AM-2016-104 - Exhibit F
APPENDIX
Buildable Land Analysis and Future Land Needs Analysis
June 20, 2001

Prepared for:
City of Prineville
Submitted by:
The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

Updated through October 2002
City Planning Department
Updated Material in "Italics" or as otherwise noted

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

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 Prineville. Buildable land is defined as land that is suitable and available and necessary for residential, commercial, and industrial 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 Prineville.

A. Gross vacant acres by zoning district

A parcel database for the City of Prineville and surrounding areas was obtained from the City of Prineville. The parcel database was current as of July 1, 1999 and was corrected for errors and discrepancies under the direction of TBAC in Fall, 2000. The list of vacant parcels was field-checked by TBAC in order to verify its accuracy. ***The data assembled by TBAC in 1999 regarding vacant lands in the Prineville UGB area has been updated through October 2002 by the City Planning Department utilizing Department building and development files, Assessor's Records, and by field verification***.

Those parcels considered as vacant in the following analysis includes fully vacant parcels and partially vacant parcels (for residentially-zoned properties only). Vacant parcels are parcels without buildings (including platted vacant lots). These parcels were identified as such in the City of Prineville's database. The City has no records of "partially vacant parcels" that have some improvements on them, but with the remainder of the property having none. Therefore, partially vacant parcels were identified using the following methodology: parcels larger than two acres, that are not listed as vacant, were allocated one acre developed and the balance of the property was designated vacant. These parcels included lands in farm use deferral that can be reasonably assumed to be converted to urban uses within the long term.

The following are the land use zones designated by the City of Prineville in its Zoning Ordinance:

Table I.1 City of Prineville Zoning Districts

Zone	Code
Non-Residential	
Commercial	
Central Commercial	C-1
General Commercial	C-2
Professional Commercial	C-3
Neighborhood Commercial	C-4
Recreation Commercial	C-5
Industrial	
Limited Industrial	M-1
General Industrial	M-2
Industrial Park	M-3
Airport	
City of Prineville zones	
Airport Approach Overlay	A-A
Airport Operations	A-O
Airport Development	A-D
Airport Commercial	A-C
Airport Business-Industrial	A-M
Other	
Open Space-Park Reserve	P-R
Residential	
Limited Residential	R-1
General Residential	R-2
Suburban Residential	R-3
Residential Redevelopment	R-4
Air Residential Park	A-R

The following are the land use zones designated by Crook County in the Prineville UGB:

Table I.2
Crook County Zoning Districts in the City of Prineville UGB

Zone	Code
Non-Residential	
Commercial	
Limited Commercial	L-C
Neighborhood Commercial	N-C
Recreation Commercial	R-C
Industrial	
Light Industrial	L-M
Heavy Industrial	H-M
Other	
Exclusive Farm Use	EFU-2
Total Other - County	
Residential	
Suburban Residential	SR-1
Suburban Residential Mobile	SRM-1

The following table is an inventory of the vacant and developed (non-vacant) land within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of the City of Prineville ***updated through October 2002***. A total of 775.3 acres designated for non-residential uses and 312.0 acres designated for residential uses are identified as vacant within the UGB, for a total of 1,087.3 acres. Of this total, 726.0 acres (623.5 nonresidential and 102.4 residential acres - figures do not add because of rounding), or 66.8 percent, is located within the city limits.

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant and Developed Land by Zoning District in the City of Prineville UGB (updated 10/02)

Zone	Code	Parcels within the UGB					
		Vacant Acreage	# of Parcels	Non-Vacant (Developed) Acreage	# of Parcels	Total Acreage	# of Parcels
Non-Residential							
Commercial							
City of Prineville zones							
Central Commercial	C-1	5.10	29	53.10	258	58.20	287
General Commercial	C-2	13.05	10	121.15	198	134.20	208
Professional Commercial	C-3	0.0	0	5.70	30	5.70	30
Neighborhood Commercial	C-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreation Commercial	C-5	0.0	0	2.70	3	2.70	3
Total Commercial - City		**18.15**	**39**	**182.65**	**489**	**200.80**	**528**
Crook County zones							
Limited Commercial	L-C	0.18	2	165.12	113	165.40	115
Neighborhood Commercial	N-C	0.0	0	6.40	10	6.40	10
Recreation Commercial	R-C	0.0	0	84.80	17	84.80	17
Total Commercial - County		**0.18**	**2**	**256.32**	**140**	**256.50**	**142**
Total Commercial		**18.33**	**41**	**438.97**	**629**	**457.30**	**670**
Industrial							
City of Prineville zones							
Limited Industrial	M-1	15.93	3	72.10	86	88.03	89
General Industrial	M-2	16.50	3	138.40	38	154.90	41
Heavy Industrial	M-3	55.77	10	207.83	26	263.60	36
Total Industrial - City		**88.20**	**16**	**418.33**	**150**	**506.53**	**166**
Crook County zones							
Light Industrial	L-M	76.93	6	403.97	38	480.90	44
Heavy Industrial	H-M	0.0	0	84.10	23	84.10	23
Total Industrial - County		**76.93**	**6**	**487.97**	**61**	**564.90**	**67**
Total Industrial		**165.13**	**22**	**906.30**	**211**	**1,071.43**	**233**
Airport							
City of Prineville zones							
Airport Approach Overlay	A-A	0.0	0	309.80	1	309.80	1
Airport Operations	A-O	0.0	0	103.30	1	103.30	1
Airport Development	A-D	163.57	1	33.00	0	163.57	1
Airport Commercial	A-C	29.40	1	6.70	2	36.10	3
Airport Business-Industrial	A-M	154.70	1	0.00	0	154.70	1
Total Airport - City		**347.67**	**3**	**419.80**	**4**	**767.47**	**7**
Other							
City of Prineville zones							
Open Space-Park Reserve	P-R	168.12	3	602.80	4	770.92	7
Total Other - City		**168.12**	**3**	**602.80**	**4**	**770.92**	**7**
Crook County zones							
Exclusive Farm Use	EFU-2	6.73	1	64.60	3	71.33	4
Total Other – County		**6.73**	**1**	**64.60**	**3**	**71.33**	**4**
Total Non-Residential – City		**622.14**	**61**	**1,623.58**	**647**	**2,245.72**	**708**
Total Non-Residential – County		**83.84**	**9**	**808.89**	**204**	**892.73**	**213**
Total Non-Residential		**705.98**	**70**	**2,432.47**	**851**	**3,138.45**	**921**

Table I.3 Inventory of Vacant and Developed Land by Zoning District in the City of Prineville UGB (cont'd.)(updated 10/02)

Zone Residential	Code	Parcels within the UGB					
		Vacant Acreage	# of Parcels	Non-Vacant (Developed) Acreage	# of Parcels	Total Acreage	# of Parcels
City of Prineville zones							
Limited Residential	R-1	8.11	15	199.69	476	207.80	491
General Residential	R-2	28.68	18	703.22	1,532	732.00	1,550
Suburban Residential	R-3	1.88	2	68.62	116	70.50	118
Residential Redevelopment	R-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Air Residential Park	A-R	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Residential - City		**38.67**	**35**	**971.63**	**2,124**	**1,010.30**	**2,159**
Crook County zones							
Suburban Residential	SR-1	124.43	21	2,071.97	623	2,196.40	644
Suburban Residential Mobile	SRM-1	12.76	4	166.34	270	179.10	274
Total Residential - County		**137.19**	**25**	**2,238.31**	**893**	**2,375.50**	**918**
Total Residential		**175.86**	**60**	**3,209.94**	**3,017.00**	**3,385.80**	**3,077**
Total - City zones		**660.81**	**96**	**2,595.21**	**2,770**	**3,256.02**	**2,866**
Total - County zones		**221.03**	**34**	**3,047.20**	**1,097**	**3,268.23**	**1,131**
TOTAL		**881.84**	**130**	**5,642.41**	**3,897**	**6,524.25**	**3,997**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001) from data provided by the City of Prineville (7/1/1999) and updated by the City of Prineville (February 2001) and (October 2002).
Note: figures may not add due to rounding.

B. Gross buildable vacant acres by zoning district

The gross vacant acreage figures within the UGB of the City of Prineville shown in Table I.3 above are converted into gross buildable vacant acreage figures by subtracting unbuildable acres and public land from total vacant acres.

Unbuildable vacant land is defined as vacant land which is subject to physical constraints, such as floodplains or wetlands, or is otherwise identified by the City of Prineville as unbuildable. For the purposes of this calculation, unbuildable vacant land also includes the developed portion of "partially vacant" parcels. For the purposes of this calculation, unbuildable vacant land also includes all of the vacant land that is zoned P-R (Open Space-Park Reserve) and/or is owned by a public entity.

Table I.4 below contains an inventory of all parcels identified as vacant and in the UGB in Table I.3. As shown in Table I.4, a total of 495.73 acres of land in the City of Prineville UGB is classified as vacant unbuildable, leaving a total of 422.99 acres of land classified as vacant buildable. Of this vacant buildable lands total, 305.70 acres are located in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) lease-only areas surrounding the airport. An additional 2.18 acres are located in Ochoco Plaza and identified as lease-only. Of the vacant buildable lands total not classified as "lease-only" (i.e. 117.29 acres), 55.64 acres are designated as residential lands, 56.92 acres are designated as commercial lands, and 4.73 acres are designated as industrial lands.

There are also a total of 370 residential units that could be built on vacant platted lots (or lots otherwise identified as having the potential for dwelling units), of which 51 lots are reserved only for manufactured home units. This figure is in addition to units that could be built on the identified vacant buildable acreages when developed.

BUILDABLE LANDS INVENTORY: Updated October 2002

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
15-15-Index	300 (Part)	A-C	29.40	25 acres VACANT	FAA Lease Only "Airport Lands	x		4.40	25.00	
15-15-Index	300 (Part)	A-D	163.57	130+ acres VACANT	FAA Lease Only "Airport Lands	x		33.57	130.00	
15-15-Index	300 (Part)	A-M	132.00	130 acres VACANT	FAA Lease Only "Airport Lands	x		2.00	130.00	
14-16-31DD	13700	C-1	0.25	Harper,Blanche	floodplain, stream, riparian; unbuildable	x		0.25	0.00	
15-16-5BA	6100	C-1	0.22	Jay,Marilyn					0.22	
15-16-5BB	1400	C-1	0.10	Schneider					0.10	
15-16-6AA	10800	C-1	0.21	Prineville Clinic	parking lot for clinic	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AA	11500	C-1	0.07	Crook Co P<>29 Am Leg	parking lot for Legion club	x		0.07	0.00	
15-16-6AA	11800	C-1	0.06	M. Chichester, Trust	restaurant under construction	x		0.06	0.00	
15-16-6AA	11900	C-1	0.04	Rimrock Investors	restaurant under construction	x		0.04	0.00	
15-16-6AA	1200	C-1	0.47	Les Schwab Tires Center					0.47	
15-16-6AA	12000	C-1	0.13	Rimrock Investors	restaurant under construction	x		0.13	0.00	
15-16-6AA	12100	C-1	0.21	Rimrock Investors	restaurant under construction	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AA	12600	C-1	0.21	B. Harper	floodplain; unbuildable	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AA	12700	C-1	0.21	B. Harper	floodplain; unbuildable	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AA	1400	C-1	0.18	Les Schwab Tire Center					0.18	
15-16-6AA	3201	C-1	0.21	US West Comm/Pacific	maintenance yard-**committed**				0.00	
15-16-6AA	3900	C-1	0.21	T. Wilson	city parking lot - leased	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AA	5700	C-1	0.03	Bank of the Cascades	required employee parking on alley; unbuildable	x		0.03	0.00	
15-16-6AA	600	C-1	0.13	Prineville Lodge	parking for Elk's Lodge	x		0.13	0.00	
15-16-6AA	7800	C-1	0.10	G. Fahlgren	parking for motor supply store	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AA	7801	C-1	0.10	K. Fahlgren	parking for sporting goods	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AA	8701	C-1	0.08	M. Shrum	parking for church	x		0.08	0.00	
15-16-6AA	9900	C-1	0.21	S. Harper					0.21	
15-16-6AB	10700	C-1	0.05	L. Angland	parking for office building	x		0.05	0.00	
15-16-6AB	11400	C-1	0.10	W. Mays					0.10	
15-16-6AB	11800	C-1	0.10	L. Goodman	parking for insurance business	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AB	12200	C-1	0.10	Lutheran Church	church parking	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AB	12300	C-1	0.10	Lutheran Church	church parking	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AB	12400	C-1	0.10	Lutheran Church	church parking	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6AB	12700	C-1	0.21	J. Wrangler	**Developed-Comm.1st Bank**				0.00	
15-16-6AB	12900	C-1	0.14	K. Williams					0.14	
15-16-6AB	2600	C-1	0.17	M. Shrum	parking for office building	x		0.17	0.00	
15-16-6AB	3400	C-1	0.21	McDonald's Corp	parking	x		0.21	0.00	
14-16-31DB	902	C-2	0.50	Rothenbucher					0.50	
14-16-32CC	3600	C-2	0.20	Freedman,Tom	canal; RR; lot depth < 30'; future truck route; unbuildable	x		0.20	0.00	
15-16-4AB	4700	C-2	4.83	Collins,John	**2 acres committed f/U-Haul**	x		2.00	2.83	
15-16-4AB	5300	C-2	0.85	Collins,John	**0.5 acres to body shop business**				0.35	
15-16-5AA	1400	C-2	0.46	Ochoco Plaza	for lease only-**Committed**				0.00	

