ADOPTED PLAN AMENDMENT

JURIS ABB :	ACOLU	Adopted Database No.:	15715
Was Proposal Submitted prior to adoption:	Y	Proposed Database No.:	17517
Date Adoption Notice Received:	9/16/2009	Jurisdiction:	COLUMBIA COUNTY
Date of Adoption:	9/9/2009	DLCD File No.:	003-09
Date Adoption Notice sent:	9/23/2009		
Appeal Deadline:	**10/6/2009**	Local File # :	TA-09-02
Additional File associated with this Proposal:	N	Appeal filed: LUBA No.:	Decision:

Proposed Adoption:
Update the Population forecasts for Columbia County and its Cities with unincorporated areas. Proposal received 42 days prior to First Evidentiary Hearing and without a Final Hearing date.

Changes to Proposed Amendments:
Added revisions to update Urbanization Section to be compatible with State Law.

Affected Agencies:
None.

M = Map T = Text B = Both

Amendment Type: T Ordinance No: 2009-7

POPULATION PE.GOAL9
ECONOMIC PE.GOAL14
URBANIZE
PE.GOAL10

Urban Growth Boundary Expansion:
UGB Expansion:
Acres Involved:

Statewide Planning Goals:

Original Use: New Use: Acres:

Proposal

Date Proposal Submitted:	4/20/2009	Number of Amendments:	
First Evidentiary Hearing date:	6/1/2009	Days to First Evidentiary Hearing:	42
Final Hearing date:		Days to Final Hearing:	
Local Government Contact:	Erika Owne	Date Proposed Notice Sent:	
Contact Phone:	503-397-7216	Date Participation Notice Sent:	

Review

Agency Participation:	YA	Assigning Supervisor:	DW	Lead Reviewer:	**GF**
Draft Deadline Date:	05/21	Time spent on Review:		Reviewer 2:	GG
Mail Deadline Date:	05/22	Response Sent:		Reviewer 3:	
Fax Deadline Date:	05/29	Type of Response:		Reviewer 4:	
		Date Response sent:		Reviewer 5:	

Oregon
Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street, Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540
(503) 373-0050
Fax (503) 378-5518
www.lcd.state.or.us

NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

9/23/2009

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: Columbia County Plan Amendment
DLCD File Number 003-09

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A Copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures*

DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: Tuesday, October 06, 2009

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review prior to adoption with less than the required 45-day notice. Pursuant to ORS 197.830(2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

*NOTE: THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAT IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT, YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.

Cc: Erika Owne, Columbia County
Doug White, DLCD Community Services Specialist /Jon Jinings, DLCD
Gary Fish, DLCD Regional Representative
Gloria Gardiner, DLCD Urban Planning Specialist

<paa> YA

FORM 2

D L C D NOTICE OF ADOPTION

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision** per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18

(See reverse side for submittal requirements)

DEPT OF

SEP 16 2009

LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Jurisdiction: Columbia County

Local File No.: TA 09-04, Ord. 2009-7 (If no number, use none)

Date of Adoption: September 9, 2009 (Must be filled in)

Date Mailed: September 15, 2009 (Date mailed or sent to DLCD)

Date the Notice of Proposed Amendment was mailed to DLCD: April 17, 2009

X Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

___ Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment

___ Land Use Regulation Amendment

___ Zoning Map Amendment

___ New Land Use Regulation

___ Other: _____ (Please Specify Type of Action)

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached."

Population forecasts for the County and 7 incorporated cities in the years 2010, 2020 and 2030. Amend Urbanization and Economy parts of the Comprehensive Plan.

Describe how the adopted amendment differs from the proposed amendment. If it is the same, write "Same." If you did not give notice for the proposed amendment, write "N/A."

Added revisions to update Urbanization Section to be compatible with State Law.

Plan Map Changed from: N/A to _____

Zone Map Changed from: _____ to _____

Location: _____ Acres Involved: _____

Specify Density: Previous: _____ New: _____

Applicable Statewide Planning Goals: Goal 14, Goal 2

Was an Exception Adopted? Yes: ____ No: X

DLCD File No.: 003-09 (17517) [15715]

Did the Department of Land Conservation and Development **receive** a notice of Proposed Amendment **FORTY FIVE (45) days prior to the first evidentiary hearing**. Yes: X No: ___

If no, do the Statewide Planning Goals apply. Yes: ___ No: ___

If no, did The Emergency Circumstances Require immediate adoption. Yes: ___ No: ___

Affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts: Cities of Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Vernonia, Rainier, Clatskanie

Local Contact: Erika Owen Area Code + Phone Number: 503-397-7216

Address: Land Development Services 230 Strand St. - Courthouse City: St. Helens, Oregon

Zip Code+4: 97051 Email Address: erika.owen@co.columbia.or.us

ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision** per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.

1. Send this Form and **TWO (2) Copies** of the Adopted Amendment to:

ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540

2. Submit **TWO (2) copies** the adopted material, if copies are bounded please submit **TWO (2) complete copies** of documents and maps.

3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE (5) working days** following the date of the final decision on the amendment.

4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.

5. The deadline to appeal will not be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE (21) days** of the date, the "Notice of Adoption" is sent to DLCD.

6. In addition to sending the "Notice of Adoption" to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.

7. **Need More Copies?** You can copy this form on to 8-1/2x11 green paper only ; or call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to:(503) 378-5518; or Email your request to Mara.Ulloa@state.or.us - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of an Application to Amend Sections IX and X of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan to Update the 20 Year Population Forecast	)))	ORDINANCE NO. 2009-7

The Board of County Commissioners for Columbia County, Oregon, ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Ordinance shall be known as Ordinance No. 2009-7.

SECTION 2. AUTHORITY.

This Ordinance is adopted pursuant to ORS 203.035, ORS 195.025 and ORS 195.036.

SECTION 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Ordinance is to approve the proposed amendments to update the Urbanization (Part IX) and Economy Sections (Part X) of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan, including an update of Columbia County's twenty (20) year coordinated Population Forecast.

SECTION 4. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

The Board of County Commissioners adopts the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in the Staff Report of the Department of Land Development Services dated July 28, 2009, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 5. AMENDMENT AND AUTHORIZATION.

The proposed amendments to Columbia County Comprehensive Plan Section IX, Urbanization, and Section X, Economy, contained in Exhibit 1 are hereby adopted as proposed in their entirety.

// //

// //

// //

SECTION 6. EMERGENCY.

An Emergency having been declared, this Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

DATED this 9th day of September, 2009.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

By: _____
Rita Bernhard, Chair

By: _____
Anthony Hyde, Commissioner

By: _____
Earl Fisher, Commissioner

Approved as to Form

By: _____
Office of County Counsel

Recording Secretary

By: _____
Jan Greenhalgh, Recording Secretary

First Reading: 9/9/09

Second Reading: 9/9/09

Effective Date: 9/9/09

County Counsel

BOARD COMMUNICATION

FROM THE LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
MEETING DATE: **August 26, 2009**

TO: **BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

FROM: Todd Dugdale, Director of Land Development Services

SUBJECT: **PUBLIC HEARING**
(TA 09-04) Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
Revisions Part IX (Urbanization)and Part X (Economy)
Update of County's 20-year Coordinated Population Forecast

DATE: August 19, 2009

COLUMBIA COUNTY
AUG 20 2009
COUNTY COUNSEL

SUMMARY:

OAR 660-024-0030 requires counties to "adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and each urban area within the county consistent with statutory requirements for such forecasts under ORS 195.025 and 195.036." Counties are further required to include up-to-date population projections in their comprehensive plans or in documents referenced by said plans.

Columbia County last updated population projections for the county overall in 1998 and for individual cities in 2001. Currently, the Comprehensive Plan contains population projections forecasted through the year 2015. In March of 2008, the County received a Technical Assistance Grant from the Department of Land Conservation and Development to update the County's 20-year coordinated population forecast. The County contracted with Portland State University Population Research Center to prepare the forecast which was reviewed by a project committee comprised of city representatives from Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Vernonia, Rainier and Clatskanie. Projections for the county, the unincorporated portions of the county and for each of the cities within the county were prepared for the years 2010, 2020 and 2030.

The County is required to adopt the new forecast into its Comprehensive Plan and then cities are to also amend their plans so that consistent population growth assumptions are used for planning decisions.

