

**CITY of LA GRANDE
City Council Regular Session
Wednesday, November 4, 2020**

AGENDA

The meeting will be available for viewing via the City's scheduled Charter Communications channel 180 that will begin at 6:00 p.m. on November 4, 2020, on the La Grande Alive website at <https://lagrandealive.tv/city-events/> or on the Eastern Oregon Alive.TV Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/EasternOregonAliveTV>.

Any person may submit written comments or questions in advance of the meeting. Written comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 3, 2020. The written comments will be read during the public comment section of the respective Agenda Item. Please email Public Comments to rstrope@cityoflagrande.org.

1. **WELCOME to this REGULAR SESSION of the LA GRANDE CITY COUNCIL**
 - a. Call to Order
 - b. Roll Call
 - Per ORS 192.670(1), Councilors will be participating in this Regular Session by electronic communication.
2. **AGENDA APPROVAL**
3. **CONSENT AGENDA**

The Consent Agenda includes routine items of business which may be approved by one Motion of the Council. Any Councilor so desiring may by request remove one or more items from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration under the Unfinished or New Business portion of the Agenda.

 - a. **Consider:** Approval of Regular Session Minutes; October 7, 2020
4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Written comments received will be read during this portion of the Agenda for non-Agenda items. Written comments for Agenda items will be read when those items are considered.
5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - a. **Consider:** Ordinance, First Reading; 2019 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), File Number 01-CPA-20 [Boquist]
6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
7. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. **Consider:** Resolution; Renewing Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone [Strope]
8. **STAFF COMMENTS**
9. **CITY MANAGER COMMENTS**
10. **CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Stacey M. Stockhoff
Assistant to the City Manager

The City Council is currently scheduled to meet again in a Regular Session on Wednesday, December 2, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. The City Council of the City of La Grande reserves the right to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized under ORS 192.660. Persons requiring special accommodations who wish to participate in the City Council Meeting are encouraged to make arrangements prior to the meeting by calling 541-962-1309. The City of La Grande does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities.

CITY of LA GRANDE
COUNCIL ACTION FORM

Council Meeting Date: November 4, 2020

PRESENTER: Robert A. Strope, City Manager

COUNCIL ACTION: CONSIDER CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. MAYOR: Request Staff Report
- 2. MAYOR: Entertain Motion

Suggested Motion: I move we accept the Consent Agenda as presented.

OR

Suggested Motion: I move we accept the Consent Agenda as amended.

- 3. MAYOR: Invite Council Discussion
- 4. MAYOR: Ask for the Vote

EXPLANATION: A Consent Agenda includes routine items of business with limited public interest, which may be approved by one Motion of the Council. Any Councilor may, by request, remove any item of business from the Consent Agenda.

- a. **Consider:** Approval of Regular Session Minutes; October 7, 2020

Reviewed By: (Initial)

City Manager _____
 City Recorder _____
 Aquatics Division _____
 Building Department _____
 ED Department _____
 Finance _____
 Fire Department _____

Human Resources Dept _____
 Library _____
 Parks Department _____
 Planning Department _____
 Police Department _____
 Public Works Department _____

AGENCY ACTION (Office Use Only)

- Motion Passed
- Motion Failed; _____
- Action Tabled: _____
Vote: _____
- Resolution Passed
Effective Date: _____
- Ordinance Adopted
First Reading: _____
Second Reading: _____
Effective Date: _____

CITY of LA GRANDE
City Council Regular Session
October 7, 2020

The meeting was available for viewing via the City's scheduled Charter Communications channel 180, on the La Grande Alive website at <https://lagrandealive.tv/city-events/> or on the Eastern Oregon Alive.TV Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/EasternOregonAliveTV>.

MINUTES

COUNCILORS PRESENT:

Stephen E. Clements, *Mayor*
Gary Lillard, *Mayor Pro Tem (present at 6:02 p.m.)*
Corrine Dutto, *Councilor*
Nicole Howard, *Councilor*
Mary Ann Miesner, *Councilor*
Justin Rock, *Councilor*

COUNCILORS ABSENT EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT

Robert Strope, *City Manager*
Kayla Rock, *City Recorder*
Stacey Stockhoff, *Assistant to the City Manager*
Gary Bell, *Police Chief*
Michael Boquist, *Community Development Director*
Kyle Carpenter, *Public Works Director*
Emmitt Cornford, *Fire Chief*
Christine Jarski, *Economic Development Director*
Kip Roberson, *Library Director*
Stu Spence, *Parks and Recreation Director*

Per ORS 192.670(1), Councilors and Staff participated in this Regular Session by electronic communication.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
AGENDA APPROVAL

Mayor CLEMENTS called to order this Regular Session of the Council at 6:01 p.m. Roll Call was taken and a quorum was determined to be present.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Consider: Approval of Regular Session Minutes;
September 2, 2020

Councilor DUTTO requested that Consent Agenda Item 3.b. - Approval of Veterans' Memorial Pool Agreements; Grande Ronde Hospital, La Grande Swim Club, and La Grande High School Swim Team be moved to New Business Item 7.c. and Consent Agenda Item 3.c. - Awarding Contract; 2019-Awarding Bid for Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation be moved to New Business Item 7.d. for further discussion.

The following Motion was introduced by MIESNER; LILLARD providing the Second:

MOTION

MOTION: I move that we accept the Consent Agenda as amended.

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

Christine JARSKI introduced Lorrie McKee as the new Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) participant with the AmeriCorps Program through the University of Oregon.

Lorrie MCKEE stated that while assisting at the Ignite Center, she would be aiding in the entrepreneurial ecosystem mapping and expansion project, conducting marketing research with La Grande Main Street and would provide business intake assistance for businesses accessing Ignite for the first time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

- a. Consider:** Approval of Name Change;
Community Field to Douglas Trice Community Field

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Stu Spence, Parks and Recreation Director

SPENCE announced that on June 24, 2020, the Parks and Recreation Department received a request from Cindy Taylor to rename Community Field, a softball field inside Pioneer Park, after the late Douglas Trice. In her request she detailed the extensive amount of community volunteer activities that Mr. Trice was involved in, from Special Olympics to high school athletics. Staff set up an electronic survey which ran for about a month, where the votes were one hundred fifteen (115) in favor and four (4) opposed. Furthermore, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission voted unanimously to recommend this change at their September 10, 2020, regular meeting.

Mayor CLEMENTS stated that he liked the idea of honoring community members, to which the City Councilors agreed and supported the idea of renaming the softball field after Douglas Trice.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

None

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by MIESNER; HOWARD providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we rename Community Field inside Pioneer Park “Douglas Trice Community Field” and authorize the Parks & Recreation Director to make appropriate changes dedicating the field as such.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

b. Consider: Approval of Revised Council Rules and Procedures

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Robert Strope, *City Manager*

STROPE stated that the City Council met for a Work Session on August 12, 2020, via electronic communication, to review proposed revisions that were collaboratively presented by the Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem and the City Manager. During this Work Session, the Council discussed the proposed changes and agreed to put the Revised Council Rules and Procedures before the City Council at a Regular Session for consideration and adoption.

STROPE gave a quick overview of the proposed revisions.

In response to LILLARD’S question in regards to sending and receiving emails, STROPE verified that all email directly received by any of the Councilors through their city email account would also be received by the City Recorder and explained different ways to handle all emailed correspondence properly in order to comply with the public meeting laws.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

None

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

DUTTO thanked Mayor CLEMENTS, LILLARD, and STROPE for revising the Council Rules and Procedures and thought they did a great job clearing up the language and increasing transparency.

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by DUTTO; MIESNER providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we approve the revisions to the City Council Rules and Procedures as presented.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

c. Consider: Approval of Veterans' Memorial Pool Agreements; Grande Ronde Hospital, La Grande Swim Club, and La Grande High School Swim Team

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Stu Spence, *Parks and Recreation Director*

SPENCE stated that three (3) of the Veterans Memorial Pool Agreements were set to expire on December 31, 2020. The first agreement was between the City of La Grande and Grand Ronde Hospital. Historically, the City and the Hospital agreement had increased 5% each year and that was reflected in the new agreement. The second agreement was between the City of La Grande and the La Grande Swim Club and the third agreement was between the City of La Grande and La Grande High School Swim Team. Normally the City would negotiate increased rates, but due to COVID-19, the City wished to simply extend the expiration dates and freeze the rates.

In response to DUTTO'S question regarding the covered time frame for the La Grande High School Swim Team agreement, SPENCE explained that the agreement would be effective during the high school swim season for 2020-2021, as noted in section twelve (12) in the agreement.

DUTTO asked about the scheduled times and lane reservations on the Swim Club agreement, to which SPENCE stated that they have a great working relationship with the club which allowed some flexibility with the times and lane reservations within the agreement.

In response to MIESNER'S question regarding the reserved lanes and if there was room for others to swim at those times, SPENCE answered that this was not usually a problem. Mayor CLEMENTS added that most patrons understood that there are certain time slots for recreational swim and other time slots were reserved for other groups.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

None

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by HOWARD; DUTTO providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we authorize the City Manager to sign the agreement between the City and Grande Ronde Hospital for the use of Veterans' Memorial Pool as presented.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by DUTTO; MIESNER providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we authorize the City Manager to sign the agreements between the City and the La Grande Swim Club and the City and La Grande High School Swim Team for the use of Veterans' Memorial Pool as presented.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

d. Awarding Bid for Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Kyle Carpenter, *Public Works Director*

CARPENTER stated that Public Works staff continually reviewed the conditions of sewer mainlines with a camera designed to travel inside the main lines, allowing staff to view the existing condition of sewer mains, some of which have been in use almost one hundred (100) years. Several locations were in need of major repair and have found cured-in-place pipe was the most cost effective and least disruptive method to recondition these lines to like-new condition. The cured-in-place-pipe process would entail installing a new pipe within the existing pipe and then reinstating the sewer services by cutting out the service line connections from within the new line. This process does not require excavation unless major problems develop. The City has eighty-five (85) miles of sewer main lines and had reconditioned approximately twenty-eight (28) miles of main lines over the last twenty-eight (28) years with the cured-in-place pipe lining with great success. This Bid Award would allow staff to proceed with the execution of this project.

CARPENTER noted that staff advertised for competitive bids and received six (6) qualified bids, with the low base bid of \$247,500 from Allied Plumbing and Pumps LLC, of Chelan, Washington. The advertisement stated that the contract was awarded using the base bid amount only. The main project (base bid) would consist of installation of approximately 1,000 Line Feet of 27-inch cured-in-place pipe and 2,760 Line Feet of 8-inch cured-in-place pipe, including reinstatement of service lines. The Added Alternative would incorporate an additional 550 Line Feet of 24-inch cured-in-place pipe. The amount budgeted for this work was \$325,000.

In response to DUTTO'S questions regarding the awarded bid, CARPENTER answered that the City had never used Allied Plumbing and Pumps, LLC, before now and there

were zero local bids received. He further explained the product that Allied Plumbing and Pumps, LLC, would use and stated that staff was excited to work with them.

Mayor CLEMENTS asked how many linear feet of sewer pipe would be treated, to which CARPENTER stated just under 4,000 linear feet.

In response to Mayor CLEMENTS question regarding how the process works and the effectiveness of the cured-in-place pipe, CARPENTER stated that it was a very effective process and explained how it worked.

In response to MIESNER'S question, CARPENTER verified that the project would replace approximately a quarter of a mile of pipe, leaving approximately fifty-six (56) miles of sewer main lines left to replace or inspect at another time.

MIESNER asked if it was an option for homeowners to hire the same company the City contracted with, to which CARPENTER stated it would be less expensive to hire a local plumber to service their line and briefly explained the process.

LILLARD asked if the Public Works Department performed work on the sewer line running from the house to the street, to which CARPENTER stated presently Public Works only work on the main lines and the service line from the main line to the property line. The property owner was responsible for the service line on their property and would need to contract with a plumber to make any repairs.

In response to LILLARD'S question regarding the final bid amount, CARPENTER answered that when the original bid went out, it was soon revised to include an additional added alternative and explained the timeline and that the award was made using the base bid amount.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

None

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by MIESNER; DUTTO providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we award the 2020/2021 Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project to Allied Plumbing and Pumps, LLC, in the amount of \$247,500, and Added Alternative one (1) as shown in the Bid Summary for a total project cost of \$307,000, and, further, that City Manager Strope be authorized to execute the contract documents.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

STAFF COMMENTS

SPENCE gave a brief update regarding the Oregon Energy Trust Project that was completed at the Veterans' Memorial Pool recently. He also confirmed that Morgan Lake was open until the end of October but no fires were allowed.

ROBERSON shared information on the library services that were currently available at Cook Memorial Library, to which Mayor **CLEMENTS** stated that he was pleased to hear about the different options that the library was providing for our community.

HOWARD expressed her appreciation towards the library staff and their commitment to the community.

CARPENTER gave a brief update on the projects left to complete before the fall season ended and announced that the leaf cleanup program was scheduled to start in November.

CARPENTER shared information regarding the Wood Shed Project that the Air Quality Commission was working on with Eastern Oregon University (EOU) with the help from a local Boy Scout troop.

CARPENTER extended Ray **CRAPO'S** gratitude towards the Council for the thoughtful support that he received while he worked for the Public Works Department.

JARSKI stated that she was currently working on a grant application for the rehabilitation and renovation work to be performed on the historic Fire Museum.

In response to Mayor **CLEMENTS'** question regarding the city owned property, **JARSKI** further explained the purpose for the renovation and the reason why this building was chosen for this project.

JARSKI also voiced that she was excited to have **Lorrie MCKEE** join the team and was looking forward to working with her.

BOQUIST gave a brief update on the next steps in the process for the adoption of the housing study. He also stated that the Council would receive an email for a survey in the next week regarding housing challenges and housing needs and urged the Council to fill it out. He reported that the housing needs analysis adoption process would also begin in the next week.

LILLARD asked if the state would allow local input for passing laws for certain structures to be included in building zones, to which **BOQUIST** answered that they allow

some local (rural community) input but it has very little influence on the decision at the state level.

DUTTO asked if the survey would be posted on the City's website, to which BOQUIST answered no because it was not intended to be a city-wide survey. He added that the survey would also be emailed to local contractors, realtors, and other targeted community members.

CORNFORD stated that the Fire Department finalized the purchase for their new Engine which was currently being outfitted with tools and equipment. He added that it should be in-service by the middle of October, 2020.

Mayor CLEMENTS asked about the drive-through trick or treat event for Halloween, to which SPENCE stated that the City's Parks and Recreation Department would be sponsoring the event and gave a detailed description of the games and activities that were scheduled for the event. He added that the press release for the event would be posted through local media by the end of the week.

Mayor CLEMENTS stated that he had spoken with a concerned citizen in regards to the downtown trick or treat event that was canceled and was happy to hear that there was an alternative and safe option for families to participate in with their children.

MIESNER added that La Grande Main Street had canceled the event due to the risks of COVID-19 and she was hopeful that next year the event would be held in downtown La Grande, as usual.

Both Mayor CLEMENTS and DUTTO offered to volunteer at the drive-through trick or treat event for Halloween.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

STROPE addressed the issue of holding the annual Holiday Open House event that was typically held in December each year, to which the Council held a brief discussion on the possible risks of holding the event at City Hall or the Riverside Park Pavilion with the consensus being not to hold the event this year.

STROPE stated that video footage for the La Grande Farmer's Market was being filmed on Saturday, October 10, 2020. He also added that the language for the agreement between the City and the La Grande Farmer's Market was currently being revised and edited.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor CLEMENTS proclaimed October, 2020, *Domestic Violence Awareness Month*.

Mayor CLEMENTS thanked City Recorder ROCK for uploading the full City Council meeting materials on the City website prior to tonight's meeting.

Mayor CLEMENTS suggested that the Council and City Manager plan a meeting before the end of the year to discuss how the City could offer additional financial help to local businesses that have been affected by COVID-19.

DUTTO stated that she recently attended the Union County Airport Commission meeting and gave a quick update on the status of the construction.

In response to MIESNER'S question regarding the airport runways, DUTTO answered that the runways would not be expanded but they would be resurfaced and renumbered as well as equipped with updated lighting and a new drainage system.

HOWARD announced that the Union County Chamber Tourism Promotion Advisory Committee was currently working on a new website. She also mentioned that the ownership of Hot Lake Hotel had changed. She gave a quick update on the improvements that the new owners were completing and stated that the new name of the property was now called *The Lodge at Hot Lakes Springs*.

LILLARD reminded the Council about the Youth in Government program and asked if any of the Councilors had any questions regarding the program, to which Mayor CLEMENTS expressed that they had a good amount of information and felt they should move forward in establishing a youth council in our community. He suggested scheduling a Work Session on the topic early next year, to which LILLARD agreed.

DUTTO suggested the Council reach out to La Grande High School to possibly establish a government pathway for students which would provide incentive and hold them accountable for participating, to which Mayor CLEMENTS agreed.

Mayor CLEMENTS reminded the Council that as of July 1, 2020, the Chamber of Commerce no longer managed the Blue Mountain Conference Center and the responsibility was transferred to the Oregon Military Department. He gave a brief update on the recent meeting with City Manager STROPE, the Blue Mountain Conference Center Board, and the Oregon Military Department.

There being no further business to come before this Regular Session of the Council, Mayor CLEMENTS adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m. The Council is scheduled to meet again in Regular Session on Wednesday, November 4, 2020, at 6:00 p.m., via electronic communications due to COVID-19 pandemic.

**Stacey M. Stockhoff
Assistant to the City Manager**

**Stephen E. Clements
Mayor**

APPROVED: _____

CITY of LA GRANDE
COUNCIL ACTION FORM

Council Meeting Date: November 4, 2020

PRESENTER: Michael Boquist, Community Development Director

COUNCIL ACTION: FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO ADOPT A HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS (HNA), FILE NUMBER 01-CPA-20

1. MAYOR: Open the Public Hearing and ask that the Rules of Order for this Public Hearing be read in their entirety.
2. MAYOR: Request Staff Report
3. MAYOR: Request that Public Testimony be read into the Record
4. MAYOR: Invite Council Discussion
5. MAYOR: Announce that the Public Hearing is Continued to December 2, 2020, at which time the proposed Ordinance is scheduled to be read a Second Time by Title Only and considered for Adoption.
6. MAYOR: Invite Additional Council Discussion.
7. MAYOR: Ask the City Recorder to Read the proposed Ordinance for the First Time by Title Only

EXPLANATION: The Community Development Department/Planning Division is seeking City Council adoption of the 2019 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), prepared for the City of La Grande by FCS Group. The adoption of the HNA will amend and replace the Goal 10 Chapter of the City of La Grande Comprehensive Plan. Please refer to the attached Draft Decision Order for more information.

The Planning Commission considered this request on October 13, 2020. Two (2) letters were submitted as public testimony and were read into the record. Such letters have been incorporated into the Draft Decision Order as Exhibits D¹ and D². By unanimous vote of the Planning Commission, the Commission adopted the Finding of Fact and Conclusions set forth in the Draft Decision Order and that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the 2019 Housing Needs Analysis be recommended to the City Council for approval.

The City Manager recommends that the Council proceed with the First Reading by Title Only of the passage of the proposed Ordinance.

Reviewed By: (Initial)

City Manager _____
 City Recorder _____
 Aquatics Division _____
 Building Department _____
 ED Department _____
 Finance _____
 Fire Department _____

Human Resources Dept _____
 Library _____
 Parks Department _____
 Planning Department _____
 Police Department _____
 Public Works Department _____

COUNCIL ACTION (Office Use Only)

Motion Passed
 Motion Failed; _____
 Action Tabled: _____
 Vote: _____

Resolution Passed # _____
 Effective Date: _____

Ordinance Adopted # _____
 First Reading: _____
 Second Reading: _____
 Effective Date: _____

RULES OF ORDER FOR A LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING

CITY RECORDER READS TO THE PUBLIC:

- A. These Rules of Order are applicable to the Public Hearing for the proposal to adopt a Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) which will be incorporated into the La Grande Comprehensive Plan Ordinance 3208, Series 2013, Planning Goal 10 – Housing.
- B. This is a legislative hearing, therefore Councilor ex parte or pre-hearing contact does not apply.
- C. The Hearing will proceed as follows:
 - 1. The Mayor will open the Public Hearing and request the Staff Report.
 - 2. The Mayor will then accept written public testimony relating to the matter. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, only written testimony will be accepted and shall be read into the record during the Hearing. There is a three minute time limit for testimony. The order of testimony this evening will begin with that of Proponents (those in favor), followed by Opponents (those opposed), and ending with those Neutral to the Ordinance being adopted.

The meetings will be available for viewing via the City's scheduled Charter Communications channel 180 beginning at 6:00 p.m. on November 4, 2020, on the La Grande Alive website at <https://lagrandealive.tv/city-events/> or on the Eastern Oregon Alive.TV Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/EasternOregonAliveTV>.

The notice of this Public Hearing required that any person that wanted to submit written comments or questions in advance of the meeting had until 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 3, 2020, to submit them to Michael Boquist via email at mboquist@cityoflagrande.org.

- 3. The proceedings are being electronically recorded, to be converted to written Minutes.
- 4. Members of the City Council may ask questions of the Staff at any time.
- 5. Subsequent to deliberation, the Mayor will close the Hearing.

**CITY of LA GRANDE
ORDINANCE NUMBER _____
SERIES 2020**

**“AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LA GRANDE, UNION COUNTY,
OREGON, AMENDING THE STATEWIDE GOAL CHAPTERS 10 OF THE CITY OF LA GRANDE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; RECODIFYING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; REPEALING ORDINANCE
NUMBER 3208, SERIES 2013, AND ALL OTHER ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN
CONFLICT HEREWITH; AND DECLARING AN EFFECTIVE DATE”**

WHEREAS, Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.296 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-008 implement Goal 10 - Housing, and the OAR requires that cities have a housing needs analysis to ensure opportunity for the provision of adequate numbers of needed housing units, the efficient use of buildable land within urban growth boundaries (UGBs), and to provide greater certainty in the development process so as to reduce housing costs; and,

WHEREAS, In 2018, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 4006 which allocated funding to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for the purpose of providing technical assistance to local governments in increasing the affordability of housing within the boundary of the local governments; and,

WHEREAS, In July 2018, the City of La Grande was awarded technical assistance funding by the DLCD to conduct a housing capacity analysis, also known as a housing needs analysis (HNA), which included updating the City of La Grande’s buildable lands inventory, assessing housing needs over next 20 years, recommending housing production incentive options, and updating elements of the Goal 10 – Housing Chapter of the City of La Grande Comprehensive Plan; and,

WHEREAS, said technical assistance was awarded in anticipation of draft rules planned for adoption by the Oregon Legislature in 2019, which requires cities with a population of 10,000 or more to adopt updated housing needs analyses (HNAs) and establishes deadlines for the adoption of HNAs; and,

WHEREAS, in partnership with the DLCD, the City of La Grande contracted with FCS Group to conduct a HNA, which was completed in June 2019 and intended to be adopted by the City to replace the Goal 10 – Housing Chapter of the City’s Comprehensive Plan; and,

WHEREAS, In 2019, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2003 which required the DLCD to establish a schedule for all Oregon cities with a population of 10,000 or more to adopt updated housing needs analyses (HNAs), with said established schedule requiring the City of La Grande to adopt an updated HNA by December 31, 2022.

THE CITY OF LA GRANDE ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Comprehensive Plan text is hereby is amended and recodified as provided in Exhibit A, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

Section 2. The City Council of the City of La Grande, Union County, Oregon, shall and hereby does adopt the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the City Council Staff Report, dated December 2, 2020.

Section 3. Ordinance Number 3208, Series 2013, and all other Ordinances or Parts of Ordinances in conflict herewith shall be and hereby are repealed.

Section 4. SEVERABILITY. If any court of competent jurisdiction declares any Section of this Ordinance invalid, such decision shall be deemed to apply to that Section only and shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as a whole or any part thereof other than the part declared invalid.

Section 5. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after its adoption by the City Council of the City of La Grande, Union County, Oregon, and its approval by the Mayor; specifically, January 1, 2021.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED on this Second (2nd) day of December, 2020, by ____ (__)
of ____ (__) Councilors present and voting.

Stephen E. Clements, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kayla M. Rock
City Recorder



BEFORE THE CITY OF LA GRANDE DECISION ORDER

1 **LAND USE APPLICATION:** Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Goal 10 - Housing
2 **FILE NUMBER:** 01-CPA-20
3 **DESCRIPTION:** All of City of La Grande and the City of La Grande Urban Growth Boundary
4
5

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. NATURE OF APPLICATION

6
7
8
9
10
11 In June 2019, through funding provided by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
12 (DLCD), a Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) was prepared for the City of La Grande by FCS Group. The
13 project included input and collaboration from several partners that included City of La Grande Staff, the
14 La Grande Planning Commission, and an HNA Advisory Committee that was comprised of housing agency
15 representatives and housing advocates serving La Grande and Union County.
16

17 The purpose of the HNA, as quoted from the final HNA report: *“The La Grande Housing Needs Analysis*
18 *(HNA) is intended to serve as a basis for the City of La Grande to document new information regarding the*
19 *city’s buildable land inventory (BLI), population and employment trends, and development policies aimed*
20 *at providing adequate land within the urban growth boundary (UGB) to handle the next 20 years of*
21 *population growth.”*
22

23 This Decision Order supports the adoption of the HNA, by amending and incorporating the HNA into the
24 Goal 10 – Housing Chapter of the City of La Grande Comprehensive Plan.
25
26

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULE

27
28 In accordance with Land Development Code Ordinance 3242, Series 2018, Articles 8.9, 9.3 and 9.4,
29 Comprehensive Plan Amendments are subject to the City Council’s review and decision authority, upon
30 receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. In accordance with these Articles and
31 Article 9.5, public hearings were held and the adoption process was scheduled as follows:

- 32 September 1, 2020.....35-Day Required Notice to the DLCD (or greater)
33 September 22, 2020.....Public Notice Mailed to all Property Owners (City and UGB)
34 October 13, 2020.....Public Hearing #1, before the Planning Commission
35 November 4, 2020.....Public Hearing #2, before the City Council, and First Reading of the adopting
36 Ordinance by Title Only.
37 December 2, 2020.....Public Hearing #3, before the City Council, and Second Reading of the
38 adopting Ordinance by Title Only.
39 January, 2021.....Public Hearing #4, before the Union County Planning Commission for Co-
40 Adoption.
41 February, 2021.....Public Hearing #5, before the Union County Board of Commissioners, and
42 First Reading of the adopting Ordinance by Title Only.
43 March, 2021.....Public Hearing #6, before the Union County Board of Commissioners, and
44 Second Reading of the adopting Ordinance by Title Only.
45 March, 2021.....DLCD Notice - Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA).
46 April, 2021.....30-Day Appeal Period - Acknowledgement

III. GENERAL BACKGROUND AND FACTS

- 1
2
3
4
5
1. In 2018, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 4006, which requires cities with a population of 10,000 people or greater, and which have at least 25 percent of the renter households within the cities being severely rent burdened, to complete an annual housing survey and proactively take steps to reduce barriers causing rent burdens.

6
7

“Severely Rent Burdened” is defined as a household spending more than 50 percent of their household income on gross rent for housing.

- 8
9
10
11
2. House Bill 4006 also allocated funding to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) *“for the purpose of providing technical assistance to local governments in increasing the affordability of housing within the boundary of the local governments.”* Priority is given to cities where at least 25 percent of the renter households are severely rent burdened.

- 12
13
14
3. The City of La Grande was identified as a city that was severely rent burdened, with 26 percent of the renter households spending more than 50 percent of their household income on gross rent for housing.

- 15
16
17
18
19
20
21
4. In July 2018, the City of La Grande was awarded technical assistance funding by the DLCD to conduct a HNA, which included updating the City of La Grande’s buildable lands inventory, assessing housing needs over next 20 years, recommending housing production strategy options, and updating elements of the Goal 10 – Housing Chapter of the City of La Grande Comprehensive Plan. The Memorandum of Understanding between the DLCD and the City of La Grande for the technical assistance funding was finalized in October 2018, and the HNA project commenced shortly thereafter.

- 22
23
24
25
5. The scope of the HNA was based on the 2018 draft of House Bill 2003, which the Oregon Legislature later passed in 2019, and which set forth the requirements for preparing HNAs in accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.296 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-008 which implement Statewide Planning Goal 10 – Housing.

- 26
27
28
29
30
31
6. In partnership with the DLCD, the City of La Grande contracted with FCS Group (Consultant) to conduct the HNA, which included forming an Advisory Committee to review the Consultant deliverables, such as proposed methodology, assumptions, draft reports and the final report. The Advisory Committee included eleven (11) volunteer members that were comprised of housing agency representatives and housing advocates that work and serve within La Grande and Union County. These members included:

- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
- Rochelle Hamilton, Homeless Services Manager, Community Connection of NE Oregon
 - Chris Evans, Community Development Coordinator, Oregon Dept. of Human Services
 - Dale Inslee, Executive Director, Northeast Oregon Housing Authority
 - John Howard, Realtor, John Howard & Associates
 - Robert Kleng, Eastern Oregon Head Start
 - Cami Miller, Director, Union County Warming Station
 - Colleen Nelson, Zion Lutheran Church/Warming Station
 - Angela Smith, Veterans Affairs
 - Audrey Smith & Jeff Hensley, Community Connection of NE Oregon
 - Phil Stenbeck, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
 - Bridget Thambert & Sherlyn Roberts, Resource Coordinators, CARE

- 43
7. The following attachments are included with this Decision Order:

44

Exhibit A: Housing Needs Analysis, June 12, 2019

45

Exhibit B: Statewide Planning Goals – Findings

46

Exhibit C: La Grande Comprehensive Plan - Findings

47

Exhibit D: Public Hearing Summaries, including Public Engagement – Public Comments

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

EXHIBIT A

**City of La Grande
Comprehensive Plan – Goal 10
and
Housing Needs Analysis**

June 12, 2019

Prepared by FCS Group, Project Consultants

Statewide Planning Goal 10 - Housing

The purpose of Statewide Planning Goal 10 is to ensure opportunity for the provision of adequate numbers of needed housing units, the efficient use of buildable land within urban growth boundaries, and to provide greater certainty in the development process so as to reduce housing costs.

Oregon Administrative Rule 660, Divisions 8 and 15 provide procedures and requirements for complying with Statewide Planning Goal 10.

Objective –

1. To provide for the housing needs of the citizens of La Grande, and to support development of an adequate supply of housing ~~in terms of quantity, quality, and availability especially to groups, such as low and moderate income households, elderly and handicapped households~~ suitable for meeting the housing needs of all income levels, but specifically at affordable price ranges and rent levels for the following housing types:
 - a. Attached and detached single-family housing and multiple family housing for both owner and renter occupancy;
 - b. Government assisted housing;
 - c. Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks;
 - d. Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential uses; and,
 - e. Housing for farm workers.
2. To assure environmental quality in residential areas, and to enhance the financial ability of households to obtain and retain decent dwelling units.
- ~~3. To assure an open housing market for all La Grande citizens, and to assure a balance of individual and community needs in residential areas.~~
- ~~5.3.~~ To provide areas suitable and desirable for all types of single and multiple family residential uses which have or will need public water and sewage services, commercial and education support facilities and employment opportunities.

1
2
3
4

HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS

Section I. Introduction

5 The La Grande Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) is intended to serve as a basis for the City of La Grande to
6 document new information regarding the city's buildable land inventory (BLI), population and employment
7 trends, and development policies aimed at providing adequate land within the urban growth boundary
8 (UGB) to handle the next 20 years of population growth.

9 Oregon Regulatory Requirements

10 The passage of the Oregon Land Use Planning Act of 1974 (ORS Chapter 197) established the Land
11 Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Department of Land Conservation and
12 Development (DLCD). The Act required the Commission to develop and adopt a set of statewide planning
13 goals. Goal 10 addresses housing in Oregon and provides guidelines for local governments to follow in
14 developing their local comprehensive land use plans and implementing policies.

15 At a minimum, local housing policies must meet the applicable requirements of Goal 10 and the statutes
16 and administrative rules that implement it (ORS 197.295 to 197.314, ORS 197.475 to 197.490, and OAR
17 600-008).¹ Goal 10 requires incorporated cities to complete an inventory of buildable residential lands. Goal
18 10 also requires cities to encourage the numbers of housing units in price and rent ranges commensurate
19 with the financial capabilities of its households.