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels **by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)**

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
15-16-5AA	200	C-2	1.72	Ochoco Plaza	for lease only				1.72	
15-16-5AA	300	C-2	1.64	Ochoco Plaza	street ROW - 0.6 ac.	x		0.60	1.04	
15-16-5AA	4101	C-2	2.00	Hudspeth,F.					2.00	
15-16-6BA	2500	C-2	0.09	S. Lartmer	parking for business	x		0.09	0.00	
15-16-6BA	2700	C-2	0.04	S. Lartmer	parking for business	x		0.04	0.00	
15-16-6BA	3500	C-2	0.25	City of Prineville			x	0.25	0.00	
15-16-6BA	3501	C-2	1.14	City of Prineville			x	1.14	0.00	
15-16-8	203	EFU-2	6.73	Crook County			x	6.73	0.00	
14-16-31C	10000	L-C	3.00	Porfily,F.; comb.w/9900	Schwab truck storage-**Committed**				0.00	
14-16-31C	9900	L-C	1.43	Porfily,F.	Schwab truck storage-**Committed**				0.00	
14-16-31CC	800	L-C	0.18	Flynn,Richard	lot area and access problems				0.18	
15-16-4AA	900	L-C	4.12	Flegel,JD	church under construction-**Committed**				0.00	
14-15-36AC	1100	L-M	10.20	Hall, Robert	Floodplain, Crooked River, access problems; 5.0 ac. vacant-**No Access;Adj.sewer plant**	x		5.20	0.00	
14-16-29	2201	L-M	7.16	Workman's	3.7 ac. developed industrial; 1.4 ac. developed residential; **Committed/Dvlpd.**	x		4.40	0.00	
14-16-30C	500	L-M	0.30	Robison,W.	**Developed**				0.00	
14-16-30C	800	L-M	16.85	Noble,G.	all wetland; unbuildable	x		16.85	0.00	
14-16-31A	100	L-M	44.53	Smith,J.	Collector Rd; RR; Sewer line;**Rezone M-C**				40.03	
14-16-31B	1300	L-M	9.45	Noble,G.	all wetland; unbuildable	x		9.45	0.00	
14-16-32	300	L-M	1.00	Hayes,James					1.00	
14-16-32	307	L-M	33.20	Laughlin,V/S	Stoneridge - 70 lots platted; **34 built**	x		33.20	0.00	33
14-16-32	308	L-M	13.60	Woodward	Stoneridge-platted; committed				0.00	
14-16-31B	2500	M-1	7.79	Ridenour,L.	all wetland; unbuildable	x		7.79	0.00	
14-16-31BC	2500	M-1	0.28	Valleybrook	(Open Space) unbuildable	x		0.28	0.00	
14-16-32CB	1400	M-1	7.86	Thompson,Van	Severely limited by wetlands, high water tables.	x		7.86	0.00	
14-15-25D	1400	M-2	6.11	CityInd.Pk.	divided/developed - **3.73** ac. vacant	x		2.15	3.73	
14-15-36	100	M-2	2.11	FP/Wetlands	unbuildable; greenway	x		2.11	0.00	
14-15-36	103	M-2	8.51	FP/Wetlands	unbuildable; greenway	x		8.51	0.00	
15-15-12B	100	M-3	5.51	City of Prineville			x	5.51	0.00	
15-15-12B	1000	M-3	3.20	City of Prineville			x	3.20	0.00	
15-15-12B	1100	M-3	2.54	City of Prineville			x	2.54	0.00	
15-15-12B	1200	M-3	2.55	City of Prineville			x	2.55	0.00	
15-15-12B	1300	M-3	2.55	City of Prineville			x	2.55	0.00	
15-15-12B	1400	M-3	2.55	City of Prineville			x	2.55	0.00	
15-15-12B	1600	M-3	2.03	City of Prineville			x	2.03	0.00	
15-15-12B	1700	M-3	2.03	City of Prineville			x	2.03	0.00	
15-15-12B	1800	M-3	2.99	City of Prineville			x	2.99	0.00	
15-15-12B	1900	M-3	5.08	City of Prineville			x	5.08	0.00	

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
15-15-12B	2000	M-3	2.70	City of Prineville			x	2.70	0.00	
15-15-12B	2100	M-3	2.71	City of Prineville			x	2.71	0.00	
15-15-12B	2200	M-3	2.71	City of Prineville			x	2.71	0.00	
15-15-12B	2300	M-3	2.71	City of Prineville			x	2.71	0.00	
15-15-12B	2400	M-3	2.70	City of Prineville			x	2.70	0.00	
15-15-12B	400	M-3	4.00	City of Prineville			x	4.00	0.00	
15-15-12B	603	M-3	0.88	O. Christiansen	**Committed-Developed**				0.00	
15-15-12B	700	M-3	4.00	City of Prineville			x	4.00	0.00	
15-15-12B	900	M-3	3.21	City of Prineville			x	3.21	0.00	
15-15-Index	300 (Part)	M-3	22.70	20.7 VACANT	FAA Lease Only "Airport Lands	x		2.00	20.70	
15-15-Index	300	P-R	136.90				x	136.90	0.00	
15-16-6-Index	200	P-R	30.93	State of Oregon	State Park		x	30.93	0.00	
15-16-6-Index	300	P-R	0.29	E. Caves	State Park		x	0.29	0.00	
14-16-29AC	100	R-1	0.71	Smith, Donald	combined w/ TL 200 & 300; extreme slopes - not developable	x		0.71	0.00	
14-16-29AC	1100	R-1	0.12	BKC-Trust	no access; reserved for sewage disposal replacement	x		0.12	0.00	
14-16-29AC	1200	R-1	0.12	Mill, Joanne	no access; reserved for sewage disposal replacement	x		0.12	0.00	
14-16-29AC	1600	R-1	0.48	Eddy, Robert	**Developed-SFD**				0.00	
14-16-29AC	2200	R-1	0.46	Smith, Ethel	sewage disposal reserve area	x		0.46	0.00	
14-16-29AC	2300	R-1	0.24	Smith, Ethel	sewage disposal reserve area	x		0.24	0.00	
14-16-29AC	2400	R-1	0.20	Smith, Ethel	sewage disposal reserve area	x		0.20	0.00	
14-16-29AC	2500	R-1	0.20	Smith, Ethel	sewage disposal reserve area	x		0.20	0.00	
14-16-29AC	300	R-1	0.50	Smith, Donald	combined w/ TL 100 & 200; extreme slopes - not developable	x		0.50	0.00	
14-16-29AC	4700	R-1	0.16	Allen, John	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-29AC	500	R-1	0.54	Moore, Charles	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-29AC	6800	R-1	1.70	Grindstaff, David	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-29AC	900	R-1	0.23	Eddy, Robert					0.23	
14-16-29AD	1700	R-1	0.75	Brown, Thomas					0.75	
14-16-29AD	2000	R-1	0.46	Sangston, Donald	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-29DB	3600	R-1	0.13	D-2 Properties	well pump station site	x		0.13	0.00	
14-16-32BD	1800	R-1	0.50	Gray, Leroy	extreme slopes - driveway - parking for SF DU; unbuildable	x		0.50	0.00	
14-16-32CA	1001	R-1	0.01		Unbuildable	x			0.00	
14-16-32CA	1114	R-1	2.69	Havnier/Low	sand-gravel operation; unbuildable	x		2.69	0.00	
14-16-32CA	3700	R-1	0.23	Jones,Evan					0.23	
14-16-32CA	3800	R-1	0.23	Carder,Ann					0.23	

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
14-16-32CB	1509	R-1	0.22	Chamness,C.					0.22	
14-16-32CD	2200	R-1	0.28	Logsdon,G.	steep slopes; access problems; combined w/ TL 1600 14-16-32DC; unbuildable	x		0.28	0.00	
14-16-32CD	2201	R-1	0.06	Phelps,H/R	steep slopes; access problems; combined w/ TL 1500 14-16-32DC; unbuildable	x		0.06	0.00	
14-16-32CD	2202	R-1	0.04	Cuddy,Paul	steep slopes; access problems; combined w/ TL 1400 14-16-32DC; unbuildable	x		0.04	0.00	
14-16-32DB	1000	R-1	0.20	Bankofier,D.					0.20	
14-16-32DB	10200	R-1	0.17	Hudspeth,Ron	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-31DD	13402	R-2	0.02	Gage,TR	bike path; unbuildable	x		0.02	0.00	
14-16-32	103	R-2	46.24		10 acres wetlands 36 ac platted	x			0.00	104 lots
14-16-32BC	3802	R-2	0.40	Caudle,Bob	Steep Slopes; Wetlands; Quarry				0.00	
14-16-32BC	6901	R-2	0.14	Kine, Dean	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BC	6903	R-2	0.14	Kine, Dean	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BC	6904	R-2	0.14	Kine, Dean	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BC	6905	R-2	0.14	Kine, Dean	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BC	6906	R-2	0.17	Kine, Dean	single-family DU under construction	x		0.17	0.00	
14-16-32BC	6907	R-2	0.17	Kine, Dean	single-family DU under construction	x		0.17	0.00	
14-16-32BC	6909	R-2	0.14	Kine, Dean	single-family DU under construction	x		0.14	0.00	
14-16-32BD	100	R-2	4.32	Kine, Dean	10 lots platted; 2.39 ac. vacant**; All Built**	x		1.93	0.00	
14-16-32BD	1000	R-2	0.14	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	1100	R-2	0.14	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	1200	R-2	0.14	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	1300	R-2	0.14	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	1900	R-2	0.15	Kine, Dean	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	200	R-2	4.60	Gray, Leroy	1 existing DU; 1.5 ac. vacant	x		3.10	1.50	
14-16-32BD	2100	R-2	0.15	Robles, Juvenal	SF DU under construction	x		0.15	0.00	
14-16-32BD	300	R-2	0.15	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	500	R-2	0.15	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	600	R-2	0.14	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32BD	800	R-2	0.15	West Branch Development	**Built**				0.00	
14-16-32CD	2600	R-2	0.59	Alder Entrps.	canal, RR, future truck route; unbuildable	x		0.59	0.00	
14-16-32CD	4300	R-2	0.12	Ochoco Lbr.Co.			x	0.12	0.00	
14-16-32CD	4800	R-2	0.24	Ochoco Lbr.Co.			x	0.24	0.00	
14-16-32CD	6800	R-2	0.14	Alder Entrps.	canal, RR, lot dimensions; unbuildable	x		0.14	0.00	
14-16-32DC	5800	**C-2**	0.49	PAC Club	RR ROW; Canal ROW;**C-2, not R-2**	x		0.14	0.35	
15-16-5AA	2700	R-2	0.21	Quant,Shirley	2/3 of lot is streamway; unbuildable	x		0.14	0.00	
15-16-5AB	900	R-2	0.54	Ochoco Lbr.			x	0.54	0.00	

Table I.4 Inventory of **Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)**

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
15-16-5AC	4100	R-2	7.88		Hudspeth Addtn: 19 lots platted; **All Built**	x		7.88	0.00	
15-16-5C	10800/ 10802	R-2	1.25	Harris,Mary	approved for 24 multi-family units	x		1.25	0.00	24
15-16-5DB	13100	R-2	1.00	Tri-County Homes	**Developed-Built**				0.00	
15-16-5DB	5900	R-2	0.20	N. Cooper					0.20	
15-16-5DB	6000	R-2	0.20	N. Cooper					0.20	
15-16-5DB	7100	R-2	0.19	City of Prineville			x	0.19	0.00	
15-16-5DB	7200	R-2	0.19	City of Prineville			x	0.19	0.00	
15-16-5DB	7700	R-2	0.30	N. Cooper					0.30	
15-16-6AB	15200	R-2	0.18	R. Cox					0.18	
15-16-6AB	301	R-2	0.21	E. Vick	floodplain, riparian, creek;unbuildable	x		0.21	0.00	
15-16-6AC	100	R-2	1.98	W. Gervais	**Committed-Platted**				0.00	5 lots
15-16-6AC	1200	R-2	0.18	W. Gervais	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	1400	R-2	0.18	W. Gervais					0.18	
15-16-6AC	1500	R-2	0.20	W. Gervais	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	1900	R-2	0.19	W. Gervais					0.19	
15-16-6AC	2101	R-2	0.01	City of Prineville			x	0.01	0.00	
15-16-6AC	2200	R-2	0.29	W. Gervais	under contruction	x			0.00	0
15-16-6AC	2500	R-2	0.87	W. Gervais	2 lots platted	x		0.87	0.00	2
15-16-6AC	2600	R-2	0.29	C. Campbell	committed to development; **Built**	x		0.29	0.00	
15-16-6AC	300	R-2	2.98	W. Gervais	11 lots platted; 10 built	x		2.98	0..00	1
15-16-6AC	3000	R-2	0.52	J. Holmlund					0.52	
15-16-6AC	3100	R-2	0.50	J. Holmlund					0.50	
15-16-6AC	3200	R-2	0.48	Palin Enterprises	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	3300	R-2	0.40	J A Morgan Construction					0.40	
15-16-6AC	3400	R-2	0.46	M. Daly	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	3500	R-2	0.42	M. Daly	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	3600	R-2	0.36	W. Gervais					0.36	
15-16-6AC	400	R-2	0.23	W. Gervais	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AC	800	R-2	0.28	W. Gervais	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6AD	1400U01	R-2	0.25	W. Kee	access and parking	x		0.25	0.00	
15-16-6AD	1400U02	R-2	0.25	Overall Investment	access and parking	x		0.25	0.00	
15-16-6AD	2339	R-2	0.26	R. Malone					0.26	
15-16-6AD	2400	R-2	0.46	City of Prineville			x	0.46	0.00	
15-16-6AD	2500	R-2	0.04	City of Prineville			x	0.04	0.00	
15-16-6AD	2601	R-2	0.07	City of prineville			x	0.07	0.00	
14-16-31BC	100	R-3	0.08	Ervin, Gary	street ROW; unbuildable	x		0.08	0.00	
14-16-31BC	2900	R-3	0.06	Ervin, Gary	open space; unbuildable	x		0.06	0.00	
14-16-31BC	3000	R-3	4.94	Valleybrook	1 lot built; 4.78 ac. vacant**; Committed**	x		0.16	0.00	21 lots; MH only