The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); the Cities of Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Vernonia, Rainier, Clatskanie and Prescott; the Scappoose, St. Helens, Clatskanie, Upper Nehalem and Mist-Birkenfeld CPACs; County Roadmaster; County Surveyor; County Assessor and County Counsel were all notified of the amendments. Comments from these entities are included as part of the attached Staff Report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Commission:
At their meeting on July 6, 2009, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of TA 09-04 to the Board of County Commissioners.

EXHIBIT 1

Staff:
Based on findings in the attached July 28, 2009 Staff report, Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments to incorporate updated 20-year population projections into the Urbanization and Economy Sections of the Comprehensive Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Board of Commissioners Staff Report
2. Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendments
3. Portland State University Population Research Center Report entitled *Population Forecasts for Columbia County Oregon, its Cities & Unincorporated Area 2010 to 2030*

COLUMBIA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Staff Report
July 28, 2009

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
Population Forecast to 2030

HEARING DATE:	August 26, 2009
FILE NUMBER:	TA 09-04
APPLICANT:	Columbia County Land Development Services
REQUEST:	A Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to revise portions of Part IX (Urbanization) and Part X (Economy) of the Comprehensive Plan to update the County's 20-year coordinated population forecast for the County as a whole, the unincorporated County and Cities within the County through the year 2030 with interim projections for the years 2010 and 2020.

APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA: — **Page**

Oregon Administrative Rule
Division 15 Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines
660-015-0000(2) - Goal 2: Land Use Planning
Part I – Planning 7 - 8

Columbia County Comprehensive Plan
Administrative Procedures 8 - 10

Columbia County Zoning Ordinance
Section 1606 Legislative Hearing 10 -11
Section 1611 Notice of Legislative Hearing 11

BACKGROUND:

OAR 660-024-0030 in conjunction with ORS 195.025 and 195.036 require counties to adopt and maintain a 20-year population forecast for the County and each urban area within the County in coordination with local jurisdictions. Population forecasts must be included in the Comprehensive Plan or in a document referenced by the Plan.

High, medium and low countywide population projections, forecasted through the year 2015, were last revised and incorporated into the County's Comprehensive Plan in 1998 (Ordinance 98-05). In 2001, 1998 population projections for individual cities were revised, and the updated forecast was incorporated into the County's Comprehensive Plan. The revisions redistributed the rural and urban populations from the (1998) adopted County total populations to more accurately reflect the growth of the cities in Columbia County (Ordinance 01-02).

In March of 2008, Columbia County received a Technical Assistance Grant from the Department of Land Conservation and Development to update the County's 20-year coordinated population forecast. Columbia County contracted with the Portland State University Population Research Center and coordinated with the County's six largest cities (Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Vernonia, Rainier and Clatskanie) to complete the project. The deliverable of this project (produced by the Portland State University Population Research Center) is a document titled *Population Forecasts for Columbia County Oregon, its Cities & Unincorporated Area: 2010 to 2030.* Forecasts were developed for the years 2010, 2020 and 2030 for the County overall, the unincorporated County and each city within the County.

Forecast methodologies are briefly summarized in the Introduction section of the document (generated by the Population Research Center and identified above) as follows:

> As integrated forecasts, results for the county's sub-areas (cities and unincorporated area) logically sum to the county total. Since forecasts for larger populations are more stable and reliable, the county-wide forecasts generally serve as a control on sub-area forecasts ('top-down'). However, both top-down and 'bottom-up' approaches are undertaken, where sub-area forecasts influence the county-wide forecast. For example, projections based on

housing unit growth in the cities and unincorporated area (bottom-up) help determine how much growth is likely in the near-term county-wide. The integration of top-down and bottom-up approaches is explained in greater detail further on. As separate tasks, forecasts for the county on the one hand, and its sub-areas on the other, are briefly described below.

Forecasts for the county rely on the Cohort-Component Model, which predicts future populations as outcomes of life events: births, deaths, and in- and out-migration. The method is a commonly used demographic forecasting technique. It involves estimating key vital rates: fertility, mortality and net migration. Regional and local plans for transportation, housing, and land use are also considered. County-wide forecasts are prepared under three scenarios, which account for different demographic assumptions: a most-likely, or medium growth scenario, and low and high growth scenarios.

Forecasts for the cities and unincorporated area primarily rely on a housing unit method, which forecasts future populations based on recent and expected housing trends. The method involves estimating changes in the housing stock, housing occupancy rates, and average household sizes for a given area. A given stock multiplied by the occupancy rate multiplied by household size produces an estimate (or projection) of household population. Group quarters populations are forecasted separately and added to the household population to produce total population figures. Census summary tabulations, residential building permits, and other sources identify the housing stock and changes over time. Occupancy rates and average household sizes are based on Census summary tabulations, changes over time, and trends in household formation. Once the sub-area forecasts and the county-wide cohort-component forecasts are consistent in the near- and medium-terms, forecasts for sub-areas become an allocation exercise in which the county-wide forecasts are allocated to the sub-areas. The sub-area forecasts are thus reconciled with the county-wide forecasts, where housing and household demographics and the population totals they produce add up to county-wide results.

Text amendments, to incorporate updated 2010, 2020 and 2030 population projections for the County and its sub-areas, are included as an attachment to this report. Amendments have been made to Part IX (Urbanization) and Part X (Economy) of the Comprehensive Plan and consist of a summary (similar to the summary above) of projection methodologies along with tables representing forecasted population figures. Although all three forecast scenarios (low, middle and high) are proposed to be included in the Comprehensive Plan, Columbia County and each city within the county shall adopt a single coordinated population forecast, not a range of forecasts. The middle series forecast (as stated in the report prepared by the Population Research Center) depicts a continuation of recent historical and current trends and is consistent with expected levels of regional employment and population growth. The low and high series forecasts, however, are based on hypothetical situations. Therefore, the low and high series forecasts are proposed to be included into the Comprehensive Plan for flexibility of future growth scenarios. The middle series forecast is proposed to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as the most logical set of projections for use as the countywide 20-year coordinated population forecast. Forecasts for the sub-areas, cities and unincorporated areas (which include people living inside urban growth boundaries of individual cities but outside the incorporated area of the city), are consistent with the county-wide forecasts; the sum of the sub-areas' populations equal the population forecast for the entire County.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

Oregon Administrative Rule

Division 15 Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines

660-015-0000(14)

Goal 14: Urbanization

To 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.

Urban Growth Boundaries

Urban growth boundaries shall be established and maintained by cities, counties and regional governments to provide land for urban development needs and identify and separate urban and urbanizable land from rural land. Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be a cooperative process among cities, counties and, where applicable regional governments. An urban growth boundary and amendments to the boundary shall be adopted by all cities within the boundary and by the county and or counties within which the boundary is located, consistent with intergovernmental agreements, except for the Metro regional urban growth boundary established pursuant to ORS chapter 268, which shall be adopted or amended by the Metropolitan Service District.

Land Need

Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be based on the following:

(1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population, consistent with a 20-year population forecast coordinated with affected local governments; and

(2) Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space, or any combination of the need categories in this subsection (2).

In determining need, local government may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need.

Prior to expanding an urban growth boundary, local governments shall demonstrate that needs cannot reasonably be accommodated on land already inside the urban growth boundary.

Boundary Location

The location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations consistent with ORS 197.298 and with consideration of the following factors:

(1) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs;

(2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

(3) Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences; and

(4) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

Finding 1: Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) requires cities and counties to establish and maintain urban growth boundaries to provide land for urban development needs and to identify and separate urban and urbanizable land from rural land. The Goal further states that the establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be based on a "demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population, consistent with a 20-year population forecast coordinated with affected local governments." Amendments to urban growth boundaries are contingent upon an up-to date and accurate 20-year population forecast. As discussed in the "Background" section above, the currently adopted population forecast only provides growth projections for the next (approximate) five years through the year 2015. The County's most recently adopted population projections do not provide the full 20-year forecast needed for urban growth boundary analyses and/or public facility and services planning. A new (up-to-date) 20-year coordinated population forecast shall be adopted by the County and its cities to allow for consistency with Goal 14. Proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments specifically address the criteria of Goal 14 as listed above. Population projections, forecast methodologies and administrative procedures associated with the adoption of said forecast are discussed in the findings that follow.

Continuing with Oregon Administrative Rule

Division 24 Urban Growth Boundaries

660-024-0030

Population Forecasts

(1) Counties must adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and for each urban area within the county consistent with statutory requirements for such forecasts under ORS 195.025 and 195.036. Cities must adopt a 20-year population forecast for the urban area consistent with the coordinated county forecast, except that a metropolitan service district must adopt and maintain a 20-year population forecast for the area within its jurisdiction. In adopting the coordinated forecast, local governments must follow applicable procedures and requirements in ORS 197.610 to 197.650 and must provide notice to all other local governments in the county. The adopted forecast must be included in the comprehensive plan or in a document referenced by the plan.

