,818 |
| 665 | Grand Forks city, North Dakota | 59,022 | 58,942 | 58,781 |
| 666 | Springfield city, Ohio | 58,940 | 58,801 | 58,763 |
| 667 | Hempstead village, New York | 59,113 | 59,000 | 58,734 |
| 668 | Hoboken city, New Jersey | 60,675 | 60,590 | 58,690 |
| 669 | Casper city, Wyoming | 59,072 | 59,242 | 58,656 |
| 670 | Cupertino city, California | 60,575 | 60,343 | 58,622 |
| 671 | Terre Haute city, Indiana | 58,621 | 58,543 | 58,525 |
| 672 | Hanford city, California | 57,932 | 58,006 | 58,496 |
| 673 | Lenexa city, Kansas | 57,425 | 57,501 | 58,388 |
| 674 | Madison city, Alabama | 57,124 | 57,389 | 58,357 |
| 675 | Lake Havasu City city, Arizona | 57,204 | 57,415 | 58,284 |
| 676 | St. Clair Shores city, Michigan | 58,893 | 58,751 | 58,200 |
| 677 | Herriman city, Utah | 55,312 | 56,321 | 58,198 |
| 678 | Midwest City city, Oklahoma | 58,459 | 58,466 | 58,145 |
| 679 | St. Peters city, Missouri | 57,725 | 57,678 | 58,129 |
| 680 | Gilroy city, California | 59,669 | 59,493 | 58,101 |
| 681 | Margate city, Florida | 58,697 | 58,552 | 58,001 |
| 682 | Royal Oak city, Michigan | 58,217 | 58,098 | 57,953 |
| 683 | Shoreline city, Washington | 58,532 | 58,699 | 57,918 |
| 684 | Orland Park village, Illinois | 58,648 | 58,501 | 57,850 |
| 685 | Decatur city, Alabama | 57,851 | 57,777 | 57,804 |
| 686 | Casa Grande city, Arizona | 53,891 | 54,335 | 57,699 |
| 687 | Weymouth Town city, Massachusetts | 57,513 | 57,568 | 57,670 |
| 688 | Bowie city, Maryland | 58,310 | 58,226 | 57,644 |
| 689 | Lancaster city, Pennsylvania | 57,842 | 57,712 | 57,503 |
| 690 | Kettering city, Ohio | 57,743 | 57,648 | 57,377 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 691 | Bartlett city, Tennessee | 57,791 | 57,711 | 57,318 |
| 692 | Highland city, California | 57,083 | 57,070 | 57,159 |
| 693 | Coconut Creek city, Florida | 57,818 | 57,668 | 57,117 |
| 694 | Pocatello city, Idaho | 56,238 | 56,282 | 57,092 |
| 695 | Oak Lawn village, Illinois | 58,271 | 58,089 | 57,013 |
| 696 | Albany city, Oregon | 56,412 | 56,599 | 56,828 |
| 697 | Bentonville city, Arkansas | 54,120 | 54,675 | 56,734 |
| 698 | Fountain Valley city, California | 57,175 | 57,054 | 56,495 |
| 699 | Olympia city, Washington | 55,435 | 55,626 | 55,919 |
| 700 | National City city, California | 56,235 | 56,149 | 55,912 |
| 701 | Bradenton city, Florida | 55,423 | 55,497 | 55,905 |
| 702 | Coeur d'Alene city, Idaho | 54,515 | 54,770 | 55,904 |
| 703 | Berwyn city, Illinois | 57,120 | 56,913 | 55,772 |
| 704 | Tigard city, Oregon | 54,832 | 54,995 | 55,767 |
| 705 | DeSoto city, Texas | 56,155 | 56,074 | 55,729 |
| 706 | Port Arthur city, Texas | 55,610 | 55,550 | 55,724 |
| 707 | New Brunswick city, New Jersey | 55,443 | 55,483 | 55,708 |
| 708 | Smyrna city, Georgia | 55,689 | 55,635 | 55,685 |
| 709 | Apple Valley city, Minnesota | 56,246 | 56,135 | 55,638 |
| 710 | Kingsport city, Tennessee | 55,444 | 55,366 | 55,582 |
| 711 | Valdosta city, Georgia | 55,485 | 55,468 | 55,567 |
| 712 | Mount Prospect village, Illinois | 56,749 | 56,626 | 55,541 |
| 713 | Smyrna town, Tennessee | 53,138 | 53,516 | 55,518 |
| 714 | Apopka city, Florida | 54,897 | 54,874 | 55,496 |
| 715 | Southaven city, Mississippi | 54,640 | 54,774 | 55,429 |
| 716 | Brookhaven city, Georgia | 55,143 | 55,119 | 55,366 |
| 717 | Arcadia city, California | 56,737 | 56,512 | 55,345 |
| 718 | West Haven city, Connecticut | 55,560 | 55,455 | 55,294 |
| 719 | Perth Amboy city, New Jersey | 55,414 | 55,389 | 55,291 |
| 720 | San Jacinto city, California | 53,946 | 54,086 | 55,290 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 721 | Beaumont city, California | 53,101 | 53,549 | 55,280 |
| 722 | Chicopee city, Massachusetts | 55,576 | 55,481 | 55,190 |
| 723 | Plainfield city, New Jersey | 54,609 | 54,418 | 54,936 |
| 724 | Bonita Springs city, Florida | 53,820 | 54,006 | 54,904 |
| 725 | Marana town, Arizona | 52,020 | 52,758 | 54,895 |
| 726 | Tinley Park village, Illinois | 55,922 | 55,770 | 54,864 |
| 727 | Anderson city, Indiana | 54,745 | 54,669 | 54,817 |
| 728 | Sarasota city, Florida | 54,108 | 54,155 | 54,764 |
| 729 | Manhattan city, Kansas | 54,507 | 54,544 | 54,763 |
| 730 | Yucaipa city, California | 54,620 | 54,605 | 54,739 |
| 731 | Bozeman city, Montana | 52,855 | 53,119 | 54,539 |
| 732 | Lacey city, Washington | 53,442 | 53,828 | 54,461 |
| 733 | Kannapolis city, North Carolina | 53,145 | 53,431 | 54,446 |
| 734 | Logan city, Utah | 52,673 | 52,665 | 54,436 |
| 735 | Colton city, California | 53,945 | 53,975 | 54,285 |
| 736 | Texas City city, Texas | 51,898 | 52,259 | 54,247 |
| 737 | Kentwood city, Michigan | 54,375 | 54,305 | 54,141 |
| 738 | Peabody city, Massachusetts | 54,486 | 54,410 | 54,119 |
| 739 | Rocky Mount city, North Carolina | 54,351 | 54,248 | 53,957 |
| 740 | Elkhart city, Indiana | 54,044 | 53,951 | 53,949 |
| 741 | Diamond Bar city, California | 55,226 | 55,026 | 53,857 |
| 742 | Pensacola city, Florida | 54,394 | 54,359 | 53,678 |
| 743 | Huntington Park city, California | 55,005 | 54,806 | 53,644 |
| 744 | West Sacramento city, California | 53,666 | 53,631 | 53,637 |
| 745 | Normal town, Illinois | 53,585 | 53,575 | 53,594 |
| 746 | Spring Hill city, Tennessee | 50,021 | 50,595 | 53,339 |
| 747 | Edina city, Minnesota | 53,563 | 53,430 | 53,318 |
| 748 | Minnetonka city, Minnesota | 53,962 | 54,241 | 53,266 |
| 749 | Oak Park village, Illinois | 54,486 | 54,318 | 53,224 |
| 750 | Galveston city, Texas | 53,585 | 53,520 | 53,219 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 751 | Twin Falls city, Idaho | 51,593 | 51,816 | 53,213 |
| 752 | Pinellas Park city, Florida | 53,116 | 53,359 | 53,202 |
| 753 | Wheaton city, Illinois | 53,718 | 53,593 | 53,126 |
| 754 | Elyria city, Ohio | 52,738 | 52,730 | 52,816 |
| 755 | Methuen Town city, Massachusetts | 53,026 | 52,999 | 52,798 |
| 756 | Winter Haven city, Florida | 50,247 | 50,603 | 52,710 |
| 757 | Novato city, California | 53,130 | 53,006 | 52,708 |
| 758 | Paramount city, California | 53,828 | 53,631 | 52,506 |
| 759 | Battle Creek city, Michigan | 52,631 | 52,541 | 52,335 |
| 759 | Grand Island city, Nebraska | 53,083 | 52,944 | 52,335 |
| 761 | West New York town, New Jersey | 52,798 | 52,493 | 52,242 |
| 762 | Cathedral City city, California | 51,535 | 51,577 | 52,220 |
| 763 | La Crosse city, Wisconsin | 52,690 | 52,647 | 52,185 |
| 764 | Delano city, California | 51,845 | 51,864 | 52,173 |
| 765 | Watsonville city, California | 52,739 | 52,623 | 52,067 |
| 766 | Florissant city, Missouri | 52,548 | 52,445 | 52,003 |
| 767 | Joplin city, Missouri | 51,719 | 51,703 | 51,846 |
| 768 | Aliso Viejo city, California | 52,174 | 52,173 | 51,824 |
| 769 | Kyle city, Texas | 45,752 | 46,464 | 51,789 |
| 770 | Draper city, Utah | 50,510 | 50,481 | 51,749 |
| 771 | Burleson city, Texas | 47,807 | 48,132 | 51,618 |
| 772 | Mooresville town, North Carolina | 50,205 | 50,452 | 51,594 |
| 773 | Glendora city, California | 52,610 | 52,505 | 51,569 |
| 774 | Palm Desert city, California | 51,163 | 51,167 | 51,541 |
| 775 | Harrisonburg city, Virginia | 51,814 | 51,675 | 51,430 |
| 776 | Hoffman Estates village, Illinois | 52,460 | 52,333 | 51,350 |
| 777 | Collierville town, Tennessee | 51,198 | 51,247 | 51,343 |
| 778 | Placentia city, California | 51,911 | 51,789 | 51,274 |
| 779 | Summerville town, South Carolina | 50,933 | 51,010 | 51,216 |
| 780 | Mishawaka city, Indiana | 51,201 | 51,126 | 51,074 |

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021

| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| 781 | Burien city, Washington | 52,121 | 52,004 | 51,073 |
| 782 | Little Elm city, Texas | 46,361 | 47,078 | 51,042 |
| 783 | Middletown city, Ohio | 51,033 | 51,026 | 50,998 |
| 784 | Dunwoody city, Georgia | 51,629 | 51,539 | 50,901 |
| 785 | Grapevine city, Texas | 50,651 | 50,756 | 50,872 |
| 786 | Cuyahoga Falls city, Ohio | 51,109 | 51,014 | 50,810 |
| 787 | Lincoln city, California | 49,808 | 49,855 | 50,649 |
| 788 | Westfield city, Indiana | 46,427 | 46,990 | 50,630 |
| 789 | Columbus city, Indiana | 50,423 | 50,391 | 50,569 |
| 790 | Enid city, Oklahoma | 51,327 | 51,149 | 50,566 |
| 791 | Milford city (balance), Connecticut | 50,587 | 50,532 | 50,541 |
| 792 | Covina city, California | 51,373 | 51,246 | 50,411 |
| 793 | Troy city, New York | 50,760 | 50,684 | 50,394 |
| 794 | Newark city, Ohio | 49,913 | 49,952 | 50,383 |
| 795 | Jeffersonville city, Indiana | 49,413 | 49,494 | 50,315 |
| 796 | Rosemead city, California | 51,268 | 51,138 | 50,245 |
| 797 | Harrisburg city, Pennsylvania | 50,090 | 50,069 | 50,135 |
| 798 | Lakewood city, Ohio | 50,848 | 50,693 | 50,104 |
| 799 | Sheboygan city, Wisconsin | 50,017 | 49,945 | 49,931 |
| 800 | Cypress city, California | 50,269 | 50,266 | 49,926 |
| 801 | Murray city, Utah | 50,743 | 50,589 | 49,729 |
| 802 | Chesterfield city, Missouri | 50,014 | 49,956 | 49,703 |
| 803 | Downers Grove village, Illinois | 50,230 | 50,126 | 49,654 |
| 804 | St. Louis Park city, Minnesota | 50,016 | 50,020 | 49,158 |

Note: Areas are included in this table if they exceed the stated threshold at any point in the time series. The estimates are based on the 2020 Census and reflect changes to the April 1, 2020 population due to geographic program revisions and the application of disclosure avoidance to protect confidentiality (DRB clearance number CBDRB-FY22-054). For population estimates methodology statements, see <http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/methodology.html>. All geographic boundaries for the Vintage 2021 subcounty population estimates series are as of January 1, 2021. For updates on Legal Boundary Change/Annexation Data, see <https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-files/time-series/geo/bas/annex.html>. Additional information on these localities can be found in the Geographic Boundary Change Notes (see <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/geography/technical-documentation/boundary-change-notes.html>).

Suggested Citation:

| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| Rank | Geographic Area | April 1, 2020 Estimates Base | Population Estimate (as of July 1) | |
| | | | 2020 | 2021 |
| Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2021 Population: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 (SUB-IP-EST2021-ANRRNK) | | | | |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division | | | | |
| Release Date: May 2022 | | | | |

Exhibit C - Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 8

Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines
GOAL 8: RECREATIONAL NEEDS
OAR 660-015-0000(8)

To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

RECREATION PLANNING

The requirements for meeting such needs, now and in the future, shall be planned for by governmental agencies having responsibility for recreation areas, facilities and opportunities: (1) in coordination with private enterprise; (2) in appropriate proportions; and (3) in such quantity, quality and locations as is consistent with the availability of the resources to meet such requirements. State and federal agency recreation plans shall be coordinated with local and regional recreational needs and plans.

DESTINATION RESORT SITING

Comprehensive plans may provide for the siting of destination resorts on rural lands subject to the provisions of state law, including ORS 197.435 to 197.467, this and other Statewide Planning Goals, and without an exception to Goals 3, 4, 11, or 14.

Eligible Areas

(1) Destination resorts allowed under the provisions of this goal must be sited on lands mapped as eligible by the affected county. A map adopted by a county may not allow destination resorts approved under the provisions of this goal to be sited in any of the following areas:

(a) Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more unless residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort;

(b) On a site with 50 or more contiguous acres of unique or prime farm land identified and mapped by the United States Natural Resources Conservation Service or its predecessor agency; or within three miles of a High Value Crop Area except that "small destination resorts" may not be closer to a high value crop area than one-half mile for each 25 units of overnight lodging or fraction thereof;

(c) On predominantly Cubic Foot Site Class 1 or 2 forest lands, as determined by the State Forestry Department, that are not subject to an approved goal exception;

(d) In the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area as defined by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act, P.L. 99-663;

(e) In an especially sensitive big game habitat as generally mapped by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife in July 1984 and as further refined through development of comprehensive plans implementing this requirement.

(2) "Small destination resorts" may be allowed consistent with the siting requirements of section (1), above, in the following areas:

(a) On land that is not defined as agricultural or forest land under Goal 3 or 4; or

(b) On land where there has been an exception to Statewide Planning Goals 3, 4, 11, or 14.

Siting Standards

(1) Counties shall ensure that destination resorts are compatible with the site and adjacent land uses through the following measures:

(a) Important natural features, including habitat of threatened or endangered species, streams, rivers, and significant wetlands shall be maintained. Riparian vegetation within 100 feet of streams, rivers and significant wetlands shall be maintained. Alterations to important natural features, including placement of structures that maintain the overall values of the feature, may be allowed.

(b) Sites designated for protection in an acknowledged comprehensive plan designated pursuant to Goal 5 that are located on the tract used for the destination resort shall be preserved through conservation easements as set forth in ORS 271.715 to 271.795. Conservation easements adopted to implement this requirement shall be sufficient to protect the resource values of the site and shall be recorded with the property records of the tract on which the destination resort is sited.

(c) Improvements and activities shall be located and designed to avoid or minimize adverse effects of the resort on uses on surrounding lands, particularly effects on intensive farming operations in the area. At a minimum, measures to accomplish this shall include:

(i) Establishment and maintenance of buffers between the resort and adjacent land uses, including natural vegetation and where appropriate, fences, berms, landscaped areas, and other similar types of buffers.

(ii) Setbacks of structures and other improvements from adjacent land uses.

(iii) Measures that prohibit the use or operation in conjunction with the resort of a portion of a tract that is excluded from the site of a destination resort pursuant to ORS 197.435(7). Subject to this limitation, the use of the excluded property shall be governed by otherwise applicable law.

Implementing Measures

(1) Comprehensive plans allowing for destination resorts shall include implementing measures that:

(a) Adopt a map consisting of eligible lands for large destination resorts within the county. The map shall be based on reasonably available information, and shall not be subject to revision or refinement after adoption except in conformance with ORS 197.455, and 197.610 to 197.625, but not more frequently than once every 30 months. The county shall develop a process for collecting and processing concurrently all map amendments made within a 30-

month planning period. A map adopted pursuant to this section shall be the sole basis for determining whether tracts of land are eligible for siting of large destination resorts under the provisions of this goal and ORS 197.435 to 197.467.

(b) Limit uses and activities to those permitted by this goal.

(c) Assure developed recreational facilities and key facilities intended to serve the entire development and visitor oriented accommodations are physically provided or are guaranteed through surety bonding or substantially equivalent financial assurances prior to closure of sale of individual lots or units. In phased developments, developed recreational facilities and other key facilities intended to serve a particular phase shall be constructed prior to sales in that phase or guaranteed through surety bonding.

DEFINITIONS

Destination Resort -- A self-contained development providing visitor-oriented accommodations and developed recreational facilities in a setting with high natural amenities, and that qualifies under the definition of either a "large destination resort" or a "small destination resort" in this goal. Spending required under these definitions is stated in 1993 dollars. The spending required shall be adjusted to the year in which calculations are made in accordance with the United States Consumer Price Index.

Large Destination Resort -- To qualify as a "large destination resort" under this Goal, a proposed development must meet the following standards:

(1) The resort must be located on a site of 160 acres or more except within two miles of the ocean shoreline where the site shall be 40 acres or more.

(2) At least 50 percent of the site must be dedicated as permanent open space excluding yards, streets and parking areas.

(3) At least \$7 million must be spent on improvements for onsite developed recreational facilities and visitor-oriented accommodations exclusive of costs for land, sewer, and water facilities and roads. Not less than one-third of this amount shall be spent on developed recreational facilities.

(4) Commercial uses allowed are limited to types and levels necessary to meet the needs of visitors to the development. Industrial uses of any kind are not permitted.

(5) Visitor-oriented accommodations including meeting rooms, restaurants with seating for 100 persons, and 150 separate rentable units for overnight lodging must be provided. Accommodations available for residential use shall not exceed two such units for each unit of overnight lodging, or two and one-half such units on land that is in Eastern Oregon as defined by ORS 321.805. However, the rentable overnight lodging units may be phased in as follows:

(a) On land that is not in Eastern Oregon, as defined in ORS 321.805:

(A) A total of 150 units of overnight lodging must be provided.

(B) At least 75 units of overnight lodging, not including any individually owned homes, lots or units must be constructed or guaranteed through surety

bonding or equivalent financial assurance prior to the closure of sale of individual lots or units.

(C) The remaining overnight lodging units must be provided as individually owned lots or units subject to deed restrictions that limit their use to overnight lodging units. The deed restrictions may be rescinded when the resort has constructed 150 units of permanent overnight lodging as required by this section.

(D) The number of units approved for residential sale may not be more than two units for each unit of permanent overnight lodging provided under this section.

(E) The development approval shall provide for the construction of other required overnight lodging units within five years of the initial lot sales.

(b) On lands in Eastern Oregon, as defined in ORS 321.805:

(A) A total of 150 units of overnight lodging must be provided.

(B) At least 50 units of overnight lodging must be constructed prior to the closure of sale of individual lots or units.

(C) At least 50 of the remaining 100 required overnight lodging units must be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurance within five years of the initial lot sales.

(D) The remaining required overnight lodging units must be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurances within 10 years of the initial lot sales.

(E) The number of units approved for residential sale may not be more than 2-1/2 units for each unit of permanent overnight lodging provided under this section.

(F) If the developer of a resort guarantees the overnight lodging units required under paragraphs (C) and (D) of this subsection through surety bonding or other equivalent financial assurance, the overnight lodging units must be constructed within four years of the date of execution of the surety bond or other equivalent financial assurance.

(6) When making a land use decision authorizing construction of a "large destination resort" in Eastern Oregon, as defined in ORS 321.805, the governing body of the county or its designee shall require the resort developer to provide an annual accounting to document compliance with the overnight lodging standards of this definition. The annual accounting requirement commences one year after the initial lot or unit sales. The annual accounting must contain:

(a) Documentation showing that the resort contains a minimum of 150 permanent units of overnight lodging or, during the phase-in period, documentation showing the resort is not yet required to have constructed 150 units of overnight lodging.

(b) Documentation showing that the resort meets the lodging ratio described in section (5)(b) of this definition.

(c) For a resort counting individually owned units as qualified overnight lodging units, the number of weeks that each overnight lodging unit is available for rental to the general public as described in section (2) of the definition for "overnight lodgings" in this goal.

Small Destination Resort -- To qualify as a “small destination resort” under Goal 8, a proposed development must meet standards (2) and (4) under the definition of “large destination resort” and the following standards:

- (1) The resort must be located on a site of 20 acres or more.
- (2) At least \$2 million must be spent on improvements for onsite developed recreational facilities and visitor-oriented accommodations exclusive of costs for land, sewer, and water facilities and roads. Not less than one-third of this amount must be spent on developed recreation facilities.
- (3) At least 25 but not more than 75 units of overnight lodging shall be provided.
- (4) Restaurant and meeting rooms with at least one seat for each unit of overnight lodging must be provided.
- (5) Residential uses must be limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.
- (6) The county governing body or its designee must review the proposed resort and determine that the primary purpose of the resort is to provide lodging and other services oriented to a recreational resource that can only reasonably be enjoyed in a rural area. Such recreational resources include, but are not limited to, a hot spring, a ski slope or a fishing stream.
- (7) The resort shall be constructed and located so that it is not designed to attract highway traffic. Resorts shall not use any manner of outdoor advertising signing except:
 - (a) Tourist oriented directional signs as provided in ORS 377.715 to 377.830; and
 - (b) Onsite identification and directional signs.

Developed Recreation Facilities -- are improvements constructed for the purpose of recreation and may include but are not limited to golf courses, tennis courts, swimming pools, marinas, ski runs and bicycle paths.

High-Value Crop Area -- an area in which there is a concentration of commercial farms capable of producing crops or products with a minimum gross value of \$1,000 per acre per year. These crops and products include field crops, small fruits, berries, tree fruits, nuts, or vegetables, dairying, livestock feedlots, or Christmas trees as these terms are used in the 1983 County and State Agricultural Estimates prepared by the Oregon State University Extension Service. The High-Value Crop Area Designation is used for the purpose of minimizing conflicting uses in resort siting and is not meant to revise the requirements of Goal 3 or administrative rules interpreting the goal.

Map of Eligible Lands -- a map of the county adopted pursuant to ORS 197.455.

Open Space -- means any land that is retained in a substantially natural condition or is improved for recreational uses such as golf courses, hiking or

nature trails or equestrian or bicycle paths or is specifically required to be protected by a conservation easement. Open spaces may include ponds, lands protected as important natural features, land preserved for farm or forest use and lands used as buffers. Open space does not include residential lots or yards, streets or parking areas.

Overnight Lodgings -- are permanent, separately rentable accommodations that are not available for residential use. Overnight lodgings include hotel or motel rooms, cabins, and time-share units. Tent sites, recreational vehicle parks, manufactured dwellings, dormitory rooms, and similar accommodations do not qualify as overnight lodgings for the purpose of this definition. Individually owned units may be considered overnight lodgings if:

(1) With respect to lands not in Eastern Oregon, as defined in ORS 321.805, they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 45 weeks per calendar year through a central reservation and check-in service, or

(2) With respect to lands in Eastern Oregon, as defined in ORS 321.805, they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 38 weeks per calendar year through a central reservation system operated by the destination resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010.

Recreation Areas, Facilities and Opportunities -- provide for human development and enrichment, and include but are not limited to: open space and scenic landscapes; recreational lands; history, archaeology and natural science resources; scenic roads and travelers; sports and cultural events; camping, picnicking and recreational lodging; tourist facilities and accommodations; trails; waterway use facilities; hunting; angling; winter sports; mineral resources; active and passive games and activities.

Recreation Needs -- refers to existing and future demand by citizens and visitors for recreations areas, facilities and opportunities.

Self-contained Development -- means a development for which community sewer and water facilities are provided onsite and are limited to meet the needs of the development or are provided by existing public sewer or water service as long as all costs related to service extension and any capacity increases are borne by the development. A "self-contained development" must have developed recreational facilities provided on-site.

Tract -- means a lot or parcel or more than one contiguous lot or parcel in a single ownership. A tract may include property that is not included in the proposed site for a destination resort if the property to be excluded is on the boundary of the tract and constitutes less than 30 percent of the total tract.

Visitor-Oriented Accommodations -- are overnight lodging, restaurants, meeting facilities which are designed to and provide for the needs of visitors rather than year-round residents.

GUIDELINES FOR GOAL 8

A. PLANNING

1. An inventory of recreation needs in the planning area should be made based upon adequate research and analysis of public wants and desires.

2. An inventory of recreation opportunities should be made based upon adequate research and analysis of the resources in the planning area that are available to meet recreation needs.

3. Recreation land use to meet recreational needs and development standards, roles and responsibilities should be developed by all agencies in coordination with each other and with the private interests. Long range plans and action programs to meet recreational needs should be developed by each agency responsible for developing comprehensive plans.

4. The planning for lands and resources capable of accommodating multiple uses should include provision for appropriate recreation opportunities.

5. The *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan* could be used as a guide when planning, acquiring and developing recreation resources, areas and facilities.

6. When developing recreation plans, energy consequences should be considered, and to the greatest extent possible non-motorized types of recreational activities should be preferred over motorized activities.

7. Planning and provision for recreation facilities and opportunities should give priority to areas, facilities and uses that

- (a) Meet recreational needs requirements for high density population centers,
- (b) Meet recreational needs of persons of limited mobility and finances,
- (c) Meet recreational needs requirements while providing the maximum conservation of energy both in the transportation of persons to the facility or area and in the recreational use itself,
- (d) Minimize environmental deterioration,
- (e) Are available to the public at nominal cost, and
- (f) Meet needs of visitors to the state.

8. Unique areas or resources capable of meeting one or more specific recreational needs requirements should be inventoried and protected or acquired.

9. All state and federal agencies developing recreation plans should allow for review of recreation plans by affected local agencies.

10. Comprehensive plans should be designed to give a high priority to enhancing recreation opportunities on the public waters and shorelands of the state especially on existing and potential state and federal wild and scenic waterways, and Oregon Recreation Trails.

11. Plans that provide for satisfying the recreation needs of persons in the planning area should consider as a major determinant, the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.

B. IMPLEMENTATION

Plans should take into account various techniques in addition to fee acquisition such as easements, cluster developments, preferential assessments, development rights acquisition, subdivision park land dedication that benefits the subdivision, and similar techniques to meet recreation requirements through tax policies, land leases, and similar programs.

C. RESORT SITING

Measures should be adopted to minimize the adverse environmental effects of resort development on the site, particularly in areas subject to natural hazards. Plans and ordinances should prohibit or discourage alterations and structures in the 100 year floodplain and on slopes exceeding 25 percent. Uses and alterations that are appropriate for these areas include:

1. Minor drainage improvements that do not significantly impact important natural features of the site;
2. Roads, bridges and utilities where there are no feasible alternative locations on the site; and
3. Outdoor recreation facilities including golf courses, bike paths, trails, boardwalks, picnic tables, temporary open sided shelters, boating facilities, ski lifts and runs. Alterations and structures permitted in these areas should be adequately protected from geologic hazards or of minimal value and designed to minimize adverse environmental effects.

Exhibit D - City of Bend Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5 Housing

Section 2 of Ordinance 2271

Exhibit B

New Chapter 5 of the Bend Comprehensive Plan, Housing



Chapter 5: Housing





Housing

Adopted Amendments

| EFFECTIVE DATE | ORD # | CHANGES |
|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 7-17-96 | Ordinance 2175 | Amendment for provision of destination resorts |
| 11-18-98 | Resolution 2247 | Major update and revisions to General Plan text and maps. |
| 9-6-00 | Ordinance NS 1753 | General Plan text amendment to figure and policy in Chapter 5, added new appendices regarding Lava Ridge Plan. |
| 9-3-03 | Ordinance NS 1886 | General Plan text amendment in Chapter 5, Figure 5-8 (or Figure #22) showing Destination Resort Siting. |
| 5-16-07 | Ordinance NS 2048 | Chapter 5 of the General Plan amended to add new text regarding affordable housing and manufactured home parks, add two new policies regarding redevelopment standards for manufactured home parks and density bonuses. |
| 2016 | NS-2271 | Significant update in response to 2010 Urban Growth Boundary Remand Order: format update, new background text, new and revised policies, deleted outdated policies |



BACKGROUND

Context

Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing) requires cities to “encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.” Goal 10 and the related Needed Housing Statute require Oregon cities to maintain adequate supplies of properly planned and zoned lands to meet their identified housing needs. The law recognizes that this may require expanding an urban growth boundary. That process is governed by other statutes and goals, and by the Growth Management chapter of this plan. Goal 10 and related statutes require the City to adopt and incorporate two important documents into the Comprehensive Plan.

The first document is a buildable lands inventory (BLI) that catalogues the development status (developed, vacant, etc.) and capacity (housing units) that can be accommodated on lands within the UGB. Bend’s BLI for both housing and employment lands is adopted and incorporated as Appendix I of the Comprehensive Plan.

The second document is a housing needs analysis (HNA) that includes an analysis of national, state, and local demographic and economic trends, and recommendations for a mix and density of needed housing types. Bend’s HNA for growth to 2028 is adopted and incorporated as Appendix J of the Comprehensive Plan. The HNA documents historical housing and demographic trends, the projection of population and housing growth, and an analysis of housing affordability.¹ Based on this analysis, the HNA presents an estimate of needed housing density and mix for growth to 2028.

The BLI and the HNA provide the factual base to support the housing goals and policies in this chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. A major objective of the Comprehensive Plan is to establish residential areas that are safe, convenient, healthful, and attractive places to live, and which will provide a maximum range of housing choices for the people in Bend. The City of Bend will face a variety of issues over the coming years in meeting these needs, including:

- Maintaining an adequate supply of land available and zoned appropriately to provide opportunities for a range of housing types needed in Bend in the face of rapid population growth.

¹ A primary indicator of affordability is whether a household is paying more than 30% of its income, including utilities, rent, mortgage payments, interest and insurance, and is therefore experiencing housing “cost burden” under federal housing guidelines. Using cost burden as an indicator is consistent with the Goal 10 requirement of providing housing that is “commensurate with the financial capabilities” of all Oregon households.



Housing

- Responding to a land and housing market that has appreciated significantly in recent years, driving the cost of housing up significantly and leaving relatively few market opportunities for low-cost owner-occupied housing.
- Affordable housing for service workers, both for individuals and families, is in short supply in Bend. Rapid increases in home and rental prices have combined with growth in the (low wage) service sector to make it difficult for much of Bend's workforce to live in the City.
- The increasing gap of housing affordable to low and moderate income households is resulting in many area workers living in other Central Oregon cities and commuting to Bend for work. This is exacerbating traffic congestion and it also affects the ability of area employers to attract workers for jobs at many income levels, including service and professional workers.
- The City is currently limited to some degree in what it can do by state and other regulations that restrict the ability to enact funding mechanisms or regulatory approaches to meeting housing needs.

As summarized in the HNA, Bend's population grew rapidly between 1990 and 2014, increasing from about 20,000 to 80,000 people during that period (in part due to significant annexations in 1998). At the same time, Bend's housing stock nearly tripled. Most new housing development during this time was single-family detached housing.

This rapid population growth increased the demand for all types of housing. During the same period, average wages were flat and the combined result was a decline in housing affordability. Housing sales prices more than doubled between 2000 and 2014, while household income levels increased by only about 18 percent. In addition to wage stagnation, several other factors contributed to a decline in affordability between 1990 and 2014, including:

- High demand for second homes in Bend
- Significant growth in the tourism/recreation economy and the associated jobs that tend to pay lower wages
- Demographic changes, as described in the Demographic Trends section below

As growth continues, Bend must carefully plan for new housing that meets the needs of its changing population. The Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies support a range of housing choices matched to Bend's needs. One of the challenges facing the community is how to plan for a variety of housing options in existing neighborhoods and new residential areas that support the changing demographics and lifestyles of Bend's current and future residents.

The need for housing correlates strongly to the need for land within Bend's urban growth boundary. The Urbanization Report provides a discussion about how land needs for housing and other uses are determined and how Bend will meet residential land needs over time.



Demographic Trends

There are a number of factors that will increasingly affect the choices people make when it comes to housing type; three primary factors are a person's age, the number of people in the household and household income. In Bend, and across the country, the first two decades of the 21st century saw some key demographic changes that will impact the way communities plan for the housing needs of their existing and future populations.

- **Growth in Baby Boomers.** The number of people over age 65 is projected to increase significantly. Households over 65 tend to have less income than younger households and are more likely to choose lower-cost multifamily housing. Some baby boomers may also choose to downsize their housing, resulting in greater demand for small dwellings.
- **Growth in Millennials.** Millennials are people who will be between 31 and 44 years old in the year 2028. This segment of the population is also expected to increase in Bend. Younger millennials typically have lower incomes and may have higher debt. Growth in millennials will increase need for affordable housing rental and ownership options.
- **Growth in Hispanic and Latino population.** The Hispanic and Latino population in Bend more than doubled between 2000 and 2014, and growth is expected to continue. Many Hispanic and Latino residents in Bend are also within the Millennial age range. To the extent that Hispanic and Latino households currently have lower household incomes than the population as a whole, demand for more affordable housing, both rental and ownership options, will increase.

In 2016, Bend will also see the opening of its first dedicated four-year university campus, which will ultimately bring up to 5,000 students into the mix. While some of these students will live on campus, there will also be a need for affordable student housing off campus.

Based on these trends, the future housing mix in Bend will look different than it has in the past. There is a growing need to provide a wider range of housing sizes and prices to accommodate the shifting demographics. Evidence suggests that a substantial portion of Bend's residents will live in attached housing, such as townhouses, cottage housing, duplexes, garden apartments, or urban apartments. At the same time, Bend also has a continuing demand for single family detached housing, primarily on small or moderately sized lots (5,000 to 7,000 square feet). A growing share of households will be renters, either by choice (e.g., Baby Boomers who prefer to rent smaller units) or by economic necessity. Demand for these types of homes will be particularly high in areas close to Bend's commercial and recreational amenities. In planning for future housing, Bend must pay close attention to the following housing issues:

- **Widening demand for a range of housing types by retirees.** Older households tend to move less frequently than younger households, and a large majority would like to age in place. Being near family, friends, and social organizations in walkable neighborhoods also becomes increasingly important with age.



Housing

- **Increasing demand for family housing.** Millennials and Hispanic households are poised to account for the largest percentages of growth in Bend over the next 20 years. Millennial will be entering the phase of life when they form families and have children. In addition, Hispanic households have larger than average household size because they often live in multi-generational households and have a larger average number of children. Growth in households with families will drive need for housing that is both affordable and has sufficient space.
- **Increasing demand for affordable housing.** A substantial proportion of Bend's households cannot afford housing in Bend. Many workers in Bend live in nearby communities because affordable housing is in short supply in Bend, and the demand for small-lot housing with nearby amenities is increasing. For two of the fastest growing demographics in Bend, the Millennials and Hispanic and Latino population, affordability is more likely to be a barrier to homeownership or higher-cost rental housing.
- **Location and design of housing.** The location of housing is becoming increasingly important, with increased demand for housing in walkable neighborhoods near retail and other amenities. Integrated multi-family and compact single-family homes located in neighborhoods can provide opportunities for a wider range of housing and transportation options.

Vision for Neighborhood Livability in Bend

While the range of housing types and prices in Bend will expand, Bend will continue to emphasize livability in all neighborhoods, old and new. What does a livable neighborhood look like?

- Safe and convenient for travel by foot, car and bike
- Natural features, parks, open space
- Small-scale shops and places to eat and drink in the neighborhood or nearby
- Quality housing that provides diverse housing types and flexibility that meets market demand
- Comfortable integration and transitions between housing types and commercial uses



RESIDENTIAL PLAN DISTRICTS

The Comprehensive Plan has five residential districts that are shown on the Comprehensive Plan Map and described in Table 5-1 below. These districts provide for variety and choice in housing types, lot sizes, and locations needed to serve the existing and future housing markets. In addition to these residential districts, some future housing will occur in the Plan's mixed use districts and as secondary uses in some commercial areas.

Table 5-1. Residential Plan Districts

| Plan Designation | Characteristics | Implementing Zone(s)* | Density Range (dwellings per gross acre)** |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Urban Low Density | <p>The Urban Low Density designation is intended for low density urban residential development. It may be used in areas that are already developed with low density housing where minimal infill is appropriate or on vacant land as part of a "transect" from urban to rural densities where consistent with the Growth Management policies of this Plan.</p> <p>It is intended to provide for residential uses, with an emphasis on single family detached homes, although a broader mix of housing types is encouraged for new neighborhoods.</p> | Residential Low Density (RL) | Min: 1.1 Max: 4.0 |
| Urban Standard Density | <p>The Urban Standard Density designation is intended to provide opportunities for a variety of residential housing types at the most common residential densities in places where sewer and water services are available. It is intended to provide for residential uses, with a mix of single family detached homes and other housing types at a scale compatible with single family homes. It also provides opportunities for supporting public and institutional uses on a case-by-case basis.</p> | Residential Standard Density (RS) | Min: 4.0 Max: 7.3 |
| Urban Medium Density | <p>The Urban Medium Density designation is intended to provide for a mix of housing types, with an emphasis on multifamily residential and medium-scale attached housing types, and opportunities for limited neighborhood commercial uses. It also provides opportunities for supporting public and institutional uses on a case-by-case basis. It is suitable in areas where sewer and water service are available. It is most appropriate for areas in proximity to commercial areas and along or near major transportation and transit corridors.</p> | Residential Medium Density (RM) | Min: 7.3 Max: 21.7 |
| | | Medium-10 Density Residential (RM-10) | Min: 6.0 Max: 10.0 |



Housing

| Plan Designation | Characteristics | Implementing Zone(s)* | Density Range (dwellings per gross acre)** |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Urban High Density | The Urban High Density designation is intended to provide land for primarily high density multifamily residential, with opportunities for neighborhood commercial uses. It also provides opportunities for supporting public and institutional uses on a case-by-case basis. It is generally suitable for locations in proximity to downtown, commercial areas and/or transit corridors. | Residential High Density (RH) | Min: 21.7 Max: 43.0 |

* Inside the Bend UGB, the Urban Area Reserve (UAR-10) and Suburban Residential (SR-2½) zoning districts are holding zones to preserve land for future urban development consistent with underlying urban plan designations. They are intended to provide limited opportunities for housing and limited other rural uses that will not interfere with future development of urban uses. Inside the Bend UGB, the SR-2½ district is intended for use only for areas with existing rural development patterns, and is generally not appropriate for large tracts of vacant land.

** See Bend Development Code for methodology to calculate minimum and maximum densities.

GOALS

The intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide and maintain sufficient residential land to accommodate needed housing units under Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing). The following goals set the context for the policies in this chapter. The citizens and elected officials of Bend wish to:

- Keep our neighborhoods livable by offering a variety of living styles and choices, creating attractive neighborhoods located close to schools, parks, shopping and employment.
- Accommodate the varied housing needs of citizens with particular concern for safety, affordability, open space, and a sense of community.
- Recognize the importance of transportation linkages (streets, bikeways, sidewalks and paths) in connecting neighborhoods and building and maintaining a sense of community.
- Promote more flexibility in development standards to balance the need for more efficient use of residential land and preservation of natural features.
- Zone adequate land in specific designations to allow for production of needed housing units.



POLICIES

Population Forecasts

- 5-1** The City will coordinate with and provide data to Portland State University for their preparation and regular update of a coordinated 50-year population forecast for the Urban Growth Boundary.
- 5-2** Using the new coordinated 50-year forecast, the City will, within 5 years after acknowledgment of the current update becomes final and no longer subject to appeal, initiate a supplemental legislative review of the UGB and/or urban reserve area planning to demonstrate continuing compliance with state needed housing laws for a new full 20-year planning period.
- 5-3** The City will use regular updates of population forecasts and Housing Needs Analyses to monitor housing trends relative to the planned housing mix, densities, location, and affordability assumed within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Housing Mix, Density, and Affordability

- 5-4** The City will apply plan designations, zoning districts and development code regulations to implement the mix of housing indicated in the adopted Housing Needs Analysis.
- 5-5** The main purpose of maximum densities shown on the Plan Map is to maintain proper relationships between proposed public facilities and services and population distribution. One purpose of minimum densities is to assure efficiency of land use, particularly for larger sites. Another is to encourage development of housing in locations and at densities that support healthy, accessible, and affordable housing choices.
- 5-6** Upon application, the City shall zone residential lands within City's corporate limits in accordance with their plan designations, and without a separate showing of public need, subject only to conditions, if applicable, requiring availability of public sewer or public water before occupancy.
- 5-7** The City will continue to create incentives for and remove barriers to development of a variety of housing types in all residential zones, consistent with the density ranges and housing types allowed in the zones. This policy is intended to implement the City's obligation under the State Housing Goal to "encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type, and density".



Housing

- 5-8** The City will apply innovative and flexible zoning tools to support a mix of housing types and densities.
- 5-9** The City and County will support public and private non-profit and for-profit entities that provide affordable housing in Central Oregon.
- 5-10** The City and County will coordinate with each other and other affected governments as required by the State Housing Goal to ensure that “the needs of the region are considered in arriving at a fair allocation of housing types and densities” and that “needed housing is provided on a regional basis through coordinated comprehensive plans”.
- 5-11** The City will continuously monitor the yield of efficiency measures as required by the state needed housing statute and publish the results on its Growth Management Documents website not less than once a year.
- 5-12** To promote complete neighborhoods and the integration of other supporting uses, the City will employ a master planning process for large development sites which are 20 acres or greater. The master plan process will offer two options for approval: 1) applying clear and objective standards or 2) applying discretionary standards for more flexibility.
- 5-13** Existing residentially-designated areas that are adjacent to commercial or mixed use designations may be re-designated for Residential Medium and High density development.
- 5-14** The City will support re-designation of suitable areas that are within a 1/4-mile walk to transit corridors from a lower density designation to a higher density designation, where plan amendment criteria are otherwise met.
- 5-15** The City shall employ special redevelopment standards and other strategies for manufactured home parks as an incentive to retain and redevelop existing affordable housing stocks at affordable prices and rent levels.
- 5-16** The City may consider density bonuses as an incentive to providing affordable housing.
- 5-17** The City will monitor parking needs for residential uses and set parking requirements to the lowest standards that will meet the community’s needs in order to reduce land utilized for parking, reduce the cost of housing development, and encourage a more walkable development pattern.
- 5-18** The City will assist in identifying, obtaining and leveraging funding sources for the development of new housing for very low, low, and moderate - income residents, as determined by appropriate

Housing



percentages of Area Median Family income in the Housing Needs Assessment.

- 5-19** The City will monitor the results of actions and programs funded through the use of the City's Affordable Housing Fee Trust Fund.
- 5-20** When affordable housing development is required by City policy or code or to meet eligibility criteria for a City incentive program or a policy requirement, affordable housing means housing with a sales price or rental amount that is within the means of a household that may occupy moderate- and low-income housing. Unless otherwise specified, affordable housing must meet one of the thresholds defined below. Nothing in this policy prevents the city from providing support for housing at other levels of affordability.
- o In the case of dwelling units for sale, affordable means housing in which the mortgage, amortized interest, taxes, insurance, and condominium or association fees, if any, constitute no more than 30 percent of such gross annual household income for a family at 80% of the area median income, based upon most recent HUD Income Limits for the Bend Metropolitan Statistical Area (Bend MSA).
 - o In the case of dwelling units for rent, affordable means housing for which the rent and utilities constitute no more than 30 percent of such gross annual household income for a family at 60% of the area median income, based upon most recent HUD Income Limits for the Bend MSA.
- 5-21** In order to ensure the continued affordability of affordable housing that has been committed by a property owner or required by the City, the City may:
- o Specify a minimum number of years that affordability must be maintained;
 - o Require an applicant to demonstrate how affordability will be ensured throughout the specified period, including addressing how units will be made available to households meeting the targeted income level, resale/recapture for ownership units, and/or rent increases for rental units, as applicable;
 - o Establish phasing requirements for construction of affordable housing units;
 - o Condition land use approvals to implement affordable housing requirements;
 - o Require restrictive covenants, deed restrictions, and/or related instruments as deemed necessary by the City; and/or
 - o Require other measures deemed necessary by the City.



Housing

Residential Compatibility

- 5-22** Private and public nonresidential uses are necessary and will be encouraged within residential areas for the convenience and safety of the residents. Such facilities shall be compatible with surrounding developments, and their appearance should enhance the area.
- 5-23** Of necessity, nonresidential uses may abut residentially planned and zoned areas in different parts of the community. In these instances, nonresidential uses will be subjected to special development standards such as setbacks, landscaping, sign regulations, and building design that harmonize and provide transitions consistent with the primary purposes of the adjacent zones.
- 5-24** Homes built to HUD Class A manufactured home standards will be permitted in manufactured home parks, or on individual lots. Non-Class A manufactured homes may be allowed in manufactured home parks or as replacement for non-conforming manufactured homes subject to conditional use approval standards that are clear and objective and that encourage retention and replacement of existing affordable housing stock.
- 5-25** Homes built to HUD manufactured home standards located on individual lots in areas already developed with conventional housing shall be subject to special siting standards as provided by state needed housing law.
- 5-26** Manufactured and modular homes meeting IRC Modular and CABO building code standards shall be permitted on the same basis as site-built homes.
- 5-27** Private covenants and deed restrictions recorded hereafter that support compact urban form, higher densities and better access to affordable housing are encouraged as supportive of City policy.
- 5-28** Neighborhood commercial shopping areas may be located within residential districts and have development standards that appropriately limit their scale and recognize their residential setting.
- 5-29** In many cases, small home-based businesses are a legitimate use within residential areas, and may be permitted subject to design and nuisance standards in the Development Code.
- 5-30** Certain private recreational uses, such as golf courses or tennis courts, may be successfully integrated into residential areas provided the location, design, and operation are compatible with surrounding residential developments and do not prevent development of lands inventoried for needed housing to minimum density standards.



- 5-31** Residential areas will offer a wide variety of housing types in locations best suited to a range of housing types, needs and preferences.

Neighborhood Appearance

(See related policies in Chapter 9, Community Appearance.)

- 5-32** Above-ground installations, such as water and sewer pumping stations, power transformer substations or natural gas pumping stations, shall be screened and designed to blend with the character of the area in which they are located.
- 5-33** All new developments shall include trees in the road right of way, as practical, in the planter strip between the curb and sidewalk.
- 5-34** Walls and fences along arterial or collector streets shall be subject to special design standards. The area between the fence or wall and the curb or pavement shall be landscaped.
- 5-35** All residential development will respect the natural ground cover of the area and existing and mature trees within the community should be preserved where practicable.
- 5-36** The City encourages flexibility in design to promote safety, livability and preservation of natural features. To that end, the City will provide development code standards to allow flexibility on dimensional standards, such as lot size and setbacks, to achieve these objectives.
- 5-37** Hillside areas shall be given special consideration in site design by both the developer and local regulations. Building sites, streets, and other improvements shall be designed and permitted in a manner that will minimize excessive cuts and fills and other erosion-producing changes. (Note: see related policies in Chapter 10, Natural Forces.)

Transportation connectivity

(See related policies in Chapter 7, Transportation Systems, and Chapter 3, Community Connections.)