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
14-16-31BC	3100	R-3	0.06	Ervin, Gary	open space; unbuildable	x		0.06	0.00	
14-16-31CB	*700	R-3	1.07	Caraway,R.	*lot limited by Ochoco Creek floodplain and associated wetland areas, and by the Ochoco Creek Bikeway easement.	x		1.07	0.00	
14-16-31CD	6200	R-3	0.45	Cook,Clarence	dimensions: 23' x 744' feet; unbuilable	x		0.45	0.00	
14-15-25D	1402	SR-1	0.60	FP/Wtlnds	unbuildable	x		0.60	0.00	
14-15-25D	1403	SR-1	1.40	FP/wtlnds	unbuildable	x		1.40	0.00	
14-15-36	1200	SR-1	9.40	FP/Wetlands	6.5 ac. buildable; **Rezone to M-C**	x		2.90	6.50	**Rezone M-C**
14-15-36AC	900	SR-1	0.28	Pres. Of the Cascades	church parking	x		0.28	0.00	
14-16-29	105	SR-1	1.04	Green,B.					1.04	
14-16-29	108	SR-1	6.94	Thurman,M.	divided into 3 parcels - 2 developed; extreme slopes; 4.25 ac. vacant	x		2.69	4.25	
14-16-29	1502	SR-1	6.74	Green,B.	**1 DU Built w/2 ac.**				4.74	
14-16-29	1504	SR-1	4.32	Green,B.	**1 DU Built w/1 ac.**				3.32	
14-16-29	1505	SR-1	3.82	Gerety,R.	**1 DU exists (1 ac. min.)**				2.82	
14-16-29	2100	SR-1	32.92	Laughlin,V.	**Committed; 11 ac.M-C; 21 ac.R-2**				0.00	80 lots +/-
14-16-29	2200	SR-1	11.13	Workman's	**Committed/Platted; 103 lots; 5 built**	x		1.20	0.00	98 lots
14-16-29	2201	SR-1	12.57	Workman's	3 ac. developed industrial; 2 ac. developed residential;**Balance see TL2200 above**	x		5.00	0.00	**See TL2200 above**
14-16-30A	300	SR-1	2.78	Vaughan,H.	**1 DU built w/1 ac.min.**				1.78	
14-16-34	1504	SR-1	39.20	Rettke,R.	steep slopes; contract to OSF; all vacant except for 1 ac.; less than 50% buildable	x		21.20	18.00	
15-16-4-Index	2501	SR-1	11.60	Purcell,C.	floodplain	x		11.60	0.00	
15-16-6C	1401	SR-1	0.34	Secretary of Housing	**Built**				0.00	
15-16-6C	2000	SR-1	0.67	D. D'Hondt	**Built (MH)**				0.00	
15-16-6C	2200	SR-1	0.37	D. D'Hondt					0.37	
15-16-6C	2800	SR-1	0.64	E. Fuller					0.64	
15-16-6C	4300	SR-1	1.00	C. Hubbard					1.00	
15-16-6C	4600	SR-1	10.16	G. Palin	steep slopes; 50% buildable	x		5.00	5.16	
15-16-6C	4601	SR-1	0.54	K. Fraser					0.54	
15-16-6C	4700	SR-1	2.30	R. Power					2.30	
15-16-6C	5300	SR-1	2.30	J. Towe	combined w/ TL 5301 (0.76 ac. built); 1.54 ac. vacant				1.54	
15-16-6C	6400	SR-1	0.37	J. Stockton					0.37	
15-16-6-Index	302	SR-1	4.15	L. Hurley	lot configuration; extreme slopes; state highway ROW; access problems; 1 DU max	x		4.15	0.00	1
15-16-6-Index	303	SR-1	0.10	R. Lau	unbuildable	x		0.10	0.00	
15-16-6-Index	307	SR-1	11.65	J. Freedman	extreme slopes; access problems; 30% buildable (3.5 ac.)**Committed 3 lots**	x		8.15	0.00	3 lots
15-16-6-Index	400	SR-1	9.90	Crook County			x	9.90	0.00	
15-16-6-Index	400	SR-1	4.12	Crook County			x	4.12	0.00	

Table I.4 Inventory of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)(10/02 Update)

Map #	Tax lot #	Zoning	Acres	Comments	Other Comments	Partially vacant or un-buildable?	Public Land?	Un-buildable Acres	Gross buildable acres	Vacant platted or potential lots (in excess of net vacant acres)
15-16-9B	102	SR-1	0.05	B. Perrin	access ROW; unbuildable	x		0.05	0.00	
15-16-9B	402	SR-1	0.82	T. Cardin					0.82	
15-16-9B	403	SR-1	0.30	T. Cardin					0.30	
15-16-9B	404	SR-1	2.06	P/Congregation	**Committed-New Church under construct**				0.00	
15-16-4C	11100	SRM-1	0.16	Hendrix,John	1 unit max w/ sewer & water only	x		0.16	0.00	1
15-16-4C	15100	SRM-1	0.15	Ward,Anne	floodway; access problems; lot dimensions				0.00	Occupied w/DU
15-16-4C	16400	SRM-1	4.50	Kennedy,Bobby	extreme slopes; access problems; unbuildable	x		4.50	0.00	
15-16-4C	3900	SRM-1	0.07	Tanori,Ramon	unbuildable without sewer & water				0.00	**Roadway**
15-16-5DD	3600	SRM-1	8.10	B. Kennedy	extreme slopes, BOR canal; access problems, unbuildable	x		8.10	0.00	
			1,087.28					**495.73**	**422.99***	**373**
Subtotals		Indust.		**FAA Lease Only Properties**					**305.7**	
		Indust.		Other Industrial Lands					4.73	
		Comm.		All Commercial Lands					56.92	
		Resid.		All Residential Lands					55.64	

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001 from data provided by the City of Prineville (7/1/1999) and updated by the City of Prineville (February 2001), and "Gross Buildable Acres" updated by the City of Prineville in October of 2002 from Building & Assessor's Records and onsite verification.

Notes:

- "Net" buildable vacant acres are calculated by subtracting land area needed for future public facilities and utilities from gross buildable vacant acres;
- Therefor, 422.99 gross vacant buildable acres less 25% (105.75 acres) results in a balance of 317.24 "net" vacant buildable acres;
  - 41.73 net vacant buildable acres are designated for residential development;
  - 42.69 net vacant buildable acres are designated for commercial development; and
  - The balance, 232.82 net vacant buildable acres are designated for industrial development, of which 229.28 acres are FAA Lease Only lands.

Table 1.5 Summary of Vacant Parcels by Zoning District (updated 10/02)

Zoning		Unbuildable Vacant Acres	Gross Vacant Buildable Acres	Additional Units on Vacant Land
A-C	All FAA Airport Lease Only properties	4.40	25.00	0
A-D	All FAA Airport Lease Only properties	33.57	130.00	0
A-M	All FAA Airport Lease Only properties	2.00	130.00	0
C-1		2.66	1.42	0
C-2		4.67	55.32	0
EFU-2		6.73	0.00	0
L-C		0.00	0.18	0
L-M		69.10	1.00	33
M-1		15.93	0.00	0
M-2		12.77	3.73	0
M-3	All FAA Airport Lease Only properties	57.77	20.70	0
P-R		168.12	0.00	0
R-1		5.54	1.86	0
R-2		22.39	4.79	137
R-3	All 21 lots in one development; Limited to MH only	1.88	0.00	21
R-C		-	-	-
SR-1	178 lots annexed to City & rezoned to R-2	75.44	48.99	182
SRM-1		12.76	0.00	0
Total		**495.73**	**422.99**	**373**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2001; Updated by City - October 2002 based on Building & Assessor's records.
Notes: units listed are *in addition to* the listed acreages.

C. Redevelopable parcels by zoning district

Planning for Residential Growth recommends a final step to separate "redevelopable parcels" from the calculations for developed land. Redevelopable parcels are then to be added to the net buildable acreage in order to calculate the final net buildable acreage totals.

The following methodology was used in order to calculate net redevelopable acreage. An inventory of all parcels in the City of Prineville parcel database that met the following criteria was made:

1) inside the UGB;
2) greater than two acres in size (or part of another ownership greater than 2 acres);
3) not listed as vacant;
4) single-family residential or farm zoning (not multi-family residential or industrial or commercial);
5) non-public ownership; and
6) listed as in residential or farm use (including manufactured home but not mobile home park)

Net redevelopable acreage was then calculated by subtracting 1.0 acre from each site for an existing dwelling, and then subtracting 25% of the site area for public facilities. In cases where there are identified site constraints, the net redevelopable acreage was based on specific site conditions as identified in the table. In certain cases, the City of Prineville has indicated in the database that certain sites have the potential for only a certain number of additional units. In these cases the number of additional units is listed in the "notes" column of the table and the redevelopable acreage is listed as zero with an asterisk.

Table I.6 below shows the inventory of redevelopable parcels. As shown in the table, there are a total of 494.47 net redevelopable acres in the Prineville UGB, of which 365.14 acres or 74% s are in one single ownership.

Table I.6 Inventory of Redevelopable Parcels by Zoning District (updated 10/02)

Map #	Tax lot	Use Status	Zoning	Acres	Notes	Net Redevelopable Acreage
14-16-32BD	1700	Resid	R-1	4.60	steep slopes, access problems, wetlands; 0.5 acre redevelopable; 1 site max.	0.00*
14-16-32CA	1000	Resid/conv	R-1	7.51	developed, built-out	0.00
14-16-32DC	6300	Resid/conv	R-2	4.25	Developed homesite; steep hills; 1.5 acres redevelopable	1.50
15-16-4AA	600	Resid/conv	R-2	8.28	extreme slopes; access problems	0.00
15-16-4AB	1100	Resid/conv	R-2	2.02		0.77
15-16-4AB	1200	Resid/conv	R-2	2.01		0.76
15-16-4AB	5200	Resid/conv	R-2	4.70	extreme slopes; access problems; 1.0 acres redevelopable	1.00
14-16-31CA	*2400	Resid/conv	R-3	4.73	*lot limited by Ochoco Creek floodplain and associated wetland areas, and by the Ochoco Creek Bikeway easement; 1.0 acre max redevelopable	1.00
14-16-31CA	*4400	Res/MH	R-3	3.47	*lot limited by Ochoco Creek floodplain and associated wetland areas, and by the Ochoco Creek Bikeway easement. All flood hazard & waterway. 0.0 acres redevelopable	0.00
14-16-31CB	*400	Res/MH	R-3	2.48	*lot limited by Ochoco Creek floodplain and associated wetland areas, and by the Ochoco Creek Bikeway easement. All flood hazard & waterway; mobile home (2 units) 0.0 acres redevelopable	0.00
14-16-31CB	200	Resid/MH	R-3	2.66	floodplain; wetland; high groundwater; access limits; 1 unit with construction shop	0.00
14-16-31CB	500	comb.w/400	R-3	2.48	floodplain; access problems; high groundwater; 1 site max.	0.00*
14-16-31CD	5900	Resid/conv	R-3	2.79	floodplain; access limits; greenway; high groundwater; 1 site max.	0.00*
15-16-5C	12801/ 12900	Resid/Comm	R-C	5.88		3.66
15-16-5C	13000	Resid/conv	R-C	3.00		1.50
14-15-25C	400/ 500	RurRes/MH	SR-1	15.65	riparian setbacks; **Rezone M-C**	10.99
14-15-36	1100	Resid/conv	SR-1	12.90	**Rezone M-C**	8.93
14-15-36	1400	Resid/conv	SR-1	4.00	flood plain; riparian setbacks; **Rezone M-C**	2.25
14-15-36	1500	Res/MH	SR-1	6.90	flood plain; riparian setbacks; **Rezone M-C**	4.43
14-15-36	900	Resid/conv	SR-1	7.56	flood plain; riparian setbacks; **Rezone M-C**	4.92
14-15-36	901	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.00	flood plain; riparian setbacks; lot dimensions; **Rezone M-C**	3.00
14-15-36B	200	Residential	SR-1	2.26		0.95
14-15-36B	307	Residential	SR-1	4.40	Riparian Setback 100'; net 2.0 redevelopable acres	2.00
14-16 Index	1600	Farm	SR-1	875.00	875 ac. out of 1,113.52 in UGB; BOR canals - 6 ac.; wetlands - 77 ac.; steep unbuildable slopes - 250 ac.; **developed-55.15 ac.** = 486.85 ac. redevelopable * 0 .75 = 365.14 net ac.	365.14
14-16-29	1500	Resid/tract	SR-1	5.33		3.25
14-16-29	1506	Resid/tract	SR-1	2.82	BOR canal; access problems; 1 site max	0.00*
14-16-29	1507	Resid/tract	SR-1	5.22		3.17
14-16-29AC	102	Resid/tract	SR-1	10.92	steep slopes; access problems; 1.77 ac. redevelopable ; 1 site max	0.00*
14-16-29BC	100	Resid(MH)	SR-1	2.20	Developed	0.00
14-16-29BC	800	Resid(MH)	SR-1	3.22		1.67
14-16-29CA	200	Resid/conv, comb.w/204	SR-1	12.09	Developed-Hunter Heights & LP's; 20 lots; 8 built	0.00
14-16-29CA	203	Resid/conv	SR-1	3.00	steep slopes; access problems; 1 site max.	0.00*
14-16-29CA	204	Resid/conv, comb.w/200	SR-1	0.99	combined w/ TL 200	-
14-16-29CA	302	Resid/conv	SR-1	3.83	BOR canal; access problems; steep slopes; developed; 1 ac. redevelopable; 1 site max.	0.00*
14-16-29CA	305	comb.w/301	SR-1	2.41	BOR canal; access problems; steep slopes; developed; 1 ac. redevelopable; 1 site max.	0.00*
14-16-29CB	5400	Resid/farm	SR-1	5.50	wetlands; drainage problems; access problems; 1.5 ac. redevelopable; 2 sites max.	0.00*
14-16-29CB	5600	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.00	divided ; developed	0.00
14-16-29CD	100	Farm	SR-1	5.17	Committed-Platted; 103 lots; 6 built	0.00
14-16-29CD	1700	Farm	SR-1	19.20	steep slopes; drainage problems; partially zoned M-1; 10.78 ac. redevelopable; Committed - See TL100 above.	0.00
14-16-29DC	1000	Farm	SR-1	4.43	developed; existing mint plant; BOR canal; access issues	0.00
14-16-29DC	1100	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.40	BOR canal; deed restrictions against subdivision	0.00