20 Goal 10 defines needed housing types as "all housing on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential
21 and commercial use that is determined to meet the need shown for housing within an UGB at price ranges
22 and rent levels that are affordable to households within the county with a variety of incomes, including but
23 not limited to households with low incomes, very low incomes and extremely low incomes." ORS 197.303
24 defines needed housing types:

- 25 (a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached and detached single-family housing and multiple
26 family housing for both owner and renter occupancy.
- 27 (b) Government assisted housing.²
- 28 (c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490.
- 29 (d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are
30 in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.
- 31 (e) Housing for farmworkers.
32

¹ ORS 197.296 only applies to cities with populations over 25,000.

² Government assisted housing can be any housing type listed in ORS 197.303 (a), (c), or (d).

1 **HNA Methodology**

2 A recommended approach to conducting a housing needs analysis is described in *Planning for Residential*
3 *Growth: A Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas*, the Department of Land Conservation and Development's
4 guidebook on local housing needs studies. As described in the workbook, the specific steps in the housing
5 needs analysis are:

- 6 1. Project the number of new housing units needed in the next 20 years.
- 7 2. Identify relevant national, state, and local demographic and economic trends and factors that
8 may affect the 20-year projection of structure type mix.
- 9 3. Describe the demographic characteristics of the population and, if possible, the housing trends
10 that relate to demand for different types of housing.
- 11 4. Determine the types of housing that are likely to be affordable to the projected households
12 based on household income.
- 13 5. Determine the needed housing mix and density ranges for each plan designation and the
14 average needed net density for all structure types.
- 15 6. Estimate the number of additional needed units by structure type.

16 While ORS 197.296 specifically applies to cities with 25,000 or more population, this statute is generally
17 followed to determine housing needs for La Grande (population 14,240). This analysis incorporates 20-year
18 population growth for the La Grande Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) based on forecasts provided by
19 Portland State University's Population Research Center.

20 **Report Organization**

21 This report provides the technical basis of findings that support proposed housing policy recommendations
22 and subsequent actions that the city will take to update its Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.
23 Each section of this report provides current data, assumptions and results that comprise all findings and
24 conclusions:

25 **I. Introduction.**

26 **II. Trends and Forecasts:** provides a demographic overview and summary of market trends influencing
27 housing growth in La Grande.

28 **III. Buildable Land Inventory:** identifies vacant, partially vacant and redevelopable residential land within
29 the La Grande UGB, and accounts for constraints to get to a final determination of capacity to meet 20-year
30 needs.

31 **IV. Sufficiency of Land Need:** this section compares expected land demand to vacant land supply to meet
32 housing mix and densities described in the HNA.

33 **V. Findings and Recommendations:** highlights key findings and draft housing policy recommendations.

34 **VI. Glossary:** list of key terms used in the housing needs analysis.

35 **Please refer to the Glossary for a list of terms used in the Housing Needs Analysis.**

36

1 **Section II. Trends and Forecasts**

2 Nestled in the Grande Ronde Valley of the Blue Mountains, La Grande is located at the junction of Interstate
3 I-84 and OR 82 and serves as the Union County seat. The town selected the name “La Grande” in 1863 at
4 the suggestion of a Frenchman who was enamored by the area’s scenic beauty.



15

16 **Population**


17 National migration patterns are generating faster population growth for Oregon in comparison to the rest of
18 the nation. However, La Grande is facing much lower growth than the rest of the state. According to the
19 U.S. Census Bureau, population in the Western U.S. is projected to grow at an average annual rate of
20 1.6%, compared to 1.0% nationally over the next 20 years.

21 While Oregon continues to experience population growth from natural increases as well as in-migration,
22 many of the communities east of the Cascades have not benefited from this influx. The same is true for the
23 City of La Grande. La Grande has experienced relatively slow growth in the past few decades.

24 Population within the La Grande UGB is projected to grow from 14,240 to 15,632 over the next 20 years
25 (0.47% avg. annual growth rate), according to Portland State University Population Research Center. As
26 indicated in **Exhibit 2.1**, this growth rate forecast is lower than that of Oregon as a whole, but is projected
27 to slightly outpace that of Union County. As the population of La Grande increases, local demand for all
28 types of housing will also increase.
29

1

Exhibit 2.1




2

3 La Grande has a relatively high share of younger residents (under age 19) and a lower share of older
 4 residents (over age 65) in comparison with Union County and Oregon. The median age of local residents
 5 was 34.3 in 2017, which is measurably less than the County and State average. The presence of Eastern
 6 Oregon University (EOU) with a student body of 3,741 (in 2015) contributes to the relatively low median
 7 age (see **Exhibit 2.2**).

8

Exhibit 2.2



9

10 La Grande also has a relatively small average household size, evidenced by that fact that there are 2.18
 11 people per housing unit, well below the State average of 2.32 (see **Exhibit 2.3**).

12

Exhibit 2.3




13
14

1 **Income**

2 Median household income in La Grande (\$40,750) is below Union County (\$46,228) and well below Oregon
3 (\$56,119). As shown in **Exhibit 2.4**, La Grande has a relatively high number of low-income residents
4 earning less than \$30,000 per year, and a relatively small share of mid and upper income residents earning
5 more than \$50,000.

6 **Exhibit 2.4**



7
8

9 **EXISTING HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS**


10 An analysis of historical development trends and local housing market dynamics provides insight regarding
11 how the housing market functions.

12 Like many rural cities, the existing housing stock in La Grande is dominated by single family detached (low
13 density development) which accounts for over a half of the inventory. Townhomes/plexes (medium density
14 development) comprise 15% of the inventory. Multifamily apartments and condos (with more than 5 units
15 per structure) make up 18% of the inventory. Mobile homes and other housing types account for the
16 remaining 10% of the inventory (see **Exhibit 2.5**).

17

1

Exhibit 2.5




2

Housing Tenancy and Occupancy

4 The majority of homeowners in La Grande reside in single family detached homes or mobile homes (as
 5 well as manufactured housing) and most renters reside in townhomes/plexes and multifamily (apartment)
 6 units (see **Exhibit 2.6**).

7


Exhibit 2.6



8
9

1 According to the U.S. Census, American Community Survey, as of 2016 the overall housing vacancy rate
 2 in La Grande was about 11% overall. Vacancy rates have since declined and the estimated vacancy rate
 3 for year-round apartment housing is currently estimated at 6% (see **Exhibit 2.7**). These estimates exclude
 4 Eastern Oregon University on-campus student housing. Regional housing agencies report zero vacancies
 5 with a 6-month wait list for government-assisted rental housing.


6 **Exhibit 2.7**



7
 8 **Construction and Permitting Activity**

9 Single family development has dominated the construction patterns in La Grande. Since 2007, La Grande
 10 issued an average of 33 single family permits for new construction annually. This is contrasted with an
 11 average of 9.7 new construction permits per year of all other types. A graph of the number of permits issued
 12 is provided in **Exhibit 2.8**.


13 **Exhibit 2.8**



1 **Housing Affordability**


2 The median home price in La Grande was \$177,300 (2019, 1st Q), which compares favorably to median
3 homes prices in Union County and Oregon, as a whole (see **Exhibit 2.9**).

4 **Exhibit 2.9**



5
6 Housing rents are also relatively low in La Grande. Rents in La Grande are about 4% lower than the Union
7 County average, and nearly 30% lower than rents in Oregon as a whole (see **Exhibit 2.10**).

8 **Exhibit 2.10**



9
10 **Housing Cost Burdens**

11 While housing prices and rents in La Grande are low in comparison to many areas, the below average
12 household income levels are creating a housing affordability challenge for many residents at this time.


13 According to the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD), households are considered “cost burdened”
14 if they pay over 30% of their income on housing. Households are “severely cost burdened” if they pay over
15 50% of their income on housing.

16 By these standards almost 1 in 4 renters in La Grande are severely cost burdened. This places La Grande
17 slightly above the statewide average, and above the Union County average by 5 percentage points (see
18 **Exhibit 2.11**).

19

1

Exhibit 2.11




2

3 In contrast to renters, only 1 in 10 homeowners with a mortgage are severely cost burdened. Overall,
 4 18% of all households in La Grande are severely cost burdened (see **Exhibit 2.12**).

5


Exhibit 2.12



6
7

1 When comparing households by income levels, it is clear that the greatest housing cost burden is faced by
 2 those earning less than \$35,000. About 2 in 3 households earning less than \$35,000 face housing cost
 3 burden (see **Exhibit 2.13**).

4 **Exhibit 2.13**



5
 6 **HOUSING NEEDS**

7 **Factors Affecting Housing Needs**


8 There is a linkage between demographic characteristics and housing choice. As shown in **Exhibit 2.14**,
 9 housing needs change over a person’s lifetime. Other factors that influence housing include:

- 10 ■ Homeownership rates increase as income rises.
- 11 ■ Single family detached homes are the preferred housing choice as income rises.
- 12 ■ Renters are much more likely to choose multifamily housing options (such as apartments or plexes)
- 13 than single-family housing.
- 14 ■ Very low income households (those earning less than 50% of the median family income) are most
- 15 at-risk for becoming homeless if their economic situation worsens.

16

1

Exhibit 2.14



2

3 The relationship between demographic changes, income levels and housing needs can be used to
4 forecast future housing needs.


5 The primary demographic cohorts in La Grande are shown in **Exhibit 2.15** and described below.

6

7

1

Exhibit 2.15



2

3 **Greatest/Silent Generation (those born before 1925 to 1945)**

4 This includes retirees better than age 74, who were raised during the Great Depression, Word War I
5 or World War II. This cohort accounted for 8% of the city's population in 2017 and is projected to be
6 the fastest growing segment over the next 20 years. As they reach their 80s some desire to move into
7 assisted living facilities with nearby health care services and transit access.

8 **Baby Boom Generation (those born 1946 to 1964)**

9 Baby boomers (currently age 55 to 74) accounted for 20% of La Grande's residents in 2017, up from
10 18% in 2010. The boomer population segment has been growing more rapidly than the other cohorts
11 over the past 10 years and many are now entering their retirement years. Boomers usually prefer to
12 "age in place" until after age 80, then may downsize or move in with family members (sometimes opting
13 to reside in accessory dwellings off the main house).

14 **Generation X (born early 1965 to 1980)**

15 GenX is the demographic cohort following the baby boomers and preceding the Millennials. This cohort
16 (currently includes people between age 39 to 54) accounted for 16% of La Grande's residents in 2017, and
17 has been trending upwards over the past several years. GenX households often include families with
18 children, and many prefer to live in single family detached dwellings at various price points.

19 **Millennials (born early 1980s to early 2000s)**

20 Millennials (currently in their twenties or thirties) accounted for 30% of the La Grande residents in 2017,
21 and its numbers overtook the Baby Boomers in recent years. This segment is expected to increase more
22 slowly than the overall population over the next few decades. Younger millennials tend to rent as they
23 attend Eastern Oregon University, establish their careers, and/or pay back student loans. Working

1 millennials often become first-time homebuyers, opting to purchase smaller single family detached homes
2 or townhomes.

3 **Generation Z (born mid-2000s or later)**

4 GenZ includes residents age 19 or less, which accounted for 26% of the La Grande residents in 2017. This
5 segment mostly includes children living with GenXers or younger Baby Boomers, and has been decreasing
6 in numbers in La Grande over the past several years. This trend is forecasted to continue as people are
7 delaying starting families and tend to have fewer children than past generations.

8 **Families with Children**

9 This category includes a subset of the baby boomers and millennials, and also includes householders
10 between the age of 40 and 55. Taken as a whole, this category constitutes the majority of La Grande's
11 population and is expected to increase moderately over the next two decades. Families prefer to live in a
12 variety of single family housing options (detached homes or townhomes/plexes) at price points
13 commensurate with their family income.

14 **Housing Need Forecast**

15 The future (20 year) housing need forecast for La Grande takes into account demographic and socio-
16 economic factors. During the HNA planning process, the consultant team worked closely with the Housing
17 Committee, DLCD, and City planning staff to formulate and evaluate various methods for forecasting La
18 Grande's housing mix. The recommended housing mix is intended to address the changing household
19 demographic and socio-economic patterns which will address the demand for a variety of housing types
20 that are attainable at all income levels.³

21 The housing forecast also anticipates there to be:

- 22 ■ A decrease in average household size as younger residents delay starting families, and older
23 residents become empty nesters and consider downsizing from single family detached homes
24 into apartments, condominiums or other forms of shared living arrangements.
- 25 ■ An increase in renters, as younger residents prefer to rent for longer periods as they pay off
26 debt and save money for down payments.
- 27 ■ A need for more affordable housing at price points that are attainable to households earning
28 less than 120% of the area's median income level. This would support greater demand for
29 government assisted housing options, as well market-rate rentals and home ownership options,
30 such as duplexes, townhomes, cottage homes, and manufactured dwellings.

31 Based on the projected population growth and housing market conditions, La Grande is expected to add
32 1,392 people and that will require 795 net new dwelling units over the next 20 years.

33 As indicated in **Exhibit 2.16**, the 20-year projected housing need is expected to consist of: 318 owner-
34 occupied dwellings and 477 renter-occupied dwellings. The types of housing that are most suited to meet
35 qualifying income levels for home ownership vary by family income level.

36 The housing mix that addresses future demand consists of approximately: 336 single-family detached
37 homes, 115 townhomes/duplexes, 200 multifamily housing units and 100 manufactured housing units.

³ For additional background on the various housing forecast methods considered, please refer to the La Grande HNA, Task 4 Memorandum, dated June 2019.

1 There will also be some “group quarters” housing demand for about 44 people that require shared living
 2 arrangements (includes congregate care or group housing).⁴
 3

4 **Exhibit 2.16**

Projected 20-year Net New Housing Need by Tenancy, La Grande UGB

Housing Type	Owner-Housing	Renter-Housing	Total
Single Family Detached	226	110	336
Townhomes/Plexes	19	96	115
Multi family (5+ units)	3	197	200
Mobile/manufactured housing	70	30	100
Group Quarters	-	44	44
Total	318	477	795

Housing Type	Owner-Housing	Renter-Housing	Total
Low Density*	310	125	436
Medium Density**	6	153	159
High Density***	2	198	200
Total	318	477	795

* Includes mobile homes. ** Includes townhomes, plexes and group quarters.

*** Includes multifamily structures with 5+ units.

Note: numbers may not add exactly due to rounding


Source: FCS GROUP based on Task 2 and Task 4 analysis.

5
 6 As indicated in **Exhibit 2.17** this new housing mix will include a lower share of single family detached
 7 housing than is currently in La Grande today, and a relatively greater share of townhomes/plexes and
 8 multifamily apartments.
 9
 10

⁴ Group housing also includes transitional housing, farmworker housing, and off-campus student housing.

1

Exhibit 2.17




2
3

4 The housing forecast takes into account median family income housing attainability levels that assume 30%
5 of income is devoted to housing costs. As shown in **Exhibit 2.18**, this forecast results in a greater share of
6 ownership housing for middle and upper income categories, and a larger share of renter housing for low,
7 very low and extremely low income categories.

8

Exhibit 2.18



9
10
11
12

1 The owner-occupied housing that's suited to meet qualifying income levels is shown in **Exhibit 2.19**.

2 **Exhibit 2.19**

Family Income Level	Upper Range of Qualifying Income	Upper Range of Home Price*	Attainable Housing Products	Estimated Distribution of Owner-Occupied Units	Projected Owner-Occupied Units Needed
Upper (120% or more of median income)	N/A	\$330,000 or more	Standard Homes	48%	153
Middle (80% to 120% of median income)	\$66,580	\$330,000	Small and Standard Homes, Townhomes	25%	78
Low (50% to 80% of median income)	\$44,386	\$264,000	Small Homes, Townhomes, Mfgd. Homes, Plexes	23%	72
Very Low (30% to 50% of median income)	\$27,742	\$164,400	Govt. Assisted	5%	15
Extremely Low (less than 30% of median income)	\$16,645	\$98,400	Govt. Assisted	0%	0
Total				100%	318

*Assumes 30% of income is used for mortgage payment, 20% downpayment, 6% interest, 30-year mortgage for middle and upper-income households, and 0% downpayment for lower-income households.


3
4
5 The rental housing forecast that's consistent with qualifying income levels is shown in **Exhibit 2.20**.

6 **Exhibit 2.20**

Family Income Level	Upper Range of Qualifying Income	Upper Range of Monthly Rent*	Attainable Housing Products	Estimated Distribution of Units	Renter-Occupied Units Needed
Upper (120% or more of median income)	N/A	\$1,387 or more	Standard Homes, Townhomes	14%	67
Middle (80% to 120% of median income)	\$66,580	\$1,387	Small Homes, Townhomes, Apartments	15%	72
Low (50% to 80% of median income)	\$44,386	\$925	Small Homes, Townhomes, Mfgd. Homes, Plexes, Apts.	25%	119
Very Low (30% to 50% of median income)	\$27,742	\$578	ADUs, Govt. Assisted Apts.	20%	95
Extremely Low (less than 30% of median income)	\$16,645	\$416	Govt. Assisted Apts.	26%	124
Total				100%	477

*Assumes 30% of income is used for rental payments. La Grande HNA Task 4 findings, June 2019.

7
8 Currently, the fair market rents within Union County range from \$470 for an efficiency (studio) unit to \$1,207
9 for a four-bedroom unit.



10
11
12
13

1 **Section III. Buildable Lands Inventory**

2 In accordance with OAR 660-008-0005 (2), an estimate of buildable land inventory (BLI) within the La
3 Grande Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) has been created to determine that amount of land available to
4 meet housing needs. The BLI analysis uses the most current Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data
5 provided available for the La Grande UGB (specific GIS data sources are shown in **Exhibit 3.1**).

6 **BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY METHODOLOGY**

7 The objective of the residential BLI is to determine the amount of developable land available for future
8 residential housing development within the UGB. The steps taken to perform this analysis are as follows:

- 9 1. **Calculate gross acres** by plan designation, including classifications for fully vacant and
10 partially-vacant parcels. This step entails “clipping” all of the tax lots that are bisected by the
11 current UGB to eliminate land outside current UGB from consideration for development at this
12 time. City staff input was included to provide assurance that the review output is consistent
13 with OAR 660-008-0005(2).
- 14 2. **Calculate gross buildable acres** by plan designation by subtracting land that is constrained
15 from future development, such as such as existing public right-of-way, parks and open space,
16 steep slopes, and floodplains.
- 17 3. **Calculate net buildable acres** by plan designation, by subtracting future public facilities such
18 as roads, schools and parks from gross buildable acres.
- 19 4. **Determine total net buildable acres by plan designation** by taking into account potential
20 redevelopment locations and mixed-use development opportunity areas.

21 **Exhibit 3.1**

Dataset Name	Type	Description	Source
City_Limits_La_Grande	GIS Layer	La Grande City Limits Boundary	City of La Grande
UGB_La_Grande	GIS Layer	Urban Growth Boundary for areas outside of La Grande city limits	City of La Grande
Urban_Renewal_Area_La_Grande	GIS Layer	Urban Renewal Areas for areas inside of La Grande city limits	City of La Grande
Zoning_La_Grande	GIS Layer	City of La Grande Zoning Designations	City of La Grande
Floodplain_2012	GIS Layer	FEMA 100-yr. Floodplains and Floodways	City of La Grande
Grande_Ronde_River_LaGrande	GIS Layer	Grand Ronde river corridor	City of La Grande
Riparian_Corridor	GIS Layer	Riparian corridors with buffers for stream and river features	City of La Grande
Geohazard	GIS Layer	Layer of geological hazards - steep slopes over 25%	City of La Grande
Taxlot	GIS Layer	Taxlots for City of La Grande and UGB.	Union County Assessor
tblAssessor	Tabular	Related table with valuation and property class coding data	Union County Assessor
OSIP 2017	GIS Service	Web service providing aerial imagery	Oregon-GEO ¹

22 ¹ - <http://imagery.oregonexplorer.info/arcgis/services>

23 The detailed steps used to create the land inventory are described below.
24
25

1 **Residential Land Base**

2 **Residential Land Use Classifications**

- 3 ▪ Hillside Development (HD)
4 ▪ Rural Residential (RR-1)
5 ▪ Low-Density Residential (R-1)
6 ▪ Medium-Density Residential (R-2)
7 ▪ High Density Residential (R-3)
8 ▪ Residential Professional (R-P)

9 In addition, since commercial and mixed-use zone classifications allow housing development, the following
10 commercial base zone classifications are included in the residential land base:


11 **Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Use Classifications**

- 12 ▪ Central Business (CB)
13 ▪ General Commercial (GC)

14 For analysis purposes, each of these classifications have been grouped into residential development
15 categories that represent the expected level of development based on the housing types/densities that are
16 permitted by the City (housing types must be permitted outright or by conditional development approval).
17 This includes: low, medium and high density residential categories; as well as a commercial/mixed use
18 category (which allows a mix of low, medium and high density housing).
19

1

Exhibit 3.2 City of La Grande Zoning Designations



2
3

1 Land Classifications

2 The next step includes classifying each tax lot (parcel) into one of the following categories.

3 **Vacant land:** Properties with no structures or have buildings with very little value. For purpose of the BLI,
4 residential lands with improvement value less than \$10,000 are considered vacant. These lands were
5 also subjected to review using aerial photography; and if the land is in a committed use such as a
6 parking lot, an assessment has been made to determine if it is to be classified as vacant, part-vacant
7 or developed.

8 **Partially vacant land:** Properties that are occupied by a use (e.g., a home or building structure with value
9 over \$10,000) but have enough land to be subdivided without the need for rezoning. This determination
10 is made using tax assessor records and aerial photography. For lots with existing buildings, it is
11 assumed that ¼ acre (10,890 sq. ft.) is retained by each existing home, and the remainder is included
12 in the part-vacant land inventory.

13 **Vacant Undersized:** Properties that are vacant or part-vacant with less than 3,000 sq. ft. of land area. This
14 category is excluded from the vacant land inventory since these lots are not likely large enough to
15 accommodate new housing units. However, it is possible that some may be suitable for accessory
16 dwelling units (ADUs).

17 **Developed & Non-Residential Land Base:** Properties unlikely to yield additional residential development
18 for one of two reasons: they possess existing building structures at densities that are unlikely to
19 redevelop over the planning period; or they include parcels with Comprehensive Land Use Plan
20 designations that do not permit housing development.

21 **Public and Constrained (unbuildable) land:** Properties which are regarded as unlikely to be developed
22 because they are restricted by existing uses such as: public parks, schools, ballfields, roads and public
23 right-of-way (ROW); common areas held by Home Owners Associations, cemeteries; and power
24 substations. In cases where public-owned land does not fall into one of the above-mentioned categories
25 and is planned or zoned to allow housing, those tax lots are included in the vacant or part-vacant
26 residential land inventory.

27 These tax lot classifications were validated using aerial photos, building permit data, and assessor records.
28 Preliminary results were refined based on City staff and public input received during the Housing Needs
29 Analysis (HNA) planning process.

30 Development Constraints

31 The BLI methodology for identifying and removing development constraints is consistent with state
32 guidance on buildable land inventories per OAR 660-008-0005(2). By definition, the BLI is intended to
33 include land that is “suitable, available, and necessary for residential uses.”

34 “Buildable Land” includes residential designated land within the UGB, including vacant, part-vacant and
35 land that is likely to be redeveloped; and suitable, available and necessary for residential uses. Public-
36 owned land is generally not considered to be available for residential use unless the underlying zoning
37 permits housing.
38

1 Land is considered to be “suitable and available” unless it:

- 2 • Is severely constrained by natural hazards as determined by the Statewide Planning Goal 7;
- 3 • Is subject to natural resource protection measures determined under Statewide Planning Goals 5,
4 6, 15, 16, 17 or 18;
- 5 • Has slopes over 25 percent;
- 6 • Is within the 100-year flood plain; or
- 7 • Cannot be provided or served with public facilities (no land was identified in this category).

8

9 Based on state guidelines and data provided by the City of La Grande, the following constraints have been
10 deducted from the residential lands inventory.

- 11 • Land within floodplains. This includes lands in flood-hazard areas (the 100-year floodplain).
- 12 • Land within Parks and Natural areas that are protected from future development.
- 13 • Land with slopes greater than 25%.


14

15 **Exhibits 3.3-3.5** illustrate these types of “environmental” constraints.

16

1


Exhibit 3.3. Floodplains and Floodways



2
3

1


Exhibit 3.4. Steep Slopes



2
3

1

Exhibit 3.5. Riparian Corridors



2
3

1 **RESIDENTIAL BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY RESULTS**

2 **Land Base**

3 As noted above, the residential land base for the BLI includes all tax lots in the UGB with residential,
4 commercial and mixed-use land use designations. A summary of the land base by generalized plan
5 designation is provided in **Exhibit 3.6**. The findings indicate that there are 4,973 tax lots in the land base
6 with 2,118 gross acres.

7 **Exhibit 3.6**

Generalized Plan Designation	Number of		Total Gross	
	Taxlots	Percent	Acres	Percent
Low-Density Residential	410	8%	560	26%
Medium-Density Residential	3,252	65%	905	43%
High-Density Residential	532	11%	138	6%
Commercial/Mixed Use	779	16%	515	24%
Total	4,973	100%	2,118	100%

8 Source: City of La Grande; FCS GROUP.

9 **Development Status**

10 Before the deduction of environmental constraints, the residential land base has been classified by
11 development status to estimate land that is “committed” and not likely to be developed for additional
12 residential uses. These definitions include residential land that is developed, tax lots that exempt residential
13 development, public-ownership, and public right-of-way⁵, as described previously (results are summarized
14 in **Exhibit 3.7**).

15 **Exhibit 3.7**

Generalized Plan Designation	Acres on Vacant Taxlots	Acres on Part-Vacant Taxlots	Total Vacant & Part-Vacant Acres	Developed, non-residential and other constrained acres			
				Developed or Non-Res Land Base	Public/Unbuildable	Undersized (less than 3,000 SF)	Total Committed Acres
Low-Density Residential	243	47	290	264	6	0.10	271
Medium-Density Residential	189	19	208	688	9	0.31	697
High-Density Residential	12	3	15	113	9	0.31	122
Commercial/Mixed Use	12	2	14	478	23	0.07	501
Total	456	71	527	1,544	46	1	1,591

16 Source: City of La Grande GIS data, FCS GROUP analysis.

17 **Buildable Land After Constraints and Public Facilities**

18 The BLI methodology calculates the residential land base after accounting for the environmental constraints
19 described previously. The findings indicate that out of a total of 2,118 gross acres, 1,591 acres are
20 committed (derived from **Exhibit 3.7**) and 44 acres are environmentally constrained (derived from **Exhibit**
21 **3.8**).

22 After allowing for future public facilities and future right-of-way, there are 370 net buildable acres within the
23 residential vacant and part-vacant land inventory. The BLI includes 190 acres with low-density plan
24 designations, 151 acres with medium-density designations, 14 acres with high-density designations and 14
25 acres in commercial and mixed-use designations (see **Exhibit 3.8**).

⁵ Includes right-of-way that is defined as a tax lot in the GIS database, which exempts residential development. This includes most major existing right-of-way which is excluded from the buildable land base.

1 As noted above, approximately 87% of the buildable land inventory is classified as vacant and 13% is
2 classified as partially vacant land.

3 **Exhibit 3.8**

Generalized Plan Designation	Total Acres	Committed Acres	Env. Constrained Acres	Buildable Acres	Less Future Public Facilities*	Net Buildable Acres
Low-Density Residential	560	271	36	254	63	190
Medium-Density Residential	905	697	7	202	50	151
High-Density Residential	138	122	1	14	-	14
Commercial/Mixed Use	515	501	0	14	-	14
Total	2,118	1,591	44	484	114	370

Source: City of La Grande GIS data, FCS GROUP analysis.

4 * assumes 25% of buildable low and medium density land area is utilized for future public facilities.

5 **Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Assumptions**

6 It should be noted that all vacant and part-vacant commercial and mixed-use land (14 acres in total) is
7 reflected in the table above. This land was included because housing development is a permitted use (i.e.
8 it is allowed on upper floors only) on land with commercial and mixed-use zoning. However, since most
9 commercial and mixed-use zoned land area will be developed for non-residential use (e.g., retail, services,
10 office, etc.), it is assumed by the City of La Grande that only 1% of the commercial and mixed-use land
11 area will be developed as housing over the next 20 years. That assumption will be reflected in the
12 "Residential BLI Results" section of this report below.

13 **Redevelopment Areas**

14 The combination of vacant, part-vacant and redevelopable land area for the residential and
15 commercial/mixed use classifications results in the total La Grande residential buildable land inventory. As
16 shown in **Exhibit 3.9** this is primarily made up of 191.1 acres of low-density land (190.4 acres of vacant
17 land and 0.8 acres of redevelopable land); 151.9 acres of medium-density land (151.2 acres of vacant and
18 0.7 acres of redevelopable land); and 14.5 acres of high-density land (14.3 acres of vacant and 0.2 acres
19 of redevelopable land).

20 The commercial and mixed-use land area expected for housing includes 0.2 acres (13.9 acres of vacant
21 land plus 4.5 acres of redevelopment land multiplied by the 1% housing conversion factor). The sum of all
22 categories provides 357.7 acres of buildable residential land within the La Grande UGB.

23 **Exhibit 3.9**

Land Classification	Vacant & Part Vacant	Redevelopable Land	Housing Development Factor*	Total Buildable Residential Land
Low Density	190.4	0.8	100%	191.1
Medium Density	151.2	0.7	100%	151.9
High Density	14.3	0.2	100%	14.5
Commercial and Mixed Use	13.9	4.5	1%	0.2
Grand Total	370	6.2	-	357.7


Source: derived from prior tables using City of La Grande GIS data.

24 *Assumes a 3% housing redevelopment rate per City Staff.

25 **Exhibits 3.10 and 3.11** illustrate the buildable vacant and partially vacant buildable land areas for the
26 residential and commercial/mixed-use land base within the La Grande UGB.

1


Exhibit 3.10



2
3

1

Exhibit 3.11



2
3

1 **Section IV. Land Sufficiency Analysis**

2 This section provides an estimate of residential development capacity (measured in new dwelling units)
3 and an estimate of La Grande's ability to accommodate needed new housing units for the 2019 to 2039
4 period, based on the analysis in the housing needs.

5 A comparison of 20-year residential land needs (demand) is made relative to the residential buildable land
6 inventory. This provides a means of reconciling housing land demand with buildable land supply within the
7 La Grande UGB. The evaluation of UGB land requirements to accommodate the planned housing need
8 included three steps.

9 **Step 1** included a determination of the total number of dwelling units by general land use types including
10 low-, medium-, high-density housing types as well as manufactured homes (see Section 2).

11 **Step 2** considered the amount of land required to address this housing demand based on the expected
12 average development density assumptions for zoning designations for each general housing type (see
13 **Exhibit 4.1**).

14 **Step 3** included a comparison between the land need determined in Step 2 to the residential buildable land
15 inventory presented in Section 3 of the HNA.

16

17 **Housing Needs**

18 As discussed in Section 2, the forecasted housing mix for La Grande includes 795 housing units. This
19 results in net new housing development as follows:

- 20 ■ Low density: 436 dwellings (including standard and small lot single family detached housing and
21 manufactured housing units)
- 22 ■ Medium density: 159 dwellings (includes townhomes, plexes and group quarters units)
- 23 ■ High density: 200 dwellings (includes apartments and condominiums with 5+ units per structure)

24

25 **Residential Land Needs**

26 The second step in the reconciliation of land needs estimated the amount of net buildable land area required
27 to address the housing growth forecast. This step applied average expected levels of density (dwellings
28 per acre) to each of the general residential development categories listed in Step 1 to arrive at a total
29 residential land need forecast.
30

1

Exhibit 4.1. La Grande Residential Classifications and Density Assumptions

Relative Housing Density	Housing Types	Local Zoning Classifications	Allowed Minimum Density (DU per acre or sq. ft.)	Expected Avg. Density (DU per acre)
Low Density 	Single family detached	HD (Hillside Residential), R-1, RR-1 (Rural Residential)	1 – 7.3 per acre	1 – 7.3 (4 avg.)
Medium Density 	Small lot single family, townhomes, plexes, cottages	R-2, R-P (Residential Professional)	5,000 Sq. ft.	7 (avg.)
High Density 	Apartments, condos	R-3	5,000 Sq. ft.	14 (avg.)
Commercial and Mixed Use 	Apartments or condos with commercial	CB (Central Business), GC (General Commercial)	N/A	14 (avg.)