- 5-38** Medium-and high-density residential developments should have good access to transit, K-12 public schools where possible, commercial services, employment and public open space to provide the maximum access to the highest concentrations of population.
- 5-39** Street widths on residential local streets shall be as narrow as reasonably possible to preserve safety, and limit the effects of surface runoff and excessive vehicle speed.



Housing

- 5-40** The City may require adjustments to the street design in order to discourage high speed traffic on local residential streets.
- 5-41** In all residential areas the City shall encourage the use of open space amenities such as landscaped traffic islands or extra-width planting strips.
- 5-42** Schools and parks may be distributed throughout the residential sections of the community, and all types of dwelling units should have safe and convenient access to schools and parks.
- 5-43** The City will coordinate with the school and parks districts to ensure that the respective plans of each local government are coordinated and consistent with state law.
- 5-44** Sidewalks will be required in all new developments. Separated sidewalks will be required on all new streets. However, an alternative system of walkways that provide adequate pedestrian circulation may be approved.
- 5-45** Per the City's Transportation Systems Plan, the City will complete or connect priority walkways on routes to schools, parks, or commercial areas.
- 5-46** Bikeways shall be considered as a transportation element, and adequate facilities shall be provided as a part of new development.
- 5-47** Efforts will be made to extend trails, pedestrian ways, and bikeways through existing residential areas. Existing trails, pedestrian ways, and bikeways will be extended through new developments to allow further extension and promote alternative modes of travel.
- 5-48** The City will encourage pedestrian scale block length to encourage connectivity and pedestrian access. When existing conditions or topography prevent a cross street, a pedestrian accessway to connect the streets may be required.
- 5-49** Residential local streets shall be developed whenever practicable to increase connectivity within and between neighborhoods.
- 5-50** Cul-de-sac and "hammer-head" residential streets may be allowed only where existing development, steep slopes, open space, or natural features prevent connections, or when the objectives of connectivity are met within the neighborhood.
- 5-51** The City will consider the need for emergency equipment access for any new development.



Public utilities and services

(See related policies in Chapter 1, Plan Management and Citizen Involvement and Chapter 8, Public Facilities and Services.)

- 5-52** All residential areas will be provided with community water and sewer services and other facilities necessary for safe, healthful, convenient urban living consistent with the density of development.
- 5-53** Residential development shall be coordinated with other land use elements and community facilities which are consistent with projected housing densities.
- 5-54** Electric power, telephone, and cable TV distribution and service lines shall be located underground in new developments.
- 5-55** New street names shall be unique within the County.

Destination Resorts

- 5-56** A destination resort within the Urban Area Reserve may be served by municipal water and sewer service or an approved community water and sewer service for domestic use compliant with state law.
- 5-57** Properties that are eligible for destination resort development will lose that eligibility upon inclusion into the UGB.

Refinement Plan Areas

(See related policies in Chapter 11, Growth Management and Chapter 1, Plan Management and Citizen Involvement.)

- 5-58** A refinement plan that includes residential areas may prescribe residential density limits on specific properties which differ from the density range provided for in the Comprehensive Plan. However, the average density of residential development allowed within a refinement plan area shall not be less than 80 percent or more than 100 percent of the maximum density, including applicable density bonuses or transfers, prescribed for the area by its pre-existing comprehensive plan map designations.

Remand Compliant

City of La Pine
Comprehensive Plan

Special Thanks & Acknowledgements

The City of La Pine Comprehensive Plan could not have been completed without the assistance of our citizens. Their participation was invaluable to the success of the document and was instrumental to developing the values, goals, and policies that are needed to shape the future of La Pine. Various public bodies and agencies also participated in the process and deserve special recognition for their efforts to refine the document. They are listed as follows:

City of La Pine:

City Council
City Planning Commission
City Staff

Deschutes County:

Board of County Commissioners
County Planning Commission
County Staff

State of Oregon:

Department of Land Conservation and Development
Department of Transportation
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Community Development and Economic Development
Department of Employment and Analysis

Federal Government:

Bureau of Land Management
US Forest Service
Corps of Engineers

Agencies:

Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council
La Pine Water and Sewer District
La Pine Park District
La Pine Rural Fire Protection District
Rural Community Assistance Corporation

Private Groups:

Economic Development for Central Oregon
La Pine Chamber of Commerce
Housing Works
La Pine Industrial Group

Special Recognition:

Special recognition and gratitude goes to DLCD Representatives Karen Swirsky, and Jon Jinings for their continued assistance in providing guidance to the City on problem

solving and urban/rural issues. The dedication, professionalism, and overall helpfulness were essential in the development of our first, independent Comprehensive Plan implementing the Statewide Planning Goals. Small cities, like La Pine, could not effectively complete comprehensive land use planning without assistance from DLCD. To that end, we are also thankful for the grant assistance and consideration of the Salem DLCD staff, Larry French, from which funding was provided for this task, and several other key projects.

Table of Contents

| <u>ELEMENT</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| Introduction | 5 |
| Chapter 1 – Community Characteristics | 16 |
| Chapter 2 – Citizen Involvement Program | 17 |
| Chapter 3 – Agricultural Lands | 25 |
| Chapter 4 – Forest Lands | 28 |
| Chapter 5 - Natural Resources and Environment | 32 |
| Chapter 6 – Parks, Recreation and Open Space | 40 |
| Chapter 7 – Public Facilities and Services | 47 |
| Chapter 8 – Transportation | 60 |
| Chapter 9 – Economy | 72 |
| Chapter 10 – Housing | 107 |
| Chapter 11- Energy | 129 |
| Chapter 12 – Urbanization | 133 |
| Appendices | 134 |

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan

I. Introduction

Incorporation:

The City of La Pine was incorporated in 2006 after a vote of citizens acknowledged the desire for La Pine to become a self-governing community. Population growth, challenging development issues, and a strong sense of personal independence of residents of the region led to the community making a governmental break from Deschutes County. Although brand new in its self-governance, the community is meeting the challenges of being a newly incorporated municipality head on. Aside from fulfilling the day to day obligations of managing City business affairs, this Comprehensive Plan is the first effort at directing long term community growth according to the vision of the City residents.

What is a Comprehensive Plan?

- **A Comprehensive Plan is a blueprint for community land use decision making to ensure that the needs of the community are met as growth occurs over the term of the planning period**
 - During the creation of the Comprehensive Plan, three fundamental questions were kept in mind, these are: *Where are we now? Where do we want to be? How will we get there?*
 - Although the document is primarily intended to provide a basis of how land will be utilized and developed, it has far-reaching affects on many day-to-day issues such as: provision of public/emergency services (police/fire); economic development/jobs; land values; schools; parks; and, transportation.
 - A Comprehensive Plan helps define a community and puts into a single document the goals and policies that ensure that the desired character and quality of life within the community is maintained as the community grows.
- **Elements of a Comprehensive Plan**
 - A Comprehensive Plan is comprised of separate chapters each addressing fundamental factors in community development. In Oregon the basis for the Plan is established by the Statewide Planning Goals – these Goals require that the following issues be addressed and planned for:
 - agricultural and forest lands
 - natural resources/historic resources
 - the quality of air, water and land resources
 - natural hazards
 - recreational needs
 - economic development
 - housing needs

- public facilities and services
 - transportation
 - energy conservation
 - Comprehensive Plans must also include provisions for regular updating to allow for changes in community direction and needs over time.
 - Provisions for implementation of the goals and policies contained within the Plan must be established. These include defining “programs” to fulfill tasks and meet obligations, the adoption of a Zoning Code, and adoption of subsequent specialized Code texts that have the effect of law.
 - A corresponding map identifies long-term land use designations and accompanies the textual document.
- **Reasons for a Comprehensive Plan**
 - Compliance with State of Oregon Land Use requirements for all municipal jurisdictions.
 - Provides the legal basis for the communities land use regulations (laws) and land use decisions.
 - Helps identify and prioritize issues that are important to the community and plan for change.
 - Ensures that adequate public facilities and services are provided and maintained to meet citizen needs
 - Provides a degree of certainty and protection for citizens regarding land uses, values, and rights in their community.
 - And, most importantly, a Comprehensive Plan ensures that the citizens of the La Pine have a say in the development of their community.

Summary of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals:

Oregon’s statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive planning. State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect. The local comprehensive plans must be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals. The State’s Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) review plans for such consistency. When the State Department of Land Conservation and Development officially approves a local government’s plan, the plan is said to be ‘acknowledged’. After acknowledgement, the Plan becomes the controlling guide for implementing ordinances – the laws that bring the plan to life. Oregon’s planning laws apply not only to local governments but also to special districts and state agencies. The laws strongly emphasize coordination between such agencies and special districts - keeping plans and programs consistent with each other, with the goals, and with acknowledged local plans. The following is a summary of the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and the issues that must be addressed in the Plan.

GOAL 1

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT Goal 1 calls for "the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process." It requires each city and county to have a citizen involvement program containing six components specified in the goal. It also

requires local governments to have a committee for citizen involvement (CCI) to monitor and encourage public participation in planning.

GOAL 2

LAND USE PLANNING Goal 2 outlines the basic procedures of Oregon's statewide planning program. It says that land use decisions are to be made in accordance with a comprehensive plan, and that suitable "implementation ordinances" to put the plan's policies into effect must be adopted. It requires that plans be based on "factual information"; that local plans and ordinances be coordinated with those of other jurisdictions and agencies; and that plans be reviewed periodically and amended as needed. Goal 2 also contains standards for taking exceptions to statewide goals. An exception may be taken when a statewide goal cannot or should not be applied to a particular area or situation.

GOAL 3

AGRICULTURAL LANDS Goal 3 defines "agricultural lands." It then requires counties to inventory such lands and to "preserve and maintain" them through farm zoning. Details on the uses allowed in farm zones are found in ORS Chapter 215 and in Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660, and Division 33.

GOAL 4

FOREST LANDS This goal defines forest lands and requires counties to inventory them and adopt policies and ordinances that will "conserve forest lands for forest uses."

GOAL 5

OPEN SPACES, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS AND NATURAL

RESOURCES Goal 5 covers more than a dozen natural and cultural resources such as wildlife habitats and wetlands. It establishes a process for each resource to be inventoried and evaluated. If a resource or site is found to be significant, a local government has three policy choices: preserve the resource, allow proposed uses that conflict with it, or strike some sort of a balance between the resource and the uses that would conflict with it.

GOAL 6

AIR, WATER AND LAND RESOURCES QUALITY This goal requires local comprehensive plans and implementing measures to be consistent with state and federal regulations on matters such as groundwater pollution.

GOAL 7

AREAS SUBJECT TO NATURAL DISASTERS AND HAZARDS Goal 7 deals with development in places subject to natural hazards such as floods or landslides. It requires that jurisdictions apply "appropriate safeguards" (floodplain zoning, for example) when planning for development there.

GOAL 8

RECREATION NEEDS This goal calls for each community to evaluate its areas and facilities for recreation and develop plans to deal with the projected demand for them. It also sets forth detailed standards for expedited siting of destination resorts.

GOAL 9

ECONOMY OF THE STATE Goal 9 calls for diversification and improvement of the economy. It asks communities to inventory commercial and industrial lands, project future needs for such lands, and plan and zone enough land to meet those needs.

GOAL 10

HOUSING This goal specifies that each city must plan for and accommodate needed housing types, such as multifamily and manufactured housing. It requires each city to inventory its buildable residential lands, project future needs for such lands, and plan and zone enough buildable land to meet those needs. It also prohibits local plans from discriminating against needed housing types.

GOAL 11

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES Goal 11 calls for efficient planning of public services such as sewers, water, law enforcement, and fire protection. The goal's central concept is that public services should to be planned in accordance with a community's needs and capacities rather than be forced to respond to development as it occurs.

GOAL 12

TRANSPORTATION The goal aims to provide "a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system." It requires communities to address the needs of the "transportation disadvantaged."

GOAL 13

ENERGY Goal 13 requires that "land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based upon sound economic principles."

GOAL 14

URBANIZATION This goal requires cities to estimate future growth and needs for land and then plan and zone enough land to meet those needs. It calls for each city to establish an "urban growth boundary" (UGB) to "identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land." It specifies seven factors that must be considered in drawing up a UGB. It also lists four criteria to be applied when undeveloped land within a UGB is to be converted to urban uses.

GOAL 15

WILLAMETTE GREENWAY Goal 15 sets forth procedures for administering the 300 miles of greenway that protects the Willamette River. *This goal does not apply to land within the La Pine UGB.*

GOAL 16

ESTUARINE RESOURCES This goal requires local governments to classify Oregon's 22 major estuaries in four categories: natural, conservation, shallow-draft development, and deep-draft development. It then describes types of land uses and activities that are permissible in those "management units." *This goal does not apply to land within the La Pine UGB.*

GOAL 17

COASTAL SHORELANDS The goal defines a planning area bounded by the ocean beaches on the west and the coast highway (State Route 101) on the east. It specifies how certain types of land and resources there are to be managed: major marshes, for example, are to be protected. Sites best suited for unique coastal land uses (port facilities, for example) are reserved for "water-dependent" or "water related" uses. *This goal does not apply to land within the La Pine UGB.*

GOAL 18

BEACHES AND DUNES Goal 18 sets planning standards for development on various types of dunes. It prohibits residential development on beaches and active foredunes, but allows some other types of development if they meet key criteria. The goal also deals with dune grading, groundwater drawdown in dunal aquifers and the breaching of foredunes. *This goal does not apply to land within the La Pine UGB.*

GOAL 19

OCEAN RESOURCES Goal 19 aims "to conserve the long-term values, benefits, and natural resources of the near shore, ocean, and the continental shelf." It deals with matters such as dumping of dredge spoils and discharging of waste products into the open sea. Goal 19's main requirements are for state agencies rather than cities and counties. *This goal does not apply to land within the La Pine UGB.*

Throughout the course of the 20-year planning period, that comprises the Comprehensive Plan timeline, the La Pine City Council and Planning Commission, as well as the citizens of La Pine, will use the Plan to guide decisions about La Pine's physical, social, and economic development.

II. Purpose and Intent

As a newly incorporated city, La Pine is required by state law to develop a Comprehensive Plan that is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals – the Goals express the State's policies on land use and planning for community growth. The La Pine Comprehensive Plan was developed for providing a guide to incorporating the specific community direction concerning future growth with the State mandated programs to the greatest degree practicable. The intent was to allow for as local control and guidance concerning future growth as possible, while maintaining efficiencies and effective delivery of public facilities and services and future use of land. Overall, a generalized long-range policy guide and land use map provides the basis for decisions on the

physical, social, and economic development of La Pine. The goals and policies included in this plan are based on coordination with local and regional agencies that provide public services to the community, and the best information available. The Plan strives to address the interrelationship between all factors, which influence community growth and not isolate them as unique facets to be looked individually. The connections between all elements inherent in community development are taken into consideration in all regards from public facilities planning to the arrangement of land uses to avoid conflict. The main objectives of this Comprehensive Plan are:

- To respect the past land use patterns in the community while preventing future conflicts with and between new land use activities;
- To provide elected officials, public agencies, and citizens of La Pine with an objective basis for participation in land use decisions;
- To provide an information document which serves as benchmark for the existing conditions and characteristics of the community;
- To identify the direction and nature of changes and future development which may be expected within the community; and,
- To provide a better understanding of specific goals, policies, actions, programs and regulations which affect the future growth of the community.

III. Process and Methodology

Planning Process

This Plan seeks to resolve some of those issues and the inevitable issues related to growth by providing clear policies on what the built environment should look like and how it should operate, and incorporating the wishes of the local Citizens. In order to accomplish these tasks, a significant amount of meaningful public involvement is required.

Goal 1 of the Statewide Planning Goals requires a strong commitment to public involvement at all levels of land use planning. Thus, since the Comprehensive Plan is the basis for all future land use decisions and provides direction for growth of the community through the 20-year planning period, it was not only a necessity from a legal standpoint to make sure the public was involved in its creation, but it was also a necessity from a community ownership standpoint. Without the Citizen input into the Plan, the Plan is lifeless and does not ensure that the local community desires are met. It was with the help of the Citizens of La Pine, including their long-term vision, that this document was created. To those ends, all of the citizens of La Pine who participated in the Comprehensive Planning process are to be thanked – especially City Councilors, Planning Commissioners, City Staff, agency participants and those members of the general public who diligently participated in the public meetings. The on-going participation of the local citizenry will be an important part of the community development process to ensure that the Plan is fulfilled and ultimately leads to the community that the citizens have envisioned.

Local Values

An overall sentiment that became apparent early in the planning process was that the Citizens wanted to maintain their small-town feel and retain the rural lifestyle, while at the same time increasing the degree of basic public services and amenities for their everyday needs. These include better access to health care/hospital, increased employment opportunities, enhancement of recreational opportunities, and other elements common to everyday life. The desire was for slow, graduated change that respected the ideals of the current Citizens and historical lifestyle of the area. The focus of this Plan is to make sure that the growth and redevelopment of the community adheres to these ideals and values, and that the vision as expressed by the Citizens.

In April, 2000 the La Pine Community Action Team sponsored the La Pine Community Design Charrette – with the help of professional at the Rocky Mountain Institute, a charrette process was completed, and a report identifying the desires of the community was produced. The primary accomplishments of the charrette were the identification of specific projects that the citizens of La Pine see as desirable and beneficial to their community, as well as considering specific design, size, and locational requirements for each. The previous Design Charrette was utilized as a basis for discussion to help identify and create the Vision for La Pine.

The following are the primary projects identified by participants in the process (with a brief description of what was desired). However, there was an acknowledgment that the prospective projects may not be built for a variety of reasons. Nonetheless, these items were deemed by citizens to be of future importance to the fabric of the community.

1. Performing Arts Center – An auditorium of 12,000 square feet with 400 seats
2. Community Health Center – A 24-hour emergency facility and rural hospital of 10,000 to 20,000 square feet.
3. Skate Park – Would require about 9,000 square feet of land
4. Safe House – A short-term residence for 1 to 5 victims of domestic violence.
5. Civic Center – A 5,000 square foot building to provide a variety of City and County services.
6. Senior Center – A 9,500 square foot building on 4-acres with parking for 100 vehicles. This would provide a variety of senior services.
7. Community Park – Large enough to accommodate many large scale recreational needs for the community and region.
8. Community Fairgrounds – A multi-use recreational and educational facility requiring 40 to 50 acres consisting of rodeo grounds, community building, administrative offices, etc.
9. Airport – On approximately 300 acres, this facility would include hangars, light industrial businesses, RV park, etc.

The following projects were also identified during the charrette process, but were less specific as to size, location, and design.

- Central Oregon Community College south campus
- New schools and school expansions
- Neighborhood parks
- Senior Housing
- Swimming pool
- Information kiosks
- Affordable housing
- City, County and State public works yard
- Open space
- Trails for equestrians, bikers, snowmobilers and skiers

Another major discussion point of the process was the opportunity to create an identifiable Town Center as a hub of community activity. The Town Center would be a compact area that is centrally located and planned for easy walking access. The uses would be comprised of a mixture of commercial businesses, civic buildings and other community uses.

Visioning as an overview

“Visioning” (as a planning term) is a process by which community values are weighed and a community identity is created. Key elements that need to be understood and defined in any community visioning process are:

- Where are we now?
- Where are we going?
- Where do we want to be?
- How do we get there?

Community involvement and participation from a broad spectrum is necessary to create a true community identity. A full scale, independent Visioning process results in a plan that does the following:

- Identifies primary community issues and desires
- Investigates the physical, cultural, economic and social fabric of a community
- Establishes community goals
- Develops strategies for meeting goals
- Creates an implementation plan

A key understanding of participants in the process is that not all desires of individual citizens will be viewed by others as a “community” need – there must be prioritization during the Visioning process. Key factors that must be kept in mind during the Visioning process are:

- What are the necessities versus aspirations?
- Fiscal, legal and procedural requirements to achieve the goals

- Who is responsible for moving goals forward (i.e. government, private business, and other agencies)?
- Is the plan sustainable over the long term?

The intended result is a definitive community direction that is aimed at empowering citizens to work in a cohesive fashion to build a better community. Successful implementation of a Vision plan requires the establishment of benchmarks so that successes and accomplishments of the plan can be weighed. Ultimately, the plan should be used to guide decisions on issues that have community wide implications.

Creating a Vision for the Future

In developing a vision for the future and creating this Comprehensive Plan, the following steps were taken and questions were asked:

- Define what “makes up” the community – Is the community of La Pine comprised of only those properties and residents within the City boundary, or does the “community” also include outlying residents who rely of City services and businesses for their everyday needs?
- Identification of available community resources – This process was both quantitative and qualitative in its efforts. It consisted of documenting the availability of public facilities and services, service agencies, private businesses and all other community resources that provide everyday service needs to the community.
- Creation of an Action Plan – An action plan is a prioritized set of specific tasks (these are the Programs listed within each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan) aimed at meeting the long term goals of the community. Other agencies, special districts, and groups who have participated in the development of the community vision have been encouraged to develop individual operation plans that contribute to the overall community vision and action plan for La Pine.
- Implementation – The tasks identified in the action plan should be assigned to individuals, groups, civic organizations, and local government entities as appropriate. Completion of tasks should be lauded in a public fashion with benchmarks established.

Visioning for La Pine

Visioning for La Pine occurred throughout the Comprehensive Planning process – the visioning included continual development of Goals and Policies for the operation and direction of the City as a jurisdictional organization (as listed throughout this Plan), as well as creating an action plan (the Programs listed throughout this Plan). After review of the points identified in the past charrette process, the discussions with the community opened up toward new ideas. The primary points raised by citizens were:

- Economy – how to create and generate jobs in La Pine

- Desire to maintain the “rural feel” of the community
- Transportation – Highway 97 bisects the city and creates physical and perceivable obstacles – need for a traffic signal at 1st Street
- Livability – a “slow degree of change” – not aggressive tactics to change the community quickly
- Establish design protocol for new development/buildings in La Pine by focusing on the “Complete Community” and “Complete Neighborhoods” concepts.
- Concern over the newest residential neighborhood within City boundaries that was reviewed/approved by Deschutes County under County development standards

Desired Outcome of Visioning Process

At the end of any visioning process there is a document that includes goals, policies and programs all aimed at fulfilling the community visioning statement – in this case, it is this Comprehensive Plan. This Plan is the document that can be looked to by the community to provide direction to all groups who provide services to community member.

Notwithstanding, the Plan is a dynamic document and must include a process for updating – it must be realized that the planning process is continual. As the community and surrounding influential circumstances change, the community must review the Plan for accuracy toward community desires. Continual adaptation of the plan to current circumstances is important in maintaining its relevance as guidance to community livability.

IV. Summary of the Plan and Recommendations

The La Pine Comprehensive Plan is a compilation of the vision and existing needs of the Citizens of La Pine, with goals, policies, and programs that give direction to bringing the vision to fruition and meeting the identified needs. Ultimately, this Plan is a useful planning tool that will help shape the City’s development regulations, capital improvement programming and budgeting, and other legal and regulatory actions necessary to manage La Pine’s physical, social, and environmental character. Aside from acting as a guide for the aspirations and current needs identified by Citizens, the Plan also includes goals and polices aimed at meeting State initiated programs – such as preservation of natural resources; providing a multi-modal transportation system; providing a variety of housing types; establishing an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB); and, planning for future UGB expansion. The primary direction of the Plan includes:

- Continual coordination with partner agencies and service districts for the effective and efficient delivery of services that are consistent with the community direction for future growth as outlined in the goals and polices of this Plan;
- Efficient utilization of land resources within the City to provide a variety of housing types, employment opportunities, transportation options and recreational activities for citizens;

- Increasing opportunities for the transition of the provision of public facilities and services to the City when economically feasible;
- Meeting the near term requirements for basic citizen needs;
- Improving opportunities for business development and creation of new jobs;
- Preservation of the local lifestyle and character of the community including the designation of the Complete Neighborhoods and Complete Community concepts;

Complete Neighborhoods is a concept whereby neighborhoods should be designed to have adequate lands for the development of a full range of housing choices, schools, transportation, open spaces, areas for energy production, commercial services, and employment lands. The goal is that if a neighborhood is complete it will create a more walkable and sustainable community that reduces reliance limited energy sources.

In La Pine, there are three primary neighborhood areas that are entirely within the City limits and proposed UGB. These neighborhoods will need various land uses and zones to become a fully complete. Over the planning period, and with adherence to the complete neighborhood concepts, La Pine will achieve its goals and become a fully functioning “Complete Community.” The City held a naming contest and the winning names the public chose for the three City neighborhoods are:

- Rosland Crossing – this area is at the northernmost part of the City and includes Wickiup Junction
- Ranchside Neighborhood – this area is south of Rosland Crossing beginning south of Burgess Road and ending at 1st Street
- Prairie Meadow – this area is the southern part of the City and the oldest part of the community.

Each of the neighborhoods contains various zones and other land use elements that ensure they are complete. The Comprehensive Plan shows how the proposed land uses will help to encourage complete neighborhoods.

The Complete Community concept is the collection of the La Pine Complete Neighborhoods. Thus, a Complete Community includes a system of complete neighborhoods by interlinking all components.

- Creating new methods for funding necessary public services and infrastructure other than new taxes – such as the adoption of System Development Charges for transportation, etc¹;
- Recognizing that La Pine as a large number of acres within the incorporated city limits and this permits creative opportunities for the transition of lands from rural to urban uses, and,
- Furthering the ability for the City to become successful at creating its own destiny through prioritization of issues important to La Pine and local decision making in this regard.

¹ The Special Districts already utilize SDC's for water and sewer facilities

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Map and How it Relates to the Current Deschutes County Zoning/Comprehensive Plan Map

The text of this Comprehensive Plan is accompanied by a land use map showing how La Pine's land uses will be arranged for the 20-year planning period. This will be La Pine's Comprehensive Plan Map and the map will include the urban growth boundary, which is the same boundary as the current city limits. The new La Pine Comprehensive Plan Map will replace the County Comprehensive Plan Map designations for La Pine.

After adoption of the La Pine Comprehensive Plan, the City will have its own Comprehensive Plan map but the current County zoning map will remain the same until the City adopts its own Transportation System Plan, zoning regulations, and a new zoning map. The reason for this is the lands that were not contained in the County Urban Unincorporated Community (UUC) cannot be intensified until further transportation study is complete – sometime in late 2012. The City and UGB lands that were not part of the previous UUC will be designated as “future urbanizable” but must retain current Deschutes County zoning or another interim “non-urban zone until La Pine adopts its TSP.

V. Amendments to the Plan

Amendments to the La Pine Comprehensive Plan may be necessary from time to time to reflect changing community conditions, needs and desires, to correct mistakes, add newer information, or to address changes in the law. An amendment or revision to the Plan may be initiated by the La Pine City Council, the La Pine Planning Commission, or the owner of the land, which is the subject of the proposed amendment or revision. In the case of a Council or Planning Commission initiated change, the change must be found to be consistent with all applicable State of Oregon requirements, including Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules. In the case of an owner initiated amendment to the Plan, the owner must, in addition to compliance with State laws, demonstrate that:

1. There was a mistake when the Plan designation was applied to the subject property; or,
2. The proposed change would result in a public need and benefit, and/or would result in a more efficient use of land.

VII. Aspirational Goals and Directives

The word “Shall” occurs frequently in this Plan. The wording is intended to direct intensity of effort when planning for La Pine's future. However, all tasks directed by this Plan are subject to the availability of City funding. Such funding will vary from year to year and in response to City Council priorities.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 1 Community Characteristics

I. Community History

La Pine was originally founded in the mid-1800s and was formally designated as a town site around 1900. The history of the original settlement was based on the fur trapping trade when trappers headed through the area from the Willamette and Columbia River valleys and followed the Deschutes River. Here they found rich trapping grounds and natural resources from which money could be made. Prior to settlement and influence from outside explorers to the region, the area was historically occupied by Native American Indian tribes. Much of the settlement of the area, by either Native Americans or European settlers, was based on the proximity to the natural resources of the area – rivers, lakes, forests and what is now called the Newberry Crater.

In the early 1900's the area became more heavily populated due to the logging industry and the national demand for timber. The resulting development led to a variety of everyday services – banks, school, hardware store, livery, newspaper, etc, to support the burgeoning population. The logging industry and services related thereto were aided by the recognition of the surrounding natural resources, which made the area ripe for tourism even in the early part of the 20th century.

The past century has seen the development of US Highway 97 through the community – this has opened up access to the area from points north to Washington and south to California. Recently though, the areas closest to La Pine have seen growth related to the tourism and second home industry – primarily in areas outlying what currently comprises the incorporated community. The development and population growth has aided the service industry of the area – typical businesses such as retail stores and services to the traveling public are common. After the decline of the timber industry over the last 20 years, the area has experienced economic stagnation with very few new industries locating in the community.

Over the past 10-15 years, progressive changes have come to La Pine. The City was incorporated by vote in 2006. Additionally, separate Park and Recreation, and Water and Sewer Districts have been created. These have brought an increased sense of awareness to La Pine as a community that has appropriate public facilities and services and is ripe for new economic development and thus, greater sustainability.

Future challenges will include increasing economic development in the community, job creation and providing additional services to meet everyday needs. Some of these will come naturally and will develop according to market demand. Others will take cooperation among agency and community groups. Increased citizen participation in these as well as governmental efforts will bring a greater independence and identity to La Pine over the next 20-years.

The community-based La Pine Industrial Group (LIGI) benefits the community. Efforts by LIGI have helped to provide land to develop three county-owned parcels east of the highway into industrial and business park sites. This is opening eyes in the Central Oregon business community. As development spreads from rapidly growing Bend outward, the newly incorporated La Pine is high on the list of communities ripe for investment and development opportunities. Water and sewer districts have brought municipal services to the community core. In 2008, the City of La Pine was designated as an enterprise zone by the State of Oregon. This allows qualified companies to forego paying property taxes for 3 to 5 years.

The City was recently incorporated and by vote of the people contains an abundant supply of land need to support planned growth for more than 20 years. While the capacity of the City in terms of acreage is large, the land is planned to be filled with a variety of uses including a significant amount of industrial/employment land infill. Transitional uses for some of the employment lands are a necessary technique for proper management of lands within the city limits. The city limits are also the proposed urban growth boundary.

Existing land uses within the city are characterized with strip commercial development along the highway and major streets with residential development scattered across the community; a significant portion of this is in the outlying areas of the city. Industrial development areas are located at the northeast and southeast corners of the City. Most residential areas contain detached single family homes. The percentage of multi-family homes, is very low, approximately 3 percent. Today, access to most employment and commercial services requires vehicular travel – even for quick services and grocery shopping. Pedestrian opportunities and multi-modal travel options are limited. These historic types of land uses are do not currently support sustainability and reduction of vehicular travel. During the citizen meetings that were instrumental in shaping the Plan, it became clear that the community has three neighborhood areas that have various supplies of employment, commercial service, industrial, parks/open space and residential lands. None of the three neighborhood areas contain adequate supplies or balance of uses to qualify as a Complete Neighborhood now. Citizens want to correct this imbalance and improve their neighborhoods with features that include:

- Better access and pedestrian ways that connect people to open spaces, parks, and recreational lands closer to where they live
- Additional employment and commercial service nodes closer within neighborhood areas so that people do not have to drive long distances to get “a gallon of milk” or other daily consumable items.
- Schools that are within shorter walking distances from residential areas
- Improved information technologies closer to neighborhoods
- Better access to medical care including a critical need for 24 hour emergency care
- Planned growth with commensurate infill policies that permit increased density but recognize that compatibility is an essential feature of maintaining and improving La Pine’s livability

- Opportunities for additional tourism support services and activities
- Reduce reliance on energy consumption in an effort to make the community energy neutral.
- Improve alternate energy options such as use of solar, bio-mass, high efficiency building techniques, and other forms of alternate energy as they are developed.
- Opportunities for using large acreages within the City limits as transition areas accommodating: alternate energy production, wildfire interface and natural resource protection areas, temporary employment lands, recreational uses, etc. until needed for urbanization or employment.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 2 Citizen Involvement Program

I. State Planning Goal 1, Citizen Involvement

Oregon State Planning Goal 1 requires a citizen involvement program to be inherent in all aspects of land use planning, and that insures the opportunity for all citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. Local governing bodies must clearly define the public involvement process and develop a process that is appropriate to the scale of the planning effort being undertaken. Additionally, all information must be presented in a manner that enables citizens to identify and comprehend the issues. Each local government must create a citizen based committee, typically the Planning Commission, which is comprised of broad based representation. Not only does the citizen involvement process have to disseminate information to the public, it must also be available to receive comment and weigh public testimony appropriately. In conjunction with his Comprehensive Planning process, a series of public meetings were held, a Technical Advisory Committee was created, and City Council input was sought. A formal Planning Commission was not available until the end of the initial planning process, but was available for review of the final draft document and to take public testimony before making a recommendation to the City Council.

II. Purpose and Intent

The provisions of this chapter provide a citizen involvement program to insure the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. This chapter defines the procedures by which the public will be involved in the ongoing land use process and to provide for a continuity of citizen participation and transmittal of information.

III. Issues and Goals

City leaders have made it a goal to improve communications and, a new City like La Pine, will benefit a formal public involvement program.

IV. Policies and Programs

It will be necessary to develop a program that includes effective two-way communication with all citizens of La Pine. The basic elements of the program should include the following tasks:

The City shall:

1. Establish a process to involve a cross section of affected citizens, ensure effective communication between citizens and elected officials, and assure citizens will receive a response from policy makers.
2. Assure compliance with all state requirements for open meetings and open records, as well as defining the process for standing for advisory committees in La Pine land use actions.
3. Provide two bodies for assisting in citizen involvement in La Pine:
 - a. The Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) shall be an advisory body to the City Council to assure that the intent and purposes of this chapter are met.
 - b. Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC's) shall insure plan amendments are developed in accordance with an overall City plan and advise the Council on individual land use matters. The La Pine Planning Commission is one example of such an advisory committee.

The Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI)

1. Creation and Composition

The Committee for Citizen Involvement will act as a liaison between the City Council and the various Citizen Advisory Committees and citizens of La Pine. The Committee shall be composed of a member from each active CAC including one representative of the La Pine Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall designate one of their members to serve as the Planning Commission Representative on the Committee for Citizen Involvement. The Planning Commission Representative shall serve on the Committee for a term of one year. With the exception of the Planning Commission representative, members shall also be appointed to serve on a Citizen Advisory Committee. Members shall represent a cross section of affected citizens, as well as all geographic areas and interests related to land use and land use decisions, and chosen by the City Council after a publicized and open selection process. Members of the Committee for Citizen Involvement will receive no compensation.

2. Tenure and Removal

- a. Members shall serve for terms of three years; provided, however, that the initial membership of the Committee shall be on staggered terms so that each year no less than two, nor more than three, members may be appointed.
- b. A member of the Committee may be reappointed by the City Council to serve additional terms.

- c. Members of the Committee may be removed by the City Council for cause, which include, but is not limited to, neglect or inattention to duty, failure to attend meetings and failure to implement the policy and purpose of this program.
- d. A member of the Committee may resign at any time by submitting such resignation to the City Council.

3. Responsibilities

- a. The Committee for Citizen Involvement shall be responsible to the City Council City Council for implementing and revising the La Pine Citizen Involvement Program, to promote and enhance citizen involvement in land use planning, further assisting in implementation of that Citizen Involvement Program and evaluation of the process used for citizen involvement.
- b. The Committee for Citizen Involvement shall be the designated agency for receipt and evaluation of communications from citizens regarding the citizen involvement process in La Pine and shall report periodically to the Council on the state of the program.
- c. The CCI shall be authorized to designate alternate members of their respective CAC's to attend CCI meetings in their absence.

The Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC's)

1. The City Council shall have the authority to establish and dissolve Citizen Advisory Committees, subject to the provisions of this chapter.
2. The City Council shall have the authority to establish, modify and abolish the boundaries in which Citizen Advisory Committees shall exercise their functions.
3. The City Council may undertake the activities listed in this section by City Council order only after consultation with the Committee for Citizen Involvement. Until such time, however, the Citizen Advisory Committees as composed on the effective date of this ordinance and the boundaries of each Citizen Advisory Committee are hereby ratified and affirmed.

Membership Requirements

1. Each Citizen Advisory Committee shall have five, seven or nine positions as designated by the City Council upon an order creating or modifying such committee. A CAC may exceed the designated positions temporarily, because of CAC boundary or issue change.
2. Members of each Citizen Advisory Committee shall be residents of the area served by such committee or a represent an issue connected to the subject matter.
3. Membership of each Citizen Advisory Committee shall be representative of a broad cross section of the citizens living in the area served by the Citizen Advisory Committee or represent an issue that relates to the committee function.

Applications and Appointments

1. All persons residing in each Citizen Advisory Committee Area are eligible to apply for membership on the committee of that district or in the case of special issues, be representative on that issue.

2. Applications for appointments to Citizen Advisory Committees shall be submitted to the City Council, Committee for Citizen Involvement or the Planning Director on forms provided by the Director.

3. Applications received for committee membership shall be treated as follows:

a. If no vacancy exists on a Citizen Advisory Committee, such application shall be held by the Planning Director for at least one year for consideration by the Committee for Citizen Involvement and the City Council when vacancies occur. The applicant shall be notified of the fact that no vacancy exists and that the application will be held for one year.

b. Where a vacancy on a Citizen Advisory Committee does exist, the application shall be referred to the Committee for Citizen Involvement for review. The Committee shall advise the City Council as to their recommendations on disposition of outstanding applications according to the following criteria:

(1) Whether there is sufficient number of applications to provide a reasonable choice among applicants, consistent with the overall goal of providing for an effective cross section of citizen involvement in the Advisory Committee area. If the Committee does not feel that there are a sufficient number of applications, it may recommend to the City Council that action be deferred until the Committee has undertaken to seek out an additional number of applicants. The City Council may, on its own motion, also undertake such recruitment.

(2) If the Committee be satisfied that appointment of one or more applicants would provide for a balance of representation on a Citizen Advisory Committee, based upon interests, occupation and geographic location, it shall recommend to the City Council that one or more of the applicants be appointed.

c. Applications for Citizen Advisory Committee membership shall be forwarded to the City Council, together with recommendations from the Committee, not less than 30 days after the Committee is notified of an existing vacancy, unless the Committee or the City Council undertakes additional active recruiting.

d. From the list of applicants submitted to the Committee for its recommendations, the City Council shall consider the recommendations of the Committee and fill the vacancy or vacancies from a list supplied by the Committee. If the City Council finds all names submitted by the Committee unacceptable, it shall return the list to the Committee with their reason for rejection and request additional lists of selections. The Committee shall, within a reasonable time of return of the list, submit to the City Council a new list for action by the City Council.

Term of Appointment

1. The term of membership on a Citizen Advisory Committee shall be three years from the date of appointment, except as otherwise provided for in this chapter.

2. A member may be reappointed by the City Council for additional terms.

3. When a vacancy occurs prior to the end of the three-year term, the City Council shall appoint a member to serve the portions of a Citizen Advisory Committee member's term.

Removal and Resignation

1. The City Council may remove a member of a Citizen Advisory Committee only after receiving a recommendation from the Committee for Citizen Involvement, if the City

Council finds that the policies of this chapter or the Comprehensive Plan are not met, or for the particular reasons set forth in this section. The City Council will also request that the Committee for Citizen Involvement undertake an investigation with respect to the grounds for removal or to respond to any complaints brought against any member of any Citizen Advisory Committee, or any Committee as a whole. The investigation shall include a Fact Finding Meeting to which all involved parties will receive a written invitation at least ten (10) days prior to the meeting. Statements will be taken, findings prepared and a recommendation for action made to the City Council.

2. The City Council may remove a member of a Citizen Advisory Committee for failure to participate actively or failure to perform adequately the duties and responsibilities of such membership. A CAC member's failure to attend three or more consecutive meetings, without explanation, shall be considered justification for removal. In all cases, the City Council shall request the recommendation of the Committee for Citizen Involvement prior to taking action.
3. A member of a Citizen Advisory Committee may resign at any time by submitting such resignation to the City.

Liability

1. Citizen Advisory Committee members shall be considered agents of the City within the coverage of ORS 30.260 to 30.330 in any actions taken by a Citizen Advisory Committee in performance of the duties, responsibilities, and functions as set forth in this chapter.
2. La Pine shall not indemnify CAC members for legal fees, judgments or other costs associated with legal suits or actions filed against any Citizen Advisory Committee or members thereof for any action taken outside of the scope of the duties, responsibilities, and functions of the Citizen Advisory Committee.
3. Upon recommendation from the Committee for Citizen Involvement, the City Council may waive the provisions of this section if the City Council finds it is necessary to undertake such action to protect citizen involvement in La Pine and the action is consistent with ORS 30.287(1).
4. No provision of this section shall be construed to diminish or deny any rights of CAC members under ORS 30.260 to 30.330, when such CAC members are acting as agents of the City.

Duties, Responsibilities and Functions of Citizen Advisory Committee Members

1. Each Citizen Advisory Committee shall elect a chairperson, vice chairperson and secretary at the first regular meeting of the calendar year.
 - a. The chairperson shall call meetings of the Citizen Advisory Committee as necessary and appropriate to discuss and respond to planning program issues.
 - b. The vice chairperson shall act as chairperson pro-tem in the absence of the chairperson.
 - c. The secretary shall take minutes of such Committee meetings.
2. Each Committee shall comply with all provisions of the Oregon Public Meeting Law (ORS 192.610 to 192.990).

- a. All meetings of the advisory committees shall be open to the public and all persons shall be permitted to attend any such meeting. A committee shall have no authority to conduct executive sessions under ORS 192.660.
- b. Each Citizen Advisory Committee shall provide notice of the time, place and subject matter of its meetings either to the Planning Director or to the Citizen Involvement Coordinator during business hours at the Planning Department. The Citizen Involvement Coordinator shall be responsible for providing notice to the media in time for them to publish the notice at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.
- c. The CAC secretary shall take minutes, which shall include:
 1. the names of all CAC members present;
 2. all motions and their disposition;
 3. the results of all votes and the vote of each member, by name;
 4. the substance of any document discussed;
 5. reference to any document discussed.

CAC minutes should also contain the date, time, and location of the meeting, the names of any guests present, and land use application references such as the applicant's name and the Planning Department file number.

The CAC minutes shall be submitted to the Planning Director no more than ten days after the meeting.

3. The Citizen Advisory Committees shall participate in the development of the La Pine Comprehensive Plan, and amendments and revisions thereto, and shall advise the City Council with regard to any concerns or comments the advisory committee may have with respect to such Plan, amendments or revisions.
 - a. The Planning Director shall submit proposals for Comprehensive Plans, or amendments or revisions thereto, at least 15 days in advance of the expected date of Citizen Advisory Committee comments; provided, however, that this paragraph shall not apply to amendments or revisions to Comprehensive Plans changed at public hearings before the Planning Commission or the City Council, if the subject matter of such plans, amendments or revisions were submitted previously to the Planning Advisory Committees.
 - b. Each Citizen Advisory Committee shall have the authority to conduct meetings to review and evaluate such Plans, or amendments or revisions thereto, and may comment in writing by submitting their responses to the Planning Director, Planning Commission or City Council, or comment orally at hearings held on such Plans, revisions or amendments.
 - c. Each Citizen Advisory Committee shall allow interested persons to participate in the review and evaluation of such Plans, revisions or amendments thereto, by means of oral or written testimony.
 - d. Citizen Advisory Committee members are encouraged to participate in the workshops and regional meetings held on Comprehensive Plans or revisions thereto.
 - e. Upon completion of Comprehensive Plan Elements, or revisions thereto, each Citizen Advisory Committee shall participate in the review of land use maps for its area or region of the City.

- f. Citizen Advisory Committee members shall be entitled to participate in regional workshop meetings dealing with selection of preferred map alternatives to be submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council in conjunction with the adoption or revision of a Comprehensive Plan.
4. Each Citizen Advisory Committee may participate in advising the Hearings Officer, Commission, or City Council with respect to quasi-judicial land use applications, which lie within, or immediately affect land within, territory of the Citizen Advisory Committee.
- a. Each Citizen Advisory Committee is entitled to become a party at hearings involving quasijudicial land use applications.
- b. The Planning Director shall provide notice of hearings to the appropriate Citizen Advisory Committee, within the time limitations as provided. The CAC may respond to the notice as it deems appropriate.
- c. No response to such notices shall be transmitted to the Planning Director, Hearings Officer, Commission or City Council except after a properly conducted meeting and affirmative vote of a quorum of such committee.
- d. All such responses shall be in written form and shall contain the following information:
- (1) Name of the Citizen Advisory Committee;
 - (2) A statement as to whether such committee desires standing as a party;
 - (3) A statement as to the reason for supporting or opposing the proposal; and
 - (4) A statement indicating whether the Citizen Advisory Committee wishes to be heard further, i.e., other than such written notice.
5. Citizen Advisory Committees may also advise the City on areas of community interests or concerns which the advisory committee feels are of importance to their area, the City, or planning activities.

Implementation Measures

Citizen Advisory Committees shall be entitled to participate in the formulation, amendment, revision or repeal of all measures implementing Comprehensive Plans for La Pine in the same manner as that provided for in the adoption, amendment or revision of Comprehensive Plans for the City.

Planning Director Responsibilities for Citizen Participation and Coordination

1. The Planning Director shall be responsible for assuring that the citizen involvement provisions of this chapter are implemented. To that end, the Director shall consult periodically with the Committee for Citizen Involvement and may make such recommendations as are necessary to implement the purposes of this chapter and LCDC Goal 1. The Planning Director may delegate his duties to a Citizen Involvement Coordinator; however, he/she shall reserve the authority to overrule such coordinator to assure compliance with the provisions of this chapter.
2. The Planning Director shall assure coordination between federal, state and regional agencies and special purpose districts to coordinate their planning efforts with La Pine and shall make use of local citizen involvement programs established by other entities, where such programs affect La Pine.
3. The Planning Director shall provide such information to the Planning Advisory

Committees as is necessary for those Committees, and the general public, to identify and comprehend planning and plan implementation issues. All information supplied by any department or agency of La Pine in planning or plan implementation matters shall be in simplified, understandable form and shall be coordinated through the Planning Director.

4. The Planning Director shall act as liaison between the citizens of La Pine and the City Council and shall respond to citizen comments on planning or plan implementation issues directly, or by referring the same to the appropriate agency for response. All departments and agencies of La Pine shall cooperate with the Planning Director in assuring effective two-way communication between citizens and their government.

5. The Planning Director shall make available to all Citizen Advisory Committees a copy of all proposed elements of any La Pine Comprehensive Plan, or amendments or revisions thereto, all implementing ordinances, or amendments or revisions thereto, and any studies, reports or background information, if any, necessary to understand such proposal, at least ten days prior to action by the City Council. Such proposals and background information shall be provided to the La Pine City Hall and at such other facilities, the Planning Director may deem necessary to provide for an informed citizenry.

6. The Planning Director shall provide, in each annual budget request to the City Council, for sufficient financial support to insure adequate funding of a citizen involvement program to meet the purposes of this chapter.

7. The responsibilities of the Planning Director, under this section, shall continue, even after acknowledgement of the La Pine Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Ordinances by the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Proposed CAC's

1. Planning Commission
2. Public Utility/Infrastructure Committee
3. Economic Development Committee
4. Public Service/Volunteer Committee
5. Code Enforcement Committee
6. Residential Committee
7. Industrial/Commercial Committee

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3 Agricultural Lands

I. State Planning Goal 3, Agricultural Lands

Oregon State Planning Goal 3 defines “agricultural lands” and requires Counties to inventory such lands. Counties are required “to preserve and maintain agricultural lands” by comprehensively planning and applying implementing zoning regulations. However, pursuant to ORS Chapter 215 and OAR, Chapter 660, Division 33, the planning for agricultural lands within cities is not required. Nonetheless, the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations have historically applied agricultural designations and zoning regulations to areas identified as Agricultural lands prior to their inclusion within the area incorporated as the City of La Pine. Because the Deschutes County comprehensive plan and zoning designations applied within the city limits (by intergovernmental agreement between Deschutes County and the City of La Pine during the transition of governmental responsibility), there are still areas within the incorporated City of La Pine that are designated Agriculture and Exclusive Farm Use on the County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning maps.