Table I.6 Inventory of Redevelopable Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)

(updated 10/02)

Map #	Tax lot	Use Status	Zoning	Acres	Notes	Net Redevelopable Acreage
14-16-30A	1400	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.05	deed restrictions against subdivision	0.00
14-16-30A	1500	Resid/conv	SR-1	6.79	developed; deed restrictions against subdivision	0.00
14-16-30A	1600	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.52	deed restrictions against subdivision	0.00
14-16-30A	1800	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.16	deed restrictions against subdivision	0.00
14-16-30A	1900	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.41	steep slopes; location of existing DU restricts redevelopment	0.00
14-16-30A	2900	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.28	steep slopes; location of existing DU restricts redevelopment; lot contamination	0.00
14-16-30A	3000	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.46	steep slopes; location of existing DU and lot layout restricts redevelopment; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30A	3100	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.35	steep slopes; location of existing DU and lot layout restricts redevelopment; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30A	3200	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.34	steep slopes; location of existing DU and lot layout restricts redevelopment	0.00
14-16-30A	3201	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.70	steep slopes; location of existing DU and lot layout restricts redevelopment	0.00
14-16-30A	3300	Resid/conv	SR-1	4.31	2 units max due to lot layout and existing DU	0.00*
14-16-30A	3400	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.00	severe slopes; access problems, soils; placement of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30A	3500	Resid/conv	SR-1	24.06	all developed	0.00
14-16-30A	3502	comb.w/TL3400	SR-1	3.51	severe slopes; access problems, placement of existing DU; I unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30A	3600	Resid/conv	SR-1	5.00	drainage problems; wetlands; access problems; placement of existing DU	0.00
14-16-30A	3700	Resid/conv	SR-1	4.77	drainage problems; wetlands; 2 units max.	0.00*
14-16-30A	3701	Res/ farm/ MH	SR-1	19.55	drainage problems; existing shop bldg.	13.91
14-16-30DA:	100	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.39	problems with lot width; access problems; location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DA:	1700	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.35	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DA:	1900	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.81	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DA:	2000	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.35	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DA:	2100	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.35	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DA:	500	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.35	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DB:	100	Resid/MH	SR-1	2.00	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DB:	200	Resid/conv	SR-1	8.25	access problems	3.17
14-16-30DB:	800	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.50	location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DC	100	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.68	access problems; location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DC	300	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.34	access problems; location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DC	400	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.63	already divided; developed	0.00
14-16-30DD	1900	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.24	lot width problems; location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-30DD	2900	Resid/MH	SR-1	2.38	lot width problems; location of existing DU; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-32	**201	Resid/MH	SR-1	16.68	**Severe development limitations due to wetlands, etc.; 9.1 redevelopable acres**; No such lot found**	0.00
14-16-32	200	Resid/conv	SR-1	4.90	steep slopes; wetlands; access problems; 1 unit max.	0.00*
14-16-34	1500	Resid/MH	SR-1	27.03	steep slopes; access problems; existing DUs; 13.5 redevelopable	13.50
15-16-4-Index	2500 (part)	Farm	SR-1	48.62	floodplain; riparian setback, collector route; 29.18 ac. redevelopable	29.18
15-16-6C	4600	Res	SR-1	8.60	extreme slopes; rimrock protection; existing DUs	5.70
15-16-6C	4601	Res	SR-1	3.78	extreme slopes; 1.5 ac. redevelopable	1.50
15-16-6C	4605	Res	SR-1	2.73		1.30
15-16-6C	5400	Res	SR-1	2.15		0.86
15-16-6C	7400	Res	SR-1	2.12	extreme slopes; 1 unit max.	0.00*
15-16-6C	7900	Res	SR-1	2.34	developed	0.00
15-16-9A	107	Tract Land Imp	SR-1	6.79	1 existing home; 1 additional site 3.0+ acres w/ steep slopes; 1.5 redevelopable acres	1.50
15-16-9A	1900	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.15	extreme slopes; difficult lot configuration; 1 unit max.	0.00*
15-16-9A	2500	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.17	extreme slopes; difficult lot configuration; 1 unit max.	0.00*
15-16-9A	2700	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.10	combine w/ TL 2500	-
15-16-9A	800	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.20	combine w/ TL 700; 1 unit max.	0.00*
15-16-9B	101	Resid/conv	SR-1	2.12	1 unit max.	0.00*
15-16-4C	12101	Resid/conv	SRM-1	2.16	**Developed**	0.00

Table I.6 Inventory of Redevelopable Parcels by Zoning District (cont'd.)
(updated 10/02)

Map #	Tax lot	Use Status	Zoning	Acres	Notes	Net Redevelopable Acreage
15-16-4C	12600	Resid/conv	SRM-1	3.98	access problems, steep slopes; floodplain; 1.98 redevelopable	1.98
15-16-4C	400	Resid/conv	SRM-1	2.30	floodplain; high groundwater	0.98
15-16-5DD	3001	Resid/conv	SRM-1	4.33		2.50
Totals				**1,377.39**		**494.47**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2000 from data provided by the City of Prineville (7/1/1999).
Notes: steep slopes are over 25%; wetland and floodplain data from City of Prineville wetland and stream inventory; access problems identified for lots for flag lot access.

- redevelopable acres listed as "0.00*" have development potential for additional units as listed in the "notes."

Table I.7 below shows a summary of vacant buildable acreage and redevelopable acreage by zoning category, along with the additional potential residential units that the vacant parcels could support.

Table I.7 Summary of Redevelopable Parcels by Zoning District(updated 10/02)

Zoning	Acres	Units
R-1	0.00	1
R-2	4.03	0
R-3	0.00	2
R-C	5.16	0
SR-1 (365.14 acres in single ownership)	447.80	25
SRM-1	2.96	0
SR-1 Rezoned to Mixed Use Commercial	34.52	
Total	**494.47**	**28**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2000.
Notes: units listed are *in addition to* the listed acreages.

D. Net buildable vacant 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.8 below.

E. Net buildable acres by zoning district

Table I.8 shows a calculation of net buildable acres by plan designation within the UGB of Prineville. As described in the steps above, *Unbuildable Vacant Acreage* is subtracted from *Gross Vacant Acreage* in order to calculate *Gross Buildable Acreage*. *Acreage for Public Facilities* is then subtracted from this in order to determine *Net Buildable Vacant Acreage*. Finally, *Net Redevelopable Acreage* is added to this to determine *Net Buildable Acreage.*

Table I.8 Net Buildable Acres by Zoning District (updated 10/02)

Zone	Code	Vacant Acreage (see Table I.3)	*Minus* Un-buildable Vacant Acreage (see Table I.5)	*Equals* Gross Buildable Acreage	*Minus* Acreage for Public Facilities (25%)	*Equals* Net Buildable Vacant Acreage	*Plus* Net Redevelopable Acreage (see Table I.7)	*Equals* Net Buildable Acreage
Non-Residential								
Commercial								
City of Prineville zones								
Central Commercial	C-1	5.10	3.78	1.32	0.33	0.99		0.99
General Commercial	C-2	13.05	4.26	8.79	2.20	6.59		6.59
Professional Commercial	C-3	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Neighborhood Commercial	C-4	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Recreation Commercial	C-5	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Total Commercial - City		**18.15**	**8.04**	**10.11**	**2.53**	**7.58**	**0.00**	**7.58**
Crook County zones								
Limited Commercial	L-C	0.18		0.18	0.05	0.13		0.13
Neighborhood Commercial	N-C	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Recreation Commercial	R-C	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	5.16	5.16
Total Commercial - County		**0.18**	**0.00**	**0.18**	**0.05**	**0.13**	**5.16**	**5.29**
Total Commercial		**18.33**	**8.04**	**10.29**	**2.58**	**7.71**	**5.16**	**12.87**
Industrial								
City of Prineville zones								
Limited Industrial	M-1	15.93	15.93	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
General Industrial	M-2	16.50	12.77	3.73	0.93	2.80		2.80
Heavy Industrial	M-3	55.77	55.77	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Total Industrial - City		**88.20**	**84.47**	**3.73**	**0.93**	**2.80**	**0.00**	**2.80**
Crook County zones								
Light Industrial	L-M	76.93	35.90	41.03	10.26	30.77		30.77
Heavy Industrial	H-M	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Total Industrial - County		**76.93**	**35.90**	**41.03**	**10.26**	**30.77**	**0.00**	**30.77**
Total Industrial		**165.13**	**120.37**	**44.76**	**11.19**	**33.57**	**0.00**	**33.57**
Airport								
City of Prineville zones								
Airport Approach Overlay	A-A	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Airport Operations	A-O	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Airport Development	A-D	163.57	33.57	130.00	32.50	97.50		97.50
Airport Commercial	A-C	29.40	4.40	25.00	6.25	18.75		18.75
Airport Business-Industrial	A-M	154.70	4.00	150.70	37.68	113.02		113.02
Total Airport - City		**347.67**	**41.97**	**305.70**	**76.43**	**229.27**	**0.00**	**229.27**

Table I.8 Net Buildable Acres by Zoning District (cont'd.)(updated 10/02)

Zone	Code	Vacant Acreage (see Table I.3)	*Minus* Un-buildable Vacant Acreage (see Table I.4)	*Equals* Gross Buildable Acreage	*Minus* Acreage for Public Facilities (25%)	*Equals* Net Buildable Vacant Acreage	*Plus* Net Redevelopable Acreage (see Table I.6)	*Equals* Net Buildable Acreage
Other								
City of Prineville zones								
Open Space-Park Reserve	P-R	168.12	168.12	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Total Other - City		**168.12**	**168.12**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.0**
Crook County zones								
Exclusive Farm Use	EFU-2	6.73	6.73	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Total Other - County		**6.73**	**6.73**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.0**
Total Non-Residential - City		**622.14**	**302.60**	**319.54**	**79.89**	**239.65**	**0.00**	**239.65**
Total Non-Residential - County		**83.84**	**42.63**	**41.21**	**10.31**	**30.90**	**5.16**	**36.06**
Total Non-Residential		**705.98**	**345.23**	**360.75**	**90.20**	**270.55**	**5.16**	**275.71**
Residential								
City of Prineville zones								
Limited Residential	R-1	8.11	6.25	1.86	0.47	1.39	0.00	1.39
General Residential	R-2	28.68	22.39	6.29	1.57	4.72	4.03	8.75
Suburban Residential	R-3	1.88	1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Residential Redevelopment	R-4	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Air Residential Park	A-R	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.0
Total Residential - City		**38.67**	**30.52**	**8.15**	**2.04**	**6.11**	**4.03**	**10.14**
Crook County zones								
Suburban Residential	SR-1	124.43	75.44	48.99	12.25	36.74	447.80	484.54
Suburban Residential Mobile	SRM-1	12.76	12.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.96	2.96
Total Residential - County		**137.19**	**88.20**	**48.99**	**12.25**	**36.74**	**450.76**	**487.50**
Total Residential		**175.86**	**118.72**	**57.14**	**14.29**	**42.85**	**454.79**	**497.64**
Total - City zones		**660.81**	**333.12**	**327.69**	**81.93**	**245.76**	**4.03**	**249.79**
Total - County zones		**221.03**	**130.83**	**90.20**	**22.56**	**67.64**	**455.92**	**523.56**
TOTAL		**881.84**	**463.95**	**417.89**	**104.49**	**313.40**	**459.95**	**773.35**

As shown in Table I.8 above, there are 275.71 acres of net buildable non-residential land and 497.64 acres of net buildable residential land for a total of 773.35 acres of net buildable land within the UGB of the City of Prineville. Of this total, 249.79 acres (239.65 nonresidential acres and 10.14 residential acres), or 32 percent, is located within the city limits.