(2) The forecast must be developed using commonly accepted practices and standards for population forecasting used by professional practitioners in the field of demography or economics, and must be based on current, reliable and objective sources and verifiable factual information, such as the most recent long-range forecast for the county published by the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA). The forecast must take into account documented long-term demographic trends as well as recent events that have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical trends. The population forecast is an estimate which, although based on the best available information and methodology, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision.

Following with Oregon Revised Statutes

Chapter 195 — Local Government Planning Coordination

195.025 Regional coordination of planning activities; alternatives.

(1) In addition to the responsibilities stated in ORS 197.175, each county, through its governing body, shall be responsible for coordinating all planning activities affecting land uses within the county, including planning activities of the county, cities, special districts and state agencies, to assure an integrated comprehensive plan for the entire area of the county. In addition to being subject to the provisions of ORS chapters 195, 196 and 197 with respect to city or special district boundary changes, as defined by ORS 197.175 (1), the governing body of the Metropolitan Service District shall be considered the county review, advisory and coordinative body for Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties for the areas within that district.

195.036 Area population forecast; coordination.

The coordinating body under ORS 195.025 (1) shall establish and maintain a population forecast for the entire area within its boundary for use in maintaining and updating comprehensive plans, and shall coordinate the forecast with the local governments within its boundary.

Finding 2: Columbia County is the agency responsible for maintaining population forecast data (as required by Oregon Administrative Rule and Oregon Revised Statute) and for coordinating the forecast with the local governments within its boundary. Columbia County Land Development Services staff coordinated with the Portland State University Population Research Center and with City Managers (or their planning staff) from Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Vernonia, Rainier and Clatskanie to complete the coordinated 20-year population forecast. The County scheduled and conducted two meetings, held on September 16, 2008 and January 21, 2009, to discuss the project, forecast methodologies and population projections. Meeting participants included Population Research Center staff, County staff and City Managers (or planning staff) from each of the County's cities (with the exception of Prescott). Prior to completion of the forecast document, City representatives had opportunities to review draft versions of the report and submit comments, concerns and recommendations to Population Research Center staff. Staff from the Portland State University Population Research Center completed the report in February of 2009 in accordance with OAR 660-024-0030(2) . Following completion of the forecast, Columbia County Land Development Services staff presented a summary of the material to City Council members of Scappoose, St. Helens, Columbia City, Clatskanie and Rainier at their regularly scheduled meetings or work sessions. Due to scheduling conflicts, the City Manager of Vernonia presented forecast material to the Vernonia City Council.

OAR 660-024-0030(1) requires population forecasts to be included in the Comprehensive Plan or within a document referenced by the Plan. This application is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to revise population projections, currently forecasted in the Comprehensive Plan through the year 2015, to reflect updated projections through the year 2030 with interim projections for the years 2010 and 2020. As discussed in the "Background" section above, although low, middle and high series forecasts were prepared for the County and its sub-areas, the Land Conservation and Development

Commission has interpreted state statute and goal to require a single 20-year coordinated forecast for the County and each of its urban areas. Therefore, in accordance with 660-024-0030(2), Columbia County proposes adoption of the middle series forecast. The middle series forecast (as stated in the report prepared by the Population Research Center) depicts a continuation of recent historical and current trends and is consistent with expected levels of regional employment and population growth. The low and high series forecasts were projected based on possible scenarios and have been included in the proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments as sources of data.

Proposed amendments will revise portions of previously approved Ordinances 98-05 and 01-02, as included in the Urbanization and Economy parts of the Comprehensive Plan. Once adopted, by the County and the cities, these projections will be used by municipalities in the County for long range planning and for updating their comprehensive plans. Columbia County cities were formally (officially) notified of these Comprehensive Plan amendments. No comments have been received as of the date of this report. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

Chapter 197 — Comprehensive Land Use Planning Coordination

POST-ACKNOWLEDGMENT PROCEDURES

197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulation; exceptions; report to commission.

(1) A proposal to amend a local government acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local government believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.

Finding 3: The proposed text amendments, as included as an attachment to this report, were forwarded to the Department of Land Conservation and Development more than 45 days prior to the July 6th Planning Commission hearing date. All notification requirements have been satisfied. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

Following again with Oregon Administrative Rule

Division 15 Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines

660-015-0000(2)

Goal 2: Land Use Planning

Part I – Planning

"...All land-use plans and implementation ordinances shall be adopted by the governing body after public hearing and shall be reviewed and, as needed, revised on a periodic cycle to take into

account changing public policies and circumstances, in accord with a schedule set forth in the plan. Opportunities shall be provided for review and comment by citizens and affected governmental units during preparation, review and revision of plans and implementation ordinances. "

Finding 4: The County finished the periodic review work task III "Population Projections" for the County and its urban areas in 1998. Forecasts specific to the cities were then revised in 2001. The 1998/2001 forecasts projected growth through the year 2015. This application proposes an update to the County's 20-year coordinated population forecast and includes amendments to previous population projections to reflect projections for the County and cities through the year 2030. The request will be heard at a public hearing before the Planning Commission. Notification was sent to all government agencies and the County's Citizen Planning Advisory Committees (CPACs), as well as published in local news media. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the County's Board of Commissioners who will make the final decision at one of their public meetings. As discussed in Finding 1 above, citizens and affected governmental entities were given opportunities to review and comment on the forecast during its preparation and will be given further opportunity for comment by attending the aforementioned public hearings. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

Following with the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan

Administrative Procedures

It is essential the citizens of Columbia County be provided with a comprehensive plan that will accommodate the changing needs of the communities in which they live, work and play. While this plan is the result of considerable public input, study and analysis of existing physical, economic, environmental, and social conditions, and a projection of what future conditions are likely to be, it recognizes the importance of providing a framework for changing the plan periodically or as the need arises.

GOALS:

1. To assure the goals and policies of this plan are implemented.

2. To provide review and revision procedures which include provisions for participation by citizens and affected interest groups.

3. To provide an understandable framework for reviewing and revising this plan.

POLICIES:

1. Establish procedures to monitor changes in population, vacant lands, public facilities and environmental and economic changes.

2. Maintain the Citizen Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) program as a means for the public and interest groups to express their views on County or Community needs, changes and improvements.

3. Insure the goals, objectives, policies, and implementing strategies of the Plan are

reviewed as needed or inventory data changes. The review shall be formally done every two (2) years. For the purpose of this Plan, the following terms are defined:

Goal:	The ultimate end toward which an activity or effort is directed.
Objective:	A position toward which an activity or effort is directed, which leads to the ultimate goal.
Policy:	A course of action designed to give constant guidance to present and future development decisions and thereby meets the goals and/or objectives.
Implementing Strategies:	Approaches or techniques for implementing the policies. They describe the necessary programs and regulations and give direction to County agencies and departments for plan-related activities.

Goals, objectives, policies, and implementing strategies are to be considered mandatory.

4. Formally update the Comprehensive Plan every five (5) years.

5. Provide a framework by which the Comprehensive Plan may be reviewed, revised and amended. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and its implementing ordinance(s) shall be in accordance with the following procedures and guidelines:

   A. The Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission, the Planning Directory or the owner(s) of the affected property may initialize amendments.

   B. A Citizen Planning Advisory Committee, may, upon a majority vote of its members, formally request either the Board of Commissioners or the Planning Commission initiates an amendment.

   C. Revisions or amendments will follow the same process as initial adoption - CPAC review, Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation, and Board hearing and adoption of revisions or amendments.

   D. For quasi-judicial amendments, all property owners within two hundred and fifty (250) feet of the affected area shall be notified of the hearing date and the requested amendment at least ten (10) days prior to the first scheduled public hearing.

6. The Planning Director shall make the initial decision on any questions of interpretation or applicability of the plan. Such decisions may be appealed to the Board of Commissioners. All appeals shall be filed pursuant to section 1700 of the Columbia County Zoning Ordinances.

7. Existing ordinances and regulations will be amended and new ordinances and regulations shall be adopted to implement this plan as appropriate.

8. All land use approvals shall be consistent with this plan.

9. Revisions or amendments proposed within an urban growth boundary shall be in accordance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement adoption for that area.