II. Purpose and Intent

As stated above, the City of La Pine is not required to plan for Agricultural lands within the City limits. However, there have been and continue to be agricultural uses of some areas within the City Limits. Historically, such uses have been limited in activity and have been concentrated in areas along the wetlands and floodplain of the Little Deschutes River. These have been the only areas where there has been ample moisture in the soils to allow forage growth that would sustain cattle grazing. Due to climatological conditions, the growing season in La Pine is too short to sustain active crop production. Overall, the areas historically used for agricultural purposes in La Pine have resulted from the limited physical ability to use the land for other purposes.

It is expected that as the City grows, the wetland and flood plain factors will limit the use of the agriculturally used lands for many other urban purposes. Nonetheless, it is the intent of this plan to recognize then potential transition of such lands to other uses more appropriate within an incorporated community. Such uses may include residential or economic lands (traditional land use designations within Cities) as land needs dictate and public facilities and services allow. However, agricultural lands may also transition to designated natural areas, open spaces, wilderness areas and wildlife habitat due to the limited uses that could be accommodated in the wetlands and flood plains. The link between agricultural lands and the natural environment will be important to define and plan for as La Pine transitions to an urban environment. This element is explored in greater detail in the Natural Resources Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

III. Issues

The City of La Pine is heavily influenced by the Little Deschutes River and areas of high ground water resulting in wetlands and flood plains – particularly along the city’s western and southern edges. These areas have historically remained undeveloped and were used for cattle grazing by early residents. The agricultural/farming uses of these areas has declined in past years as the land uses within the City limits (even prior to incorporation) have transitioned from rural to urban as La Pine became the service area for the southern portion of Deschutes County. Although the use of such areas is receiving pressure from surrounding land uses, such as residential and commercial development adjacent to such lands, there has been very little change to the physical properties of the agriculturally designated areas. It is expected that the transition for uses of many of the agricultural lands will be best planned for as natural resources (State Planning Goal 5) to serve as natural areas, wetlands, wildlife habitat, parklands and buffer areas to development. These are addressed in Chapter 5, Natural Resources.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal #1: To plan for the appropriate transition of Agricultural lands within La Pine to urban uses (residential, commercial, and industrial uses).

Policies

- Owners of lands that have been historically employed in agricultural uses or that remain designated for agricultural uses through this Comprehensive Planning process, shall not be prevented from using such lands for farming purposes; such rights shall be protected until such lands are re-designated for urban uses through future amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or zoning code.
- All lands designated Agriculture shall be reviewed for their potential to be utilized for urban land uses – including the ability to be utilized in conjunction with adjacent residential, commercial and industrial land uses, as well as the ability to provide urban services and facilities to such lands.

Goal #2: Recognize the unique physical characteristics and development limitations of Agricultural lands within La Pine and plan for the enhancement of those elements within the surrounding urban environment.

Policies

- All lands with historic use for agricultural purposes, whether designated Agriculture or not, that have wetlands or flood plain, shall be reviewed for their potential to be utilized as natural areas, parklands and buffers between and among areas designated for traditional urban development.

- For the purpose of identifying wetlands, flood plain and historic agricultural use, the City shall rely upon the Federal Emergency management Agency’s adopted floodplain maps and the National Wetlands Inventory maps, and Deschutes County Tax Assessors data unless more specific data can be supplied.
- Encourage property owner protection and enhancement of environmentally sensitive areas that have been and continue to be used for agricultural purposes such as livestock grazing, including the implementation of specific zoning regulations for such purposes.
- The City shall work with the La Pine Park and Recreation Department to look for opportunities to acquire agricultural lands that can be utilized for recreational purposes.
- The City shall work with the Bureau of Land Management and other federal agencies to seek transfers of federally owned agricultural lands within and adjacent t the City to be utilized as open space, buffer lands and other amenities to serve the urban environment.

V. Programs

The City shall complete the following:

1. Create an inventory of flood plain and wetland areas for all lands designated Agriculture.
2. Work with local, State and Federal Agencies in identifying long term land uses for lands under their ownership within the City limits that are designated as Agricultural lands.
3. Coordinate and map the current park and open space system with potential or proposed open space linkages on current agricultural lands.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4 Forest Lands

I. State Planning Goal 4, Forest Lands

Oregon State Planning Goal 4 defines “forest lands” and requires Counties to inventory such lands. Counties are required “to conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state’s forest economy” through efficient use of forest lands that balance forest practices with sound environmental practices. However, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes and Administrative Rules, the planning for forest lands within cities is not required. Nonetheless, the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations have historically applied forest designations and zoning regulations to areas identified as Forest lands prior to their inclusion within the area incorporated as the City of La Pine. Because the Deschutes County comprehensive plan and zoning designations applied within the city limits (by intergovernmental agreement between Deschutes County and the City of La Pine during the transition of governmental responsibility), there are still areas within the incorporated City of La Pine that are designated Forest on the County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning maps. This will change upon completion of the implementing ordinances for the Plan.

II. Purpose and Intent

As stated above, the City of La Pine is not required to plan for Forest lands within the City limits. However, there have been and continue to be Forest uses of some areas within the City Limits. Historically, such uses have been the basis for the surrounding economy, with lands currently inside the City limits used for actual timber harvest, as well as timber processing to varying degrees. However, in the recent past, forest/timber activities have been limited on those lands designated as Forest within the City due to the immaturity of the existing timber stands and the availability of Industrial lands for processing operations. The areas designated as Forest include large tracts along the entire eastern edge of the city, in the area east of Highway 97 between what was historically referred to as Wickiup Junction and La Pine.

Although some of the lands designated Forest within La Pine are privately owned, the majority of Forest designated lands are under federal (Bureau of Land Management - BLM) ownership. Through the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan adopted by the BLM, it is recognized that the forest lands within the City limits will someday be subject to community expansion. Thus, there is an acknowledgment by the BLM that such lands will most likely transfer ownership at some point in the future and that the long term use of the property will transition from forest to other Public Facility (PF) uses.

It is expected that as the City grows, the forest lands will be converted to Public Facility uses. It is the intent of this plan to recognize then potential transition of such lands to

other uses more appropriate within an incorporated community. Such uses may include sewer treatment plant expansion, cemetery, energy production, wildfire buffers, and highway 97 expansion uses. However, due to the rural nature of the community, and the desire for the residents to retain this character, forest lands may also transition to designated natural areas, open spaces, wilderness areas and wildlife habitat. The link between forest lands and the natural environment will be important to define and plan for as La Pine transitions these lands to PF uses.. This element is explored in greater detail in the Natural Resources Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

III. Issues

The City of La Pine is heavily influenced by the thick coniferous forest that extends from inside City limits to areas surrounding the community in all directions. These areas have historically remained undeveloped where federal ownership is in place - large tracts of private land have been continuously used for forest practices, as prospective yields will allow. It is assumed that forest practices will continue to be an important part of the economy and lifestyle of the La Pine area, and will influence the overall land development pattern, especially in transition areas along the community edge. Although the use of such areas is receiving pressure from urbanizing land uses, such as residential, commercial and industrial development adjacent to such lands, there has been very little change to the physical properties of the designated forest areas. It is expected that the transition of use for some of the forest lands will be best planned for as natural resources (State Planning Goal 5) to serve as natural areas, wildlife habitat, parklands and buffer areas in and among planned development, while some areas are designated specifically for conversion to public facility uses – not residential or commercial uses. However, the timing of such conversion will be dependent upon the land need within La Pine and the ability to access the designated forest areas with transportation facilities and utilities.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal #1: To plan for the appropriate transition of Forest lands within La Pine to Public Facility (PF) uses.

Policies

- Owners of lands that have been historically employed in forest uses or that remain designated for forest uses through this Comprehensive Planning process, shall not be prevented from using such lands for forest and timber harvest purposes; such rights shall be protected until such lands are re-designated for Public Facility uses through future amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or zoning code.
- All lands designated Forest shall have a Public Facilities designation to be utilized for non-residential uses such as: public open and recreation spaces,

cemetery expansion, right of way necessary for the ODOT Overpass project and typical public uses and facilities to such lands.

- The City of La Pine shall coordinate any transition of Forest lands to Public Facility uses with the BLM, U.S. Forest Service, State Department of Forestry and La Pine Fire District as applicable to ensure adherence with the forest practices act and the adopted management plans of each agency.

Goal #2: Recognize the unique physical characteristics and uses for Public Facility lands within La Pine..

Policies

- Forestlands within the City shall be designated Public Facilities on the Comprehensive Plan Map. These areas are primarily for public facility uses including for non-residential uses such as: public open and recreation spaces, cemetery expansion, right of way necessary for the ODOT Overpass project, natural areas, parklands and buffers between other areas designated for traditional urban development.
- The City recognizes the importance of the forested areas as crucial migration corridors and winter range for wildlife; these forested areas shall be reviewed for as Public Facility development occurs.
- The City shall work with the La Pine Park and Recreation Department to look for opportunities to acquire Public Facility lands that can be utilized for recreational purposes.
- The City shall work with the Bureau of Land Management and other federal agencies to seek transfers of federally owned forest lands within and adjacent to the City to be utilized as Public Facility lands for sewer treatment plant expansion, energy production, large lot industrial uses, open space, buffer lands and other amenities to serve the urban environment.

V. Programs

The City shall complete the following:

1. Work with local, State and Federal Agencies in completing property transfer to the City and/or County and identifying Public Facility uses for lands under their ownership within the City limits that are designated as Forest lands.
2. Revise the City Zoning Ordinance to incorporate a Public Facilities Zone. The zone shall not permit privately-owned residential uses.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 5 Natural Resources and Environment

I. State Planning Goals 5, Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces; 6, Air, Water and Land Resources Quality; and, 7, Natural Hazards.

Oregon State Planning Goals 5, 6 and 7 are interrelated in their intent to protect the important natural resource and environmental elements intrinsic to Oregon's heritage. The three separate purpose statements of these Goals are:

Goal 5: To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces;

Goal 6: To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state; and,

Goal 7: To protect people and property from natural hazards.

These goals together protect the basic fabric of what the citizens of La Pine have deemed the underlying foundation of the community. Clean air, water and the forest environment within the urban area have been long standing attractions for residents of the community. The preservation of the natural environment within the urban area to the greatest extent practicable and its ties to the future growth of the community is of the utmost importance in long range planning for La Pine.

II. Purpose and Intent

The future of La Pine will be shaped by how the community decides to accommodate growth and balance that against preservation of various elements of the natural environment. The State of Oregon Goal 5 Guidelines requires the following resources to be inventoried:

- Riparian Corridors, including water and riparian areas and fish habitat;
- Wetlands;
- Wildlife Habitat;
- Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers;
- State Scenic Waterways;
- Groundwater Resources;
- Approved Oregon Recreation Trails;
- Natural Areas;
- Wilderness Areas;
- Mineral and Aggregate Resources;
- Energy Sources; and,
- Cultural Areas.

Local governments and state agencies are encouraged but not required to maintain current inventories of the following resources:

- Historic Resources;
- Open Space; and,
- Scenic Views and Sites.

The procedures, standards, and definitions contained in State Department of Land Conservation and Development rules, provide that local governments shall determine significant sites for inventoried resources as listed above, and develop programs to achieve the goals for protection. Many of the resources listed above do not occur within the urban area of La Pine, but do occur nearby in the outlying rural area. Also, since La Pine was just recently incorporated (2006), many of the inventories and subsequent policies and programs to protect the resources were prepared by Deschutes County when La Pine was under their jurisdiction. Those inventories, policies, and programs are utilized herein as a basis for identifying appropriate policies and programs within the La Pine urban area.

Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces

Goal 5 Resources for which Inventories are required

OAR-660-23 requires inventories of riparian corridors, wetlands, and wildlife habitat must be conducted by the City. However, the Rule also provides for safe harbors that may replace the required inventory and program protection for riparian corridors, wetlands, and wildlife habitat. The safe harbor provisions work well as a basis for La Pine given the limited resources of the community. Other inventories from other agencies can also be used to support the Plan. Thus, La Pine has adopted the inventories completed by Deschutes County and State and Federal agencies. For all inventoried significant Goal 5 resources, a local government must complete a program to develop and implement appropriate protection measures. La Pine will satisfy all requirements through implementation of this Plan and its supporting ordinances.

Riparian Corridors and Wetlands

The City of La Pine relies upon the Deschutes County inventory of riparian corridors and Wetlands. The County's inventory is older and does not meet the newer rules and does not cover all of the corridor and wetland areas. Thus, the City will need to apply a safe harbor provision or greater regulations to protect the resources until funds permit the City to do its own inventory.

The safe harbor provision allows the City to protect approximately 1200 feet of the Little Deschutes near Glenwood Drive, and Huntington Roads. While the Safe Harbor would provide a 75-foot setback, the City would prefer to adopt the County's provisions at 100 feet of setback protection. Within the setback area resources will be protected from activities that may harm or interfere with riparian values. The City will further impose

protection standards through its Zoning Ordinance, which will include conditional use permits for any fill, removal, or disturbance of vegetation within 100 feet of the ordinary high water mark/ top of bank of the river. Wetland protection standards will also be added to the Zoning Ordinance. While additional LWI studies will verify if the 100 feet is adequate to protect the riparian area resources, additional studies will be needed to verify wetlands. If these are not adequate then new regulations will be required. Nonetheless, the Zoning ordinance provisions and in some cases, the Floodplain regulations will protect the resources.

Wildlife Habitat

The citizens of La Pine have identified wildlife protection, including migration corridors as a primary component of the community. The city relies on the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan for wildlife information.

The City has chosen to apply the Safe Harbor provision to its wildlife resources. Under this provision, the City may determine that wildlife does not include fish, and that significant wildlife habitat is only those sites where:

- The habitat has been documented to perform a life support function for a wildlife species listed by the Federal government as a threatened or endangered species or by the State of Oregon as a threatened, endangered, or sensitive species;
- The habitat has documented occurrences of more than incidental use by a wildlife species listed by the Federal government as a threatened or endangered species or by the State of Oregon as a threatened, endangered, or sensitive species;
- The habitat has been documented as a sensitive bird nesting, roosting, or watering resource site for osprey or great blue herons;
- The habitat has been documented to be essential to achieving policies or population objectives specified in a wildlife species management plan adopted by the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission pursuant to ORS Chapter 496; or
- The area is identified and mapped by ODFW as habitat for a wildlife species of concern (e.g., big game winter range and migration corridors, golden eagle and prairie falcon nest sites, or pigeon springs).

Natural Resources:

The City of La Pine and the surrounding area lie in an arid plateau of thick coniferous forests, volcanic geological formations and forest resource lands. Area residents have quick and convenient vehicle access to a variety of rural areas, forests, reservoirs, recreational areas, rivers, creeks, and other open spaces. Some of these areas, such as the Deschutes River, the Little Deschutes River, the Cascade Mountains, high lakes, and State and Federal public lands are close by, but do not extend within the city limits. Nonetheless, the forested areas within the City limits have been identified by residents as a primary source of community identity and important to preserve as the city grows - preservation and enhancement of the surrounding natural environmental system is a vital aspect of the community. Providing trails and alternate mode access to these special

areas is necessary to avoid capacity issues, encourage healthy lifestyles, and to encourage safe access by children and adults. Protection of these special areas offers more than just aesthetic benefits; they can preserve the community's natural beauty without sacrificing economic development.

A historic and primary natural resource of the region has been timber. The forested lands of Lodgepole Pine within and around La Pine have been a direct source of the regions economy through timber production, as well as a draw for tourism. The U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have responsibility for regulating use of federally-owned forest lands pursuant to their own respective management plans. The BLM currently owns large tracts of forested land on the City's east side – the BLM has recently been in discussions with the City of La Pine and Deschutes County regarding transfer of some of these lands for future expansion of the La Pine Sewer District's sewage treatment facility. The US Forest Service maintains jurisdiction over much of the forested lands surrounding the City (Deschutes National Forest). Continued coordination with these agencies regarding decisions and actions they take regarding forested lands will continue to have, major effects on the economic, social and natural environment of the City of La Pine. Specific goals and policies related to management of urban forested lands are contained in Chapter 4.

Wildlife is another primary natural resource of the region. The citizens of La Pine have identified wildlife protection, including trails for migration corridors, as a primary component of the community. Within the urban area, the primary habitat is located within the floodplain/riparian corridor along the Little Deschutes River to the west of the City, and the large tracts of forested land to the east. Such areas provide year-round habitat for big game, such as deer and elk, as well as for smaller animals and game, and birds. Various routes have been identified through La Pine as deer and elk migration corridors between summer grounds to the west and winter grounds to the east. Deschutes County has created an inventory of wildlife native to the region, including La Pine, as well as habitat and special protection areas. As state above, such areas have been mapped and migration corridors run through the City.

There have not been any aggregate or other resources natural resources identified within the urban area.

Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers

According to the US Forest Service, there are no Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers within the La Pine Urban Area.

State Scenic Waterways

According to the Oregon Park and Recreation Department, there are no State Scenic Waterways within the La Pine urban area.

Other Scenic Resources:

Scenic resources common to all areas of La Pine are related to the natural environment – views of the Three Sisters and surrounding mountains; the Little Deschutes River and associated riparian areas; and the surrounding National Forest. There are no canyons, rimrock or other significant geologic formations within the urban area that have been identified for scenic protection

Approved Recreational Trails

According to the Oregon Park and Recreation Department, there are no designated trails within the La Pine urban area.

Wilderness Areas

According to the US Forest Service, there are no Wilderness Areas within the La Pine urban area.

Other Goal 5 Resources

Historic and Cultural Resources

The City has completed an inventory of potential and listed historic and cultural resources and these are included in the appendix and for protection in the zoning ordinances. The City has also completed new policies and regulations for the protection and enhancement of historic resources Native Peoples, including the Northern Molala (La'tiaufq), Tenino (Wayampam), Klamath (Maklaks) and the Northern Paiute tribes, seasonally used the La Pine area for at least the last 13,500 years. Having no clear boundaries of their territories resulted in longstanding conflicts that kept all of the tribes in a constant advance-retreat mode. The Klamath Indian children today sing a song about the dangers of their ancestors being ambushed by the Northern Paiutes in the La Pine/Lava Butte area as they traveled back and forth along the key trade route to the Columbia River. Some of the Native People intermarried and forged alliances, but others did not. Each tribe had a unique language, customs and styles of dwellings.

After leaving winter camps in the spring, nuclear family groups of native peoples moved toward base camps in the various drainage basins, savannas and meadows in the higher Central Oregon country. Groups followed the seasonal appearance of roots, grass seeds, berries, and game such as deer, elk, antelope and bear. In addition to abounding with large game and waterfowl, the local area had plenty of aquatic resources such as chub, steelhead and trout. Women smoked and dried the fish and meat that the men caught.

Thousands of tiny arrowheads found along Long Prairie in and around La Pine and Big Meadow (around Crosswater and Sunriver) are evidence of the importance of waterfowl in the diet. Women and children also gathered duck and geese eggs. In addition to spears and bows and arrows, people used hunting dogs, snares and traps. During mid-summer, many

of them returned to the villages for summer festivals. In late fall, the people headed back to the winter villages in the Klamath River Valley, Harney Valley, Columbia River or the Willamette Valley.

Small mobile groups made seasonal use of the area before and after the Mt. Mazama eruption. There is evidence that the semi-nomadic Teninos and Northern Paiutes had horses in the 1700s and readily moved around Central and Eastern Oregon. Other groups were pedestrians. During the early to mid 1800s, epidemics of influenza, measles, smallpox, malaria and other pathogens brought by the explorers killed up to 90% of people in Central Oregon. This radical depopulation changed the survivors forever.

Mt. Mazama is located 86 miles southwest of La Pine. The mountain was destroyed by a volcanic eruption that occurred around 5,677 (\pm 150) BC. The eruption reduced Mt. Mazama's approximate 12,000-foot height by 5,000 feet and resulted in the creation of Crater Lake. Mt. Mazama's eruption blew ash and rock to the northeast. The ash plume was so high that ash blew into Canada. Ash and rock covered the La Pine area several feet deep. After the eruption, it took time for the vegetation to re-grow and for the animals and people to repopulate and reuse the area.

Between the time of the recovery from the eruption and the mid 1800s, Native Americans from Southern Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Northern California met each summer at Paulina Lake and East Lake to gather obsidian, make stone tools and to participate in social activities, trading and games of competition. Evidence of campfires and tool making is plentiful along Paulina Creek and around the lakes.

Important prehistoric north-south trails and trade routes ran along the Deschutes River between the Columbia River Basin and the Klamath Basin. The east-west trails from Nevada and the Harney Valley to the Deschutes River passed through Horse Ridge, East Lake and the La Pine area.

The nearby water bodies such as the Fall River, Deschutes River, Little Deschutes River, Davis Creek, Paulina Creek, East Lake and Paulina Lake and the prairies such as Big Meadow, Long Prairie and Paulina Prairie provided excellent habitat for fish, waterfowl and game animals. They also attracted Native Americans to hunt and fish here. Evidence of prehistoric camps, obsidian tool making, and hunting by tribes from the Columbia River, Harney Valley, Nevada, Eastern Oregon and Northern California is prevalent in the La Pine area.

Much has been written about early explorers who traveled through the La Pine area and named many of the geographic features. They include Finian McDonald in 1825, the Hudson Bay Company's trapping expedition through the Deschutes and John Day Valleys led by Peter Skene Ogden in 1826, Nathaniel J. Wyeth's journey along the Deschutes River in 1834-35, John C. Fremont's journey along the Deschutes River while in route to California in 1843 and the Lieutenant Henry L. and the Abbot and Williamson Army Corps

of Engineers railroad survey party from Klamath Country down the Deschutes River in 1885.

The Oregon Central Military Wagon Road ,under the leadership of Oregon Surveyor General Bynon John Pengra, was constructed between 1865 and 1870. The road would connect into the Huntington Wagon Road just southeast of Crescent Lake. It provided a connection between Eugene and the Deschutes River and became a major travel route for emigrants, livestock, packers and drovers passing between the Willamette Valley and Central and Southeastern Oregon. It played an important role in Deschutes County's development.

The Huntington Wagon Road was built in 1876 by crews under the direction of the Oregon Superintendent of Indian Affairs, J. W. Perit Huntington. The purpose of the road was to provide an easier and smoother route for horse and mule teams to pull wagon loads of supplies from the Dalles on the Columbia River to Fort Klamath. A portion of the historic road goes through La Pine. It loosely follows Native American trails.

The timber, grassy meadows, available fish and game and the ease of digging domestic water wells in the high water table attracted ranchers and lumber companies in the late nineteenth century. Two thousand pioneer farmers tried to dry farm the high desert and some of them who grew grains and hay were successful. In spite of all of the sun and flat land, others found farming was not practical due to the elevation, long stretches of dry days during the growing season, low night temperatures with the threat of freezing temperatures any day of the year and the isolation the snow brought in the winters. However, some ranchers on Paulina Prairie and Long Prairie harvested natural grasses and hay to feed dairy cows, sheep and cattle year-around. It was common to see youngsters herding flocks of sheep up the meadowlands along the rivers between Gilchrest and Madras during the summers. Cattle drives and capturing and driving wild horses to sell to the military during World War I were also common.

Recreation, hunting and fishing were always important activities in the area and provided food for settlers. Trappers settled in La Pine and set and managed trap routes that were often over a hundred miles long. Winters saw trappers on snow shoes checking lines for miles around.

The extensive ponderosa and Lodgepole pine forests provided timber to build houses, barns, fences and cabins. They provided the resources for the lumber mills. The Masten Mill opened in 1908 and produced lumber, laths, pickets, shingles, and moldings. 1910 and 1911 were busy years at the mill because many buildings were built in La Pine. The lumber mill at Pringle Falls was soon running and others followed. Shevlin-Hixon Lumber Company, the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Company and other smaller companies were buying up timber land during the late 19th Century and early 20th Century. The big mills opened in Bend in 1916. The lumber companies constructed hundreds of miles of railroad tracks and trestles to transport logs to the mills. When the lumber camps around La Pine closed, many of the portable camp buildings were purchased and moved to La Pine and re-used as residences and shops. La Pine is dotted with old lumber camp buildings today.

It is not known who named the area “La Pine,” but the name “La Pine” is on a 1907 railroad survey map and is shown on the early 20th century survey maps. Various spellings show up on early records. The 1934 US Geological Survey Maiden Peak Quadrangle Map and the 1935 Metsker’s Atlas of Deschutes County Oregon both labeled the community “Lapine”. The 1910 plat of the townsite reads, “La Pine”.

Oregon Geographic Names Sixth Edition by Lewis A. McArthur states, “La Pine was named by Alfred A. Aya. The name was suggested by the abundance of pine trees in the neighborhood.” The book goes on to say that the “Lapine” Post Office was established in September of 1910 and the Post Office changed its name to La Pine on April 1, 1951.




Figure 1
1910 Plat of the Townsite of La Pine

In early 1910, 30-year old Portland attorney, Alfred Aya, hired civil engineer Robert Gould to plat the Townsite of La Pine. Deschutes County was not formed yet, and the plat was signed in Prineville by the Crook County Court on May 4, 1910. The rectangular plat consisted of 37 blocks bounded by Bogue Street on the west, First Street on the north, Huntington Wagon Road on the east and Ninth Street on the south. Aya was criticized for platting and trying to sell city lots in the marshy meadow.

Aya named a north-south street after James Scott (Jobe) Bogue and his wife Caroline Hollingshead Bogue who settled west of the Little Deschutes River north of La Pine around 1885. Bogue was born in Illinois and came to Oregon on a wagon train led by his father,

Amos Bogue. The Bagues raised 1,000 head of sheep in the tall natural grass meadow. Later they raised cattle and opened a mercantile store in Rosland in 1900. In 1903 they built a larger store, and that store building was moved to downtown La Pine at Aya's urging in 1910.

Cattle rancher Sidney Stearns came to the La Pine area in 1884 with his cousin Billie Pengra when they were each around 28 years old. In 1887 Sidney Stearns married Francis Elizabeth Day. Both Sidney and Francis Stearns were born in Oregon. Stearns Street was named for them.

Aya named a street for his business partner, John E. Morson. Having been born in Canada, Morson was Aya's partner in the Des Chutes Land Company and the developer of the Walker Basin Irrigation Project that was approved by the Oregon State Legislature. Morson was backed by businessmen in Minneapolis, Minnesota. At age 44, in 1910, he and his wife Jean were living in Portland.

Hill Street was named for James J. Hill of Minnesota who owned the Northern Pacific Railway, the Great Northern Railway and the Oregon Trunk Railway. He planned to extend the railroad from Bend to Chemult through La Pine and to construct a passenger and freight station in the new town. It is unknown who was honored with the street names Salzar and Stilwell.

In 1910 James Gleason, W. R. Riley and Alfred Aya came from Portland and promoted La Pine. Aya graduated in 1903 from the University of Oregon Law School and was valedictorian of his class. He became president of the La Pine Townsite Company, the La Pine Commercial Club and the La Pine State Bank. Gleason and Riley were his partners in the townsite company. Aya was a tireless promoter, even traveling to the Midwest to advertise his townsite and the land they thought would be served by the proposed irrigation system.

Aya lobbied the legislature hard in 1909 and 1910 and the Walker Basin Irrigation Project bill was passed by the Oregon State Legislature in March 1911. The bill, and other related irrigation bills preceding it since 1901, allowed the commercial investment enterprises owned by Morson and Aya the rights to water in Crescent Lake and Crescent Creek and the right to store water in the lake. The bill allowed them to sell over 67,637 acres of land in the La Pine and Crescent areas. But, in return, they had to dig and construct a canal system. They got financial backing from financiers in Minnesota and later from Arizona to tackle the ambitious project.

Governor West was highly critical of the project's slow progress. Due to the bad publicity, financiers demanded their money back and the state reduced the land in the operation to 28,000 acres and later reduced it again to 10,000 acres. The project ended in bankruptcy. The project included Aya's Des Chutes Land Company, which was associated with the La Pine Townsite Company, and Morson's Walker Basin Land and Irrigation Company, which was formed in 1901.

It was thought that with the irrigation project attracting farmers and the expected railroad being extended from Bend to California through La Pine to allow goods and lumber to be transported, the area would thrive. The Oregon Trunk Railroad running south from the Columbia River was under construction and excitement for the future of Central Oregon was high. James Hill completed the railroad line to Bend in 1911.

Aya, Gleason and Riley promoted the new townsite. They convinced many people from Rosland to move to La Pine to locate on the future railroad line and station that he had platted. James Scott (Job) Bogue moved his store. Joseph Beesley moved his hotel that was renamed the La Pine Hotel. George Raper moved his saloon. Houses were also moved to La Pine and some are still in use today.

The “Lapine Post Office” was established on September 21, 1910 and the Rosland Post office was closed. By 1912, many new commercial and residential buildings were under construction, including the Riley Hotel, La Pine State Bank, the Haner building, the Catholic Church, the Commercial Club and the Aya, David Hill, J. J. Stephenson, Albert Ridgley and Clow houses.

By 1911, 600 people lived in La Pine and over 100 children attended school. Logging, lumber mills, ranching, dairies, recreation and farming were primary industries.



Figure 2

US forest service photo of crews laying track south of Bend.

In 1912 the federal government changed the residency requirements for homesteaders. The homesteaders could file for their patents after three years of living on their land, instead of the previously required five years and the homesteaders were no longer required to reside on the land year round. They were required to inform the General Land Offices of their absences, but they could be at their jobs elsewhere half of each year. Those changes attracted non-traditional homesteaders from the western Oregon and Portland to homestead in La Pine to acquire the lands for recreational uses.

Aya had moved back to Portland before rail service was established in La Pine, and no railroad was ever laid between Hill Street and Railroad Street, as he planned. Martin Morisette wrote the following about the logging roads and railroad grades.

“By late 1926 the end of (the Shevlin-Hixon Logging) track was in the La Pine area, and a spider web of grades had been built in the country between the town and Paulina Lake. At this point the mighty Great Northern entered the picture, as it finally received permission to build its long-sought line south from Bend to Klamath Falls. The S-H (Shevlin-Hixon Company) logging railroad lay directly in the path of the contemplated construction, and the GN (Great Northern Railway Company) saw it as a means to reduce the amount of initial construction required to build their new line. The result was that the GN purchased a 75 percent stake in the S-H “mainline” between Bend and La Pine, with S-H retaining the other 25 percent. S-H retained the right to operate log trains over the GN mainline to Bend, with the stipulation that all movements were controlled by the GN and that S-H trains and crews must operate under GN rules. The first GN train ran from Bend to La Pine on 8 September 1927, and construction of the GN line south from La Pine to a connection with the Southern Pacific line at Chemult started shortly thereafter. The line was completed on 8 March 1928, and GN commenced offering through service to Klamath Falls the following May.”

After World War II, vacationers and retirees discovered the recreational opportunities in La Pine. Ranches were divided into smaller tracts for retirement and vacation homes. Tourism, hunting and fishing and year-round recreation continue to be important activities in La Pine.

More information about La Pine’s early history can be found in:

- 1) *History of La Pine Pioneers*, written by Friends of the La Pine Library, published in 2000;
- 2) *History and Homesteaders of the La Pine Country*, written by Veerland A. Ridgley, published in 1993;
- 3) *Irrigation Development in Oregon’s Upper Deschutes River Basin 1871-1957, A Historic Context Statement*, written by Michael Hall in 1994;
- 4) *A History of the Deschutes Country in Oregon*, written by The Deschutes County Historical Society, published in 1985;
- 5) *Green Gold: The Incomplete, and Probably Inaccurate, History of the Timber Industry in Parts of Central and Eastern Oregon from 1867 to near the Present*, written by Martin Gabrio Morisette;

- 6) *Vandevert, The Hundred-Year History of a Central Oregon Ranch*, written by Ted Haynes and Grace Vandevort McNellis, published in 2011;
- 7) *Crater Lake, Gem of the Cascades, The Geological Story of Crater Lake National Park*, written by K. R. Cranson, published in 1982.
- 8) *Roadside Guide To The Geology Of Newberry Volcano, Third Edition*, written by Robert A. Jensen, published in 2000.
- 9.) *Crescent Lake: Archaeological Journeys into Central Oregon's Cascade Range*, a Thesis submitted to Oregon State University by Daniel M. Mulligan on April 21, 1997.
- 10.) *The Triangle Outfit, The true story of one man's dream and the many people who made it a reality in central Oregon country*, a book about Sidney Summer Stearns, written by Nita Lowry, published in 1995.

Table 1
La Pine's List of Designated Historic and Cultural Resources

| | Date of Significance | Name of Property | Address | County Tax Map and Lot Numbers |
|----|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| 1. | 1912 | Pioneer Hall/La Pine Commercial Club/Little Deschutes Grange 939* | 51518 Morson Street | 221015AA 06000 |
| 2. | 1905 | Improved Order of Red Men Cemetery Also known as La Pine Cemetery.* | 17200 Reed Road | 22-11-00 00200 (SW ¼ of SE ¼ of Section 7) |

*The two properties listed above were designated as Significant Historic Resources by the Board of County Commissioners on March 18, 1991.



Figure 3
2009, Little Deschutes Grange 939 Hall

1. The one-story wood frame Commercial Club Building was constructed by the community in 1912 to provide a place to hold town meetings, socials, dances, church services, weddings and funerals. Alfred Aya donated the land and many residents donated the lumber, nails and money to buy a piano. Volunteers milled the lumber and others built the 20-foot by 75-foot rectangular building. The Commercial Club has 82 members in 1912 and was similar to a Chamber of Commerce today.



Figure 4

Improved Order of Red Men Cemetery, also known as La Pine Cemetery

2. The United State government recorded a sale of 40 acres in the southwest one-quarter of the southeast one-quarter of Section 7, Township 22 South, Range 11 East of the Willamette Meridian on May 6, 1926 to the Great Council of the United States Improved Order of Red Men. It is thought that the Order of Red Men bought the property around 1905. On March 14, 1980, the Order of Red Men granted the cemetery to Deschutes County. Deschutes County granted the property to the City of La Pine on August 8, 2007. Early residents of La Pine were buried either on their own property, south of town in Masten Cemetery, north of town in the Paulina Prairie Cemetery also known as the Reese Cemetery, or in the Improved Order of Red Men/La Pine Cemetery. Many of the early graves are unmarked.

Goal 6: Air, Water, and Land Resources

Air Quality

Air quality within the area is generally very good except for variable woodstove smoke. La Pine is not within an air quality maintenance area as designated by the EPA – such areas exceed established State and Federal air quality standards. Notwithstanding the above factor, air quality can become a concern on rare occasions of atmospheric inversion during winter months where smoke from domestic wood burning fireplaces and stoves can trap smoke at the surface in a stagnant situation. The City intends to improve this situation by exploring incentives and change-out options. The City will also implement various techniques to reduce vehicle miles traveled as a method to improve air quality. These methods include zoning, urban form, new trail, bicycle, and sidewalk connections. Improved conditions for walking and bicycling are companion goals.

Ground Water Resources

According to the Oregon Water Resources Department there are no critical groundwater areas or restrictively classified areas within the La Pine urban area.

Water Quality

Although La Pine has a domestic water system, many residences still utilize wells constructed prior to the establishment of the water system. Some wells are very shallow and draw water from an aquifer that is associated with evidence of contamination in the recent past. Over the past 10 years, through their Regional Problem Solving effort, Deschutes County has found that groundwater in and around the La Pine area is at risk for groundwater contamination due to the amount of nitrates found in samples taken from around the region – the cause it thought to be from the large number of on-site septic systems that discharge to the ground, in combination with the high water table. Typically, wells from shallow sources have shown such evidence of contamination while deeper wells have not. As a result of the concern Deschutes County has worked jointly with the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and the US Geological Survey to study, map and find solutions to this problem – this effort is called the La Pine Demonstration Project. Overall, the primary solution to such contamination and the provision of clean water within the urban area will be the expansion of the La Pine Water and Sewer Systems (the water and Sewer Systems are discussed in the Public Facilities and Services Chapter).

The local riparian, wetland and flood plain areas within the community are resources that will be enhanced and protected. The interrelationship with other water resources and community health is significant. Thus, the balance between protection and management of growth will be an ongoing effort.

Stormwater management is a goal of the City and inventories of street condition and runoff are underway with completion in 2013.

Land Resources

The primary concern for land resources is the preservation of adequate land on the City's east side for an expansion of the La Pine Sewer Districts sewage treatment facility. A goal of the City of La Pine is to have all residences within the City eventually connect to the sewer system, including a requirement for all new construction to connect to the sewer system. Thus, based on the information provided in the La Pine Sewer Districts Capital Facilities Plan, a major expansion will be necessary in order to provide capacity for the anticipated growth. For cost effectiveness and efficiency, expansion on vacant land adjacent to the existing treatment facility will be necessary. For this reason, the City of La Pine and Deschutes County have been working with the BLM to acquire and preserve land (via a land transfer) for such expansion.

Mineral and Aggregate Resources

According to Deschutes County, there are no recognized mineral or aggregate resources within the La Pine urban area.

Energy Sources

According to wind maps available through the Oregon Department of Energy, La Pine is located within a region with “poor” wind energy potential. There are no known geothermal sources within the City. The City has designated large areas of land for potential solar energy production and bio mass energy production. In fact, a biomass plant is has received approval from the City. La Pine recognizes that the potential for solar production of energy is likely to occur on lands that lie east of the Highway, which will be available following the transfer of land from the BLM. This is viable since development of these lands for other urban uses is constrained by the railroad, wildfire protection overlay, sewer expansion, and large lot industrial development.

Goal 7: Natural Hazards:

The purpose of Goal 7 is to protect people and property from natural hazards. The two potential natural hazard threats in La Pine are wildfire and flooding – a floodplain of the Little Deschutes River runs partially within the western boundary of the City and thickly forested lands are on many sides of the City UGB. Thus, the City is required to adopt inventories, policies, plans, and measures to reduce risk to people and property from natural hazards.

Each year, multiple forest fires occur in the southern portion of Deschutes County. Some are nature-caused (lightning) but many are man-caused. The subdivisions scattered throughout the timbered areas, particularly in the Lodgepole Pine area of southern Deschutes County, increase not only the risk of people being hurt or killed but also increase the likelihood of a fire. Many of these rural development areas lie on the northeast side of La Pine and pose threats for expansion into the City if fire should occur. The City will adopt the Community Wildfire Plan and coordinate with the wildfire experts at Deschutes County. In addition, the City zoning ordinance and map will include a Fire Protection Overlay Zone that will comply with the guidelines of the CWP. Flooding along the Little Deschutes River has caused damage in the past where development has been allowed to occur within the established 100-year floodplain. However, past controls by Deschutes County over development within the floodplain have limited such occurrences. The City will adopt zoning regulations to control and use activities in the floodplain and other flood prone areas.

Summary:

Overall, La Pine’s tie to the natural environment and small town charm are inseparably linked with the surrounding forests, mountains, river corridors, flora and fauna, and their extension across city limit boundaries. This has been continually restated by residents of the community. Thus, La Pine will need to adopt development regulations to protect critical areas, including wildlife habitat, flood plains, urban forests and groundwater quality. Policies and regulations should be balanced with local values and in conformance with state law. Efforts to protect the natural environment should focus on

maintaining a balance between the economy and ecology of the area while enhancing the aesthetic and livability ideals of the community.

Local area livability can be enhanced and growth can occur in and around special areas if development regulations take the following issues into consideration:

- Preservation of the natural environment in open space protection areas and requiring preservation of natural features with new development when and where appropriate
- Opportunities for trail connections between existing and planned development areas and open space/natural areas, and other recreational activities
- Implementing development ordinance regulations related to natural hazards such as flooding, wildfire, etc.
- Inventory and analysis of important wildlife habitat and migration areas
- Enhancement of the urban forest
- Work with County, State, Federal agencies and La Pine Water and Sewer District's to monitor water quality
- Protection of local values regarding the social and ecological benefits of maintaining the natural environment

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Protect and enhance identified Goal 5 resources and other features of the natural environment using a variety of methods and strategies.

GENERAL POLICIES

- Until such time that the City receives title or other controls over the Forest and BLM lands east of the Highway, the City shall coordinate with the BLM and Forest Service for the preservation of the natural forest environment on lands under their respective jurisdictions that are within and adjacent to the City, including transitions from rural to Public Facility uses: sewer treatment facility expansion, energy production and renewable resource activities, open space and recreation, rail and transit options, and, large lot industrial development needs. These lands shall not be used for residential subdivisions, or destination shopping centers.
- The City will develop programs to address the protection of the natural environment and related natural resources consistent with State law and local goals related to protection of such resources.
- Protection of groundwater, a natural resource, is of prime concern to the community. The City shall coordinate efforts with the La Pine Water and Sewer District, and Deschutes County to ensure appropriate provisions for connections

to the La Pine sewer system for new and existing development in order to maintain safe groundwater.

- The City shall continue its inventory of storm runoff, its effects on the environment, and any needed management programs.
- Riparian, floodplain and wetland areas along the Little Deschutes River support important wildlife and ecological habitat and shall be protected to the greatest extent possible and regulated by the zoning ordinance and other studies.
- Wildlife habitat associated with the Little Deschutes River and its related riparian areas shall be protected by maintaining habitat within significant riparian corridors and wetlands.
- The City shall delineate open space and trail areas to serve as wildlife migration corridors. This will allow migrating deer and elk to cross US Highway 97. The Plan map shows where the primary corridor is to be located via a 500 foot green-colored strip running east-west through the Newberry Neighborhood. This location was jointly agreed upon with Deschutes County - the property owner in this case.
- The City shall coordinate with Deschutes County for the identification and protection of Cultural and Historic Resources. The City shall investigate options that will identify and potential protect significant scenic resources.
- The County already has a FIRM and other regulations that protect natural resources and manage development within the flood plain and floodways. The City shall adopt its own floodplain protection regulations to incorporate a “no net loss of flood storage capacity” standard, which is consistent with DLCDC’s natural Hazards Division
- Riparian corridors and wetlands within the 100-year floodplain shall have a high level of protection.
- The City shall coordinate efforts with the La Pine Water District to protect inventoried groundwater resources and wellheads.
- The City recognizes that open spaces and natural areas within the community function together in a synergistic fashion. Thus, they need to be inventoried and networks of open space within the community shall be maintained and enhanced, including wildlife habitat corridors, storm water management areas, trails and other sensitive areas.
- La Pine shall maintain updated inventories of Goals 5, 6, 7, and 8 natural resources, recreation, and hazard areas.

- Because the local urban forest helps to create shade, improve respite areas, enhance drainage ways, and beautify the community, the City shall develop regulations that promote the retention of trees and natural landscapes with all new development, as appropriate.
- Citizens shall develop and maintain convenient access to natural areas in a manner that protects sensitive areas.
- The City recognizes that children and other citizens will benefit from learning about and understanding the special characteristics of urban wildlife and natural habitats and therefore will support educational opportunities.
- The City shall develop a Historic Resources program, including creation of the Historic Landmarks Commission, additional historic resource designation and protection for qualifying sites within the City.

La Pines Historic Preservation Policies

- La Pine encourages historic preservation and integrates its preservation program into community development and economic development programs. Conserving our heritage helps build a vibrant and sustainable local economy and gives La Pine an identity and a sense of place.
- Historic preservation will be employed to create and preserve affordable housing, generate jobs, retain existing businesses, attract new ones, and increase civic participation. Community revitalization and historic preservation are uniquely compatible principles. When used together, they create sustainable, vibrant places to live, work and play. Preservation-based community development uses the older and historic built environment to improve the quality of life for residents of all income levels.
- La Pine's historic preservation program will be used to attract cultural heritage tourism. Cultural heritage tourism is traveling to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes cultural, historic and natural resources. Cultural heritage tourism produces income for local businesses and improves the quality of life for residents and visitors.
- La Pine's preservation program aims to enhance the public's appreciation for and understanding of its prehistory and the early and mid-20th Century architecture and history that is unique to our city. The City hopes to unite emerging popular interest in preserving the recent past with proper preservation practices through the promotion of continuing historic uses and adaptive re-use, and sensitive maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation of these structures and sites.

- Historic preservation can and should be an integral component of any effort to promote sustainable development. Conserving and improving our existing built resources, including re-using historic and older buildings to meet current needs that require minimal alterations, greening the existing building stock, and reinvestment in older and historic neighborhoods, is crucial to creating a desirable city. Preserving La Pine's historic churches, cemeteries and schools is especially important to people who live in La Pine or have lived here.
- La Pine's historic buildings were systematically inventoried in 2009. The inventory shall be updated every decade. The City will encourage the owners of significant properties to apply to the City Council to designate their properties as resources. It is important that the resources represent the significant men and women and ethnic groups that contributed to the community as well as the architects, designers, craftsmen, trades people, and carpenters. Some simple structures will represent the frugality, resourcefulness and individuality of the pioneers. Many will display the use of local building materials. Buildings in La Pine were often moved to be reused in new ways and some were pulled on skids from Rosland or transported from lumber camps.
- Districts, buildings, structures, cemeteries and sites in La Pine which have significant prehistoric, historic, and cultural association should be preserved as part of the heritage of the citizens of the La Pine. Their preservation benefits the education, enjoyment, economic development and pride of the citizens. Preservation provides architectural diversity and enhances the value of protected resources and their neighborhoods.
- The City will protect all properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and all properties that are included in the City's list of designated historic and cultural resources in this Comprehensive Plan. To that end, regulatory controls and administrative procedures are necessary. The Historic and Cultural Preservation Code shall be used to protect designated historic and cultural resources. The Code shall be based on and be compatible with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The Standards and Guidelines shall be used when the Code is silent on a matter.
- The City's preservation program shall be carried out by the La Pine Landmarks Commission or the La Pine Planning Commission, when the Landmarks Commission does not have at least three members.
- Financial incentives shall be developed to encourage regular maintenance, rehabilitation, and restoration of the historic and cultural resources.

Goal #2: To reduce wildfire hazard on forested lands within the City and coordinate wildfire hazard reduction with adjacent federal forested lands.

Policies

- The City of La Pine shall adopt before 2013 and implement the Greater La Pine Community Wildfire Protection Plan within the City of La Pine through local development codes and regulations – work with all appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to coordinate efforts in wildfire hazard reduction through local regulations.
- The City shall coordinate wildfire protection plans with the County and La Pine Rural Fire protection District and shall implement the wildfire protection Community Plan regulations for new development.

V. Programs

The City shall:

1. Conduct a local wetland inventory for areas within the City, along the Little Deschutes River, and update the existing La Pine Wickiup Junction Local Wetland Inventory – LWI - before 2015.
2. Create an inventory of resources and natural areas that require special protection. Develop new regulations and zoning regulations to protect such resources consistent with Statewide planning goals.
3. Coordinate with the La Pine Park and Recreation District to develop:
 - a. an inventory of open spaces that can complement the system of parks and other recreational spaces.
 - b. develop a system of linking open spaces, cultural/historic areas, natural areas, recreational areas, and public parks in coordination with the La Pine Park and Recreation District and other affected agencies.
 - c. create an educational program that better informs the community about the importance of natural systems, cultural/historic areas, and open spaces. This may include collaborative efforts educational providers and parks district.
 - d. keep the community Parks and Recreation Plan Comprehensive Plan updated, regarding current and future requirements for open space and related Goal 5 resources within the City limits.
 - e. leverage funding for habitat improvements by applying for grants to develop and protect natural areas, build trails, and sustain wildlife as appropriate.