2

3

UGB Sufficiency Analysis

5 As shown in **Exhibit 4.2**, the forecasted housing need (795 dwelling units) is expected to require 146 acres
 6 of buildable land area. Since the current UGB includes 358 acres, there is an overall residential land surplus
 7 of 212 acres at this time.

8 **The BLI findings indicate that the existing amount of vacant and redevelopable land within the La**
 9 **Grande UGB is generally sufficient to accommodate planned 20-year housing needs.**

10 However, when you consider land needs for high density housing (primarily apartments) there is expected
 11 to be no remaining surplus of high density land supply after 20 years. This finding indicates that based on
 12 analysis of projected incomes and housing costs, La Grande will need to look for opportunities to rezone
 13 surplus lower density residential land to high density residential land, where appropriate.
 14

1

Exhibit 4.2

Reconciliation of Residential Land Need, La Grande UGB

	Recommended Forecast
Net New Dwellings/Units	Hybrid
Low Density*	436
Medium Density**	159
High Density	200
Total	795
Land Need (net acres)	
Low Density*	109
Medium Density**	23
High Density	14
Total	146
Buildable Land Inventory (net acres)	
Low Density*	191
Medium Density**	152
High Density	14
Commercial/Mixed Use	0
Total	358
UGB Land Surplus/Deficit (net acres)	
Low Density*	82
Medium Density**	129
High Density	0
Commercial/Mixed Use	0
Total	212
Adequacy of UGB to meet housing need	adequate

* Includes detached units and mobile homes.

** Includes townhomes, plexes and group quarters.

*** Includes multifamily structures with 5+ units.

2

3

4

1 **Section V. Findings and Recommendations**

2 As mentioned previously, La Grande's population growth over the next 20 years will result in new
3 households that will require additional housing.

4 **Key Findings**

5 Key findings of the housing needs analysis are:

- 6 • La Grande's population is forecast to grow at 0.45% per year over the next two decades, adding more
7 than 1,392 new residents.
- 8 • Population growth will require the addition of 795 new dwelling units over the next 20 years.
- 9 • About 42% of the future housing need will consist of single family detached housing, 45% will be a mix
10 of plexes, townhomes and apartments; and 13% will be comprised of manufactured housing and other
11 housing types.
- 12 • The share of low-income households in La Grande (those making 80% or less of the median family
13 income level for Union County) is represented by over 1 in 2 households.
- 14 • Almost 1 in 4 renter households are severely rent burdened with over 50% of their income going
15 towards monthly housing costs.
- 16 • La Grande has an existing 6 month wait list for affordable housing, and very low (less than 5% vacancy
17 rate) for quality market-rate rental apartments.
- 18 • The results of the housing needs analysis indicates that the current UGB is sufficient to accommodate
19 future housing needs.
- 20 • Based on an analysis of projected incomes and housing costs, La Grande will need to look for
21 opportunities to rezone surplus lower density residential land to high density residential land, where
22 appropriate

23

24 **Housing Policy Recommendations**

25 As part of the HNA process, FCS GROUP met with City staff and the HNA Advisory Committee to discuss
26 potential housing policies that cities throughout Oregon have implemented to address various housing
27 issues, which are summarized in OAR 660-038-0190(5) measures to accommodate needed housing in the
28 UGB. In addition, the findings contained in the Oregon DLCDC workbook titled "Housing and U" was also
29 discussed.

30 The purpose of the draft housing element comprehensive plan amendments is to strengthen
31 and renew the City of La Grande's intention to help foster development of a wide variety of
32 housing to meet the needs of the community. The following recommendations are intended to
33 supplement or replace the existing housing policies in the comprehensive plan.

34 **New Housing Goal**

35 *To encourage the development of a variety of housing types to meet the needs and desires of the*
36 *community, and assure that residents of La Grande have the opportunity to live in safe and sanitary housing*
37 *at a reasonable cost.*
38

1 New Housing Strategies**2 Strategy 1: Increase Opportunities for Multifamily Development**

- 3 • Consider opportunities to rezone surplus lower-density residential land to high-density residential land,
4 where appropriate
- 5 • Explore Opportunity Zone investments that include housing component
- 6 • Support policies that could utilize urban renewal funding grants or loans to leverage private investment
7 of multiuse housing developments within downtown
- 8 • Encourage higher density development around existing and proposed major commercial areas and
9 near Eastern Oregon University campus

10 Strategy 2: Develop Affordable Housing

- 11 • Identify public-owned properties that could be used for affordable housing
- 12 • Partner with nonprofits to leverage local, state and federal grants and Opportunity Zone investments to
13 develop affordable housing
- 14 • Utilize urban renewal funding or financing to help leverage downtown housing redevelopment
- 15 • Consider deferrals or waivers of SDCs for affordable housing developments
- 16 • Create a limited year tax abatement program for development of affordable and market-rate multifamily
17 housing
- 18 • Encourage the provision of separate water meters for townhomes and plexes
- 19 • Continue to support subsidized water/sewer utility charges for qualifying households

20 Strategy 3: Enhance Condition of Existing Housing Stock

- 21 • Explore creation of a limited year tax abatement program that promotes redevelopment of existing
22 housing stock throughout the city

23 Strategy 4: Support Measures that Increase Housing Capacity

- 24 • Residential development in most areas of the city should be planned at a density of between 5 and 24
25 units per acre
- 26 • Encourage Planned Unit Developments that optimize number of dwelling units
- 27 • Reevaluate neighborhood street design standards, amenities and other requirements for Planned Unit
28 Developments to help enhance development feasibility
- 29 • Work with federal agencies to revise FEMA floodplain maps

30 Strategy 5: Address Severe Rent Burdens

- 31 • Encourage installation of separate water meters for 2-4 unit plexes
- 32 • Continue to provide affordable water/sewer rates for low income households
- 33 • Monitor annually the % of severely rent burdened households

- 1 • Monitor annually the number of total housing units, regulated affordable units, multifamily units,
2 regulated affordable multifamily units and single family units, and regulated affordable single family
3 units

4

5 **GLOSSARY**

6 **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU):** A small living space located on the same lot as a single-family house.

7 **Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI):** An assessment of the capacity of land within the city's Urban Growth
8 Boundary to accommodate forecasted housing and employment needs.

9 **Buildable Residential Land:** Includes land that is designated for residential development that is vacant
10 and part-vacant and not constrained by existing buildings or environmental issues.

11 **Constrained land:** Land that is unavailable for future net new residential development based on one or
12 more factors, such as environmental protections, public lands, floodplains, or steep slopes.

13 **Cost Burdened:** Defined by US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as households
14 who spend over 30% of their income on housing.

15 **Cottages:** Small, single-level, detached units, often on their own lots and sometimes clustered around
16 pockets of shared open space. A cottage is typically under 1,000 square feet in footprint.

17 **Density:** Defined by the number of housing units on one acre of land.

18 **Development density:** Expected number of dwelling units (per acre) based on current zoning designations.

19 **Family:** A group two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or
20 adoption and residing together.

21 **High Density:** Lots with the average density of 12+ dwelling units per acre. Best suited for multifamily
22 housing such as apartments and condos.

23 **Housing Needs Analysis (HNA):** The Housing Needs Analysis consists of four distinct reports that analyze
24 the state of housing supply, housing affordability issues and the City's ability to meet projected housing
25 demand going into 2040.

26 **Housing Unit (or Dwelling Unit):** A house, an apartment or other group of rooms, or a single room is
27 regarded as a housing unit when it is occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters; that
28 is, when the occupants do not live and eat with any other person in the structure and there is direct access
29 from the outside or common hall.

30 **Household:** Consists of all people that occupy a housing unit.

31 **HUD:** Acronym for US Department of Housing and Urban Development, the federal agency dedicated to
32 strengthening and supporting the housing market.

33 **Low Density:** Lots with the average density of 3-4 dwelling units per acre. Best suited for family housing
34 such as single-family detached homes.

35 **Manufactured Housing:** is a type of prefabricated home that is largely assembled of site and then
36 transported to sites of use. The definition of the term in the United States is regulated by federal law (Code
37 of Federal Regulations, 24 CFR 3280): "Manufactured homes are built as dwelling units of at least 320
38 square feet in size, usually with a permanent chassis to assure the initial and continued transportability of
39 the home. The requirement to have a wheeled chassis permanently attached differentiates "manufactured
40 housing" from other types of prefabricated homes, such as modular homes.

41 **Manufactured Home Park (or manufactured home park):** a local zoning designation that is specifically
42 intended to address demand for this housing type. OAR chapter 813, division 007 is adopted to implement
43 section 9, chapter 816, Oregon Laws 2009, and sections 2, 3 and 4, chapter 619, Oregon Laws 2005, as

- 1 amended by sections 10 to 12, chapter 816, Oregon Laws 2009, and sections 19, and 21, chapter 503,
2 Oregon Laws 2011 for the purpose of regulating manufactured dwelling parks.
- 3 **Median Family Income (MFI):** The median sum of the income of all family members 15 years and older
4 living in the household. Families are groups of two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related
5 by birth, marriage, or adoption and residing together; all such people (including related subfamily members)
6 are considered as members of one family.
- 7 **Medium Density:** Lots with the average density of 6-12 dwelling units per acre. Best suited for small lot
8 housing such as single family attached, townhomes, plexes and cottages.
- 9 **Mixed Use:** Characterized as two or more residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, and/or industrial
10 uses into one combined building or building(s) on the same parcel of land.
- 11 **Multi-Family Housing:** Stacked flats in a single buildings or groups of buildings on a single lot. Parking is
12 shared, and entrance to units is typically accessed through a shared lobby.
- 13 **Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR):** Administrative Rules are created by most agencies and some
14 boards and commissions to implement and interpret their statutory authority (ORS 183.310(9)). Agencies
15 may adopt, amend, repeal or renumber rules, permanently or temporarily. Every OAR uses the same
16 numbering sequence of a three-digit chapter number followed by a three-digit division number and a four-
17 digit rule number. For example, Oregon Administrative Rules, chapter 166, division 500, rule 0020 is cited
18 as OAR 166-500-0020. (oregon.gov)
- 19 **Part-vacant land:** Unconstrained land that has some existing development but can be subdivided to allow
20 for additional residential development.
- 21 **Plexes and Apartments:** Multiple units inside one structure on a single lot. Usually each unit has its own
22 entry.
- 23 **Seasonal dwellings:** These units are intended by the owner to be occupied during only certain seasons
24 of the year. They are not anyone's usual residence. A seasonal unit may be used in more than one season;
25 for example, for both summer and winter sports. Published counts of seasonal units also include housing
26 units held for occupancy by migratory farm workers. While not currently intended for year-round use, most
27 seasonal units could be used year-round.
- 28 **Severely Cost Burdened:** Defined US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as
29 households who spend over 50% of their income on housing.
- 30 **Single Family Attached:** Dwelling units that are duplexes without a subdividing property line between the
31 two to four housing units. "Attached" duplexes require a single building permit for both dwelling units. The
32 "attached" units would be addressed with one numerical street address for the overall structure with
33 separate alpha-numeric unit numbers for each dwelling.
- 34 **Single Family Detached:** Free standing residential building, unattached, containing separate bathing,
35 kitchen, sanitary, and sleeping facilities designed to be occupied by not more than one family, not including
36 manufactured and mobile homes.
- 37 **Townhome (also known as duplexes, rowhouse, etc.):** Attached housing units, each on a separate lot,
38 and each with its own entry from a public or shared street or common area.
- 39 **Urban Growth Boundary (UGB):** Under Oregon law, each of the state's cities and metropolitan areas has
40 created an urban growth boundary around its perimeter – a land use planning line to control urban
41 expansion onto farm and forest lands.
- 42 **Vacant housing unit:** A housing unit is vacant if no one is living in it at the time of enumeration, unless its
43 occupants are only temporarily absent. Units temporarily occupied at the time of enumeration entirely by
44 people who have a usual residence elsewhere are also classified as vacant.
- 45 **Vacant land:** Vacant and part-vacant land identified within the local buildable land inventory that is not
46 developed and unconstrained for future planned residential development.
47

Note: The following text is the existing Goal 10 Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, which includes the City’s 2000-2001 buildable lands inventory. Such information is outdated and is proposed to be repealed and replaced with the 2019 buildable land inventory and text above.

~~I. Buildable Land Inventory~~

~~The objective of this section is to calculate the number of acres of buildable land in each plan designation in the existing Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of the City of La Grande. Buildable land is defined as land that is suitable and available and necessary for the designated uses. This section provides the basis for subsequent calculations on the capacity of the UGB to accommodate future growth.~~

~~The following analysis uses a methodology suggested by *Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon’s Urban Areas* produced by the Transportation and Growth Management Program (TGM) of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The steps used in this methodology have been followed to the greatest extent possible, given the data available for the City of La Grande.~~

~~A. Gross buildable vacant acres by zoning district~~

~~The City of La Grande has a GIS-based parcel database that was current as of December 2000. TBAC field-checked a preliminary list of vacant parcels in January 2001. The City and TBAC refined this list through further field-checking and GIS analysis in February and March 2001.~~

~~Those parcels considered as vacant in the following analysis include fully vacant parcels and parcels that are partially vacant and/or redevelopable.~~

~~Table I.1 shows the land use zones designated by the City of La Grande in its Zoning Ordinance. These zones account for all the land within the UGB.~~

Table I.1 City of La Grande Zoning Districts

Zone	Code
Non-Residential	
Commercial	
General Commercial	GC
Central Business	CB
Interchange Commercial	IC
Industrial	
Light Industrial	M-1
Heavy Industrial	M-2
Other	
Public Facilities	PF
Residential	
Hillside Development Residential	HD
Rural Residential	RR-1
Low Density Residential	R-1
Medium Density Residential	R-2
High Density Residential	R-3
Residential Professional	R-P

~~Source: City of La Grande Land Development Code Ordinance~~

Table I.2 shows the total land within the UGB of the City of La Grande. Note: the Public Facilities (PF) Zone was added to the City of La Grande Zoning Code in March 2001, but the GIS system was not updated as of the writing of this report to allow an inventory of PFzoned parcels.

Table I.2 Land within UGB by Zoning District

Zone	Total Acres	Total Parcels	Total Acres in Parcels
PF	338.34	-	-
CB	35.01	113	19.44
GC	390.57	537	324.47
IG	29.45	35	26.82
M-1	191.84	106	69.03
M-2	210.57	29	211.93
HD	160.70	115	150.62
R-1	316.80	173	324.12
R-2	1,322.39	3,173	1,159.41
R-3	302.73	548	239.86
R-P	64.95	155	53.05
RR-1	90.30	15	99.86
Not Zoned (Highway Area)	128.74	-	-
UGB Total	3,582.35	4,999	2,678.62

Source: ~~The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001 from data provided by the City of La Grande (December 2000) and updated by the City of La Grande (March 2001).~~

The gross vacant buildable acreage figures within the UGB of the City of La Grande are shown in Table I.3. ~~Unbuildable vacant land is defined as vacant land which is subject to physical constraints, such as steep slopes or riparian corridors, or was otherwise identified by the City of La Grande as unbuildable. For the purposes of this calculation, unbuildable vacant land also includes the developed portion of partially vacant or redevelopable parcels. For the purposes of this calculation, the vacant land inventory excludes all of the vacant land that is zoned PF (Public Facilities) and/or is owned by a public entity.~~

Table I.3 below contains an inventory of all parcels identified as vacant and in the UGB. ~~The parcels have been given four classifications: 1) "vacant" - 100% of the parcel has been identified by City Staff as buildable; 2) "partially vacant/redevelopable" - parcels with some development on the site and with development potential on the vacant portion of site, or parcels with major development constraints (such as steep slopes) on a portion of the site; 3) "committed" - the site has already committed to development; and 4) "unbuildable" - 100% of the site has been identified by City Staff as unbuildable, due to constraints such as steep slopes or committed uses on the site.~~

The "preliminary unbuildable acres" column represents the area of the parcel that was identified by the City of La Grande as unbuildable for a variety of reasons, including: parcels committed to development, steep slopes, and creeks. ~~TBAC and the City conducted further GIS analysis to identify other constraints on the development potential of parcels. These constraints are identified in the table as City-designated riparian buffer areas, pond/lakes, elevations greater than 3,000 feet, and "other/combined" constraints identified by the City, including power transmission lines by themselves or combined with riparian areas. "Preliminary unbuildable acres," "riparian acres," "pond acres," "greater than 3,000 feet acres," and "other/ combined constraints" acres are subtracted from total parcel area to arrive at the "final gross buildable acres" figure for each parcel.~~

The table also shows land within the 100-year floodplain for each parcel. This land is not exclusive from the other constraints listed and can potentially overlap with other constraints shown, such as riparian areas. ~~Also, since development is currently allowed in floodplain areas, the presence of floodplains does not necessarily limit development. The City may address this issue as part of Periodic Review.~~

1 ~~As shown in Table I.3, a total of 575.68 acres of land in the City of La Grande UGB is classified as~~
2 ~~vacant buildable, out of a total of 430 vacant parcels containing 856.70 acres. There are a total of~~
3 ~~141.1 acres in the parcels listed as in the 100-year floodplain, including: 28.05 acres on 22~~
4 ~~unbuildable parcels, 6.34 acres on 3 committed parcels, 63.88 acres on 15 partially~~
5 ~~vacant/redevelopable parcels (including 49.818 acres on 5 parcels proposed for an~~
6 ~~industrial/business park; many of the parcels have riparian areas already subtracted from the~~
7 ~~buildable acreage total), and 42.83 acres on 54 vacant parcels (many of these parcels already have~~
8 ~~riparian areas subtracted from the buildable acreage total).~~

9
10 ~~In Table I.3, all commercially zoned land with a final gross buildable acreage figure of less than~~
11 ~~0.25 acres has been classified as unbuildable. All industrially zoned land with a final gross~~
12 ~~buildable acreage figure of less than 0.5 acres has been classified as unbuildable. The City does~~
13 ~~not feel that these sites are viable for development.~~
14

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.5CC/5200	GB		unbuildable	parking lot	0.118	0.118	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CG/7200	GB		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.220	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.220	
3S38.5CD/8600	GC		committed	committed	0.077	0.077	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CD/1202	GC		committed	committed	0.124	0.124	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8AC/100	GC		committed	committed; Safeway	6.846	6.846	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9BB/202	GC		committed		2.866	2.866	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9BB/200	GC		committed	committed (storage units) w/ .627 ac unb	1.374	1.374	0.264	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4DC/704	GC		committed	committed (La Grande Automotive)	0.924	0.924	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5DD/1004	GC		committed	committed	0.450	0.450	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4DC/500	GC		committed	committed	4.992	4.992	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4/9800	GC		committed	committed (Roberts Ford Expansion)	9.342	9.342	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8DA/500	GC		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	4.284	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.284	
3S38.5DD/1000	GC		partial/redevelop	50% vacant; existing house	4.873	0.936	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.937	
3S38.9CD/104	GC		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.489	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.489	0.204
3S38.4CC/1200	GC		partial/redevelop	1.79 acres (.75 acre committed); existing house; .302 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	4.922	0.750	0.302	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.870	
3S38.4CA/1600	GC		partial/redevelop	vacant w/ .5 acre redevelopable	3.395	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.395	
3S38.4CA/1500	GC		partial/redevelop	50% vacant, 50% redevelopable	3.426	1.714	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.712	
3S38.6DA/6604	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.114	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.114	
3S38.5CD/3800	GC		unbuildable	paved pkg lot	0.218	0.218	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CA/9900	GC		unbuildable	gravel pkg lot; final buildable acres < 0.25	0.206	0.206	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CD/2800	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.106	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.106	
3S38.5CA/10400	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.166	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.166	
3S38.5CD/1400	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.065	
3S38.8BA/100	GC		unbuildable	.146 ac unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.25	0.276	0.000	0.146	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.130	
3S38.8DA/1803	GC		unbuildable	undevelopable (vacant)	0.117	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.115
3S38.8AD/3400	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.127	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.127	
3S38.9CD/200	GC		unbuildable	Riparian/other	0.806	0.806	0.245	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.806

3S38.9CD/202	GC		unbuildable	.065 ac unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.25	0.239	0.000	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.174	0.239
3S38.5DC/2500	GC		unbuildable	50% committed (house on south half); final buildable acres < 0.25	0.279	0.139	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.140	
3S38.5DC/504	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.084	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.084	
3S38.5DC/400	GC		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.25	0.094	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.094	
3S38.4CC/1801	GC		unbuildable	committed	0.216	0.216	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4CC/704	GC		unbuildable	.01 ac unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.25	0.092	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.4CA/1700	GC		unbuildable	hotel gravel truck pkg	1.443	1.443	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4CA/1400	GC		unbuildable	hotel gravel truck pkg	1.450	1.450	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4AC/700	GC		unbuildable	gravel truck pkg	4.128	4.128	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8AB/2106	GC	M-1	unbuildable	redevelopable; final buildable acres < 0.25	0.174	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.174	
3S38.8AB/5504	GC		vacant		0.682	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.682	
3S38.8DA/1702	GC		vacant		0.432	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.432	0.022
3S38.8AD/2804	GC		vacant		0.253	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.253	
3S38.8DA/1200	GC		vacant		2.166	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.166	
3S38.8AD/1400	GC		vacant		0.260	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.260	
3S38.8AA/3602	GC		vacant		0.941	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.941	
3S38.9CD/100	GC		vacant	.128 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	5.344	0.000	0.128	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.216	5.342
3S38.4CD/1200	GC		vacant	.063 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	2.983	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.920	
3S38.4DC/700	GC		vacant		3.922	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.922	
3S38.4DC/000	GC		vacant		2.893	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.893	
3S38.4CC/1400	GC		vacant		1.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.031	
3S38.4CC/1800	GC		vacant		0.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.333	
3S38.4CC/700	GC		vacant	.095 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.884	0.000	0.095	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.789	
3S38.4CC/604	GC		vacant	.176 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	1.667	0.000	0.176	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.491	
3S38.4DC/800	GC		vacant		1.085	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.085	

3S38.9CC/104	GC	R-2	vacant	1.304 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	15.225	0.000	1.304	0.000	0.000	0.000	13.921	12.122
3S38.6DB/11905	GC	R-3	vacant		0.584	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.584	
3S38.7BD/900	HD		committed	committed (private/community pool)	0.119	0.119	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.18AA/100	HD		partial/redevelop	redevelopable; stables; 1.052 acres undevelopable (power line)	4.727	1.052	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.675	
3S38.7DC/3500	HD		unbuildable	entire parcel >3000'	0.929	0.929	0.000	0.000	0.926	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DC/3604	HD		unbuildable	45% slope; >3000'	7.612	7.612	0.000	0.000	7.477	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7/1010	HD		unbuildable	entire parcel >3000'	3.757	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.760	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DC/3600	HD		unbuildable	unbuildable. 45% slope; >3000'	2.926	2.926	0.000	0.000	2.910	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7/1011	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (steep and insuf setback); >3000'	2.798	2.798	0.000	0.000	2.629	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DC/3009	HD		unbuildable	riparian, other	0.272	0.272	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DC/3002	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (creek); riparian	0.042	0.042	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.041
3S38.7DC/3000b	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (creek); riparian	0.043	0.043	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DB/4200	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); entire parcel >3000'	0.081	0.081	0.000	0.000	0.084	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DB/5800	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); >3000'	0.140	0.140	0.000	0.000	0.072	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DB/4200	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); entire parcel >3000'	0.278	0.278	0.000	0.000	0.284	0.000	0.000	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.7DB/5700	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); riparian; >3000'	0.516	0.516	0.006	0.000	0.485	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DB/5400	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); riparian; >3000'	2.197	2.197	0.108	0.000	1.371	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7/710	HD		unbuildable	undevelopable (25%+ slope, too small); >3000'	8.115	8.115	0.000	0.000	8.046	0.000	0.000	
3S38.18/304	HD		unbuildable	pond; entire parcel >3000'	0.303	0.000	0.000	0.049	0.302	0.000	0.000	
3S38.18AA/500	HD		unbuildable	committed	0.404	0.404	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7BA/200	HD		unbuildable	unbuildable (landlocked)	0.461	0.461	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6B/500	HD		unbuildable	entire parcel >3000'	0.969	0.969	0.000	0.000	0.969	0.000	0.000	
3S38.18/303	HD		vacant	pond; >3000'	9.568	0.000	0.000	0.584	9.524	0.000	0.000	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.5CD/7500	M-1		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.5	0.074	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.074	
3S38.5CD/7100	M-1		unbuildable	final buildable acres < 0.5	0.149	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.149	
3S38.5CD/9000	M-1		unbuildable	undevelopable (railroad)	0.115	0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CD/9100	M-1		unbuildable	undevelopable (railroad)	0.068	0.068	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5CD/6100	M-1		unbuildable	undevelopable (railroad)	0.186	0.186	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31CD/1104	M-1		unbuildable	redevelopable; .215 ac unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.522	0.000	0.215	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.307	
3S38.8AD/1004	M-1		unbuildable	redevelopable; final buildable acres < 0.5	0.265	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.265	
3S38.9BC/1500	M-1		unbuildable	only redev. w/ adj. prop.	0.050	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9CB/100	M-1		unbuildable	undevelopable	0.124	0.124	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.4BC/1100	M-1		unbuildable	unbuildable (riparian area, other); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.374	0.000	0.335	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.036	
3S38.4BD/2500	M-1		unbuildable	undevelopable (vacant/small)	0.136	0.136	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5AA/2200	M-1		unbuildable	unbuildable (riparian area, other)	0.084	0.084	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8AD/400	M-1		vacant		0.598	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.598	
3S38.16AD/400	M-2		committed	committed	1.279	1.279	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.280
3S38.16/694	M-2		partial/redevelop	proposed industrial business park; riparian and landscaping—25% unbuildable	2.949	0.000	0.737	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.212	2.938
3S38.16/500	M-2		partial/redevelop	proposed industrial business park; riparian and landscaping—25% unbuildable	48.962	0.000	12.241	0.000	0.000	0.000	36.721	25.334
3S38.16/600	M-2		partial/redevelop	proposed industrial business park; riparian and landscaping—25% unbuildable	14.352	0.000	3.588	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.764	1.431
3S38.16/690	M-2		partial/redevelop	proposed industrial business park; riparian and landscaping—25% unbuildable	15.515	0.000	3.879	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.636	15.416
3S38.16/504	M-2		partial/redevelop	redev. 3 ac; 1.310 ac unbuildable (riparian area); proposed industrial business park; riparian and l	4.715	1.715	1.310	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.690	4.702
3S38.16AD/104	M-2		partial/redevelop	redev. 100%; .07 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	5.170	0.000	0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.100	3.752

3S38.16AD/600	M-2		partial/redevelop	redev. 100%; .231 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.149	0.000	0.231	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.406
3S38.16AD/200	M-2		unbuildable	Riparian/other	1.938	1.938	0.205	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.938
3S38.16AD/600	M-2		unbuildable	redev. 100%; .231 ac-unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.258	0.000	0.231	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.027	0.406

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.16AD/102	M-2		unbuildable	redev. 100%; .006 ac-unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.405	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.399	0.769
3S38.16AD/104	M-2		unbuildable	redev. 100%; .07 ac-unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.196	0.000	0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.126	3.752
3S38.16AD/102	M-2		unbuildable	redev 100%; .006 ac-unbuildable (riparian area); final buildable acres < 0.5	0.366	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.360	0.769
3S38.16AD/500	M-2		unbuildable	riparian, other	1.036	1.036	0.074	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.511
3S38.16AD/500	M-2		unbuildable	riparian, other	0.506	0.506	0.227	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.511
3S38.15/900	M-2		unbuildable	committed; riparian	1.983	1.983	0.232	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.982
3S38.16AD/100	M-2		vacant	12.97 ac. undeveloped w/ 1.389 ac-unbuildable (rip)	12.257	0.000	1.389	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.868	4.199
3S38.17/1804	R-1		committed	Committed	1.385	1.385	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.17BA/100	R-1		committed	committed	2.612	2.612	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.17/1600	R-1		partial/redevelop	1 acre committed (rest is vacant); .570 acres undevelopable (power line)	5.729	1.570	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.159	
3S38.17/1800	R-1		partial/redevelop	17.44 acres (1 acre committed); riparian; 2.710 acres undev (powerline/riparian)	18.106	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.719	14.387	
3S38.17BA/600	R-1		partial/redevelop	4.76 acres (.5 acre committed, wetlands); existing house; .053 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	4.845	0.500	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.292	
3S38.6BA/1290	R-1		partial/redevelop	25% committed	1.224	0.305	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.916	
3S38.17AA/600	R-1		partial/redevelop	4.77 acres vacant; .48 ac committed; .017 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	5.249	0.480	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.752	0.135

3S38.17AA/500	R-1		partial/redevelop	5 acres vacant, .48 committed; .947 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	5.378	0.480	0.947	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.954	1.256
3S38.17AA/304	R-1		partial/redevelop	.5 acres committed	1.635	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.135	
3S38.17AA/504	R-1		partial/redevelop	100% redevelopable; .484 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	1.179	0.000	0.484	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.695	0.624
3S38.17AA/400	R-1		partial/redevelop	vacant w/ 1.5 acres committed; .543 acres undevelopable (power line and riparian)	1.867	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.543	0.000	0.158
3S38.17/2100	R-1	HD	partial/redevelop	39.83 acres (3.5 acres committed); riparian; pond; .770 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	39.255	3.500	0.770	0.526	0.000	0.000	34.459	
3S38.6/300	R-1		unbuildable	city park; riparian	3.118	3.118	0.183	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6BA/1000	R-1		unbuildable	committed	0.072	0.072	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6BA/800	R-1		unbuildable	committed	0.254	0.254	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6BA/900	R-1		unbuildable	committed	0.330	0.330	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
2S38.31DD/100	R-1		unbuildable	ODOT owned/landlocked	0.262	0.262	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.32GC/100	R-1		unbuildable	riparian; ODOT owned/landlocked	13.527	13.527	5.054	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.887
3S38.17AA/503	R-1		unbuildable	riparian, other	1.304	1.304	0.058	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.381
3S38.17BA/700	R-1		vacant	.035 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	2.440	0.000	0.035	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.405	
3S38.17BD/602	R-1		vacant		0.279	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.279	
3S38.17BD/600	R-1		vacant		5.945	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.945	
3S38.6/300	R-1		vacant	.475 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	3.665	0.000	0.475	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.190	
3S38.6B/1102	R-1		vacant		1.318	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.318	
3S38.6B/1104	R-1		vacant		1.582	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.582	
3S38.6BA/1102	R-1		vacant		0.636	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.636	
2S38.32CD/304	R-1		vacant		1.166	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.166	0.814
2S38.32CD/304	R-1		vacant		0.329	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.329	0.248
3S38.17AC/9800	R-1		vacant		0.264	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.264	
3S38.17AC/5100	R-1		vacant		0.409	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.409	0.041
3S38.17DB/103	R-1		vacant	.318 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.750	0.000	0.318	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.432	0.007
3S38.17AA/200	R-1		vacant		7.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.017	0.003
3S38.17AA/300	R-1		vacant		1.922	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.922	