10. The county will continue coordination with affected governmental agencies in future reviews and revisions of the comprehensive plan and its implementing ordinances.

Finding 5: The Columbia County Comprehensive Plan is designed to be periodically revised as is shown in the general purpose statement, Goal 2, and Policies 3 and 5. More specifically, Policy 1 directs the County to establish procedures to monitor changes in population. Policy 10 also instructs the County to continue coordination with affected governmental agencies. This application is being brought forth upon completion of a collaborative effort between the Portland State University Population Research Center, Columbia County and Cities within the County to produce an updated population forecast for the County (countywide), unincorporated county and cities. The request proposes amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to update 2015 population projections to 2030 projections. This request is not only consistent with the Comprehensive Plan but encouraged by the plan. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

Following with the Columbia County Zoning Ordinance:

Section 1606 **Legislative Hearing:** Requests to amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance or to change a large area of the Zoning Map of Columbia County in order to bring it into compliance with the Comprehensive Plan are legislative hearings. Legislative hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedures.

.1 A legislative amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Text or Map may be initiated at the request of the Board of Commissioners, a majority of the Commission, or the Director, or any citizen of the County may petition the Commission for such a change.

.2 Notice of a Legislative Hearing shall be published at least twice, one week apart in newspapers of general circulation in Columbia County. The last of these notices shall be published no less than 10 calendar days prior to the Legislative Hearing. The mailing of notice to individual property owners is not required but shall be done if ordered by the Board of Commissioners.

Finding 6: The LDS Director brought this issue before the Board of Commissioners at their March 17, 2009 work session meeting. The Board at that time, directed LDS to initiate the population projection revisions via a comprehensive plan text amendment. These will be legislative changes to the comprehensive plan, however, they will not involve a re-zone or change of plan designation regarding specific properties in the County. These changes will not limit or preclude the

use of individual properties, as they have been previously used, prior to the adoption of these amendments. Notice of the proposed text amendments was sent to the cities and affected agencies on May 27, 2009. Notice of the legislative hearing was published in the local news media on May 20, 2009 and May 27, 2009. The first public hearing will be before the Planning Commission on July 6, 2009. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

Section 1611 Notice of Legislative Hearing: The notice of a legislative hearing shall contain the following items:

.1 Date, time and place of the hearing;

.2 A description of the area to be rezoned or the changes to the text;

.3 Copies of the statement for the proposed changes are available in the Planning Department. These proposed changes may be amended at the public hearing;

.4 Interested parties may appear and be heard;

.5 Hearings will be held in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Finding 7: The above information was included in the mailed and published notices. Notices were mailed to affected agencies on May 27, 2009 and were published in the local news media on May 20 and May 27, 2009. Staff finds that the criterion is met.

COMMENTS:

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development: (Comments dated June 8, 2009) The county will need to adopt a single 20-year coordinated population number for each of the cities and the unincorporated county. A range of population numbers for each city does not satisfy the requirements of statute and rule. The final population forecast adopted by the county could be derived from preliminary studies of low, medium, or high scenarios (pick one), but must be supported by adequate findings that are justified by the work and methodology described in OAR 660, division 24. It may be difficult to justify and write findings that support a high growth scenario given that PSU determined that the medium growth scenario is the most consistent with expected levels of regional employment and population growth and continues current trends.

(Comments dated June 15, 2009) If the County is updating its plan for population forecasts, it should update all information and findings related to urbanization. In the last few years, Goal 14 has been amended, and UGB amendment rules have been adopted as OAR 660, Division 24. In 1999, ORS 197.298 was adopted. As the County's Urbanization section of the Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 1998, language needs to be incorporated to reference current state law. ...what will guide future amendments of UGBs will be the amended Goal 14, which now has 2 need criteria and 4

boundary location factors (one deleted from old Goal 14, some the same as before, and some amended); the ORS 197.298 priorities of land to add to a UGB; and the OAR 660, Division 24 rules and safe harbors.

Tables 18-22 show annual growth rates for 1960-2000, medium growth forecasts for 2010, 2020 and 2030, and high growth forecasts for 2010, 2020, and 2030. Why are there no low growth forecasts?

Forecasts must be for urban areas (i.e., UGBs), not cities (OAR 660-024-0030(1)).

The plan should clarify that County UGB amendment factors may be applied only after the state criteria and procedure have been applied.

Why did the County use PSU to create this forecast as opposed to using the OEA's most recent long-range forecast for the County.

(Comments dated July 20, 2009) Comments relevant to proposed Comprehensive Plan text: The Background section should state that growth be directed to lands within the urban growth boundaries for the County's unincorporated cities, and not just to the incorporated cities.

The goal of the Urbanization section should require the creation and maintenance of urban growth boundaries based on Statewide Planning Goal 14, ORS 197.298, OAR 660, division 14 and other relevant state laws.

Policy # 2, which states "Utilize the area in the urban growth boundaries with the most efficient manner of service expansion," should be replaced with "Accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, ensure efficient use of land, and provide for livable communities."

Revise Policy # 18, taking out "Coordinate population projections at the time of the first periodic review of the County or any city plan..." and adding "Periodically update coordinated 20-year population forecasts for each city's urban growth boundary and for the unincorporated areas..."

Add language to the end of Policy # 20 which states, "...and are consistent with Goal 14 and OAR 660, division 4.

Comments relevant to the Staff Report: Include additional language to the Background section clarifying that "the sum of all middle scenario forecasts equals the 20-year forecast for the entire County population."

Revise language in Finding 1 to state that the most recently adopted population projections do not provide the full 20-year forecast needed for urban growth boundary analyses and/ or public facility and services planning; remove the language that says adopted projections are no longer sufficient for analyses and planning.

In Finding 2, make it clear that both the County and cities have to adopt population projections.

City of Scappoose: No Objection

City of St. Helens: No Objection

City of Columbia City: None

City of Vernonia: No Objection

City of Rainier: No Objection; The City of Rainier, Oregon greatly appreciates the effort and time involved with this project. The information supplied will greatly enhance the City's future management of land use regulations.

City of Clatskanie: No Objection

City of Prescott: None

Scappoose CPAC: None

St. Helens CPAC: None

Clatskanie CPAC: None

Upper Nehalem CPAC: None

Mist-Birkenfeld CPAC: None

County Roadmaster: No Objection

County Assessor: None

County Surveyor: None

County Counsel: None

No other comments have been received from citizen groups, government agencies or the general public as of July 28, 2009.

STAFF COMMENTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the findings of this report, Columbia County has a responsibility to maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the County as a whole, the unincorporated County and Cities within the County. The County is further required to collaborate with each urban area (city) within the County to generate population projections. Forecasts shall be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan or included in a document referenced by the Comprehensive Plan. Columbia County's Comprehensive Plan supports revisions to its contents to include up-to-date information related to the population of Columbia County. The Portland State University Population Research Center and Columbia County Staff generated population projections and coordinated with affected agencies in accordance with Oregon Administrative Rules and Oregon Revised Statutes. The proposed amendments in conjunction with this application are consistent with Oregon State law and the goals and policies of Columbia County's Comprehensive Plan.

Based on the facts, findings and comments herein, the Planning Director and the Planning Commission **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of the proposed text amendments to the County's Comprehensive Plan to update the coordinated 20-year population forecast.

Attachments:

Proposed Text Amendments

Available Upon Request:

Population Forecasts for Columbia County Oregon, its Cities & Unincorporated Area: 2010 to 2030 (Prepared by the Portland State University Population Research Center - dated February, 2009)

Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Part IX (Pages 78-90)

URBANIZATION

[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-5 effective 7/98;
[Amended by Ordinance No. 01-02 effective March 2001].

PURPOSE

The goal of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In addition, it is the goal of the county to provide for an efficient method of managing urban growth so that the needs of all citizens of the County are met. A major consideration in the management of urban growth is the reduction of the costs associated with uncontrolled and scattered development. These costs are measured both in terms of wasted resources and in the expense of providing services to far-flung residences. The purpose is not to prevent growth from occurring, but to minimize the conflicts between land uses. When growth is directed into identifiable and desirable communities, people are able to enjoy a pleasant environment at a reasonable cost, while still conserving the County's resource base.

BACKGROUND

There are two types of residential lands in Columbia County. These are rural lands and urban lands.

Rural Lands, as defined by the Statewide Planning Goals, "are those (lands) which are outside the Urban Growth Boundary and are: a) non-urban agriculture, forest, or open space lands, or b) other lands suitable for sparse settlement, small farms, or acreage homesites with no, or hardly any, public services and which are not suitable, necessary, or intended for urban use."