4. Work with surrounding jurisdictions, including Deschutes County, the BLM and Forest Service, to develop and implement a regional system of Goal 5 and open space corridors.
5. Continue to refine and develop new regulations (as part of the Zoning/Development Code) regarding riparian setbacks, flood plain protection, enhancement, and development mitigation.
6. Encourage corridor development for riparian protection, pedestrian use, and wildlife routes.
7. Re-evaluate street design guidelines to include provisions for street trees, paths as alternatives to sidewalks, and plantings that provide shade and a variety of drainage controls to enhance and support a variety of habitats as well as control storm water and snow melt.
8. Develop focused donation programs to help manage identified sensitive areas, naming of open spaces, riparian corridors, respite areas, waysides, trail segments, and other programs that can count toward grant match programs.
9. Encourage provision of open space with new development by providing developer incentives in addition to minimum standards in regulations.
10. Create design guidelines to include provisions for critical areas and natural resource lands that minimize fragmentation of species and habitat due to development.
11. Adopt and implement the applicable portions of the Deschutes County Community Fire Protection Plan before 2013
12. Continually participate with local, State and Federal Agencies on developing and implementing management plans (i.e. use, fire protection, etc.) for forest lands inside City limits, as well as the transition areas along the City boundary.
13. Coordinate with emergency services agencies and plan for the development and recognition of fire zone interface areas and supportive land management techniques.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 6 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

I. State Planning Goal 8, Recreational Needs

Oregon State Planning Goal 8 intends to satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts. The requirement for meeting these needs fall to local governmental agencies, in coordination with private enterprise, and must be done so in appropriate proportions and in such quantity, quality and locations as is consistent with the availability of the resources to meet such requirements. In doing so, the local and regional recreational needs must be coordinated with state and federal recreation plans. Included in recreational planning needs are developed recreational facilities as well as open space, including the retention of natural areas and linkages between developed and natural areas where appropriate.

II. Purpose and Intent

As stated above, the State of Oregon requires that local governments manage and operate adequate facilities for recreation and open space. Open space responsibilities also overlap with Goal 5 issues (as discussed in Chapter 5 of this Comprehensive Plan) but the emphasis for utilization and preservation remains the same. Thus, this chapter discusses how the City of La Pine intends to recognize and strengthen the City's parks and recreation opportunities through land use strategies and inter-agency cooperation with the La Pine Park and Recreation District, as well as Deschutes County, and state and federal agencies who own open space lands within and surrounding La Pine. An important element to the quality of life to citizens in the community is based upon the location and function of the area parks, natural areas, and open space. The opportunity for multiple forms of and interconnectivity between passive and active recreation creates solid community connections and promotes healthier lifestyles for residents.

III. Issues

The City of La Pine, within the City limits has not seen rapid growth in the recent past. However, the surrounding area, primarily to the north and west, has seen rapid growth as existing rural residential lots have been developed en masse over the last 15 years. Citizens and visitors alike are attracted to La Pine's forested character and rural setting. The community is also very close to many other recreational activities and open spaces in the nearby forests, lakes and rivers. Fishing, hunting, camping, boating, ATV riding and wildlife observation in the surrounding rural areas are the primary activities that are enjoyed by many of the residents (much of the reason why they moved to the area) visitors alike. Much of these activities occur on the surrounding undeveloped county, state, and federal lands.

The specific goals and objectives for meeting the City's open space and recreational requirements are based on identified needs, desires, and other issues as specified by the citizens and conveyed through the La Pine Park and Recreation District (LPRD). The chapter also strives to identify the services, programs, and future preservation and enhancement of recreational and community facilities, including parks, ball fields, trails, community centers and historic places as development occurs within the city, all coordinated with the LPRD. However, the LPRD jurisdiction and responsibility goes beyond the La Pine city limits. This chapter will focus on those amenities within the city, but will also address the transition between urban and rural areas, as well as surrounding County, State and Federal programs.

The La Pine community is fortunate to have existing natural and manmade features that provide open space and recreational opportunities within and adjacent to the urban area. Some of these are under the control of the City, County, State and Federal Government and others are under the control of the LPRD. The policies and programs contained in this chapter are a "guide" for the City and local agencies, and provide a basis for helping to resolve issues and set a strategic course for physical improvements.

LPRD PLANNING:

The LPRD, which was established as a special service district in 1990, has a Comprehensive Plan for the area within their district boundary (which extends beyond the La Pine City limits) which identifies the primary services, facilities, programs and direction provided by the District. The Plan was adopted in 2005 and is intended to focus on the operation, planning and management for a five-year period (Five Year Action Plan), as well as a master plan to guide the acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities for the next 20-years (Park and Facility Master Plan). Notwithstanding, since the inception of the District, the District has struggled financially with six failed tax measures for a fixed tax base. Thus, the District's ability to provide facilities and services has been severely limited in past years. However, in May, 2009, the voters approved a tax rate of \$0.30 for every \$1000 of assessed value for properties within the District. This reliable source of funding will allow the LPRD to move forward the goals identified in their Comprehensive Plan.

Per the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, the primary mission of the LPRD is to: find reliable funding sources; maintain existing parks and facilities; plan for future parks and facilities; improve existing recreation programs; and, plan for future recreation programs. At this time, the LPRD manages a number of facilities designed to provide varied recreational opportunities for the community. Although they are all within the District boundary, those located within the City of La Pine include:

LPRD FACILITIES:

White School Park Complex: This site is home to the District office. It includes a variety of uses such as the White School Park Building (Gymnasium), John C. Johnson Center, etc. Greater detail can be found in the LPRD Comprehensive Plan.

Finley Butte Road Park Complex: This 10 acre park site is developed with a recreation meeting hall, three baseball fields, t-ball field, undeveloped athletic fields/open areas,

bathrooms and associated recreational; facilities. This facility is the focal area for active sports within the community and future formal skate park.

Vacant Land: The District also owns a vacant, unimproved 5-acre parcel near the La Pine High School. There are currently no formal plans for the use of this site although the district plans include a future swimming pool.

Planned: Although not yet developed, the master plan for the Newberry Neighborhood in central La Pine, west of Huntington Road, includes areas for the development of formal parks to serve residents within near/walking distance of the planned residences. A timeline for establishment of these parks is not yet known and will be dependent upon development of the surrounding residential subdivision.

Rosland Park contains day use areas, 11 campsites, historical Forest Service Ranger Station, river frontages and play grounds. The Park will need to be zoned specifically for park uses and related facilities. There has been a desire to develop a nature center and other uses here and this should be permitted outright.

LPRD PROGRAMS:

With limited funding and resources since its inception, the type and number of programs provided by LPRD has been limited. The primary focus of programs that are offered has been oriented toward children's activities and community/holiday events and tourism. These include joint efforts with the South Central Little League and youth sports such as baseball, softball, soccer and flag/tackle football, and community events such as Frontier Days (4th of July), Holiday Bazaar and Crab Feed. The LPRD comprehensive plan contains greater detail on each activity, etc.

PRIVATE RECREATION PROGRAMS:

There are various sources of private recreation programs in La Pine that provided by churches, youth organizations and special purpose organizations. These include La Pine Little League; the La Pine Rodeo Association; 4-H; Boy/Girl Scouts; an, the La Pine Senior Center.

Other open space and recreation areas include local schools, public areas such as riparian areas/floodplain areas in public ownership, public facilities and surrounding BLM/Forest Service properties, etc. Additionally, there several private campgrounds in the areas surrounding La Pine. The LPPRD, City, County, and State are collaborating on a new rodeo and Frontier Days activity area. This may be located on BLM land that is slated for potential transfer to the City of La Pine.

STATE AMENITIES:

Although not included within the City limits, the La Pine State Park is a large campground and recreation area approximately 5 miles north of La Pine, adjacent to the Deschutes River. The Park provides camping (both tent and RV) opportunities as well as access to the River for boating and fishing opportunities. Although not within the City of La Pine (access/entrance road is approximately 5 miles north of La Pine on US Highway

97), the monument is a large attraction for visitors to the region. Thus, it has a great affect of the local tourism economy of La Pine.

FEDERAL AMENITIES:

The BLM manages a large number of acres within and around the UGB. Additionally, much of the land surrounding La Pine is within the Deschutes National Forest. These public lands have historically been a primary attraction for residents living in and moving to the community. The opportunities for hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, nature watching and ATV and snowmobile use are convenient for all residents. At public meetings held for the Comprehensive Planning process, some residents explained that hunting is currently taking place on the BLM lands on the City's east side; they expressed an interest in maintaining these opportunities within the City limits. While some of the aforementioned activities may be appropriate, hunting and discharge of firearms within City limits is typically not compatible with urban development and is prohibited by State law.

The BLM lands, located within the city limits, may be transferred to the City for public uses. This action would improve the City's desire for cohesive planning and control of urban land uses. The size of the BLM lands is quite large and abuts the City's waste water treatment plant on the east side of the community. The BLM lands would provide needed area for long term treatment capacity. Opportunities for other transitional uses are likely to occur until the land is actually needed for treatment purposes. Current recreational uses (not hunting), industrial infill, and opportunities for alternate energy production (solar fields, bio-mass storage, etc.)are appropriate uses on these large acreages. The large number of acres of the BLM parcels helps to provide good buffers between rural and urban uses including wildfire/wildlife control areas too.

Newberry Crater National Monument – Paulina and East Lakes: The Newberry National Monument is a federally designated recreation area that preserves a key local component of Oregon's volcanic history. The monument contains two large lakes, campgrounds, a lodge and amenity rentals. Although not within the City of La Pine (access/entrance road is approximately 5 miles north of La Pine on US Highway 97), the monument is a large attraction for visitors to the region. Thus, it has a great affect of the local tourism economy of La Pine.

Further away, but also having a direct affect on the quality of life in La Pine are the Cascade Mountains and the high lakes approximately 25 miles to the west. The mountains and lakes within the Deschutes National Forest provide a variety of recreational opportunities such as skiing, hunting, fishing hiking, snowmobiling and wildlife watching. Since La Pine is one of the closest centers where urban services are provided, residents, recreationists and tourists regularly utilize La Pine as a point of gathering for such activities.

FUTURE:

The biggest challenge for the City will be to coordinate and sustain a beneficial strategy for parks, open space, and recreation for the urban area. While the primary responsibility

to develop parks will be with LPRD, the City must work hand in hand with the District to implement an overall plan for determining actual need and key linkages between the various open space and recreational uses. The existing and future demand by citizens and visitors for recreations areas, facilities and opportunities must be continually refined within the District's Comprehensive Plan and implementation strategy that is based upon continuing analysis of public need and desires.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Create a system of parks, recreational facilities, and open space areas that provide quality active and passive recreational experiences for all urban area residents.

Policies

- The City shall coordinate the development of new parks and recreation opportunities, and programs with the La Pine Park and Recreation District.
- The City shall explore the creation of Park System Development Charges (SDC's) as a means of providing a funding base for new park and recreation facilities to serve anticipated growth.
- The City shall encourage the continual involvement of private recreation providers to citizens.
- The City shall acknowledge the importance of the ties between the recreational opportunities provided by the natural environment and the developed portion of the community.
- The City shall encourage recreational opportunities within the community to acknowledge and encourage use by visitors and tourists to the community.
- The City shall continue its coordination with County, State and Federal agencies to seek land and recreation opportunities (both active and passive) within the City limits.
- Given the various agencies involved in providing open space, parks, trails, and recreational opportunities – a high level of coordination and planning will be required in order to maximize efficiency and reduce duplication.
- The addition of new parks and recreational opportunities shall be sought in the most cost effective way possible, including land grants from County, State and Federal agencies.

- Continual updating of the LPRD Comprehensive Plan will allow the City and the District to determine if the recreation needs of the community are being met.
- Local parks and recreational opportunities tend to be distributed throughout the community without connecting links other than streets; La Pine's citizens desire to connect existing and future parks and recreation facilities by sidewalks, trails, and other mechanisms. Such connections provide greater opportunities for citizens, particularly children, to safely access parks without vehicle use.
- Open space and/or recreational areas should be available to residents within ¼ mile of their homes unless an exception is granted by the City as new development occurs.
- New parks, linkages, and recreational facilities should be incorporated into new developments as a way to distribute resources throughout the community and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Older neighborhoods and redevelopment areas should consider incorporating parks, trails, and other recreational facilities as a way to enhance the community.
- New parks to serve new residents should be developed without community subsidy, while new trails and regional community recreational facilities may require additional funding through those sources available to the City and LPRD.
- The Bend-La Pine School District should participate in the discussion about new parks and be willing to link school resources to the community/LPRD park system as a way to leverage open space opportunities.
- When adopted, local development codes should require an analysis of new resident impacts as it relates to the need for parks and recreation facilities beyond the collection of LPRD SDC's (if and when SDC's are adopted). Such codes should require open space, parks, and recreational opportunities where justifiable and appropriate.
- New trails are important elements that link open spaces and parks.
- Riparian habitats and other natural areas may be used for recreational and open space opportunities.
- Land use processes for the development of parks and related facilities shall be expedited and any costs for application processing not greater than actual cost of service or free whenever possible.

V. Programs

The City shall:

1. Develop a mechanism to coordinate the efforts of local (public and private) and other agency groups as it relates to the development of open spaces, parks, and recreation opportunities within the UGB and develop intra-agency agreements as necessary to further foster and control the acquisition and development of such elements.
2. The City shall work with the Parks and Recreation District, as appropriate to stabilize and increase its tax base to include all potential users of LPRD facilities.
3. Defer the parks and recreation Comprehensive Planning efforts to the LPRD as appropriate.
4. Inventory all current open space, trail, active and passive recreational opportunities.
5. Develop land use regulations to better manage the acquisition, development, and maintenance of open spaces, parks, and recreation opportunities within the UGB, as coordinated with the LPRD.
6. Encourage the LPRD to upgrade existing parks, as necessary, through renovation to provide quality services as designated for that particular park space.
7. Encourage new residential development to provide additional resources to satisfy additional recreational demand generated by growth.
8. Require that compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility requirements be part of new and upgraded facilities where appropriate. Law requires that ADA accessibility deficiencies be rectified whenever a LPRD facility is substantially upgraded. If suitable funding becomes available sooner, any existing ADA deficiencies must be rectified.

References as attached:

1. La Pine Park and Recreation District Comprehensive Plan, Summer 2005 – (GEL Oregon and J.T. Atkins & Company PC)

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 7 Public Facilities and Services

I. State Planning Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services

Oregon State Planning Goal 11 requires local governments “to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.” As defined in the Goal, “*A Timely, Orderly, and Efficient Arrangement* – refers to a system or plan that coordinates the type, locations and delivery of public facilities and services in a manner that best supports the existing and proposed land uses.” As part of the Comprehensive Planning process for La Pine, the existing public facilities and services will be assessed in order to evaluate the necessary improvements required to support the anticipated population growth over the 20-year planning period.

II. Purpose and Intent

As Oregon’s newest City, La Pine does not provide a full array of public services and facilities under its own jurisdiction. Although such services and facilities are available to residents, they are typically provided by Deschutes County (through inter-governmental agreement/contract), private businesses, or Special Districts, which are government entities formed under and authorized by state statute. This chapter catalogs the existing facilities and utilities that serve the businesses and residents of La Pine. The intent of the chapter is to identify the current service and facilities, the provider of such services and facilities, and any future improvements, projects, costs, and sources for funding in order to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban development. The public services currently available within the city limits and UGB include:

- Community governmental services
- Cemetery
- Emergency response services (Deschutes County Sheriff/La Pine Fire District)
- Land use planning and zoning control (Deschutes County Community Development Department)
- Health services (Deschutes County Health Department)
- Recreation facilities and services (La Pine Park and Recreation District)
- Public streets and maintenance (City of La Pine, ODOT and Deschutes County)
- Public water source, distribution, and maintenance (La Pine Water District)

- Public sewer treatment, delivery, and maintenance (La Pine Sewer District)
- Public Schools – Bend-La Pine School District
- Library - Deschutes County
- Solid waste collection and disposal – Deschutes County
- Electric power (Mid-State Electric Co-op)
- Natural gas (Cascade natural Gas)
- Telephone and internet services
- Television, radio, cable and fiber-optic services

Community Governmental Services

La Pine operates through a City Manager-Council form of government. The City Council hires the City Manager, creates policy and programs, and adopts a city budget supporting various municipal functions. The City Manager is responsible for hiring staff, responds to Council requirements, and manages the day-to-day functions of the local government and services, and plans for the future needs of the community. However, the City does contract with Deschutes County, and outside consultants and service providers for some basic and required community functions – such as planning/zoning, law enforcement, administration and legal counsel. This is due to the newness of the City and the limited staffing/resources currently available.

Emergency Response Services

The City of La Pine contracts for law enforcement with the Deschutes County Sheriffs Department. Fire protection is funded by a separate Fire District budget – the La Pine Fire District. Services are provided to citizens throughout the urban area. The departments are consulted on new land use applications (via Deschutes County Community Development Department), which are examined in the context of services needed to support new development.

Land Use Planning, Building and Zoning Control

The City of La Pine does not have its own Community Development Department that serves the incorporated area and UGB. Rather, the City coordinates planning and building activities in the City through an intergovernmental agreement with Deschutes County. Thus, the County Zoning Map will serve as the City map until such time as a Zoning Code and corresponding map are adopted by the City. Until the City adopts a TSP the County zoning designations on non-UUC lands remain in effect.

Health Services

The City of La Pine is served by a satellite office of the Deschutes County health Department, primarily mental health and children's and community services, as well as a private clinic. The City and surrounding area do not have a hospital or emergency medical services – the nearest such services are in Bend, approximately 30-miles to the north. Medical uses are permitted in the local commercial zones.

Recreation Facilities and Services

The City of La Pine is served by the La Pine Park and Recreation District. The District provides services to the City of La Pine and surrounding rural residential area. The District has an adopted Comprehensive Plan that anticipates community needs and anticipated growth of the area. The District is funded by a newly voter approved tax base, as well as grants and other sources of private funding.

Public Street Systems

The City of La Pine, Deschutes County and the State of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) provide and maintain various streets throughout the City and outlying area (as such streets interconnect). However, the City of La Pine currently has limited funds for street improvements and/or maintenance. Deschutes County maintains some streets via intergovernmental agreement with the City and ODOT maintains U.S. Highway 97 that bisects the City. La Pine does not have a Transportation System Plans (TSP). The Deschutes County TSP, which includes the area within City limits, currently serves as the City Transportation Plan and will continue to do so until the City adopts a separate TSP in 2012.

Public Water Systems

The City of La Pine does not provide a municipal owned and run water system. Rather, the La Pine Water District provides water source, disinfection, distribution and maintenance of a water delivery system to approximately 650 customers. The service area includes most, but not all of the area within the City limits. The District does have plans for expansion of the system to serve all of the urban area, dependent upon adequate funding sources. Their plan identifies existing community needs, how to accommodate anticipated growth, reduction in private well heads, aquifer protection, land acquisition for new municipal well heads, reservoir siting and land needed for treatment and storage. Additional resource information from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality can be found in the appendix. This information shows the City source in relationship to distance from other sources and the relationship of water compared to time travel from the source and/or other influences.

Public Sewer Systems

The City of La Pine does not provide a municipal owned and run sewer system. Rather, the La Pine Sewer District provides collection and treatment to more than 650 customers. The service area includes most, but not all of the area within the City limits.

The District does have plans for expansion of the system to serve all of the urban area, dependent upon adequate funding sources. Their plan identifies existing community needs, necessary capital improvements, funding and implementation, accommodation of new growth, reduction in septic fields, new connections, and future land needs for the community treatment plant. The City plans to preserve adequate land on the City's east side for an expansion of the La Pine Sewer Districts sewage treatment facility. A goal of the City of La Pine is to have all residences within the City eventually connect to the sewer system, including a requirement for all new construction to connect to connect to the sewer system. Thus, based on the information provided in the La Pine Sewer

Districts Capital Facilities Plan, a major expansion will be necessary in order to provide capacity for the anticipated growth. For cost effectiveness and efficiency, expansion on vacant land adjacent to the existing treatment facility will be necessary. For this reason, the City of La Pine and Deschutes County have been working with the BLM to acquire and preserve land (via a land transfer) for such expansion.

Many developed residential lots outside of the City limits and UGB surround the City. It is anticipated that these lots, (more than 3,000) will need to be connected to municipal sewer services. Because La Pine has the closest treatment plant and anticipates obtaining additional lands from the BLM, it is likely that collection lines will need to be extended to the outlying areas. This action, when determined to be needed, may require special approval from the State of Oregon.

Note: The City is currently investigating the ways and means of incorporating the water and sewer district into the local government operations.

Public Schools – Bend-La Pine School District

The Bend-La Pine School District (BLSD) currently operates La Pine High School, La Pine Middle School and La Pine Elementary. A new elementary school has been built on the south side of Burgess Road in the Newberry Neighborhood. (this was anticipated to be built for half enrollment (300 students) in 2010, with completion for a total enrollment of 600 students by 2015. Overall, the enrollment of the La Pine schools has grown, mostly as a result of residential development and growth in the outlying rural area between La Pine and Sunriver to the north. La Pine Elementary serves kindergarten through 4th grade with an enrollment of approximately 475 students. La Pine Middle School serves 5th through 8th grades with an enrollment of approximately 520 students. La Pine High School serves 9th through 12th grades with an enrollment of approximately 540 students.

Discussions with the BLSD Superintendent John Rexford reveal that they have no plans within the next 20 years to develop additional schools within the City limits or UGB. The School Facility Plan also states that no new schools are needed during the planning horizon to 2029 and this is incorporated into this document and can be found in the Appendix and restated as part of the chapter discussing Goal 14.

Library

The La Pine Public Library is a relatively new structure, which opened in November, 2000. This is a full service library with on-site book collections ranging from children's through adult sources. The library also has internet connection with on-site PC's available to the public. The library is part of the Deschutes Public Library System

Solid Waste Collection and Disposal

La Pine's citizens have access to waste disposal service via Wilderness Garbage Company or self service at the Deschutes County Transfer Station, north of the city limits.

Storm Water Collection and Distribution

The City of La Pine does not have any municipally maintained storm water facilities. Storm runoff, including significant snowmelt, is accommodated in roadside drainage ditches and allowed to percolate into the soil. However, new development on private property is required to meet all DEQ standards for storm water retention, treatment, and dispersal. The development of new, paved streets in new subdivisions are required to install storm water retention facilities in the form of drywells that also meet DEQ standards.

Electric Power

Electric power in La Pine is provided by Mid-State Electric Co-op. The City provides access to right of way and franchise availability to these service providers. Mid-State utilizes a master plan for determining new substation areas and other elements necessary to accommodate anticipated growth.

Natural Gas

Natural gas is provided to urban area residents by Cascade Natural Gas. The City provides access to right of way and franchise availability for new extensions. Cascade Natural Gas utilizes a master plan for determining new substation areas and other elements necessary to accommodate anticipated growth. Propane is supplied by multiple private entities that serve Central Oregon.

Telecommunications, Phone and Internet Services

Qwest and a variety of private wireless phone and internet providers primarily serve the community. Deregulation of the telephone service, satellite access and other advances in telecommunications allow La Pine residents a wide range of phone and Internet connection choices. Wireless access will also be expanding to serve local citizens.

Television, Radio, Cable and Fiber Optic Services

Cable TV service provides access to premium and nationwide broadcasts. Radio stations include a variety of local AM/FM stations that provide news and entertainment. Fiber optic access is expanding throughout the community and of particular importance for public, commercial and industrial users.

III. Issues

State law and Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services, requires that cities plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

Excerpt from Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines GOAL 11:

"Urban and rural development shall be guided and supported by types and levels of urban and rural public facilities and services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the urban, urbanizable, and rural areas to be served. A provision for key facilities shall be included in each plan. Cities or counties shall develop and adopt a public facility plan for areas within an urban growth boundary containing a population greater than 2,500 persons. To meet current and long-range needs, a provision for solid waste disposal sites, including sites for inert waste, shall be included in each plan."

The City of La Pine does not currently have a population exceeding 2,500 persons (current population is approximately 1,662). However, during the 20-year comprehensive planning period La Pine's population growth is expected to result in an urban area population that exceeds the 2,500 threshold requiring a public facility plan. Thus, even though a formal public facility plan is not required, extensive planning for the provision of such services has been considered as part of the Comprehensive Planning effort.

As described herein, key public facilities are typically described as transportation systems; water supply; emergency services; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; solid waste collection and processing; energy and communication services; schools; and, community governmental services. While the City and other local providers offer a wide range of services, the key elements are essential to accommodating growth and maintaining public health and safety. Likewise, the City is preparing and maintaining planning tools that make sure adequate levels of key services are available and not stressed beyond their carrying capacities.

As described above, the City of La Pine does not manage many of the key facilities that will affect the overall growth and development of the community – a primary goal of the City though is to acquire the responsibility for such services and facilities over time. Services such as planning/zoning, law enforcement, fire protection, health, certain elements of recreation, solid waste collection and processing, building permitting, schools, energy, and communication services are provided by other entities. Other City services are funded through a combination of resources and General Fund programs. The City budget process occurs every fiscal year and describes how services will be funded.

The basics... transportation, water and sewer

Basic infrastructure - transportation, water and sewer systems - are carefully planned, monitored, studied, and provided to citizens by the City or the Special Districts. The City Planning Commission and City Council will eventually review and approve public facility plans (The La Pine Water and Sewer Districts retain control over their programs at this time) that are developed to support and accommodate growth. These documents, in addition to local regulations, implement the goals of the Plan.

The appendix of the Plan contains the public facility plans and current implementing regulations. The facility plans describe the water, sewer and transportation facilities, which support the land uses designated in the UGB. Likewise, capital facilities funding is included in the plans to ensure that implementation keeps pace with growth, and that such growth can be accommodated as required by law. The development patterns envisioned by the Plan and the commensurate level of maintenance necessary for each system is also part of each facility plan. The overall goal is to maintain and improve the

quality of life for existing and future development by establishing and maintaining standards for the level-of-service of facilities.

Transportation

The City of La Pine currently does not have a Transportation Systems Plan (TSP). As a new City, a TSP that identifies long term needs and recommends a priority system for implementation of new streets and possible funding sources will be created soon after the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan. The TSP elements will be master planned to match the land needs of the community over the planning horizon; typically 20 years to match the Comprehensive Plan. The State requires cities to provide adequate lands for growth matched with adequate supporting transportation facilities over the planning horizon.

Currently the City of La Pine has streets classified by type and function under the Deschutes County TSP. The existing street system, to a great degree, is based on previous subdivision design and has local streets that are oriented in a grid fashion. However, some arterials and collectors, such as Huntington Road, are influenced by topography and geographic influences – such as wetlands and the Little Deschutes River to the west.

U.S. Highway 97, which bisects the community, is under the jurisdiction of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Efforts to signalize the highway/arterial intersections to provide access to the City's industrial and commercial areas are currently in the discussion stages. The City and the La Pine Industrial Group are working with ODOT to fund and sponsor a highway corridor study that will lay the groundwork for the necessary intersection improvements over the planning period. Once this work is complete, it will be a major component of the future La Pine Transportation System Plan.

Future funding for new streets, street upgrades and street maintenance comes from a variety of sources. A primary source for new street needs that is being explored by the City is the collection of system development charges (SDC's). The establishment of SDC's is an adopted goal of the City Council commensurate with the development of the TSP in 2012. Other street needs, maintenance, and operation are funded from the General Fund and/or a combination of alternate funding (grants, etc.) if and when available. In very limited instances, new development has instigated street improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of that development. However, new streets have been limited to those within recently developed residential subdivisions. Because demands upon the General Fund are expected to increase as a variety of City needs all compete for scarce dollars, it is expected that new streets and street maintenance will mostly rely on new development for funding and actual construction.

Water

The La Pine Water District has a water system capital facilities and water management and conservation plan adopted in 2009. The plan identifies the current status of water service in La Pine and also addresses needs for the next 20-years. Currently the District maintains two wells, a 1.2 million gallon reservoir, a 250k gallon reservoir and pump stations. The series of service lines provide service to 446 residential connections, 168 commercial connections and 17 industrial connections within the service area boundary. However, this does not include connections to all potential users within the boundary.

The District utilizes groundwater to serve residents and maintains a system of water rights and permits necessary for additional sources. Future growth needs are identified to the 2033 horizon. It is anticipated that additional water rights, wells and water storage facilities will be necessary to provide service to all existing unserved properties, as well as to meet projected growth for planned development areas within the City. The HGE Inc. study includes three levels of prioritized capital improvements necessary to provide adequate water service to the community for the next 20-years and slightly beyond.

Currently user rates are charged to those who affect the water system and these fees are used to maintain and upgrade the water system. System Development Charges (SDC's) are collected and help offset the cost of master planned improvements. Lastly, loans could be made available from a variety of sources and can be paid back from the fees and SDC payments. However, such sources of funding can be limited and should not be relied upon for all necessary improvements.

Sewer

The sewer collection system in La Pine was initiated in the 1980's with a significant expansion in 2004 to serve the areas of Wickiup Junction and the Newberry neighborhood (now both within the boundaries of La Pine) The system is comprised of a combination of gravity and pressure lines that deliver sewage to the treatment plant on the City's east side. Storm drainage is not collected in the sewer system.

In a wastewater system capital facilities plan adopted in 2006, the primary needs for expansion and adequate operation of the system were identified. The primary need was for an area to develop additional treatment facilities, including an area for effluent disposal, adjacent to the existing wastewater treatment plant. Such plans were based on projected growth of the community for the next 20-years.

Currently, user rates are charged to those who use the sewer system and these fees are used to maintain and upgrade the system as necessary. The collection of water SDC charges help offset the cost of master planned capital improvements. Lastly, loans and grants could be possible to obtain from a variety of sources and can be paid back from the fees and SDC payments. However, such sources of funding can be limited and should not be relied upon for all necessary improvements.

Growth and Facility Demand

The anticipated growth in La Pine is approximately 1,000 persons over the next 20-years. Existing water and sewer within the community will require expansion of facilities as stated in the above referenced studies provided by the Special Districts. Based on those studies though, it appears that the necessary improvements will not be outpaced by growth demands in the community. However, new funding sources for the water and sewer districts may be necessary. Additionally, it is essential that growth pay its own way in order to avoid unnecessary impacts upon existing residents and quality of life. Existing residents and those lands reserved and designated for public, commercial and industrial development should be given priority for service over new residential uses. This means that new development may need to supply an array of services ahead of the

City/County/State/Special District schedule and at their own cost, subject to City approval and authorization before development.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Coordinate intra-agency efforts, including coordination with private service and Special District providers, and create a system of public facilities for the planning horizon.

Policies

- Continued coordination with Deschutes County for the provision of certain public services, such as law enforcement, waste management, and zoning/building services, shall continue until such time as services can be converted to City jurisdiction.
- The La Pine Rural Fire Protection District shall continue to provide fire protection service within the City of La Pine.
- The City of La Pine shall actively coordinate with the Bend La Pine School District and Central Oregon Community College on the need and options for providing locations for new school facilities, if needed. Such coordination shall be a high priority. This includes potential for reservation of public/private lands for future school sites, and active coordination regarding the impact of new development upon school capacity. The land use process for the development approval of public schools shall be a priority and expedited to the greatest extent possible.
- Local public and private plans for providing urban levels of services to all land within the UGB must be comprehensive.
- Although many of the public facilities and services are not currently provided by the City, the City shall take an active role in coordinating and ensuring that such services are adequate for existing residents and businesses without adverse effects from anticipated future growth.
- The City shall explore the creation of water, sewer, and street Systems Development Charges to help fund necessary master planned capital improvements. This will require in-depth review and coordination with the Special Districts as it relates to water and sewer SDC's.
- Schools shall not be charged City System Development Charges for any new or expanded school or college construction.

- The City shall explore the conversion of privately owned services and facilities to public ownership as necessary and economically viable to ensure long term service and availability to the community.
- Providing needed services in an economically viable and effective manner is good business and a good growth management tool.
- Plans providing for public facilities and services should be coordinated with plans for designation of urban boundaries, land use and zoning designations, surrounding urbanizable land and rural uses, and for the transition of rural land to urban uses.
- Service providers other than the City of La Pine may be allowed to use the surface, subsurface and air above City right of ways to provide necessary public services provided that all applicable rules and regulations are adhered to. In no event, shall these entities create a situation whereby the City must subsidize activity or repair damage caused by other service providers.
- Public facility and service plans in the urban area should be developed to meet the projected growth levels for the community.
- Public facilities and services should be provided at levels necessary and suitable for existing uses. The provision for future public facilities and services should be based upon: (1) the time required to provide the service; (2) reliability of service; (3) financial cost; (4) levels of service needed and desired; and (5) economic benefit to the community.
- All utility lines and facilities should be located on or adjacent to existing public or private rights-of-way. Other locations may be approved if they are part of a planned development or master plan.
- Plans providing for public facilities and services should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development action provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.
- Because the area surrounding the City of La Pine is densely populated and without sewer services, the expansion and use of the La Pine Sewer District sewer collection and treatment facilities for such areas shall be pursued when State law so permits.

Goal # 2: Create a system of conservation practices for public resources, services, and related facilities.

Policies

- Conservation practices and other techniques for sustaining limited resources and facilities are beneficial to the community.
- Natural resources, such as clean air and water, energy sources, timber sources, aggregate sources are limited in quality and supply.
- Alternative energy sources should be explored as a complement to existing resources and industries and as a way for the City to reach an energy consumption neutral status or better. Alternate energy sources may be developed on lots that are already developed or on vacant lands that are being planned for other future purposes such as the BLM land that is expected to be transferred to the City. This land is anticipated to be used for wastewater treatment as the community grows. La Pine is in an advantageous position as compared to other cities that do not have an opportunity to plan long term for sewer expansion. Moreover, because the City is interested in encouraging multiple uses/transitional uses on lands there are greater efficiencies that can be derived from the large vacant acreages until it is needed for wastewater treatment. For example, the BLM transfer land adjacent to the wastewater plant could accommodate solar field arrays that create energy for the community. And, because the land would need to be cleared anyway, this also provides fuel reductions in the wildfire interface and needed materials for bio-mass plants or other wood-based industries.
- Services such as public sewer collection facilities, public water sources, solid waste disposal, other point of contact public services, and services related to emergency response will need to be carefully managed to ensure supply and duration.
- In order to sustain local services and resources over the life of the Plan, and beyond, there should be a continued focus on improving efficiency.
- Land use regulations for new development and long range land use planning have a direct connection to preserving and enhancing livability and the efficient delivery of all public facilities and services.
- The La Pine community understands that making growth pay its own way is one of many techniques that can sustain limited resources without resulting in unnecessary subsidy from tax dollars.
- Local government and other agencies should set examples for the community by adopting and utilizing sustainability practices.
- The La Pine community expects the local school and or college district and City Planning officials will coordinate the location of new school/college sites and implement strategies for multiple use spaces. The opportunity for reduced vehicle usage at school/college campuses should be evaluated and implemented.

- Even with prudent management and careful sustainability of resources, the La Pine community understands that property taxes and current service fees (including private district fees) may not be sufficient to provide the service levels desired by the community. In some cases, new funding strategies, including the establishment of new System Development Charges (the Special Districts already implement water and sewer SDC programs) may be necessary.

V. PROGRAMS

The City shall:

1. Work with partner agencies in regularly updating the primary transportation, sewer, and water master plans within the City. These master plans must examine the desired service levels, infrastructure needs of the urban area, funding, and implementation strategies. Additionally, the City shall work with public and private agencies as applicable to establish and maintain level of service standards for the following areas:
 - Law Enforcement
 - Fire Protection
 - Emergency Medical Service
 - Transportation
 - Parks and Recreation
 - Natural Open Space
 - Public Buildings
 - Water System
 - Sewer System
 - Storm water System
 - Solid Waste Management
 - Schools/Colleges
 - Utilities
 - Libraries
2. Provide the leadership in coordination efforts among the various agencies and entities that provide public services to the community. This may require the imposition of franchise agreements and special protocols and fees for using public right of ways.
3. Identify specific capital facilities projects for the City and for other agencies that may benefit from coordinating with the City. Prioritize capital improvement projects based on a series of criteria; identify project costs and likely funding sources; relate projected improvements to forecast demand on services; identify current and proposed levels of service for each public service; and, establish a

siting process for the location of essential public facilities, including property acquisition needs.

4. Develop a concurrency requirement that new development demonstrate the adequate provision of public services or provide for impact mitigation, including providing appropriate infrastructure and public services as a condition of development.
5. Encourage communication and cooperation between the school/college district, developers, and the public. The local development codes and regulations shall require the development of neighborhoods in close proximity to school locations.
6. Continue to work with BLM to acquire lands near the sewer treatment plant.
7. Develop methods to support the addition of alternate energy sources within the community.

Conservation:

1. Develop a sustainability program for all City functions, services, and products. The plan shall identify goals and levels of conservation necessary for the planning horizon. Such goals shall have measurable outcomes and be monitored on a regular basis to insure proper management and effectiveness.
2. Adopt land use regulations (with a new Development Code) that require citizens to conserve water and reduce excessive irrigation of plant materials.
3. Develop air quality standards and monitor all air emissions into the community.
4. Develop an energy source and use evaluation plan. Implement measures to reduce energy consumption and unnecessary lighting.
5. Promote the creation of energy efficient structures and sustainable building practices. Requirements on specific architectural styles and materials may be necessary in order to reduce heating and cooling costs; a major part of local energy output.
6. Coordinate with Deschutes County on the supply and anticipated life of aggregate resources necessary to support development. Regulations to permit onsite rock crushing and extraction may be necessary to properly implement such programs.
7. Develop a study to monitor non-sewage infiltration of the community sewage system. Industrial discharge permits may be needed to adequately reduce negative effects of large volume discharges into the sewer system.

8. Storm drainage plans shall not permit drainage to enter the public sewage collection system to the greatest extent practical.
9. Institute recycling program requirements aimed at reuse and reduction of solid waste. This may require implementation of, and changes to local garbage hauler franchise or license agreements.
10. Coordinate landfill needs and other operations with Deschutes County.
11. Examine and develop strategies for maximizing capacity of transportation systems before street widening.
12. Examine the actual cost of service for each service provided to the public. A cost/benefit analysis shall be developed in order to ascertain proper allocation of funding resources and or reduction/expansion of City services and programs.
13. Examine emergency service needs and funding necessary to provide adequate services levels throughout the community over the planning horizon. Land use regulations that examine potential for efficient delivery of emergency services will need to be incorporated into implementation codes.
14. Recognize that community development services are necessary to implement local land use regulations and long term planning needs. The City shall examine the potential for a partially fee supported current development department and General Fund support for long range planning functions.

References:

1. Wastewater System capital Facilities Plan, La Pine Special Sewer District, Deschutes County, Oregon - January 2006 (HGE Inc.)
2. Water System Capital facilities Plan and Water Management and Conservation Plan, La Pine Water District, Deschutes County, Oregon – January 2009 – Draft (HGE Inc.)
3. La Pine Park and Recreation District Comprehensive Plan - Summer 2005 (GEL Oregon Inc.; J.T Atkins & Company PC)
4. Bend-La Pine Schools 2005 Sites and Facilities Plan – December 5, 2005
5. Greater La Pine Community Wildfire Protection Plan – December 13, 2005 (Kate Lighthall)

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8 Transportation

I. State Planning Goal 12, Transportation

Oregon State Planning Goal 12 requires local governments “to provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.” When referring to “transportation system” the goal requires that all modes of transportation be considered – including mass transit, air, water, pipeline, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian. Further, the goal requires that the local, regional and state transportation needs be considered and that they be done so through appropriate combinations of the modes listed above rather than reliance on any one particular method of transportation. Transportation systems must be coordinated with local Comprehensive Plans – including the development of a specific Transportation System Plan (TSP) that is in conformance with the State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) – Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012. In 2012-2013, a TSP will be developed for the City of La Pine. The TSP will address the requirements of capital facilities planning for transportation amenities and funding. Until the TSP is complete, the following discussion is limited to the area with the historic Unincorporated Urban Area (UUA). These areas have been previously planned for urban transportation services as part of the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan.

The areas outside of the UUA were not part of previous urban-level transportation planning, and so will retain existing County land use designations until the La Pine TSP is adopted and incorporated into this Comprehensive Plan. Once the TSP is adopted and incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, the areas outside of the historic UUA will be designated with urban levels of use and will governed by the City’s Plans.

II. Purpose and Intent

This chapter generally addresses the existing conditions of La Pine’s short and long-term transportation needs. The TSP will provide further detail on the community’s transportation needs for the next 20 years. Overall, the road system is the backbone of the overall transportation system in La Pine and will be the basis for much of the transportation planning discussed herein. The emerging transportation needs of La Pine will be coordinated with the Oregon Department of Transportation and Deschutes County to ensure an efficient and smooth transition of transportation facilities between the rural to urbanizing areas, as well as accommodating ODOT’s jurisdiction over US Highway 97 within the urban area. In addition to local needs, the TSP will also consider regional and state needs to achieve a balanced transportation system that includes automobile, bicycle, rail, transit, air, pedestrian and pipeline facilities.

This chapter addresses issues and ideas related to circulation and the interaction between transportation and land use. Bike lanes, sidewalks, trail connections, future transit

expansions, transportation demand management, and transportation system management will be considered for all new and enhanced transportation systems. Each new development must consider the impact of the development upon these systems and provide incremental mitigation for impacts as deemed warranted through the review process. The arrangement of land uses and desired development patterns should focus on supporting and increasing alternate modes of transportation, especially as complete neighborhoods are developed (neighborhoods containing a mix of residential and employment lands, with public services such as schools and parks) and more services become available in the community. The goal is to move the city toward alternate mode use as an alternative for those who do not wish to drive a car and as an alternative to excessive vehicle miles traveled as a way to deter sprawl.

III. Issues

As described above, the issues explored in this chapter are not intended to serve as a TSP as required by the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) – OAR 660-012. Rather, the issues addressed in the Comprehensive Plan provide a snapshot of existing conditions and generally identify future needs, with goals and policies aimed at directing transportation planning activities to bring the 20-year needs to fruition. . Until the TSP is complete, the following discussion is limited to the area with the historic Unincorporated Urban Area (UUA). These areas have been previously planned for urban transportation services as part of the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan.

The areas outside of the UUA were not part of previous urban-level transportation planning, and so will retain existing County land use designations until the La Pine TSP is adopted and incorporated into this Comprehensive Plan. Once the TSP is adopted and incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, the areas outside of the historic UUA will be designated with urban levels of use and will governed by the City’s Plans.

Existing Road System:

Until the recent incorporation of La Pine, Deschutes County was responsible for road maintenance, construction and design within what is now the urban area. Many of the primary roads within the community extend beyond the City limits and become rural county roads still under the jurisdiction of Deschutes County. Thus, the County Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan all address the road network in La Pine and have designated streets by general classification to include: Highway/Principal Arterial, Arterial, Collector and Local Street. The street classifications are described in the following chart (as listed in the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan).

| Urban Street Types | |
|---------------------|---|
| Principal Arterial: | Serves the major activity centers in a metropolitan area, and also serves the highest traffic corridors and satisfies the longest trip desires; and |
| | Carries the major portion of trips entering and leaving the urban area, as well as the majority of the through traffic desiring to bypass the city |
| Arterial: | Provides service to trips of moderate length at a somewhat lower level of travel mobility than principal arterials; and |
| | Distributes travel to geographic areas smaller than those served by principal arterials, while not penetrating specific neighborhoods; and |
| | Spacing varies from 1/2 to 1 mile in downtown areas, to 2 to 3 miles in areas outside downtown. |

| | |
|------------|---|
| Collector: | Provides both land access and traffic circulation within residential neighborhoods, commercial, and industrial areas; and |
| | Distributes trips from arterials through these areas to their final destination, and conversely, collects traffic from local streets and channels it onto arterials |
| Local: | Provides access to adjacent land and access to higher classified roads; and |
| | Provides lowest level of travel mobility including no bus routes; and |
| | Normally carries less than 1,700 vehicles per day. |

The foundation of the La Pine transportation system is a product of the existing roads and highways that cross the community. The basic grid is framed by the following primary roadways (with the street designation listed) which provide access among various parts of the community:

East-West Alignments

- Cagle Road - Local
- Burgess Road - Arterial
- Rosland Road - Local
- 1st Street/Reed Road - Collector
- 3rd Street - Local
- 4th Street/William Foss Road – Local
- Finley Butte Road - Collector
- 6th Street - Local

North-South Alignments

- US Highway 97 (The Dalles-California Highway) – Highway/Principal Arterial
- Huntington Road - Collector
- Mitts Way - Local

Although not all the streets listed above are Arterial or Collector streets, all of these streets provide the basic alignments and connectivity throughout the community. Other local roads aid in forming the internal grid serving the existing neighborhoods and outer areas. Overall, the historic development pattern for neighborhoods in La Pine is comprised of gridded streets. The relatively level topography presents the opportunity for a continuation of this pattern, building from the primary streets listed above. However, as is evident from the list of primary streets included above, additional north/south running streets, including arterials and collectors will be needed in the future. Currently, only Highway 97 and Huntington Road provide the sole north/south access from one end of town to the other.

The primary streets listed above are paved, some with sidewalks (in the area around Huntington Road and 1st Street), but few with curbs and drainage facilities. There are no delineated bike lanes. In most areas, pedestrians and bicyclists share the roadway or shoulder with automobiles.

U.S. Highway 97 bisects the City from north to south and, while serving as a direct transportation link between northern and southern portions of the City, it also creates an obstacle to east-west travel by any mode. Currently, intersections of Highway 97 at Burgess Road (Wickiup Junction); 1st Street/Reed Road; 4th Street/William Foss Road; and Finley Butte Road are all heavily congested and experience failure during certain segments of the day. Improvements to these intersections to increase capacity, improve safety and allow east-west crossing are necessary in the near future. Because Highway 97 is under the jurisdiction of ODOT, all improvements must be coordinated with that agency. Potential improvements and solutions to existing problems are discussed in the “Road Improvements” section below.

Many of the existing streets in the residential neighborhoods (Local Streets) in the northern part of La Pine have unimproved (not paved) streets. Such streets are graded gravel and/or compacted dirt – there are no curbs, sidewalks or drainage facilities. Maintenance of these streets, such as filling potholes and dust control measures, have been lacking in the past as Deschutes County does not typically maintain streets built to these standards and the City of La Pine has had limited funds for such maintenance. Such streets are not conducive to effective pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Road Improvements:

Public health and safety, as well as efficiency, are the primary design goals of all transportation elements. As street design standards are developed in the TSP, requirements for bicycle lanes, drainage facilities and pedestrian facilities must be included, especially along Arterial and Collector Streets. Such designs will improve street capacity and encourage use of alternate modes by all citizens.

As discussed above, the primary vehicular transportation problems in La Pine are associated with Highway 97. Over the past few years ODOT has been working with the community on developing plans for an improved interchange at the Highway 97/Burgess Road intersection (Wickiup Junction). Such improvements will alleviate safety and access issues in that immediate area. This study will examine all of the primary intersections with Highway 97 and suggest necessary improvements, including the timing for such improvements. All of this is in an effort to correct problems of failure at intersections such as 1st Street/Reed Road, and allow better east/west travel and connectivity between residential and employment areas.

Maintenance:

A primary concern for many of La Pines residents is street maintenance – particularly maintenance of unimproved/unpaved streets. During the wet winter months these streets can become pot-holed and muddy – which leads to hazardous travel conditions. During the dry summer months, dust generated from vehicular travel can impact the livability of neighboring properties. The City plans to institute a regular street maintenance program that will eventually result in more permanent surfaces (such as a chip sealed or oil mat surface, with asphalt paving as a long term goal).

Alternative Modes of Transportation:

Bicycles:

A lack of developed routes combined with long block lengths inhibit safe and efficient bicycle travel in La Pine.. There are currently no designated bicycle lanes along the Arterial or Collector streets in La Pine. Bicyclists must share the vehicular travel lands with automobiles. New development standards which require bicycle lanes along the curb of Arterial Streets and certain collector streets that provide access to public services and facilities will be developed as part of the TSP.

Pedestrians:

Sidewalks have been developed in and around the intersection of 1st Street and Huntington Road. These facilities provide a separate pedestrian refuge and allow safe access to the businesses, schools and public facilities in that immediate area. However, due to the lack of extension of sidewalks or trails in other parts of the community, safe and efficient access between residential areas and other employment areas is difficult. The lack of pedestrian crossings along major streets, particularly near schools, and activity centers, present hazards to citizens. New development standards which require sidewalks along streets and trails where appropriate will be developed as part of the TSP.

Transit:

A public transit (bus) system provides service in and around the urban area. Residents can be picked up at designated locations and transported within the urban area. This same service is also a regional bus service operated by the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council. Transit provides an alternative to driving for residents of LaPine that travel north for work and shopping in Bend and beyond. Additionally, there is a park and ride lot at Wickiup Junction from which the transit service is available.