3S38.17AA/502	R-1		vacant	.427 acres undev (power line/riparian)	3.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.427	2.603	4.248
3S38.17/1900	R-1	HD	vacant	riparian; pond; 2.82 acres unbuildable (roadway and riparian area)	38.925	0.000	0.000	7.828	0.000	2.820	28.277	
3S38.17/2000	R-1	HD	vacant	2.95 ac unbuildable (riparian area); >3000'	37.354	0.000	2.950	0.000	1.331	0.000	33.073	
3S38.6AB/5600	R-2		committed	committed (future park land)	3.228	3.228	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6AB/3301	R-2		committed	committed; riparian	0.374	0.374	0.138	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6AA/6400	R-2		committed	committed	0.189	0.189	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5BC/7400	R-2		committed	committed (City owned snow storage)	0.489	0.489	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5BB/3500	R-2		committed	committed	0.290	0.290	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6AA/9301	R-2		committed	committed	0.125	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.32CC/1000	R-2		Committed	Committed	0.117	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8DD/1314	R-2		committed	committed	0.202	0.202	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8DD/1800	R-2		committed	committed (Nazarene Church w/ devel ball field on east half); developed (no designation)	6.008	6.008	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.970
3S38.8AA/4501	R-2		committed	committed; trucks	0.255	0.255	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8AA/2801	R-2		committed	committed	0.097	0.097	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9CD/501	R-2		committed	committed	2.221	2.221	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9CD/600	R-2		committed	committed	0.512	0.512	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.088
3S38.9BB/757	R-2		committed	committed	0.172	0.172	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9BB/754	R-2		committed	committed	0.170	0.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9BB/785	R-2		committed	committed	0.175	0.175	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.9BA/2100	R-2		committed	committed	0.200	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.5AD/603	R-2		committed	committed (future road)	0.470	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.470	
3S38.5AB/1604	R-2		committed	committed	0.276	0.276	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DD/4000	R-2		partial/redevelop	6.5 acres vacant (rest is undevelopable); pond	4.527	0.000	0.000	0.960	0.000	0.000	3.567	
3S38.7DD/4000	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable (small out buildings)	0.497	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.497	
3S38.8CC/3400	R-2		partial/redevelop	50% vacant	3.062	1.531	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.531	
3S38.6DA/6000	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.188	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.188	
3S38.6AD/4800	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.203	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.203	
3S38.6DA/400	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable; existing house	0.241	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.241	
3S38.6BA/1600	R-2		partial/redevelop	25% committed	2.587	0.647	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.940	
3S38.6AB/5400	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.307	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.307	
3S38.6AB/5300	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.717	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.717	
2S38.31DC/3900	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.530	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.530	
3S38.6AA/1100	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.183	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.183	
2S38.31DD/3500	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.488	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.488	
2S38.31DD/500	R-2		partial/redevelop	50% vacant; east half is vacant; riparian; -186 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.700	0.350	0.186	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.164	
3S38.6AA/1101	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.186	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.186	
3S38.5BD/15500	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.151	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.151	
3S38.6AA/3200	R-2		partial/redevelop	50% vacant	0.328	0.164	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.164	
3S38.5BA/1900	R-2		partial/redevelop	50% vacant	1.480	0.740	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.740	
3S38.8AA/3300	R-2		partial/redevelop	1.84 acres (.91 vacant); eastern half	1.888	0.978	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.910	
3S38.9BC/500	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	2.390	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.390	
3S38.8AB/5100	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.201	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.201	
3S38.5DB/800	R-2		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.412	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.412	
3S38.4BC/300	R-2		partial/redevelop	4.75 acres (1 acre committed)	4.935	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.935	
3S38.5AB/3800	R-2		partial/redevelop	50% vacant	0.823	0.411	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.412	
3S38.5AB/3701	R-2		partial/redevelop	2/3 vacant (steel garage built only)	0.463	0.153	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.310	
3S38.4BB/400	R-2		partial/redevelop	1.65 acres (1 acre vacant)	1.379	0.379	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	
3S38.18/500	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (creek); riparian	0.028	0.028	0.026	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.026
3S38.18/400	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (creek); riparian	0.805	0.805	0.184	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.259
3S38.7DD/6000	R-2		unbuildable	riparian	0.510	0.519	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.055
3S38.7DD/6300	R-2		unbuildable	committed	0.070	0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DD/6200	R-2		unbuildable	committed	0.220	0.220	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

3S38.7BA/1204	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (too steep & no access); riparian	0.084	0.084	0.071	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.076
3S38.6DC/5512	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (too steep & narrow)	0.071	0.071	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6DC/7600	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (too steep & no access)	0.247	0.247	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6AD/4502	R-2		unbuildable	committed	0.165	0.165	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.6BA/1800	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (steep slopes)	1.314	1.314	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.6AB/1400	R-2		unbuildable	Riparian areas, other	0.150	0.150	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31CC/100	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (GR river); riparian	0.369	0.369	0.368	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017
2S38.31CD/100	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (GR river); Riparian/other	0.826	0.826	0.829	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31CD/101	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (river)	0.941	0.941	0.681	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31CD/102	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (river)	1.271	1.271	0.747	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31DD/400	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (GR river); riparian	0.512	0.512	0.514	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.31DD/600	R-2		unbuildable	ODOT owned/river; riparian	1.267	1.267	0.461	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.32CC/702	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (size/shape)	0.165	0.165	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.32CC/701	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (shape)	0.462	0.462	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2S38.32CD/802	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (small/setback conflict)	0.224	0.224	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.17AA/502	R-2		unbuildable	100' power easement; 1.194 acres undevelopable (power line/riparian)	1.714	1.714	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.194	0.000	4.248
3S38.17AA/400	R-2		unbuildable	100' power easement; riparian; .551 acres undevelopable (power line)	1.076	1.076	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.551	0.000	0.158
3S38.5DB/1003	R-2		unbuildable	committed	0.110	0.110	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5AB/900	R-2		unbuildable	unbuildable (shape)	0.333	0.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.5AD/414	R-2		unbuildable	undevelopable (can't meet setbacks)	0.164	0.164	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.7DC/3002	R-2		vacant	.042 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.104	0.000	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.062	0.041
3S38.7DC/3000	R-2		vacant		0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.115	
3S38.7DC/100	R-2		vacant		0.242	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.242	
3S38.7DD/5700	R-2		vacant	.114 ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.339	0.000	0.114	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.097
3S38.7DA/1801	R-2		vacant		0.127	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.127	
3S38.7AD/5100	R-2		vacant	vacant (existing structure outbuilding); northeastern quadrant	1.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.005	
3S38.7BA/1202	R-2		vacant		1.382	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.382	

3S38.7AB/2700	R-2		vacant	-.039 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.374	0.000	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.335	0.053
3S38.7AB/2904	R-2		vacant	-.063 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.227	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.164	0.055
3S38.7AB/2704	R-2		vacant		0.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.030	
3S38.7AB/2600	R-2		vacant		0.234	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.234	
3S38.6DC/7700	R-2		vacant		0.113	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.113	
3S38.8CC/3504	R-2		vacant		0.198	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.198	
3S38.8CC/3000	R-2		vacant		2.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.004	
3S38.7AD/6000	R-2		vacant		0.229	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.229	
3S38.7AD/5804	R-2		vacant		0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.080	
3S38.8CC/2600	R-2		vacant	-.087 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	8.065	0.000	0.087	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.978	
3S38.8CD/1604	R-2		vacant	-.115 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.213	0.000	0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.098	
3S38.8CD/1600	R-2		vacant	-.145 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.220	0.000	0.145	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.075	
3S38.8/202	R-2		vacant	-.657 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	4.066	0.000	0.657	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.409	
3S38.6DC/5502	R-2		vacant		0.152	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.152	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 4	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.6DC/5200	R-2		vacant		0.183	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.183	
3S38.6DB/7000	R-2		vacant		0.105	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.105	
3S38.6AD/4700	R-2		vacant		0.804	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.804	
3S38.6AD/2504	R-2		vacant		0.145	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.145	
3S38.6BA/1200	R-2		vacant		0.304	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.304	
3S38.6BA/2400	R-2		vacant		0.114	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.114	
3S38.6BA/1102	R-2		vacant		0.313	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.313	
3S38.6BA/100	R-2		vacant		1.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.005	
3S38.6AB/5700	R-2		vacant		0.347	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.347	
3S38.6AB/3500	R-2		vacant		0.222	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.222	
3S38.6AB/3504	R-2		vacant	-.215 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.245	0.000	0.215	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.030	
2S38.31CD/2004	R-2		vacant	-.076 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.194	0.000	0.076	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.115	

2S38.31CC/300	R-2		vacant	-.697 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.902	0.000	0.697	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.205	
2S38.31CC/200	R-2		vacant	-.605 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.655	0.000	0.605	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.050	
2S38.31CD/424	R-2		vacant	-.095 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.114	0.000	0.095	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	
2S38.31CD/423	R-2		vacant	-.09 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.119	0.000	0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.029	
2S38.31CD/426	R-2		vacant	-.115 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.117	0.000	0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	
2S38.31CD/427	R-2		vacant	-.112 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.118	0.000	0.112	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.006	
2S38.31CD/425	R-2		vacant	-.106 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.116	0.000	0.106	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	
2S38.31CD/415	R-2		vacant	-.167 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.235	0.000	0.167	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.068	
2S38.31CD/1102	R-2		vacant		0.252	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.252	
2S38.31CD/1400	R-2		Vacant		0.301	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.301	
3S38.6AB/4500	R-2		Vacant		0.140	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.140	
3S38.6AB/4600	R-2		vacant		0.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.170	
3S38.6AB/4800	R-2		vacant		0.102	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.102	
3S38.6AA/1500	R-2		vacant		0.464	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.464	
3S38.6AB/108	R-2		vacant		0.258	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.258	
3S38.5CA/8100	R-2		vacant		0.193	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.193	
3S38.5CA/8000	R-2		vacant		0.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.170	
3S38.5CA/7900	R-2		vacant		0.163	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.163	
3S38.5BC/7501	R-2		vacant		0.139	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.139	
3S38.5BC/7600	R-2		vacant		0.137	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.137	
3S38.5CA/7800	R-2		vacant		0.255	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.255	
3S38.5CA/1201	R-2		vacant		0.147	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.147	
3S38.5CA/1200	R-2		vacant		0.074	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.074	
3S38.5BD/12600	R-2		vacant		0.154	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.154	
3S38.5BB/1700	R-2		vacant		0.215	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.215	
3S38.6AD/200	R-2		vacant		0.126	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.126	
3S38.5BB/2300	R-2		vacant		0.266	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.266	
3S38.5BC/1101	R-2		vacant		0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.115	
3S38.5BC/1200	R-2		vacant		0.138	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.138	

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 4	Zone 2	TBAC-Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-
--------	--------	--------	---------------------------	-------	-------------	--------------------	----------------	------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

3S38.17AB/10500	R-2		vacant	-.014 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.202	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.188	
3S38.17AB/10000	R-2		vacant		0.204	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.204	
3S38.17AB/0400	R-2		vacant		0.204	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.204	0.088
3S38.17AB/9500	R-2		vacant		0.210	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.210	0.141
3S38.17AB/10600	R-2		vacant	-.165 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.189	0.000	0.165	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.024	0.001
3S38.17AB/10900	R-2		vacant	-.039 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.187	0.000	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.148	0.169
3S38.17AB/10800	R-2		vacant		0.217	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.217	0.046

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 4	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.17AB/10700	R-2		vacant	-.103 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.224	0.000	0.103	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.118	0.133
3S38.17AB/0900	R-2		vacant	-.034 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.190	0.000	0.034	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.156	
3S38.17AB/9600	R-2		vacant		0.192	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.192	0.042
3S38.17AB/0700	R-2		vacant	-.177 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.217	0.000	0.177	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.040	
3S38.17AB/0800	R-2		vacant	-.213 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.216	0.000	0.213	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.004
3S38.8DD/1200	R-2		vacant		2.826	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.826	1.193
3S38.8DD/1804	R-2		vacant		0.266	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.266	0.263
3S38.8DD/1802	R-2		vacant		0.313	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.313	0.307
3S38.8DD/700	R-2		vacant	-.174 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.996	0.000	0.174	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.822	0.996
3S38.8AB/5406	R-2		vacant	-.118 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.167	0.000	0.118	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.049	
3S38.8AA/3601	R-2		vacant		0.482	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.482	
3S38.8AA/3503	R-2		vacant		0.348	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.348	
3S38.8AA/3000	R-2		vacant		0.613	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.613	
3S38.8AA/3001	R-2		vacant		0.608	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.608	
3S38.9/1500	R-2		vacant	-.160 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	22.662	0.000	0.160	0.000	0.000	0.000	22.502	0.054
3S38.9/1600	R-2		vacant	3.771 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	30.540	0.000	3.771	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.769	
3S38.9/1500	R-2		vacant	-.16 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	15.378	0.000	0.160	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.218	0.054

3S38.4BC/1500	R-2		vacant	-.147 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	1.074	0.000	0.147	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.927	
3S38.4BC/1200	R-2		vacant	-.14 ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	1.158	0.000	0.140	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.018	
3S38.5AB/3703	R-2		vacant		0.124	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.124	
3S38.5AB/4300	R-2		vacant		0.576	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.576	
3S38.5AC/100	R-2		vacant		0.213	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.213	
3S38.5AB/4400	R-2		vacant		0.418	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.418	
3S38.4DC/200	R-3		committed	committed; subdividing	7.592	7.592	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8DB/1200	R-3		committed	west 1.6-ac committed (rest developed)	1.800	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.210	
3S38.6DB/3700	R-3		partial/redevelop	redevelopable	0.189	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.189	
3S38.8DA/3100	R-3		partial/redevelop	redevelopable; drive in; 1.356-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	6.264	0.000	1.356	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.908	6.264
3S38.8DA/1000	R-3		partial/redevelop	.36-ac committed (dev. limited by creek);-.526-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	1.017	0.360	0.526	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.131	0.872
3S38.8DA/2604	R-3		partial/redevelop	redevelopable;-.121-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.470	0.000	0.121	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.349	0.391
3S38.8DC/900	R-3		unbuildable	100' power easement; power lines (only 55' width outside of easement)	2.410	2.410	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
3S38.8AD/3203	R-3		unbuildable	undevelopable (vacant)	0.100	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.100
3S38.6DB/2602	R-3		vacant		0.301	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.301	
3S38.8DB/1404	R-3		vacant		3.063	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.063	
3S38.8DB/1406	R-3		vacant		0.288	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.288	
3S38.8DB/1405	R-3		vacant		0.280	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.280	
3S38.8DA/2900	R-3		vacant	vacant (w/barn-redevelopable)	3.441	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.441	2.482
3S38.8DA/2400	R-3		vacant	.01-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	1.461	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.451	1.291
3S38.8DD/501	R-3		vacant	-.19-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	0.630	0.000	0.190	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.440	0.095
3S38.8DD/500	R-3		vacant	-.976-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	3.250	0.000	0.976	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.274	1.232
3S38.8DD/300	R-3		vacant		0.230	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.230	0.140
3S38.8DD/100	R-3		vacant	1.259-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	2.764	0.000	1.259	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.505	2.766
3S38.8AC/2700	R-3		vacant		0.361	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.361	0.362
3S38.8DB/501	R-3		vacant		0.669	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.669	
3S38.8DB/1000	R-3		vacant		0.837	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.837	
3S38.8DB/1100	R-3		vacant		0.621	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.621	
3S38.8AC/9000	R-3		vacant		0.204	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.204	
3S38.8DA/2704	R-3		vacant	-.332-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	1.285	0.000	0.332	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.953	0.704

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning Districts

Parcel	Zone 1	Zone 2	TBAC Final Classification	Notes	Total Acres	Un-buildable Acres	Riparian Acres	Pond Acres	Greater than 3,000' acres	Other/ Combined Constraints	Final gross buildable acres	100 year flood-plain acres
3S38.8DA/2702	R-3		vacant	.047-ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	0.076	0.000	0.047	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.029	0.064
3S38.8DA/2402	R-3		vacant	.315-ac-unbuildable (riparian area)	1.462	0.000	0.315	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.147	1.313
3S38.8DA/1802	R-3		vacant		0.294	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.294	0.065
3S38.4DC/400	R-3		vacant		4.922	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.922	
3S38.4DC/100	R-3		vacant	subdividing	0.460	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.460	
3S38.4DC/300	R-3		vacant		5.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.020	
3S38.7DA/5600	R-P		partial/redevelop	50%-vacant; western half; riparian	1.288	0.644	0.040	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.604	
3S38.6DD/7600	R-P		vacant		0.232	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.232	
3S38.17CA/201	RR-4		partial/redevelop	6.92-acre lot (1 acre committed)	6.600	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.600	
3S38.17BD/800	RR-4		partial/redevelop	50% committed; pond	4.214	2.107	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.000	2.099	
3S38.16/900	RR-4		partial/redevelop	6.28-acres vacant (rest is committed); 1.398-ac unbuildable (riparian area)	12.482	6.202	1.398	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.882	
3S38.18/400	RR-4		vacant	.851-acres undevelopable (power line and riparian)	2.557	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.854	1.706	0.259
3S38.17/1700	RR-4		vacant	riparian; pond; >3000'; 1.339 acres undev (power line/riparian)	36.453	0.000	0.000	0.262	14.582	1.339	20.270	
3S38.17CA/202	RR-4		vacant	>3000'	1.165	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.469	0.000	0.696	
TOTALS					856.70	170.04	66.27	10.22	63.14	13.90	575.68	141.10

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001 from data provided by the City of La Grande (December 2000) and updated by the City of La Grande (March and May 2004).



BEFORE THE CITY OF LA GRANDE DECISION ORDER

Table I.4 below shows a summary of the data in Table I.3 by zoning district. As described previously, all commercially-zoned land with a final gross buildable land figure of less than 0.25 acres and all industrially-zoned land with a final gross buildable land figure of less than 0.5 acres have been classified as unbuildable. Since these sites are classified as unbuildable, the buildable acreage is treated as zero. In Table I.4 below, only sites classified as “vacant” and “partially vacant/redevelopable” contribute to the buildable acreage total.

Table I.4 Summary of Vacant Parcels within UGB by Zoning District

Primary Zone	Total			Vacant			Partially Vacant/Redevelopable			Committed		Unbuildable	
	Parcels	Total Acres	Buildable Acres	Parcels	Total Acres	Buildable Acres	Parcels	Total Acres	Buildable Acres	Parcels	Total Acres	Parcels	Total Acres
CB	2	0.34	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.34
GC	52	87.47	47.64	17	40.69	38.92	6	12.39	8.69	9	24.00	20	40.40
IC	7	3.62	0.98	4	0.98	0.98	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	6	2.64
M-1	20	6.27	1.32	4	0.60	0.60	4	0.72	0.72	6	2.84	12	2.14
M-2	17	112.04	78.99	4	12.26	10.87	7	91.81	68.12	4	1.28	8	6.69
HD	34	64.34	11.28	14	27.65	7.64	4	4.73	3.68	4	0.12	18	31.84
R-1	36	215.26	160.49	17	107.93	91.75	10	84.46	68.75	2	4.00	7	18.86
R-2	224	250.62	200.47	155	193.06	179.09	25	28.88	21.38	19	15.57	25	13.11
R-3	30	51.76	34.37	22	31.92	28.79	4	7.94	5.58	2	0.39	2	2.51
R-P	2	1.52	0.84	1	0.23	0.23	1	1.29	0.60	0	0.00	0	0.00
RR-1	6	63.47	35.25	3	40.18	22.67	3	23.30	12.58	0	0.00	0	0.00
Totals	430	856.70	571.59	232	455.50	381.50	58	255.54	190.09	40	57.16	100	88.53

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001.

Note: figures may not add due to rounding.

Table I.5 below shows the inventory for total parcels, vacant parcels and gross buildable land within the La Grande UGB.

Table I.5 Inventory of Vacant and Developed Land in the City of La Grande UGB

Zone		Total Parcels			Vacant Parcels				
		Total Acres	Total Parcels	Total Acres in Parcels	Acres	Parcels	Unbuildable Acreage	Buildable Acreage	Buildable Parcels
Non-Residential									
Commercial									
General Commercial	GC	390.6	537	324.5	87.5	52	39.9	47.6	23
Central Business	CB	35.0	113	19.4	0.3	2	0.3	0.0	0
Interchange Commercial	IC	29.5	35	26.8	3.6	7	2.6	1.0	1
Total Commercial		455.0	685	370.7	91.4	61	42.8	48.6	24
Industrial									
Light Industrial	M-1	191.8	106	69.0	6.3	20	5.0	1.3	2
Heavy Industrial	M-2	210.6	29	211.9	112.0	17	33.0	79.0	8
Total Industrial		402.4	135	281.0	118.3	37	38.0	80.3	10
Total Non-Residential		857.4	820	651.7	209.7	98	80.8	128.9	34
Residential									
Hillside Development Residential	HD	160.7	115	150.6	64.3	34	53.1	11.3	15
Rural Residential	RR-4	90.3	15	99.9	63.5	6	28.2	35.3	6
Low-Density Residential	R-4	316.8	173	324.1	215.3	36	54.8	160.5	27
Medium Density Residential	R-2	1,322.4	3,173	1,159.4	250.6	224	50.2	200.5	180
High Density Residential	R-3	302.7	548	239.9	51.8	30	17.4	34.4	26
Residential-Professional	R-P	64.9	155	53.1	1.5	2	0.7	0.8	2
Total Residential		2,257.9	4,179	2,026.9	647.0	332	204.3	442.7	256
TOTAL		3,115.3	4,999	2,678.6	856.7	430	285.1	571.6	290

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001.

Note: figures may not add due to rounding.

B. Net buildable acres by zoning district

Net buildable vacant acres are calculated by subtracting land needed for future public facilities from gross buildable vacant acres. For the purpose of this analysis, land needed for future facilities is defined as 25% of all non-public vacant land.

The calculations for subtracting 25% from gross buildable acres to convert to net buildable acres are shown in Table I.6 below.

Table I.6 Inventory of Net Buildable Land by Zoning District

Zone		Buildable Parcels	Gross Buildable Acreage	Net Buildable Acreage
Non-Residential				
Commercial				
General Commercial	GC	23	47.6	35.7
Central Business	CB	0	0.0	0.0
Interchange Commercial	IC	1	1.0	0.7
Total Commercial		24	48.6	36.4
Industrial				
Light Industrial	M-1	2	1.3	1.0
Heavy Industrial	M-2	8	79.0	59.2
Total Industrial		10	80.3	60.2
Total Non-Residential		34	128.9	96.7
Residential				
Hillside Development Residential	HD	15	11.3	8.5
Rural Residential	RR-1	6	35.3	26.4
Low Density Residential	R-1	27	160.5	120.4
Medium Density Residential	R-2	180	200.5	150.3
High Density Residential	R-3	26	34.4	25.8
Residential Professional	R-P	2	0.8	0.6
Total Residential		256	442.7	332.0
TOTAL		290	571.6	428.7

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001.

Note: figures may not add due to rounding

As shown in Table 1-6 above, there are 96.7 acres of net buildable non-residential land and 332.0 acres of net buildable residential land for a total of 428.7 acres of net buildable land on 290 parcels within the UGB of the City of La Grande.

II. Actual Density and Mix of Housing

A. Residential mix – City of La Grande

Table II.1 below shows the housing units built and demolished in La Grande from 1990 to 2000.

**Table II.1
 Total Number of Housing Units, 1990—2000**

Type of Housing	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total 1990-2000
Single-family	6	4	16	20	28	14	20	19	13	10	16	166
Multi-family	4	2	2	4	14	0	35	27	2	2	0	92
Manufactured homes (1)	6	17	23	20	24	27	50	44	33	28	18	290
Less demolition	3	2	2	1	4	2	0	2	7	4	6	33
Total	13	21	39	43	62	39	105	88	41	36	28	515

Notes: (1) includes manufactured homes in parks and manufactured homes on single-family lots. The total number of mobile homes within the City as of June 30, 2000 is 340. The total number of residents living in group facilities as of June 30, 2000 is 680.

Table II.2 indicates the number and percentage of housing units by type for the housing stock in the City of La Grande as a whole. Single-family units include manufactured homes on individual lots and single-family attached units.

As shown in Table II.2, there are an estimated total of 5,427 housing units in the La Grande City limits as of December 1999.

Table II.2 Residential Housing Types in the City of La Grande

	1990 Housing Mix ⁽²⁾	1990 Housing Mix %	New Housing (from 1990-2000) ⁽³⁾	New Housing %	Current Housing Mix (2000) ⁽⁴⁾	Current Housing Mix %
Single-family (detached and attached) ⁽¹⁾	3,165	64.4%	400	77.7%	3,565	65.7%
Multi-family	1,387	28.2%	81	15.7%	1,468	27.0%
Manufactured homes	306	6.2%	34	6.6%	340	6.3%
Other	54	1.1%	0	0.0%	54	1.0%
Total	4,912	100.0%	515	100.0%	5,427	100.0%

Notes: Manufactured home totals are for those in parks.

⁽¹⁾—City of La Grande does not distinguish between single-family detached and single-family attached in its data;

⁽²⁾—1990 U.S. Census

⁽³⁾—Data tabulated by the City of La Grande as shown in Table II.1. Includes 35 demolitions from 1990 to 2000 (assumes 11 each for manufactured home, single-family and multi-family units; also assumes that 245 manufactured home units shown in Table II.1 are on single-family lots and counted as single-family units in this table).

⁽⁴⁾—Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data and (3) above.

As shown in Table II.2, single-family units represent a greater share of the development that has occurred in the last ten years in La Grande compared to the 1990 overall housing type mix. In 1990 single-family housing represented 64.4 percent of the housing mix, with multi-family units and manufactured homes representing 28.2 percent and 6.2 percent, respectively. Of the housing built from 1990 to 2000, however, 77.7 percent were single-family homes (including manufactured homes built on single-family lots), while multi-family units and manufactured homes represented 15.7 percent and 6.6 percent of the new housing mix, respectively. In 2000, single-family units represent 65.7 percent of the total housing mix, with multi-family units and manufactured homes at 27.0 percent and 6.3 percent, respectively.

~~B. Residential density—City of La Grande~~

~~In order to determine the existing residential density in the City of La Grande, an inventory of all parcels in the Assessor's parcel database (provided by the City of La Grande and cross-referenced to the City of La Grande parcel database) that met the following criteria was made:~~

- ~~1. In the City of La Grande UGB and in a City of La Grande residential zone: R-1, R-2, R-3, R-P, RR-1, or HD Zone;~~
- ~~2. Listed as in residential use (SFD, SFA-1, MFA, or MHP) in the Assessor's parcel database, and not listed in the vacant parcel list (see Table I.3); and~~
- ~~2. Improved value listed as greater than zero in the Assessor's parcel database.~~

~~Residential units in zones other than those listed above were not considered for the purposes of this calculation. This is because the calculation is intended to provide direction for determining projected development densities in City of La Grande residential zones in the next 20 years. Residential density (in dwelling units per acre) was calculated using the following methodology:~~

- ~~• Average density: total dwelling units divided by total acreage;~~
- ~~• Median density: the median of the individual densities (dwelling units on the lot divided by lot size) for each developed lot, weighted by dwelling units;~~
- ~~• Average density totals: average density: total dwelling units divided by total acreage;~~
- ~~• Median density totals for each housing type: average of median densities for each component, weighted by dwelling units.~~

~~The median density figures shown in Table II.3 and II.4 below are a much more accurate representation of overall development density in La Grande than the average density figures. This is because the average density figures can be unduly swayed by extremely large or small lots. For example, in Table II.3, the average density of the 121 developed lots zoned R-1 is distorted by 14 lots larger than 1 acre (2.66, 2.46, 2.49, 2.38, 2.73, 2.86, 1.23, 1.02, 1.17, 2.07, 4.25, 1.95, 2.36, and 1.70 acres). These existing large lots do not provide an accurate picture of what lot sizes current R-1 zoning provides for. The R-1 Zone (Low Density Residential) is intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan designation of a low density residential land use of a density between 4 and 6 dwelling units per acre. The median density of 5.7 units per acre for existing lots reflects this more accurately.~~

~~As another example, the R-2 Zone is intended to develop at densities of 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre. The average density of existing development is well below this (at 4.05 units per acre. This is again due to a number of existing large lots that would not be allowed under current zoning.~~

**Table II.3 Existing Residential Development Density
 City of La Grande Residential Zones**

	Total Acreage	Developed Lots	Dwelling Units (DU)	Average Density (DU/acre)	Median Density (DU/acre)
Single-Family Detached (SFD)					
R-1 Zone	67.7	121	121	1.79	3.7
R-2 Zone	579.0	2,501	2,501	4.32	5.6
R-3 Zone	89.6	430	430	4.80	6.6
R-P Zone	16.7	94	94	5.61	6.7
RR-1 Zone	5.1	6	6	1.18	1.1
HD Zone	32.0	52	52	1.62	2.9
Total single-family detached	790.2	3,204	3,204	4.05	5.7
Single-Family Attached (SFA-1)					
R-2 Zone	27.5	126	252	9.16	11.0
R-3 Zone	2.9	19	38	12.90	13.9
R-P Zone	0.8	6	12	14.23	18.2
Total single-family attached	31.3	151	302	9.65	11.7
Multi-Family (MFA)					
R-2, R-3 and R-P zones	26.3	27	385	14.64	12.9
Manufactured Home Park (MHP)					
R-2 and R-3 zones	43.8	8	385	8.79	9.0
TOTAL	891.6	3,390	4,276	4.80	6.0

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001 from Assessor's parcel database provided by the City of La Grande.

As shown in Table II.3 above, the median density of existing single-family detached units in La Grande is 5.7 dwelling units per acre. Single-family attached units have a median density of 11.7 dwelling units per acre. Multi-family units have a median density of 12.9 dwelling units per acre and manufactured homes in parks have a median density of 9.0 dwelling units per acre. The overall median density in La Grande for all dwelling units in residential zones is 6.0 dwelling units per acre (weighted average of the median densities of single-family, multi-family, and manufactured home park units).

Table II.4 below shows residential development densities for recent development (1990-2000). This data was compiled for all single-family residential (detached or attached) parcels for which the "building year" field in the Assessor's parcel database was listed as 1990 or later. There were not sufficient multi-family units or manufactured home parks listed in the Assessor's parcel database as built in 1990 or later in residential zones to provide recent density figures for these units.

**Table II.4 Residential Development Density
 for Recent (1990-2000) Development
 City of La Grande Residential Zones**

	Total Acreage	Developed Lots	Dwelling Units (DU)	Average Density (DU/acre)	Median Density (DU/acre)
Single family (SFD)					
R-1 Zone	9.8	25	25	2.56	4.6
R-2 Zone	50.1	195	195	3.90	5.1
R-3 Zone	1.3	6	6	4.70	4.5
R-P Zone	0.6	2	2	3.47	3.9
RR-1 Zone	1.0	1	1	1.04	1.0
HD Zone	4.1	6	6	1.45	1.8
Total	66.8	235	235	3.52	4.9
Single family attached (SFA-1)					
R-2 Zone	1.3	6	12	9.58	10.0

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001 from Assessor's parcel database provided by the City of La Grande.

As shown in Table II.4 above, densities for single family detached and attached development for the last ten years are slightly below the densities for all existing development shown in Table II.3.

The objective of this section is to determine the amount of residential land needed in the City of La Grande for each needed housing type for the next 20 years.

The following analysis uses a methodology suggested by *Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas* produced by the Transportation and Growth Management Program (TGM). The steps used in this methodology have been followed to the greatest extent possible, given the data available for the City of La Grande. Since the City of La Grande is a small City, much of the data which is available for larger urban areas, such as Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) from the 1990 U.S. Census and detailed historical data from 1970 and 1980 U.S. Census is not available. Consequently, not all of the suggested analysis steps in the Workbook have been conducted.

A. New housing units needed in the next 20 years.

1. Existing population and historical growth

The Center for Population Research and Census is located in the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University. Its primary responsibility is to produce the official population estimates for Oregon's counties and incorporated cities. The most recent population estimates were released on December 13, 2000, for counties and cities in Oregon as of July 1, 2000, (these figures have been subsequently revised upwards for the City of La Grande and Union County by 460 people). As shown in Table III.1, PSU estimated the City of La Grande's population at 13,015, or 52.1 percent of the total Union County population of 24,960. As shown in Table III.1 below, the City estimates the population of the La Grande UGB at 14,015, or 56.1 percent of the total Union County population (based on an Urban Area population outside of City limits of 1,000).

U.S. Census figures for 2000 were released near the end of this study. They are not being used in this study because the City has evidence of an undercount and will be working through the Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) process to correct the problem. Block level data will not be available until some time between June and September of 2001 for the City to review and find undercounts. The process could take several months to resolve after that.

The 2000 Census showed a population of 12,327 in La Grande and 24,530 in Union County as of April, 2000, (compared to 13,015 and 24,960, respectively, shown in Table III.1 below).

2. Population projections

The following section summarizes population projections that have been made for La Grande and Union County. The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services is the main forecasting body for the State of Oregon. The latest Long Term Employment and Population Forecasts were released in January 1997. The forecast shows a Union County population projection of 26,971 in 2020.

Population estimates and projections for 1990, 2000, and 2020 are shown in Table III.1 below.