Urban Lands, as defined by the Statewide Planning Goals, " are those places which must have an incorporated city. Such areas may include lands adjacent to and outside the incorporated city and may also: a) have concentrations of persons who generally reside and work in the area, and b) have supporting public facilities and services."

Urban lands in this plan are those lands which are contained within a mutually adopted Urban Growth Boundary. **Goal 14 identifies urban growth boundaries as lands intended "to provide land for urban development needs and to identify and separate urban and urbanizable land from rural land." Urban growth boundaries were established in Columbia County using State criteria and as a result of the combined efforts of Columbia County and its incorporated cities.** ~~These boundaries have been developed as a result of the combined efforts of Columbia County and its incorporated communities.~~

~~The boundaries themselves were developed using the seven (7) criteria listed in Goal 14. The same criteria will be used in judging any expansion of these boundaries. These criteria are:~~

~~1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals~~

~~2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;~~

~~3. Orderly and economic provision for needed public facilities and services;~~

~~4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;~~

~~5. Environmental, energy, economic, and social consequences;~~

~~6. Retention of agricultural land as defined with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority; and~~

~~7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.~~

Urban growth boundary changes or expansions are guided by OAR 660, Division 24, which identifies rules regarding the adoption or amendment of an urban growth boundary; ORS 197.298, which establishes priorities of land to be included within urban growth boundaries; and Goal 14: Urbanization. Goal 14 requires Urban Growth Boundary amendments to be based on land need criteria and boundary location factors.

Land Need

Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be based on the following:

1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population, consistent with a 20-year population forecast coordinated with affected local governments; and

2. Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space, or any combination of the need categories in this subsection.

In determining need, local government may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need. Prior to expanding an urban growth boundary, local governments shall demonstrate that needs cannot reasonably be accommodated on land already inside the urban growth boundary.

Boundary Location

The location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations consistent with ORS 197.298 and with consideration of the following factors:

1. Efficient accommodation of identified land needs;

2. Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

3. Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences and;

4. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

In order to plan for urban growth boundary expansions, the seven (7) incorporated cities have been asked to address Goal 14 by identifying sufficient amounts of land to accommodate ~~their~~ future expansions, taking into account: the growth policy of the area; ~~the projected population needs by the year 2015~~ the needs of the forecast population through the year 2030; the carrying capacity of the planning area; and open space and recreational needs. For some cities, there may be sufficient land to meet their needs

already within their city limits while other cities may require additional land. In either case, an Urban Growth Boundary must be defined which focuses on the areas that will become urban - the future part of these communities. ~~The establishment of this boundary, and any later changes, are to be made after consideration of the following factors which are outlined in the Goals and Guidelines: *[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-5 effective 7/98].*~~

~~1. Orderly, economic provisions for public facilities and services;~~

~~2. Availability of sufficient land for various uses to insure choices in the market place;~~

~~3. LCDC goals; and~~

~~4. Encouragement of urban development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas.~~

Specific provisions relating to the process of changing an Urban Growth Boundary are outlined under the administrative provision of this plan.

Until annexed, the lands between the boundary and the city limits remain the responsibility of the County. To assure that the urbanizable lands will be managed in a coordinated manner, a joint Management Agreement between each city and the County has been adopted. The urban growth area joint management agreements are included in the appendix. In addition, Oregon law requires that special districts enter into a cooperative agreement with the city or County within whose boundaries the district operates.

Throughout most of its history, Columbia County has increased in population by "natural" means (that is, by the difference between births and deaths). However, during the last several years, there has been a consistent rise in the population by migration into the County. *[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*

One of the primary factors in this growth has been the pressure of suburbanization from Portland. In the southeastern section of the County, many residents who live in St. Helens or Scappoose commute to Portland or Washington County to work. Many of Vernonia residents and those who live in the Nehalem River Valley in the southwestern portion of the County are also commuting to the Tualatin Valley to work. In the northern section of the County, many of those who work in Longview, Washington prefer to commute from the Oregon side of the river, and have strongly affected the residential development of Rainier and other nearby communities. *[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*

~~In the 1990s, there was a general tendency for the seven (7) incorporated cities to attract most of the population increase. Columbia County has been averaging 30 to 50 new dwelling units per year in forest lands, as well as many new units in rural residential exception areas.~~ **Most of Columbia County's population increase in the 1990s and 2000s occurred within the County's seven (7) incorporated cities, but the unincorporated county gains new dwelling units each year in forest lands and rural residential exception areas.** Although there will continue to be growth in the rural communities, such as Alston-Delena, Mist, Birkenfeld, and Quincy, movement into the cities should be encouraged to protect the County from random subdivisions and a deterioration of the resource base. Growth should be directed ~~onto urban lands, defined as: "Those places which must have an incorporated city."~~ **into the County's incorporated cities and to land within the urban growth boundaries of the incorporated cities.** *[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*

The development of population projections for the urban and rural areas of the County is a complex task

involving ~~changing~~ multiple state mandates implemented at the county and local levels across a ~~changing~~ range of time. ~~Columbia County has conducted a series of population projection coordination meetings with local jurisdictions to allocate population. This allocation will be updated every time the State Office of Economic Analysis updates their Long-Term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon. The next update is scheduled for the year 2000. Considering these factors, projections were developed and assumptions made with a low, intermediate, and high range of growth as follows:~~ [*Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*

~~Projection #1 (Low):~~ ~~The State Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) in their Long-Term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon determined a County total population number of 47,954 persons in the year 2015. Population was then allocated to each city based on that city's percentage or ratio of county total population established in the 1990 census. The County assumes that each city's ratio of total county population as derived from the 1990 census of population will be applied to the 2015 number for allocation purposes. The State mandated that Projection #1, Low, total number for the County be used to provide a benchmark for indicating consistency with state population allocated at the County level.~~ [*Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*

~~Projection #2 (Intermediate): This projection utilizes a total number 5% above Projection #1, the low number in this projection series, which is the Office of Economic Analysis number. The incorporated cities population number is the arithmetic mean half way between the low, Projection #1 number and the high, Projection #3 number. The remainder of the population in the unincorporated areas of the County is reduced so the projection total will remain within 5% of the Low Projection #1 OEA number and because growth will be directed towards cities due to recent restrictions on rural residential lands. Projection #2, Intermediate, will be used for land use planning purposes. [*Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*~~

~~Projection #3 (High):~~ ~~The County Transportation System Plan (TSP) assumes that the year 2016 population of the County will exceed 55,600 persons if the comprehensive plan for each city and the county are implemented. The TSP 2016 population total county population number is assumed to be the 2015 number for purposes of this projection. Population was then allocated to each city based upon that city's percentage or ratio of county total population established in the 1990 census. The Transportation System Plan, Chapter 3, "Future Conditions and Alternative Scenarios" assumptions are included as an attachment. Projection #3, High, will be used to implement the current Transportation Systems Plan. Future studies or projects may use lower numbers if necessary. [*Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*~~

ORS 195.025 and ORS 195.036 require counties to adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and each urban area within the county. Integrated long term population projections for the years 2010, 2020 and 2030 were generated by the Portland State University Population Research Center, in coordination with Columbia County and its six largest incorporated cities. A series of population projection coordination meetings with Columbia County, Portland State University and the local jurisdictions were conducted to allocate population. Projections were developed for the county as a whole, for the unincorporated county and for each city in the county (with the exception of Prescott). County-wide forecasts were prepared under three scenarios accounting for different demographic assumptions: low growth scenario, middle growth scenario and high growth scenario. Forecasts for the cities and unincorporated county were prepared only under middle and high growth scenarios based on recent and expected housing trends. Columbia County finds that the middle series forecast is the most logical and likely growth scenario for planning purposes. Methodologies used for each forecast scenario are as follows:

Methodology County-wide:

The county-wide population forecasts use a demographic cohort-component model. The components of population change are births, deaths, and migration (residential relocation). An area's population grows when births outnumber deaths and when more people move into an area than out of it. These events occur at different rates for persons of different age groups, or cohorts. Using age-specific *fertility rates*, age-sex specific *mortality rates*, age-sex specific *migration rates*, estimates of recent net migration levels, and forecasts of future migration levels, each component is applied to the base year population in a manner that simulates actual dynamics of population change.