Long Range Transportation Planning:

A requirement of the State Planning System is the development of a Transportation System Plan (TSP). The TSP will be based upon the needs of the community and the requirements to meet the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. Elements of the TSP include: developing functional classifications of roads; road and street design standards; establishing levels of service; developing alternative modes; transportation demand management, capital facilities planning; and, funding for improvements.

Air and Rail:

There are currently no air travel facilities in La Pine. The closest private airstrip is located in the community of Sunriver, approximately 15 miles to the north. The closest commercial airport is Roberts Field in Redmond, approximately 50 miles to the north. The idea of a local airport providing service to small, privately owned aircraft has been discussed by community members, but formal plans have not been developed. It has been acknowledged that an airstrip in La Pine would increase accessibility to the area and could make the community more attractive for businesses and recreationists. However, locating such a facility within the City limits would interfere with other public facility needs.

A Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail line runs on the east side of and parallel to Highway 97 through most of the community. However, there are no stops or passenger service provided directly to/from La Pine. The closest passenger rail stop is in the community of Chemult, approximately 30 miles to the south.

Pipelines:

A primary natural gas pipeline that runs from Washington to California, which provides gas service to many areas all along the west coast, runs north/south through La Pine, east of and parallel to Highway 97. The pipeline lies within an easement that is generally 100 to 200 feet wide so as to prevent damage a major disruption. There are no plans for removal or alteration of this pipeline.

Transportation Facility Funding:

Local community leaders and citizens expect that new growth will pay its way, without the need for existing residents to subsidize new development projects. The Transportation Planning Rule requires that cities plan for the impacts of new development on the transportation system. The goal is to make sure that needed transportation facilities are either in place, funded, or other acceptable mitigation provided before development is authorized to proceed.

The adoption and imposition of System Development Charges (SDC's) is one option that will be explored in the TSP to help pay for needed transportation infrastructure to add capacity to the system. The increasing operational and material costs for facility improvements, limited construction time periods, and the conflicting demands of regional versus local traffic (on Highway 97) will make La Pine more heavily reliant on developers to solve problems that are directly tied to new growth.

The City's budget is not adequate to resolve existing transportation project needs. Other sources of money will be required in order to build the system as necessary to support existing development as well as future growth. Existing problems create complex funding issues since the State of Oregon mandates certain limitations on the expenditure of. Thus, the community will have to rely on special levies, limited general fund revenues, the State's funding for highway maintenance and other revenue sources for improvements to address existing transportation needs.

Wickiup Junction Improvement Area

The area identified on the Comprehensive Plan map as the Wickiup Junction Improvement Area is in a state of transition as major improvements to this existing Highway/Arterial intersection are planned. The potential improvements include a complete grade separated interchange aimed at improving the overall long-term function and safety of the junction. The surrounding land uses include a variety of primarily service commercial uses, with residential uses close by. Because of the incomplete designs for the eventual improvements, and the unknown effects on surrounding properties (meaning just which properties will be physically affected by the road alignment, as well as by the changes to the traffic pattern), the area is identified as an area in which future land use designation may change. Once the final alignment is known, the

City will conduct a re-examination of the highest and best land uses within the designated area, including possible master planning.

Specific Wickiup Junction Improvement Area Policies

1. Upon final design and adoption of the Highway 97/Burgess Road interchange design within the area labeled Wickiup Junction Improvement Area on the Comprehensive Plan Map, to the City will review and revise the existing Plan designations and zoning in the area to reflect the highest and best land uses (designations) on the properties within the boundary.
2. Planning efforts within the Wickiup Junction Improvement Area shall coordinate access to surrounding properties with local, state and county transportation facilities as appropriate, and may include a master planning process.

IV. General Transportation Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Create a safe, convenient, balanced, functional and economical transportation system to maximize and extend the life of transportation facilities and improve livability throughout the La Pine community.

Policies

General Street Transportation Network Policies

- The City recognizes that motor vehicle use is currently the primary form of transportation for the majority of La Pines citizens, but also recognizes that increased alternate mode use is essential to the livability of the community and to preserve valuable resources.
- The City's top transportation priority is the safe and efficient provision of emergency services.. .
- The City shall support efficient and effective freight transportation consistent with the City's economic plans and policies.
- The City recognizes that a functional Highway 97 is essential to the regional as well as the local economy, and will balance the needs of the local community with regional transportation needs in cooperation with residents, local business interests, state agencies, Deschutes County, and special interest groups.

The City will continue coordination with Deschutes County for transportation planning services until the TSP is developed and planning services are provided by the City.

- Alternate mode use is essential for providing a full complement of transportation choices and that land use regulations need to require an analysis of transportation impacts, needs, and mitigation options.
- The City recognizes that the proper function of Highway 97 to and through the community contributes to the local economy and therefore will collaborate with ODOT to protect that function.
- The City will balancing the needs of the local community, including the state, county, local business interests, special interest groups, and tourism professionals, with regional transportation needs in its decisions..
- The City will continue to participate in discussions with regional partners (Cities and Counties) through organizations such as COACT and COCO to find solutions to regional transportation issues.
- The City shall continue efforts to complete the Highway 97 Corridor Study through La Pine to determine future improvements at key intersections to facilitate acceptable intersection function, safe and efficient highway crossings, and increased access to the industrial area on the east side.
- The City will implement traffic calming measures in core commercial areas and residential neighborhoods as necessary to reduce vehicular speeds on roadways and create a safer travel environment.
- The City will continuously monitor transportation problems through comprehensive planning and regular analysis
- The City recognizes that the community benefits from transportation systems that provide sidewalks, trails, bike lanes and transit amenities to encourage alternate mode use and promote a high level of livability.
- Recognizing that the City has limited funds to use for the maintenance of public streets, the City will continue to pursue innovative methods for financing increased street maintenance, including resurfacing as necessary of unpaved streets.
- The City recognizes that the ability development of private streets systems, where appropriate and where they are guaranteed to be maintained by parties other than the City, will reduce the overall funding need for street maintenance and the need to seek additional tax revenues from citizens. The City recognizes private streets as legitimate components of the transportation system when designed properly and maintained to at least City standards.

- The City will utilize transportation demand management (TDM) and transportation system management (TSM) techniques as a method of reducing the impacts of new projects on the transportation system.
- The City will include street trees, pedestrian facilities, separated sidewalks; curb extensions, traffic calming, and other related design elements where appropriate.
- The City of La Pine believes that a City representative shall participate with the Transportation Advisory Group for the specific purpose of analyzing the need for an airport in the La Pine Area. The representative shall be appointed by the City Council and will have specific knowledge of airport needs and operations.
- When the final designs and plans for the Wickiup Junction interchange (Highway 97 and Burgess Road intersection) have been completed, designations for lands within the area labeled Wickiup Junction Improvement Area on the Plan map may be revised by the City..

Transit Policies

The City shall:

- Encourage private efforts to supply forms of inter and intra city transit to the commuter.
- Cooperate with COIC and Commute Options to increase opportunities for access to transit, park and ride lots and ride share.
- In cooperation with COIC, the City will provide adequate facilities to allow for safe operation of mass transportation vehicles.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Policies

The City shall:

- Require bike lanes and sidewalks as a part of all new collectors and arterials.
- .
- Require that all proposed subdivisions include bicycle and pedestrian facilities, integrated with other bicycle and pedestrian path systems within the City.
- Insure that bicycle and pedestrian paths are well lit and designed for the security of the user..

- Require all proposed activity centers to provide safe and convenient off-street bicycle parking space and routes in their design.
- Insure neighborhoods and activity centers, including public loading and pickup areas, are served by pedestrian and bicycle routes.
- Require paving of pedestrian and bicycle ways where appropriate.
- Require MUTCD signs, markings, and safety features on bicycle and pedestrian paths.
- The City recognizes that an airport (privately owned or public) would be a strong economic driver for the la Pine area. Efforts to explore the creation of an airport shall be supported by the City, but shall not be the obligation of the City.

Goal # 2: Develop a supportable and sustainable financing method for funding necessary transportation system master plan improvements over the life of the Plan

Policies:

Funding Policies

- The City will develop a prudent and realistic financing plan, including a funding analysis of the recommended transportation projects and their funding needs, funding resources, and a multiple-year financing plan that can support the development of needed TSP facilities for the life of the plan.

The City will continue to seek alternate funding sources to enable the community to receive grants, implement a CIP, and maintain existing infrastructure. Alternative funding sources may include levies, increased taxes, local improvement districts, grants, franchise fees, tax increment financing, bonds, and other typical and atypical sources necessary for the full implementation of the TSP and maintenance functions.

V. Programs

The City shall:

1. Develop and adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP), which inventories and analyzes the existing transportation system, and recommends capital improvements to the entire transportation system as required by Oregon Administrative Rules. The City shall recognize that uses on lands that were not part of the former UUC before incorporation cannot be intensified until the City adopts a TSP. These lands must retain their current County zoning until the TSP

is adopted. Once the TSP is adopted the City may rezone lands that have County zoning designations to urban designations.

2. Develop Transportation System Development Charges (SDC's) to provide funding for capital improvements projects to add capacity to the transportation system.
3. Inventory and prioritize needed alternate mode improvements and project timing of implementation.
4. Inventory and prioritize funding alternatives (other than SDC's) necessary to implement the needed capital improvements.
5. Work with Deschutes County and ODOT to monitor the transportation system for effectiveness and describe any needed improvements for the upcoming fiscal year to the City Council every 12 months, prior to the budgeting process.
6. Coordinate discussions with local and state agencies, Deschutes County, local business interests, special interest groups, and tourism professionals about the performance of the transportation system and collect feedback for use in TSP development, capital improvement prioritization and budgeting programs.
7. Coordinate all transportation projects with emergency service and special district providers, such as, Fire, Sheriff, Water and Sewer Districts.
8. Establish a SDC methodology that generates fees and refund programs for individuals and entities that construct a TSP master planned transportation improvement
9. Add a financing element to the TSP and develop a listing of priorities for the anticipated transportation improvement projects for the transportation systems. The financing element shall highlight these improvement projects by giving project descriptions, anticipated year of project initiation, and associated costs and funding sources..
10. Develop mitigation strategies aimed at resolving the impact of new development impacts upon the transportation system. This should include the application of SDC's and/or other techniques to make sure development "pays its own way." Incremental mitigation strategies that include a pro rata share of needed improvements are a preferred method to ensure fairness.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 9 Economy

I. State Planning Goal 9, Economic Development

Oregon State Planning Goal 9 requires local jurisdictions to plan for and provide adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare and prosperity of its citizens. In doing so, an analysis of the local economy must be generated. The analysis is based on the current economic conditions and trends of the community, combined with the physical capabilities of the community to support a variety of businesses and industries. The analysis provides a snapshot of the current state of the local economy and a prediction of what is needed and can be supported in the future. The overall intent is to ensure that there are adequate lands and infrastructure for new business and industry, as well as identifying any obstacles. The end result is an economic planning tool that aids the local governing body in creating incentives and opportunities for businesses to thrive, and to enable the private sector plan for economic and efficient growth.

II. Purpose and Intent

La Pine’s focus on economic development is a key component of its vision to be a “complete” community. As previously discussed in other Plan chapters, the concept of creating a complete community begins with providing enough jobs, education, services, and industry to sustain the community without heavy reliance upon other nearby cities such as Bend and Redmond.

Goal 9 of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines pertains to economic development. This goal calls for diversification and improvement of the economy. It requires La Pine to inventory its supply of commercial and industrial lands, project future needs for such lands, and plan and zone enough land to meet those needs. La Pine is required, by law, to provide at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial land and commensurate infrastructure. The goal also requires that comprehensive plans shall “include an analysis of the community’s economic patterns, potentialities, strengths, and deficiencies as they relate to state and national trends.”



Aerial view of the Highway 97 La Pine commercial corridor

III. Issues

Inventory Snapshot - Overall assessments of the current inventories suggest that while La Pine has vacant industrial lands in 2010 there is a need to plan for additional expansion to the industrial area. Likewise, with the emphasis on creating “complete neighborhoods” it is necessary to define additional commercial service centers that can serve the three primary neighborhoods that define the La Pine community. It is generally understood that when the supply of economic lands are constrained, land prices unnecessarily increase and this could reduce La Pine’s chances at attracting business. Thus, a healthy supply of industrial, commercial, and mixed-use lands is necessary for to meet employment demand over the 20-year planning period. The city’s own studies and other agency data show that most of the 20 year supply of land can be derived from lands *within* the current City limits by conversion of Farm lands and mixed-use development techniques.

La Pine Stats at a Glance

| La Pine, Oregon | |
|--|--|
| Elevation: | 4300' |
| Population (July 2009) | 1,662 |
| Median Resident Age | 44.7 |
| Estimated Median Hh Income (2007) | \$21,000 |
| Median single family home price (YTD thru Dec 2008) | \$120,000 |
| Average household size | 2.57 |
| Property Tax Rate 2007/2008 | \$13,8339 per \$1000 assessed value (for the industrial park) |
| Assessed Value 2008 | \$126,232,993 |
| Telecommunications Infrastructure | BendBroadband, Qwest, Crestview Cable, Chambers Cable |
| Major Employers | Rays Grocery Stores, MidState Electric Coop, Utilities, Sunriver Resort, Governmental Agencies |
| Top 5 Deschutes County Taxpayers in 2008-09 (in order) | Cascade Natural Gas Corp., Qwest Corp., Gas Transmission Northwest Corp., PacifiCorp (PP&L), Pronghorn Investors LLC |

In conformance with Goal 9, the City conducted and updated a Buildable Lands Analysis² in order to evaluate land availability and market trends. Other studies/data were also used to determine land supply and long-term land needs. These, along with the updated buildable lands inventory, provide good data sets from which to derive assumptions about economic land needs. Local and regional experts have also supplied the city with information about other economic factors that affect La Pine. The findings derived from the Buildable Lands Analysis and other studies were used to address the key factors of Goal 9 identified above. The bulk of these data sets are located in the appendix.

The City and private groups should continue their efforts to implement programs to help new businesses locate easily in La Pine.

Understanding the City’s economic assets will also be a key task in analyzing the existing and future economy. Land use planning, permitting processes, infrastructure development and related efforts of the City will influence future business development. Coordination with local business groups such as LIGI³, the Chamber of Commerce, ODOT, Economic development For Central Oregon, and the La Pine Sewer and Water Districts will be essential to identifying what type of development enhancement and infrastructure is necessary to support desired industries.

²

The analysis has been updated as needed to reflect actual land absorption, City Council policy, and other relevant inventory monitoring factors.

³ The La Pine Industrial Park is 327-acres owned by Deschutes County, Oregon, developed and managed by the non-profit La Pine Industrial Group, Inc. (LIGI)

IV. La Pine's Key Economic Features

Top reasons why La Pine is desirable for economic development

Access, Location, Supply, and Leadership

The City of La Pine is a small community 35 minutes south of Bend, along the Highway 97 corridor, a vital link to the Willamette Valley and other metropolitan areas. The location of the community and proximity/distance from other urban areas will continue to be somewhat of an obstacle for new businesses and industries that rely on speedy shipping and proximity to support services in Bend, Redmond, Portland-Metro and the I-5 Corridor. However, the charm of the area, quality of life, progressive industrial and commercial development strategies, supportive business and government leadership along with **a ready supply of available land and labor at lower costs**, will continue to be the key elements that can help overcome the business advantages that larger urban areas provide.

Labor Force

La Pine offers a pleasing alternative for people and businesses looking to locate in places other than Bend, Sunriver, and Redmond. With many ready-to-go commercial and development sites available at prices that are very competitive, La Pine also provides a variety of home site options, typically with larger acreages on flat, wooded areas. A majority of new residential building permits in unincorporated Deschutes County have been issued in the La Pine area. Estimates for the greater La Pine area (south of Sunriver and north of the Klamath County line) are between 15,000 and 16,000 residents – making it potentially the second largest population “center” in the Central Oregon region. The population estimate for zip code 97739 in 2007 was 9,421 residents. Portland State University's Population Research Center estimated in July 2008 that the incorporated town of La Pine had 1,610 residents. Thus, there is a large labor pool within the community of La Pine. Companies in the La Pine area draw from the labor force of Deschutes County and northern Klamath County, which includes more than 60,000 workers. Work force training is available locally in most occupation specialties. Local economic development efforts are available to assist firms in obtaining qualified workers through contacts with labor training agencies.

Taxes and Rates

Oregon does not have a sales tax. The Worker's Compensation rate is below the national average. The state income tax ranges from 5-9%, depending on the level of taxable income. La Pine enjoys the lowest property tax rates in Central Oregon and the lowest electric power rates.

Regional Incentives

Several incentive programs are available from state and local governments, as well as federal loan and grant programs for qualified companies. The La Pine Industrial Park is

327-acres owned by Deschutes County, Oregon, developed and managed by the non-profit La Pine Industrial Group, Inc. (LIGI). The 1st phase of 130 acres was sold out in 2001.

Natural Gas

Cascade Natural Gas Company supplies the La Pine Industrial Park. The main transmission line of Pacific Gas Transmission Pipeline Company runs along the eastern boundary of the industrial park, carrying natural gas from production fields in Alberta, Canada, to California.

Water

The La Pine Industrial Park is fully serviced by water provided by the La Pine Water District. The District's wells are located in the foothills of the Paulina Mountains and produce high quality water at pressures to meet fire codes.

Wastewater

The La Pine Sewer District services the industrial park. Its primary treatment and distribution facility is located just north of Reed Road, the northern boundary of the industrial park.

Telecommunications

Qwest provides telephone services to the industrial park. Fiber optic lines and digital switching assure modern, high-speed data transmission capabilities as well as voice communications. There are several Internet service providers with local access connections.

Air Service

La Pine is 45 miles south of the Redmond Airport, an all-weather facility with control tower and multiple instrument approaches. Horizon Air and United Express offer non-stop service between Redmond and Portland, Seattle, and San Francisco. Sunriver Airport, 15 miles north of La Pine, has a 5,500-ft. runway with an instrument approach, accommodating private aircraft up to medium-sized corporate jets. Citizens and City Council have discussed the need for a local airport. Early studies reviewed placement of a facility within the City limits. However, through the public process that occurred during the formation of the Comprehensive Plan it was determined that a local airport should be outside of the City limits. Issues that lead to this decision included potential conflict with the wastewater treatment plant, wildlife conflicts, and urban expansion needs over the 20 year planning horizon. The City Council agreed that a citizen committee should be developed to further research the issue on alternate airport locations.

Railroad

A main north/south line of the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe Railroad runs through the La Pine Industrial Park, with service to individual sites and common loading facilities.

Recent Development – *an excerpt from EDCO – Economic Development for Central Oregon*

Fitting with its pioneering spirit, La Pine and its surrounding area has become a hub of activity for the renewable energy industry. The city boasts the first gold LEED certified building east of the Cascade Mountains, Midstate Electric Cooperative, and with the completion of Little Deschutes Lodge Retirement Center, will have the first platinum LEED building – the highest certification available. Recent interest and implementation of renewable energy projects including geothermal, biomass and solar have made La Pine the potential hub for renewable energy technology.

The commercial area of La Pine has several sizeable developments underway or recently completed including a new multi-million dollar senior/assisted living facility, elementary school, and several new commercial/retail businesses. Community leaders in the La Pine area have also been working diligently on development of municipal services including a community water and sewer system. As a result, the area's new industrial park and surrounding areas have water provided by a new well, distribution system and 250,000 gallon storage reservoir managed by La Pine Water District. Sewer services are also available, provided by the La Pine Sewer District.

These efforts have been well timed with the development of the area's business "drawing card," the [La Pine Industrial Park](#). This newer, fully serviced park offers flat and "rock-less" buildable lots from ¼ acre to 40 + acres. The park also has the advantage of easy access to both the Burlington Northern – Santa Fe Railroad mainline as well as U.S. Hwy 97, which connects with I-5 to the south in California, I-84 in northern Oregon, and I-90 in central Washington.

Currently available are several 0.43-acre lots in the Newberry Business Park on Reed Road, and 17 lots ranging from 1 - 3 acres in the Finley Butte Industrial Park south of the new Midstate Electric Coop headquarters. There is also a 78-acre parcel certified by the State of Oregon as "shovel ready" that is being reserved for a large rail user.

LIGI – La Pine Industrial Group, Inc. - can provide a range of site options including fully-serviced ready-to-build lots, build-to-suit facilities for purchase or lease, and multi-tenant space for lease. Financing can also be arranged for qualified companies.

Key Industrial Areas –The vision of LIGI

Led by community-based LIGI – the La Pine Industrial Group, Inc., efforts to develop three county-owned parcels east of the highway into industrial and business park sites are opening eyes in the Central Oregon business community. As development spreads from rapidly growing Bend outward, newly incorporated La Pine is high on the list of communities ripe for investment and development opportunities. Water and sewer districts have brought municipal services to the community core. In 2008, the City of La Pine was designated as an enterprise zone by the State of Oregon. This allows qualified companies to forego paying property taxes for 3 to 5 years. La Pine is located on US Hwy 97, the primary route between California and the Canadian border on the east side of the Cascades. Hwy 97 has been designated as an Expressway by the Oregon Department of Transportation and will be upgraded to four lanes between California and Washington. It connects with I-5 in northern California, I-84 in northern Oregon, and I-90 in central Washington. Three major highway routes link La Pine with Eugene, Salem, Portland, and other Willamette Valley cities. Electricity is provided by Midstate Electric Cooperative headquartered in La Pine. Midstate is a preferred customer of the Bonneville Power Administration, giving it first right to low cost, federally owned hydro-electric resources and a significant cost advantage to new firms locating in its service area.

The La Pine Industrial Park

The La Pine Industrial Park consists of three segments: The Newberry Business Park, Finley Butte Industrial Park and an 80-acre, shovel-ready, certified site. Development of the 327-acre La Pine Industrial Park is a cooperative effort undertaken by the land-owner Deschutes County and the La Pine Industrial Group, Inc. a non-profit organization. LIGI can provide a range of site options including fully-serviced ready-to-build lots, build-to-suit facilities for purchase or lease, and multi-tenant space for lease. Financing can also be arranged for qualified companies.

Newberry Business Park

Newberry Business Park is owned by Deschutes County and is developed and marketed by the La Pine Industrial Group, Inc., a 501(c)(3) non-profit civic organization in La Pine. Newberry Business Park opened in 2002 with 40 acres of developed sites. All utilities are installed underground. NBP is designed to provide an attractive environment for light industrial firms and protection of property values. It has its own zoning ordinance and CC&R's. Lot sizes range from 0.4 acres (18,760 sq. ft.) to 0.6 acres (25,000 sq. ft.). Lots can be combined for larger requirements. Generous building standards allow maximum site coverage. The La Pine Industrial Group also provides assistance to arrange build-to-suit construction and financing for qualified companies. Newberry Business Park has been designed with higher development standards than the older areas of the industrial park. It is intended to provide an attractive and functional environment for smaller companies that provide services and supplies to other industries, commercial businesses, and the public. LIGI's objective in developing Newberry Business Park is to generate family-wage job opportunities for workers in La Pine and the surrounding area. Minimum employment standards will be imposed, making these lots unsuitable for uses that provide minimal or no employment such as self-storage units. Remaining lots range from 9,000 square feet to 25,200 square feet. Lots can be combined for larger requirements. Streets, curbs, and underground utilities are included. Current pricing is at \$2.50 per square foot with higher premium for corner lots.

The 80-acre Rail Site

This key parcel is located on the east side of La Pine abutting the main line of BNSF Railroad and approved for rail siding or drill track to interior of site. The parcel is certified as "shovel ready"⁴ by the State of Oregon and is available for a single rail user or can be subdivided. The current pricing is at \$1.50 per square foot depending on level of employment.

⁴ Governor Kulongoski unveiled the 11 shovel-ready sites in May following months of searching statewide for available industrial land. The parcels - located in Portland, Hillsboro, The Dalles, Hermiston, Pendleton, Springfield, Eugene and Central Point - are guaranteed developable in six months or less. To make the list, each site was evaluated to make sure there is a willing owner, adequate access to major roadways, onsite utilities such as water and electricity, and no environmental issues like wetlands or contamination. The site was recently re-certified under authority of ORS 284.565 and 285B.283 until September of 2009.

Finley Butte Industrial Park

Finley Butte Industrial Park is 90 acres subdivided into one-acre to three-acre lots⁵. Larger lots are available by combining the sites shown on this map. Rail access is planned using two easements to common loading docks. Lots are available and include water, sewer, and underground electric power, natural gas, telephone, DSL and other broadband communications. Initial prices have been set at \$108,900 per acre or about \$2.50 per square foot.

La Pine's Commercial Areas

Like many cities that historically grew up around a key transportation corridor, the City of La Pine contains established strip development along Highway 97. This commercial area is a product of direct access to Hwy 97 and currently serves as a central feature in the community serving both tourists and local citizens. However, direct access to the highway will eventually be limited as traffic counts increase over time. The predicted increase in traffic, a boon to business, also creates increased traffic conflicts and reduced mobility for through traffic. ODOT will require corridor management techniques to improve transportation mobility on its system and this will require the use of frontage roads and other alternatives to limit direct access. La Pine has been progressive in realizing this issue and has encouraged commercial center development in other areas of the community to reduce sole reliance on highway commercial areas. Additional planning techniques can be used to improve other service commercial opportunities that help to create complete neighborhoods, improve efficiency, reduce energy consumption, and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

The negative effects of such strip development include:

- poor access control, conflict with ODOT, and undesirable access for commercial developments;
- shallow lot depth limiting future business or center-type development;
- poor sign control and limited aesthetic options;
- longer vehicle trips to reach needed shopping services; and, reduced opportunities for buffering between land uses.

Strip commercial areas on the edges of the community force shoppers to travel by cars along the primary access ways. Pedestrian and alternate mode opportunities are lost when commercial zones are located great distances from population centers and neighborhoods. In addition, sole reliance upon vehicle travel to reach strip shopping areas can lead to unnecessary vehicle travel and expensive widening improvements along major roads. The synergy of commercial activities is lessened when commercial uses are not located in centers or downtown. Mixed-use zoning and rezoning of certain parcels to provide enough land in sizes necessary to accommodate commercial centers, rather than a

⁵ A 20-acre parcel was sold to Midstate Electric Cooperative and is now the home of their new headquarters and operations center.

continuation of additional shallow-depth strip commercial, will be necessary to provide a better balance of commercial development and reduce unnecessary vehicle trips.

Various data sets and research studies show that La Pine needs a broader range of commercial mixed-use services within the community. This is where the maximum effort should be expended to improve the retail and service business climate. The highway strip area could benefit from the addition of commercially zoned lands as necessary to deepen lots and broaden redevelopment opportunities.

Assumptions and Trends

The City of La Pine can play an active role in helping to support the local economy by continuing to enhance LIGI, existing businesses, avoid creating obstacles, and provide incentives that help generate new activity. The local economy of La Pine is directly tied to land zoning and available supply, historical land uses, local and regional demographics, labor pool, suitable housing, public services and transportation facilities. Future City regulations will have a direct impact on the ability of existing business to expand and attraction of new business – they should carefully crafted and they should not create barriers to economic development.

Private and public economic development efforts should focus on strategies that increase opportunities for existing businesses to succeed and flourish. Likewise, efforts should also focus on expanding the possibilities for future workers and entrepreneurs by offering opportunities for local citizens to stay in the community and obtain nationally competitive jobs.

The national economy, society, and environment are key factors that will influence the local economic climate of La Pine. This chapter illustrates La Pine’s existing economic patterns and potential economic opportunities. The analysis begins with a review of the current economic state of economic development in La Pine and Deschutes County. It also is necessary to identify any local, State, and national obstacles to future enterprise. This type of analysis approach can strengthen the community’s position as a unique, established, and attractive place to work, live, shop, and recreate. In other words, become a “Complete Community.”

Mixed Use Commercial Residential District

The Comprehensive Plan map includes a Mixed Use Commercial Residential area in the southern part of the city, along a traditional hard-line, prescriptive boundary between standard Commercial and single-family Residential. Most of the land along on either side of this boundary is either undeveloped or under-developed. The Mixed Use Commercial Residential District is intended primarily as a smaller scale, service and office commercial district, with associated residential that may consist of upper level apartments. A live-work design concept within the mixed use district would serve as an appropriate buffer between the formal commercial and residential districts, which abut. Although, stand alone commercial and residential uses that are designed to be compatible with abutting uses would also be appropriate. It is desirable for the development within the mixed use district to be master planned, but that may not be possible in all properties

due to the small to medium size of the parcels. Some assemblage of properties will be necessary for proper master planning.

V. Critical Drivers of La Pine's Economy

Many factors drive an economy. Some are influenced by the global economy, others by federal and state policies, and still others by regional elements. Some factors are within the control of the community and others are not, yet they all interrelate. One of the first steps in developing sound economic development plans is to understand what drives the local economy. The factors identified as those most directly affecting La Pine's economy include:

Local Development Factors:

- Available infrastructure & transportation services
- Supportive business and government climate
- Livable community standards
- Reasonable tax structure
- Land availability and competitive cost factors – must be less than Bend or Redmond
- Affordable housing and a range of housing choices
- Access to post-secondary education system
- Access to retail, service and medical facilities
- Diverse labor force
- Access to financing and capital resources
- Transportation options
- Access to leisure activities and recreation

Existing Types of Businesses:

- Traditional manufacturing businesses: products, components, machines, farm and construction equipment, woods, metals, glass, stone, fertilizer and chemicals, and composite materials.
- Emerging businesses: knowledge based industries, energy, high tech, Internet, e-commerce, creative services, manufacturing and, mixed-use developments providing jobs and workforce housing to reduce employee commute time/highway congestion.
- Support businesses: Suppliers, retail, services and repair, personal, health, and business services. A variety of company sizes: from small to large - commensurate with growth trends.

It is essential that La Pine's community leaders examine how these drivers, whether they are strengths or weaknesses, affect economic development planning. Businesses, industry groups, the Chamber of Commerce, city staff, community development

representatives and others involved in the adoption of the Plan identified the following as *key issues* that will likely influence the future economy.

1. The ability to capture the growth in emerging industries such as manufacturing, high tech, software, bioscience, and e-commerce.
2. The ability to redevelop areas to meet density and employment goals while keeping a sense of place.
3. The need to consider small business and local services as part of the overall economic picture.
4. The ability to promote an image for La Pine that will support and retain existing businesses and attract new ones.
5. The ability to evaluate the link between La Pine's economy and that of the broader Central Oregon region.
6. How to identify, improve, and pay for the basic transportation and infrastructure needs necessary to facilitate business development.
7. How to develop and retain quality workforce housing.

Existing Economic Conditions: National, State, and Local Trends

The community will need to monitor and consider the importance of local and national trends and related economic activities as part of local growth management. For example, the *2000 Census*, *Claritas studies*, *Oregon Employment Department data sets*, *Economic Development for Central Oregon (EDCO)* and other local experts have provided data used to forecast certain features of the local economy. This data is utilized in the subsequent economic evaluation detailed below.

Labor Statistics and Trends:

The current unemployment rate is at 16% and is a result of a dramatic downswing in economy and construction industry. This rate and other factors are serious issues that affect La Pine and the local economy.

Car commuting in La Pine is higher than other places in Central Oregon. This is typical given the rural setting and distance from other employment areas in Bend and Redmond. This situation will not change until the local population can support more industry, service and retail choices in the La Pine community. Full scale transit is not anticipated in the short term due to cost and the need for sort headway times to meet employer demand. The primary means of transportation for the local workforce was private vehicles where 69.3% of the workers drove alone while commuting to their jobs. Interestingly, 13% of La Pine's commuters carpooled to places of employment and only 3.3% walked to work.

Availability of Products and Services:

Competition for products and services currently provided by Bend and Redmond will typically continue until there is an adequate demographic base in La Pine to support additional shopping, employment and service needs of the community. The large commute has certain disadvantages in that it tends to over-utilize existing road capacities at peak hours and this creates a high subsidy for City and State transportation projects,

etc. However, the ability for business owners to draw from a wide labor pool is an advantage and helps to broaden job choices for residents. As the community diversifies and moves further away from a farm and forest based economy the opportunities for more variety in employment *and* shopping choices is expected to increase. The Comprehensive Plan shows where new employment areas are to be located. The future zoning ordinances will regulate the details of development and other factors.

Employment Changes:

The Oregon Employment Department releases updated ten year employment forecasts every two years at the regional level. The most recent forecast (2004-2014) indicates an anticipated 17,520 job increase for Region 10. Historical industry growth was led by Transportation and Warehouse (11.6%), Financial Activities (9.1%), Retail Trade (8.8%), and Leisure and Hospitality (8.5%). Manufacturing was the only industry that had a net loss of jobs between October 2005 and 2006. The manufacturing industry lost 150 jobs for a decrease of 13.3%. This decrease is attributable to a decrease in wood product manufacturing.

Future employment gains are expected to be realized largely through service sector growth. Roughly, 50.3% of anticipated employment growth is projected to originate from Professional & Business Services, Education & Health Services, Leisure & Hospitality Services, and Other Services.

La Pine and Deschutes County lie within State of Oregon Assessment Region 10. The Region 10 data indicate that non-farm income is dramatically increasing. These regional reports show that manufacturing, lumber remanufacturing production and service sectors are expanding as population growth occurs.

Primary Industries and Employers:

The primary industries in Deschutes County and Central Oregon are listed in the table below.

| PRIMARY INDUSTRIES IN CENTRAL OREGON | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| County | Industry | Total Employment |
| Deschutes | Computer & Electronic Manufacturing | 362 |
| | Distribution & Warehousing | 862 |
| | Health & Social Assistance | 5,908 |
| | Professional, Scientific & Technical Services | 1,889 |
| | Recreational & Transportation Equipment | 1,110 |
| | Tourism | 7,652 |
| | Wood Product Manufacturing | 1,920 |

Local occupations are distributed among several areas and are consistent with the recently updated Census data. Management, professional, and related occupations cover about 21% of the employed individuals in La Pine; 26.7% in production, transportation, and material moving; while another 37% work in the sales, service and offices

occupations. Farming accounts for only 2.5% of city occupations and less than 1% of total revenue generated in Deschutes County.

Even with the current economic crisis, the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis fully expects regional and County-level population to resume continue a healthy growth pattern. Recent coordinated population projections show that La Pine reaches a population of 2,566 persons by 2029. This may not seem substantial, but it is critical to take into consideration that the outlying area of La Pine contains a large amount of developed and undeveloped lots. Growth in this area will affect La Pine. This factor must be combined with the growth needs within the UGB. Thus, it is essential to recognize that the employment and commercial service needs of the broader community will affect the urban community of La Pine. Efforts to address economic issues related to incorporated city *and* outlying areas will be essential to developing effective long range planning strategies. Over time, and as the population increases, the trend appears to be for more diversification in job choices trending away from construction and related activities. According to the Oregon Employment Department report, Employment Projections by Occupation⁶ the community can expect to see the greatest job growth in the following occupational areas:

- Health Care
- Professional and Technical, including education and government
- Service and Retail including hospitality services

The increase in health care jobs is much different from the current local situation and is primarily due to an expected increase in young families with children, and an older population made up of retirees and baby-boomers. As the older population and general population increase so does the need for more choices in medical services. Health care professionals are in current demand and this is expected to continue as the largest growth area. The City will need to provide the proper amount of developable and adequately zoned lands to accommodate the expected increase in healthcare businesses and medical services.

La Pine's small town charm and high level of livability will continue to attract young professionals and entrepreneurs. The retail and service markets will need to respond to this influx in order to meet demands of the growing population, particularly as housing choices increase. Likewise, the recreational nature of the La Pine area will continue demand for hospitality services. The City will need to provide the proper amount of developable and adequately zoned lands to accommodate the expected increase in professional, technical, service, education, retail, and hospitality professions.

Specific Employment and Industry Projections

The 'snapshot' of data tables below provide a more precise projection detail for a period of 10 years beginning in 2004. This data is derived from the 2000 Census and information prepared by the Oregon Employment Department (OED). This type of



projection is useful for analyzing the current land use ordinances to make sure the community can adapt to the projected needs. Generally, the current ordinances are adequate, although a few modifications are needed to better support desired outcomes.


**Oregon: Employment Forecast
By Broad Industry, 2006-2016**

| Broad Industry | 2006 | 2016 | Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Total nonfarm employment | 1,702,500 | 1,943,600 | 241,100 | 14% |
| Educational and health services | 205,200 | 262,700 | 57,500 | 28% |
| Professional and business services | 193,100 | 232,800 | 39,700 | 21% |
| Leisure and hospitality | 165,300 | 197,500 | 32,200 | 19% |
| Construction | 100,300 | 115,000 | 14,700 | 15% |
| Trade, transportation, and utilities | 336,200 | 379,800 | 43,600 | 13% |
| Other services | 59,000 | 66,500 | 7,500 | 13% |
| Financial activities | 105,800 | 117,900 | 12,100 | 11% |
| Information | 35,000 | 38,800 | 3,800 | 11% |
| Government | 286,500 | 314,200 | 27,700 | 10% |
| Manufacturing | 206,800 | 209,100 | 2,300 | 1% |
| Natural resources and mining | 9,200 | 9,300 | 100 | 1% |

Oregon Industry Employment: Forecasts by Region, 2006-2016

| Workforce Region | Counties | 2006 | 2016 | Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 10 | Crook, Deschutes, Jefferson | 82,780 | 103,670 | 20,890 | 25% |
| 9 | Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco, Wheeler | 20,860 | 25,130 | 4,270 | 20% |
| 8 | Jackson, Josephine | 108,880 | 126,080 | 17,200 | 16% |
| 15 | Clackamas | 144,200 | 165,300 | 21,100 | 15% |
| 5 | Lane | 153,400 | 176,100 | 22,700 | 15% |
| 3 | Marion, Polk, Yamhill | 179,800 | 205,600 | 25,800 | 14% |
| 2 | Multnomah, Washington | 692,700 | 792,200 | 99,500 | 14% |
| 1 | Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook | 36,140 | 40,900 | 4,760 | 13% |
| 13 | Baker, Union, Wallowa | 18,080 | 20,210 | 2,130 | 12% |
| 6 | Douglas | 39,840 | 44,530 | 4,690 | 12% |
| 14 | Grant, Harney, Malheur | 16,790 | 18,610 | 1,820 | 11% |
| 11 | Klamath, Lake | 26,790 | 29,650 | 2,860 | 11% |
| 4 | Benton, Lincoln, Linn | 98,480 | 108,500 | 10,020 | 10% |
| 7 | Coos, Curry | 30,620 | 33,610 | 2,990 | 10% |
| 12 | Morrow, Umatilla | 30,940 | 34,150 | 3,210 | 10% |









Region 10 Industries At A Glance ...



| Employment Projections by Industry, 2006-2016 | | | | |
|---|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Industry | 2006 | 2016 | Change | Percent Change |
| Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment | 82,780 | 103,670 | 20,890 | 25.2% |
| Natural Resources & Mining | 420 | 480 | 60 | 14.3% |
| Construction | 8,560 | 10,880 | 2,320 | 27.1% |
| Manufacturing | 9,080 | 9,440 | 360 | 4.0% |
| Trade, Transportation, & Utilities | 15,970 | 19,810 | 3,840 | 24.0% |
| Information | 1,720 | 2,100 | 380 | 22.1% |
| Financial Activities | 5,490 | 6,820 | 1,330 | 24.2% |
| Professional & Business Services | 7,840 | 10,310 | 2,470 | 31.5% |
| Educational & Health Services | 8,820 | 11,870 | 2,950 | 33.1% |
| Leisure & Hospitality | 10,510 | 14,320 | 3,810 | 36.3% |
| Other Services | 2,570 | 3,130 | 560 | 21.8% |
| Government | 11,720 | 14,530 | 2,810 | 24.0% |



For additional information, contact Steve Williams at:
Stephen.C.Williams@state.or.us or **(541) 388-6442**

WorkSource Oregon is an equal opportunity employer/program.
 WorkSource Oregon es un programa/empleador que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades.
 WorkSource Oregon Employment Department • www.QualityInfo.org • RS PUB 246 R 10 (0408)




Region 10 Occupations At A Glance ...





| 2006 Employment by Occupational Group | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Occupational Group | 2006 Employment | Percent of Total | Statewide % of Total |
| Total Payroll Employment | 83,611 | 100% | 100% |
| Management, Business, and Financial | 5,830 | 7.0% | 8.6% |
| Professional and Related | 9,929 | 11.9% | 15.2% |
| Health Care | 5,156 | 6.2% | 6.5% |
| Service | 14,436 | 17.3% | 15.2% |
| Sales and Related | 10,084 | 12.1% | 10.6% |
| Office and Administrative Support | 13,489 | 16.1% | 16.5% |
| Farming, Fishing, and Forestry | 775 | 0.9% | 2.0% |
| Construction and Extraction | 6,544 | 7.8% | 4.8% |
| Installation, Maintenance, and Repair | 3,267 | 3.9% | 3.9% |
| Production | 6,773 | 8.1% | 7.6% |
| Transportation and Material Moving | 6,445 | 7.7% | 7.6% |
| Nonclassifiable* | 883 | 1.1% | 1.5% |

* Leased, sheltered workshop, noncovered agricultural, and home care workers.



| Top Performing Occupations | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 2006 Employment | 2016 Employment | 2006-2016 Percent Change | 2006-2016 Growth Openings | 2006-2016 Total Openings* |
| Occupations With the Most Jobs | | | | | |
| Retail Salespersons | 3,452 | 4,510 | 30.6% | 1,058 | 2,505 |
| Combined Food Preparation & Serving Workers, Including Fast Food | 1,782 | 2,213 | 24.2% | 431 | 1,297 |
| Office Clerks, General | 1,780 | 2,230 | 25.3% | 450 | 894 |
| Waiters & Waitresses | 1,679 | 2,183 | 30.0% | 504 | 1,498 |
| Cashiers | 1,637 | 1,968 | 20.2% | 331 | 1,208 |
| Occupations Adding the Most Jobs, 2006-2016 | | | | | |
| Retail Salespersons | 3,452 | 4,510 | 30.6% | 1,058 | 2,505 |
| Waiters & Waitresses | 1,679 | 2,183 | 30.0% | 504 | 1,498 |
| Maids & Housekeeping Cleaners | 938 | 1,440 | 53.5% | 502 | 752 |
| Office Clerks, General | 1,780 | 2,230 | 25.3% | 450 | 894 |
| Customer Service Representatives | 1,602 | 2,044 | 27.6% | 442 | 713 |
| Occupations Growing the Fastest**, 2006-2016 | | | | | |
| Correctional Officers | 125 | 439 | 251.2% | 314 | 373 |
| Hotel, Motel, & Resort Desk Clerks | 250 | 421 | 68.4% | 171 | 322 |
| Amusement & Recreation Attendants | 259 | 409 | 57.9% | 150 | 246 |
| Entertainment Attendants & Related Workers, All Other | 44 | 69 | 56.8% | 25 | 42 |
| Lodging Managers | 55 | 85 | 54.5% | 30 | 42 |

*Total Openings include openings resulting from growth and from workers leaving the occupation. ** Limited to occupations with a minimum 2006 employment of more than 40.



For additional information, contact Steve Williams at:
Stephen.C.Williams@state.or.us or **(541) 388-6442**

WorkSource Oregon is an equal opportunity employer/program.
 WorkSource Oregon es un programa/empleador que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades.
 WorkSource Oregon Employment Department • www.QualityInfo.org • RS PUB 246 R10 (0408)



The State and National prediction data for commerce and industry growth do not show a large increase in the type of high employment, large manufacturing industrial development that La Pine and EDCO hope to attract to the community and region. However, the current economic incentives, limited land supply in other nearby communities, and the level of commitment shown by local leaders may dispel the predicted trend and lure additional large manufacturing, industrial, and technologically-based businesses to the community.

Alternatives to Access Difficulties – A Focus on Technology:

Difficulty in reaching convenient access to regional transportation corridors, like I-5, can be partially overcome by transitioning to a technology and knowledge-based economy. Jobs that rely upon the development of technology and the transfer of knowledge products do not necessarily rely upon trucking to access regional highway systems. Information and technology markets influence and support all types of industries from retail to wholesale to manufacturing and service firms. Such industry is changing the speed and efficiency of business operations, the skills of workers, and the expectations of consumers. As a result, business owners and employees in the technology industries do not need to solely rely on ground shipping to deliver products to customers. Linking economic development strategies to a technological based economy is a trend that will be critical to enhancing the local job market.

Local Efforts to Target Desired Industries

LIGI, City of La Pine, and Economic Development for Central Oregon (EDCO) have focused their efforts in attracting new business and industry by targeting specific types of development. These include:

General Industry Cluster Targets

- Energy development
- Distribution related services
- High Technology (includes software, hardware and biotechnology)
- Light Industrial and Manufacturing (Plastics, assembly, printing, misc.)
- Recreational Equipment Manufacturing
- Tourism related services
- Research and Development Firms
- Secondary Wood Products
- Headquarter Firms

All of the above targets are suitable uses in the La Pine community. The City will need to make sure that the upcoming industrial, commercial, and mixed-use zoning regulations can accommodate the future development industries identified above.

As mentioned above, the identified target industries do not necessarily match the forecasted local trends. However, this does not mean the desired industries are unsuitable for La Pine. On the contrary, the local desires, and State/National trends are **all** to be

considered when developing the assumptions used to support this economic opportunities analysis.

Existing Economic Conditions Conclusion

La Pine's local leaders encourage quality development and job creation. Retail, service, and health care industries will continue to grow and expand consistent with regional, State and National projections. Community leaders will continue to aggressively focus efforts on attracting large industrial development and reducing barriers to all economic development. It is anticipated that these efforts will bring forth industries that rely on a large number of employees and create additional family-wage jobs in the community. Community leaders have made it clear that large industrial development is needed in addition to the sectors identified in the predicted trend data. Likewise, there is a companion goal to reduce the daily commute for local residents by the creation of additional family wage jobs within the community.

According to Economic Development for Central Oregon -EDCO staff

"Central Oregon has steadily diversified its employment and economic base. For the past decade, Deschutes County has lead Oregon in high technology growth (over 270%). Numerous companies from the Silicon Valley, Portland-Vancouver Metro, and Puget Sound have relocated or expanded here - escaping skyrocketing costs, electricity shortages and tight labor markets. Many of these firms are small but extremely innovative, producing niche-market products from semiconductors to software, medical instruments to recreational equipment."

Competitive wages, relatively lower housing costs, and high quality of life features will continue to attract businesses and companies to the region. La Pine will need to supply adequate levels of skilled labor force, developable lands and increased housing choices to continue to be attractive to new business development and competitive with other nearby cities.

Overall, Central Oregon is a desirable place to locate businesses and, while the region is not on the I-5 corridor, there are certain advantages to the area given the labor rate comparisons, livability factors, and other positive demographic features.

VI. Land Inventory Analysis

Summary of Gross Acreages Including General Non-Developable

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Residential | = 1414.0 |
| Commercial/Mixed Use | = 168.40 |
| Traditional Commercial | = 260.30 |
| Industrial | = 508.5 |
| Public Facilities | = 1772.83 |
| General Non-Developable | = 349.97 |
| Total = 4474.00 acres | |

Summary of Net Vacant/Redevelopable Acreages

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| Residential | = 857.51 |
| Commercial/Mixed Use | = 67.95 |
| Traditional Commercial | = 103.44 |
| Industrial | = 234.0 |
| Total = 1262.90 acres | |

Employment Land (Comm./Industrial) Inventory and Needs Analysis

The chart above shows a summary of gross and vacant commercial and industrial lands. The combination of commercial and industrial lands is known as “employment” land because together, they are where the most jobs can be created. La Pine would like to provide jobs for all of its citizens and not suffer the continued negative impacts of the daily commute made by citizens to other cities. However, the City of La Pine cannot meet this goal at present; most jobs are located outside of the community.

Efforts to induce additional local job creation are underway and were given a boost by the recent incorporation in 2006, LIGI’s efforts, Deschutes County TDC program, and the creation of the water and sewer districts. These basic building blocks will provide the foundation for a solid economic strategy.