Table III.1 Population Estimates and Projections 1990-2020

	1990 ⁽¹⁾	2000 ⁽²⁾	2020 ⁽³⁾
Union County	23,598	24,960	26,971
La Grande UGB	-	14,015	-
City of La Grande	11,763	13,015	-

Notes: ⁽¹⁾ 1990 U.S. Census for City and County

⁽²⁾ State certified population estimate - PSU (for July, 2000); and City of La Grande estimate for UGB

⁽³⁾ 1997 Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) projection

Sources: 1990 U.S. Census

Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University

Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA)

City of La Grande

The growth rates implied by these estimates and projections are shown below. Table III.2 below shows the annual average growth rate (AAGR) for the population estimates and projections for Union County and the City of La Grande.

**Table III.2 Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
for Population Estimates and Projections 1990-2020**

	1990 Census – 2000 PSU Estimate	2000 PSU Estimate – 2020 OEA Projection
Union County	0.56%	0.39%
La Grande UGB	-	-
City of La Grande	1.02%	-

As shown in Table III.2, the annual average growth rate (AAGR) implied by the PSU population estimate for Union County in 2000 and the OEA forecast for 2020 is 0.39 percent. PSU estimates show an AAGR of 0.56 percent for Union County and 1.02 percent for the incorporated area of La Grande from 1990 to 2000.

3. Scenarios

The projection information from the above analysis is integrated into Table III.3 below. Two population projections are presented.

Scenario A is based on the official population estimates and projections from PSU and OEA. The population projection for the La Grande Urban Area is based on maintaining the same percentage of the total County population within the UGB as is estimated for 2000. Because of the findings of the 2000 U.S. Census, which showed that La Grande grew at an annual rate of only 0.49 percent during the 1990s, it appears that Scenario A is a closer indication of recent growth. While the City intends to plan for growth in accordance with the findings of Scenario A, the City intends to implement Scenario B in the future upon completion of further research, analysis and coordination with DLCD and OEA.

Scenario B is based on a higher growth rate for Union County and La Grande that will be proposed to the State of Oregon by Union County and the City of La Grande. This scenario assumes a 1 percent AAGR for Union County for the next 20 years and maintaining the same percentage of the total county population within the UGB as is estimated for 2000.

Scenario B is further justified by planned growth at Eastern Oregon University. Enrollment is projected to increase to 4,250 in twenty (20) years from the current enrollment of 2,000. While 83 percent of students currently reside on campus, this percentage is expected to decline as enrollment increases, since sufficient housing facilities will not be available. A total of fifty (50) faculty members, administrative and operational support staff are expected to be added in Phase I of the expansion, with another fifty (50) faculty members and administrative staff in Phase II.

This planned growth at Eastern Oregon University would have not only direct impacts to La Grande, but also would potentially generate indirect impacts because of spin-off ventures in the private sector that would be supported. These include research and development and bio-technology ventures that could take advantage of the trained workforce and university research efforts. Because of the private sector growth that it supports, growth at Eastern Oregon University can be assumed to generate additional employment and household growth beyond its direct impacts.

As shown in Figures III.3a and III.3b below, the growth rate for the La Grande urban area for 2000-2020 is 0.39 percent in Scenario A and 1.00 percent in Scenario B. Scenario A projects a population growth of 1,129 for the La Grande Urban Area, while Scenario B projects a population growth of 3,086 for the 2000-2020 period.

Table III.3a Scenario A – Population Projection 2000-2020

	Current Population (July, 2000)⁽¹⁾	Projected Population (2020)—OEA⁽²⁾	Projected Growth 2000-2020	% Increase	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Union County	24,960	26,971	2,011	8.1%	0.39%
La Grande UGB	14,015	15,144	1,129	8.1%	0.39%

Notes:

⁽¹⁾—2000 La Grande UGB population based on PSU estimated for the incorporated area + a population of 1,000 estimated by the City of La Grande as within the Urban Area and outside of City limits.

⁽²⁾—2020 Projected UGB population based on 56.15% share of total County population.

Table III.3b Scenario B—Population Projection 2000-2020

	Current Population (July, 2000)⁽¹⁾	Projected Population (2020)—OEA⁽²⁾	Projected Growth 2000-2020	% Increase	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Union County	24,960	30,456	5,496	22.0%	1.00%
La Grande UGB	14,015	17,101	3,086	22.0%	1.00%

Notes:

⁽¹⁾—2000 La Grande UGB population based on PSU estimated for the incorporated area + a population of 1,000 estimated by the City of La Grande as within the Urban Area and outside of City limits.

⁽²⁾—2020 Projected UGB population based on 56.15% share of total County population.

4. Household Projection

The average household size for new households in La Grande in the next 20 years has been estimated at 2.20 persons/household, based on an existing Citywide figure of 2.25 used by PSU. In general, average household size across the state is decreasing gradually and is projected to continue. In 1990, the persons per household figure in La Grande was 2.41 (based on 11,763 total population minus 582 people in group quarters, and then divided by 4,640 households).

The total number of new households in 2020 was projected by dividing the new projected population in 2020 by the projected average household size for new households. Table III.4 shows the results of this analysis for Scenarios A and B.

Table III.4 Scenarios A and B—New Household Projection 2000-2020

	Projected New Population (2020)	Projected Household Size for New Population	Projected New Households (2020)
La Grande UGB—Scenario A	1,129	2.20	513
La Grande UGB—Scenario B	3,086	2.20	1,403

Notes: Non-household population (person in group quarters) factored in by household size figure. There were an estimated 582 persons in group quarters in the City of La Grande in 1990 (U.S. Census)

As shown in Table III-4, there are 513 new households projected in Scenario A and 1,403 new households projected in Scenario B in the La Grande Urban Area in 2020. The projected total number of new housing units needed in the community in the next 20 years is equivalent to the projected number of new households.

B. National, state, and local demographic and economic trends and factors that may affect the 20-year projection of structure type and mix.

1 This section is intended to determine how the projected number of new households will be
2 distributed among different housing structure types in 20 years. In order to make this determination,
3 it is necessary to analyze factors that will likely influence housing choice in the future (e.g., the
4 decision to buy a single-family home as opposed to renting an apartment, the need for housing a
5 seasonal labor force, second homes in recreation areas).

6
7 Major state and national housing and demographic trends, which may influence the housing types
8 that will be needed in the next 20 years, are summarized below. This information about national
9 and state housing trends is a summary of information in *Planning for Residential Growth: A
10 Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas*.

- 11 ● Households are becoming smaller. More households are being formed by “empty nesters,”
12 young singles, and couples than by the “traditional family.”
- 13 ● Declining household sizes suggest (with other things, especially income, being equal) a shift
14 toward smaller-sized housing.
- 15 ● Age of the head of the household is increasing. Aging of the baby boomers is the primary cause
16 of this factor.
- 17 ● Greater household age generally indicates a greater propensity toward home ownership.
18 However, home ownership rates decline in the 65 and older age group. Older households also
19 have a tendency to “trade down” to smaller housing types as their children leave the household.
- 20 ● Household incomes are generally increasing though they have not kept pace with housing
21 prices or rents. Demand for more affordable housing types (e.g., manufactured homes,
22 apartments, townhouses, and small-lot single-family houses) will increase as housing costs
23 continue to outstrip income growth.

24
25 In conclusion, smaller households, older households and higher housing costs are expanding
26 markets for “alternative housing”. Housing types which will see greater demand include smaller-
27 lot single-family developments, manufactured housing, and duplexes.

28
29 At the same time, local trends in La Grande and Union County contradict some of the national
30 trends. There is a strong demand for traditional large lots with aesthetic amenities. La Grande's
31 quality of life and surrounding scenic beauty contributes to this need. Household size in La Grande
32 is slightly lower than the Statewide average and has been decreasing gradually.

33
34
35 **C. Local demographic characteristics of the population and, if possible, household trends that**
36 **relate to demand for different types of housing.**

37
38
39 Some of the best indicators of housing needs are household incomes by household size and age
40 of head of household. Ideally, an analysis would examine these statistics cross-tabulated against
41 each other. However, cross-tabulation of this data can only be obtained from Public Use Microdata
42 Samples (PUMS) from the 1990 Census for larger metropolitan areas. The smallest geographic
43 level for which PUMS data is available is 100,000 people. The PUMS area that includes the City
44 of La Grande contains all of the following counties: Gilliam, Wheeler, Morrow, Umatilla, Union,
45 Wallowa, and Baker. This information is not useful for conducting a housing analysis for the City
46 of La Grande. Therefore, non cross-tabulated data is examined separately in order to determine
47 the connection of this demographic information to housing need.

48
49
50 Unfortunately, 2000 Census numbers are not yet available and tabulations in the 1970 Census and
51 1980 Census for household income, household size, and age of householder are unavailable or
52 unavailable in the same format as the 1990 Census. For example, household size and household
53 income breakdowns are unavailable for places with less than 50,000 in population. Therefore, a
54
55

1 ~~trend analysis of these variables is impossible. The general trend analysis presented in Part B is~~
2 ~~a substitute for a more detailed trend analysis.~~

3
4 ~~Table III.5 below provides a summary of household income, age of the head of household,~~
5 ~~household size, and tenure for the City of La Grande in 1990. This information is examined in more~~
6 ~~detail in subsequent tables.~~
7

**Table III.5 City of La Grande
 Household Income, Size, Age of Head of Household, and Tenure, 1990**

	Number	% Share
Household Income		
<\$10,000 (Very Low)	1,148	24.7%
\$10-14,999 (Low)	548	11.8%
\$15-24,999 (Mid)	913	19.7%
\$25-34,999 (High-Mid)	742	16.0%
\$35-49,999 (High)	739	15.9%
>\$50,000 (Very High)	550	11.9%
Total	4,640	100.0%
Median Income	\$21,318	-
Household Size		
1	1,332	28.7%
2	1,674	36.1%
3	610	13.1%
4	595	12.8%
5+	429	9.2%
Total	4,640	100.0%
Age of Head of Household		
15-24	580	12.5%
25-34	855	18.4%
35-44	1,072	23.1%
45-54	520	11.2%
55-64	505	10.9%
65+	1,108	23.9%
Total	4,640	100.0%
Renter Households	2,141	46.1%
Owner Households	2,492	53.7%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

Note: Small discrepancies in the number of households are due to sampling in the Census tabulation.

Table III.6 below illustrates housing types broken down by tenure (whether the housing is renter- or owner-occupied).

1
2
3

4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Table III.6 City of La Grande Structure Type by Tenure, 1990

Structure Type	Renter-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	% Owner-Occupied	Vacant	% Vacant	Total
Single-family detached	689	22.9%	2,218	73.8%	98	3.3%	3,005
Single-family attached	131	81.9%	21	13.1%	8	5.0%	160
Multi-family (2+ units)	1,190	85.8%	42	3.0%	155	11.2%	1,387
Manufactured homes	111	36.3%	182	59.5%	13	4.2%	306
Other	20	37.0%	29	53.7%	5	9.3%	54
Total	2,141	43.6%	2,492	50.7%	279	5.7%	4,912

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

As shown in Table 3-6, in 1990 there were 4,912 housing units in the City of La Grande. Of these, 4,633 were occupied and 279 were vacant—a vacancy rate of 5.7 percent. Of the occupied housing units, 2,141 were renter-occupied (46.2 percent of occupied units and 43.6 percent of all units) and 2,492 were owner-occupied (53.8 percent of occupied units and 50.7 percent of all units).

Single-family detached housing units had the highest percentage of owner-occupancy. Single-family attached units were overwhelmingly occupied by renters. Apartments units had a large vacancy rate—11.2 percent—with almost all of the occupied units naturally occupied by renters. Manufactured homes were owner-occupied at almost a 60 percent rate, suggesting that these units are a popular alternative to ownership of single-family homes.

Table III.7 below examines housing tenure by the age classification of the head of the household.

Table III.7 City of La Grande Age of Household Head by Tenure, 1990

Age of Head of Household	Renter-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	% Owner-Occupied	Total
Under 25	602	97.3%	17	2.7%	619
25-34	592	71.1%	241	28.9%	833
35-44	388	38.5%	620	61.5%	1,008
45-54	164	33.7%	323	66.3%	487
55-64	115	23.1%	383	76.9%	498
65+	280	23.6%	908	76.4%	1,188
Total	2,141	46.2%	2,492	53.8%	4,633

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

As shown in Table III.7, propensity for home ownership in La Grande is the least among younger households and increases steadily with age.

Among the youngest householder age group (15-24 years), over 97 percent of households were renters in 1990, as compared to 46 percent of all households in La Grande. Household aged 25-34 also had large rental rates, with over 71% such households renting their housing. Household aged 35-44 and 45-54 were more representative of the population as a whole. For older householders aged 55-64, however, almost 77 percent owned their own home. This rate was almost identical for households with the head above the age of 65. Table III.8 below shows how income correlates with the age of the householder.

Table III.8 City of La Grande Age of Household Head by Income, 1990

Age of Head of Household	<\$10,000 (Very Low)	\$10,000-14,999 (Low)	\$15,000-24,999 (Mid)	\$25,000-34,999 (High-Mid)	\$35,000-49,000 (High)	\$50,000+ (Very High)	Total
Under 25	64.3%	11.0%	18.1%	4.1%	0.3%	2.1%	100.0%
25-34	20.8%	15.6%	20.6%	19.2%	16.8%	7.0%	100.0%
35-44	9.1%	9.1%	17.0%	20.5%	25.0%	19.2%	100.0%
45-54	14.8%	5.0%	11.9%	15.8%	24.0%	28.5%	100.0%
55-64	16.4%	4.2%	14.3%	24.0%	23.8%	17.4%	100.0%
65+	30.6%	18.6%	28.5%	11.8%	7.2%	3.2%	100.0%
Total	24.7%	11.8%	19.7%	16.0%	15.9%	11.9%	100.0%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

The median household income in 1990 for La Grande was \$21,318 (see Table III.5). Income ranges have therefore been divided into the categories shown in Table III.8.

As shown in Table III.8, 36.5 percent of all households were in the Very Low and Low income groups, 35.7 percent were in the Mid and High-Mid income groups, and 27.8 percent were in the High and Very High income groups.

Younger households where the age of the head of the household (householder) was in the under 25 age group had lower incomes than the population as a whole and many more households in the Very Low income group. Households where the householder was in the 35 to 44 and 45 to 54 age group had much lower percentages in the Very Low income group and had 44.2 percent and 52.5 percent rates, respectively, of households in the High and Very High income groups.

Households with the householder beyond retirement age (65+ years) had low income levels, with almost half of these households in the Very Low and Low income categories. However, it should be remembered that, relative to housing need, these households tend to be “cash poor and equity rich,” meaning that they have high home ownership rates (76 percent, see Table III.7) and have frequently paid off their mortgages. Therefore, the reduced income that these post-retirement households have does not necessarily translate into housing affordability problems.

Table III.9 below illustrates housing affordability among income groups. Note that due to the way the Census tabulates these figures, the income groups shown do not exactly correspond to the income groups in Table III.6.

Table III.9 City of La Grande Housing Affordability by Income Group, 1990

Income Group	Renter with Housing Cost Burden	Owner with Housing Cost Burden
<\$10,000 (very low)	84.80%	67.84%
\$10-19,999 (low)	34.64%	18.08%
\$20-34,999 (mid)	3.23%	6.42%
\$35-49,999 (high)	0.00%	1.44%
>\$50,000 (very high)	0.00%	0.00%
Total	44.26%	13.87%

1 ~~Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.~~

2
3 ~~A 'housing cost burden' is defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development~~
4 ~~(HUD) as a household which pays more than 30 percent of its gross income for housing, including~~
5 ~~utilities. As shown in Table III.9, 44 percent of all renter households and 14 percent of all owner~~
6 ~~households had a housing cost burden in 1990. However, housing cost burdens were concentrated~~
7 ~~almost exclusively among the lower income groups in La Grande. Of households with an income~~
8 ~~at less than \$10,000 per year, 85 percent of those renting and 68 percent of those owning their~~
9 ~~home had a housing cost burden. Among the households with an income of between \$10,000 and~~
10 ~~\$19,999, 35 percent of renters and 18 percent of owners had a housing cost burden. Of the~~
11 ~~households with incomes greater than \$20,000 there are no significant cost burdens experienced~~
12 ~~—except for 3 percent of renter-occupied households and 6 percent of owner-occupied households~~
13 ~~with incomes of \$20,000 to \$34,999 and 1 percent of owner-occupied households with incomes of~~
14 ~~\$35,000 to \$49,999.~~

15
16 ~~D. Housing types that are likely to be affordable to the projected population based on household~~
17 ~~income.~~

18
19 ~~The following types of housing are addressed by this study:~~

- 20
21 ~~• Detached single family houses~~
22 ~~• Attached single family houses~~
23 ~~• Multi-family apartments~~
24 ~~• Multi-family apartments for low income households (government-assisted)~~
25 ~~• Manufactured housing on single family lots~~
26 ~~• Manufactured housing in parks~~

27
28 ~~Table III.10 below illustrates the income groups in the City of La Grande in 1990, the percentage~~
29 ~~of total households that each income group represents, and the type of housing which is financially~~
30 ~~attainable by each group. This information is derived from the analysis in *Planning for Residential*~~
31 ~~*Growth: A Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas.*~~

32
33

**Table III.10 City of La Grande
 Households by Income Group and Type of Financially Attainable Housing**

Income Group	Household Income Range	% of Total Households in 1990	Financially Attainable Housing
Very low	<\$10,000	24.7%	Multi-family, manufactured homes in parks, subsidized housing
Low	\$10-14,999	11.8%	Attached single and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
Mid	\$15-24,999	19.7%	Single-family manufactured homes, attached single and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High-Mid	\$25-34,999	16.0%	Single-family detached on smaller lots, attached single and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High	\$35-49,999	15.9%	All housing types
Very high	>\$50,000	11.9%	All housing types

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, STF3A Database. Financially attainable housing list derived from *Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas*, TGM program, ODOT and DLCDC, p. 19.

E. Additional units needed by structure type.

Tables III.12a and III.12b below present a numerical distribution of the new projected needed housing types for each income group in the La Grande Urban Area in 2020 for Scenarios A and B. These distributions are based on Table III-10 above, estimates of current tenure by income, and projections of housing need by income group. Based on the analysis in parts B and C of this section, emphasis has been placed on a greater projected need for alternative housing types versus large-lot single-family residences in the next 20 years.

The relative distribution of income groups has been kept the same as in 1990, as shown in Tables III.8 and III.10. Homeownership/renter rates were distributed as follows:

Income Group	Owners/Renters
Very Low:	25/75%
Low:	35/65%
Mid:	55/45%
Mid-High:	65/35%
High:	75/25%
Very High:	85/15%

These percentages were allocated to the different housing types using the following formula:

Table III.11 City of La Grande Income Category by Housing Type

	Very low	Low	Mid	Mid-High	High	Very high
Owner-occupied						
Single-family detached	2%	7%	35%	61%	75%	85%
Single-family attached	3%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Apartments	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Manufactured homes	20%	24%	19%	4%	0%	0%
Subtotal	25%	35%	55%	65%	75%	85%
Renter-occupied						
Single-family detached	7%	10%	11%	13%	13%	9%
Single-family attached	4%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Apartments	44%	33%	19%	12%	11%	5%
Manufactured homes	20%	19%	13%	8%	0%	0%
Subtotal	75%	65%	45%	35%	25%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Table III.12a Scenario A
 Projection of New Households by Income Group and Housing Need**

	Very Low		Low		Mid		Mid-High		High		Very High		TOTAL	
	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units
Owner-occupied														
Single-family detached	2%	3	7%	4	35%	35	61%	50	75%	64	85%	52	74.7%	205
Single-family attached	3%	4	4%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2.6%	7
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0
Manufactured homes	20%	25	24%	15	19%	19	4%	3	0%	0	0%	0	22.7%	62
Total	25%	32	35%	21	55%	56	65%	53	75%	64	85%	52	100%	275
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	9	10%	6	11%	11	13%	11	13%	11	9%	5	22.2%	53
Single-family attached	4%	5	3%	2	2%	2	2%	2	1%	1	1%	1	5.0%	12
Apartments	44%	56	33%	20	19%	19	12%	10	11%	9	5%	3	49.1%	117
Manufactured homes	20%	25	19%	12	13%	13	8%	7	0%	0	0%	0	23.7%	57
Total	75%	95	65%	39	45%	45	35%	29	25%	20	15%	9	100%	238
Total	100%	127	100%	61	100%	101	100%	82	100%	82	100%	64	100%	513
Percentage out-of-Total Units	24.7%		11.8%		19.7%		16.0%		15.9%		11.9%		100%	

1
2

3
4
5
6

7
8

**Table III.12b Scenario B
 Projection of New Households by Income Group and Housing Need**

	Very Low		Low		Mid		Mid-High		High		Very High		TOTAL	
	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%	units
Owner-occupied														
Single-family detached	2%	7	7%	12	35%	97	61%	137	75%	168	85%	141	74.7%	564
Single-family attached	3%	10	4%	7	1%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2.6%	20
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0
Manufactured homes	20%	69	24%	40	19%	52	4%	9	0%	0	0%	0	22.7%	174
Total	25%	87	35%	58	55%	152	65%	146	75%	168	85%	141	100%	754
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	24	10%	17	11%	30	13%	29	13%	29	9%	15	22.2%	144
Single-family attached	4%	14	3%	5	2%	6	2%	4	1%	2	1%	2	5.0%	33
Apartments	44%	153	33%	55	19%	52	12%	27	11%	25	5%	8	49.1%	320
Manufactured homes	20%	69	19%	31	13%	36	8%	18	0%	0	0%	0	23.7%	155
Total	75%	260	65%	108	45%	124	35%	79	25%	56	15%	25	100%	654
Total	100%	347	100%	166	100%	276	100%	224	100%	223	100%	166	100%	1,403
Percentage out of Total Units	24.7%		11.8%		19.7%		16.0%		15.9%		11.9%		100%	

As shown in Table III.12a, in Scenario A, a total of 275 new owner-occupied units and 238 new renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2020 in the La Grande UGB, for a total of 513 housing units. As shown in Table III.12b, in Scenario B, a total of 751 new owner-occupied units and 651 new renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2020 in the La Grande UGB, for a total of 1,403 housing units. These figures, however, do not account for a structural vacancy rate for housing.

Tables III.13a and III.13b show the projected housing needs and allow for a structural vacancy rate for new units for Scenarios A and B, respectively. Vacancy rates are estimated at 3 percent for all new owner-occupied units and 6 percent for all new renter-occupied units. The projected needed housing mix is also compared to the housing mix within the City limits of La Grande as tabulated in the 1990 U.S. Census.

**Table III.13a Scenario A
 Projected Housing Needs by Housing Type and Tenure**

	1990 Housing Mix %⁽⁴⁾	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied					
Single-family detached	89.0%	74.7%	205	3.0%	211
Single-family attached	0.8%	2.6%	7	3.0%	7
Multi-family	1.7%	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	7.3%	22.7%	62	3.0%	64
Total	98.8%	100.0%	275	3.0%	283
% of housing mix	53.8%	-	53.6%	-	52.8%
Renter-occupied					
Single-family detached	32.2%	22.2%	53	6.0%	56
Single-family attached	6.1%	5.0%	12	6.0%	13
Multi-family	55.6%	49.1%	117	6.0%	124
Manufactured homes	5.2%	23.7%	57	6.0%	60
Total	99.1%	100.0%	238	6.0%	253
% of housing mix	46.2%	-	46.4%	-	47.2%
Total					
Single-family detached	61.2%	50.3%	258	3.6%	267
Single-family attached	3.3%	3.7%	19	4.9%	20
Multi-family	28.2%	22.8%	117	6.0%	124
Manufactured homes	6.2%	23.2%	119	4.4%	124
Total	98.9%	100.0%	513	4.4%	536

Notes:

⁽⁴⁾ Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.

1
2
3

4
5
6
7

**Table III.13b Scenario B
 Projected Housing Needs by Housing Type and Tenure**

	1990 Housing Mix %⁽⁴⁾	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied					
Single-family detached	89.0%	74.7%	564	3.0%	578
Single-family attached	0.8%	2.6%	20	3.0%	20
Multi-family	1.7%	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	7.3%	22.7%	174	3.0%	176
Total	98.8%	100.0%	754	3.0%	774
% of housing mix	46.6%	-	53.6%	-	52.8%
Renter-occupied					
Single-family detached	32.2%	22.2%	144	6.0%	153
Single-family attached	0.0%	5.0%	33	6.0%	35
Multi-family	0.0%	49.1%	320	6.0%	339
Manufactured homes	0.0%	23.7%	155	6.0%	164
Total	32.2%	100.0%	654	6.0%	694
% of housing mix	53.4%	-	46.4%	-	47.2%
Total					
Single-family detached	62.7%	50.3%	705	3.6%	731
Single-family attached	3.3%	3.7%	53	4.9%	55
Multi-family	26.6%	22.8%	320	6.0%	339
Manufactured homes	6.3%	23.2%	325	4.4%	340
Total	98.9%	100.0%	1,403	4.4%	1,464

Notes:

⁽⁴⁾ Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.

As shown in Table III.13a, taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 283 owner-occupied units and 253 renter-occupied units, for a total of 536 units, are projected to be needed over the next 20-year time period in Scenario A. This breaks down to 52.8 percent owner-occupied units and 47.2 percent renter-occupied units.

As shown in Table III.13b, taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 774 owner-occupied units and 691 renter-occupied units, for a total of 1,464 units (total is not sum of components due to rounding), are projected to be needed over the next 20-year time period in Scenario B. The projected tenure is the same as in Scenario A—52.8 percent owner-occupied units and 47.2 percent renter-occupied units.

F. Density range projected for each plan designation and the average projected density for all residential types.

Table III.14 shows the plan designations for residential zoning districts in the City of La Grande, the permitted and conditional residential uses for each zone, and the minimum lot sizes and maximum densities permitted. Note that the maximum allowed development densities are based on minimum lot sizes and therefore do not include the additional land required for streets and other infrastructure. Based on the maximum allowed densities in each residential zone, the density range to accommodate a wide variety of housing types is available.

Table III.14 Allowed Housing Types and Densities – City of La Grande Zoning Districts

Residential Zone		Permitted Residential Uses	Conditional Residential Uses	Minimum Lot Size	Maximum Allowed Density (Dwelling Units) (DUs) Per Acre
Hillside Development Residential	HD	Single family dwellings	none	1 acre	4
Rural Residential	RR-1	Single family dwellings	none	15,000 sq. ft. – individual lots – 17,000 sq. ft. – when creating 2 or more lots ⁽¹⁾	2.90
Low-Density Residential	R-1	Single family dwellings	PUDs	6,000 sq. ft. – individual lots – 8,700 sq. ft. – when creating 2 or more lots ⁽¹⁾	7.26
Medium Density Residential	R-2	Single family dwellings; duplexes	PUDs; accessory residential unit; manufactured home park	4,800 sq. ft. – individual lots – 7,000 sq. ft. – when creating 2 or more lots ⁽¹⁾ 1 duplex per 6,000 sq. ft.	9.08 for SF DU 14.52 for duplex
High Density Residential	R-3	Single family dwellings; duplexes; apartments	PUDs; accessory residential unit; manufactured home park	5,000 sq. ft. for first DU + 1,000 sq. ft. for each additional DU	8.71 for SF DU 14.52 for duplex 18.67 for triplex 31.11 for ten-plex
Residential-Professional	R-P	Single family dwellings; duplexes	Accessory residential unit; Multi-family – 5,000 1st unit; 1,000 each unit after; Attached single family.	5,000 sq. ft. – 1 duplex per 6,000 sq. ft.	8.71 for SF DU 14.52 for duplex

Source: City of La Grande Development Code (Chapter 2 – Land Use Zones)

Note: 3,000 square feet per unit for attached single family for zones R-1 through R-P.

⁽¹⁾ Refers to average lot size not to be exceeded.

The projected density range for each housing type is estimated below. This estimation is based on the types of structures that would be allowed in each designation and on an estimate of the density at which each structure type is likely to develop in the community.

Tables III.15a and III.15b below show net residential acreage needed by housing type in the La Grande Urban Area in 2020 for Scenarios A and B. Net land needs are calculated by dividing the number of needed units of each structure type by the density at which it is most likely to be developed for each type of housing. Since this figure does not take into account the land needed for public facilities (including streets and utilities) it is directly comparable to the “net buildable acreage” figure in Table I.6.

Projected development densities were developed by City of La Grande Staff based on current development activity.

Table III.15a Scenario A Acreage Needed by Housing Type

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	267	49.9%	4.00	66.8
Single-family attached	20	3.8%	8.00	2.5
Multi-family	124	23.1%	11.00	11.3
Manufactured homes in parks	124	23.2%	5.00	24.9
Total	536	100.0%	5.08	105.5

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table III.15b Scenario B Acreage Needed by Housing Type

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	731	49.9%	4.00	182.7
Single-family attached	55	3.8%	8.00	6.9
Multi-family	339	23.1%	11.00	30.8
Manufactured homes in parks	340	23.2%	5.00	67.9
Total	1,464	100.0%	5.08	288.3

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

In Scenario A, a total of 105.5 net acres of residential land are projected to be required over the next 20 years to meet the projected housing demand of 536 units, assuming that projected development densities are met.

In Scenario B, a total of 288.3 net acres of residential land are projected to be required over the next 20 years to meet the projected housing demand of 1,464 units, assuming that projected development densities are met.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

~~IV. Future Land Needs for Commercial and Industrial Land Uses~~

~~The objective of this section is to determine the amount of commercial and industrial land that will be needed in the UGB of the City of La Grande for the next 20 years. To do this, regional economic forecasts are examined in order to determine the land needed by industry sector and land use type.~~

~~The employment data that is presented in this section is only available at the county and, in some cases, the regional level. Specific employment data is not available for the City of La Grande or its UGB. For this reason, the analysis treats larger regional trends as applying to the City of La Grande. While this is not necessarily a generalization, it does provide a reasonable estimate of land use needs.~~

~~A. Existing employment patterns by sector.~~

~~Table IV.1 provides a summary of recent population and employment data for Union County for the 1990 through 1999 time period.~~

~~Table IV.1 Union County Recent Employment Data~~

Year	Population	Per Capita Income	Annual Average Covered Wage	Annual Average Unemployment %	Total Employment	Nonfarm Payroll Employment
1990	23,600	\$14,980	\$17,776	7.0%	10,950	9,020
1991	24,000	\$15,353	\$18,790	6.9%	10,880	8,820
1992	24,000	\$16,101	\$19,925	8.3%	10,970	8,930
1993	24,300	\$16,828	\$20,016	7.8%	11,350	9,240
1994	24,500	\$17,472	\$20,327	6.4%	11,750	9,400
1995	24,400	\$18,252	\$20,331	6.3%	11,560	9,470
1996	24,500	\$18,460	\$20,849	7.8%	11,650	9,550
1997	24,500	\$19,606	\$21,864	7.9%	11,460	9,630
1998	24,400	\$20,272	\$22,877	6.9%	11,690	9,680
1999	24,500	n/a	n/a	6.0%	11,530	9,760

~~Source: Oregon Data Sheets: Union County, Oregon Employment Department, April 1999.~~

~~As shown in Table IV.1, nonfarm payroll employment in Union County increased by 740 (from 9,020 to 9,760), or 8.2 percent, over the 1990 to 1999 time period. The population in Union County increased by 900, or 3.8 percent, over the same time period.~~

~~The following is a summary of recent economic trends in Union County provided by the Oregon Employment Department:~~

~~Slow but steady job growth best characterizes Union County's employment trends. Over the years, the county seems to have had fewer instances of boom-and-bust-type experiences than its neighbors. That means fewer really bad years but, also, fewer really good years. As an example, consider data from the late 1990s. Union County's nonfarm employers put together a net gain of 70 jobs in 1995, 80 jobs in 1996, 80 jobs in 1997, and another 80 jobs in 1998. You can't get much more consistent than that!~~

~~Before you start thinking that labor market conditions in Union County are completely predictable, you need to look at industrial differences, too. There's quite a lot of variation between the eight major industrial divisions.~~

~~Like the other counties of Northeast Oregon, wood products manufacturing is on a downward path here, too. The timber industry of Union County employed an estimated 870 workers in 1998, the fewest since 1964.~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

~~However, the loss of 370 wood products manufacturing jobs was almost entirely balanced by a gain of 340 jobs among other manufacturing companies in Union County. The number of jobs with these other manufacturers has more than doubled between 1990 and 1998.~~

~~The plight of the wood products industry is pretty well known by now. Far less attention has been given to job losses in Union County's transportation/communications/ utilities industry. On a percentage basis, transportation/ communications/utilities has suffered even more than wood products during the 1990s in Union County. Each of the three components— transportation and communications and utilities – shed jobs between 1990 and 1998. This industrial division has decreased in size for nine consecutive years now.~~

~~A leading contributor to Union County's net job growth in the 1990s has been the wholesale and retail trade division (+390). This portion of the economy has seen widespread job increases among many types of stores, the largest of which have been at eating and drinking places, general merchandise stores, and auto dealers and service stations.~~

~~Mirroring the pattern of Baker County, Union County's fastest growing industry of the 1990s (when measured by percent increase in jobs) has been construction and mining. In just eight years, employment in construction and mining is up by an amazing 113.3 percent in Union County. This isn't the result of some large, one-time project. It comes from general growth in the industry as well as reflecting just how low construction employment was in 1990.~~

Table IV.2 provides a summary of the most recently available figures for employment by industry in Union County.