Table I.9 that follows shows the net buildable land included in the above totals that is located in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) lease-only areas assigned to and surrounding the airport. Out of the total of 275.71 acres of net buildable acres in nonresidential areas in the Prineville UGB, 229.27 acres or 83% are FAA lease-only airport properties.

Table I.9 Net Buildable Acres in Lease-Only Land by Zoning District

		Gross Buildable Acreage	Net Buildable Acreage
Airport Development	A-D	130.00	97.50
Airport Commercial	A-C	25.00	18.75
Airport Business-Industrial	A-M	130.00	97.50
Heavy Industrial	M-3	20.70	15.52
Total		**305.70**	**229.27**

II. Actual Density and Mix of Housing

The City of Prineville does have limited data for the density and mix of housing of recent development (last 5 years), but not for any time previously. The City also has building permit data for July 1997 through October 2002; This data includes the number of building permits by type (residential, commercial, plumbing, electrical, etc.) and month, and but it does not contain information that differentiates residential type or size, nor does it contain information on the lot or parcel size of each unit. The City of Prineville and Crook County both have building permit data for the entire county, the incorporated area of Prineville, and the UGB area of Prineville from April 1990 through October 2002. However, this data does not report lot sizes, type of unit, densities, etc.

Because of this limitation in the available data, TBAC only completed calculations for the density and mix of housing for the city's housing stock as a whole. Information for the entire city has been obtained from the City of Prineville parcel database. The City has, however, calculated the overall and net densities of some of the most recent developments within the City, but not within the UGB outside the City. For example, the overall density of recent subdivisions (10 developments encompassing a total of 197 acres divided into 640 lots) has averaged 3.26 units per acre; Deducting 25% of the land area for streets and other public rights-of-ways and easements, the net density of such developments would be 4.35 units per net acre. Of the 640 lots total of these 10 developments, more than 90% are either currently occupied by or limited to single-family dwelling units because of minimum lot size requirements.

A. Residential mix – City of Prineville

Table II.1 indicates the number and percentage of housing units by type for the housing stock in the City of Prineville as a whole. Single-family units include manufactured homes on individual lots and single-family attached units. *In comparison to the data reported in Table II.1, the 2000 Census reports that single-family units comprise 66% of the total housing units, multi-family units (duplexes & more) consist of 16%, and mobile homes in mobile home parks represent 17%.*

As shown in Table II.1, based on the City's *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections* document, TBAC reported a total of 3,328 housing units in the Prineville city limits as of July 2000 and an average household size of 2.4 persons. *In comparison thereto, the 2000 Census (only recently available) reports a total of 4,160 housing units in the City "Urban Cluster," and an average household size of 2.57 for an "urban cluster" 2000 population of 10,691.*

Table II.1 Residential Housing Types in the City of Prineville

	1990 Housing Mix (2)	1990 Housing Mix %	New Housing (from 1990-July 2000) (3)	New Housing %	Current Housing Mix (July 2000) (4)	Current Housing Mix %
Single-family (detached & attached) (1)	1,644	71.9%	367	35.3%	2,011	60.4%
Multi-family	387	16.9%	311	29.9%	698	21.0%
Manufactured homes	229	10.0%	313	30.1%	542	16.3%
Other	27	1.2%	50	4.8%	77	2.3%
Total	**2,287**	**100.0%**	**1,041**	**100.0%**	**3,328**	**100.0%**

Notes:
Manufactured home totals are for those in parks.
(1) City of Prineville does not distinguish between single-family detached and single-family attached in its data;
(2) 1990 U.S. Census
(3) data from building permit records and tabulated by the City of Prineville in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000).
(4) Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data and (2) above.

Table II.1 Residential Housing Types in the City of Prineville
2000 Census Update

	1990 Housing Mix (2)	1990 Housing Mix %	New Housing 1990-2000 Census data	New Housing %	Current Housing Mix (2000 Census)	Current Housing Mix % (2000 Census)
Single-family (detached & attached) (1)	1,644	71.9%	1,093	58.4%	2,737	65.8%
Multi-family	387	16.9%	289	15.4%	676	16.3%
Manufactured homes	229	10.0%	473	25.2%	702	16.9%
Other	27	1.2%	18	1.0%	45	1.0%
Total	**2,287**	**100.0%**	**1,873**	**100.0%**	**3,328**	**100.0%**

As shown in Table II.1 above, multi-family units and manufactured/mobile homes in parks represent a much greater share of the development that has occurred in the last ten years in Prineville compared to the 1990 overall housing type mix. In 1990 single-family housing represented nearly 72 percent of the housing mix, with multi-family units and manufactured homes representing 17 percent and 10 percent, respectively. Of the housing built from 1990 to 2000, however, only 58 percent were single-family homes, while multi-family units and manufactured homes represented 15 percent and 25 percent of the new housing mix respectively.

This significant increase in multiple and mobile home units in the past decade is directly related to a number of senior housing projects that were developed in response to a clearly identified need, including a number of multi-family unit complexes and one "major" mobile home park. It is also important to note that 80% of the multi-family units developed during this reporting period has been "government assisted" housing; Relative thereto, the private sector indicates that funding for non-government assisted multi-family housing units for the Prineville area is extremely difficult to obtain.

Also, contrary to this apparent trend towards more multi-family housing, in the past 5 years nearly 80 percent of the new units constructed in the City have been single-family detached units. As a result, the 2000 Census reports that single-family units still represent 66 percent of the total housing mix, with multi-family units and manufactured homes at 16 percent and 17 percent, respectively. Such is not a significant change from the reported housing mix in 1990.

B. Residential density – City of Prineville

In order to determine the existing residential density in the City of Prineville, an inventory of all parcels in the City of Prineville parcel database that met the following criteria was made: 1) in a City of Prineville R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 zone; and, 2) listed as in residential use.

Residential units in zones other than R-1, R-2, or R-3 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 Prineville 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.;
Average density totals: total dwelling units divided by total acreage;
Median density totals: average of median densities for each component, weighted by dwelling units.

The *median density* figures shown in Table II.2 below are a more accurate representation of overall development density in Prineville than the *average density* figures. This is because the average density figures can be unduly swayed by extremely large or small lots.

Table II.2 Existing Residential Development Density
City of Prineville Residential Zones

	Total Acreage	Developed Lots (1)	Dwelling Units (DU)	Average Density (DU/acre)	Median Density (DU/acre)
Single-family					
R-1 zone	143.6	422	422	2.94	4.35
R-2 Zone	312.4	1,281	1,281	4.10	5.26
R-3 Zone	29.0	58	58	2.00	3.33
Manufactured home on single-family lot in R-2 and R-3 zones	9.72	25	25	2.57	4.35
Total Single-family	**494.6**	**1,786**	**1,786**	**3.61**	**4.97**
Multi-Family					
R-2 and R-3 zones	16.3	39	243	14.95	11.01
Manufactured Home Park					
R-2 and R-3 zones	23.4	4	207	8.87	9.82
Total	**534.2**	**1,829**	**2,236**	**4.19**	**6.08**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp., 2000 from data provided by the City of Prineville (7/1/1999).
Notes:
(1) lots listed as "combined" in database are aggregated.

As shown in Table II.2 above, the median density of existing single-family units in Prineville is approximately 5.0 dwelling units per acre. Multi-family units have a median density of 11.0 dwelling units per acre and manufactured home parks have a median density of 9.8 dwelling units per acre. The overall density in Prineville for all dwelling units in residential zones is 6.1 dwelling units per acre (weighted average of the median densities of single-family, multi-family, and manufactured home park units).

III. Housing and Residential Land Needs Analysis

The objective of this section is to determine the amount of land needed in the City of Prineville *Urban Area* for each needed housing type for the next 20 years; *i.e. Year 2003 thru 2023*.

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 Prineville. Since the City of Prineville 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. As shown in Table III.1, PSU estimated the City of Prineville's population was 8,205, or 45.2 percent of the total Crook County population of 18,150. PSU estimated the City of Prineville's population in 1999 was 7,255, or 43.2 percent of the total Crook County population of 16,800.

The City of Prineville and Crook County disagreed with this population estimate as detailed in a letter to DLCD entitled *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000). As shown in Table III.1 below, the City of Prineville estimates its 1999 population at 7,593, or 38.0 percent of its estimate of the Crook County population of 19,960. Furthermore, the City estimates the 1999 UGB population of Prineville at 10,707, or 53.6 percent of the total estimated Crook County population of 19,960.

The *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections* document estimates the July 2000 population of the Prineville Urban Area (all land within the UGB) at 10,902, or 53.1 percent of the total estimated Crook County population of 20,536.

In comparison to the foregoing population information set forth in the TBAC report, the following corresponding data is derived from (or based on) the 2000 Census and PSU Population Data for 2001 and 2002:

- *2000 Census Data:*
  - *Crook County population: 19,182;*
  - *City population: 7,356;*
  - *City population as % of County: 38.4%.*

- *PSU 2001 Population Data:*
  - *Crook County population: 19,850;*
  - *City population: 7,940;*
  - *City population as % of County: 40.0%*

2. Population projections

The following section summarizes population projections which were made by TBAC for Prineville and Crook 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 Crook County population projection of 23,678 in 2020. *Note: The 2001 population for Crook County, as certified by PSU, is approximately equal to the OEA projections for the year 2009.*

The City of Prineville formally proposed a modification to the official Crook County population forecast (and the resulting allocation for the city) in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County*. This document provided a proposed new Crook County population forecast. This new forecast increased Crook County's population forecast for the year 2020 to 31,385. The forecast also estimated the Prineville urban area population at 18,203 in 2020, based on a 58 percent share of the total Crook County population estimate. This figure has been agreed upon by the City and County.

Population estimates and projections for 1990, 1999, 2000, and 2020 set forth in the TBAC report are shown in Table III.1 below.

Table III.1 Population Estimates and Projections 1990-2020

	1990 U.S. Census (1)	PSU (2)	City of Prineville (3)	PSU (4)	City of Prineville (5)	OEA Projection	City of Prineville Projection (6)
	1990	1999	1999	2000	2000	2020	2020
Crook County	14,111	16,800	19,960	18,150	20,536	23,678	31,385
Prineville UGB	7,780	-	10,707	-	10,902	-	18,203
City of Prineville	5,355	7,255	7,593	8,205	-	-	-

Notes:
(1) 1990 U.S. Census for City and County, and City of Prineville estimate for UGB
(2) State-certified population estimate - PSU (for July, 1999)
(3) City of Prineville estimate (for July, 1999)
(4) State-certified population estimate - PSU (for July, 2000)
(5) City of Prineville estimate (for July, 2000)
(6) City of Prineville estimate (in coordination with Crook County)
Sources:
1990 U.S. Census
Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University
Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA)
City of Prineville

The growth rates implied by these different estimates and projections are shown below. Table III.2 below shows the annual average growth rate (AAGR) for a number of different population estimates and projections for Crook County, the Prineville urban area, and the City of Prineville.

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

	1990 Census - 1999 PSU Estimate	1990 Census - 1999 City Estimate	1990 Census – 2000 PSU Estimate	1990 Census – 2000 City Estimate	2000 PSU Estimate – 2020 OEA Projection	2000 City Estimate – 2020 OEA Projection	2000 City Estimate – 2020 City Projection
Crook County	1.96%	3.93%	2.55%	3.82%	1.34%	0.71%	2.14%
Prineville UGB	-	3.61%	-	3.43%	-	-	2.60%
City of Prineville	3.43%	3.96%	4.36%	-	-	-	-

As shown in Table III.2, the annual average growth rate (AAGR) implied by the City of Prineville population estimate for Crook County in 2000 and the OEA forecast for 2020 is 0.71 percent. By contrast, even using the contested PSU estimate for the Crook County population in 1999 shows an AAGR of 1.96 percent from the 1990 U.S. Census figures. City of Prineville estimates show a 3.93 percent AAGR for the Crook County population from 1990 to 1999. PSU estimates show an AAGR of 4.36 percent for the incorporated area of Prineville from 1990 to 2000.

The City of Prineville projected AAGR for Crook County as a whole from 2000 to 2020 is 2.14 percent, a rate that is only approximately 55 percent of the growth rate estimated by the City for Crook County from 1990 to 1999 of 3.93 percent. The AAGR for the Prineville urban area for 2000 to 2020 is 2.60 percent, based on an increasing share of the total County population (to 58 percent by 2020)agreed to by the City and the County.

- *Note: All of the foregoing AAGR's were developed without the data now provided by the 2000 Census. Based on said Census data, the following AAGR's are set forth:*
  - *AAGR for Crook County - 1990 to 2000: 3.59 percent.*
  - *AAGR for City of Prineville - 1990 to 2000: 3.74 percent.*

3. Scenarios

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

Scenario A is based on the official population estimates and projections from PSU and OEA.

Scenario B is based on a higher growth rate for Crook County and Prineville proposed by the City of Prineville and Crook County in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County.* Refer to that document for an in-depth explanation of the figures. Scenario B more closely follows historic population trends and recent population trends in the region.

As shown in Tables III.3a and III.3b below, the growth rate for the Prineville urban area for 1999-2020 is 1.79 percent in Scenario A and 2.60 percent in Scenario B. Scenario B represents a growth rate 45.2 percent greater than Scenario A. However, because the two scenarios have **different "base" population figures for 2000**, the projected population growth varies by a greater amount.