The responsibility to maintain a supply of adequate industrial lands, and provide a sound industrial climate to support additional job creation is a continuing responsibility of the City as part of the Goal 9 requirements and City Council policy. The City intends to preserve existing industrial areas for predominantly industrial uses.

Short Term Supply of Serviceable Employment Lands

La Pine has a ready supply of serviceable employment lands. 405.39 acres are available within the combined commercial areas and La Pine Industrial Park (LIGI). These lands have direct access to street, water, sewer, and other utility services or are within ¼ mile of such services. The LIGI lands make up the majority of serviceable employment lands

with 327 acres of ready to go land. Each new development, no matter where it is located, will be analyzed on its own merits to determine if any additional improvements need to be made to any portion of La Pine's or other utility providers infrastructure elements.

Commercial and Industrial Land Needs 2009- 2029 – *Creating a 20-year supply*
 Yearly absorption rate data describes what lands actually are developed over time. This data is not sufficient to use alone for determining future employment land needs over a 20-year period. Other issues must be taken into consideration. The development of the "Complete Neighborhoods" concept, making large lots available for energy production, the need for buffers between land uses, mixed-use needs for healthy sustainability are just a few of the factors that shape a future land needs analysis. Thus, the City has chosen to use a variety of forecasting factors and those are listed below. Identifying a 20-year supply of land is really an estimate using a combination of data sets and forecasting factors. These estimates are used as a basis for making land use decisions; as new data or new predictive models become available, the estimates will be revised.

Land Need Considerations and Forecasting Factors

- Demand for services and job creation
- Availability of infrastructure and transportation access
- Physical features that enable easy development; including infrastructure capacity
- Features that restrict or limit development – open space, natural resource protection, buffers, and lot size
- Location and proximity to labor force
- Absorption patterns and other factors that affect land usability
- Growth management goals and compliance with State law
- Community employment needs, niche development, emerging markets
- Complete Neighborhood development techniques
- Private or public ownership land transfers – BLM, DSL, Deschutes County, State of Oregon, etc.
- Special areas for railroad-dependent industrial development
- Opportunities for transitional/temporary industrial development

- Opportunities for energy development
- Flexibility to accommodate unforeseen needs

The land need and forecasting factors can be used to formulate assumptions about economic trends and determine commercial and industrial land needs. These factors form assumptions and when combined with local planning and economic development goals, are intended to provide a foundation for assessing any changes in the Plan. As of the date of approval of this plan, the basic assumptions are as follows:

- The National, State and Local trend shows that the highest economic growth will be in Health, Retail, Energy, Service, and Professional fields.
- The goals of the community and those of local economic development experts focus on high technology, manufacturing, and production as desired industries. These goals may conflict with the predicted trends.
- Public facilities that serve industrial lands must be complete and adequate to support community economic development goal. The most recent geological data shows the Deschutes Aquifer serves the La Pine community.
- Lands that have appropriate infrastructure in place and are competitively priced will be easier to market to prospective developers. Lease-only lands may be more difficult to market because of bank financing conditions.
- Commercial and Industrial lands must be attractive and include local support services and workforce housing options for employees.
- Industrial lands that contain natural resource areas and other areas that require special protection will reduce the overall inventory of developable industrial land.

Commercial and Industrial Lands Located Near Residential Lands

The City has also studied the potential negative impacts of commercial and industrial land designations that abut established or future residential areas within the city. Over time, there may be a need to buffer expanding industrial and commercial uses from residential areas. The proposed zoning map shows various areas proposed to be either open space or mixed-use areas that can serve as a “buffer.” This type of buffering technique also serves to better establish the “Complete Neighborhood” concept.

Land Supply and Needed Acres

Study and analysis of the above factors shows that La Pine has an adequate amount of land within its city limits/UGB to supply a 20-year inventory of employment lands, but not enough large industrial and recreation parcels to satisfy identified needs. This is further described below.

Overall, a total acreage of 342.00 acres of employment land is required to sustain the community over the 20-year period without the need for the large industrial parcels and large recreational land. The 342.00 acre figure is derived from a combination of historical absorption, needed employment and service nodes in deficient neighborhood areas, needed shopping centers capable of supplying a greater choice in services, lands upon which to develop smaller incubator/light industrial developments, and mixed-use buffer areas to supply needed transitional lands. This land need projection breaks down as follows:

| Employment Land Breakdown and Projection of Needed Acres Over 20-year Period⁷ | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| Employment Land Type | Zoning Required | Acres |
| Neighborhood Commercial and Service Nodes | Mixed Use, Industrial, Commercial | 12 |
| Middle sized, 20-acre minimum parcels | Industrial | 200 |
| Smaller sized incubator/light industrial type parcels | Mixed-use, Industrial, Commercial | 50 |
| Shopping Centers | Mixed-use or Commercial | 80 |
| | Total Land Needed Net | 342.0 |
| | Total Employment Land in UGB Gross | 450.0 |
| | Reserve | 108.0 |

The projected breakdown of needed employment lands is 342.0 gross acres which is less than the 405.39 acres available within the current UGB, leaving 63.39 gross acres as a reserve over the 20- year period. This figure is a total of all employment lands and does not mean that all lands are organized as a composite or abutting one another. Thus, assemblage of parcels, re-zonings, etc. may be necessary. When large Industrial parcels are needed, and the actual availability does not support the need, an UGB expansion may be required. This type of development forecast may seem aggressive but it is appropriate over the 20 year planning horizon. The City of La Pine can accommodate this need within its current city limits/UGB unless unique factors warrant UGB expansion. For example, large industrial developments with large acreage requirements may not be able to find suitable land within the current UGB and close to other employment lands – this situation may necessitate expansion or conversion/zone changes.

Large Industrial Acreages

The community supports targeting of specific industrial uses that can provide many jobs at one location. These industries tend to require large acreages from 50 to 120 acres to support large buildings in a “campus” arrangement or buffer adjacent areas from the negative effects of large manufacturing plants. The community intends to provide for and reserve large tracts for these types of developments. The existing Enterprise Zone was created to entice large industrial developments to La Pine. UGB expansion to supply

⁷ Approximately 3 new commercial nodes 4 acres each, 1 mid-size 20 acre industrial project every 2 years, 5, ½ acre projects every year, 2 40- acre shopping centers

the larger acreage lots, 50 to 120 acre parcels should be located adjacent to the current bulk of industrial lands or in areas that have supportive infrastructure.

It is anticipated that there should be an inventory of large “for purchase” industrial lots. This allows for a variety of industrial development on the lands required for industrial development. This assumption is based upon local data and the demonstrated goal of targeting specific industries beyond the current trends. It is important to do this since the trend information does not necessarily reflect all of the needs of a growing community like La Pine, where supporting a broader range of employment and industrial choices to reduce historical jobs/housing imbalances is a community goal.

**Estimated 20-year Industrial Land Absorption
Over the Planning Period 2009-2029**

| Type of Industrial Lands | Years 2009-2014 | Years 2015-2020 | Years 2020-2025 | Years 2025-2029 | Total Acres* |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Leased Only | Varies | Varies | Varies | Varies | 200 |
| Typical Industrial Lands | 10 acres dev./year | 20 acres dev./year | 20 acres dev./year | 20 acres dev./year | 90 |
| Large Industrial Parcels | 50 acres | 120 acres | 100 acres | 50 acres | 320 |
| Other Mixed-employment | Varies | Varies | Varies | Varies | 50 |
| | | | | | 660 |

The above chart looks out 20 years and takes into consideration proposed absorption of all types of industrial and mixed-use lands, including large industrial parcels. This does not take into consideration commercial land needs, just industrial and The result is a need of 660 acres of industrial and mixed –employment land. As noted earlier in this chapter, the current land need derived from using a variety of factors, not just absorption, shows a need for 342.0 acres of employment lands. However, it is important to realize that forecasting is not a precise science and that large industrial parcels and large recreational parcels will be need by the community and these are likely to require an UGB expansion at some point over the next 20 years.

Industrial service, energy, manufacturing, contractor operations, assembly, and repair businesses look to La Pine’s available industrial lands for development opportunities. This trend is expected to continue. As commercial lands increase in cost, lower priced industrial lands become more attractive to developers for service uses. It is appropriate to assume that industrial projects requiring less than 15 acres of land each will develop the

quickest during the planning period. The evidence to support this conclusion includes the past historical data showing that industrial development has been occurring on parcels less than 15 acres in size. The lack of easy to develop industrial lands in both Bend and Redmond will help attract industrial uses to La Pine where land is plentiful, serviceable, and available at a competitive cost. Likewise, it is anticipated demand for low cost developable residential land in Bend and Redmond will help attract more people to La Pine where such lands are available.

Specialized employment lands that have a dual purpose (recreational *and* employment), such as the future La Pine Rodeo grounds, may also require expansion due to its unique locational factors, special siting needs, or the other factors listed below. Revisions to the Plan can occur at any time, once supporting evidence shows a need for a change or update. Thus, the community can be assured that careful monitoring of all predictive data will be the best method for addressing the economic land needs of the community.

VII. Urban Growth Boundary and UGB Expansion Options

At this time, the land within the City limits can generally serve the community's long-term land use needs. Land use control and cohesive government jurisdiction over the City limits is a strong factor for keeping the City limits and the proposed UGB boundary the same. Significant confusion can occur when the city limits and UGB boundary are not the same line. Citizens have expressed a strong desire, as evidenced in the public meetings that shaped this plan, to retain land use control over all of the City limits. Thus, for these and other reasons, the UGB should match the City limits. This means that the City Limits can serve as the La Pine Urban Growth Boundary supplying most if not all of the needed residential, commercial, industrial and other land uses over the 2009-2029 growth period. The exceptions to this are listed below.

Unique Factors that may require UGB expansion before 2029:

- Studies show that land use inventories are reduced below the 20-year supply
- Educational, recreational, or open space opportunities requiring urban services
- Large site needs for unanticipated industrial and employment technologies requiring urban services and supporting creation of local jobs
- Disaster planning needs that require large areas of carefully managed lands
- Emergency services facilities that require inclusion into the UGB
- Tourism services and Rodeo facilities that require urban services, but need to be buffered from residential areas

- Rail or other transportation facilities on lands that would benefit the community by being located within the UGB
- Federal or State facilities
- Utility facilities, including telecommunications and energy producing facilities

Future UGB expansion for purposes of providing additional employment land should focus expansion areas near existing industrial areas and existing population centers. This will further help La Pine address the current jobs/housing imbalance. As previously stated, Bend currently has a greater number of employment and service opportunities, which results in a significant number of La Pine's residents commuting⁸ on a daily basis. Such commutes have the effect of over utilizing limited energy and natural resources, creating unnecessary business expenses, and increased infrastructure costs for community. Any restriction on the ability to expand the UGB to include more land, when justified, would have a harmful effect on La Pine's economy. The community should be able to expand the UGB when needed to remedy absorption of employment lands and address unique or unanticipated factors/situations.

VIII. Existing and Proposed Commercial/Mixed-use Opportunities

The City of La Pine contains a variety of commercial zones located throughout the community that are either located in the highway strip or in other scattered areas. There are many opportunities to add commercial or mixed-use zone designations to various areas throughout the community in an effort to balance neighborhoods and improve mixed-uses as well as deepen existing areas so re-development can easily accommodate new commercial centers. Because there are many opportunities to rezone and revitalize various areas with mixed-use development techniques, it has been concluded that there is adequate land within the current city limits to satisfy the long-term commercial needs of the community. New commercial or mixed-use designations within the City limits will occur as a result of the following actions:

- Addition of new commercial/mixed-use lands to deepen the strip commercial areas
- Addition of commercial/mixed lands to serve neighborhoods and employment areas
- Addition of commercial/mixed-use lands in other areas where industrial, residential, or open space opportunities are inappropriate.

⁸ Commuting has been found to reduce effectiveness of business operations due to increased employee travel time and increased absences related to weather and road conditions. Likewise, La Pine has lower housing prices, which attract employees who cannot afford to live in Bend or Redmond. Additional supplies of appropriately located commercial and industrial land will help to provide quality jobs in the La Pine community thus, reducing the need for citizens to seek employment and services in other cities.

- Addition of mixed-use areas to buffer incompatible uses from one another

The City will need to encourage the additional of new commercial centers to areas near expanding residential areas and avoid lengthening shallow strip development. This is sound land use planning and allows for flexibility to respond to market forces while recognizing that mixed-use planning and the “Complete Neighborhood” concept can meet the future economic development demand for any needed commercial development in the urban area. The downtown core of the community is likely to be the focus of future revitalization efforts. Several studies have been completed to provide guidelines for improved aesthetics and other development strategies intended to attract and retain businesses to the downtown area.

Main Street Concepts

A new technique that builds on an old concept, “Main Street” type development, is a successful land use technique that can correct and improve commercial vitality by encouraging pedestrian access. “Main Street” development techniques provide for a more walkable shopping experience without excessive vehicle trips. The storefronts face a local access street that is perpendicular to the primary access street. Future development codes should enable this development technique.

Challenges to Compact Development Goals

The 2006 incorporation took in the area known as Wickiup Junction. This peninsula-like area is located at the northern most tip of the community. The result is that the City, as a whole, is forced to grow in a less-than-compact form. However, the development pattern *within* the new areas can be compact and designed to serve as many citizen needs as possible. This means that mixed-uses, including convenience commercial service centers, open space, and some employment areas will be required to develop in older neighborhoods to encourage reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve efficiency for all residents. The community will benefit from adding small commercial areas to new and revitalized neighborhoods as the community grows. Citizens have expressed a need for additional neighborhood and local shopping opportunities that do not require excessive vehicle trips or vehicle trips to other communities.

IX. Community Neighborhoods

The La Pine community is made up of 3 primary neighborhoods. Some of these neighborhoods are located in areas that are not served with adequate commercial or employment lands. The broadly applied mixed-use and/ or improved land use development practices advocated in other parts of this Plan could not be achieved if the new commercial lands were limited to existing strip areas. Thus, La Pine’s economy will benefit by being flexible with the placement and variety of new mixed-use and commercial lands over the 20-year period rather than restrict itself to only a few areas. It should be noted that the primary growth industry and target areas described earlier in this chapter also apply to the commercial analysis. Again, as the trend information suggests, the primary growth sectors will be health care and commercial activities, particularly service, education, and retail. The EDCO target areas are mostly industrial but could

have a retail/commercial component that would be a secondary use to the primary industrial development.

The community is poised to respond to the need for additional mixed-use and commercial designations. The current city limits/UGB contains adequate lands upon which to develop needed commercial uses as long as the needed rezoning are timely and planned to respond to mixed-use and other development techniques that can enhance the urban community. Performance standards and the planned unit development (PUD) section of the future implementing land use ordinances will likely provide for a more integrated and balanced development pattern, particularly with new commercial areas.

X. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Provide adequate industrial and commercial land inventories to satisfy the urban development needs of La Pine for the 20-year planning horizon.

Policies

- The current city limits is adequate for serving as the Urban Growth Boundary, although special circumstances may necessitate expansion before 2029.
- Updates to inventories and analysis of needed industrial and commercial land types, existing land supplies, and economic development strategies for meeting the requirements of the community are essential. It is necessary to provide adequate buildable industrial and commercial land for the 20 years planning horizon.
- Frequent updates to the inventories may be required in response to redevelopment, proposed zone changes, mixed-use development techniques and planned unit developments that enable “Complete Neighborhood” concepts and economic development opportunities.
- State, local, and nationwide trends are not adequate to properly estimate needed industrial and commercial lands. Other local information and economic development targeting goals must be used to properly evaluate future land needs.
- Adequate public facilities must be planned, funded, and installed to serve industrial sites and commercial areas.
- Preservation of large industrial parcels over 30 acres in size will attract target industries and new manufacturing businesses.
- Planning for workforce housing will also attract target industries.

- Urban reserve planning will be needed to project growth beyond the 20-year period.
- Additional land may be needed to support large scale recreational and industrial uses. Where there are particular locational requirements for certain activities, amendments to the Comprehensive Plan may be necessary too. Amendments should be evaluated in relation to all applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Goal # 2: Develop an “Economic Development Strategic Plan” and other mechanisms necessary for supporting and enhancing the local economy.

Policies

- Successful economic development strategies require cooperation with a variety of agencies and other groups to develop a plan that best meets the requirements of a growing community.
- Successful economic opportunities rely upon the communities’ ability to support and connect various elements of the economic development into an integrated framework.
- Promoting an entrepreneurial climate for existing and new businesses is a key factor in strategic planning.
- Providing a strong public partnership with local businesses is key to successful economic development.
- Ensuring a high quality of life and the small town atmosphere is essential to addressing citizen concerns about growth and economic development.
- SDC charges must be carefully developed and monitored. This will ensure that development pays its own way while not creating obstacles to desired development or educational needs.
- The State of Oregon transportation system (ODOT) has a significant effect upon the local community. Local groups and City decisions makers will need to establish good working relationships with ODOT to ensure coordination and adequate capacity.
- The City recognizes that an airport (privately owned or public) would be a strong economic driver for the la Pine area. Efforts to explore the creation of an airport shall be supported by the City, but shall not be the obligation of the City.

XI. Programs

The City shall:

1. Adopt the City Limits as the urban growth boundary - UGB.
2. Regularly monitor and analyze commercial and industrial land inventories. When new lands are needed, the City Council shall authorize expansion of the UGB or other methods to ensure that at least a 20-year inventory of land for each category is available within the urban area.
3. Coordinate growth needs with the various utility providers within the community.
4. Explore and initiate methods for preserving large industrial parcels to meet projected demand.
5. Initiate and complete urban reserve planning consistent with the other provisions previously listed in this Plan.
6. Any correction amendments and needed legislative changes for rezoning shall be processed immediately upon City Council directive.
7. Develop a community entrance plan that fosters improved aesthetic treatments and buffering along the entrances to the community
8. Organize and staff an economic development committee whose purpose is to monitor the economy and manage local infrastructure needs. The committee shall include three members of the City Council, two members of the Planning Commission, and two ad hoc members of the community experienced in economic development and any staff members deemed appropriate by the City Manager.
9. Continue to refine which commercial and industrial activities are lacking in the community. The City shall identify needed commercial and industrial areas on an overlay map. The overlay map is a general framework plan that represents where certain areas of the community could benefit from additional commercial or industrial designations.
10. Develop strategies to capture the opportunities of a technology and knowledge-based economy.
11. Develop land use development codes to address economic development objectives and encourage appropriate mixed-uses in commercial and industrial zones.
12. Develop and monitor a SDC methodology/program to assure appropriate charges to new development, excepting public schools and colleges.

13. Develop other methods of funding that can be used for economic development purposes and supplement tax funds.

City of La Pine – Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 10 Housing

I. State Planning Goal 10, Housing

Oregon State Planning Goal 10 is very straightforward in its statement that each local jurisdiction must provide for the housing needs of its existing citizens and the anticipated population growth. Essential in this planning effort is the creation of a buildable lands inventory (BLI) and Residential Needs Assessment (RNA). The BLI assesses vacant lands, developed lands and re-developable lands and makes an overall determination of the amount of land available in the community to accommodate the future population. The RNA makes a determination of existing and needed housing types. These analyses are contained in one document because they are interrelated and easier for citizens to use. This document enables a community to assess whether or not lands within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) are adequate for the projected growth or if the UGB needs to be expanded. Notwithstanding the need for the raw land area data is the need to provide a variety of housing types (i.e. single-family homes versus multi-family dwellings) and price ranges (i.e. owner occupied versus rentals). These factors must be weighed against the desired density and affordability of housing. Overall, the intent is to provide opportunities for housing to serve all socio-economic strata within the community.

II. Purpose and Intent

The purpose of this chapter is to ensure the provision of appropriate types and amounts of land within the La Pine urban growth boundary - UGB (city limits in this case) to support a range of housing types necessary to meet current and future needs. These lands should support suitable housing for all income levels for maximum sustainability. Likewise, the Plan must also ensure the appropriate type, location and phasing of public facilities and services are sufficient to support housing development in areas presently developed or undergoing development, or redevelopment.

In addition to inventories of buildable lands, this chapter of the Plan includes: (1) a comparison of the distribution of the existing population by income with the distribution of available housing units by cost; (2) a determination of vacancy rates, both overall and at varying rent ranges and cost levels; (3) a determination of expected housing demand at varying rent ranges and cost levels; (4) allowance for a variety of densities and types of residences; and (5) an inventory of sound housing in urban areas including units capable of being rehabilitated.

The La Pine community contains a variety of housing choices and vacant and redevelopable lands. Single-family homes are the dominant housing type at 84% of the inventory. This chapter examines housing supply, condition, occupancy, affordability,

and available land supply to meet community needs over the 20-year planning horizon. Implementation programs for meeting future housing demand are also included in this chapter.

III. Issues

Affordability

The affordability of housing is a significant determinant to the livability and sustainability of the La Pine community. Housing affordability affects all segments of the local population including business viability and commerce. According to federal housing guidelines, no more than 30% of a family's gross monthly income should be spent on housing, including heating and other bills.

Available, affordable, safe housing are also critical ingredients to the success of how a community accommodates population growth. The attractiveness of La Pine to new residents relies upon the availability of housing choices to accommodate varied citizen demands and pricing thresholds. Historically, La Pine offers single-family housing and only a small percentage of attached housing options. A vibrant community must offer more choices to be competitive and sustainable. La Pine has actively pursued new Plan policies and flexible implementation codes that will promote a wider range of housing choices over time.

To understand the future of housing needs in La Pine, it is important to assess and analyze the existing characteristics of the community's housing stock. Various factors must be taken into consideration to obtain a clear picture of the situation. The following elements should be examined:

- Trends in housing types;
- Age of structures;
- Condition and value of structures;
- Household demographics;
- Income levels of households;
- Percentage of income spent for housing;
- Occupancy patterns;
- Vacancy rates;
- Ownership and rental trends

The tables in this section include data from the recent census and local economic development agencies, and other experts. Information was also obtained from other resources including DLCD, Deschutes County, EDCO, and personal interviews with Central Oregon Regional Housing Authority CORHA (now HousingWorks) staff, local bank representatives, housing service providers, and others as noted. The data helps local decision makers understand the various aspects of housing and population change. This chapter also takes into account the effects of utilizing financial incentives and resources to (a) stimulate the rehabilitation of substandard housing without regard to the financial capacity of the owner so long as benefits accrue to the occupants; and (b) bring into

compliance with codes adopted to assure safe and sanitary housing the dwellings of individuals who cannot on their own afford to meet such codes.

Housing History

La Pine has been a community for over 100 years and the current housing choices reflect the historical growth and nature of the City. La Pine's history as a small town with recreation, retirement, timber and agricultural community attributes has shaped the stock of existing housing. Over the years, and as the community economic situation diversified, so has the variety of detached housing stock. A quick visual tour of La Pine shows a range of housing from older mill worker residences, Victorian-era homes to more modern homes developed post WWII. A recent influx of bedroom-community homes and recreational/retirement housing is evident throughout the community. A striking lack of multi-family housing is evident but not uncommon for a community with less than 1,700 people. However, this is beginning to change as a few, well-designed housing projects have developed within the incorporated City area.

Effects of Growth – Past and Present

The incorporated area of La Pine includes a large number of developed and undeveloped residential lots. However, the vicinity surrounding the incorporated area has a greater number of lots and a population higher than the current population of incorporated area. This situation creates a significant impact upon the interrelationship of land uses and service needs of the entire community.

Households

Deschutes County and 2000 Census⁹ data show that there were 5,799 people, 2,331 households, and 1,699 families residing in the CDP¹⁰. The population density was 197.7 people per square mile (76.3/km²). There were 2,975 housing units at an average density of 101.4/sq mi (39.2/km²). The racial makeup of the CDP was 95.84% White, 0.09% African American, 1.28% Native American, 0.24% Asian, 0.10% Pacific Islander, 0.55% from other races, and 1.90% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race was 2.22% of the population. Data shows that there were 2,331 households out of which 26.6% had children under the age of 18 living with them, 61.3% were married couples living together, 7.3% had a female householder with no husband present, and 27.1% were non-families. 20.8% of all households were made up of individuals and 10.3% had someone living alone who was 65 years of age or older.

Population Ranges and Projections

In the CDP the population was spread out with 23.0% under the age of 18, 4.9% from 18 to 24, 22.5% from 25 to 44, 28.8% from 45 to 64, and 20.7% who were 65 years of age or older. The median age was 45 years. For every 100 females, there were 99.8 males. For every 100 females age 18 and over, there were 98.7 males.

⁹ The 2000 Census data has been updated, by projection, via the Claritas research data found in the Appendix.

¹⁰ Before the 2006 incorporation the Census recognized the broader community of La Pine as a CDP or Census Designated Place.

Table 1 - Portland Statue University (PSU) July 1st Population Estimates

| Geographic Area | 2010 | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Deschutes County | 172,050 | 170,705 | 167,015 | 160,810 | 152,615 | 143,490 | 135,450 | 130,500 | 126,500 | 122,050 |
| Bend | 83,125 | 82,280 | 80,995 | 77,780 | 75,290 | 70,330 | 65,210 | 62,900 | 57,750 | 55,080 |
| Redmond | 25,945 | 25,800 | 25,445 | 24,805 | 23,500 | 20,010 | 18,100 | 17,450 | 16,110 | 14,960 |
| Sisters | 1,935 | 1,925 | 1,875 | 1,825 | 1,745 | 1,660 | 1,490 | 1,430 | 1,080 | 960 |
| La Pine | 1,635 | 1,625 | 1,610 | 1,590 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 59,410 | 59,075 | 57,090 | 54,810 | 52,080 | 51,490 | 50,650 | 48,720 | 51,560 | 51,050 |

Table 2 - Annual Population Change and Percentage Change based on PSU Population Estimates

| Geographic Area | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2007-08 | 2006-07 | 2005-06 | 2004-05 | 2003-04 | 2002-03 | 2001-02 | 2000-01 |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Deschutes County | 1,345 0.8% | 3,690 2.2% | 6,205 3.9% | 8,195 5.4% | 9,125 6.4% | 8,040 5.9% | 4,950 3.8% | 4,000 3.2% | 4,450 3.6% | 5,450 4.7% |
| Bend | 845 1.0% | 1,285 1.6% | 3,215 4.1% | 2,490 3.3% | 4,960 7.1% | 5,120 7.9% | 2,310 3.7% | 5,150 8.9% | 2,670 4.8% | 2,280 4.3% |
| Redmond | 145 0.6% | 355 1.4% | 640 2.6% | 1,305 5.6% | 3,490 17.4% | 1,910 10.6% | 650 3.7% | 1,340 8.3% | 1,150 7.7% | 1,190 8.6% |
| Sisters | 10 0.5% | 50 2.7% | 50 2.7% | 80 4.6% | 85 5.1% | 170 11.4% | 60 4.2% | 350 32.4% | 120 12.5% | -15 -1.5% |
| La Pine | 10 0.6% | 15 0.9% | 20 1.3% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 335 0.6% | 1,985 3.5% | 2,280 4.2% | 2,730 5.2% | 590 1.1% | 840 1.7% | 1,930 4.0% | -2,840 -5.5% | 510 1.0% | 1,995 4.1% |

Table 3 - Average Annual Growth Rate based on PSU Estimates

| Geographic Area | 2000 to 2010 |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Deschutes County | 3.97 |
| Bend | 4.64 |
| Redmond | 6.54 |
| Sisters | 7.09 |
| La Pine | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 1.93 |

The City and Deschutes County work together to develop a coordinated population forecast. This work is adopted at the local level and was approved by DLCD in 2010. The section of the County data is as follows:

23.16.020. Population. The population of the County has increased significantly since the adoption of the comprehensive plan in 1979.

| Population Growth in Deschutes County: 1980 to 2000 | | | |
|--|--------|--------|---------|
| Sources | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 |
| Population Research Center - July 1 estimates | 62,500 | 75,600 | 116,600 |
| Census Bureau - April 1 census counts | 62,142 | 74,958 | 115,367 |

ORS 195.025(1) requires the counties to coordinate local plans and population forecasts. In 1996, Bend, Redmond, Sisters and the County reviewed the most recent population forecasts from the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census, the Department of Transportation, Woods and Poole, the Bonneville Power Administration and the State Department

of Administrative Services Office of Economic Analysis. After review of these projections, the cities and Deschutes County agreed on the coordinated population forecast adopted by the County in 1998 by Ordinance 98-084

The results of the 2000 decennial census and subsequent population estimates prepared by the Population Research Center (PRC) at Portland State University revealed the respective populations of the County and the incorporated cities were growing faster than contemplated under the 1998 coordinated forecast. The cities and the County engaged in a coordination process between 2002 and 2004 that culminated with the County adopting a revised population forecast that projected population for the cities and the County to the year 2025. The following table displays the 2004 coordinated population forecast for Deschutes County and the urban growth boundaries of the cities of Bend, Redmond, and Sisters from 2000 to 2025:

The process through which the County and the cities coordinated to develop the 2000-2025 coordinated forecast is outlined in the report titled "Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast 2000-2025: Findings in Support of Forecast" dated July 2004. This report provides the findings in support of the adopted forecast. The Deschutes County Year 2000 Comprehensive Plan (1979) included a population forecast from 1980 to 2000 that was incorporated in several chapters.

In 1998, the County adopted a coordinated population forecast under ORS 195.036. The following table displays all three forecasts for comparison:

**Deschutes County Population Forecasts
from 1979, 1998, and 2004**

| 2000-2025 Coordinated Population Forecast | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Year | Bend UGB | Redmond UGB | Sisters UGB | Unincorporated County | Total County |
| 2000 | 52,800 | 15,505 | 975 | 47,320 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | 69,004 | 19,249 | 1,768 | 53,032 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | 81,242 | 23,897 | 2,306 | 59,127 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | 91,158 | 29,667 | 2,694 | 65,924 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | 100,646 | 36,831 | 3,166 | 73,502 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | 109,389 | 45,724 | 3,747 | 81,951 | 240,811 |

| Year | 1979 forecast | 1998 forecast | 2004 forecast |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1980 | 53,400 | - | - |
| 1985 | 66,600 | - | - |
| 1990 | 82,900 | 74,958 | - |
| 1995 | 103,400 | 94,100 | - |
| 2000 | 128,200 | 113,231 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | - | 132,239 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | - | 151,431 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | - | 167,911 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | - | 182,353 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | - | - | 240,811 |

The fourth city in Deschutes County is La Pine. Incorporated on November 7, 2006, the City of La Pine's 2006 population estimate of 1,590 was certified by Portland State University, Population and Research Center on December 15, 2007. As of January 1, 2009, La Pine is coordinating with the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to develop its first comprehensive plan. As a result of La Pine incorporation, Deschutes County updated its Coordinated Population Forecast with Ordinance 2009-006. The purpose of this modification was to adopt a conservative twenty-year population forecast for the City of La Pine that can be used by city officials and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to estimate future land need and an Urban Growth Boundary. The following table displays the coordinated population forecast for Deschutes County, the urban growth boundaries of the cities of Bend, Redmond, and Sisters, and the city of La Pine from 2000 to 2025:

| 2000-2025 Coordinated Population Forecast | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Year | Bend UGB | Redmond UGB | Sisters UGB | La Pine UGB | Unincorporated County | Total County |
| 2000 | 52,800 | 15,505 | 975 | - | 47,320 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | 69,004 | 19,249 | 1,768 | - | 53,032 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | 81,242 | 23,897 | 2,306 | 1,697 | 57,430 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | 91,158 | 29,667 | 2,694 | 1,892 | 64,032 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | 100,646 | 36,831 | 3,166 | 2,110 | 71,392 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | 109,389 | 45,724 | 3,747 | 2,352 | 79,599 | 240,811 |

In the fall of 1998, the Oregon Water Resources Department acknowledged that virtually all groundwater in the Deschutes River basin discharges to the rivers of the basin. The Water Resources Department may place restrictions on the consumptive use of groundwater to protect the free flowing nature of the Deschutes River, instream water rights and existing water rights. These restrictions may affect the use of groundwater resources for future development and consequently affect the future growth and allocation of population in the County and the three four urban jurisdictions.

Population with DLCD Approved Growth Rate

| Year Incorporation November 7, 2006 | Population | Average Annual Growth Rate |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2007 | 1585 | 2.20 |
| 2010 | 1697 | 2.20 |
| 2015 | 1892 | 2.20 |
| 2020 | 2110 | 2.20 |
| 2025 | 2352 | 2.20 |
| 2029 | 2566 | 2.20 |

DLCD Approved Coordinated Deschutes County Population Forecast, which shows 1,585 people at the date of incorporation and using the 2.2% growth rate, provides 2,566 people in 2029.

Household Incomes

The median income for a household in the CDP was \$29,859, and the median income for a family was \$33,938. Males had a median income of \$30,457 versus \$20,186 for females. The per capita income for the CDP was \$15,543. About 9.5% of families and 13.2% of the population were below the poverty line, including 13.4% of those under age 18 and 11.5% of those age 65 or over. Newer Census data shows the median income for a family at around \$27,388. La Pine is classified as a Severely Distressed Community and the recent 2008 economic crisis is strongly felt in La Pine.

Snapshot of the Housing Market

The housing market in Central Oregon is changing. Even with the current downward economy, a greater share of families/households are fundamentally “priced out” of Bend and Redmond thus, buyers are considering alternative options in La Pine. Over the past 10 years, Deschutes County has experienced robust population growth, which was more than doubled the State’s five-year forecast. Much of this growth occurred in the areas outlying the City of La Pine. However, the incentives provided by the County’s Sewer TDC – Transfer Development Credit - program are having a positive effect on encouraging more people to live within the incorporated area where community services are available.

Current Housing Mix All Units Plus New Permits Through 2011

| Totals 2008 through 2011 | Percent of total for each housing type: |
|--|--|
| 791 detached SFD's | 84.00% |
| 21 duplexes – 42 units | 4.46% |
| 3 fourplexes – 12 units | 1.27% |
| 26 unit attached-over 55 -LDLodge | 2.76% |
| 62 unit Health Home/Group Quarters – Prairie House | 6.58% |
| 9 other –7 over garage apts, 2 caretakers residences | 0.95% |
| 942 household units – total | 244 vacant |
| | 100.00% |

Through 2025, State forecasts estimate an additional 91,382 individuals are expected to permanently reside within Region 10. 2566 persons are estimated to reside within La Pine.

The total demand profile by age indicates sizable demand from existing households among middle age and pre-retirees. Approximately 34% of all ownership demand is expected to be derived from households of 35-54 years. In other words, turnover demand from existing younger household will likely combine with demand from elderly households to provide a diverse range of qualified buyers within the primary market area over the next five to ten years.

Building Permit Data

Residential construction, as measured by building permits, has been brisk in the central Oregon region until the 2008 economic crisis. Driven largely by growth in the Bend/Redmond Market, the three-city region has averaged over 2,416 permits annually since 2000 and in 2005 displayed a 12.8% increase over the previous year. However, 2006 year to date figures for La Pine, Bend, and Redmond indicate that residential permits have slowed significantly from the record levels of 2005. Nearly all of the residential growth in La Pine has been detached, single-family residential. The exception is the Little Deschutes Lodge, an Over 55 Senior Facility and Prairie House an assisted living facility .

A considerable proportion of growth, roughly 37%, will be derived from households earning less than \$25,000 annually, indicating a significant number of smaller less-advantaged families, senior and retired buyers with non-income wealth.

Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2009 Chart

Geographic Area: La Pine city, Oregon
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000
 Data Set: [Census 2000 Summary File 1 \(SF 1\) 100-Percent Data](#)
 Geographic Area: **La Pine CDP, Oregon**

| Subject | Number | Percent |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| OCCUPANCY STATUS | | |
| Total housing units | 2,975 | 100.0 |
| Occupied housing units | 2,331 | 78.4 |
| Vacant housing units | 644 | 21.6 |
| TENURE | | |
| Occupied housing units | 2,331 | 100.0 |
| Owner-occupied housing units | 1,883 | 80.8 |
| Renter-occupied housing units | 448 | 19.2 |
| VACANCY STATUS | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Vacant housing units | 644 | 100.0 |
| For rent | 49 | 7.6 |
| For sale only | 61 | 9.5 |
| Rented or sold, not occupied | 17 | 2.6 |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use | 448 | 69.6 |
| For migratory workers | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other vacant | 69 | 10.7 |
| RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER | | |
| Occupied housing units | 2,331 | 100.0 |
| One race | 2,284 | 98.0 |
| White | 2,252 | 96.6 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 0.0 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 24 | 1.0 |
| Asian | 4 | 0.2 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.0 |
| Some other race | 3 | 0.1 |
| Two or more races | 47 | 2.0 |
| HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER | | |
| Occupied housing units | 2,331 | 100.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 26 | 1.1 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 2,305 | 98.9 |
| White alone | 2,234 | 95.8 |
| AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER | | |
| Occupied housing units | 2,331 | 100.0 |
| 15 to 24 years | 57 | 2.4 |
| 25 to 34 years | 239 | 10.3 |
| 35 to 44 years | 404 | 17.3 |
| 45 to 54 years | 487 | 20.9 |
| 55 to 64 years | 400 | 17.2 |
| 65 years and over | 744 | 31.9 |
| 65 to 74 years | 426 | 18.3 |
| 75 to 84 years | 257 | 11.0 |
| 85 years and over | 61 | 2.6 |
| Subject | Number | Percent |

Population Snapshot

Between 1990 and 2000, the Central Oregon population grew by an incredible 49% as compared to the State as a whole at 5.9%. Most of this growth is due to in-migration. Other areas of the nation, especially in the Southwestern states, also have high in-migration rates, but the demographics of those new residents vary greatly from Central Oregon.

US Census Bureau

| Counties & Cities | Actual | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000* | 1995 | 1990* |
| Deschutes County | 20,300 | 20,200 | 19,850 | 19,182 | 15,700 | 14,111 |
| La Pine CDP | 8,500 | 8,150 | 7,750 | 7,356 | 7,205 | 5,355 |
| Unincorporated | 11,800 | 12,050 | 12,100 | 11,826 | 9,947 | 8,756 |
| Deschutes County | 130,500 | 126,500 | 122,050 | 115,367 | 89,500 | 74,958 |
| Bend | 62,900 | 57,750 | 55,080 | 52,029 | 29,425 | 20,469 |
| Redmond | 17,450 | 16,110 | 14,960 | 13,481 | 9,650 | 7,163 |
| Sisters | 1,430 | 1,080 | 960 | 959 | 765 | 679 |
| Unincorporated | 48,720 | 51,560 | 51,050 | 48,898 | 49,660 | 46,647 |
| Jefferson County | 19,900 | 19,850 | 19,400 | 19,009 | 15,400 | 13,676 |
| Culver | 840 | 840 | 800 | 802 | 600 | 570 |
| Madras | 5,370 | 5,290 | 5,200 | 5,078 | 4,290 | 3,443 |
| Metolius | 780 | 770 | 660 | 635 | 540 | 450 |
| Warm Springs | NA | NA | NA | 5,727 | NA | NA |
| Unincorporated | 12,910 | 12,950 | 12,740 | 6,767 | 9,905 | 9,213 |
| Total Area Population | 170,700 | 166,550 | 161,300 | 153,558 | 120,600 | 102,745 |

County Population Projections As Noted By Oregon Bureau of Economic Analysis

| County | 2000 | 2003 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Crook | 19,300 | 20,300 | 21,035 | 23,051 | 25,249 | 27,590 | 30,125 | 32,796 | 35,569 | 38,553 |
| Deschutes | 116,600 | 130,500 | 139,994 | 158,792 | 178,418 | 197,150 | 214,479 | 229,933 | 244,069 | 257,088 |
| Jefferson | 19,150 | 19,900 | 20,491 | 22,168 | 24,079 | 26,065 | 28,298 | 30,831 | 33,390 | 36,094 |
| Tri-County Total | 155,050 | 170,700 | 181,520 | 204,011 | 227,746 | 250,805 | 272,902 | 293,560 | 313,028 | 331,735 |

Deschutes County and La Pine Coordinated Population Forecast Data

The City and County have agreed to accept that in 2009 there was a population of 1,661 persons within the city limits¹¹. In 2029, the population within the City limits of La Pine is expected to be 2,566 persons. The appendix contains the entire text of the coordinated population study; also acknowledged by DLCD.

¹¹ PSU recently updated their current population for La Pine slightly less – 1653 persons versus 1661.

Residential Types and Values

While the community appears to have adequate affordable housing supplies, the inventory of a full range of housing is virtually non-existent. *The current housing mix is 97% single family detached and 3% attached.*

Current Housing Mix

The total number of housing units in La Pine is approximately 909 housing units. Of this, the predominant housing type in La Pine is single family detached, 876 units. These also include manufactured homes on individual lots. There are 21 existing duplexes, 3 existing fourplexes, and one new 26 unit, over 55 only, multi-family complex as of 2012.. It is assumed that the demand for traditional single-family housing will remain relatively strong over the planning period given the rural nature of La Pine and the current base of existing single-family homes. However, La Pine will need to plan for a mix of housing choices over the 20-year planning period.

La Pine does not currently have a enough housing choices for people to choose from. The Plan must provide more housing opportunities to help correct this situation.

Many of the older homes are located in areas without access to community water and sewer services. The result is potential for demonstrated water contamination and extra cost to homeowners who have to take special and costly measures to ensure properly working private well and septic systems. Public health and safety issues are a concern as populations increase. This situation presents a significant problem with regard to community health and redevelopment potential. A number of homes may appear to satisfy affordable housing cost targets but they may have infrastructure problems that are not easy to catalog and identify. Thus, the number of true affordable housing units that do not have serious basic service issues is difficult to assess. Other measures to extend public services to all areas of the community are underway and the City is absorbing the sewer and water district.

The largest percentage of householders are age 65 an older – 32%. Those less than 34 years of age make up less than 13% of householders. However, this trend will change as La Pine improves its economic base and implements the complete community concepts which tend to attract younger families.

DP-4. Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000

Data Set: [Census 2000 Summary File 3 \(SF 3\) - Sample Data](#)

Geographic Area: **La Pine CDP, Oregon**

| Subject | Number | Percent |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Total housing units | 3,008 | 100.0 |
| UNITS IN STRUCTURE | | |
| 1-unit, detached | 1,704 | 56.6 |
| 1-unit, attached | 14 | 0.5 |
| 2 units | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3 or 4 units | 16 | 0.5 |
| 5 to 9 units | 0 | 0.0 |

| Subject | Number | Percent |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| 10 to 19 units | 0 | 0.0 |
| 20 or more units | 7 | 0.2 |
| Mobile home | 1,116 | 37.1 |
| Boat, RV, van, etc. | 151 | 5.0 |
| YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT | | |
| 1999 to March 2000 | 134 | 4.5 |
| 1995 to 1998 | 406 | 13.5 |
| 1990 to 1994 | 364 | 12.1 |
| 1980 to 1989 | 553 | 18.4 |
| 1970 to 1979 | 1,003 | 33.3 |
| 1960 to 1969 | 245 | 8.1 |
| 1940 to 1959 | 271 | 9.0 |
| 1939 or earlier | 32 | 1.1 |
| ROOMS | | |
| 1 room | 128 | 4.3 |
| 2 rooms | 106 | 3.5 |
| 3 rooms | 272 | 9.0 |
| 4 rooms | 535 | 17.8 |
| 5 rooms | 964 | 32.0 |
| 6 rooms | 459 | 15.3 |
| 7 rooms | 321 | 10.7 |
| 8 rooms | 121 | 4.0 |
| 9 or more rooms | 102 | 3.4 |
| Median (rooms) | 5.0 | (X) |
| Occupied Housing Units | 2,342 | 100.0 |
| YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT | | |
| 1999 to March 2000 | 518 | 22.1 |
| 1995 to 1998 | 634 | 27.1 |
| 1990 to 1994 | 583 | 24.9 |
| 1980 to 1989 | 387 | 16.5 |
| 1970 to 1979 | 217 | 9.3 |
| 1969 or earlier | 3 | 0.1 |
| VEHICLES AVAILABLE | | |
| None | 49 | 2.1 |
| 1 | 493 | 21.1 |
| 2 | 1,092 | 46.6 |
| 3 or more | 708 | 30.2 |
| HOUSE HEATING FUEL | | |
| Utility gas | 42 | 1.8 |
| Bottled, tank, or LP gas | 106 | 4.5 |
| Electricity | 993 | 42.4 |
| Fuel oil, kerosene, etc. | 92 | 3.9 |
| Coal or coke | 0 | 0.0 |
| Wood | 1,062 | 45.3 |
| Solar energy | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other fuel | 47 | 2.0 |
| No fuel used | 0 | 0.0 |
| SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS | | |
| Lacking complete plumbing facilities | 18 | 0.8 |
| Lacking complete kitchen facilities | 25 | 1.1 |
| No telephone service | 22 | 0.9 |

| Subject | Number | Percent |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| OCCUPANTS PER ROOM | | |
| Occupied housing units | 2,342 | 100.0 |
| 1.00 or less | 2,229 | 95.2 |
| 1.01 to 1.50 | 101 | 4.3 |
| 1.51 or more | 12 | 0.5 |
| Specified owner-occupied units | 1,025 | 100.0 |
| VALUE | | |
| Less than \$50,000 | 52 | 5.1 |
| \$50,000 to \$99,999 | 444 | 43.3 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 319 | 31.1 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 107 | 10.4 |
| \$200,000 to \$299,999 | 74 | 7.2 |
| \$300,000 to \$499,999 | 20 | 2.0 |
| \$500,000 to \$999,999 | 9 | 0.9 |
| \$1,000,000 or more | 0 | 0.0 |
| Median (dollars) | 101,900 | (X) |
| MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS | | |
| With a mortgage | 682 | 66.5 |
| Less than \$300 | 7 | 0.7 |
| \$300 to \$499 | 59 | 5.8 |
| \$500 to \$699 | 192 | 18.7 |
| \$700 to \$999 | 216 | 21.1 |
| \$1,000 to \$1,499 | 161 | 15.7 |
| \$1,500 to \$1,999 | 30 | 2.9 |
| \$2,000 or more | 17 | 1.7 |
| Median (dollars) | 787 | (X) |
| Not mortgaged | 343 | 33.5 |
| Median (dollars) | 198 | (X) |
| SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 | | |
| Less than 15 percent | 384 | 37.5 |
| 15 to 19 percent | 129 | 12.6 |
| 20 to 24 percent | 156 | 15.2 |
| 25 to 29 percent | 107 | 10.4 |
| 30 to 34 percent | 92 | 9.0 |
| 35 percent or more | 144 | 14.0 |
| Not computed | 13 | 1.3 |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 440 | 100.0 |
| GROSS RENT | | |
| Less than \$200 | 0 | 0.0 |
| \$200 to \$299 | 14 | 3.2 |
| \$300 to \$499 | 109 | 24.8 |
| \$500 to \$749 | 223 | 50.7 |
| \$750 to \$999 | 51 | 11.6 |
| \$1,000 to \$1,499 | 7 | 1.6 |
| \$1,500 or more | 0 | 0.0 |
| No cash rent | 36 | 8.2 |
| Median (dollars) | 558 | (X) |
| GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 | | |
| Less than 15 percent | 62 | 14.1 |
| 15 to 19 percent | 24 | 5.5 |
| 20 to 24 percent | 98 | 22.3 |
| 25 to 29 percent | 33 | 7.5 |

| Subject | Number | Percent |
|--------------------|--------|---------|
| 30 to 34 percent | 30 | 6.8 |
| 35 percent or more | 157 | 35.7 |
| Not computed | 36 | 8.2 |
| Subject | Number | Percent |

Housing Affordability Details

Housing costs in La Pine, as compared to other Central Oregon cities, has been traditionally very favorable. Federal housing affordability standards recommend that no more than 30 % of household income be dedicated to mortgage payments. However, Census data shows that more than 22% of La Pine homeowners pay more than 30 percent of their income for mortgage payments. Renters tend to pay more than 31% of household income on gross rent. Thus, many La Pine households are spending more for shelter than they should. Alternatives to this situation range from more housing choices such as the development of more affordable housing types - townhouses, zero-lot line homes, multi-family structures, manufactured housing or condominiums, and, of course, a better jobs market.

| | Median Home Price | | | | Average Home Price | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Bend | \$184,984 | \$209,750 | \$250,880 | \$327,500 | \$226,725 | \$245,006 | \$296,817 | \$388,607 |
| La Pine | \$90,000 | \$116,850 | \$129,600 | \$154,000 | \$90,097 | \$118,375 | \$136,626 | 165,170 |
| Madras/Jefferson County | \$89,500 | \$93,750 | \$114,000 | \$154,900 | \$91,605 | \$65,421 | \$111,639 | \$150,138 |
| La Pine/Deschutes County | \$96,900 | \$108,500 | 129,240 | 172,900 | \$103,894 | \$105,224 | \$134,724 | \$176,187 |
| Redmond | \$138,500 | \$151,897 | \$171,685 | \$238,000 | \$148,926 | \$164,031 | \$195,021 | \$266,057 |
| Sisters | \$292,500 | \$265,000 | \$29,500 | \$421,500 | \$311,048 | \$293,474 | \$398,724 | \$432,508 |
| Sunriver | \$270,000 | \$405,000 | \$444,500 | \$524,950 | \$378,510 | \$455,002 | \$453,204 | \$599,801 |

Source: Central Oregon Association of Realtors

Aesthetic and Design Characteristics of Housing

La Pine's citizens have made it clear to local decision-makers that the small town feel of the community should also be a template for future neighborhood development and infill. The "complete neighborhoods" concept mentioned in Chapter 1 is essential for meeting the expectations of the community with regard to residential development. New and redeveloping areas will need to take into consideration the template characteristics needed for constructing housing in "Complete Neighborhoods." Thus, adequate land for "Complete Neighborhood" components is essential as well as a mix of housing choices and open spaces. Mixed-uses and preservation of natural resources will also be part of the neighborhood design and could increase the need for additional residential land inventories.