High, middle and low forecast scenarios were projected based on differences in fertility rates and in and out migration. The differences in fertility rates between the three scenarios are not extreme. In each scenario, future fertility rates for women younger than 30 are lower than the rates in 2000, while fertility rates for women 30 and older are higher. The differences are based on trends in national, state, and county fertility rates that began in 1990 and have continued into the 2000s. Mortality rates are the same in all three series. The biggest difference between the three scenarios is the impact of migration. In the middle series, net migration contributes about 13,000 residents to the county between 2000 and 2030, compared with 8,700 in the low series and 17,400 in the high series. The average per decade in the middle series is similar to the 1990s net migration level.

TABLE 17:
County-wide Forecast Scenarios

	1990	2000	2010	2020	2030
Middle Series Population	37,557	43,560	48,695	54,025	58,505
Numeric Change		*6,003*	*5,135*	*5,330*	*4,480*
Average Annual Growth		*1.5%*	*1.1%*	*1.0%*	*0.8%*
High Series Population	*37,557*	*43,560*	*49,234*	*56,792*	*63,675*
Numeric Change		*6,003*	*5,674*	*7,558*	*6,883*
Average Annual Growth		*1.5%*	*1.2%*	*1.4%*	*1.2%*
Low Series Population	*37,557*	*43,560*	*48,285*	*51,433*	*53,501*
Numeric Change		*6,003*	*4,725*	*3,148*	*2,068*
Average Annual Growth		*1.5%*	*1.0%*	*0.6%*	*0.4%*

Methodology for the Unincorporated County and Cities:

Forecasts for cities and unincorporated Columbia County rely on a housing unit method, which forecasts future populations based on recent and expected housing trends. The method involves estimating and forecasting changes in the *number of housing units*, housing *occupancy rates*, and average *household sizes*. The number of housing units multiplied by the occupancy rate, multiplied by household size, equals household population. Four of the cities and the unincorporated area include a small number of residents who do not live in housing units. This population, called the group quarters population, is forecast based on its current ratio to household population in each area. Household population plus group quarters population equals total population. In each forecast increment, the sums of the initial forecasts for cities and the unincorporated area are close to the county-wide forecasts. However, the sum of the cities and unincorporated area produced in the housing unit models must be consistent with the county totals produced by the cohort-component models. Therefore, the final step is to control, or scale proportionally, the city and unincorporated area forecasts to the county-wide populations.

City and unincorporated area forecasts were prepared under two scenarios. One scenario corresponds to the county-wide medium series forecast, and one corresponds to the county-wide high series forecast. The models rely primarily on information reported in the 1990 and 2000 Censuses and more recent population estimates and housing data, and where available, detailed information about historic and planned future residential development. Forecasts were not constrained by either current city boundaries or residential building capacities. Adjustments to 1990 and 2000 census counts for Clatskanie and 2000 census counts for Vernonia were based on surveys and censuses conducted by the PSU Population Research Center in 1991 and 2006. The housing unit model was not used to forecast the population of the City of Prescott; its population remains at its 2008 level throughout the forecast period.

TABLE 18:
Historical & Medium Growth Forecast: Total Population
Columbia County Cities & Unincorporated Area

	Clatskanie	Columbia City	Prescott	Rainier	St. Helens	Scappoose	Vernonia	Unincorp.	County-wide
1990: Total Population	1,708	1,003	63	1,674	7,535	3,529	1,808	20,237	37,557
2000:									
Total Population	1,675	1,571	72	1,687	10,019	4,976	2,292	21,268	43,560
Numeric change	*-33*	*568*	*9*	*13*	*2,484*	*1,447*	*484*	*1,031*	*6,003*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*-0.2%*	*4.6%*	*1.3%*	*0.1%*	*2.9%*	*3.5%*	*2.4%*	*0.5%*	*1.5%*
2010:									
Total Population	1,795	1,979	75	1,844	12,847	6,601	2,405	21,149	48,695
Numeric change	*120*	*408*	*3*	*157*	*2,828*	*1,625*	*113*	*-119*	*5,135*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*0.7%*	*2.3%*	*0.4%*	*0.9%*	*2.5%*	*2.8%*	*0.5%*	*-0.1%*	*1.1%*
2020:									
Total Population	1,948	2,292	75	2,060	15,591	8,234	2,605	21,220	54,025
Numeric change	*153*	*313*	*0*	*216*	*2,744*	*1,633*	*200*	*71*	*5,330*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*0.8%*	*1.4%*	*0.0%*	*1.1%*	*1.9%*	*2.2%*	*0.8%*	*0.0%*	*1.0%*
2030:									
Total Population	2,058	2,532	75	2,210	17,842	10,022	2,700	21,066	58,505
Numeric change	*110*	*240*	*0*	*150*	*2,251*	*1,788*	*95*	*-154*	*4,480*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*0.5%*	*1.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.7%*	*1.3%*	*1.9%*	*0.4%*	*-0.1%*	*0.8%*

TABLE 19:
Historical & High Growth Forecast: Total Population
Columbia County Cities & Unincorporated Area

	Clatskanie	Columbia City	Prescott	Rainier	St. Helens	Scappoose	Vernonia	Unincorp.	County-wide
1990: Total Population	1,708	1,003	63	1,674	7,535	3,529	1,808	20,237	37,557
2000:									
Total Population	1,675	1,571	72	1,687	10,019	4,976	2,292	21,268	43,560
Numeric change	*-33*	*568*	*9*	*13*	*2,484*	*1,447*	*484*	*1,031*	*6,003*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*-0.2%*	*4.6%*	*1.3%*	*0.1%*	*2.9%*	*3.5%*	*2.4%*	*0.5%*	*1.5%*
2010:									
Total Population	1,810	1,979	75	1,871	13,073	6,698	2,418	21,310	49,234
Numeric change	*135*	*408*	*3*	*184*	*3,054*	*1,722*	*126*	*42*	*5,674*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*0.8%*	*2.3%*	*0.4%*	*1.0%*	*2.6%*	*2.9%*	*0.5%*	*0.0%*	*1.2%*
2020:									
Total Population	2,034	2,398	75	2,180	16,457	8,934	2,787	21,942	56,807
Numeric change	*224*	*419*	*0*	*309*	*3,384*	*2,236*	*369*	*632*	*7,573*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*1.1%*	*1.9%*	*0.0%*	*1.5%*	*2.3%*	*2.9%*	*1.4%*	*0.3%*	*1.4%*
2030:									
Total Population	2,257	2,787	75	2,451	19,661	11,193	3,068	22,212	63,704
Numeric change	*223*	*389*	*0*	*271*	*3,204*	*2,259*	*281*	*270*	*6,897*
Average Annual Growth Rate	*1.0%*	*1.5%*	*0.0%*	*1.1%*	*1.8%*	*2.2%*	*0.9%*	*0.1%*	*1.1%*

TABLE 20:
Historical & Forecasted Medium and High Growth Forecast: City and Unincorporated Area Populations as Shares of County Total

	COUNTY, Total Population	Clatskanie	Columbia City	Prescott	Rainier	St. Helens	Scappoose	Vernonia	Unincorp.
HISTORIC:									
1960[1]	22,379	3.56%	1.89%	0.58%	5.15%	22.44%	4.12%	4.87%	57.39%
1970[1]	28,790	4.47%	1.87%	0.36%	6.01%	21.58%	6.46%	5.71%	53.55%
1980[1]	35,646	4.62%	1.90%	0.20%	4.64%	19.82%	9.01%	5.01%	54.79%
1990[2]	37,557	4.55%	2.67%	0.17%	4.46%	20.06%	9.40%	4.81%	53.88%
2000[2]	43,560	3.85%	3.61%	0.17%	3.87%	23.00%	11.42%	5.26%	48.82%
MEDIUM GROWTH:									
2010	48,695	3.69%	4.06%	0.15%	3.79%	26.38%	13.56%	4.94%	43.43%
2020	54,025	3.61%	4.24%	0.14%	3.81%	28.86%	15.24%	4.82%	39.28%
2030	58,505	3.52%	4.33%	0.13%	3.78%	30.50%	17.13%	4.61%	36.01%
HIGH GROWTH:									
2010	49,234	3.68%	4.02%	0.15%	3.80%	26.55%	13.60%	4.91%	43.28%
2020	56,807	3.58%	4.22%	0.13%	3.84%	28.97%	15.73%	4.91%	38.63%
2030	63,704	3.54%	4.37%	0.12%	3.85%	30.86%	17.57%	4.82%	34.87%

(1) Based on Decennial Census 100% count (2) Based on Decennial Census 100% count and adjusted figures for Clatskanie (1990 & 2000), Vernonia (2000), & unincorporated area (1990 & 2000).