Table IV.2 Union County Nonfarm Payroll Employment By Industry

	February 2001⁽¹⁾	% of Total
Total Employment	11,400	-
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment⁽²⁾	9,920	100.0%
Goods Producing ⁽³⁾	1,820	18.3%
Service Producing ⁽⁴⁾	8,100	81.7%
Manufacturing, Total	1,530	15.4%
Lumber and Wood Products	820	8.3%
Other Manufacturing	710	7.2%
Nonmanufacturing, Total	8,390	84.6%
Construction and Mining	290	2.9%
Transportation and Public Utilities	480	4.8%
Wholesale and Retail Trade	2,460	24.8%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	370	3.7%
Services	2,060	20.8%
Government	2,730	27.5%
Federal	180	1.8%
State	1,200	12.1%
Local	1,350	13.6%

Source: *Eastern Oregon Labor Trends*, Oregon Employment Department, April 2001.

Note: Estimates are subject to revision.

⁽¹⁾ Preliminary estimate.

⁽²⁾ Nonfarm payroll data are based on 1987 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) manual. The data are by place of work. Persons working multiple jobs are counted more than once. The data exclude the self-employed, volunteers, unpaid family workers, domestics, and persons involved in labor disputes. Persons on sick leave, vacations, or holidays, and being paid for that period by the employer, are considered employed.

⁽³⁾ Goods producing agencies include manufacturing, mining, and construction.

⁽⁴⁾ Service-producing industries include transportation, communications & utilities, real estate; services; and government.

As shown above, manufacturing accounts for 15.4 percent of the payroll employment in Union County (with Lumber and Wood Products accounting for 53.6 percent of manufacturing employment), with nonmanufacturing-related employment accounting for the remaining 84.6 percent. Of the major nonmanufacturing employment sectors, Trade accounts for 24.8 percent of total employment, Services accounts for 20.8 percent, and Government accounts for 27.5 percent.

B. Sector-level employment forecasts.

The following section summarizes regional employment projections and estimates the impact on the City of La Grande.

The following long-term employment forecast for Union County was prepared by the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) in 1997. As shown in Table IV.3 below, employment is projected to increase by 430 over the 10-year period from 2000 to 2010. It is projected to increase by another 61 over the next 10 years to the year 2020, for a total increase of 491 from 2000 to 2020.

The projected increase of 491 in employment from 2000 to 2020 represents a total increase of 5.1 percent, or an annual average growth rate (AAGR) of 0.25 percent for the twenty-year period (0.44 percent AAGR for 2000-2010 and 0.06 percent AAGR for 2010-2020) compared to the 1.30 percent AAGR for the 1990 to 2000 time period.

As these figures demonstrate, long-term economic forecasts call for a gradual slowing down of economic growth towards the second half of a 20-year time frame. This is consistent with Statewide and national forecasts.

Table IV.3 Union County Employment Forecast

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Union County	8,469	9,066	9,639	9,916	10,069	10,111	10,130

Source: Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, Long Term Population and Employment Forecasts, County Employment Forecasts, January 1997.

Table IV.4 shows employment projections made by the Oregon Employment Department for the 1998-2008 time frame. These projections were only made on a regional basis. Union County is part of Region 13, which included Union, Baker, Grant and Wallowa Counties when the forecast was made.

**Table IV.4 Employment Projections by Industry, 1998 – 2008
 Region 13: Union, Baker, Grant and Wallowa Counties**

	1998	2008	Change	% of Change	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	19,990	22,220	2,230	11.2%	1.06%
Goods Producing	3,730	3,960	230	6.2%	0.60%
Service Producing	16,260	18,260	2,000	12.3%	1.17%
Manufacturing, Total	2,930	3,060	130	4.4%	0.44%
Durable Goods	2,740	2,870	130	4.7%	0.46%
Lumber and Wood Products	1,820	1,700	-120	-6.6%	-0.68%
Other Durable Goods	920	1,170	250	27.2%	2.43%
Nondurable Goods	190	190	0	0.0%	0.00%
Nonmanufacturing, Total	17,060	19,160	2,100	12.3%	1.17%
Construction and Mining	800	900	100	12.5%	1.18%
Transportation, Communications and Utilities	1,050	1,120	70	6.7%	0.65%
Trade	4,690	5,270	580	12.4%	1.17%
Wholesale Trade	730	820	90	12.3%	1.17%
Retail Trade	3,960	4,450	490	12.4%	1.17%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Services	780	970	190	24.4%	2.20%
Health Services	1,260	1,370	110	8.7%	0.84%
Other Services	2,630	3,250	620	23.6%	2.14%

**Table IV.4 Employment Projections by Industry, 1998 – 2008
 Region 13: Union, Baker, Grant and Wallowa Counties (Continued)**

	1998	2008	Change	% of Change	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Government	5,850	6,280	430	7.4%	0.71%
Federal	1,010	1,000	-10	-1.0%	-0.10%
State	1,480	1,740	260	17.6%	1.63%
Local	3,360	3,540	180	5.4%	0.52%

Source: ~~The Benkendorf Associates Corp. based on Oregon Employment Department, *Industry Projections, 2008, Workforce Region 13, July 1, 1999*~~

~~As shown in Table IV.4, nonfarm payroll employment is expected to increase by 2,230 jobs in Region 13 over the 1998-2008 period—an AAGR of 1.06 percent. This is much greater than the 0.44 percent AAGR for employment for 2000-2010 for Union County made by the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) discussed above.~~

~~The employment projection made by the Oregon Employment Department (OED) in Table IV.4 shall be used as the basis for projections for the La Grande rather than the OEA projections. This is because the OED projection: 1) has a short term (10 year) growth rate projection similar to recent population growth rates in Union County (1.02 percent for 1990 to 2000); 2) is more recent than the OEA projection; and 3) breaks down employment projections by industry.~~

~~As shown in Table IV.4, manufacturing employment in Region 13 is expected to grow at a much lower rate than overall employment, with only a 4.4 percent total projected growth. The industry sectors with the greatest projected relative increases in employment are: Other Durable Goods (27.2%), Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate (24.4%), Other Services (23.6%) and State Government (17.6%). The industry sectors with the largest projected employment gains are: Retail Trade (490 jobs), Other Services (620 jobs) and State Government (260 jobs)~~

~~Table IV.5 below shows the 1998-2008 OED employment projection for Region 13. It also shows a projected 2020 employment projection extrapolated from the growth rate for the 1998-2008 period and the existing 2000 employment.~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

**Table IV.5 Employment Projection Summary, 1998–2018
 Region 13: Union, Baker, Grant and Wallowa Counties**

	2000 employment	2008 employment	change 1998- 2008	AAGR 1998- 2008	estimated 2020 employment	estimated employment growth 2000- 2020
Region 13	19,450	22,220	2,770	1.34%	26,070	6,620

Source: Oregon Employment Department (OED); The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

In order to apply these regional projections to the City of La Grande, several assumptions are made. These are listed as follows:

- The La Grande Urban Area will capture employment growth as a percentage of regional employment growth equivalent to the ratio of its projected population growth to the projected population growth of the region.
- The La Grande Urban Area will capture employment growth by industrial sector at the same rate as these industrial sectors make up total employment growth for the region. This assumption provides a useful assessment of the land necessary for employment growth if the City of La Grande is able to capture its 'fair share' of regional employment growth by industry.

The methodology used here is a basic "gravity model", commonly used in economic development analysis. The basic assumption behind this is that a locality will attract investment relative to a given region based on its relative size. In this case, population growth is used as a proxy for employment growth. This is done because there are no direct economic projections for La Grande (or indeed for any other sub-county area) broken down by industry.

Table IV.6 shows the projected 2020 population levels in Region 13 (1997 OEA projections) and the La Grande Urban Area in order to determine the share that the La Grande Urban Area represents of the Region 13 population.

Table IV.6 Union County and La Grande Population – 2000 & 2020

	2000 Population	2020 Projected Population	2000-2020 Growth
Scenario A			
Region 13 Total	56,860	64,357	7,497
Union County	24,960	26,971	2,011
Baker County	16,700	19,893	3,193
Grant County	8,000	9,245	1,245
Wallowa County	7,200	8,248	1,048
La Grande UGB	14,015	15,144	1,129
La Grande UGB as % of Union County	56.15%	56.15%	56.15%
La Grande UGB as % of Region 13	24.65%	23.53%	15.06%
Scenario B			
Region 13 Total	56,860	67,842	10,982
Union County	24,960	30,456	5,496
Baker County	16,700	19,893	3,193
Grant County	8,000	9,245	1,245
Wallowa County	7,200	8,248	1,048
La Grande UGB	14,015	17,101	3,086
La Grande UGB as % of Union County	56.15%	56.15%	56.15%
La Grande UGB as % of Region 13	24.65%	25.21%	28.10%

Sources: ~~Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University; Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA); TBAG.~~

~~As shown in Table IV.6, the population in the La Grande Urban Area was estimated at 24.65 percent of the total Region 13 population for 2000 and projected to decline to 23.53 percent of the total Region 13 population for 2020 under Scenario A. The projected population growth from 2000 to 2020 for the La Grande Urban Area represents 15.06 percent of total Region 13 population growth under Scenario A.~~

~~Under Scenario B, the population in the La Grande Urban Area is projected to increase to 25.21 percent of the Region 13 total in 2020. The projected population growth from 2000 to 2020 for the La Grande Urban Area represents 28.1 percent of total Region 13 population growth under Scenario B.~~

~~Table IV.7 below shows the employment projections for Region 13 converted to the La Grande Urban Area. The 2000 employment figure for the La Grande Urban Area was estimated by taking the current Union County nonfarm employment of 9,920 (see Table IV.2) and multiplying by the Urban Area share of the county population of 56.15 percent (see Table IV.6). The employment growth from 2000 to 2020 was estimated by multiplying the 2000-2020 Region 13 job growth of 6,620 (see Table IV.5) by the Urban Area share of the Region 13 population growth for 2000 to 2020 of 15.06 percent under Scenario A and 28.1 percent under Scenario B (see Table IV.6).~~

Table IV.7 Employment Projections, 2000-2020 La Grande Urban Area

	2000	Job-growth 2000-2020	2020 employment	%-growth 2000-2020	2000-2020 AAGR
La Grande UGB Scenario A	5,570	997	6,567	17.9%	0.83%
La Grande UGB Scenario B	5,570	1,860	7,430	33.4%	1.45%

~~Sources: TBAC, based on :Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, *Long Term Population and Employment Forecasts, County Employment Forecasts, January 1997*; and Oregon Employment Department, *Nonfarm Payroll Employment for Union County, July 2000*.~~

~~As shown in Table IV.7, under Scenario A, a total of 997 new jobs are projected for the La Grande Urban Area for 2020 for a total employment of 6,567. This is equivalent to a 0.83 percent annual average growth rate (AAGR). Under Scenario B, a total of 1,860 new jobs are projected for the La Grande Urban Area for 2020 for a total employment of 7,430. This is equivalent to a 1.45 percent annual average growth rate (AAGR).~~

~~Table IV.8 below shows the projected new employment by industry for the La Grande Urban Area for 2020. The relative percentages of the industry employment sectors are identical to those of the new employment shown in Table IV.4.~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Table IV.8 Employment Projections by Industry, 2000-2020 La Grande Urban Area

	% of Total	Employment Growth Scenario A	Employment Growth Scenario B
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	100.00%	997	1,860
Goods Producing	10.31%	103	192
Service Producing	89.69%	894	1,668
Manufacturing, Total	5.83%	58	108
Durable Goods	5.83%	58	108
Lumber and Wood	-5.38%	-54	-100
Other Durable Goods	11.21%	112	209
Nondurable Goods	0.00%	0	0
Nonmanufacturing, Total	94.17%	939	1,752
Construction and Mining	4.48%	45	83
Transportation, Communications and Utilities	3.14%	31	58
Trade	26.01%	259	484
Wholesale Trade	4.04%	40	75
Retail Trade	21.97%	219	409
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	8.52%	85	158
Services	32.74%	326	609
Health Services	4.93%	49	92
Other Services	27.80%	277	517
Government	19.28%	192	359
Federal	-0.45%	-4	-8
State	11.66%	116	217
Local	8.07%	80	150

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

G. Employee per acre ratios

The following table presents typical square foot per employee and land coverage ratios by land use and industry classification. These numbers are based on typical nationwide figures and modified slightly downward for the La Grande area. There is no data available at the local level for employee per acre ratios.

The coverage ratios listed in Table IV.9 refer to the typical land area which is taken up by a structure on its site. In other words, the 20 percent coverage ratio for industrial uses means that an industrial building will typically take up 20 percent of the land area on an industrial site. The employees per acre figure is calculated by dividing the square foot floor area per employee figure by the coverage ratio in order to determine the total land area per employee figure. This figure is then converted to employees per acre.

In Table IV.9 industry types are repeated for each land use type e.g., new retail trade is listed under industrial, office, and retail land uses. This is because employees of a certain industry work at jobs located on multiple land use types. For example, as shown in Tables IV.10a and IV.10b below, retail trade has a capture factor of 10 percent in industrial space, 2 percent in office space, and 88 percent in retail space. This means that, on average, 10 percent, 2 percent, and 88 percent of retail trade employment is in industrial, office, and retail space, respectively.

More compact, pedestrian-oriented development patterns might affect certain sector employee/acre ratios. Some of the office and retail land uses; particularly services and retail trade would be able to increase employee per acre ratios primarily by reducing parking lot size requirements. In this analysis for La Grande, standard ratios shall be used in order to avoid

underestimating land needs. If land use regulations which encourage compact, pedestrian-oriented development patterns are put into place, land use needs will be less than the estimates presented in this section.

Table IV.9 Allocated Employees Per Acre by Land Use Type and Industry

Land Use and Industry Type	Floor Area Per Job (sq. ft.)	Coverage Ratio	Employees per Acre
Industrial		20%	
Manufacturing	750		11.62
Construction and Mining	750		11.62
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	1,400		6.22
Wholesale Trade	1,100		7.92
Retail Trade	2,500		3.48
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	350		24.89
Services	350		24.89
Government	300		29.04
Office	-	25%	
Manufacturing	225		48.40
Construction and Mining	225		48.40
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	250		43.56
Wholesale Trade	225		48.40
Retail Trade	225		48.40
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	225		48.40
Services	250		43.56
Government	200		54.45
Retail	-	20%	
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	300		29.04
Retail Trade	500		17.42
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	300		29.04
Services	300		29.04

Source: Hobson Johnson & Associates and The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

D. Employee/acre ratios compared to employment forecasts by sector

Tables IV.10a and IV.10b applies the employee/acre ratios presented in Table IV.9 to the employment projections by sector for La Grande presented in Table IV.8. New jobs by sector are listed in the first column. Note that these figures are repeated for each land use type; i.e., new retail trade jobs are listed under industrial, office, and retail land uses. The capture factor refers to the rate at which the employees of a certain industry type work on a certain land use type. For example, as stated previously, retail trade has a capture factor of 10 percent in industrial space, 2 percent in office space, and 88 percent in retail space. This means that, on average, 10 percent, 2 percent, and 88 percent of retail trade employment is in industrial, office, and retail space, respectively. The capture factors are based on typical nationwide industry averages.

The adjusted new jobs figure refers to the employment in a specific land use type and industry sector after capture factors are taken into account. Floor area requirements are calculated based on the floor area requirements per job shown in Table IV.9. Land requirements are calculated by dividing the required floor area by the coverage ratio listed in Table IV.9.

**Table IV.10a Projection of Land Required by Employment Sector
 La Grande Urban Area, 2000-2020
 Scenario A**

Land Use and Industry Type	New Jobs -2000- 2020	Capture Factor	New Jobs- 2000-2020 (adjusted)	Floor Area Required (sq. ft.)	Land Required (net acres)
Industrial	-	-	245	208,534	23.9
Manufacturing	58	85%	49	37,052	4.3
Construction and Mining	45	60%	27	20,119	2.3
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	31	60%	19	26,289	3.0
Wholesale Trade	40	85%	34	37,622	4.3
Retail Trade	219	10%	22	54,768	6.3
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	85	10%	8	2,973	0.3
Services	326	25%	82	28,558	3.3
Government	192	2%	4	1,153	0.1
Office	-	-	263	59,822	5.5
Manufacturing	58	15%	9	1,962	0.2
Construction and Mining	45	40%	18	4,024	0.4
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	31	30%	9	2,347	0.2
Wholesale Trade	40	15%	6	1,358	0.1
Retail Trade	219	2%	4	986	0.1
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	85	80%	68	15,290	1.4
Services	326	25%	82	20,398	1.9
Government	192	35%	67	13,457	1.2

**Table IV.10a Projection of Land Required by Employment Sector
 La Grande Urban Area, 2000-2020
 Scenario A (Continued)**

Land Use and Industry Type	New Jobs -2000- 2020	Capture Factor	New Jobs- 2000-2020 (adjusted)	Floor Area Required (sq. ft.)	Land Required (net acres)
Retail	-	-	368	148,835	17.1
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	34	10%	3	939	0.1
Retail Trade	219	88%	193	96,392	11.1
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	85	10%	8	2,548	0.3
Services	326	50%	163	48,956	5.6
Total	-	-	876	417,194	46.5

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp. and Hobson Johnson & Associates

Note: Only 37% of all government jobs are captured in the land use categories in the table; the remainder are assumed to locate on public land

**Table IV.10b Projection of Land Required by Employment Sector
 La Grande Urban Area, 2000-2020
 Scenario B**

Land Use and Industry Type	New Jobs 2000-2020	Capture Factor	New Jobs 2000-2020 (adjusted)	Floor Area Required (sq. ft.)	Land Required (net acres)
Industrial	-	-	457	389,040	44.7
Manufacturing	108	85%	92	69,124	7.9
Construction and Mining	83	60%	50	37,534	4.3
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	58	60%	35	49,044	5.6
Wholesale Trade	75	85%	64	70,188	8.1
Retail Trade	409	10%	41	102,175	11.7
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	158	10%	16	5,547	0.6
Services	609	25%	152	53,277	6.1
Government	359	2%	7	2,152	0.2
Office	-	-	491	111,604	10.2
Manufacturing	108	15%	16	3,660	0.3
Construction and Mining	83	40%	33	7,507	0.7
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	58	30%	18	4,379	0.4
Wholesale Trade	75	15%	11	2,534	0.2
Retail Trade	409	2%	8	1,839	0.2
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	158	80%	127	28,526	2.6
Services	609	25%	152	38,055	3.5
Government	359	35%	126	25,106	2.3

**Table IV.10b Projection of Land Required by Employment Sector
 La Grande Urban Area, 2000-2020
 Scenario B (Continued)**

Land Use and Industry Type	New Jobs 2000-2020	Capture Factor	New Jobs 2000-2020 (adjusted)	Floor Area Required (sq. ft.)	Land Required (net acres)
Retail	-	-	686	277,665	31.9
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	58	10%	6	1,752	0.2
Retail Trade	409	88%	360	179,828	20.6
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	158	10%	16	4,754	0.5
Services	609	50%	304	91,332	10.5
Total	-	-	1,634	778,310	86.8

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp. and Hobson Johnson & Associates

Note: Only 37% of all government jobs are captured in the land use categories in the table; the remainder are assumed to locate on public land

As shown in Table IV-10a, a total of 23.9 net acres of industrial land, 5.5 net acres of office land and 17.1 net acres of retail land, for a total of 46.5 net acres of non-residential land is estimated to be needed over the next 20 years in the La Grande Urban Area in Scenario A. This table only takes into account land needs for 37 percent (2 percent in industrial space and 35 percent in office space) of government employment. The remainder is assumed to be located on the land zoned for public facilities and community services (PF Zone).

A total of 44.7 net acres of industrial land, 10.2 net acres of office land and 31.9 net acres of retail land, for a total of 86.8 net acres of non-residential land is estimated to be needed over the next 20 years in the La Grande Urban Area in Scenario B. Again, this table only takes into account land needs for 37 percent (2 percent in industrial space and 35 percent in office space) of government employment.

Tables IV.11a and IV.11b provides a summary of land needs for industrial, office, and retail land. The job growth and the net acreage figures are from Tables IV.10a and IV.10b. The jobs/net acre figure is calculated based on these figures. A standard vacancy rate of 10 percent has been applied to all new employment land needs.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

**Table IV.11a Employment Land Needs-2020, La Grande Urban Area
 Scenario A**

	Industrial	Office	Retail	Total
Job growth	245	263	368	876
Jobs/net acre	40.2	47.9	21.5	18.8
Preliminary buildable acres (net) needed by 2020	23.9	5.5	17.1	46.5
Vacancy rate	10%	10%	10%	10%
Total net buildable acres needed by 2020	26.3	6.0	18.8	51.2

Note: figures may not add due to rounding. Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

**Table IV.11b Employment Land Needs-2020, La Grande Urban Area
 Scenario B**

	Industrial	Office	Retail	Total
Job growth	457	491	686	1,634
Jobs/net acre	40.2	47.9	21.5	18.8
Preliminary buildable acres (net) needed by 2020	44.7	10.2	31.9	86.8
Vacancy rate	10%	10%	10%	10%
Total net buildable acres needed by 2020	49.1	11.3	35.1	95.5

Note: Figures may not add due to rounding.
 Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

As shown in Table IV-11a, a total of 26.3 net buildable acres of industrial land, 6.0 net buildable acres of office land and 18.8 net buildable acres of retail land (for a total of 24.8 net acres of commercial land) are projected to be needed for new employment needs in La Grande in 2020 in Scenario A, taking into account structural vacancy.

As shown in Table IV-11b, a total of 49.1 net buildable acres of industrial land, 11.3 net buildable acres of office land and 35.1 net buildable acres of retail land (for a total of 46.4 net acres of commercial land) are projected to be needed for new employment needs in La Grande in 2020 in Scenario B, taking into account structural vacancy.

V. 20-year land need compared to vacant buildable land

This section compares the mix of projected housing types to the mix of existing development; compares projected residential density to existing residential density; compares 20-year land need to land availability; and discusses whether any measures are required to meet housing mix or density projections, or to provide for additional land to address the residential, commercial, and industrial land needs for the next 20 years for the La Grande Urban Area.

A. Comparison of the existing housing mix with the projected housing mix.

Table V.1 below compares the current housing mix to the projected needed housing mix.

Table V.1 Existing and Projected Residential Mix

	1990 Housing (1)	Existing Housing (2000) (2)	Recent Housing Construction-Only (1990-2000) (3)	Projected New Needed Housing Scenario A (2000-2020) (4)	Projected New Needed Housing Scenario B (2000-2020) (5)					
Housing type	Units	Mix	Units	Mix	Units	Mix	Units	Mix	Units	Mix
Single-family detached and attached	3,165	64.4%	3,565	65.7%	400	77.7%	288	53.7%	786	53.7%
Single-family detached	3,005	61.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	267	49.9%	731	49.9%
Single-family attached	160	3.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20	3.8%	55	3.8%

Table V.1 Existing and Projected Residential Mix (Continued)

Multi-family units	1,387	28.2%	1,468	27.0%	81	15.7%	124	23.1%	330	23.1%
Manufactured homes in parks	306	6.2%	340	6.3%	34	6.6%	124	23.2%	340	23.2%
Other	54	1.1%	54	1.0%	0	0.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	4,912	100.0%	5,427	100.0%	515	100.0%	536	100.0%	1,464	100.0%

- (1) From Table III.6
- (2) From Table II.2
- (3) From Table II.2
- (4) From Table III.13a
- (4) From Table III.13b

As shown in Table V.1 above, the projected new housing mix is roughly equivalent to the existing (2000) housing mix. A higher percentage of manufactured homes are projected to be needed to meet housing demand. Single-family detached homes and multi-family units are projected to be needed at lower rates.

B. Comparison of the existing net density for specific housing types with the needed net density ranges.

Table V.2 below compares the current housing density to the projected density for new housing. The existing housing density and recent housing development density (1990-2000) in the City of La Grande was obtained from Tables II.3 and II.4. Projected density figures were obtained from Tables III.15a and III.15b.

Table V.2 Existing and Projected Residential Mix

Housing Type	Existing Density (2000)	Recent Density (1990-2000)	Maximum Allowed Density (Current Zoning Districts)	Projected Density for New Housing (2000-2020)
Single-family detached	5.7	4.9	HD Zone: 1.00; RR-1 Zone: 2.16; R-1 Zone: 5.00; R-2 Zone: 6.20; R-3 Zone: 8.71; R-P Zone: 8.71	4.0
Single-family attached	11.7	10.0	R-2, R-3 and R-P Zones: 14.52	8.0
Multi-family units	12.9	n/a	R-3 Zone: 18.67 for triplex, 31.11 for ten-plex	11.0
Manufactured homes in parks	9.0	n/a	R-2 Zone: 5.00; R-3 Zone: 8.71	5.0
Total	6.0	n/a		5.4

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

As shown in Table V.2 above, the projected housing densities for new housing are less than existing housing densities and recent housing densities. As discussed previously, the projected housing densities were provided by City of La Grande Staff, based on current development activity.

C. Comparison of net buildable acreage needed to net buildable acreage available

Table V.3 below shows the assumptions used to calculate the number of potential residential units on the net buildable acreage figures by zoning district shown in Table I.6. The density ranges are from Table V.2 above. The calculations make the following assumptions regarding housing types for each zone:

- 0. 100 percent of the parcels in the HD, RR-1, and R-1 zones will develop as single-family detached units;
- 0. 60 percent of the land in the R-2 zone will develop as single-family detached units, 5 percent will develop as single-family attached units, 5 percent will develop as multi-family units (duplexes), and 30 percent will develop as manufactured home park units;
- 0. 80 percent of the land in the R-3 zone will develop as multi-family units and 20 percent will develop as manufactured home park units; and
- 0. 10 percent of the land in the R-P zone will develop as single-family detached units, 10 percent will develop as single-family attached units, and 80 percent will develop as multi-family units (30% as duplexes and 50% as other multi-family units).

Table V.3 Projected Residential Units on Net Buildable Land

Residential Zone		Net buildable acreage	Density (DU/acre) and residential type (percentage)	Potential Residential Units Single-family detached	Single-family attached	Multi-family	Manufactured homes	Total units
Hillside Development Residential	HD	8.5	1.0—single-family detached	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	8
Rural Residential	RR-1	26.4	2.0—single-family detached	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	53
Low Density Residential	R-1	120.4	4.0—single-family detached	481	n/a	n/a	n/a	481
Medium Density Residential	R-2	150.3	4.0—single-family detached (60%); 8.0—single-family attached (5%); 11.0—multi-family (duplex) (5%); 5.0—manufactured home parks (30%)	364	60	83	226	730
High Density Residential	R-3	25.8	11.0—multi-family (80%); 5.0—manufactured home parks (20%)	n/a	n/a	227	26	253
Residential-Professional	R-P	0.6	4.0—single-family detached (10%); 8.0—single-family attached (10%); 11.0—multi-family (duplex) (80%—30% duplex, 50% other)	0	4	6	n/a	7
Total		332.0		903	64	316	252	1,532

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

As shown in Table V.3 above, a total of 1,532 units are estimated to be able to be built on the 332.0 net acres of buildable residential land, for an overall density of 4.61 units per net acre.

Tables V.4a and V.4b below show needed residential units and acreage compared to available land and potential units for the 2000-2020 time period.

Table V.4a Projected Additional Needed Residential Acreage Scenario A

Type of unit	Net Acreage Needed (1)	Allocated Units (1)	Net Buildable Acreage Available (2)	Potential Units on Net Buildable Acreage (3)	Deficit (Surplus) of Units	Additional Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	66.8	267	298.4	903	(636)	-
Single-family attached	2.5	20	7.8	64	(41)	-
Multi-family	11.3	124	7.7	316	(192)	-
Manufactured homes in parks	24.9	124	18.0	252	(128)	-
Total	105.5	536	332.0	1,532	(996)	-

(1) From Table III.15a

(2) From Table I.6

(3) From Table V.3

**Table V.4b Projected Additional Needed Residential Acreage
 Scenario B**

Type of unit	Net Acreage Needed (1)	Allocated Units (1)	Net Buildable Acreage Available (2)	Potential Units on Net Buildable Acreage (3)	Deficit (Surplus) of Units	Additional Needed Acreage
Single-family detached	182.7	731	298.4	903	(172)	-
Single-family attached	6.9	55	7.8	64	(6)	-
Multi-family	30.8	339	7.7	316	23	2.1
Manufactured homes in parks	67.9	340	18.0	252	88	17.5
Total	288.3	1,464	332.0	1,532	(68)	-

(1) From Table III.15b

(2) From Table I.6

(3) From Table V.3

As shown in Table V.4a above, under Scenario A, there are 105.5 acres of net buildable residential land projected to be needed for 536 units. There are 332.0 acres of net buildable residential land available with a total potential of 1,532 units based on current zoning and density projections. Overall, there is a surplus capacity of 996 units.

As discussed previously and shown in Table III.3a, Scenario A is based on a projected annual average growth rate (AAGR) of 0.39 percent for population for the twenty-year planning period from 2000 to 2020. The number of housing units in La Grande increased by 515 from 1990 to 2000 (see Tables II.2 and V.1), an AAGR of 1.0 percent, while population grew at a 1.02% AAGR from 1990 to 2000 (based on 1990 Census figures and 2000 PSU figures, see Table III.2). Scenario A, based on the official state population forecast for Union County, does not take these recent growth rates into account.

Scenario B is based on an AAGR of 1.0 percent that mirrors actual growth rates in La Grande from 1990 to 2000. Under Scenario B, there are 288.3 acres of net buildable residential land projected to be needed for 1,464 units. There are 332.0 acres of net buildable residential land available with a total potential of 1,532 units based on current zoning and density projections. Overall, there is a surplus capacity of 68 units. However, there is a projected deficit of 23 multi-family units and 88 manufactured home units based on current zoning. These units would require 2.1 acres and 17.5 acres of vacant buildable land, respectively, based on the density assumptions (11.0 and 5.0 units/acre), for a total of 19.6 acres.

The City has a desire to provide residential areas with 1-acre lot sizes to attract higher-end residential communities. The City feels that it is losing out on this market to other communities in the region that offer this housing type. The provision of 1-acre lots is not reflected in the analysis above and could require additional land beyond that shown in the analysis unless compensated for by increasing densities elsewhere.

Table V.5 below shows the comparison of net buildable acreage needed to net buildable acreage available in the La Grande Urban Area for commercial and industrial land for the next twenty years.

Table V.5 Projected Additional Needed Commercial and Industrial Acreage

Zone	Net Buildable Acreage	Net Buildable Acreage Needed	Net Buildable Acreage Needed	Deficit (Surplus) of Net Buildable	Deficit (Surplus) of Net Buildable

		Available (1)	Scenario-A (2)	Scenario-B (3)	Acreage Scenario-A	Acreage Scenario-B
Commercial						
General Commercial	GC	35.7	-	-	-	-
Central Business	CB	0.0	-	-	-	-
Interchange Commercial	IC	0.7	-	-	-	-
Total Commercial		36.4	24.8	46.3	(11.6)	9.9

Table V.5 Projected Additional Needed Commercial and Industrial Acreage (Continued)

Industrial		-	-	-		
Light Industrial	M-1	1.0	-	-	-	-
Heavy Industrial	M-2	59.2	-	-	-	-
Total Industrial		60.2	26.3	49.1	(33.9)	(11.1)
TOTAL		96.7	51.2	95.5	(45.5)	(1.2)

- (1) From Table I.6
- (2) From Table IV.11a
- (3) From Table IV.11b

As shown in Table V.5, in Scenario A, there are surpluses of both commercial and industrial land (11.6 and 33.9 net buildable acres, respectively). Scenario B shows a deficit of 9.9 acres of commercial land and a surplus of 11.1 acres of industrial land.