Scenario A projects a population growth of 4,098 for the Prineville Urban Area, while Scenario B projects a population growth of 7,301 for the 2000-2020 period. The figure for Scenario B is 78 percent greater than the figure for Scenario A.

TBAC believes that even the growth rate under Scenario B (based on the coordinated City of Prineville and Crook County population estimate and projection) is low, based on recent growth history in Prineville. Therefore, a third growth scenario – Scenario C is proposed. This scenario uses a 3.50 percent AAGR, based on recent growth trends. Scenario C projects a population growth of 10,791 for the 2000-2020 period for the Prineville Urban Area as shown in Table III.3c.

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)
Crook County	18,150	23,678	5,528	30.5%	1.34%
Prineville UGB	9,635	13,733	4,098	42.5%	1.79%

Notes:
(1) 2000 Prineville UGB population based on 53.1% share of total County population estimated by Prineville for 2000 (10,902 UGB population divided by 20,536 County population).
(2) 2020 Projected UGB population based on 58% share of total County population agreed upon by City of Prineville and Crook County.

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

	Current Population (July, 2000) (1)	Projected Population (2020) (2)	Projected Growth 2000-2020	% increase	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Crook County	20,536	31,385	10,849	52.8%	2.14%
Prineville UGB	10,902	18,203	7,301	67.0%	2.60%

Notes:
(1) 2000 Crook County and Prineville UGB population based City of Prineville estimates.
(2) 2020 Crook County population based on City of Prineville estimates; projected UGB population based on 58% share of total County population agreed upon by City of Prineville and Crook County.

Table III.3c Scenario C - Population Projection 2000-2020

	Current Population (July, 2000) (1)	Projected Population (2020) (2)	Projected Growth 2000-2020	% increase	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Prineville UGB	10,902	21,693	10,791	99.0%	3.50%

Notes:
(1) 2000 Prineville UGB population based City of Prineville estimates.
(2) Projected UGB population based on 3.50% AAGR.

The City and County have thoroughly evaluated the foregoing TBAC Population Projections Scenarios, past OEA projections, and the "actual growth rates" resulting from a comparison of 1990 and 2000 Census data; The City and County have also discussed the findings related thereto with regional LCDC staff whom have agreed that such a methodology should be acceptable; As a result of such evaluations and discussions, and primarily based on the 1990 to 2000 growth rates shown by Census data (i.e. AARP of 3.59% for the County; and, AARP of 3.74% for the City), the City and County have jointly agreed to utilize a 3.5% AARP for the period from 2003 to 2023 as the basis for projecting population for the Prineville Urban Area (the period of 2003 to 2023 was used as the 20-year needs period based on an expected Year 2003 completion [adoption] date for the Prineville Urban Area Comprehensive Plan).

The City and Urban Area population projections resulting from this methodolgy are set forth in the following Table III.3d. Scenario D-Population Projection 2003-2023.

Table III.3d Scenario D - Population Projection 2000-2020

	Current Population (January, 2003) (1)	Projected Population (2023) (2)	Projected Growth 2003-2023	% increase	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Prineville UGB	11,800	24,540	12,740	100.8%	3.50%

Notes:

(1) 2003 Prineville UGB population based Census data for 2000, PSU data for 2002, Crook County Assessment Rolls, and City and County Building & Planning Department records.

(2) Projected UGB population based on 3.50% AAGR.

The foregoing population projection is equal to the TBAC Scenario C Projection for 2000-2020 if such was projected forward to the Year 2023. The foregoing population projection is derived from the detailed year-by-year projections for the County, the Prineville UGB Area, and the City of Prineville set forth in the following Table III.3e.

Table III.3e - Population Projection 2003-2023
CROOK COUNTY, PRINEVILLE UGB & CITY OF PRINEVILLE
Average Annual Growth Rate for County: 3.5%

	COUNTY	PRINEVILLE UGB AREA		CITY OF PRINEVILLE		
YEAR	POPULATION	%COUNTY	POPULATION	%COUNTY	%UGB	POPULATION
2000 (Census)	**19,182**	**55.3%**	**10,600**	**38.3%**	**69.4%**	**7,356**
2001 (PSU)	**19,850**	**55.3**	**10,995**	**39.0**	**70.6**	**7,750**
2002	20,545	55.5	11,400	39.2	70.6	8,050
2003	21,264	55.5	11,800	39.4	71.0	8,378
2004	22,008	55.6	12,236	39.6	71.3	8,724
2005	**22,779**	**55.7**	**12,688**	**39.9**	**71.7**	**9,097**
2006	23,576	55.8	13,155	40.2	72.0	9,472
2007	24,400	55.9	13,640	40.5	72.5	9,889
2008	25,255	56.0	14,142	40.9	73.0	10,324
2009	26,139	56.2	14,690	41.2	73.4	10,782
2010	**27,054**	**56.4**	**15,258**	**41.6**	**73.7**	**11,245**
2011	28,000	56.5	15,848	41.9	74.0	11,728
2012	28,980	56.7	16,432	42.1	74.3	12,209
2013	29,995	56.8	17,037	42.4	74.7	12,727
2014	31,045	56.9	17,665	42.7	75.0	13,249
2015	**32,130**	**57.0**	**18,314**	**42.9**	**75.3**	**13,790**
2016	33,256	57.2	19,022	43.2	75.6	14,380
2017	34,420	57.4	19,757	43.6	76.0	15,015
2018	35,625	57.5	20,484	43.9	76.3	15,629
2019	36,872	57.6	21,238	44.2	76.7	16,290
2020	**38,162**	**57.7**	**22,020**	**44.4**	**77.0**	**16,955**
2021	39,498	57.8	23,000	45.0	77.0	17,650
2022	40,880	57.9	23,670	45.0	77.6	18,368
2023	**42,310**	**58.0**	**24,540**	**45.2**	**78.0**	**19,125**

- Notes: The foregoing population projections for Crook County, the Prineville UGB and the City of Prineville are based on the following factors:
  - The 1990 & 2000 U.S. Census data is utilized as the "base data" and is assumed to be accurate.

- Table III.3e, Notes; Contd.
  - The **average annual growth rate for the City** from 1990 to 2000 was **3.74%.**
  - The **average annual growth rate for the County** from 1990 to 2000 was **3.59%.**
  - The **projected average annual growth rate for the County** for the next 20 years (i.e. 2003 to 2023) utilized for the foregoing population projections **is 3.5%**.
  - A 3.5% AARP is approximately equal to the average overall annual growth for the Central Oregon Region by OEA.
  - The **2002 County Population is approximately equal to the State's (OEA) projected County Population through the year 2012.**
  - As agreed to previously by the City and the County, it is assumed that the percentage of total County population to be located within the UGB in the next 20 years will increase from the current level of 55.5% to 58.0%.
  - That the percentage of the total UGB population located within the City over the next 20 years will increase from the current level of 70.6% to 78.0% due to the fact that the vast majority of new development within the UGB will be developed with City water and sewer services which requires annexation.
  - That the percentage of the total County population located within the City over the next 20 years will increase from the current level of 39.0% to 45.0%.

4. Household projection

The average household size for *new* households in Prineville in the next 20 years has been conservatively estimated at 2.25 persons/household, based on an existing citywide figure of 2.40 in the *Central Oregon Housing Needs Assessment of 2000* report (Central Oregon Regional Housing Authority/Rees Consulting) and on PSU data relative to the number of added dwelling units per year versus annual population growth. In general, average household size across the state is decreasing gradually and is projected to continue. In 1990, the persons per household figure in Prineville was 2.43 (based on 5,355 total population minus 90 people in group quarters, and then divided by 2,165 households).

In the TBAC Report, the projected 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, B & C– New Household Projection 2000-2020

	Projected New Population (2020)	Projected Household Size for New Population	Projected New Households (2020)
Prineville UGB - Scenario A	4,098	2.25	1,821
Prineville UGB - Scenario B	7,301	2.25	3,245
Prineville UGB - Scenario C	10,791	2.25	4,796

Notes: non-household population (person in group quarters) factored in by household size figure. There were an estimated 90 persons in group quarters in the City of Prineville in 1990 (U.S. Census)

As shown in Table III.4, there are 1,821 new households projected in Scenario A, 3,245 new households projected in Scenario B, and 4,796 new households projected in Scenario C in the Prineville 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.

Utilizing this same methodology for projecting new households for the year 2023, and utilizing the population projection set forth in Tables III.3d and III.3e (i.e. ***Scenario D), a total of 5,662 new households will be needed by the Year 2023.***

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

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

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

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

In conclusion, smaller households, older households and higher housing costs are expanding markets for "alternative housing" and reducing the demand for traditional large-lot single-family development. Housing types which will see greater demand include smaller-lot single-family developments, manufactured housing, clustered single-family housing, duplexes, condominiums, and zero-lot line houses. ***Although markets for "alternative housing" in the Prineville Urban Area have shown some demand in recent years (especially duplexes, including both rental units and zero-lot-line sale units), the vast majority (80%+) of new housing units are still single-family conventional dwelling units on individual lots. It has also become apparent that there is an expanding demand for single-family "higher valued" custom homes ($150,000+) on individual lots at a lesser density than currently being developed for the highest demand single-family housing on individual lots at less than $125,000.***

There is no indication that local trends in Prineville and Crook County significantly contradict the degree to which larger trends affecting the nation as a whole will affect the local market for housing. Household size in Prineville is slightly lower than the statewide average and has been decreasing gradually.

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

Some of the best indicators of housing needs are household incomes by household size and age of head of household. Ideally, an analysis would examine these statistics cross-tabulated against each other. However, cross-tabulation of this data can only be obtained from Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) from the 1990 Census for larger metropolitan areas. The smallest geographic level for which PUMS data is available is 100,000 people. The PUMS area which includes the City of Prineville, contains all of the following counties: Crook, Deschutes, Hood River, Jefferson, Sherman, and Wasco. This information is not useful for conducting a housing analysis for the City of Prineville. Therefore, non-cross-tabulated data is examined separately in order to determine the connection of this demographic information to housing need.

Unfortunately, 2000 Census number are not yet available ***(i.e. such was unavailable at the time of the TBAC Report, but some related 2000 Census data is now available and is set forth hereinafter)*** and tabulations in the 1970 Census and 1980 Census for household income, household size, and age of householder are unavailable or unavailable in the same format as the 1990 Census. For example, household size and household income breakdowns are unavailable for places with less than 50,000 in population. Therefore, a trend analysis of these variables is impossible. The general trend analysis presented in Part B is a substitute for a more detailed trend analysis.

Table III.5a below provides a summary of household income, age of the head of household, household size, and tenure for the City of Prineville in 1990. This information is examined in more detail in subsequent tables.

Table III.5a City of Prineville
Household Income, Size, Age of Head of Household, and Tenure, 1990

	Number	% Share
Household Income		
<$10,000 (Very Low)	411	19.0%
$10-14,999 (Low)	292	13.5%
$15-24,999 (Mid)	556	25.7%
$25-34,999 (High-Mid)	439	20.3%
$35-49,999 (High)	336	15.5%
>$50,000 (Very High)	131	6.1%
Total	2,165	100.0%
Median Income	$22,127	-
Household Size		
1	647	29.9%
2	716	33.1%
3	327	15.1%
4	286	13.2%
5+	189	8.7%
Total	2,165	100.0%
Age of Head of Household		
15-24	146	6.7%
25-34	381	17.4%
35-44	435	19.8%

	Table III.5a; Contd.		
	Age of Head of Household; Contd.		
	45-54	231	10.5%
	55-64	337	15.4%
	65+	664	30.3%
Total		2,194	100.0%
Renter Households		838	38.2%
Owner Households		1,356	61.8%

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.5b City of Prineville
Household Income, Size, Age of Head of Household, and Tenure, 2000 Census

	Number	% Share
Household Income - 1999		
<$10,000 (Very Low)	355	12.7%
$10-14,999 (Low)	323	11.5%
$15-24,999 (Mid)	483	17.3%
$25-34,999 (High-Mid)	468	16.7%
$35-49,999 (High)	469	16.8%
>$50,000 (Very High)	701	25.0%
Total	2,799	100.0%
Median Income	$30,435	-
Average Household Size	2.55	
Age of Head of Household		
15-24	224	8.0%
25-34	524	18.6%
35-44	543	19.3%
45-54	438	15.5%
55-64	350	12.4%
65+	738	26.2%
Total	2,817	100.0%
Renter Households	1,031	36.6%
Owner Households	1,786	63.4%

Table III.5c City of Prineville Urban Area
Household Income, Size, Age of Head of Household, and Tenure, 2000 Census

	Number	% Share
Household Income - 1999		
<$10,000 (Very Low)	443	11.3%
$10-14,999 (Low)	388	9.9%
$15-24,999 (Mid)	759	19.4%
$25-34,999 (High-Mid)	618	15.8%
$35-49,999 (High)	720	18.4%
>$50,000 (Very High)	994	25.3%
Total	3,922	100.0%
Median Income	$31,472	-
Average Household Size	2.57	
Age of Head of Household		
15-24	288	7.3%
25-34	679	17.3%
35-44	744	18.9%
45-54	675	17.2%
55-64	513	13.1%
65+	1,030	26.2%
Total	3,929	100.0%
Renter Households	1,311	33.4%
Owner Households	2,618	66.6%

- *Notes: Tables III.5a, III.5b and III.5c comparisons:*
  - *The percentage of households by Income level category has increased relatively uniformly from the lower income categories to the upper income categories which is reflective of increasing higher median incomes in general.*
  - *The Ages of Head of Households shows a shift from older to younger with the under 35 age categories increasing from 24.1% to 26.6% and 24.6% for the City and Urban Area respectively, the 35 to 55 age categories increasing from 30.3% to 34.8% and 36.1% for the City and Urban Area respectively, and the over 55 age categories have decreased from 45.7% to 38.6% and 39.3% for the City and Urban Area respectively.*
  - *The classification of households between "renters" and "home owners" has increased in the "home owners" category from 61.8% to 63.4% and 66.6% for the City and Urban Area respectively.*
  - *Average household sizes show little change from 1990 to 2000.*
  - *The trends shown by the foregoing Tables are contrary to the national trends in the matter of households becoming smaller, the ages of heads of households increasing, and shifts from ownership to renters.*

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

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

Structure Type	Renter-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	% Owner-Occupied	Vacant	% Vacant	Total
Single-family detached	363	23.1%	1,150	73.2%	59	3.8%	1,572
Single-family attached	57	79.2%	15	20.8%	0	0.0%	72
Multi-family (2+ units)	334	86.3%	22	5.7%	31	8.0%	387
Manufactured homes	66	28.8%	160	69.9%	3	1.3%	229
Other	18	66.7%	9	33.3%	0	0.0%	27
Total	**838**	**36.6%**	**1,356**	**59.3%**	**93**	**4.1%**	**2,287**

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

As shown in Table III.6, in 1990 there were 2,287 housing units in the City of Prineville. Of these, 2,194 were occupied and 93 were vacant - a vacancy rate of 4.1 percent. Of the occupied housing units, 838 were renter-occupied (38.2 percent of occupied units) and 1,356 were owner-occupied (61.8 percent of occupied 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 – 8.0 percent - with most of the occupied units naturally occupied by renters. Manufactured homes were owner-occupied at a rate approaching that of single-family homes, suggesting that these units are a popular alternative to ownership of single-family homes.