TABLE 21:
Historical & Forecasted: Average Annual Housing Unit Growth Rates Columbia County Cities & Unincorporated Area

Period	Clatskanie	Columbia City	Prescott	Rainier	St. Helens	Scappoose	Vernonia	Unincorp.	County-wide
1990-2000	0.2%	5.9%	1.0%	0.9%	2.7%	4.3%	2.4%	1.0%	1.9%
2000-2010	0.9%	2.4%	0.0%	1.0%	2.1%	2.9%	0.3%	0.4%	1.2%
1990-2010	0.5%	4.1%	0.5%	0.9%	2.4%	3.6%	1.3%	0.7%	1.5%
Forecast, Medium Growth:									
2010-2020	0.9%	2.0%	0.0%	1.0%	2.1%	2.7%	0.9%	0.4%	1.3%
2020-2030	0.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.8%	1.7%	2.2%	0.7%	0.1%	1.0%

TABLE 22:
Historical & Forecasted: Occupancy Rates & Average Household Sizes
Columbia County Cities & Unincorporated Area

	Clatskanie	Columbia City	Prescott	Rainier	St. Helens	Scappoose	Vernonia	Unincorp.	County-wide
Occupancy Rates, Historic & Forecast (medium or high growth):									
1990	92.7%	96.7%	86.7%	95.5%	96.8%	97.3%	91.4%	95.2%	95.4%
2000	91.5%	93.0%	84.8%	91.0%	92.3%	94.3%	89.7%	94.1%	93.2%
2010	94.0%	94.6%	87.9%	92.5%	93.7%	95.1%	92.5%	94.1%	94.0%
2020 & 2030	94.0%	94.0%	87.9%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%
Average Household Size, Historic & Medium Growth Forecast:									
1990	2.49	2.87	2.42	2.60	2.48	2.73	2.77	2.77	2.68
2000	2.42	2.63	2.57	2.53	2.65	2.62	2.83	2.66	2.65
2010	2.30	2.55	2.59	2.46	2.70	2.57	2.79	2.53	2.58
2020	2.29	2.45	2.59	2.44	2.65	2.49	2.72	2.44	2.51
2030	2.28	2.43	2.59	2.43	2.55	2.45	2.62	2.40	2.46
Pct. change 2000-2030	*-5.7%*	*-7.7%*	*NA*	*-4.1%*	*-3.7%*	*-6.4%*	*-7.3%*	*-9.9%*	*-7.0%*

~~TABLE 18~~ **Table 23**

[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-5 effective 7/98].

DECENNIAL CENSUS OF POPULATION 1920 - ~~1990~~ **2000**

Decennial Census Year	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	**2000**
Clatskanie	1,171	739	708	901	797	1,286	1,648	~~1,629~~ **1,708**	**1,675**
Prescott				119	129	105	73	63	**72**
Rainier	1,287	1,353	1,183	1,285	1,152	1,731	1,655	1,674	**1,687**
Columbia City		310	327	405	423	537	678	1,003	**1,571**
St. Helens	2,220	3,994	4,304	4,711	~~5,922~~ **5,022**	6,212	7,064	7,535	**10,019**
Scappoose		248	336	659	923	1,859	3,213	3,529	**4,976**
Vernonia	142	1,625	1,412	1,521	~~1,095~~ **1,089**	1,643	1,785	1,808	**2,292**
Incorporated County	4,820	8,269	8,270	9,601	~~10,441~~ **9,535**	13,373	16,116	~~17,241~~ **17,320**	**22,292**
Unincorporated County	9,140	11,778	12,701	13,366	~~11,938~~ **12,844**	15,417	19,530	~~20,316~~ **20,237**	**21,268**
Total County	13,960	20,047	20,971	22,967	22,379	28,790	35,646	37,557	**43,560**

Source: PSU Center for Population Research

~~TABLE 17~~

~~ANNUAL POPULATION FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY AND INCORPORATED CITIES, WITH GROWTH RATES IN PERCENTAGES, 1970-1978~~

	1970	%	1971	%	1972	%	1973	%	1974	%	1975	%	1976	%	1977	%	1978
St. Helens	6212	(1.9)	6330	(4.1)*	6600	(1.6)	6710	(2.1)	6855	(0.8)	6910	(1.6)	7020	(6.4)*	7500	(7.4)	8100
Scappoose	1876	(5.0)	1975	(9.2)*	2175	(11.6)	2460	(3.3)	2545	(2.5)	2610	(8.1)	2840	(7.2)	3060	(2.6)	3150
Rainier	1731	(0.8)	1745	(0.2)	1750	(3.6)	1815	(0.5)*	1825	(0.8)	1840	0**	1840	(4.7)*	1930	(3.5)*	2000
Vernonia	1643	(0.1)	1645	0	1645	0	1645	(0.3)	1650	(1.2)	1670	(1.8)	1700	(5.0)	1790	(5.3)*	1890
Clatskanie	1286	(2.2)	1315	(3.3)	1360	(4.2)	1420	(3.7)	1475	(1.6)	1500	(9.1)	1650	(1.5)	1675	(1.5)	1700
Columbia City	537	(0.6)	540	(4.4)	565	(7.4)	610	(6.2)	650	(5.1)	685	0	685	(3.5)	710	(4.1)	740
Prescott	105	(-0.5)	100	(-0.5)	95	(0.5)	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
Total City Population	13,390	(1.9)	13,650	(3.8)	14,190	(3.8)	14,760	(2.3)	15,100	(1.4)	15,315	(3.3)	15,035	(5.5)	16,765	(5.2)	17,680
																	Ave. 3.4%
Unincorporated County Population	15,400	(5.1)	16,220	(-2.1)	15,880	(-2.8)	15,440	(3.9)	16,060	(2.6)	16,485	(0.5)	16,565	(-0.2)	16,535	(0.4)	16,600
																	Ave. 0.93%
Total County Population	28,790	(3.6)	29,870	(0.7)	30,070	(0.4)	30,200	(3.1)	31,160	(2.0)	31,800	(1.9)	32,400	(2.7)	33,300	(2.9)	34,280
																	Ave. 2.2%

~~* Growth rate reflects population annexed.~~

~~** Growth rate reflects population withdrawn from city by boundary change.~~

~~Sources: Metropolitan Boundary Commission and Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University.~~

~~TABLE 19~~

~~*[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].*~~

~~POPULATION FORECAST FOR 2015~~

~~LOW~~	~~INTERMEDIATE~~	~~HIGH~~
~~Office of Economic Analysis~~	~~5% Above Low With Arithmetic Mean for Cities~~	~~Transportation System Plan~~
~~47,954~~	~~50,351~~	~~55,600~~

~~The low, intermediate, and high projection allocations follow:~~

~~TABLE 20~~

~~*[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-5 effective 7/98; Amended by Ordinance No. 01-02, effective 3/01].*~~

~~POPULATION PROJECTION CITY/COUNTY ALLOCATION FOR 2015~~

	~~% of 2015 population estimate~~	~~LOW 2015 population estimate~~	~~INTERMEDIATE 5% higher than the low estimate~~	~~HIGH Transportation System Plan (TSP) total allocated to each city as 1990 census~~
~~Clatskanie~~	~~4.16~~	~~2,028~~	~~2,095~~	~~2,315~~
~~Columbia City~~	~~5.52~~	~~2,686~~	~~2,779~~	~~3,069~~
~~Prescott (Note 2)~~	~~.012~~	~~43~~	~~60~~	~~60~~
~~Rainier~~	~~3.9~~	~~1,895~~	~~1,964~~	~~2,170~~
~~St. Helens~~	~~23.1~~	~~11,230~~	~~11,631~~	~~12,844~~
~~Scappoose~~	~~14.38~~	~~6,996~~	~~7,241~~	~~7,997~~
~~Vernonia~~	~~6.12~~	~~2,978~~	~~3,082~~	~~3,403~~
~~Incorporated County~~	~~57.19~~	~~27,856~~	~~28,852~~	~~31,858~~
~~Unincorporated County~~	~~42.80~~	~~20,098~~	~~21,500~~	~~23,742~~
~~County Total~~	~~100.00~~	~~48,641~~	~~50,352~~	~~55,600~~

~~Notes:~~

~~1. Based on the assumption of a continuing 20-year trend in population proportion.~~

2. 1980 proportions: Clatskanie - 4.6%; Columbia City - 1.9%; Prescott - 0.2%; Rainier - 4.6%; St. Helens - 19.8%; Scappoose - 9.0%; Vernonia - 5.0%.
1980 unincorporated population proportion - 54.8%.