Residential Land Need

The current city limits of La Pine contain 4,474.00 acres of land. As noted above, the city has a 20 year population forecast that has been coordinated with Deschutes County and acknowledged by the State of Oregon. The city's population forecast predicts that La Pine will grow from 1697 in 2009 to 2566 in 2029, which would be an increase of 869

citizens. Based on an assumed 1.98 persons per home across all housing types it will take 439 housing units to accommodate the forecasted population growth. Some of the needed housing will be accommodated through occupancy of units that are currently vacant while the majority will need to be constructed. If an expected 15% residential vacancy rate is applied the total number of new housing units needed is increased to 548.

The city’s residential lands need is calculated by dividing the number of additional housing units needed by the expected average units per acre. The residential lands needs are then further refined by applying a dedication factor to project the portion of each acre that will be not available for residential development due to the presence of infrastructure and other community services. The resulting figure is known as “net” acres.

The city’s historic settlement pattern combined with more recent development activity, the presence of city services and an assumed increase in attached housing indicate that a reasonable expected development pattern is 3 units per gross acre or 4.3 units per net acre. This figure reflects new construction and redevelopment on larger, pre-existing lots and parcels generally of 1-2.5 acres in size for an average density of one dwelling per acre, future subdivision activity 5- units per net acre and the projection of 25% of the city’s housing stock being multifamily at an estimated 12 units per acre. If 548 new housing units are needed it will take a total of 182 gross acres or 126 net acres. Since the mixed use commercial designation is expected to absorb about 23 net acres (about 32 gross acres) of housing opportunity the city’s total residential lands need is approximately 149 gross acres (about 104 net acres) of undeveloped or re-developable land.

Summary of Gross Acreages Within City Limits Including General Non-Buildable

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Residential | = 1414.0 |
| Commercial/Mixed Use | = 168.40 |
| Traditional Commercial | = 260.30 |
| Industrial | = 508.50 |
| Public Facilities | = <u>1772.83</u> |
| General Non-Buildable | = <u>349.97</u> |
| Total = 4474.00 acres per Deschutes County GIS Data | |

Summary of Net Vacant/Redevelopable Acreages

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Residential | = 1135.00 |
| Commercial/Mixed Use | = 67.95 |
| Traditional Commercial | = 103.44 |
| Industrial | = <u>234.00</u> |
| Total = 1540.39 acres | |

Residential 1414.0 Gross Acres

Residential - Improved. = 129.6 Acres

Residential – Vacant and/or Redevelopable = 1284.4 Acres

Total Residential Vacant/Redevelopable= 1284.4 acres less dedication factor¹² of 30% = 899.08 acres plus the 22.65 Residential net acres in Commercial Mixed-Use = 921.73 Net Acres available for development over the life of the Plan to 2029

As shown above, there is a surplus of residential lands now within the current City limits. Because there is a surplus that exceeds the land needed to support the projected population, a Goal 14 exception process has been approved by the City, County, and proposed to the State. For these and other reasons the current City limits will also serve as the urban growth boundary UGB for the community.

Residential Districts

The Comprehensive Plan map indicates three distinct Residential Districts – these are: Residential – Single Family; Residential – Multi-Family; and, Master Plan Residential. The Single Family and Master Plan Residential Districts primarily identify an existing development pattern (single family consisting of larger lot, site built homes) and previously planned but not built out areas owned by Deschutes County. The multi-family areas are primarily large, vacant undeveloped parcels along major transportation corridors and are close to commercial service/employment areas. Overall, there is a desire through the land use designations to increase the overall density within the La Pine UGB and transition the development pattern from one where single family residential is dominant to one that includes more medium to high density housing options. An overall ratio of 60% single family residential to 40% multi-family residential is desirable, but the city of La Pine is projected to meet a 75:25 ratio by 2029. The Plan provides various strategies to meet this goal.

Table 1.

| Development Type | Estimated Percentage of New Housing Stock | Estimated Residential Density |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| New Homes on & Re-Development of Existing Large Lots | 10% | 1 units/acre |
| Future Subdivision Activity | 65% | 5 units/acre |
| Future Multi-Family Development | 25% | 12 units/acre |

The city’s Buildable Lands Inventory and the Goal 10 element of its comprehensive plan show that the existing city limits and proposed urban growth boundary contain about

¹² **Dedication Factor** means the amount of land projected as part of future developments that may be used for future public ROW, landscaping, parks, sewer, water, storm drainage, art, easements, street improvements, and other public purposes, etc.

1284.4-acres of vacant or re-developable land to respond to a calculation of about 182 – acres of need.

After a 30% dedication factor is applied to account for public infrastructure and other services that would need to be provided a net amount of about 922-acres, including about 23-acres included in a Commercial Mixed Use designation, remains to respond to about 127 net acres of need.

The figures above indicate that the city's existing supply of residentially designated land results in surplus of about 1,135 gross acres once the Commercial Mixed Use lands have been deducted from the needs category.

Types of Housing

Single Family Residential: Due to a desire to preserve the existing character of single-family neighborhoods, no changes to the designations of these areas are proposed. However, upon implementation of zoning regulations, it is desirable to allow accessory housing in some areas where large lots occur and land is under utilized. Such accessory housing units may include studio apartments, above garage units or “granny flats.” In some instances, townhouse, cottage cluster, duplex or triplex development may be appropriate. Any additional increase in densities within the Single family areas must be predicated on the effects to the existing character of the neighborhood as well as the ability for the area to be adequately served with public facilities and services. An overall density range of 1.0 to 7.0 units per acre is desired for the Single Family Residential District.

Multi-Family Residential: Currently only 3% of the residential development in La Pine is multi-family (i.e. duplex, four-plex, and apartment) – 33 individual units. This shortage of multi-family residential development is a result of past development patterns based on inexpensive land costs combined with the lack of a municipal sewer system thereby necessitating larger lots to accommodate on-site septic systems. Now that a city wide sewer system is available to serve all areas, it is desirable to develop multi-family residential options for La Pines anticipated growth. Such areas should be located along primary transportation corridors and in areas where service commercial and employment opportunities will be convenient to residents. Such areas should be respective of surrounding single family residential neighborhoods and be so located to serve as an appropriate buffer between lower density single family neighborhoods and commercial/industrial uses. It is anticipated that the Multi-Family areas will allow a variety of typical multi-family housing options, with some small scale service commercial uses to serve the higher density populations. An overall density range of 5.0 to 40 units per acre is desired for the Multi Family Residential District.

Master Plan Residential: The master Plan Residential District includes a large area within the center of the urban area, lying between Highway 97 on the east and Huntington Road on the north. The area is also bounded by the traditional Wickiup Junction community on the north (Burgess Road) and the historically developed portions of La Pine on the south. This large expanse of land is owned by Deschutes County and

remains largely undeveloped except for a single family area that was subdivided and developed with homes in the mid 2000's. The County has developed a conceptual master plan for the area and has included internal areas for neighborhood commercial, public facilities/school site, and open space/recreation areas. The overall concept is to allow a development pattern that incorporates a balanced mix of traditional single family residential development with a variety of multi-family residential options. The overall densities are aimed at being a blend of traditional single family and multi family residential development patterns spread out throughout the area. The densities within specific areas of the district are intended to be more dependent on complimentary design elements and arrangements of facilities (i.e. proximity to commercial services, proximity to schools, design of pedestrian amenities, etc.) rather than prescriptive zoning boundaries. An overall density range of 3.0 to 21.0 units per acre is desired for the Master Plan Residential District.

Mixed Use Commercial Residential District

The Comprehensive Plan map includes a Mixed Use Commercial Residential area in the southern part of the city, along a traditional hard-line, prescriptive boundary between standard Commercial and single-family Residential. Most of the land along on either side of this boundary is either undeveloped or under-developed. The Mixed Use Commercial Residential District is intended primarily as a smaller scale, service and office commercial district, with associated residential that may consist of upper level apartments. A live-work design concept within the mixed use district would serve as an appropriate buffer between the formal commercial and residential districts, which abut. Although, stand alone commercial and residential uses that are designed to be compatible with abutting uses would also be appropriate. Multi-family development in the Mixed Use Commercial Residential District should be subject to the same standards as that within Multi-family Residential District. It is desirable for the development within the mixed use district to be master planned, but that may not be possible in all properties due to the small to medium size of the parcels. Some assemblage of properties will be necessary for proper master planning.

Transition Areas

The two Transition Areas within the City (as shown on the Comprehensive Plan map) are located along the Burgess Road, Huntington Road and Highway 97 corridors (in the northern part of the City) and on some undeveloped properties in the southern part of the City where single family residential land abuts industrial land. The Transition Areas, which total 212 acres, were so designated because these areas were primarily undeveloped larger lots and are located in areas where adjoining land uses and transportation facilities could cause conflicts between uses. Additionally, these properties are located in areas where increased residential density and/or a mix of residential and commercial uses may be appropriate due to their proximity to major transportation corridors and existing facilities and services.

North Transition Area

The Transition Area in the north is approximately 162 acres and includes a large undeveloped area on the north side of Burgess Road, east of Huntington Road and an undeveloped parcel along Highway 97 south of the Burgess/Highway 97 intersection, as well as the majority of the length of the south side of Burgess Road. Although the underlying designations on the Comprehensive Plan map for these areas are shown as Master Planned Residential, Multi-Family Residential and Forest, it is assumed that there may be necessary changes to the land use development pattern in the future as a result of recent and planned transportation system improvements. A traffic signal was recently installed at the intersection of Burgess Road and Huntington Road (two arterial roadways) due to the surrounding development pattern, the presence of a new school, the existing volume of traffic, and the expected increase in volume of traffic in the immediate area. Also, the Oregon Department Transportation has planned a new interchange at the Burgess Road and Highway 97 intersection (Wickiup Junction) – this busy intersection has been a safety hazard in the area for many years as it is a primary access point between the western portions of La Pine and outlying areas, and the north/south Highway 97 corridor.

Because an increase in traffic volume can be expected on the roadways serving these areas, it is assumed that this will have a long term influence on the livability and desired development pattern. Also, because these areas lie adjacent to and between the transportation facilities and areas with existing development (a large area developed with single family residential on large lots north of Burgess Road), it is appropriate that any development within these areas serve as a transitional buffer between the road corridor and the existing and anticipated development. Further, because the Transition Area is in close proximity to existing and planned commercial services, a school and a potential transit corridor, an increase in residential density, especially along the south side of Burgess Road corridor, would be appropriate as more residents can be served efficiently and effectively from these locations.

As the development and improvements to the transportation facilities occurs in the future, a development pattern that includes a mixture of service commercial uses and medium density residential development is desired. Such development should occur in a master planned fashion and should treat all sides of the development in a similar fashion – the development must not be linear in nature and should tie together all sides of the surrounding development.

South Transition Area

The Transition Area in the south is approximately 50 acres in area and includes large, undeveloped parcels that lie along the southeastern edge of the City's Industrial district. This area overlaps land that is currently designated for Single Family Residential uses, but if developed as such, could pose compatibility problems with the anticipated surrounding industrial development. Because of the Transition Area's location between the main commercial center to the west and the industrial district to the east, it is a prime area for multi-family dwelling development constructed in a fashion where higher densities occur along the industrial edge and lower densities along the single family residential edge.

As development of the industrial and single family residential areas occurs over time, the development of the transition area as a graduated multi-family residential buffer between the uses is desired. It is anticipated that the average density within the transition area will be medium density, but portions along the edges will vary in their densities in a manner that corresponds with the desired development pattern in the adjoining district. Such development should occur in a master planned fashion and should treat all sides of the development in a similar fashion – the development should be done in a manner where it is integrated into the surrounding development pattern and be respectful of all sides of the surrounding uses.

IV. Transition Area Goals and Policies

Goals

1. Recognize that future infrastructure development, specifically transportation improvements, will cause a change to the existing and anticipated land use patterns over time.
2. Recognize that buffer and transitional development between potentially incompatible land uses shall be implemented.

Policies

1. Transition Area Overlay Zones shall be created and located in portions of the City where anticipated infrastructure development and adjoining land uses may cause a change in the desired underlying land use patterns, and where buffers between potentially incompatible land uses are necessary.
2. Development within Transition Areas shall be master planned to show an inter-relationship between the proposed development, and infrastructure and adjoining land uses.
3. Transition Area development shall allow increased residential densities along primary transportation corridors.
4. A mix of uses, including service commercial uses, may be appropriate as part of a master planned development within the transition areas.
5. Transition Area development shall not be linear in nature and shall be comprised of a pattern that is integrated into and respectful of the surrounding development pattern to the greatest extent practicable given parcel size and configuration.
6. Densities may be averaged over the entirety of the parcel, but shall transition from higher densities adjacent to adjoining uses with the highest intensity to lower densities adjacent to adjoining uses with lower intensities.
7. Guidelines for Transition Area development shall be implemented, but such guidelines shall not be so specific as to prevent adaptability over time or to limit good design.

Programs

1. Draft zoning regulations that specify land use guidelines for the Transition Area Overlay Zones. Such regulations shall include provisions for master plan development.
2. Coordinate transportation infrastructure improvements with State and County agencies to ensure compatibility with adjoining land uses within Transition Areas.

V. General Housing Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Encourage a wide range housing types satisfying the urban development needs of the La Pine community.

Policies

- It is essential to develop strategies that increase the variety of housing choices in the community. These strategies must include an inventory and analysis of needed housing types, existing housing supplies, and strategies for meeting the changing community demographic.
- It is necessary to provide adequate buildable residential land for the 20-year planning horizon. The La Pine community needs a full range of housing types to sustain a healthy community
- It is necessary to accommodate growth and provide mechanisms to ensure that a variety of housing options for all income levels are available in both existing neighborhoods and new residential areas.
- It is necessary to encourage development and redevelopment of residential areas to make them safe, convenient, and attractive places to live and located close to schools, services, parks, shopping and employment centers.
- Residential developments shall be located in close proximity to employment and shopping opportunities.
- The community should maintain the feel of a small community through careful design of new and redeveloping residential areas. Mixed-use and “Complete Neighborhood” design techniques can accomplish this objective.
- A regular housing analysis shall be the basis for understanding and projecting housing needs. City staff will need to manage the calibration data in order to accommodate local cultural characteristics and anomalies. This shall include analysis of financial capability and policies/programs as needed to improve financial capability.

- Development code regulations should allow and provide standards for a range of housing types including multi-family, townhouses, zero lot line, cottage/tiny home developments, accessory dwelling units, and low income housing within the UGB.
- La Pine desires to encourage and sustain affordable housing while protecting the physical characteristics of land relating to the carrying capacity of the land, drainage, natural features, and vegetation.
- Where multi-family development is permitted in commercial districts it should generally be subject to the same density and design standards as that within Multi-Family Residential District.

Goal # 2: Determine opportunities for housing rehabilitation, redevelopment, and connection to urban infrastructure and services.

Policies

- It is important to inventory existing residences in need of rehabilitation and develop strategies to improve housing stock
- Housing that is in need of rehabilitation, without connections to urban services limits the livability of the community, and diminishes redevelopment potential.
- The La Pine community understands that it is necessary for the public health and safety of the community to identify and remedy situations where residences are not connected to City sewer and water.
- Improved residential structural integrity and weatherproofing will reduce energy consumption levels for those living in older homes and the overall community.

Goal # 3: Identify and permit alternatives to traditional stick-built homes, such as manufactured, mobile homes, and accessory dwellings necessary for providing a range of housing choices with in the UGB.

Policies

- Manufactured, mobile homes, and accessory dwellings are appropriate in certain residential areas and subject to the same siting requirements and compatibility standards as traditional stick-built homes.
- It is necessary for the public health and safety of the community to allow for a full range of housing types for all income levels.

- The La Pine community contains a significant number of older mobile homes and manufactured homes that need repair or replacement.
- State law requires the City to establish clear and objective criteria and standards for the placement and design of mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks.
- In order to protect the public health and safety of all residents the City, in conjunction with the Deschutes County Building Department, La Pine shall impose safety and inspection requirements for homes, which were not constructed in conformance with the National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974.
- In order to enhance industry and commerce, a mobile home or manufactured dwelling park shall not be established on land zoned for commercial or industrial use unless needed to address workforce-housing needs.
- Accessory dwellings to homes, i.e. “Granny flats”, are necessary to provide a range of housing types in new subdivisions and existing neighborhoods subject to appropriate compatibility standards and siting requirements.
- Temporary housing for medical hardships and the disadvantaged is necessary and shall be permitted in residential areas and subject to special development conditions.

Goal # 4: Promote and protect neighborhood qualities that reflect the small town appeal of La Pine and improve compatibility between various uses.

Policies:

- Compatibility standards are effective tools for making sure neighborhood uses are consistent with community goals and design standards.
- The La Pine community demands a quality living experience for all residents and multi-family developments. Thus, site plans for multi-family developments or attached single-family housing are required to provide for adequate yard space for residents and play space for children which have distinct area and definite shape, appropriate for the proposed use, and are not just the residue left after buildings are designed and placed on the land. It is necessary for the public health and safety of the community to monitor and manage neighborhood uses.
- The La Pine community desires to preserve, protect, and strengthen the vitality and stability of existing neighborhoods while permitting uses that make neighborhoods more “complete” and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Developments that border underdeveloped urban lands and/or rural lands at the edges of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) shall include design techniques to

reduce the impact of new, denser urban development on abutting lower density lands. Examples of such techniques include the use of buffer areas, designing projects that work with the natural features of the site, shadow plats, and redevelopment plans that extend 300 feet off site, density transition zones, increased landscaping, master planning areas larger than the project site, etc.

- New residential developments in areas without an established character or quality should be permitted maximum flexibility in design and housing type consistent with densities and goals and objectives of this Plan.
- New developments in existing residential areas where there is an established character deemed desirable by community standards should use a variety of compatibility techniques to blend in with surrounding developments, including landscaping, traffic patterns, mass, height, screened parking areas, public facilities, visual impact, architectural styles and lighting.
- “Complete Neighborhoods” include private and public nonresidential uses for the convenience and safety of the neighborhood residents. These uses should be permitted within residential areas. Such facilities shall be compatible with surrounding developments, and their appearance should enhance the area.
- Multi-modal access should be provided internally and to adjacent new and existing neighborhood developments.
- Where alleys are available, garages or parking areas in neighborhoods should be accessed from alleys instead of driveways connecting to public streets.
- Residential units should be permitted above or as an incidental use in conjunction with certain commercial and industrial uses as a way to improve compatibility between uses and zones.
- A range of housing types, including housing for the elderly, disabled, developmentally challenged and low-income citizens of the community should be dispersed throughout those residential neighborhoods, which are close to schools, services, parks, shopping and employment centers rather than concentrating these dwellings in just a few areas.
- A range of lot sizes should be dispersed throughout the community to provide space for a full spectrum of housing types.
- Higher density developments should be in close proximity to schools, services, parks, shopping, employment centers, and public transit.
- Smaller lot sizes may be appropriate and should be encouraged with flexible Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinances allowing a mix of lot sizes.

- Areas developed or designated for multi-family development should be compatible with adjoining land uses and not detract from the character of existing residential areas.
- The location of most multi-family housing will be best suited near the City core, major transportation corridors, schools, services, parks, shopping, employment centers, and transit corridors.

Goal # 5: Promote quality affordable housing and recognize that lack of affordable housing is an economic issue negatively affecting the vitality and sustainability of La Pine

Policies

- Affordable housing should be available for all income levels in the community. This issue affects all citizens because the economic health of the community is tied to providing greater choices in housing types.
- It is necessary for the public health, safety, and economic values of the community to improve awareness of affordable housing problems and to encourage affordable housing for all income levels.
- A lack of particular housing choices create traffic congestion as people commute from one community to another, increase costs for businesses related to employee travel time, employee absences, unnecessary street expansions and parking demand, reduced mobility for certain disadvantaged groups, and unnecessary community subsidy to remedy these and other impacts.
- The profit margin on affordable housing projects is very thin. Barriers to affordable housing will need to be removed from local regulations and land use processes to enable property owners and developers to pursue affordable housing projects.
- The City will be experiencing the same types of demographic forces that currently impact Bend, Redmond, and other communities in Oregon. For example, the population will age and the baby-boomer generation will retire. Households will become smaller. To prepare for this eventuality La Pine must provide for a variety of housing types. The variety will help meet affordability demand, and it will help meet new housing demand in general. Since there will be more single head of households, people will desire units that are smaller and those that will require less maintenance and can be located within walking distances of shopping, houses of worship, parks/recreation, schools, and medical facilities. This dictates development of more compact housing forms and innovations in how structures are designed and arranged to suit a variety of needs.

- The City and County should encourage subsidized housing to be located at a variety of locations in close proximity to support services and/or near transit.
- Residential zones and other neighborhoods should offer a wide variety of compatible housing types and densities.

Goal # 6: Recognize that addressing the housing needs of the community is essential to the successful future of La Pine as desirable place to live, work, shop, and play.

Policies

- Strategies to improve the type and range of housing choices in the community must be based upon careful examination of demographic data, trends, and local demands.
- Certain development regulations and techniques can influence the market-driven nature of housing development.
- The recent Census data is one of many resources necessary to examine for understanding local and regional demographics.
- The vitality of the City depends not just on the health of one aspect of housing but preferably by taking a systemic approach to growth and development, preservation and continuity.
- The greatest housing needs include a more diverse base of affordable rental opportunities signified by range of rent and housing type, particularly smaller sized structures such as duplexes and triplexes. However, the ability to take advantage of low interest rates has moved many people into homeownership where they are paying more than 30% of income on mortgages.
- The community needs more affordable single-family homes. Some potential homebuyers are being priced out of the market due to insufficient income and escalating real estate prices. For renters, the census data and other information suggests that there is a high demand for units serving people under 80% of median income. It also appears there are very few apartment units affordable to people at median income or less, and yet many households are paying more than 30% of household income for housing.
- There is a need for temporary shelters or transitional housing opportunities for people with special needs, including but not limited to, households experiencing domestic violence issues, or youth homelessness.
- The population projections anticipate more than 400 new units will be needed by 2029. This means that the community will need to provide more living units for

new households where families will number 2.80 to 3.00 persons per household. Thus, over the 20-year period the community is expected to grow at 3 % per year on average.

VI. Programs

The City shall:

1. Regularly monitor and analyze residential land inventories each year.
2. Determine housing type demand and encourage mechanisms to permit development of needed housing types and minimum density levels in master planned areas and mixed-use areas.
3. Allocate where the identified needed housing should be developed by using overlay mapping techniques and framework planning.
4. Require the development of “Complete Neighborhoods.” The City may need to update development regulations in order to remove any barriers that restrict quality residential design and/or hinder “complete neighborhood development”.
5. Update the development codes with regard to housing development and natural feature protection.
6. Inventory and determine which types of residential units and neighborhoods would benefit from rehabilitation and connection to urban services.
7. Encourage rehabilitation and maintenance of housing in existing neighborhoods to preserve the housing stock and increase the availability of safe and sanitary living units.
8. Explore funding options such as CDBG, HOME, and other local, State or Federal programs designed to help promote affordable housing and to help disadvantaged property owners rehabilitate their homes.
9. Study and develop a range of incentives and other programs aimed at helping the community understand the value of participating in the rehabilitation of housing units.
10. Revise and update the development codes to ensure that wide ranges of housing types are required and permitted throughout the community.
11. Inventory all manufactured, mobile and accessory dwellings.
12. Provide for mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks within the urban growth boundaries to allow persons and families a choice of residential settings.

13. Update regulations to require development of new mobile home parks and siting of individual mobile homes consistent with State law.
14. Develop special standards for the siting and development of accessory dwellings.
15. Institute fee mechanisms and programs that help to encourage the development of affordable housing.
16. Develop land use regulations to improve compatibility standards between uses in the development of “complete neighborhoods” and redevelopment in existing neighborhoods.
17. Develop the land use regulations to require multi-modal access in new and redeveloping neighborhoods as appropriate.
18. Develop the land use regulations to permit a range of housing types and flexible PUD standards that encourage more efficient use of land.
19. Participate with Housing Works(formerly Central Oregon Regional Housing Authority), COCAAN and/or other public or private non-profit organizations in the development of a regional housing plan to address issues and to establish programs which address housing affordability, density, home ownership, neighborhoods and location. Such plans should provide for a detailed management program to assign respective implementation roles and responsibilities to those governmental bodies operating in the planning area and having interests in carrying out the goal.
20. Provide funding for affordable housing when feasible and with community consensus.
21. Modify the development review process to expedite affordable housing proposals and reduce development and operating costs when such proposals are in accordance with zoning ordinances and with provisions of comprehensive plans.
22. Determine that SDC payments and other development deposits, fees and taxes for affordable housing projects will be deferred until title transfer or final occupancy of the structure. Additional methods and devices for reducing development barriers should be examined and, after consideration of the impact on lower income households, include, but not be limited to: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) building and construction code revision; (3) zoning and land use controls; (4) subsidies and loans; (5) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; (6) enforcement of local health and safety codes; and (7) coordination of the development of urban facilities and services to disperse low income housing throughout the planning area.

23. Examine any needed changes to local regulations to create incentives for increasing population densities in urban areas taking into consideration (1) key facilities, (2) the economic, environmental, social and energy consequences of the proposed densities and (3) the optimal use of existing urban land particularly in sections containing significant amounts of unsound substandard structures. This may include the promotion and development of institutional and financial mechanisms to provide for affordable housing and the investigation of available federal, state and local programs and private options for financing affordable and special needs housing.
24. Monitor the stability of existing affordable housing options to determine their sustainability and usefulness.
25. Encourage and support social and health service organizations, which offer support programs for those with special needs, particularly those programs that help people remain in the community.
26. Preserve existing affordable housing through adoption of land use regulations that promote affordable housing and examine alternatives for providing services, including transit.
27. Create an inventory of city-owned land that can be set aside for special housing development (TDC credits, low income, etc.) this may include the development of organizational capability to coordinate such efforts.
28. Develop a density bonus program in which developers may receive “credit” in additional units (beyond what zoning allows) if units available and affordable to households under 80% of median income are integrated into new projects.
29. Modify the development regulations to allow housing above retail in the town center/downtown.
30. Develop workforce housing standards and implementation programs.
31. Build understanding and support for affordable housing by instituting a public information program and community forums.
32. Examine the most recent sources of data to determine housing needs and monitor demographic trends.
33. Promote an awareness of housing issues and provide regulatory solutions. This may include changes to development regulations and increased flexibility for those who desire to build affordable housing units.

34. Provide flexible regulations as appropriate for those entities that propose to build temporary shelters and transitional housing opportunities.
35. Monitor and evaluate the population projections as they are amended from time to time. The City shall also inventory all new development and prepare a report of all new activity and housing unit creation, demolitions and expansion.

**City of LaPine – Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 11
Energy Conservation**

I. State Planning Goal 13, Energy Conservation

Oregon State Planning Goal 13 intends that the land itself, the uses and the arrangement of the land and uses be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based upon sound economic principles. The methods prescribed by the Goal require maximum efficiency in energy utilization should be achieved through the implementation measures of land use planning. Consideration must also be given to redevelopment of land that is no longer being utilized to its maximum extent, including increased density of housing development along high volume transportation corridors to encourage use of multi-modal transportation systems. Additionally, development should encourage the conservation of natural resources and minimize the depletion of non-renewable resources – when ever possible land use plans should encourage the use of renewable resources. However, in doing so, the local and regional development pattern must be taken into consideration. Rural areas that rely on larger service areas and greater travel distances should initiate programs locally to meet the intent of the goal through greater self reliance.

II. Purpose and Intent

The conservation of energy in every community has a different set of variables that must be evaluated and weighed when developing local rules regarding energy consumption. For La Pine, the large travel distance between the primary employment and service areas of Bend and Redmond to the north must be taken into consideration. Additionally, the very cold, snowy winters and hot, dry summers have implications not only the amount of energy consumed, but also the opportunity to implement local policies to reduce consumption. While there are always methods that can be put into effect, in communities like La Pine with these unique circumstances some methods that may work in other communities may not be practical in La Pine. For instance, in the northern part of Deschutes County, where winters are milder and commute distances are shorter, pure energy consumption in the form of heating and cooling, and automobile fuel consumption, are not as great as they are in La Pine. Thus, while certain energy saving policies toward local development can be implemented, there are certain factors that cannot be ignored. Although, at the local level there are a variety of development patters that can be implemented in La Pine to begin to more efficiently use energy resources.

III. Issues

Travel Requirements

The City of La Pine serves as a service center for the outlying rural area which has a sprawling residential development pattern that was established in the 1960's, prior to Oregon's current land use planning requirements. The outlying area lacks many urban services, including commercial and service needs necessary for everyday life. Although lacking some services itself, the City of La Pine is the primary source for services such as grocery shopping, education and medical facilities. Thus, the transportation system is key to the citizens of the area, beyond the La Pine City limits. Most of the outlying residents needing such services from La Pine reside within 10 miles of the city limits.

Notwithstanding the fact that La Pine is the service area for many everyday needs to the surrounding area, La Pine is still today lacking some more specific requirements of everyday life (such as hospital and specialty/emergency medical services, and upper education opportunities) and a variety of employers and employment options. Thus, regional travel, primarily to the City of Bend 35 miles to the north is essential.

The large distance between La Pine, the outlying residents and the larger service areas make vehicular travel the primary method of transportation. This is the most energy consumptive methods of travel in the immediate area. In order to minimize vehicular energy consumption the transportation system must be efficient and economical. A key component in future development will be to work with Deschutes County and ODOT to maintain an efficient and economical transportation system. Additionally, La Pine must seek methods for improving mass transit opportunities to move people and goods between La Pine, the outlying areas and larger service centers to the north in a more efficient manner.

Existing Development Pattern

The existing development pattern in La Pine was primarily established in the 1950's and 1960's. The commercial pattern is oriented toward US Highway 97 which bisects the community. The residential pattern is removed from the commercial areas and consists of larger lot neighborhoods. This pattern results in difficulty for pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between their homes and service areas. New development patterns which require increased density along primary street corridors, with the development of bike lanes, sidewalks and bike/pedestrian trails that link residential areas to public destinations will encourage alternative travel modes (other than automobiles) and reduce energy consumption.

Energy Suppliers and Opportunities

La Pine's industrial areas and key location within Central Oregon will attract businesses seeking to develop alternative energy sources. A potential Bio-mass or other similar facility could easily locate to La Pine given the abundance of served industrial sites. Utilities to serve such uses will need to be coordinated with the service providers to ensure capacity availability. Mid-State Electric Co-operative provides electrical services to the community including long-range service and expansion plans. Natural Gas services are available from Cascade Natural Gas and opportunities for expansion are included in their long range capital program plans.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Create an arrangement and density of land uses to encourage energy conservation.

Policies

- Land use patterns shall achieve greater density for new residential development, including greater density along primary roadways where multi-modal transportation options are more practical.
- The City will require new construction to meet State standards and all building code requirements for weatherization and energy conservation.
- The land planning and site design shall encourage the positioning of buildings and use of vegetation to regulate the effects of the sun during the winter and summer months to implement passive energy use for heating and reduce the need for supplemental cooling.
- The City shall encourage the development of alternative energy sources such as solar, wind, geothermal and bio-mass.
- Lands that can accommodate energy production as a transitional use shall be encouraged.
- The City will seek ways to require and will encourage the further development of sidewalks, trails and other bike and pedestrian paths.
- The City shall increase the efficiency of all City operations where possible.
- Encourage recycling efforts throughout the community.

V. Programs

The City shall:

1. Collaborate with the Parks and Recreation District to create plans for the development of an efficient pedestrian bike and trail system.
2. Collaborate with Deschutes County and the Oregon Department of Transportation to develop and maintain an economical and efficient transportation system.
3. Develop land use regulations that increase residential densities along primary transportation corridors for new developed areas.
4. Develop land use regulations that require development to be oriented so that the effects of solar energy can be both maximized and minimized during the winter and summer months respectively.

City of LaPine – Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 12 Urbanization

I. State Planning Goal 14, Urbanization

The goal intends that cities provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

The Comprehensive Planning Process included an analysis of buildable land within the City limits as established with the 2006 incorporation. Along with the buildable lands determination, such lands were examined for their ability to be provided with necessary public facilities and services – this was coordinated with the master plans and comprehensive plans of the service providers and special districts. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the area within the existing City boundary contains enough land area to meet the projected housing and economic land needs for the projected population growth over the 20-year planning period. Thus, based upon this and the commensurate Goal 14 Exception, the Urban Growth Boundary is the same as the established incorporated boundary. An expansion of the UGB and/or City boundary is not anticipated at this time.

II. Purpose and Intent

The purpose of the city in meeting this goal is to conform with the laws and statutes for establishing a sufficiency of buildable lands within urban growth boundary and making sure that there is a supportable analysis and determination of needed residential housing patterns. The appendix and other references above indicate that the inventory of buildable lands within the city limits is more than adequate to meet the demand over the 20 year planning period. This in combination with the inventory of economic and needed park, recreation, open space and utility facility lands shows that the current city limits is more than adequate to serve the needs of the community over a 20 year period.

When comparing the amount of acres available for housing of all types within the city limits with the necessary acres and number of housing units, the data shows that there is a surplus of acreage available within the current city limits to accommodate the projected housing need. A Goal 14 exception is required as noted below. With approval of the exception, the city limits can serve as the proposed UGB and this is commensurate with the existing incorporated boundary.

III. Issues

Transition of Resource lands to needed public facility (PF zone) utility expansion, ROW for ODOT Overpass project, energy production, large lot employment, recreation and open spaces.

The City of La Pine currently contains over a thousand acres of forest and BLM lands. These lands are located on the eastern part of the community and mostly east of the BNSF rail line. These acres will be used for public facilities such as sewer expansion, ROW for the ODOT overpass, energy production, and other public uses..

Mixed Use Commercial Residential Districts

The Comprehensive Plan map includes a Mixed Use Commercial Residential area in the southern part of the city, along a traditional hard-line, prescriptive boundary between standard Commercial and single-family Residential. Most of the land along on either side of this boundary is either undeveloped or under-developed. The Mixed Use Commercial Residential District is intended primarily as a smaller scale, service and office commercial district, with associated residential that may consist of upper level apartments. A live-work design concept within the mixed-use district would serve as an appropriate buffer between the traditional commercial and residential districts.. Although stand alone commercial and residential uses that are designed to be compatible with abutting uses would also be appropriate. It is desirable for the development within the mixed-use district to be master planned, but that may not be possible in all properties due to the small to medium size of the parcels. Some assemblage of properties will be necessary for proper master planning.

Public Schools – Bend-La Pine School District

The Bend-La Pine School District currently operates La Pine High School, La Pine Middle School, and La Pine Elementary. A new elementary school has been built on the south side of Burgess Road in the Newberry Neighborhood. As the subdivision develops over time (this was anticipated to be built for half enrollment (300 students) in 2010, with completion for a total enrollment of 600 students by 2015. Overall, the enrollment of the La Pine schools has grown, mostly as a result of residential development and growth in the outlying rural area between La Pine and Sunriver to the north. La Pine Elementary serves kindergarten through 4th grade with an enrollment of approximately 475 students. La Pine Middle School serves 5th through 8th grades with an enrollment of approximately 520 students. La Pine High School serves 9th through 12th grades with an enrollment of approximately 540 students.

School District officials have confirmed they have no plans within the next 20 years to develop additional schools within the City limits or UGB. The School Facility Plan and the confirmation are incorporated into this document and can be found in the Appendix and restated as part of the chapter discussing Goal 14.

Population Forecast

The data provided by Deschutes County below shows that there are approximately 1,653 – 1,697 persons within the City Limits. There is no accurate data for the City limits prior to this date since La Pine was not incorporated at the time of the previous Census.

| Geographic Area | US Census | | | 2010 PSU Forecast | | | 2010 County Coord. Forecast | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|----------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------|
| | 2010 | 2000 | 10 yr % Change | 2010 | 2000 | 10 yr % Change | 2010 | 2000 | 10 yr % Change |
| Deschutes County | 157,733 | 115,367 | 36.7% | 157,905 | 116,600 | 35.4% | 166,572 | 116,600 | 42.9% |
| Bend | 76,639 | 52,029 | 47.3% | 76,740 | 52,800 | 45.3% | 81,242 | 52,800 | 53.9% |
| Redmond | 26,215 | 13,481 | 94.5% | 26,225 | 13,770 | 90.5% | 23,897 | 15,505 | 54.1% |
| Sisters | 2,038 | 959 | 112.5% | 2,040 | 975 | 109.2% | 2,306 | 975 | 136.5% |
| La Pine | 1,653 | N/A | N/A | 1,660 | N/A | N/A | 1,697 | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 51,188 | 48,898 | 4.7% | 51,240 | 49,055 | 4.5% | 57430 | 47320 | 21.4% |

| Geographic Area | 2010 | 2000 | 1990 |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Deschutes County | 157,733 | 115,367 | 74,958 |
| Bend | 76,639 | 52,029 | 20,447 |
| Redmond | 26,215 | 13,481 | 7,165 |
| Sisters | 2,038 | 959 | 708 |
| La Pine | 1,653 | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 51,188 | 48,898 | 46,638 |

| Geographic Area | 2010 | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Deschutes County | 157,905 | 170,705 | 167,015 | 160,810 | 152,615 | 143,490 | 135,450 | 130,500 | 126,500 | 122,050 | 116,600 |
| Bend | 76,740 | 82,280 | 80,995 | 77,780 | 75,290 | 70,330 | 65,210 | 62,900 | 57,750 | 55,080 | 52,800 |
| Redmond | 26,225 | 25,800 | 25,445 | 24,805 | 23,500 | 20,010 | 18,100 | 17,450 | 16,110 | 14,960 | 13,770 |
| Sisters | 2,040 | 1,925 | 1,875 | 1,825 | 1,745 | 1,660 | 1,490 | 1,430 | 1,080 | 960 | 975 |
| La Pine | 1,660 | 1,625 | 1,810 | 1,590 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | 51,240 | 59,075 | 57,090 | 54,810 | 52,080 | 51,490 | 50,650 | 48,720 | 51,560 | 51,050 | 49,055 |

| Geographic Area | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2007-08 | 2006-07 | 2005-06 | 2004-05 | 2003-04 | 2002-03 | 2001-02 | 2000-01 |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Deschutes County | -12,800 -7.5% | 3,690 2.2% | 6,205 3.9% | 8,195 5.4% | 9,125 6.4% | 8,040 5.9% | 4,950 3.8% | 4,000 3.2% | 4,450 3.6% | 5,450 4.7% |
| Bend | -5,540 -6.7% | 1,285 1.6% | 3,215 4.1% | 2,490 3.3% | 4,960 7.1% | 5,120 7.9% | 2,310 3.7% | 5,150 8.9% | 2,670 4.8% | 2,280 4.3% |
| Redmond | 425 1.6% | 355 1.4% | 640 2.6% | 1,305 5.6% | 3,490 17.4% | 1,910 10.6% | 650 3.7% | 1,340 8.3% | 1,150 7.7% | 1,190 8.6% |
| Sisters | 115 6.0% | 50 2.7% | 50 2.7% | 80 4.6% | 85 5.1% | 170 11.4% | 60 4.2% | 350 32.4% | 120 12.5% | -15 -1.5% |
| La Pine | 35 2.2% | 15 0.9% | 20 1.3% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Unincorporated | -7,835 -13.3% | 1,985 3.5% | 2,280 4.2% | 2,730 5.2% | 590 1.1% | 840 1.7% | 1,930 4.0% | -2,840 -5.5% | 510 1.0% | 1,995 4.1% |

| Geographic Area | 2000 to 2010 |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Deschutes County | 3.08 |
| Bend | 3.81 |
| Redmond | 6.65 |
| Sisters | 7.66 |

The population of the County has increased significantly since the adoption of the comprehensive plan in 1979 as the charts indicate.

| Population Growth in Deschutes County: 1980 to 2000 | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sources | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 |
| Population Research Center - July 1 estimates | 62,500 | 75,600 | 116,600 |
| Census Bureau - April 1 census counts | 62,142 | 74,958 | 115,367 |

ORS 195.025(1) requires the counties to coordinate local plans and population forecasts. In 1996, Bend, Redmond, Sisters and the County reviewed the most recent population forecasts from the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census, the Department of Transportation, Woods and Poole, the Bonneville Power Administration and the State Department of Administrative Services Office of Economic Analysis. After review of these projections, the cities and Deschutes County agreed on the coordinated population forecast adopted by the County in 1998 by Ordinance 98-084.

The results of the 2000 decennial census and subsequent population estimates prepared by the Population Research Center (PRC) at Portland State University revealed the respective populations of the County and the incorporated cities were growing faster than contemplated under the 1998 coordinated forecast. The cities and the County engaged in a coordination process between 2002 and 2004 that culminated with the County adopting a revised population forecast that projected population for the cities and the County to the year 2025. The following table displays the 2004 coordinated population forecast for Deschutes County and the urban growth boundaries of the cities of Bend, Redmond, and Sisters from 2000 to 2025:

| 2000-2025 Coordinated Population Forecast | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Year | Bend UGB | Redmond UGB | Sisters UGB | Unincorporated County | Total County |
| 2000 | 52,800 | 15,505 | 975 | 47,320 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | 69,004 | 19,249 | 1,768 | 53,032 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | 81,242 | 23,897 | 2,306 | 59,127 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | 91,158 | 29,667 | 2,694 | 65,924 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | 100,646 | 36,831 | 3,166 | 73,502 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | 109,389 | 45,724 | 3,747 | 81,951 | 240,811 |

The process through which the County and the cities coordinated to develop the 2000-2025 coordinated forecast is outlined in the report titled "*Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast 2000-2025: Findings in Support of Forecast*" dated July 2004. This report provides the findings in support of the adopted forecast. The Deschutes County Year 2000 Comprehensive Plan (1979) included a population forecast from 1980 to 2000 that was incorporated in several chapters. In 1998, the County adopted a coordinated population forecast under ORS 195.036. The following table displays all three forecasts for comparison:

| Deschutes County Population Forecasts from 1979, 1998, and 2004 | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Year | 1979 forecast | 1998 forecast | 2004 forecast |
| | | | |


| | | | |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1980 | 53,400 | - | - |
| 1985 | 66,600 | - | - |
| 1990 | 82,900 | 74,958 | - |
| 1995 | 103,400 | 94,100 | - |
| 2000 | 128,200 | 113,231 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | - | 132,239 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | - | 151,431 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | - | 167,911 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | - | 182,353 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | - | - | 240,811 |

The fourth city in Deschutes County is La Pine. Incorporated on November 7, 2006, the City of La Pine's 2006 population estimate of 1,590 was certified by Portland State University, Population and Research Center on December 15, 2007. As of January 1, 2009, La Pine is coordinating with the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to develop its first comprehensive plan. As a result of La Pine incorporation, Deschutes County updated its Coordinated Population Forecast with Ordinance 2009-006. The purpose of this modification was to adopt a conservative twenty-year population forecast for the City of La Pine that can be used by city officials and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to estimate future land need and an Urban Growth Boundary. The following table displays the coordinated population forecast for Deschutes County, the urban growth boundaries of the cities of Bend, Redmond, and Sisters, and the city of La Pine from 2000 to 2025:

| 2000-2025 Coordinated Population Forecast | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Year | Bend UGB | Redmond UGB | Sisters UGB | La Pine UGB | Unincorporated County | Total County |
| 2000 | 52,800 | 15,505 | 975 | - | 47,320 | 116,600 |
| 2005 | 69,004 | 19,249 | 1,768 | - | 53,032 | 143,053 |
| 2010 | 81,242 | 23,897 | 2,306 | 1,697 | 57,430 | 166,572 |
| 2015 | 91,158 | 29,667 | 2,694 | 1,892 | 64,032 | 189,443 |
| 2020 | 100,646 | 36,831 | 3,166 | 2,110 | 71,392 | 214,145 |
| 2025 | 109,389 | 45,724 | 3,747 | 2,352 | 79,599 | 240,811 |

As a result of La Pine's incorporation, Deschutes County updated its Coordinated Population Forecast with Ordinance 2009-006. The purpose of this modification was to adopt a conservative twenty-year population forecast for the City of La Pine that can be used by city officials and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to estimate future land need and an Urban Growth Boundary. Deschutes County's 2004 Coordinated Population Forecast applied a conservative 2.2% annual average growth rate to estimate the county's unincorporated population from 2000 to 2025. This method applied the growth rate as a compounding rate throughout the entire forecast. Recognizing that La Pine incorporation occurred on November 7, 2006, it is reasonable to apply a 2.2% annual average growth rate to La Pine's estimated population, starting in July 1, 2007, the first time Portland State University's Population Research Center officially certified the City of La Pine in an Annual Population Report. By extending the growth rate to the

Year 2025, La Pine’s population will be 2,352. The Nonurban unincorporated population decreases by 2,352 from its original projection of 81,951 to 79,599. Extending the growth rate to the Year 2029 results in a twenty year population estimate of 2,566 for La Pine.



Population and Growth

| Year Incorporation November 7, 2006 | Population | Average Annual Growth Rate |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| | 2007 | 1585 |
| 2010 | 1697 | 2.20 |
| 2015 | 1892 | 2.20 |
| 2020 | 2110 | 2.20 |
| 2025 | 2352 | 2.20 |
| 2029 | 2566 | 2.20 |


DLCD Approved Coordinated Deschutes County Population Forecast, which shows 1,585 people at the date of incorporation and using the 2.2% growth rate, provides 2,566 people in 2029.

Existing Development/Settlement Pattern Shape City Limits and UGB

The existing settlement pattern in La Pine was primarily established in the 1950’s and 1960’s. The commercial pattern is oriented toward US Highway 97, which bisects the community. Before incorporation was voted in 2006, Deschutes County classified La Pine as an Urban Unincorporated Community (UUC) as the map below shows. Also shown on this map are a number of urban-like subdivisions on the western side of the UUC. Visually, as one drives through La Pine the City seems like it is cut in half, but if one reviews the city maps it is clear the large areas to the east of the City is preserved for the city’s sewer expansion and other public facilities, including the cemetery. The BNSF rail line also runs through this area and, given the costly nature of rail crossings, the City felt it was best to not use the area for anything other than public facilities.

At the top of the UUC map is a turquoise colored spur of commercial services intermixed with residential uses. The residential area due west of the green spur contains consists of well-established, larger lot neighborhoods with lots as large as 10 acres in size or more. This pattern results in difficulty for the City to plan for pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between their homes and service areas. New development patterns which require increased density along primary street corridors, with the development of bike

The community voted to incorporate and the City limits and proposed UGB is hand-drawn on the UUC map to provide a better presentation on the areas of the community included into the city limits. The appendix contains the final GIS map, which is an exhibit to the adopting ordinance.