The figures above are based on land demand that is strictly accounted for in employment projections. However, this does not account for the ability of La Grande to compete successfully against other communities in the region for large scale commercial and industrial projects that require large sites. As shown in Table I.3, there is only one commercially zoned site that has more than 10 acres of gross buildable area (Parcel #3S38.9CC/101 with 12.12 acres) and only one additional site with more than 5 acres of gross buildable area (Parcel #3S38.9CD/100 with 5.22 acres). As shown in Table I.3, there is only one industrially zoned site that has more than 30 acres of gross buildable area (Parcel #3S38.16/500 with 36.72 acres of gross buildable area) and only four additional sites with more than 5 acres of gross buildable area (Parcel #3S38.16/600 (10.76 acres), Parcel #3S38.16/690 (11.64 acres), Parcel #3S38.16AD/101 (5.10 acres), and Parcel #3S38.16AD/100 (10.87 acres)).

In order to have the potential to attract large scale commercial or industrial operations, La Grande requires additional commercial and industrial land beyond what is strictly indicated by the employment forecast. The additional land should allow for large scale commercial development and industrial development. Under current conditions, potential large scale commercial and industrial facilities will need to “assemble” a site, which is costly and time consuming. If companies can find a suitable development site in another City in this region, they will likely chose it over a redevelopment site in La Grande. Unfortunately, a surplus land condition exists in at least two (2) cities in this region that received Urban Growth Boundary acknowledgement several years before La Grande. La Grande’s relatively tight land supply makes it difficult to compete with these “land rich” communities.

Table V.6 below shows the total gross acreage needs for commercial and industrial land, with the addition of the potential for large scale commercial and industrial development to the net land needs shown in Table V.5.

**Table V.6 Gross Needed Commercial and Industrial Acreage,
 Including Large Sites**

Zone	Scenario A Deficit (Surplus) of Net Buildable Acreage (1)	Scenario B Converted to Gross Acreage (2)	Additional Gross Acreage Needed for Large Sites	Total Gross Acreag e Neede d	Deficit (Surplus) of Net Buildable Acreage (1)	Converted to Gross Acreage (2)	Additional Gross Acreage Needed for Large Sites	Total Gross Acreag e Neede d
Total Commercial	(11.6)	(14.5)	80.0	65.5	9.9	12.4	80.0	92.4
Total Industrial	(33.9)	(42.4)	160.0	117.6	(11.1)	(13.9)	160.0	146.1
Total Non-Residential	(45.5)	(56.9)	240.0	183.1	(1.2)	(1.5)	240.0	238.5

(1) From Table V.5

(2) Net acreage plus 25%

As shown in Table V.6 above, if these large tracts of commercial and industrial land can be justified in the future Scenario A requires 65.5 additional gross acres of commercial land and 117.6 additional gross acres of industrial land within the UGB, for a total of 183.1 acres of non-residential land. Scenario B requires 92.4 additional gross acres of commercial land and 146.1 additional gross acres of industrial land within the UGB, for a total of 238.5 acres of non-residential land. Again, the City recognizes that further research, analysis and coordination with DLCD and OEA will need to occur before such large scale commercial or industrial lands could be added to the Urban Growth Boundary.

Policies

- 0. ~~The City recognizes that public interest requires that every citizen be given the opportunity to provide themselves with safe, sanitary and adequate housing.~~
- 0. ~~That an adequate housing supply will be encouraged through development of new dwelling units, maintenance or rehabilitation of existing units, and removal of dwelling units unsuitable for rehabilitation.~~
- 0. ~~That all types of residential units, including mobile home, modular and manufactured units, are acceptable resources of housing and that recognition will be reflected in zoning, building codes and other regulatory means without compromising quality standards.~~
- 0. ~~That quality residential environments will be assured by considering safety, health, design, provision of services and overall ecology in the area.~~
- 0. ~~The City will exercise primary governmental control in any housing activities which occur within the City limits, including those activities undertaken or assisted by other governmental organizations.~~
- 0. ~~The City will assertively develop and use effective techniques to assure that its housing policies are implemented and administered.~~
- 0. ~~A mix of low and moderate cost housing should be encouraged, but an undue concentration in any area should be avoided.~~
- 0. ~~That medium density residential be located away from activities which generate heavy traffic and are otherwise incompatible with living areas.~~
- 0. ~~That medium density residential areas be located with reference to shopping and other public and private services and be provided with good access to centers of employment.~~
- 0. ~~That planned developments and duplexes be included in medium density residential areas provided the density does not exceed 10 units per gross acre.~~

- ~~1. That high density residential areas be located in such a manner as to be provided with good access to arterial streets, shopping facilities, schools, and major employment centers.~~
- ~~1. That high density development be located so that traffic generated by the high density development will not be required to travel through areas of lesser density en route to principal community facilities.~~
- ~~1. That high density development be located in areas where municipal utility facilities economically can be provided at a level adequate to meet the demand for the concentrated service.~~
- ~~1. That the street pattern within the residential neighborhood permits convenient circulation and easy, safe access to neighborhood parks and schools.~~
- ~~1. That residential areas be developed in a manner that provides a healthful, aesthetically pleasing atmosphere, and in a manner that affords safe and convenient access to neighborhood commercial centers, schools, and other public facilities.~~
- ~~1. That certain non-residential uses be located within residential areas if careful control is exercised over their location and their relationship to abutting property.~~

~~Recommendations—~~

- ~~0. The City encourage development of residential units in an amount and variety sufficient to accommodate a wide range of taste and income levels.~~
- ~~0. The City work cooperatively with private developers and investors to solve the problem of development of suitable housing for low income levels.~~
- ~~0. The City protect residential property values from depreciating influences consistent with overall objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.~~
- ~~0. "Planned unit developments" and other innovative design and development techniques should be encouraged to provide freedom in land development and assist in achieving land use plan objectives.~~
- ~~0. The City should review and process applications promptly and expeditiously so as to not unnecessarily impede developmental processes.~~
- ~~0. Provision should be made for the satisfactory accommodation of off-site built housing within the City.~~
- ~~0. The Land Development Code should allow for the location of manufactured homes within the City on residential lots and manufactured homes in manufactured home parks, providing certain conditions are met as stipulated in the Land Development Code.~~
- ~~0. The Land Development Code should provide for the location of certain non-residential uses, subject to conditions that would serve to preserve the residential character of the neighborhood.~~
- ~~0. That high density residential areas be used as a transitional use between certain commercial areas and medium density residential uses.~~
- ~~0. High density areas be encouraged around existing and proposed major commercial areas and near the Eastern Oregon University campus.~~
- ~~0. The City's zoning ordinance should be revised to reflect the residential density established by the land use plan and more than 2 residential zones should be provided for.~~
- ~~0. Residential development in most of the City should be planned at a density of between 5 and 10 dwelling units per net acre.~~

-
- ~~1. Provisions for planned high density residential developments should be included in the zoning ordinance in the high density zone, to provide for greater freedom in development than that permitted by strict interpretation of the zoning ordinance requirements.~~
 - ~~1. Ensure that residential development meets projected densities. Projected densities have been set low to correspond with recent development patterns, but the City should still examine measures to encourage residential densities to approach the maximum allowed in each zone.~~
 - ~~1. Ensure that the R-3 zone does not develop with single family units and that the R-2 zone does not develop with more than the assumed 60 percent of land devoted to single family detached units. The assumptions of the number of multi family and manufactured home units that could develop on vacant R-2 and R-3 zoned sites are dependent on the mix of land devoted to each housing type shown in Table V.3.~~
 - ~~1. Rezone some R-2 land to R-3 to allow for additional multi family units and manufactured home units, or take steps to encourage greater production of manufactured home parks and/or multi family units on R-2 zoned land. Scenario B shows a shortfall of a total of 2.1 acres of land for multi family development and 17.5 acres of land for manufactured home units.~~
 - ~~1. Encourage the development of residential areas designed to attract higher end residential uses as may be desired by "footloose" entrepreneurs, high income retirees and others.~~
 - ~~1. Conduct a study to determine feasibility of adding large sites to the Urban Growth Boundary for industrial and commercial uses under Scenario A. The first phase of this study should be a Target Industries Analysis.~~
 - ~~1. If large lot commercial or industrial lands can be justified after further study, said lands shall be protected by large lot zoning to ensure that such lands are not subdivided down to sizes that preclude the type of land uses being sought.~~
 - ~~1. Upon acceptance of the one percent (1%) growth rate by the Office of Economic Analysis, add land to the Urban Growth Boundary or convert other lands for commercial uses. The new land areas should allow for large scale commercial development.~~
 - ~~1. Upon acceptance of the one percent (1%) growth rate by the Office of Economic Analysis, add land to the Urban Growth Boundary or convert other lands for industrial uses. The new land areas should allow for large scale industrial development.~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

EXHIBIT B

**Statewide Planning Goal 10
Oregon Administrative Rules**

Findings of Fact

OAR CHAPTER 660, DIVISION 8 – INTERPRETATION OF GOAL 10 HOUSING

This division is intended to provide standards for compliance with Goal 10 “Housing” and to implement ORS 197.303 through 197.307. [660-008-0000]

OAR 660-008-010 – Allocation of Buildable Land

The mix and density of needed housing is determined in the housing needs projection. Sufficient buildable land shall be designated on the comprehensive plan map to satisfy housing needs by type and density range as determined in the housing need projection. The local buildable lands inventory must document the amount of buildable land in each residential plan designation.

Finding: The 2019 buildable lands inventory (BLI) was conducted in conformance with OAR 660, Division 8. This standard is met.

Mix and density of needed housing. Section II of the BLI outlines the projected 20-year housing need for the City of La Grande by tenancy. A table is provided in Exhibit 2.16 that is sorted by housing need categories, one for “owner housing” and another for “renter housing.” Within each category, the table identifies the number of housing units needed over the next 20-years for single-family detached, townhomes/plexes, multi-family (5+ units), mobile/manufactures homes, and group quarters. The total need for all housing types over the next 20-years is 795 housing units. A second table was provided under this exhibit that identifies the same owner vs. renter housing types, but breaks down the need by low, medium and high density. The BLI takes this a step further by breaking down these numbers into five (5) income levels from extremely low income (less than 30% of the median) to upper income (120% or more of the median), with attainable housing products identifies for each income level.

Buildable lands maps and buildable lands in each residential zone designation. Section III of the BLI explains how the buildable lands inventory was conducted by evaluating each of the City’s six (6) residential zone classifications. In addition, the City allows residential uses within two (2) of its commercial zones, which were also included in the inventory and evaluation.

The BLI took into consideration all of the lands within each land use zone, subtracting constrained lands (floodplain, steep slopes and riparian areas) and public facilities and rights-of-way, and found that the City has 358 net buildable acres for new residential development. This was further broken down into the different zone density classification (low, medium, high and commercial/mixed use) with the buildable land amount reflected with each classification. (See BLI maps and tables in Exhibits 3.3-3.11)

Section IV, Exhibit 4.2 evaluates the number of housing units needed (795), breaking this amount down into zone classifications (low, medium and high density), and identifies that 146 net acres are needed to achieve the needed housing unit density. This Exhibit then compares the land need (146 net acres) with the number available acres in the various zoned (358 net acres), which shows that the City has a surplus of 212 net acres. Based on this, the City has surplus buildable land within the City’s UGB and sufficient capacity to accommodate the 20-year housing needs.

OAR 660-008-0015 – Clear and Objective Approval Standards Required

A local government may adopt and apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of needed housing on buildable land. The standards, conditions and procedures may not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.

Finding: The provisions of this OAR are not applicable to this Comprehensive Plan amendment request. This OAR guides local governments in preparing land use codes and

standards that would be adopted into the local zoning ordinance or land development code. The HNA proposed for adoption into the Goal 10 Chapter of the City of La Grande Comprehensive Plan (see Decision Order Exhibit A) does not include or recommend specific development standards, conditions or procedures for adoption into the City of La Grande Land Development Code Ordinance.

OAR 660-008-0020 – Specific Plan Designations Required

Plan designations that allow or require residential use shall be assigned to all buildable land. The plan designations shall be specific so as to accommodate the varying housing types and densities identified in the local housing needs projection.

Finding: This standard is met. As identified in BLI Exhibit 4.2, plan designations (classifications) are currently assigned to all buildable lands. The City's existing Comprehensive Plan map identifies areas within the City zoned for low, medium and high density residential classifications. Within each zone classification, the City has sufficient buildable land to accommodate identified over the 20-year forecast projected.

Low Density:	109 acre need; 191 acres available; 82 acre surplus
Medium Density:	23 acre need; 152 acres available; 129 acre surplus
High Density:	14 acre need; 14 acres available; 0 acre surplus

- OAR 660-008-0025 – The Rezoning Process
- OAR 660-008-0030 – Regional Coordination
- OAR 660-008-0035 – Exceptions
- OAR 660-008-0040 – Restrictions on Housing Tenure

Finding: The above OAR subsections are not applicable to this Comprehensive Plan amendment request. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments do not include any rezoning, regional plan coordination, exceptions process, or any restrictions on the construction of new housing or requirements for owner vs. renter occupied. Some of these items may be relevant in a future plan amendment as part of considering a housing production strategy (HPS), but these are not relevant as part of this HNA.

OAR CHAPTER 660, DIVISION 15 – STATEWIDE PLANNING GOAL 10 HOUSING

OAR 660-015-0000(10) refers to a Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines publication provide by the DLCDD for Goal 10 – Housing. As part of updating and addressing Goal 10 requirements, the following guidelines are provided for developing plans:

PLANNING

1. *In addition to inventories of buildable lands, housing elements of a comprehensive plan should, at a minimum include:*
 - (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 residencies in each community;*
 - (5) *An inventory of sound housing in urban areas including units capable of being rehabilitated.*
2. *Plans should be developed in a manner that insures the provision of appropriate types and amounts of land within urban growth boundaries. Such land should be necessary and suitable for housing that meets the housing needs of households of all income levels.*

3. *Plans should provide for the appropriate type, location and phasing of public facilities and services sufficient to support housing development in areas presently developed or undergoing development or redevelopment.*
4. *Plans providing for housing needs 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.*

Finding: It's important to recognize that the above guidelines are not requirements, but rather are elements that "should" be considered as part of a Goal 10 update. With that said, the HNA does take into consideration and evaluate most of these guidelines.

Planning Guidelines 1(1), 1(2) and 1(5) were not included in the HNA due to the lack of availability of detailed information that identifies the locations within the City of individuals at various income levels, the rent costs for various housing choices or the physical conditions of a property to determine the feasibility for rehabilitation.

Planning Guidelines 1(3) and 1(4) were included in the HNA. General information was available for the US Census or State agencies on income levels, which were then compared with the cost of housing choices and affordability. This information is presented in the HNA, predominantly in Section II and IV. To address the various housing needs, the City has low, medium and high density residential zones that allow for a variety of housing choices and varying densities throughout the community.

Planning Guideline 2 was addressed in the HNA. HNA Exhibits 2.19 and 2.20 identify the various income levels and their housing needs. This is further discussed in HNA Section 4 with discussions and exhibits that identify housing choices and densities that various choices may accommodate. HNA Exhibit 4.2 identifies the different zones within the City where such housing choices may be constructed, with a conclusion demonstrating that the City has a surplus of land zoned appropriately for the development of housing to accommodate all income levels.

Planning Guideline 3 was not discussed in any detail as part of the HNA. This should be included in future housing discussions as part of developing a housing production strategy in accordance with HB2003. However, as the City has sufficient lands, even a surplus, the City will not be considering any expansion efforts following the adoption of this HNA. The City has a valid public facilities plan (water, sewer and storm water) and transportation plan that demonstrates that services can be provided to all residential lands within the UGB. The timing and construction of services to vacant lands is addressed at the time development is proposed.

Planning Guideline 4 was partially addressed in the HNA. This guideline is more relevant to County planning where resource lands are affected. With the City, the focus is on lands subject to natural hazards. This includes lands within the floodplain, wetlands, riparian areas and geologic hazard areas. For other resource protections, the City prohibits new development to be served with well and septic systems, which helps preserve and protect aquifers and other natural resources. Additionally, this allows for further urbanization of the City at the densities encouraged by the HNA.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

EXHIBIT C

**City of La Grande
Comprehensive Plan
Findings of Fact**

1 **ANALYSIS OF APPLICABLE STANDARDS**

2 Comprehensive Plan Document Amendments are subject to the Planning Commission and City Council
3 review procedures and subject to the review criteria contained in the City of La Grande Land
4 Development Code Ordinance 3242, Series 2018 (LDC), Article 8.9, Section 8.9.003, which includes
5 conformance with applicable State laws, such as the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and recent
6 Legislative action.
7

8 **A. LDC SECTION 8.9.003 – REVIEW CRITERIA**

9 *A proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment shall be approved if the reviewing authority finds:*

10 *A. That the proposed amendment is in compliance with Oregon Planning Goals; and,*

11 **Finding:** Exhibit B of this Decision Order addresses Oregon Statewide Plan Goal 10, as
12 well as the Oregon Administrative Rules applicable to a Goal 10 Housing update. The
13 requirements have been satisfied as provided in Exhibit B above.
14

15 *B. That the proposed amendment is in conformance with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;*
16 *and,*

17 **Finding:** This proposed Goal 10 update is subject to the goals and policies set forth in
18 Goals 1 (Citizen Involvement) and Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) of the Comprehensive Plan.
19 Other goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan as specific to other long range
20 planning efforts that are outside of the scope of this Goal 10 Comprehensive Plan
21 amendment. Other goals and policies that are not applicable include park master planning,
22 natural disaster planning, economic development planning, water/sewer infrastructure
23 planning, transportation planning, and others.
24

25 **Citizen Involvement.** This is Comprehensive Plan Goal 1, which includes goals and
26 policies that requires a public process where citizens are informed of the proposed Plan
27 amendments and have the opportunity be engaged in the review and adoption process.
28 The process discussed below satisfies the citizen involvement policies provided in Goal 1.
29 Also, see Exhibit D below, outlining and discussion the City’s public engagement process.
30

31 The land use process implemented by the City follows the procedural requirement in LDC
32 Chapter 9, Articles 9.3-9.6. The adoption process will include a minimum of three (3) public
33 hearings before City officials, one (1) hearing before the Planning Commission and two (2)
34 hearings before the City Council. Subsequently, three (3) additional hearings will be held,
35 one (1) before the Union County Planning Commission and two (2) before the Union
36 County Board of Commissions for co-adoption. In preparation for these hearings, the City
37 Planning Department provides a City-wide public notice that is mailed to all property
38 owners within the City. The public notice includes a link to the City’s webpage, where
39 meeting materials and other information is published and made available for citizens to be
40 informed of the proposed Plan amendments, meeting dates are identified and information
41 is provided as to how citizens can engage in the process.
42

43 In advance of the public hearing process, as part of preparing the HNA, the City formed an
44 advisory committee that was made up of citizens in the community that represented various
45 housing interests. The Committee met on 4+ different occasions to review and advise on
46 the consultant’s draft HNA. In the Spring 2019 (February and April), the City held one (1)
47 open house that was open to the public, along with one (1) joint work session of the
48 Planning Commission and City Council, where the consultant presented the HNA and
49 received comments and recommendations from participants. These meetings were
50 advertised, along with public service announcements being read over local radio and other
51 on-line media.
52
53
54

1
2 Land Use Planning: This is Comprehensive Plan Goal 2, which is very similar to Statewide
3 Planning Goal 2, and Review Criterion C below. This Goal includes goals and policies that
4 require code amendments to be made on a factual basis (e.g. studies) and a demonstrated
5 “need” for the proposed change. This Goal has been adequately discussed and address
6 as part of the Findings for Statewide Planning Goals in Exhibit B above, as well as in
7 Review Criterion C below.
8

- 9 **C.** *The proposed amendment is supported by specific studies or other factual information which*
10 *documents the public need for the amendment.*
11

12 **Finding:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Goal 10 amendment is supported by a
13 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) study that was prepared for the City of La Grande by FCS
14 Group (see Exhibit B of this Decision Order). The project was funded by the Oregon
15 Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and included input and
16 collaboration from several partners that included City of La Grande Staff, the La Grande
17 Planning Commission, and an HNA Advisory Committee that was comprised of housing
18 agency representatives and housing advocates serving La Grande and Union County
19

20 The need for this HNA was based in part on the fact the City of La Grande’s current housing
21 needs analysis was prepared around 2001, based on trends and recommended
22 methodology used at that time which is now considered outdated. Since the City’s 2001
23 HNA, Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.296 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)
24 660-008 have been amended and now include more comprehensive requirements for
25 conducting HNAs, and evaluating and projecting housing needs that are affordable for all
26 income ranges within a community.
27

28 In 2018, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 4006, which requires cities with a
29 population of 10,000 people or greater, and which have at least 25 percent of the renter
30 households within the cities being severely rent burdened, to proactively take steps to
31 reduce barriers causing rent burdens. These steps are intended to be addressed through
32 conducting a new HNA and adopting goals and policies that would be adopted by the City.
33

34 The City of La Grande was identified as being severely rent burdened, and was awarded
35 technical assistance funding by the DLCD to conduct a new HNA to update the Goal 10
36 Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. The scope of the HNA was based on the 2018 draft
37 of House Bill 2003, which the Oregon Legislature later passed in 2019, and which set forth
38 the requirements for preparing HNAs in accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)
39 197.296 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-008 which implement Statewide
40 Planning Goal 10 – Housing.
41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

EXHIBIT D

Public Hearing Summaries

Including

Public Engagement – Public Comments

1
2 In accordance with LDC Chapter 9, Articles 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 and 9.6, the adoption process includes a minimum
3 of three (3) public hearings before City officials and three (3) public hearings before County officials, see
4 Public Hearing Schedule on page 1 of this Decision Order.

5
6 A minimum of six (6) public meetings were scheduled, all of which were open to the public for citizen
7 involvement. Below is a summary of each meeting held. The City of La Grande Planning Division provided
8 a City-wide public notice, which was mailed to all property owners within the City. The public notice includes
9 a link to the City's webpage, where meeting materials and other information was published and made
10 available for citizens to be informed of the proposed Plan amendments, meeting dates and how citizens
11 can engage in the process.

12
13 **A. Notice of Public Hearings**

14 In advance of holding public hearings, the following public notices were provided in accordance
15 with City and/or State laws:

- 16
17 1. Notice to DLCD of Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA). State law requires that
18 proposed changes to local comprehensive plans, along with supporting documents and
19 implementing regulations be submitted to DLCD for review a minimum of thirty-five (35) days
20 in advance of the first evidentiary hearing. For this application, the first evidentiary hearing was
21 scheduled before the City of La Grande Planning Commission on October 13, 2020. Notice
22 was provided to DLCD via PAPA Online on September 3, 2020.
23
24 2. Notice City-wide of Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments. In accordance with LDC
25 Article 9.6, Section 9.6.001(A), notices of public hearings on legislative matters shall be
26 provided a minimum of twenty (20) days, but not more than forty (40) days before the schedule
27 hearing. With the first hearing before the Planning Commission scheduled for October 13,
28 2020, notice must be mailed by September 23, 2020 (20-days) but not later than September 3,
29 2020 (40 days). In this case, notice was mailed on September 16, 2020, which is 27-days in
30 advance of the first public hearing.

31
32 The city-wide public notice identified both the Planning Commission public hearing scheduled
33 for October 13, 2020 and the City Council public hearing scheduled for November 4, 2020.
34 Additionally, public notice was provided to local media and published on the City's website.
35 Resources for download were made available via the City's website at
36 <https://planning.cityoflagrande.org>, which included information on meeting dates and copies of
37 materials (e.g. HNA, Draft Decision Order, and Draft Implementing Ordinance).
38

39 **B. Public Hearing #1, before the Planning Commission on October 13, 2020**

40 Due to Governor Brown's Executive Order 20-16, this Planning Commission meeting was held by
41 electronic communications via Zoom meetings and broadcast live on the City of La Grande City
42 Manager's Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/LaGrandeCityManager> where the public
43 could watch and listen to the public hearing live. Public comments or questions were requested to
44 be submitted in writing in advance of the meeting, which were read into the record during the public
45 comment section of the public hearing. In accordance with City of La Grande Land Development
46 Code Ordinance (LDC) 3242 Series 2018, Chapter 9, public notice was mailed to the owners of
47 properties located within one hundred feet (100') of the subject property.
48

49 The following public comments were submitted in advance of the public hearing and were read into
50 the record:

- 51
52 1. (Exhibit D¹) Louise Dix, Housing and Land Advocates (HLA) & Fair Housing Council of Oregon
53 (FHCO), submitted a letter in support of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the
54 Goal 10 Housing Chapter, and the adoption of the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA). The letter
55 concluded with a recommendation that encourages the City of La Grande "to go further in its'

1 *analysis in the future, including valuable data within the HNA, covering such topics as housing*
2 *insecure individuals and racial demographics.”*
3

4 **Finding:** The letter from Ms. Dix requested that actions to consider additional
5 demographic populations be taken in the future, and not specifically as part of adoption
6 this Housing Needs Analysis (HNA). For future considerations, the City is currently in the
7 process of developing a Housing Production Strategy (HPS), which State law requires that
8 racial, ethnic and other populations be considered. For completing the HPS, the City has
9 received grant funding from the State and has contracted with a consultant to prepare the
10 HPS. The consultant has been provided with Ms. Dix’s letter and they intend to conduct
11 additional demographic analysis as required by State law.
12

- 13 2. (Exhibit D²) Housing Matters Union County, submitted a letter in support of the proposed
14 Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Goal 10 Housing Chapter, but pointing out that the
15 HNA only shows a need for 235 new dwelling units for low and extremely low income
16 households. Referring to data from the US Census (ACS 2013-2017), it is suggested that 866
17 low income households are cost burdened. Housing Matters Union County asks that the City
18 incorporate the additional 631 households into the HNA. Additional, Housing Matters Union
19 County asked that additional data be included from the Department of Human Services SNAP
20 program and school homeless student data be included which reflects that 153 students faced
21 homelessness in the La Grande School District (6.5% of students).
22

23 **Finding:** As the Planning Commission considered the letter from Housing Matters Union
24 County, the Commission inquired as to the discrepancy in the HNA number of 235 vs. the
25 Census number of 866. With the numbers being considerably different, the Commission
26 recognized that the 235 figure represented the housing need over the next 20 years.
27 However, insufficient information was provided to determine what the 866 number
28 represented. Based on the testimony and reference, the Commission pointed out that 866
29 appears to represent the number of existing low income households, not necessarily that
30 this is the amount of new housing needed. No action was taken or recommendation made
31 as the 235 vs 866 appear to represent different statistics and are not the same.
32

33 Secondly, the HNA was completed in 2019 based on the best available data at the time.
34 The analysis was conducted by FCS Group, which is a professional consulting firm
35 experienced in conducting demographic analysis and they performed such analysis in
36 accordance with the State law requirements for the Housing Needs Analysis, which was
37 vetted and approved by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
38 as meeting State law requirements. While considering the recommended additional data
39 sources (SNAP and school homelessness counts) in this analysis would be desirable, it is
40 unknown if such data is broken down to counts specific to the City of La Grande, or to a
41 wider population that includes County residents within the La Grande School District
42 boundaries. Also, it is unknown whether such data would influence the outcomes of the
43 HNA.
44

45 Planning Commission Conclusions: As the HNA was prepared completed by FCS Group in 2019,
46 vetted and supported by the DLCD as satisfying State law requirements for HNAs, the Planning
47 Commission does not recommend delaying adoption of the HNA to conduct further analysis, but
48 rather recommends that the HNA move forward to the City Council for adoption.
49

50 By unanimous vote, the Planning Commission approved the following motion: *“that the Finding of*
51 *Fact and Conclusions set forth in the Draft Decision Order be adopted and that the Proposed*
52 *Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the 2019 Housing Needs Analysis be Recommended*
53 *to the City Council for approval.”*
54
55

-
- 1 **C. Public Hearing #2, before the City Council, and First Reading of the adopting Ordinance by**
2 **Title Only.**
3 To be completed subsequent to this public hearing.
4
5
6 **D. Public Hearing #3, before the City Council, and Second Reading of the adopting Ordinance**
7 **by Title Only.**
8 To be completed subsequent to this public hearing.
9
10
11 **E. Public Hearing #4, before the Union County Planning Department for Co-Adoption.**
12 To be completed subsequent to this public hearing.
13
14
15 **F. Public Hearing #5, before the Union County Board of Commissioners, and Second Reading**
16 **of the adopting Ordinance by Title Only.**
17 To be completed subsequent to this public hearing.
18
19
20 **G. Public Hearing #6, before the Union County Board of Commissioners, and Second Reading**
21 **of the adopting Ordinance by Title Only.**
22 To be completed subsequent to this public hearing.
23
24
25
26
27



City of La Grande

OCT 13 2020

Received
Planning/Economic Dev Dept.

D'
EXHIBIT

October 12, 2020

City of La Grande Planning Commission
1000 Adams Avenue
P.O. Box 670
La Grande, OR 97850

RE: 01-CPA-20

Repeal and Replace the Goal 10 Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and the adoption of a Housing Needs Analysis.

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is submitted jointly by Housing Land Advocates (HLA) and the Fair Housing Council of Oregon (FHCO). Both HLA and FHCO are non-profit organizations that advocate for land use policies and practices that ensure an adequate and appropriate supply of affordable housing for all Oregonians.

Both HLA and FHCO commend the planning staff for their thoughtful and thorough analysis of 01-CPA-20 within the Goal 10 findings of the staff report. Additionally, the HNA to be adopted has much within it to be commended, including in depth regulations related to supporting subsidized, low cost, and rental housing. However, we encourage the City to go further in its' analysis in the future, including valuable data within the HNA, covering such topics as housing insecure individuals and racial demographics.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Louise Dix".

Louise Dix
AFFH Specialist
Fair Housing Council of Oregon

Cc: Gordon Howard, DLCD

1221 SW Yamhill Street, Portland, Oregon 97205



October 13, 2020



Dear La Grande Planning Commission:

Housing Matters Union County (HMUC) greatly appreciates the efforts of the Planning Commission, the City Council and the City Planner in addressing housing needs in our community. We are pleased to see the city has adopted a housing goal in their current priorities. The HMUC vision is safe, affordable, and stable housing for all. We share this common ground, and both want to see our community members adequately housed and able to prosper. With the adoption of the Housing Needs Analysis report, we wish to express the following comments:

Goal 10 of Oregon Land Conservation and Development and ORS 660-008 is important because adequate housing is critical for community health.

Goal 10 definitions state that:

- "Housing Needs Projection" refers to a local determination, justified in the plan, of the mix of housing types, amounts and densities that will be.
- Commensurate with the financial capabilities of present and future area residents of all income levels during the planning period.
- "Needed Housing" means housing types determined to meet the need shown for housing within an urban growth boundary at particular price ranges and rent levels

Housing Matters Union County supports the general HNA preference for an adequate housing supply for current and future needs. Currently, **one out of every four residents** is severely rent burdened, meaning more than half of their income goes towards housing. This leaves very little money to pay for other necessities, to create a savings, invest in education, participate in recreation or prepare for emergencies. Research show that people become homeless when rent burdened and the unpredictable happens.

Goal 10 is explicit in requiring a plan to address housing needs for all income levels. To that end, the HNA should include data regarding the number of low- and moderate-income households, those earning less than 50% of the area median income, and the number of housing units needed to meet the housing needs. HNA exhibits 2.18 -2.20 only show planning for 235 units for low and extremely low-income households. Currently, 866 low income households are cost burdened in La Grande. (source ACS 2013-2017).