3. 2000 Proportions: Clatskanie - 4.4%; Columbia City - 4.0%; Prescott - 0.1%; Rainier - 4.2%; St. Helens - 21.9%; Scappoose - 12.2%; Vernonia - 5.7%.
2000 unincorporated population proportion - 47.4%.

TABLE 21
[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].

NEW DWELLING UNITS BY BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY

1990-1997

	1990 Census	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Avg. Units Per Year 90-97	Persons Per Unit (1990)	Occ. rate per Unit
Clatskanie	1,629	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	2.25	.926
Columbia City	4,003	18	5	6	14	30	25	44	15	20	2.43	.966
Prescott	63	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.42	.955
Rainier	1,674	0	4	3	0	4	9	10	2	4	2.27	.955
Scappoose	3,529	12	24	18	29	47	75	136	63	51	2.42	.972
St. Helens	7,535	42	38	37	57	64	67	44	179	66	2.19	.967
Vernonia	1,808	0	9	28	11	37	35	38	11	21	2.35	.911
Incorp. County	17,178	74	82	104	112	183	212	273	272	164		
Unincorp. County	20,379	56	79	65	83	64	81	74	63	71	2.34	
County Total	37,557	130	161	169	195	247	293	347	335	235	2.42	

In order to provide an additional empirical reference to test the recommended population series and the use of the intermediate 5% above OEA low total with incorporated cities using the arithmetic mean with the remainder assigned to the unincorporated county, the County developed the Population Projections based on Average Units/Year 1990-1997.

This empirical method's assumptions were made using the average number of dwelling units added to each city between the years 1990 to 1997. This average was then applied to the Portland State University certified estimate for each city in the county as of July 1, 1997.

Population was then projected to the year 2015 by multiplying the average number of new units in the years 1990-1997, by the 1990 census "Occupancy Rate" for each city, by the 1990 census "persons per dwelling unit" for each city, to arrive at the population projection for the year 2015.

This projection method was not utilized as the "intermediate" in the "low, intermediate, and high" projection series because the population went down from the low to the intermediate because of occupancy rate, when in a low, intermediate, and high series the population should go up through time assuming positive growth. This method yielded a total County population of 51,265 as compared to the Intermediate 5% above OEA Low number of 50,351.

TABLE 22

[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-4 effective November 1998].

POPULATION PROJECTIONS BASED ON AVERAGE UNITS/YEAR: 1990-1997

Population Projections Based on Avg. Units/Year

	PSU Pop. Est. as of 7-1-97	Avg. Pop./yr. 90-97	1998	1999	2000	2005	2010	2015
Clatskanie	1,880	4.2	1,884	1,888	1,893	1,923	1,944	1,965
Columbia City	1,550	47	1,597	1,644	1,691	1,926	2,161	2,396
Prescott	60	2.3	62	65	67	79	90	102
Rainier	1,780	3.8	1,784	1,788	1,791	1,810	1,829	1,848
St. Helens	8,555	139.7	8,695	8,834	8,974	9,673	10,372	11,070
Scappoose	4,650	120	4,770	4,890	5,010	5,610	6,210	6,810
Vernonia	2,345	45	2,390	2,435	2,480	2,705	2,930	3,155
Incorp. County	20,820	384.1	21,204	21,588	21,972	23,893	25,814	27,734
Unincorp. County	20,680	158.4	20,838	20,997	21,155	21,947	22,739	23,531
County Total	41,500	542.5	42,043	42,585	43,128	45,840	48,553	51,265

[Tables 23 and 24, and the "Population Update" section were all deleted by Ordinance No. 98-5 effective 7/98].

URBANIZATION: GOALS AND POLICIES

GOAL:

To create and maintain the urban growth boundaries based upon **Statewide Planning Goal 14, ORS 197.298, OAR 660, Division 24 and other relevant state laws as provided in the Background section.** ~~the consideration of the following factors:~~

~~1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals.~~

~~2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability.~~

~~3. Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services.~~

~~4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.~~

~~5. Environmental, energy, economic, and social consequences.~~

~~6. Retention of agricultural lands as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.~~

~~7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.~~

POLICIES: It shall be a policy of the County to:

1. Provide an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.

2. ~~Utilize the area in the urban growth boundaries with the most efficient manner of service expansion.~~ **Accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, ensure efficient use of land, and provide for livable communities.**

3. Minimize the number of new special districts inside the urban growth boundaries.

4. Accommodate the growth projected for urban areas to the year ~~2000~~ **2030**.

5. Minimize the conflicts between urban and rural land uses.

6. Control development within the limitation of the public's ability to provide services.

7. Develop managing techniques with the incorporated cities.

8. Locate major public and private developments where they will not encourage residential growth outside the designated boundary.

9. Provide direction for developers to utilize land within the boundary in the most efficient manner.

10. Review the supply of buildable lands within the urban growth boundaries in cooperation with the cities, during each major review of the County's plan. The process of expanding the urban growth areas may begin when there is less than a five (5) year supply of residential land. Cities also are required by Statewide Planning Goal 9 to maintain at least an eight (8) year supply of serviceable industrial or commercial land inside the Urban Growth Boundary. Serviceable land is that which can be provided with public water and sewer utilities within one year, if such services are requested. *[Amended by Ordinance 2001-09 eff. 4/07/02]*.

11. Not to form new special districts within the urban growth boundaries unless the services are compatible with the plans of the cities for the provision of services within the urban growth boundaries.

12. Have mutually agreed upon land use designations with each city.

13. Review all subdivision plats in the urban growth ~~boundaries~~ **areas** to insure the establishment of a safe and efficient road system.

14. Support the annexation by cities in accordance with the State statutes.

15. Support the development of Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) to develop local services.

16. Coordinate the development of facilities by existing special districts to insure coordination with city plans.

17. Adopt the urban growth boundaries, and those portions of the adopted comprehensive plans relating to the unincorporated urban growth areas, for the municipalities of Clatskanie, Columbia City, Rainier, Scappoose, St. Helens, and Vernonia.

18. ~~Coordinate population projections at the time of the first periodic review of the County or any city plan~~ **Periodically update coordinated 20-year population forecasts for each city's urban growth boundary and for the unincorporated areas**, based upon the projections of a regionally accepted population forecast, such as the studies prepared by the Portland State University and the BPA. The County's projection will be within 10% of the regionally accepted projection and the incorporated cities' projections will be allocated on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.

19. Existing population projections for the unincorporated areas will not be used as a basis for residential needs exception.

20. Limit development outside of urban growth boundaries to densities which do not require an urban level of public facilities or services **and are consistent with Goal 14 and OAR 660, Division 4**.

Part X (Page 94-95)
ECONOMY

POPULATION: *[Amended by Ordinance No. 98-5 eff. 7/98; amended by Ordinance No. 01-02eff. 3/01].*

The population of Columbia County at the time of the ~~1990~~ **2000** census was ~~37,557~~ **43,560**. The ~~1997~~ **2008** County population estimated by the Center for Population Research at PSU is certified at ~~41,500~~ **48,020**. The ~~2000~~ **2010** County population estimated by the Center for Population Research at PSU is estimated at ~~43,200~~ **48,695**. **Based on 2010 population estimates,** more than one-half of the population lies in the incorporated areas (approximately ~~52.57%~~ **56.57%**) while the remainder is found in the unincorporated areas (approximately ~~47.43%~~ **43.43%**) of the County.

In ~~2000~~ **2008**, St. Helens was the County seat and population center with an estimated population of ~~9,450 (2000)~~ **12,425**. Columbia City, two miles to the north, had an estimated population of ~~1,735 (2000)~~ **1,964**, and Scappoose, eight miles to the south of St. Helens, had an estimated population of ~~5,270 (2000)~~ **6,439**. Other cities included Vernonia ~~(2,460)~~ **(2,385)**, Prescott ~~(60)~~ **(72)**, Rainier ~~(1,835)~~ **(1,800)**, and Clatskanie ~~(1,900)~~ **(1,790)**. The remaining residents were scattered throughout the **unincorporated** County, largely along the major roadways, and along the Nehalem River.

Hasler

016H16501628

$02.750

09/15/2009

Mailed From 97051

US POSTAGE

ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540