- *Corresponding data in the 2000 Census shows the following information for comparison to the data in Table III.6 above:*
  - *Of a total of 3,022 housing units in the City in 2000, 2,817 or 93.2% were occupied; and 205 units were vacant for a vacancy rate of 6.8%.*

- *Of a total of 4,190 housing units in the Urban Area in 2000, 3,929 were occupied; and 261 units were vacant for a vacancy rate of 6.2%.*
- *Of a total of 2,817 occupied housing units in the City in 2000, 63.4% were Owner-occupied, and 36.6% were Renter-occupied.*
- *Of a total of 3,929 occupied housing units in the Urban Area in 2000, 66.6% were Owner-occupied, and 33.4% were Renter-occupied.*
- *In the City in 2000, the vacancy rate for owner-occupied housing was 2.8% and for rental housing 7.9%.*
- *In the Urban Area in 2000, the vacancy rate for owner-occupied housing was 2.6% and for rental housing 7.8%.*
- *Therefor, the percentage of total occupied housing units that is Owner-occupied increased from 1990 to 2000 from 59.3% to 63.4%, and the overall vacancy rate has increased from 4.1% to 6.8% from 1990 to 2000.*

Tables III.7a *and III.7b* below examine housing tenure by the age classification of the head of the household in 1990 and 2000.

Table III.7a City of Prineville Age of Household Head by Tenure, 1990

Age of Head of Household	Renter-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	% Owner-Occupied	Total
Under 25	136	93.2%	10	6.8%	146
25-34	204	53.5%	177	46.5%	381
35-44	178	40.9%	257	59.1%	435
45-54	97	42.0%	134	58.0%	231
55-64	90	26.7%	247	73.3%	337
65+	133	20.0%	531	80.0%	664
Total	**838**	**38.2%**	**1,356**	**61.8%**	**2,194**

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

Table III.7b City of Prineville Age of Household Head by Tenure, 2000

Age of Head of Household	Renter-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	% Owner-Occupied	Total
Under 25	152	95.6%	7	4.4%	159
25-34	276	52.7%	248	47.3%	524
35-44	209	38.5%	334	61.5%	543
45-54	138	31.5%	300	68.5%	438
55-64	82	23.4%	268	76.6%	350
65+	174	23.6%	564	76.4%	738
Total	**1,031**	**36.6%**	**1,786**	**63.4%**	**2,817**

Source: 2000 U.S. Census.

As shown in Tables III.7a and III.7b above, propensity for home ownership in Prineville is the least among younger households and increases steadily with age. *However, the greatest increase in home ownership from 1990 to 2000 occurred in the age category of 45-54, while the largest decrease occurred in the age category of 55-64. It is also noted that home ownership from 1990 to 2000 only decreased by 2.4% for the age category "under 25", while the decrease for the age category of 65+ was 3.6%. It is also important to note that the overall ratio of renter-occupied to owner-occupied in 2000 (36.6% to 63.4% respectively) for Prineville is very similar to the State ratio of 33.6% to 66.4%.*

In 1990, among the youngest householder age group (15-24 years), over 93 percent of households were renters, as compared to 38 percent of all households in Prineville. *In 2000, over 95% of the 15-24 age group householders were renters, as compared to 36.6% for all households in the City.*

Householders aged 20-34 also had large rental rates in 1990, with over 53% of such households renting their housing, *but by 2000 that factor had decreased to just under 53%. In both 1990 and 2000,* householders aged 35-44 and 45-54 were more representative of the population as a whole, *however the ratio of renter households in both of these categories decreased significantly from 1990 to 2000.* For older householders aged 55-64 in 1990, over 73 percent owned their own home, *and that factor increased to nearly 77% by 2000.* The home owner rate in 1990 increased to 80 percent for households with head above the age of 65, *but actually decreased to 76+% by 2000.*

Table III.8 below shows how income correlated with the age of the householder in 1990.

Table III.8
City of Prineville: 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	16.9%	10.0%	26.2%	32.3%	10.0%	4.6%	100.0%
25-34	15.5%	13.2%	29.4%	14.4%	22.7%	4.9%	100.0%
35-44	10.6%	3.2%	22.1%	33.6%	25.3%	5.3%	100.0%
45-54	11.9%	14.2%	25.2%	8.0%	23.9%	16.8%	100.0%
55-64	18.3%	14.9%	20.3%	22.4%	11.2%	12.9%	100.0%
65+	30.1%	20.4%	28.1%	16.2%	4.3%	0.8%	100.0%
Total	**19.0%**	**13.5%**	**25.7%**	**20.3%**	**15.5%**	**6.1%**	**100.0%**

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

The median household income in 1990 for Prineville was $22,127. Income ranges have therefore been divided into the categories shown in Table III.8.

As shown in Table III.8, 32.5 percent of all households were in the Very Low and Low income groups, 46.0 percent were in the Mid and High-Mid income groups, and 21.6 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 more households in the Very Low, Low and Mid income groups. Households where the householder was in the 35 to 44 and 45 to 54 age group had much lower percentages in the Very Low and Low income groups and had 30.6 percent and 40.7 percent rates, respectively, of households in the High and Very High income groups.

Households with the householder beyond retirement age (65+ years) had the lowest income levels, with over 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 (80 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.

Directly corresponding data from the 2000 Census is not yet available, however, the 2000 Census data set forth in Tables III.5b and III.5c does provide some comparative data.

Tables III.9a, III.9b and III.9c below illustrates housing affordability among income groups in 1990 *and 1999 (2000 Census)*. 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.9a City of Prineville
Housing Affordability by Income Group, 1990

Income Group	Renter with Housing Cost Burden	Owner with Housing Cost Burden
<$10,000 (very low)	77.7%	66.2%
$10-19,999 (low)	29.4%	14.8%
$20-34,999 (mid)	4.8%	7.2%
$35-49,999 (high)	0.0%	0.0%
>$50,000 (very high)	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**31.8%**	**14.1%**

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

Table III.9b City of Prineville
Housing Affordability by Income Group, 1999

Income Group	Renter with Housing Cost Burden	Owner with Housing Cost Burden
<$10,000 (very low)	63.8%	71.1%
$10-19,999 (low)	59.8%	42.4%
$20-34,999 (mid)	9.4%	45.4%
$35-49,999 (high)	0.0%	2.3%
>$50,000 (very high)	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**60.0%**	**22.9%**

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

Table III.9c Prineville Urban Area
Housing Affordability by Income Group, 1999

Income Group	Renter with Housing Cost Burden	Owner with Housing Cost Burden
<$10,000 (very low)	67.4%	77.1%
$10-19,999 (low)	57.7%	47.1%
$20-34,999 (mid)	17.6%	35.9%
$35-49,999 (high)	0.0%	4.7%
>$50,000 (very high)	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**30.8%**	**20.1%**

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, STF3A Database.

A 'housing cost burden' is defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a household which pays more than 30 percent of its gross income for housing, including utilities. As shown in Table III.9a, 32 percent of all renter households and 14 percent of all owner households had a housing cost burden in 1990. However, housing cost burdens were concentrated almost exclusively among the lower income groups in Prineville. Of households with an income at less than $10,000 per year, 78 percent of those renting and 66 percent of those owning their home had a housing cost burden. Among the households with an income of between $10,000 and $19,999, 29 percent of renters and 15 percent of owners had a housing cost burden. Of the households with incomes greater than $20,000 there are no significant cost burdens experienced - except for 5 percent of renter-occupied households and 7 percent of owner-occupied

households with incomes of $20,000 to $34,999, no households with incomes above $20,000 experienced any kind of housing cost burden whatsoever.

In 1999, there is little change in the percentage of "burdened" households for those with incomes less than $10,000 per year; In fact the percentage of burdened rental households actually decreased from 1990 to 1999 from 77.7% to 63.8% for the City, while owner occupied households increased from 66.2% to 71.1%. For the Prineville Urban Area, these corresponding decreases and increases were approximately the same. However, in the income categories of $10-19,999 (low) and $20-34,999 the increases in both the number of rental and owner households was significantly greater.

The changes occurring from 1990 to 1990 are either an indication that salaries have not kept pace with the increase in housing costs, or that a significant number of households have chosen to convert from rental to owner housing even though such has required a greater percentage of household income; More than likely both reasons have validity. The overall changes from 1990 to 1999 are much less for the Urban Area than for just the City, indicating that average income levels are greater outside the City.

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

The following types of housing are addressed by this (the Benkendorf) study:

- Detached single-family houses
- Attached single-family houses
- Multi-family apartments
- Multi-family apartments for low-income households (government-assisted)
- Manufactured housing on single-family lots
- Manufactured housing in parks

Tables III.10a, III.10b and III.10c below illustrates the income groups in the City of Prineville in 1990 and for the City and City Urban Area in 1999, the percentage of total households that each income group represents, and the type of housing which is *concluded to be* financially attainable by each group. This information is derived from the analysis in *Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon's Urban Areas*.

Table III.10a City of Prineville - 1990
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	19.0%	Multi-family, manufactured homes in parks, subsidized housing
Low	$10-14,999	13.5%	Attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks

Table III.10a; Contd.			
Mid	$15-24,999	25.7%	Single-family manufactured homes, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High-Mid	$25-34,999	20.3%	Single-family detached on smaller lots, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High	$35-49,999	15.5%	All housing types
Very high	>$50,000	6.1%	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 DLCD, p. 19.

Table III.10b City of Prineville - 1999
Households by Income Group and Type of Financially Attainable Housing

Income Group	**Household Income Range**	**% of Total Households in 1999**	**Financially Attainable Housing**
Very low	<$10,000	12.7%	Multi-family, manufactured homes in parks, subsidized housing
Low	$10-14,999	11.5%	Attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
Mid	$15-24,999	17.3%	Single-family manufactured homes, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High-Mid	$25-34,999	16.7%	Single-family detached on smaller lots, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High	$35-49,999	16.8%	All housing types
Very high	>$50,000	25.1%	All housing types

Source: 2000 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 DLCD, p. 19.

Table III.10c City of Prineville Urban Area - 1999
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	11.3%	Multi-family, manufactured homes in parks, subsidized housing
Low	$10-14,999	9.9%	Attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
Mid	$15-24,999	19.4%	Single-family manufactured homes, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High-Mid	$25-34,999	15.8%	Single-family detached on smaller lots, attached single- and multi-family, manufactured homes in parks
High	$35-49,999	18.4%	All housing types
Very high	>$50,000	25.3%	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 DLCD, p. 19.

The foregoing Tables III.10a, b & c clearly indicate that, in general, household income levels have increased because the percentage of households in the higher income group categories has increased; However, such does not indicate whether or not income level increases have kept pace with increases in housing costs, which is generally not the case.

It is, however, important to note that the total percentage of Mid to Very High Income households in the City increased from 67.6% to 75.9% from 1990 to 1999; This increase is significant because these are the income groups that are the most likely to demand, purchase and occupy single-family residences on individual lots . It is also important to note that major employers in the City report that significant numbers of executive personnel reside outside the City and commute to work because of the lack of adequate higher quality housing. This factor is supported by the fact that, as reported by the Oregon State Employment Department, the level of workers commuting to work to-and-from the City has nearly doubled in the past five years to a current level of approximately 19% of all wage and salary workers.

E. Additional units needed by structure type.

Tables III.12a, III.12b, III.12c *and III.12d* below present a numerical distribution of the new projected needed housing types for each income group in the Prineville Urban Area in 2020 for Scenarios A, B and C, *and for the recently adopted Population Projections through the year 2023*. These distributions are based on Tables III.10a, III.10b and III.10c above, estimates of current tenure by income, and projections of housing need by income group.