Housing Matters Union County asks that the city incorporate the additional 631 households into the HNA, to show the true level of need in La Grande. We ask that city housing goals be evaluated to fully incorporate the actual need and explain how the city will address this rent burden for all community members represented in the data. We would also like to include data from Department of Human Services SNAP program that shows in the month of August 2020, 265 individuals were experiencing homelessness. Finally, we would ask the school homelessness student data be included. This data that shows in the 2018-19 school year 153 students faced homelessness in La Grande school district or 6.5% of students.


Some of the policy recommendations we support:

- Use of Urban Renewal for affordable housing rehabilitation and development to house low- and moderate-income households. Being clear and transparent that the funds will be used for low and moderate housing needs specifically.
- Reduce or remove building or zoning barriers and fees to incentivize affordable housing projects that house low- and moderate-income households.

Thank you for all your efforts, and we want to celebrate this accomplishment toward the goal of housing for all La Grande residents. The HMUC team is available to help or with any and all steps along the way.

Sincerely,


Lenore Case
HMUC Vice Chair



Colleen Nelson
HMUC Convener



Taylor Gould
HMUC Secretary



Cami Miller
HMUC Coordinator



Lisa Ladendorff
HMUC Facilitator



Attachments:


- a) Oregon Housing Alliance local housing needs
- b) ACS Housing Data for La Grande

A Place to Call Home: Union County

Homes give people an opportunity to build better lives and communities. But how do Union County residents fare?

We have a serious shortage of affordable housing

For every 100 families with extremely low incomes, there are only 38 affordable units available.



531

units are needed to meet the need

1 in 4




renters are paying more than 50% of their income in rent

Nearly 3 out of 4



renters with extremely low incomes are paying more than 50% of their income in rent


Our neighbors are facing homelessness



Oregonians on fixed incomes struggle to pay rent even for a one bedroom apartment.

1 in 25 students

experienced homelessness in 2018-2019



That's 176 children during the 2018-19 school year in Union County.

Workers can't afford rent

\$11.68




Mean renter wage



Number of hours per week at minimum wage needed to afford a 2 bedroom apartment

A household must earn at least \$29,280 to afford a 2 bedroom apartment at fair market rent.




Homeownership is out of reach for many

Average home price someone can afford

\$202,300


median home value in 2019



...up 3.7% from 2018



HOUSING COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF INCOME RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS



Housing costs as a percentage of household income

Renter-occupied housing units:	Number of Households	paying less than 20 percent toward rent	paying 20 to 29 percent toward rent	Paying 30 percent or more
Annual Income Less than \$20,000:	813	58	114	641
Annual Income \$20,000 to \$34,999:	606	54	178	374
Annual Income \$35,000 to \$49,999:	436	170	147	119
Annual Income \$50,000 to \$74,999:	274	214	38	22
Annual Income \$75,000 or more:	253	209	31	13

Source: 2017 ACS table B25106 Tenure by housing costs as a percentage of household income in the past 12 months

CITY of LA GRANDE
COUNCIL ACTION FORM

Council Meeting Date: **November 4, 2020**

PRESENTER: Robert A. Strobe, City Manager

COUNCIL ACTION: CONSIDER ADOPTING A RESOLUTION RENEWING THE GRANDE RONDE ENTERPRISE ZONE

1. **MAYOR:** Request Staff Report
2. **MAYOR:** Request that Public Testimony be read into the Record
3. **MAYOR:** Invite Council Discussion
4. **MAYOR:** Entertain Motion:

Suggested Motion: I move that the proposed Resolution renewing the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone, be read by title only, put to a vote, and passed.

5. **MAYOR:** Invite Additional Council Discussion.
6. **MAYOR:** Ask the City Recorder to Read the Proposed Resolution by Title Only.
7. **MAYOR:** Ask for the Vote

EXPLANATION: The Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone is an overlay zone that typically consists of industrially zoned properties. The zone provides an opportunity for tax incentives to be used to attract new business investment into the area. Most of the industrially zoned land within Union County is located within the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone.

In 2013, the City of La Grande completed an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion that added approximately 300 acres of Heavy Industrial zoned land to the City's UGB. The land is located along Pierce Road, near the Union County Airport and the Airport Industrial Park, but was not located within the Enterprise Zone. As a result, there were no local economic incentives available to attract new investment to this land area. Because the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone boundary is located immediately adjacent to the City's UGB expansion area, the City of La Grande requested the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone Manager to amend the Enterprise Zone boundary to include the City's UGB expansion area, which was completed in 2015.

The Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone designation will expire at the end of 2020 unless all sponsoring agencies adopt a Resolution agreeing to renew the Enterprise Zone. Sponsoring agencies include Union County, the City of Elgin, the City of La Grande, the City of North Powder and the City of Union.

Attached is the City of La Grande Resolution authorizing the renewal of the Enterprise Zone, which includes the boundary maps (Exhibit A) and the legal description (Exhibit B). Also attached is the notice from Union County dated October 2, 2020, regarding the proposed renewal.

The City Manager recommends Council passage of this proposed Resolution.

Reviewed By: (Initial)

City Manager _____

City Recorder _____

Aquatics Division _____

Building Department _____

ED Department _____

Finance _____

Fire Department _____

Human Resources Dept _____

Library _____

Parks Department _____

Planning Department _____

Police Department _____

Public Works Department _____

COUNCIL ACTION (Office Use Only)

Motion Passed

Motion Failed; _____

Action Tabled; _____

Vote: _____

Resolution Passed # _____

Effective Date: _____

**CITY of LA GRANDE
RESOLUTION NUMBER _____**

SERIES 2020

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LA GRANDE, UNION COUNTY, OREGON, SUPPORTING THE RE-DESIGNATION OF THE GRANDE RONDE ENTERPRISE ZONE; REPEALING RESOLUTION 4696, SERIES 2015; AND ALL OTHER RESOLUTIONS OR PARTS OF RESOLUTIONS IN CONFLICT HEREWITH

WHEREAS, the City of La Grande is sponsoring an enterprise zone re-designation jointly with Union County, the City of Island City, The City of Elgin, the City of North Powder and the City of Union; and

WHEREAS, Union County, the City of La Grande, the City of Island City, The City of Elgin, the City of North Powder and the City of Union have formally advised and received consultation from the Oregon Business Development Department (OBDD) according to ORS 285C.078; and

WHEREAS, the municipal corporations, school districts, special service districts, that receive operating revenue through the levying of ad valorem taxes on real and personal property in any area of this enterprise zone were sent notice and invited to a public meeting held on October 27, 2020, regarding its re-designation, in order for the sponsoring governments to effectively consult with these other local taxing districts; and

WHEREAS, this enterprise zone has a total area of approximately 11.94 square miles, it meets other statutory limitations on size and configuration, and it is depicted on the drawn-to-scale map (Exhibit A) and its boundary is described in (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS the City of La Grande shall fulfill its duties and implement provisions jointly with other cosponsors under ORS 285C.105 or elsewhere in ORS Chapter 285C and related parts of Oregon Law, including but not limited to having appointed a local enterprise zone manager, and to preparing a list or map of local, publicly owned lands and buildings in this enterprise zone for purposes of ORS 285C.110; and

WHEREAS, re-designation of this enterprise zone does not grant or imply permission to develop land inside it without complying with jurisdictional zoning, regulatory and permitting processes and restrictions; nor does it indicate any intent to alter those processes or restrictions, except as otherwise done in accordance with Comprehensive Plans as acknowledged by the state of Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC); and

WHEREAS, the availability of enterprise zone exemptions to businesses that operate hotels, motels or destination resorts would help diversify local economic activity and facilitate the expansion of accommodations for visitors, who in turn will spend time and money in the area for business, recreation or other purposes; and

WHEREAS, the City of La Grande, is interested in encouraging new business

investment, job creation, higher incomes for local residents, and greater diversity of economic activity; and

WHEREAS, the City of La Grande appreciates the impacts that the re-designated enterprise zone would have and the property tax exemptions that eligible business firms might receive therein; and

WHEREAS, the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone has proven successful in the past as a tool to encourage economic growth.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the City of La Grande, under ORS does hereby re-designate an Oregon enterprise zone to be named: The Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone, jointly with Union County, the City of Island City, The City of Elgin, the City of North Powder and the City of Union, the boundary and area of which are described in the exhibits.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Shelley Burgess, Union County Administrative Officer, is authorized to submit the documentation of this enterprise zone re-designation to OBDD on behalf of the zone sponsors for purposes of a positive determination in favor under ORS 285C.074.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that re-designation of this enterprise zone takes effect on January 1, 2021 or later, as so stipulated by OBDD in its determination pursuant to any revision and resubmission of documentation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Shelley Burgess, Union County Administrative Officer, is jointly appointed as the local zone manager for the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, subject to grant of approval by the director of OBDD, the City of La Grande would jointly with co-sponsors waive the distance maximum of 25/20 miles overall/and/15 miles between separate areas within the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone under ORS 285C.120 (2) for purposes of this re-designation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the City of La Grande jointly with co-sponsors will provide the local incentives described in (Exhibit C) to any authorized business firm in the proposed enterprise zone for the length of the standard enterprise zone exemption,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the City of La Grande as co-sponsor of the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone exercises its option herewith under ORS 285C.070 that qualified property of and operated by a qualified business as a hotel, motel or destination resort shall receive the property tax exemption in the Zone, and that such business firms are eligible for purposes of authorization in the Zone.

PASSED and EFFECTIVE ON this Fourth (4th) day of November, 2020, by _____ () of _____ () Councilors present and voting in the affirmative.

Stephen E. Clements, Mayor

Gary Lillard, Mayor Pro Tem

Corrine Dutto, Councilor

Nicole Howard, Councilor


Mary Ann Miesner, Councilor

Justin Rock, Councilor

ATTEST:

**Stacey M. Stockhoff
Acting City Recorder**

Exhibit A



GRANDE RONDE ENTERPRISE ZONE

NORTHEAST LA GRANDE, ISLAND CITY, BAUM INDUSTRIAL PARK

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Section 35, Township 2 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,

- Thence: South, along the East line of said Section 35, to the Easterly prolongation of the South line of Parcel 1 of Minor Partition Plat Number 1999-29, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: South 88°37'19" West, along the South line of said Parcel 1, to the Southwest corner of said Parcel 1,
- Thence: North 89°20'41" West, a distance of 1301.91 feet,
- Thence: South 00°2'23" East, a distance of 763.52 feet,
- Thence: South 89°57'37" West, a distance of 1332.05 feet, to the West line of said Section 35,
- Thence: North, along said West line, approximately 660 feet, to the Easterly prolongation of an interior Northerly line of Parcel 1 of Minor Partition Plat Number 1992-07, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: South 89°42'26" West, along said prolongation, and along said Northerly line, a distance of 430 feet,
- Thence: North 0°17'34" West, along an exterior line of said Parcel 1, and its Northerly prolongation, approximately 650 feet, to the Northerly right of way line of the Joseph branch of the Union Pacific Railroad,
- Thence: Southwesterly, along said Northerly right of way line, to the Easterly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 82 (Wallowa Lake Highway),
- Thence: South, along said Easterly right of way line, to the North line of the Southwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 34 of Township 2 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: East, along said North line, approximately 1300 feet, to the Northeast corner of said Southwest quarter of the Southeast quarter,
- Thence: South, along the East line of said Southwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, to the Northerly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 237,

- Thence: Southerly, to the Northeast corner of Ronde Valley Addition to Island City, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: Southerly, along the East line of said Addition, to the South right of way line of East Fifth Street,
- Thence: Westerly, along said South right of way line, approximately 235 feet, to an angle point in the exterior of said Addition,
- Thence: South, along said exterior approximately 113 feet, to the South line of said Addition,
- Thence: West, along said South line, and its Westerly prolongation, to the West right of way line of McAlister Road,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, to the Northerly right of way line of White Birch Lane,
- Thence: West, along said Northerly right of way line, a distance of 832 feet,
- Thence: North 002'40" West, a distance of 10.29 feet,
- Thence: North 89°19'45" West, approximately 46 feet, to the Southerly prolongation of the East line of Island West Addition, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: North, along said Southerly prolongation, and the East line of said Addition, to the North right of way line of West Fourth Street,
- Thence: East, along said North right of way line, to the West right of way line of South D Street,
- Thence: North, along said West right of way line, to the centerline of vacated West Third Street,
- Thence: West, along said vacated centerline, to a point 610 feet Southeasterly (when measured at right angles) from the Southeasterly right of way line of Island Avenue (Oregon State Highway Number 82),
- Thence: Southwesterly along a line 610 feet Southeasterly (when measured at right angles) from said Southeasterly right of way line, to the East line of the Southwest quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 4, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,

- Thence: North, along said East line, approximately 60 feet, to a point which bears South 35°15'03" West, a distance of 2305.73 feet from the Northeast corner of said Section 4,
- Thence: South 89°54'48" West, a distance of 247.74 feet,
- Thence: North 122°7'26" West, approximately 410 feet, to the Southeasterly right of way line of Island Avenue (Oregon State Highway Number 82),
- Thence: Southwesterly, along said right of way line, approximately 690 feet, to a point opposite engineers station 67+39.53,
- Thence: South 31°08'31" East, a distance of 233.77 feet,
- Thence: South 02°1'43" East, a distance of 339.32 feet,
- Thence: South 01°8'42" West, a distance of 195.61 feet,
- Thence: South 02°4'07" East, approximately 320 feet, to the South right of way line of Mulholland Drive,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the Northeast corner of Minor Partition Plat Number 20080022T, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: South, along the East line of said Partition Plat, to the Southeast corner thereof,
- Thence: West, along the South line of said Partition Plat, to the West right of way line of 26th Street,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, approximately 210 feet, to the Northeast corner of that tract conveyed to Fred and Connie Bell by Microfilm Number 124207 of the deed records of Union County,
- Thence: West, along the North line of said Bell tract, to the Easterly right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Easterly right of way, to the East right of way line of 25th Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the South right of way line of East Q Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the East right of way line of 26th Street,

- Thence: South, along said East right of way line, to the Southwest corner of Lot 3 of Eastgate Addition to La Grande, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: East, along the South line of said Lot 3, and its Easterly prolongation, to the East right of way line of 27th Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the South right of way line of East Q Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the Northeast corner of Minor Partition Plat Number 20030009, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: South, along the East line of said Partition Plat, and its Southerly prolongation, to the South line of Section 4, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: West, along said South line, to the Westerly right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said Westerly right of way line, to the South line of vacated East Q Avenue,
- Thence: West, along said South line, to the West right of way line of 22nd Street,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, to the Southeast corner of Minor Partition Plat Number 1991-02,
- Thence: West, along the South line of said Partition Plat, and its Westerly prolongation, to the West right of way line of 21st Street,
- Thence: North, along said West right of way line, to the South right of way line of East Q Avenue,
- Thence: West, along said South right of way line, to the Northwest corner of Lot 1 of Block 5 of Home Investment Addition to La Grande, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: South, along the West line of said Lot 1 and the West line of Lot 6 of said Block 5, to the North right of way line of East Penn Avenue,
- Thence: West, along said North right of way line, to the East right of way line of Portland Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the North right of way line of Island Avenue (Oregon State Highway 82),

- Thence: Southwesterly, along said North right of way line, to the East right of way line of Spruce Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the South right of way line of Q Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the West line of the vacated alley in Block 25 of Williamson's Addition to La Grande, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: North, along the West line of the alley running through blocks 5, 6, 15 and 16 of said Addition, to the North right of way line of Jackson Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said North right of way line, to the East right of way line of North Cherry Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the North right of way line of U Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said North right of way line, to the Southwest corner of Lot 8 of Block 5, Pleasant Home Addition to La Grande, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: North, along the West line of said Lot 8 and Lot 1 of said Block 5, to the South right of way line of V Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the East right of way line of North Willow Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the South right of way line of X Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the Westerly right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Northwesterly, approximately 820 feet, along said Westerly right of way line, to a point opposite Engineer's Station "EB" 152+40.00 P.O.S.,
- Thence: Northeasterly, through said station, to the South right of way line of May Lane,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the East line of Section 5, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: South, along said East line, to the Easterly right of way of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Easterly right of way line, to the centerline of vacated Watson Street,

- Thence: North, along said centerline, to the South line of Joy Meadows Subdivision, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: East, along the South line of said Subdivision, and its Easterly prolongation, to the East line of the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of Section 4, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: North, along said East line, to the South right of way line of May Lane,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the East right of way line of Riddle Road,
- Thence: South, along said East right of way line, to the Northerly right of way line of the Joseph Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad,
- Thence: Northeasterly, along said Northerly right of way line, to a point 450 feet East (when measured at right angles) of the West line of Section 34, Township 2 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: North, parallel with and 450 feet East (when measured at right angles) of the West line of Section 34, to the North line of the South half of said Section 34,
- Thence: East, along said North line, to the Northerly right of way line of Oregon State Highway 82 (Wallowa Lake Highway),
- Thence: Northeasterly, along said Northerly right of way line, to the East line of Section 26 of said Township and Range,
- Thence: South, along said East line, to the Point of Beginning of this description.

NORTHWEST LA GRANDE

Beginning at the intersection of the Northwesterly right of way line of North Fir Street and the Southwesterly right of way line of Madison Avenue,

- Thence: Southwesterly, along the Northwesterly right of way line of North Fir Street, to the South right of way line of Union Pacific Railroad,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said South right of way line, approximately 385 feet, to an angle point in said right of way,
- Thence: Southwesterly, to the Northeasterly right of way line of Jefferson Street,

- Thence: Northwesterly, along said Northeasterly right of way line, and the Southwesterly right of way line of U.S. Highway Number 30 Access Road, to the Westerly terminus of said Access Road,
- Thence: North, along the West right of way line of U.S. Highway Number 30 Access Road, to the Southwesterly right of way line of Union Pacific Railroad,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said Southwesterly right of way line, to the Southerly prolongation of the most Easterly right of way line of Rapid Run Loop,
- Thence: North, along said Prolongation, to the North right of way line of Harrison Avenue,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said North right of way line, to the East right of way line of Columbia Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, approximately 123 feet, to the Southwest corner of that tract monumented by survey number 011-2002 as filed in the office of the Union County Surveyor,
- Thence: North 89°35'46" East, along the South line of said tract, a distance of 130.09 feet,
- Thence: South 02°6'12" East, approximately 85 feet, to the centerline of vacated Lake Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said centerline, to the West right of way line of North Union Street,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, to the center of the vacated alley in Block 67 of Riverside Addition to La Grande,
- Thence: East, along the Easterly prolongation of said centerline, and the centerline of the vacated alley in Block 59 of said Riverside Addition, a distance of 149 feet,
- Thence: South, to the South right of way line of Division Avenue,
- Thence: West, along said South right of way line, to the Northeasterly right of way line of Harrison Avenue,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Northeasterly right of way, to the South right of way line of Z Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the West right of way line of Cedar Street,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, to the Northeasterly right of way line of Union Pacific Railroad,

- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Northeasterly right of way line, to the Westerly prolongation of the centerline of vacated W Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said prolongation and said centerline, to the East right of way line of vacated North Third Street,
- Thence: North, along said East right of way line, to the South right of way line of X Avenue,
- Thence: East, along said South right of way line, to the West right of way line of North Fourth Street,
- Thence: South, along said West right of way line, to the Southwesterly right of way line of Jackson Avenue,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Southwesterly right of way line, to the West right of way line of North Depot Street,
- Thence: Southerly, along said West right of way line, to the Southwesterly right of way line of Monroe Avenue,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Southwesterly right of way line, to the Northwesterly right of way line of Elm Street,
- Thence: Southwesterly, along said Northwesterly right of way line, to the Westerly right of way line of Madison Avenue,
- Thence: Southerly, along said Westerly right of way line, to the Southwesterly right of way of said Madison Avenue,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Southwesterly right of way line, to the Northwesterly right of way line of North Fir Street, said point being the Point of Beginning of this description.

TRUCK STOP, AIRPORT, HOT LAKE

Beginning at the Southwest corner of Section 4, Township 4 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian,

- Thence: North, along the West line of said Section 4, to the intersection of the Southerly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said right of way line, to the North line of the South half of the South half of Section 5 of said Township and Range,

- Thence: West, along said North line, to the West line of said Section 5,
- Thence: North, along said West line, to the North right of way line of Foothill/Ladd Canyon County Road Number 12,
- Thence: Easterly along said North right of way line to the intersection of the Southwesterly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said right of way line, to the East line of Section 26, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: South, along said East line, to the Northeast corner of the South half of the North half of said Section 26,
- Thence: West, along the North line of said South half of the North half of Section 26, to the East right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Northerly, along said East line, to the intersection of with the South right of way line of Oregon State Highway 203,
- Thence: Northwesterly, to the intersection of the South right of way line of Bond Lane and the West right of way line of McAlister Road,
- Thence: North along said West right of way line, to the Southwesterly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,
- Thence: Northwesterly, along said Southwesterly right of way line, to the West line of Section 9, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: North, along said West line, to the Northwest corner of the Southwest quarter of said Section 9,
- Thence: East, along the North line of said Southwest quarter, to the Northeasterly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Northeasterly right of way line, to the South line of the North half of said Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: East, along said South line, to the Westerly right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Westerly right of way line, to its intersection with the Northeasterly right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,

- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Northeasterly right of way line, to the West line of the East half of Section 23, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: North, along said West line, to the Northwest corner of the South half of the Northeast quarter of said Section 23,
- Thence: East, along the North line of said South half of the Northeast quarter, to the Westerly right of way line of Pierce Road,
- Thence: North, along said Westerly right of way line, to its intersection with the North right of way line of Bond Lane, Union County Road Number 124,
- Thence: East, along said North right of way line, to the East line of Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 38 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: South, along said East line and also the East line of Section 24 of said Township and Range, to the South right of way line of Airport Lane, Union County Road Number 29,
- Thence: West, along said South right of way line, to the East right of way line of Pierce Road,
- Thence: South, along said East right of way line, to the Northeasterly right of way line of right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 203,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said Northerly right of way line, to the West line of Section 4, Township 4 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: North, along said West line, to the Northwest corner of the West half of the Southwest quarter of said Section 4,
- Thence: East, along the North line of said West half of the Southwest quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner thereof,
- Thence: South, along the East line of said West half of the Southwest quarter, approximately 2640 feet, to the Southeast corner thereof,
- Thence: West, along the South line of said Section 4, approximately 1320 feet, to the Southwest corner of said Section 4, said point being the Point of Beginning of this description.

ELGIN

Situate in the South half of Section 15, and in the North half of Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian, said tract being more particularly described as follows;

Beginning at a point on the East right of way of the Idaho Northern Railroad right of way, said point being the Southwest corner of Parcel 3 of Minor Partition Plat Number 2005-0009T, as filed in the Plat records of Union County,

Thence: Northeasterly, along said East right of way line, to the North line of Block 77 of Hindman's Addition to the Town of Elgin, as filed in Plat Cabinet A-27 and in Book 1, Page 27 the Plat records of Union County,

Thence: East, along said North line, to the Northeast corner thereof,

Thence: South, along the East line of said Block 77, to the Southeast corner thereof;

Thence: Southwesterly, along the South line of said Block 77, to the Northerly prolongation of the East line of Block 3 of the Town of South Elgin, as filed in as filed in Plat Cabinet A-25 and in Book 1, Page 25 of the plat records of Union County,

Thence: South, along said prolongation, to the South line of Dogwood Street,

Thence: East, along said South line, to the West right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 82 (Wallowa Lake Highway),

Thence: South, along said East line, to the Southeast corner of said Minor Partition Plat Number 2005-0009T,

Thence: South 69°45'21" West, along the South line of said Partition Plat, approximately 1792 feet, to the Point of Beginning of this description.

NORTH POWDER

Situate in Section 22, the Southwest quarter of Section 14, the Northwest quarter of Section 23 and the Northwest quarter of Section 27, Township 6 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian, said tract being more particularly described as follows;

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Section 22, Township 6 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian;

- Thence: West, along the North line of said Section 22, approximately 3960 feet, to the Northwest corner of the East half of the Northwest quarter of said Section 22,
- Thence: South, along the West line of said East half of the Northwest quarter, approximately 2640 feet, to the Southwest corner of said East half of the Northwest quarter,
- Thence: West, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northwest corner of the Southwest quarter of said Section 22,
- Thence: South, along the West line of said Section 22, approximately 1320 feet, to the Southwest corner of the North half of the Southwest quarter of said Section 22,
- Thence: East, along the South line of the North half of the Southwest quarter of said Section 22, to the Easterly right of way line of Interstate 84,
- Thence: Southeasterly, along said right of way line, to the centerline of the North Powder River,
- Thence: Northeasterly, along said centerline, to the East line of said Section 22,
- Thence: North, along said East line, to a point 94.94 feet Northerly when measured at right angles to the North right of way line of the Union Pacific Railroad right of way,
- Thence: North 51°53'10" East, parallel with said right of way line, a distance of 250.00 feet,
- Thence: South 38°06'50" East, a distance of 94.94 feet, to said North right of way line,
- Thence: Northeasterly, along said right of way line, to its' intersection with the South right of way line of Oregon State Highway Number 237,
- Thence: Southwesterly, along said South right of way line, to the East line of said Section 22,
- Thence: North, along said East line, approximately 1007 feet, to the Point of Beginning of this description.

UNION

Situate in the East half and Southwest quarter of Section 13, and in Section 24 of Township 4 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian, and also in Section 18 and 19 of Township 4 South, Range 40 East of the Willamette Meridian, said tract being more particularly described as follows;

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Section 19, Township 4 South, Range 40 East of the Willamette Meridian;

- Thence: West, along the North line of said Section 19, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section 19,
- Thence: South, along the East line of the West half of the East half of said Section 19, approximately 5280 feet, to the South line of said Section 19,
- Thence: West, along said South line, approximately 3960 feet, to the Southwest corner of said Section 19,
- Thence: North, along the West line of said Section 19, approximately 1320 feet, to the Southeast corner of the North half of the South half of Section 24 of Township 4 South, Range 39 East of the Willamette Meridian,
- Thence: West, along the South line of the North half of the South half of said Section 24, approximately 3960 feet, to the Southwest corner of the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of said Section 24,
- Thence: North, along the West line of the East half of the West half of said Section 24, and along the West line of the East half of the West half of Section 13 of said Township and Range, to the centerline of Catherine Creek,
- Thence: Northeasterly, along said Centerline, to the Southwest corner of West Catherine Meadows Subdivision, as filed in the plat records of Union County,
- Thence: North, along the West line of said Subdivision, to the North line of the Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of said Section 13,
- Thence: East, along said North line, approximately 20 feet, to the Southwest corner of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of said Section 13,
- Thence: North, along the West line of said Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northwest corner thereof,
- Thence: East, along the North line of said Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter,

approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner thereof,

Thence: North, along the West line of the Southeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section 13, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northwest corner thereof,

Thence: East, along the North line of said Southeast quarter of the Northeast quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner thereof,

Thence: North, along the East line of said Section 13, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner of said Section 13,

Thence: East, along the North line of Section 18 of Township 4 South, Range 40 East of the Willamette Meridian, approximately 2640 feet, to the Northeast corner of the Northwest quarter of said Section 18,

Thence: South, along the East line of said Northwest quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northwest corner of the Southwest quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section 18,

Thence: East, along the North line of said Southwest quarter of the Northeast quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner thereof,

Thence: South, along the East line of said Southwest quarter of the Northeast quarter, approximately 1320 feet, to the Southeast corner thereof,

Thence: East, along the North line of the Southeast quarter of said Section 18, approximately 1320 feet, to the Northeast corner of said Southeast quarter,

Thence: South, along the East line of said Section 18, approximately 2640 feet, to the Point of Beginning of this description.



Renewal Date: June 30, 2015

**Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone
Local Incentives
Effective January 1, 2021**

Qualifying businesses locating within the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone who complete an Oregon Enterprise Zone Authorization Application and receive approval will be entitled to the following local incentives:

A. Permit & User Fees

1. The following permits will be provided without charge for initial construction:
 - a. All required Planning Department permits;
 - b. Driveway and curb cut permits;
 - c. Excavation permits
 - d. Basic building permits (not included are plan review fees, fire life safety permit fees, mechanical permits, electrical permits, plumbing permits, fire sprinkler permits, fire alarm permits or state surcharge fees)

2. After initial construction, if an Enterprise Zone Authorization is still active, fees will be reinstated at a rate of 20% per year for phased development.

3. The following fees may be reduced or waived based on negotiation with the individual jurisdiction involved:
 - a. Water system connection fees;
 - b. Sewer system connection fees.

Note: If a business fails to meet all Enterprise Zone requirements for the three-year authorization period, permit fees waived may be recovered by the issuing authority.

B. Simplified Permit Application Procedures

The City of La Grande provides coordination of new development through the Economic Development Director's Office and provides fast track approvals of any required permits for the enterprise zone. Coordinated plan review and notification of other affected public agencies is part of the service provided. This applies to areas with the City of La Grande or La Grande Urban Growth Boundary.



UNION COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Donna Beverage, Commissioner
Paul Anderes, Commissioner
R. Matthew Scarfo, Commissioner

Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer

1106 K Avenue

La Grande, OR 97850

PHONE (541)963-1001

FAX (541)963-1079

October 2, 2020

Robert Strobe
City of La Grande
P.O. Box 670
La Grande, OR 97850

Subject: Notice to Local Taxing Districts of Proposed Renewal of the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone

Dear Robert:

This letter is to inform you that Union County and the cities of La Grande, Island City, Elgin, Union, and North Powder are considering proposing re-designation of the Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone. The current designation will expire on December 31, 2020. We will submit documentation to Business Oregon for it to determine that the enterprise zone satisfies statutory requirements.

Notice and Invitation to Public Meeting

Your district is being notified of this proposed designation because the enterprise zone would include all or parts of one or more tax code areas in which your district levies taxes on property value. In an enterprise zone, certain types of businesses that create new jobs may receive exemptions of limited duration on qualified new property that they invest in within the zone.

In particular, we are inviting every such local district to have one or more representatives participate in a special public meeting to discuss the enterprise zone. At the meeting, there will be a proposed map of the zone boundary and other information for presentation and review.

The meeting will be held on October 27, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. In a continuing effort to limit the spread of the COVID-19 virus and to comply with the Governor's executive orders, the meeting will be conducted via Zoom teleconference. • To participate in the meeting, please call: (253) 215-8782 or (301) 715-8592 and enter meeting ID number: 817 7659 3358, Passcode: 189069.

Written comments are welcome and may be submitted either to 1106 K Avenue, La Grande, OR 97850 or sburgess@union-county.org. Please submit any written comments by October 26.

Resolutions

Not less than seven days after this meeting, the sponsoring governments would adopt the requisite resolutions to designate the enterprise zone. The following are anticipated dates for consideration of these resolutions:

La Grande City Council on November 4
Island City City Council on November 9
Elgin City Council on November 10
North Powder City Council on December 7
Union City Council on November 9
Union County Board of Commissioners on December 2

An Enterprise Zone and Property Tax Abatement

These zones in Oregon are discrete areas up to 12 or 15 square miles in size and have been in existence since the mid-1980s. Each designation lasts up to 11 years. State law no longer sets a limit or cap on how many may be designated statewide with local government sponsorship.

They are intended to induce additional investment and employment by non-retail businesses in areas meeting certain measures of economic hardship. They have proven to be Oregon's key offering in the pursuit of business growth and expansion. Their effectiveness is due to a typically short-term but immediate benefit for the business project's cash flow.

General information is available online at www.oregon4biz.com/Oregon-Business/Tax-incentives/Enterprise-Zones/.

The proposed re-designation would reflect the current boundaries of the existing Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone which includes 11.94 acres and encompasses property in the County, the City of La Grande, the City of Island City, the City of Elgin, the City of Union, and the City of North Powder.

An Oregon enterprise zone exempts only new property that an eligible business might build or install in the zone at some future time. A qualifying investment under the standard exemption program entails the creation of new full-time employment in the zone- greater of one new job or a 10 percent increase.

A standard enterprise zone exemption is temporary, usually lasting only three years, after which time the property induced by these incentives is available for assessment. These property tax exemptions are not available to just any business. Most commercial or retail operations that compete locally are ineligible. Rather, the primary recipients of enterprise zone benefits are manufacturing and other types of facilities serving other business operations.

The Grande Ronde Enterprise Zone designation has provided incentives for business location and expansion and is seen as a valuable tool in growing our local economy.

Please contact me at 541-963-1001 or sburgess@union-county.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shelley Burgess".

Shelley Burgess
Administrative Officer

Enc: Preliminary Agenda

cc: Special Districts Association of Oregon