As shown above, the voters determined that the established settlement pattern of the neighborhood next to the green spur was necessary to include within the City limits and UGB. This area is strongly linked to the employment and services available in the green spur area. Because of this and the fact that the community wanted parks and schools to be within the city as well as the UGB, citizens felt it was imperative that those uses be within one jurisdictional area. This results in cohesive planning and an increased sense of community whereby public utilities such as transportation, water, and sewer services are planned to serve the area.

Just to the east of the green spur contains a major gas line and land for employment uses that rely upon the street grid provided for by streets in the green spur area. This area has urban features and is bound by the Resource lands to the east. Thus, this and the lands to the southeast of the green spur were considered to be essential to the growing community and serve to provide for the following Public Facility uses:

- Expansion for the existing sewer treatment plant consisting of treatment ponds, pasture lands upon which to distribute treated effluent, and a buffer from residential uses west of the highway;
- Opportunities to create a buffer from wildfires originating from the east;
- Needed lands for ODOT's grade separated crossing/overpass project, including staging space
- Inclusion of Cemetery land and expansion lands needed to support the use.
- Opportunities for energy production in the form of Solar, Bio-Mass, etc.
- Opportunities for open space and effective buffer between Rail ROW and nearby residential lands

The large yellow area on the above map contains the Planned Newberry Neighborhood. This area was developed by Deschutes County to assist in the transfer of development credits from the areas outside of the City limits that have failing septic systems and through the credit program can relocate housing to the new neighborhood area. Lands west of this area were included in the City limits and UGB because they contained existing platted neighborhoods and public facility lands that are intended to be served with public sewer.

Lands included into the City limits beyond the UUC at the southwest of the community include very old subdivisions that have an existing urban pattern and right of ways and lands that currently have active public facilities upon them such as the Sheriff's facility and other public service agencies serving the community.

As required by OAR 660-024-0040 and related statutes, the UGB must be based on the adopted 20-year population forecast for the urban area described in OAR 660-024-0030, and must provide for needed housing, employment and other urban uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks and open space over the 20-year planning period consistent with the land need requirements of Goal 14 and this rule – or an exception to the rule must be approved. The 20-year need determinations are estimates which, although based on the best available information and methodologies, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision. La Pine has been lucky that as a small city, it is fairly easy to perform the BLI and RNA. The RNA revealed that there were a surplus of residential lands for developing a broad range of housing types. The BLI shows that there were adequate lands for supporting employment lands throughout the planning period.

Goal 14 Exception Excerpt

The Appendix contains the rationale for supporting a Goal 14 Exception approving the location of the UGB, which is proposed to be the same as the current, voter-approved city limits.

Urban growth boundaries are ordinarily designated based on a projection of land needs for a variety of categories (residential, commercial, employment, public, etc...) over a 20-year planning horizon. However, this ordinary principle of urban growth boundary designation need not apply to the city's residential lands inventory for at least three reasons. First, the city is establishing an urban growth boundary for the very first time as opposed to expanding an existing urban growth boundary. In this situation the city has an established city limits but no urban growth boundary. The city believes it would be poor public policy to have an urban growth boundary within the city limits because it would be confusing for the citizens, challenging for city administration and, for based on the materials included in this document, ultimately unnecessary. Second, most all of La Pine was planned and zoned for urban levels of residential development and urban facilities and services when it was under county jurisdiction prior to incorporation. Third, the city has a fairly small population and a fairly large land base relative to its size. Existing residential neighborhoods are disbursed throughout the city boundary instead of focused at a central location. Failure to include all of the city's residential lands into the urban growth boundary would result in a significant portion of the city's population living on "rural" lands within the city's boundaries, frustrating the city's ability to furnish public facilities and services to its citizens.

Statewide Planning Goal 14 and its implementing administrative rule direct cities to rely on a 20 year population forecast to establish residential lands needs. Instead, for reasons to be explained in greater detail within the exception show the city may rely on its corporate city limits as the natural and reasonable location for its urban growth boundary. In other words, the city proposes its city limits and urban growth boundary to

be co-terminus and thus, strict adherence to the 20 year population forecast is not necessary to establish an amount of residential lands within the city's first urban growth boundary and justifies an exception to that provision of Goal 14.

Residential Lands Needs

The city has a 20 year population forecast that has been coordinated with Deschutes County and acknowledged by the State of Oregon. The city's population forecast predicts that La Pine will grow from 1697 in 2009 to 2566 in 2029, which would be an increase of 869 citizens. Based on an assumed 1.98 persons per home across all housing types it will take 439 housing units to accommodate the forecasted population growth. Some of the needed housing will be accommodated through occupancy of units that are currently vacant while the majority will need to be constructed. If an expected 15% residential vacancy rate is applied the total number of new housing units needed is increased to 548.

The city's residential lands need is calculated by dividing the number of additional housing units needed by the expected average units per acre. The residential lands needs are then further refined by applying a dedication factor to project the portion of each acre that will be not available for residential development due to the presence of infrastructure and other community services. The resulting figure is known as "net" acres.

The city's historic settlement pattern combined with more recent development activity, the presence of city services and an assumed increase in attached housing indicate that a reasonable expected development pattern is 3 units per gross acre or 4.3 units per net acre. This figure reflects new construction and redevelopment on larger, pre-existing lots and parcels generally of 1-2.5 acres in size for an average density of one dwelling per acre, future subdivision activity 5- units per net acre and the projection of 25% of the city's housing stock being multifamily at an estimated 12 units per acre. If 548 new housing units are needed it will take a total of 182 gross acres or 126 net acres. Since the mixed use commercial designation is expected to absorb about 23 net acres (about 32 gross acres) of housing opportunity the city's total residential lands need is approximately 149 gross acres (about 104 net acres) of undeveloped or re-developable land.

Table 1.

| Development Type | Estimated Percentage of New Housing Stock | Estimated Residential Density |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| New Homes on & Re-Development of Existing Large Lots | 10% | 1 units/acre |
| Future Subdivision Activity | 65% | 5 units/acre |
| Future Multi-Family Development | 25% | 12 units/acre |

Residential Lands Supply

The city's Buildable Lands Inventory and the Goal 10 element of its comprehensive plan show that the existing city limits and proposed urban growth boundary contain about 1284.4-acres of vacant or re-developable land to respond to a calculation of about 182 – acres of need.

After a 30% dedication factor is applied to account for public infrastructure and other services that would need to be provided a net amount of about 922-acres, including about 23-acres included in a Commercial Mixed Use designation, remains to respond to about 127 net acres of need.

The figures above indicate that the city's existing supply of residentially designated land results in surplus of about 1,135 gross acres once the Commercial Mixed Use lands have been deducted from the needs category.

Commercial Lands

The existing pattern of commercial zoning established by the former UUC is not proposed to be expanded except in areas where neighborhoods do not have convenient access to service or employment uses. No new commercial nodes are proposed outside of the City limits or UGB. Within the city limits a few new commercial mixed-use areas or transitional areas are proposed to accommodate daily living need and employment uses.

Lands for Transportation and Other Public Facilities

The 20-year land needs for transportation and public facilities for an urban area comply with applicable requirements of Goals 11 and 12, rules in OAR chapter 660, divisions 11 and 12, and public facilities requirements in ORS 197.712 and 197.768. Right of way (ROW) needs for transportation are a result of examining current improvements and planned improvements. A dedication factor of 30% was used to analyze lands needed for ROW improvements and assures that land needed for on-site development does not conflict with land needed for ROW.

The Plan and its supporting studies show that La Pine has properly planned for expansion of its public facilities and placed them in logical locations throughout the community. The Sewer and Water District has planned to extend and serve all development within the proposed UGB.

IV. Goals and Policies

Goal # 1: Forest and BLM lands within the City limits and proposed UGB will be designated as Public Facility Lands and the small amount of undeveloped Agricultural lands within the City limits will be converted to urban uses.

Policies

- The City will complete and adopt a TSP for the community. After the TSP has been adopted, the City may rezone lands to the Comprehensive Plan designation.

Goal #2: Land within the City limits is adequate to serve as the La Pine Urban Growth Boundary unless special circumstances are identified and established as reasonable, supportable, and consistent with State law..

Policies

- Land use patterns shall enhance the development of “Complete Neighborhoods;” and development regulations should promote the following principles:
 - Compact Development, which promotes the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure;
 - Mixed-Use, which places homes, jobs, stores, parks, and services within walking distance of one another;
 - Full Utilization of Urban Services (e.g., water, sewer, storm drainage, parks, and transportation facilities), which maximizes the return on public investments in infrastructure;
 - Transportation Efficiency, or development of an interconnected street system supporting multiple modes of transportation, which yields more direct routes (shorter distances) between local destinations, conserves energy, reduces emergency response times, and provides alternatives to the automobile for those who are unable or choose not to drive a car;
 - Human-Scale Design, or development in which people feel safe and comfortable walking from place to place because buildings, streetscapes, parking areas, landscaping, lighting, and other components of the built environment are designed foremost with pedestrians in mind; and
 - Environmental Health, which requires adequate light and air circulation, management of surface water runoff, and treatment and disposal of waste.
- The City will facilitate development of a downtown area that is desirable for tourists and local residents and that will allow La Pine to establish itself as a hub and service center for the South Deschutes and North Klamath Counties.
- Development regulations for the commercial zone within the downtown area should provide for a pedestrian-friendly, attractive, and vibrant center that can draw new investment, offer a desirable place for people to visit and live, and serve the surrounding area between Sunriver Resort and Klamath County.

- Lands needed for supplementing housing, economic development, or other land uses shall be processed based upon need and balancing the urban form for the benefit of the community in its goal to establish a “Complete Community.”
- The City shall create details on the “Complete Neighborhood” concepts and prepare guidelines for implementing the goals. This includes a listing of what elements are missing and how to establish them within the three neighborhoods.
- The land planning and site design shall encourage the positioning of buildings and use of vegetation to promote and encourage the development of the missing elements in each neighborhood.
- The need for new mixed-use areas within the City shall be explored on an as needed basis for the purpose of furthering the Complete Neighborhood planning concepts envisioned by the Plan.
- The City shall adopt the Bend-La Pine School District Facility Plan.
- At such time as a transfer of land from the Bureau of Land Management to a government agency (City of La Pine or Deschutes County) occurs along the southwest City boundary, the use of such lands for rodeo facilities and City authorized festivals shall be examined. The City desires such land to be included within the City limits, with future administration of the lands and facilities used as rodeo grounds to be determined by mutual agreement of the City and the La Pine Park and Recreation District.
- Because the final designs and plans for the Wickiup Junction interchange (Highway 97 and Burgess Road intersection) have not been completed, designations for lands within the area labeled Wickiup Junction Improvement Area on the Plan map may need to be changed after final plans for the ODOT Overpass project are completed. Such changes to land use designations shall be for the purpose of better coordination between the transportation facilities and adjacent land uses.
- The Urban Growth Boundary and need for new lands/annexation should be reviewed every 2-years.

V. Programs

The City shall:

1. Hold workshops to further refine the complete neighborhood concepts.

2. Hold hearings to formalize the guidelines and goals for each neighborhood.
3. Develop standards that provide how and when Forest and Agricultural lands are to be converted to Public Facility uses.
4. Define special exceptions for expanding the urban growth boundary for special uses, etc. – Rodeo grounds, tourist areas, utility needs, etc.
5. Review the inventory of land needs within the urban growth boundary every two years to determine adequacy and provisions for any needed expansion.

Appendices

1. Wastewater System capital Facilities Plan, La Pine Special Sewer District, Deschutes County, Oregon 2006 (HGE Inc.)
2. Water System Capital facilities Plan and Water Management and Conservation Plan, La Pine Water District, Deschutes County, Oregon – 2009 – (HGE Inc.)
3. La Pine Park and Recreation District Comprehensive Plan - Summer 2005 (GEL Oregon Inc.; J.T Atkins & Company PC)
4. Bend-La Pine Schools 2005 Sites and Facilities Plan – December 5, 2005 including correspondence
5. Greater La Pine Community Wildfire Protection Plan – December 13, 2005 (Kate Lighthall)
6. Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan – Title 23 of the Deschutes County Code, 2009 Buildable Lands Analysis, 2009 Economic Opportunities Analysis, Historic Lands Inventory – Pat Kliewer, Census and Claritas, Inc., Data sets, Oregon Employment Department Data

Sets, Related Resource Data – State of Oregon and Bureau of Economic
Analysis

Exhibit F – Proposed amendments to DCC

18.113.030 Uses In Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of, and are intended to serve persons at, the destination resort pursuant to DCC 18.113.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

- A. Visitor-oriented accommodations designed to provide for the needs of visitors to the resort:
 1. Overnight lodging, including lodges, hotels, motels, bed and breakfast facilities, time share units and similar transient lodging facilities;
 2. Convention and conference facilities and meeting rooms;
 3. Retreat centers;
 4. Restaurants, lounges and similar eating and drinking establishments; and
 5. Other similar visitor-oriented accommodations consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- B. Developed recreational facilities designed to provide for the needs of visitors and residents of the resort;
 1. Golf courses and clubhouses;
 2. Indoor and outdoor swimming pools;
 3. Indoor and outdoor tennis courts;
 4. Physical fitness facilities;
 5. Equestrian facilities;
 6. Wildlife observation shelters;
 7. Walkways, bike paths, jogging paths, equestrian trails;
 8. Other similar recreational facilities consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- C. Residential accommodations:
 1. Single-family dwellings;
 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
 3. Condominiums;
 4. Townhouses;
 5. Living quarters for employees;
 6. Time-share projects.
 7. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**
- D. Commercial services and specialty shops designed to provide for the visitors to the resort:
 1. Specialty shops, including but not limited to delis, clothing stores, bookstores, gift shops and specialty food shops;
 2. Barber shops/beauty salons;
 3. Automobile service stations limited to fuel sales, incidental parts sales and minor repairs;
 4. Craft and art studios and galleries;
 5. Real estate offices;
 6. Convenience stores;

7. Other similar commercial services which provide for the needs of resort visitors and are consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
- E. Uses permitted in open space areas generally include only those uses that, except as specified herein, do not alter the existing or natural landscape of the proposed open space areas. No improvements, development or other alteration of the natural or existing landscape shall be allowed in open space areas, except as necessary for development of golf course fairways and greens, hiking and bike trails, lakes and ponds and primitive picnic facilities including park benches and picnic tables. Where farming activities would be consistent with identified preexisting open space uses, irrigation equipment and associated pumping facilities shall be allowed.
 - F. Facilities necessary for public safety and utility service within the destination resort.
 - G. Other similar uses permitted in the underlying zone consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113.030.
 - H. Accessory Uses in Destination Resorts:
 1. The following accessory uses shall be permitted provided they are ancillary to the destination resort and consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8:
 1. Transportation-related facilities excluding airports;
 2. Emergency medical facilities;
 3. Storage structures and areas;
 4. Kennels as a service for resort visitors only;
 5. Recycling and garbage collection facilities;
 6. Other similar accessory uses consistent with the purposes of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
 - I. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**

18.113.060 Standards For Destination Resorts

The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

- A. The destination resort shall, in the first phase, provide for and include as part of the CMP the following minimum requirements:
1. At least 150 separate rentable units for visitor oriented overnight lodging as follows:
 - a. The first 50 overnight lodging units must be constructed prior to the closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
 - b. The resort may elect to phase in the remaining 100 overnight lodging units as follows:
 - (1) At least 50 of the remaining 100 required overnight lodging units shall be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurance within 5 years of the closure of sale of individual lots or units, and;
 - (2) The remaining 50 required overnight lodging units shall be constructed or guaranteed through surety bonding or equivalent financial assurance within 10 years of the closure of sale of individual lots or units.
 - (3) If the developer of a resort guarantees a portion of the overnight lodging units required under subsection 18.113.060(A)(1)(b) through surety bonding or other equivalent financial assurance, the overnight lodging units must be constructed within 4 years of the date of execution of the surety bond or other equivalent financial assurance.
 - (4) The 2.5:1 accommodation ratio required by DCC 18.113.060(D)(2) must be maintained at all times.
 - c. If a resort does not chose to phase the overnight lodging units as described in 18.113.060(A)(1)(b), then the required 150 units of overnight lodging must be constructed prior to the closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
 2. Visitor oriented eating establishments for at least 100 persons and meeting rooms which provide seating for at least 100 persons.
 3. The aggregate cost of developing the overnight lodging facilities, developed recreational facilities, and the eating establishments and meeting rooms shall be at least \$ 7,000,000 (in 1993 dollars).
 4. At least \$ 2,333,333 of the \$7,000,000 (in 1993 dollars) total minimum investment required by DCC 18.113.060(A)(3) shall be spent on developed recreational facilities.
 5. The facilities and accommodations required by DCC 18.113.060(A)(2) through (4) must be constructed or financially assured pursuant to DCC 18.113.110 prior to closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots or as allowed by DCC 18.113.060(A)(1).
- B. All destination resorts shall have a minimum of 160 contiguous acres of land. Acreage split by public roads or rivers or streams shall count toward the acreage limit, provided that the

- CMP demonstrates that the isolated acreage will be operated or managed in a manner that will be integral to the remainder of the resort.
- C. All destination resorts shall have direct access onto a state or County arterial or collector roadway, as designated by the Comprehensive Plan.
 - D. A destination resort shall, cumulatively and for each phase, meet the following minimum requirements:
 - 1. The resort shall have a minimum of 50 percent of the total acreage of the development dedicated to permanent open space, excluding yards, streets and parking areas. Portions of individual residential lots and landscape area requirements for developed recreational facilities, visitor oriented accommodations or multi family or commercial uses established by DCC 18.124.070 shall not be considered open space;
 - 2. Individually owned residential units that do not meet the definition of overnight lodging in DCC 18.04.030 shall not exceed two and one-half such units for each unit of visitor oriented overnight lodging. Individually owned units shall be considered visitor oriented lodging if they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 38 weeks per calendar year through one or more central reservation and check in service(s) operated by the destination resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010.
 - a. The ratio applies to destination resorts which were previously approved under a different standard.
 - E. Phasing. A destination resort authorized pursuant to DCC 18.113.060 may be developed in phases. If a proposed resort is to be developed in phases, each phase shall be as described in the CMP. Each individual phase shall meet the following requirements:
 - 1. Each phase, together with previously completed phases, if any, shall be capable of operating in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of DCC 18.113 and Goal 8.
 - 2. The first phase and each subsequent phase of the destination resort shall cumulatively meet the minimum requirements of DCC 18.113.060 and DCC 18.113.070.
 - 3. Each phase may include two or more distinct noncontiguous areas within the destination resort.
 - F. Destination resorts shall not exceed a density of one and one-half dwelling units per acre including residential dwelling units and excluding visitor oriented overnight lodging.
 - G. Dimensional Standards:
 - 1. The minimum lot area, width, lot coverage, frontage and yard requirements and building heights otherwise applying to structures in underlying zones and the provisions of DCC 18.116 relating to solar access shall not apply within a destination resort. These standards shall be determined by the Planning Director or Hearings Body at the time of the CMP. In determining these standards, the Planning Director or Hearings Body shall find that the minimum specified in the CMP are adequate to satisfy the intent of the comprehensive plan relating to solar access, fire protection, vehicle access, visual management within landscape management corridors and to protect resources identified by LCDC Goal 5 which are identified in the Comprehensive Plan. At a minimum, a 100-foot setback shall be maintained from all streams and rivers. Rimrock setbacks shall be as provided in DCC Title

18. No lot for a single family residence shall exceed an overall project average of 22,000 square feet in size.
2. Exterior setbacks.
- a. Except as otherwise specified herein, all development (including structures, site-obscuring fences of over three feet in height and changes to the natural topography of the land) shall be setback from exterior property lines as follows:
 - (1) Three hundred fifty feet for commercial development including all associated parking areas;
 - (2) Two hundred fifty feet for multi family development and visitor oriented accommodations (except for single family residences) including all associated parking areas;
 - (3) One hundred fifty feet for above grade development other than that listed in DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(1) and (2);
 - (4) One hundred feet for roads;
 - (5) Fifty feet for golf courses; and
 - (6) Fifty feet for jogging trails and bike paths where they abut private developed lots and no setback for where they abut public roads and public lands.
 - b. Notwithstanding DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(3), above grade development other than that listed in DCC 18.113.060(G)(2)(a)(1) and (2) shall be set back 250 feet in circumstances where state highways coincide with exterior property lines.
 - c. The setbacks of DCC 18.113.060 shall not apply to entry roadways and signs.
- H. Floodplain requirements. The floodplain zone (FP) requirements of DCC 18.96 shall apply to all developed portions of a destination resort in an FP Zone in addition to any applicable criteria of DCC 18.113. Except for floodplain areas which have been granted an exception to LCDC goals 3 and 4, floodplain zones shall not be considered part of a destination resort when determining compliance with the following standards;
1. One hundred sixty acre minimum site;
 2. Density of development;
 3. Open space requirements.
- A conservation easement as described in DCC Title 18 shall be conveyed to the County for all areas within a floodplain which are part of a destination resort.
- I. The Landscape Management Combining Zone (LM) requirements of DCC 18.84 shall apply to destination resorts where applicable.
- J. Excavation, grading and fill and removal within the bed and banks of a stream or river or in a wetland shall be a separate conditional use subject to all pertinent requirements of DCC Title 18.
- K. Time share units not included in the overnight lodging calculations shall be subject to approval under the conditional use criteria set forth in DCC 18.128. Time share units identified as part of the destination resort's overnight lodging units shall not be subject to the time share conditional use criteria of DCC 18.128.
- L. The overnight lodging criteria shall be met, including the 150-unit minimum and the 2-1/2 to 1 ratio set forth in DCC 18.113.060(D)(2).

1. Failure of the approved destination resort to comply with the requirements in DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) through (6) will result in the County declining to accept or process any further land use actions associated with any part of the resort and the County shall not issue any permits associated with any lots or site plans on any part of the resort until proof is provided to the County of compliance with those conditions.
2. Each resort shall compile, and maintain, in perpetuity, a registry of all overnight lodging units.
 - a. The list shall identify each individually-owned unit that is counted as overnight lodging.
 - b. At all times, at least one entity shall be responsible for maintaining the registry and fulfilling the reporting requirements of DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) through (6).
 - c. Initially, the resort management shall be responsible for compiling and maintaining the registry.
 - d. As a resort develops, the developer shall transfer responsibility for maintaining the registry to the homeowner association(s). The terms and timing of this transfer shall be specified in the Conditions, Covenants & Restrictions (CC&Rs).
 - e. Resort management shall notify the County prior to assigning the registry to a homeowner association.
 - f. Each resort shall maintain records documenting its rental program related to overnight lodging units at a convenient location in Deschutes County, with those records accessible to the County upon 72 hour notice from the County.
 - g. As used in this section, "resort management" includes, but is not limited to, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors in interest, assignees other than a home owners association.
3. An annual report shall be submitted to the Planning Division by the resort management or home owners association(s) each February 1, documenting all of the following as of December 31 of the previous year:
 - a. The minimum of 150 permanent units of overnight lodging have been constructed or that the resort is not yet required to have constructed the 150 units;
 - b. The number of individually-owned residential platted lots and the number of overnight-lodging units;
 - c. The ratio between the individually-owned residential platted lots and the overnight lodging units;
 - d. For resorts for which the conceptual master plan was originally approved on or after January 1, 2001, the following information on each individually-owned residential unit counted as overnight lodging.
 - (1) Who the owner or owners have been over the last year;
 - (2) How many nights out of the year the unit was available for rent;
 - (3) How many nights out of the year the unit was rented out as an overnight lodging facility under DCC 18.113;

- (4) Documentation showing that these units were available for rental as required.
- e. For resorts for which the conceptual master plan was originally approved before January 1, 2001, the following information on each individually owned residential unit counted as overnight lodging. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Deschutes County Code, these resorts may count units that are not deed-restricted and/or do not utilize a central check-in system operated by the resort so long as such units meet the Oregon statutory definition of overnight lodgings in Eastern Oregon
 - (1) For those units directly managed by the resort developer or operator.
 - (A) Who the owner or owners have been over the last year;
 - (B) How many nights out of the year the unit was available for rent;
 - (C) How many nights out of the year the unit was rented out as an overnight lodging facility under DCC 18.113;
 - (D) Documentation showing that these units were available for rent as required.
 - (2) For all other units.
 - (A) Address of the unit;
 - (B) Name of the unit owner(s);
 - (C) Schedule of rental availability for the prior year. The schedule of rental availability shall be based upon monthly printouts of the availability calendars posted on-line by the unit owner or the unit owner's agent.
- f. This information shall be public record subject to the non-disclosure provisions in ORS Chapter 192.
4. To facilitate rental to the general public of the overnight lodging units, each resort shall set up and maintain in perpetuity a telephone reservation system..
5. Any outside property managers renting required overnight lodging units shall be required to cooperate with the provisions of this code and to annually provide rental information on any required overnight lodging units they represent to the central office as described in DCC 18.113.060(L)(2) and (3).
6. Before approval of each final plat, all the following shall be provided:
 - a. Documentation demonstrating compliance with the 2-1/2 to 1 ratio as defined in DCC 18.113.060(D)(2);
 - b. Documentation on all individually-owned residential units counted as overnight lodging, including all of the following:
 - (1) Designation on the plat of any individually-owned units that are going to be counted as overnight lodging;
 - (2) Deed restrictions requiring the individually-owned residential units designated as overnight lodging units to be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010;

- (3) An irrevocable provision in the resort Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions ("CC&Rs) requiring the individually-owned residential units designated as overnight lodging units to be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010;
- (4) A provision in the resort CC&R's that all property owners within the resort recognize that failure to meet the conditions in DCC 18.113.060(L)(6)(b)(3) is a violation of Deschutes County Code and subject to code enforcement proceedings by the County;
- (5) Inclusion of language in any rental contract between the owner of an individually-owned residential unit designated as an overnight lodging unit and any central reservation and check in service or real estate property manager requiring that such unit be available for rental at least 38 weeks each year through a central reservation and check-in service operated by the resort or by a real estate property manager, as defined in ORS 696.010, and that failure to meet the conditions in DCC 18.113.060(L)(6)(b)(5) is a violation of Deschutes County Code and subject to code enforcement proceedings by the County.

7. Compliance Fee.

- a. In the event that a resort that was originally approved before January 1, 2001 fails to report compliance with the 2.5:1 ratio in a calendar year as reported in accordance with 18.113.060(L)(3)(e), the remedy shall be that such resort shall pay a compliance fee due not later than April 15 of the year following the year in which the shortfall occurred.
- b. The compliance fee will be calculated as follows:
 - (1) First, by calculating the average per unit transient lodging tax paid by the resort the prior calendar year by dividing the total amount paid by the resort in transient lodging taxes for the prior calendar year by the sum of the number of overnight units managed by the resort for which the resort paid transient lodging taxes that same year and the number of timeshare units;
 - (2) Second, by multiplying that average per unit transient lodging tax amount by the number of additional overnight lodging units that would have been necessary to comply with the 2.5:1 ratio for the applicable calendar year.
- c. If the Resort were to apply to create more residential lots, the Resort may not apply the compliance fee to meet the 2.5:1 ratio of individually-owned residential units to overnight lodging units per DCC 18.113.060(D)(2) and will have to demonstrate compliance per the new reporting methods or construct more overnight lodging units in order to comply with the 2.5:1 ratio.

M. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.

19.106.030 Uses In Destination Resorts

The following uses are allowed, provided they are part of and are intended to serve persons at the destination resort pursuant to DCC 19.106.030 and are approved in a final master plan:

- A. Visitor-oriented accommodations designed to provide for the needs of visitors to the resort:
 1. Overnight lodging, including lodges, hotels, motels, bed and breakfast facilities, time share units and similar transient lodging facilities;
 2. Convention and conference facilities and meeting rooms;
 3. Retreat centers;
 4. Restaurants, lounges and similar eating and drinking establishments; or
 5. Other similar visitor-oriented accommodations consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- B. Developed recreational facilities designed to provide for the needs of visitors and residents of the resort including:
 1. Golf courses and clubhouses;
 2. Indoor and outdoor swimming pools;
 3. Indoor and outdoor tennis courts;
 4. Physical fitness facilities;
 5. Equestrian facilities;
 6. Wildlife observation shelters;
 7. Walkways, bike paths, jogging paths, equestrian trails; or
 8. Other similar recreational facilities consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.
- C. Residential accommodations:
 1. Single-family dwellings;
 2. Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and multi-family dwellings;
 3. Condominiums;
 4. Townhouses;
 5. Living quarters for employees; or
 6. Time share projects.
 7. **Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort.**
- D. Commercial services and specialty shops designed to provide for the visitors to the resort:
 1. Specialty shops including, but not limited to delis, clothing stores, book stores, gift shops and specialty food shops;
 2. Barber shops and beauty salons;
 3. Automobile service stations limited to fuel sales, incidental parts sales and minor repairs;
 4. Craft and art studios and galleries;
 5. Real estate offices;
 6. Convenience stores; or
 7. Other similar commercial services which provide for the needs of resort visitors and are consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.

- E. Uses permitted in open space areas generally include only those uses that, except as specified herein, do not alter the existing or natural landscape of the proposed open space areas. No improvements, development or other alteration of the natural or existing landscape shall be allowed in open space areas, except as necessary for development of golf course fairways and greens, hiking and bike trails, lakes and ponds and primitive picnic facilities including park benches and picnic tables. Where farming activities would be consistent with identified pre-existing open space uses, irrigation equipment and associated pumping facilities shall be allowed.
- F. Facilities necessary for public safety and utility service within the destination resort.
- G. Other similar uses permitted in the underlying zone consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106.020.
- H. Accessory uses in destination resorts:
 - 1. The following accessory uses shall be permitted provided they are ancillary to the destination resort and consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8:
 - 1. Transportation-related facilities excluding airports;
 - 2. Emergency medical facilities;
 - 3. Storage structures and areas;
 - 4. Kennels as a service for resort visitors only;
 - 5. Recycling and garbage collection facilities; or
 - 6. Other similar accessory uses are consistent with the purposes of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8.

19.106.060 Standards For Destination Resorts


The following standards shall govern consideration of destination resorts:

- A. The destination resort shall, in the first phase, provide for and include as part of the CMP the following minimum requirements:
 - 1. At least 150 separate rentable units for visitor-oriented lodging;
 - 2. Visitor-oriented eating establishments for at least 100 persons and meeting rooms which provide eating for at least 100 persons;
 - 3. At least \$7 million shall be spent on improvements for on-site developed recreational facilities and visitor-oriented accommodations exclusive of costs for land, sewer and water facilities and roads. Not less than one-third of this amount shall be spent on developed recreational facilities. The spending minimums provided for are stated in 1993 dollars; and
 - 4. The facilities and accommodations required by this DCC 19.106.060 must be physically provided or financially assured pursuant to DCC 19.106.110 prior to closure of sales, rental or lease of any residential dwellings or lots.
- B. All destination resorts shall have a minimum of 160 contiguous acres of land. Acreage split by public roads or rivers or streams shall count toward the acreage limit, provided that the CMP demonstrates that the isolated acreage will be operated or managed in a manner that will be integral to the remainder of the resort.
- C. All destination resorts shall have direct access onto a state, county, or city arterial or collector roadway, as designated by the Bend Urban Area General Plan.
- D. A destination resort shall, cumulatively and for each phase, meet the following minimum requirements:
 - 1. The resort shall have a minimum of 50 percent of the total acreage of the development dedicated to permanent open space, excluding yards, streets and parking areas. Portions of individual residential lots and landscape area requirements for developed recreational facilities, visitor-oriented accommodations or multi-family or commercial uses established by DCC 19.76.080 shall not be considered open space; and
 - 2. Individually-owned residential units shall not exceed two and one-half such units for each unit of visitor-oriented overnight lodging constructed or financially assured within the resort. Individually-owned units shall be considered visitor-oriented lodging if they are available for overnight rental use by the general public for at least 45 weeks per calendar year through one or more central reservation and check-in service(s).
- E. Phasing. A destination resort authorized pursuant to DCC 19.106.060 may be developed in phases. If a proposed resort is to be developed in phases, each phase shall be as described in the CMP. Each individual phase shall meet the following requirements:
 - 1. Each phase, together with previously completed phases, if any, shall be capable of operating in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of DCC 19.106 and Goal 8;
 - 2. The first phase and each subsequent phase of the destination resort shall cumulatively meet the minimum requirements of DCC 19.106.060 and DCC 19.76.070, and;

3. Each phase may include two or more distinct non-contiguous areas within the destination resort.
- F. Dimensional standards:
1. The minimum lot area, width, lot coverage, frontage and yard requirements and building heights otherwise applying to structures in underlying zones and the provisions of DCC 19.88.210 relating to solar access shall not apply within a destination resort. These standards shall be determined by the Planning Director or Hearings Body at the time of the CMP. In determining these standards, the Planning Director or Hearings Body shall find that the minimum specified in the CMP are adequate to satisfy the intent of the Bend Urban Area General Plan relating to solar access, fire protection, vehicle access, and to protect resources identified by LCDC Goal 5 which are identified in the Bend Urban Area General Plan. At a minimum, a 100 foot setback shall be maintained from all streams and rivers. No lot for a single-family residence shall exceed an overall project average of 22,000 square feet in size.
 2. Exterior setbacks and buffers.
 - a. A destination resort shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of buffers between the resort and adjacent land uses, including natural vegetation and where appropriate, fences, berms, landscaped areas, and other similar types of buffers.
 - b. Exterior setbacks shall also be provided to ensure that improvements and activities are located to minimize adverse effects of the resort on uses on surrounding lands.
- G. Floodplain requirements. The Flood Plain Zone (FP) requirements of DCC 19.72 shall apply to all developed portions of a destination resort in an FP Zone in addition to any applicable criteria of DCC 19.106. Except for flood plain areas which have been granted an exception to LCDC goals 3 and 4, Flood Plain Zones shall not be considered part of a destination resort when determining compliance with the following standards;
1. One hundred sixty acre minimum site;
 2. Open space requirements.

A conservation easement as described in DCC Title 19 shall be conveyed to the County for all areas within a flood plain which are part of a destination resort.

- H. Excavation, grading and fill and removal within the bed and banks of a stream or river or in a wetland shall be a separate conditional use subject to all pertinent requirements of DCC Title 19.
- I. Time share units not included in the overnight lodging calculations shall be subject to approval under the conditional use criteria set forth in DCC 19.100. Time share units identified as part of the destination resort's overnight lodging units shall not be subject to the time share conditional use criteria of DCC 19.100.
- J. Within 24 air miles of an urban growth boundary with an existing population of 100,000 or more, residential uses are limited to those necessary for the staff and management of the resort. All other standards of this section continue to apply.**



Land Ownership

- 1 - Aspen Lakes Development
- 2 - Wildhorse Meadows
- 3 - Eden
- 4 - Cyrus
- 5 - Three Sisters Irrigation District
- 6 - Kerith Springs Lodge
- 7 - Desert Springs Ranch
- 8 - Thornburgh
- 9 - Dorsey
- 10 - Ferguson Creek Investments
- 11 - State of Oregon - Thornburgh
- 12 - Walton
- 13 - Deschutes River Ranch
- 14 - Bunge
- 15 - Deschutes County - Hunnell
- 16 - Bend Park & Rec District - Shevlin
- 17 - Deschutes County - Bend Airport
- 18 - Gassner
- 19 - State of Oregon - Alfalfa
- 20 - Bend Park & Rec District - Gosney
- 21 - Baney
- 22 - Central Oregon Irrigation District - 1
- 23 - Central Oregon Irrigation District - 2
- 24 - Deschutes County - Rickard
- 25 - USA
- 26 - Windlinx
- 27 - Kerr
- 28 - Pape Properties
- 29 - Sundance Meadows

Attachment 4 - DR Properties Map

| Map Number | Taxlot | Situs Address | Owner Name | Acres | Full Owner Name |
|------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--|
| 1 | 1410350004500 | 73000 CAMP POLK RD | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT | 69.20 | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT L L C |
| 1 | 141035C001700 | 69300 HAWKSFLIGHT DR | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT | 14.10 | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT L L C |
| 1 | 1410350004600 | 69201 PANORAMIC DR | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT | 0.54 | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT L L C |
| 1 | 1410350004400 | 72001 CAMP POLK RD | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT | 256.67 | ASPEN LAKES DEVELOPMENT L L C |
| 2 | 1510010004800 | 16900 ASPEN LAKES DR | WILDHORSE MEADOWS | 388.06 | WILDHORSE MEADOWS LLC |
| 3 | 1412280000300 | 10311 NW COYNER AVE | EDEN | 20.03 | EDEN CENTRAL PROPERTIES LLC |
| 3 | 1412210000300 | | EDEN | 65.77 | EDEN CENTRAL PROPERTIES LLC |
| 3 | 1412210000400 | | EDEN | 9.54 | EDEN CENTRAL PROPERTIES LLC |
| 3 | 1412280000200 | 10325 NW COYNER AVE | EDEN | 150.17 | EDEN CENTRAL PROPERTIES LLC |
| 4 | 1510130000501 | | CYRUS | 1.90 | CYRUS, O KEITH & CONIDA E |
| 4 | 1510130000100 | 16850 JORDAN RD | CYRUS | 185.13 | CYRUS,O KEITH & CONIDA E |
| 4 | 1510130000200 | | CYRUS | 3.00 | CYRUS,O KEITH & CONNIE |
| 4 | 1510120000500 | 16809 HWY 126 | CYRUS | 81.31 | CYRUS,OMER K & CONIDA E |
| 4 | 1510130000702 | 68157 CLOVERDALE RD | CYRUS | 133.02 | CYRUS,OMER KEITH & CONIDA E |
| 4 | 1510130000701 | | CYRUS | 1.27 | CYRUS,OMER KEITH & CONIDA ELMA |
| 5 | 1510130000600 | | THREE SISTERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT | 16.71 | THREE SISTERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 5 | 1510140000700 | 68000 HWY 20 | THREE SISTERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT | 190.96 | THREE SISTERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 6 | 1510240000200 | 67750 HWY 20 | KERITH SPRINGS LODGE | 108.35 | KERITH SPRINGS LODGE INC |
| 6 | 1510240000300 | 67640 HWY 20 | KERITH SPRINGS LODGE | 79.52 | KERITH SPRINGS LODGE INC |
| 7 | 1511300000100 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 87.86 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000002801 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 79.41 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000004002 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 80.98 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000003302 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 40.42 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000004001 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 159.05 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 151119A001200 | 17585 FORKED HORN DR | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 5.47 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000002802 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 161.61 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 151119A001303 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 10.12 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 151119A001304 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 5.06 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000002800 | 17830 FORKED HORN DR | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 160.23 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511000003303 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 40.44 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511170001000 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 37.64 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511170001200 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 39.56 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 151119A001305 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 5.06 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511300000300 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 80.60 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 7 | 1511170001100 | | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH | 27.41 | DESERT SPRINGS RANCH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| 8 | 1511000002600 | 19419 W HWY 126 | THORNBURGH | 158.08 | THORNBURGH,AMBERS J & BONNIE J |
| 9 | 1511000005901 | 67300 SAGE RANCH RD | DORSEY | 80.86 | DORSEY, SAGE & LYNNE |
| 9 | 1511000005902 | 67190 SAGE RANCH RD | DORSEY | 3.79 | DORSEY, SAGE & LYNNE |
| 9 | 1511000005900 | 67200 SAGE RANCH RD | DORSEY | 105.91 | DORSEY, SAGE & LYNNE L |
| 10 | 1511000006000 | | FERGUSON CREEK INVESTMENTS | 163.32 | FERGUSON CREEK INVESTMENTS LLC |
| 11 | 1512000005104 | 67565 CLINE FALLS RD | STATE OF OREGON | 39.86 | OREGON DEPT OF STATE LANDS |
| 11 | 1512000005103 | 67575 CLINE FALLS RD | STATE OF OREGON | 80.77 | OREGON DEPT OF STATE LANDS |
| 11 | 1512000005200 | 67655 CLINE FALLS RD | STATE OF OREGON | 40.18 | OREGON DEPT OF STATE LANDS |
| 11 | 1512000005300 | 67755 CLINE FALLS RD | STATE OF OREGON | 162.97 | STATE OF OR |
| 11 | 1512000005102 | 67605 CLINE FALLS RD | STATE OF OREGON | 40.44 | OREGON DEPT OF STATE LANDS |

| Map Number | Taxlot | Situs Address | Owner Name | Acres | Full Owner Name |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------|---|--------|--|
| 12 | 1611000010500 | | WALTON | 286.77 | WALTON PROPERTIES LLC |
| 13 | 1612160001001 | 20475 ARROWHEAD DR | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 31.54 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160000800 | 65850 WHITE ROCK LOOP | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 9.96 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160001100 | 65796 WHITE ROCK LOOP | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 1.10 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160000700 | 65900 WHITE ROCK LOOP | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 26.33 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160000703 | | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 2.95 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160001002 | 20405 ARROWHEAD DR | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 1.86 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160001006 | 20485 ARROWHEAD DR | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 3.34 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612170002500 | 65750 WILD HORSE TRL | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 10.19 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160000400 | 65950 WHITE ROCK LOOP | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 47.54 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160000900 | 65790 WHITE ROCK LOOP | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 24.49 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612160001000 | 20420 ARROWHEAD DR | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 2.90 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612170002503 | 65770 WILD HORSE TRL | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 1.36 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 161220AA02500 | 20355 ROCK CANYON RD | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 5.14 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612170002600 | 65695 WILD HORSE TRL | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 21.37 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC |
| 13 | 1612170002700 | 65620 TWIN BRIDGES RD | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH | 3.73 | DESCHUTES RIVER RANCH GROUP LLC, |
| 14 | 1612140000502 | 65825 61ST ST | BUNGE | 19.64 | BUNGE JOINT REVOCABLE TRUST |
| 14 | 1612140000500 | 65745 61ST ST | BUNGE | 79.04 | BUNGE JOINT REVOCABLE TRUST |
| 14 | 1612140000802 | 21225 YOUNG AVE | BUNGE | 85.92 | BUNGE JOINT REVOCABLE TRUST |
| 15 | 1712040000100 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - HUNNELL | 1.72 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 15 | 1612330000700 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - HUNNELL | 80.52 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 15 | 1612340000400 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - HUNNELL | 187.75 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 16 | 1711340000600 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 9.67 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711350000900 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 6.43 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000700 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 49.80 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000200 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 86.13 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000400 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 58.75 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000300 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 7.58 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000100 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 73.21 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340001200 | 18880 SKYLINERS RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 24.34 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | 1711340000500 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - SHEVLIN | 6.25 | BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT |
| 17 | 1713170000100 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - BEND AIRPORT | 299.59 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 18 | 1713210000100 | | GASSNER | 231.24 | GASSNER, PETER & PIYAJIT |
| 19 | 1714200010800 | | STATE OF OREGON - ALFALFA | 79.54 | STATE OF OR |
| 19 | 1714290000100 | | STATE OF OREGON - ALFALFA | 79.74 | STATE OF OR |
| 20 | 1813070000100 | 61595 TEAL RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 120.70 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813060001700 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 79.58 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813080000700 | 61305 GOSNEY RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 80.49 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813070000500 | 61395 TEAL RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 39.84 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813080000800 | 61225 GOSNEY RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 78.80 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813070000600 | 61130 WARD RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 39.27 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 181317B000100 | | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 78.02 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 1813180000100 | 61135 WARD RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 194.12 | BEND METRO PARK & REC DISTRICT |
| 20 | 181317B000200 | 61105 WARD RD | BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT - GOSNEY | 38.53 | BEND METROPOLITAN PARK AND RECREATION... |

| Map Number | Taxlot | Situs Address | Owner Name | Acres | Full Owner Name |
|------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--------|--|
| 21 | 1813080000900 | 61388 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 59.13 | CURTIS O BANEY MARITAL TRUST |
| 21 | 1813080001000 | 61270 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 71.63 | CURT BANEY INC |
| 21 | 181309C000500 | 61330 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 20.58 | BANEY, CURTIS A & ROBIN J |
| 21 | 181309C000600 | | BANEY | 19.06 | BANEY, CURTIS A & ROBIN J |
| 21 | 1813080000100 | 61508 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 127.52 | CURTIS A BANEY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST |
| 21 | 1813040000803 | 22805 HWY 20 | BANEY | 90.49 | BANEY CORPORATION |
| 21 | 1813080001001 | 61330 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 44.56 | BANEY CORPORATION |
| 21 | 1813080000101 | 61530 GOSNEY RD | BANEY | 4.44 | CURTIS A BANEY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST |
| 21 | 1813050000201 | 22775 HWY 20 | BANEY | 116.23 | BANEY CORPORATION |
| 22 | 181303A000800 | | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT - 1 | 39.92 | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 22 | 1813000000100 | | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT - 1 | 488.33 | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 22 | 1813030000602 | | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT - 1 | 31.27 | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 23 | 1814000000400 | | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT - 2 | 160.62 | CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION DISTRICT |
| 24 | 1813150000100 | 23505 RICKARD RD | DESCHUTES COUNTY - RICKARD | 152.23 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 24 | 1813150000200 | 23205 RICKARD RD | DESCHUTES COUNTY - RICKARD | 319.08 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 24 | 1813150000300 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - RICKARD | 77.49 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 24 | 1813100001101 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - RICKARD | 40.18 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 24 | 1813100001100 | | DESCHUTES COUNTY - RICKARD | 152.05 | DESCHUTES COUNTY |
| 25 | 1814000000100 | 60200 HWY 20 | USA | 199.75 | USA |
| 26 | 1812310000300 | 59885 SCALE HOUSE RD | WINDLINX | 39.87 | WINDLINX, FREDRICK R |
| 26 | 1812300000101 | | WINDLINX | 2.81 | WINDLINX RANCH TRUST |
| 26 | 1812300000102 | | WINDLINX | 15.68 | WINDLINX RANCH TRUST |
| 26 | 1812300000100 | 60000 SCALE HOUSE RD | WINDLINX | 382.62 | WINDLINX RANCH TRUST |
| 26 | 1812310000100 | 59850 SCALE HOUSE RD | WINDLINX | 240.44 | WINDLINX RANCH TRUST |
| 26 | 1812310000200 | 59895 SCALE HOUSE RD | WINDLINX | 39.99 | WINDLINX, FREDERICK R |
| 26 | 1812300000103 | 60025 SCALE HOUSE RD | WINDLINX | 17.91 | WINDLINX, RICHARD S & KARIN A |
| 27 | 1812310000700 | | KERR | 53.30 | CAMERON M KERR REV LIV TRUST |
| 27 | 1812310000600 | 59770 SCALE HOUSE RD | KERR | 6.70 | KERR, HODGE & DEBORA NORENE |
| 27 | 1812310000800 | 59700 SCALE HOUSE RD | KERR | 159.86 | CAMERON M KERR REV LIV TRUST |
| 28 | 181222C000600 | 20905 SHOLES RD | PAPE PROPERTIES | 11.80 | PAPE' PROPERTIES INC |
| 28 | 1812270000100 | | PAPE PROPERTIES | 80.08 | PAPE PROPERTIES INC |
| 28 | 1812270000200 | 60340 CORRAL RD | PAPE PROPERTIES | 138.39 | PAPE PROPERTIES INC |
| 28 | 1812270000800 | 60375 CORRAL RD | PAPE PROPERTIES | 8.22 | PAPE' PROPERTIES INC |
| 29 | 1813300000400 | | SUNDANCE MEADOWS | 3.89 | SUNDANCE MEADOWS INC, |
| 29 | 1813200001401 | 60300 ARNOLD MARKET RD | SUNDANCE MEADOWS | 157.42 | SUNDANCE MEADOWS PROPERTY OWNER'S ASS... |
| 29 | 1813000006005 | 60305 ARNOLD MARKET RD | SUNDANCE MEADOWS | 415.49 | SUNDANCE MEADOWS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSO... |