In the Benkendorf Report, based on the analysis in parts B and C of this section, emphasis was placed on a greater projected need for alternative housing types to large-lot single-family residences in the next 20 years. *However, based on the facts that major employers report difficulties in attracting executive personnel because of the difficulty of finding a good selection of housing for such employees, because of the significant increases in worker commuting levels, and because one of the City's "major" employers has recently announced considerations for relocating its main company offices out of the City because of the lack of such housing, the City and County are seriously concerned for the emphasis on projecting a low demand for the more expensive custom single-family residences on larger individual lots. This demand for higher costing single-family housing on individual lots is also supported by the fact that a significant percentage (approximately 75%) of new housing occurring in the County outside the City's Urban Area is that type of housing, and represents a type of housing generally not available within said urban area.*

In the Benkendorf Report, the relative distribution of income groups was kept the same as in 1990, as shown in Tables III.8 and III.10. Therefor, the Homeownership/renter rates used in said Report were distributed as follows:

Income Group	owners/renters(1990)
Very Low:	25/75%
Low:	35/65%
Mid:	55/45%
Mid-High:	65/35%
High:	75/25%
Very High:	85/15%

These percentages were then allocated to the different housing types using the formula represented in Table III.11 that follows:

Table III.11 City of Prineville 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 **1/**	3%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Apartments	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Manufactured homes **2/**	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 **1/**	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%**

Note 1/ *Contrary to the values assigned in this table in the Benkendorf Report, recent housing trends (last 5 years) have clearly shown an increasing demand for owner-occupied single-family attached housing in the form of zero-lot-line units in the higher income categories. In the renter-occupied category of such housing, it is noted that the vast majority of such housing is in the form of duplexes or tri-plexes where one of the units is an owner-occupied unit, usually representing higher income categories.*

Note 2/ *Also contrary to the values assigned in this table for this type of housing relative to higher income categories, it is known that a significant portion of such housing in the City (approximately 50%) is represented by owner-occupied units on rental spaces in a manufactured home park of which many are in the "mid" to "mid-high" income categories.*

Therefor, although the foregoing Table set forth in the Benkendorf Report is utilized for the projection of new households by income group and housing need because there is not sufficient Census 2000 data by which to alter said income category assignments by housing type, this is an area which should be monitored closely for the Prineville Urban Area and adjustments made as additional information becomes available; Relative thereto, a re-evaluation of projections based on these assignments should be completed at least on a five-year cycle.

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	
Owner-occupied	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**
Single-family detached	2%	7	7%	17	35%	164	61%	225	75%	212	85%	94	**73.7%**	**719**
Single-family attached	3%	10	4%	10	1%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**2.6%**	**25**
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**0.0%**	**0**
Manufactured homes	20%	69	24%	59	19%	89	4%	15	0%	0	0%	0	**23.8%**	**232**
Total	**25%**	**86**	**35%**	**86**	**55%**	**257**	**65%**	**240**	**75%**	**212**	**85%**	**94**	**100%**	**975**
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	24	10%	25	11%	51	13%	48	13%	37	9%	10	**23.0%**	**195**
Single-family attached	4%	14	3%	7	2%	9	2%	7	1%	3	1%	1	**4.9%**	**42**
Apartments	44%	152	33%	81	19%	89	12%	44	11%	31	5%	6	**47.6%**	**403**
Manufactured homes	20%	69	19%	47	13%	61	8%	30	0%	0	0%	0	**24.4%**	**206**
Total	**75%**	**259**	**65%**	**160**	**45%**	**210**	**35%**	**129**	**25%**	**71**	**15%**	**17**	**100%**	**846**
Total	**100%**	**346**	**100%**	**246**	**100%**	**468**	**100%**	**369**	**100%**	**283**	**100%**	**110**	**100%**	**1,821**
Percentage out of Total Units	**19.0%**	**346**	**13.5%**	**246**	**25.7%**	**468**	**20.3%**	**369**	**15.5%**	**283**	**6.1%**	**110**	**100%**	**1,821**

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	
Owner-occupied	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**
Single-family detached	2%	12	7%	31	35%	292	61%	401	75%	378	85%	167	**73.7%**	**1,281**
Single-family attached	3%	18	4%	18	1%	8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**2.6%**	**44**
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**0.0%**	**0**
Manufactured homes	20%	123	24%	105	19%	158	4%	26	0%	0	0%	0	**23.8%**	**413**
Total	**25%**	**154**	**35%**	**153**	**55%**	**458**	**65%**	**428**	**75%**	**378**	**85%**	**167**	**100%**	**1,738**
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	43	10%	44	11%	92	13%	86	13%	65	9%	18	**23.0%**	**347**
Single-family attached	4%	25	3%	13	2%	17	2%	13	1%	5	1%	2	**4.9%**	**75**
Apartments	44%	271	33%	144	19%	158	12%	79	11%	55	5%	10	**47.6%**	**718**
Manufactured homes	20%	123	19%	83	13%	108	8%	53	0%	0	0%	0	**24.4%**	**367**
Total	**75%**	**462**	**65%**	**284**	**45%**	**375**	**35%**	**230**	**25%**	**126**	**15%**	**29**	**100%**	**1,507**
Total	**100%**	**616**	**100%**	**438**	**100%**	**833**	**100%**	**658**	**100%**	**504**	**100%**	**196**	**100%**	**3,245**
Percentage out of Total Units	**19.0%**	**616**	**13.5%**	**438**	**25.7%**	**833**	**20.3%**	**658**	**15.5%**	**504**	**6.1%**	**196**	**100%**	**3,245**

Table III.12c Scenario C
Projection of New Households by Income Group and Housing Need

	Very Low		Low		Mid		Mid-High		High		Very High		TOTAL	
Owner-occupied	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**
Single-family detached	2%	18	7%	45	35%	431	61%	593	75%	558	85%	247	**73.7%**	**1,893**
Single-family attached	3%	27	4%	26	1%	12	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**2.6%**	**66**
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**0.0%**	**0**
Manufactured homes	20%	182	24%	155	19%	234	4%	39	0%	0	0%	0	**23.8%**	**610**
Total	**25%**	**228**	**35%**	**226**	**55%**	**677**	**65%**	**632**	**75%**	**558**	**85%**	**247**	**100%**	**2,568**
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	64	10%	65	11%	135	13%	126	13%	97	9%	26	**23.0%**	**513**
Single-family attached	4%	36	3%	19	2%	25	2%	19	1%	7	1%	3	**4.9%**	**110**
Apartments	44%	401	33%	213	19%	234	12%	117	11%	82	5%	15	**47.6%**	**1,061**
Manufactured homes	20%	182	19%	123	13%	160	8%	78	0%	0	0%	0	**24.4%**	**543**
Total	**75%**	**683**	**65%**	**420**	**45%**	**554**	**35%**	**340**	**25%**	**186**	**15%**	**44**	**100%**	**2,227**
Total	**100%**	**910**	**100%**	**647**	**100%**	**1,232**	**100%**	**972**	**100%**	**744**	**100%**	**290**	**100%**	**4,796**
Percentage out of Total Units	**19.0%**	**910**	**13.5%**	**647**	**25.7%**	**1232**	**20.3%**	**972**	**15.5%**	**744**	**6.1%**	**290**	**100%**	**4,796**

Table III.12d Scenario D - Year 2023
Projection of New Households by Income Group and Housing Need

	Very Low		Low		Mid		Mid-High		High		Very High		TOTAL	
Owner-occupied	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**	**%**	**units**
Single-family detached	2%	22	7%	54	35%	511	61%	701	75%	656	85%	293	**73.7%**	**2,237**
Single-family attached	3%	32	4%	30	1%	14	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**2.6%**	**76**
Apartments	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	**0.0%**	**0**
Manufactured homes	20%	214	24%	183	19%	276	4%	46	0%	0	0%	0	**23.8%**	**719**
Total	**25%**	**268**	**35%**	**267**	**55%**	**801**	**65%**	**747**	**75%**	**656**	**85%**	**293**	**100%**	**3,032**
Renter-occupied														
Single-family detached	7%	77	10%	76	11%	160	13%	151	13%	113	9%	31	**23.0%**	**608**
Single-family attached	4%	42	3%	23	2%	29	2%	23	1%	9	1%	4	**4.9%**	**130**
Apartments	44%	473	33%	252	19%	276	12%	137	11%	96	5%	17	**47.6%**	**1,251**
Manufactured homes	20%	215	19%	146	13%	189	8%	91	0%	0	0%	0	**24.4%**	**641**
Total	**75%**	**807**	**65%**	**497**	**45%**	**654**	**35%**	**402**	**25%**	**218**	**15%**	**52**	**100%**	**2,630**
Total	**100%**	**1,075**	**100%**	**764**	**100%**	**1,455**	**100%**	**1,149**	**100%**	**874**	**100%**	**345**	**100%**	**5,662**
Percentage out of Total Units	**19.0%**	**1,075**	**13.5%**	**764**	**25.7%**	**1,455**	**20.3%**	**1,149**	**15.5%**	**874**	**6.1%**	**345**	**100%**	**5,662**

As shown in Table III.12a, in Scenario A, a total of 975 new owner-occupied units and 846 new renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2020 in the Prineville UGB, for a total of 1,821 housing units. As shown in Table III.12b, in Scenario B, a total of 1,738 new owner-occupied units and 1,507 new renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2020 in the Prineville UGB, for a total of 3,245 housing units. As shown in Table III.12c, in Scenario C, a total of 2,568 new owner-occupied units and 2,227 new renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2020 in the Prineville UGB, for a total of 4,796 housing units. *As shown in Table III.12d, in Scenario D, a total of 3,032 new owner-occupied units and 2,630 renter-occupied units are projected to be needed by 2023 in the Prineville UGB for a total of 5,662 housing units.* These figures, however, do not account for a structural vacancy rate for housing.

Tables III.13a, III.13b, III.13c *and III.13d* show the projected housing needs and allow for a structural vacancy rate for new units for Scenarios A, B, C, *and D* respectively. As set forth in the original Benkendorf Report, 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 Prineville as tabulated in the 1990 U.S. Census, the July 2000 mix tabulated by the City of Prineville, *and as tabulated in the 2000 U.S. Census*.

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

	Current Housing Mix (1990) % (1)	Current Housing Mix (2000 Census) % (2)	New Housing from 1990-July 2000 (3)	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied							
Single-family detached	84.8%	-	-	73.7%	719	3.0%	740
Single-family attached	1.1%	-	-	2.6%	25	3.0%	26
Multi-family	1.6%	-	-	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	11.8%	-	-	23.8%	232	3.0%	239
Total	**99.3%**	**-**	**-**	**100.0%**	**975**	**3.0%**	**1,005**
% of housing mix	**61.8%**	**66.6%**	**-**	**-**	**53.6%**	**-**	**52.8%**
Renter-occupied							
Single-family detached	43.3%	-	-	23.0%	195	6.0%	207
Single-family attached	6.8%	-	-	4.9%	42	6.0%	44
Multi-family	39.9%	-	-	47.6%	403	6.0%	427
Manufactured homes	7.9%	-	-	24.4%	206	6.0%	219
Total	**97.9%**	**-**	**-**	**100.0%**	**846**	**6.0%**	**897**
% of housing mix	**38.2%**	**33.4%**	**-**	**-**	**46.4%**	**-**	**47.2%**
Total							
Single-family detached	68.7%	58.3%	35.3%	50.2%	914	3.6%	947
Single-family attached	3.1%	?	?	3.7%	67	4.9%	70
Multi-family	16.9%	21.0%	29.9%	22.1%	403	6.0%	427
Manufactured homes	10.0%	16.3%	30.1%	24.0%	438	4.4%	457
Total	**98.8%**	**95.5%**	**95.2%**	**100.0%**	**1,821**	**4.4%**	**1,901**

Table III.13a; Contd.

Notes:
(1) Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.
(2) Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data (updated with 2000 Census data) and (3) below.
(3) data from building permit records and tabulated by the City of Prineville in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000).
(4) The City of Prineville does not track single-family attached units; it includes those units in the single-family detached count.

As shown in Table III.13a, taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 1,005 owner-occupied units and 897 renter-occupied units, for a total of 1,901 units (total is not sum of components due to rounding), 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.

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

	Current Housing Mix (1990) % (1)	Current Housing Mix (July 2000) % (2)	New Housing from 1990-July 2000 (3)	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied							
Single-family detached	84.8%	-	-	73.7%	1,281	3.0%	1,319
Single-family attached	1.1%	-	-	2.6%	44	3.0%	46
Multi-family	1.6%	-	-	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	11.8%	-	-	23.8%	413	3.0%	425
Total	**99.3%**	**-**	**-**	**100.0%**	**1,738**	**3.0%**	**1,790**
% of housing mix	**46.6%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**53.6%**	**-**	**52.8%**
Renter-occupied							
Single-family detached	43.3%	-	-	23.0%	347	6.0%	368
Single-family attached	0.0%	-	-	4.9%	75	6.0%	79
Multi-family	0.0%	-	-	47.6%	718	6.0%	761
Manufactured homes	0.0%	-	-	24.4%	367	6.0%	389
Total	**43.3%**	**-**	**-**	**100.0%**	**1,507**	**6.0%**	**1,598**
% of housing mix	**53.4%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**46.4%**	**-**	**47.2%**
Total							
Single-family detached	69.0%	58.3%	35.3%	50.2%	1,628	3.6%	1,687
Single-family attached	3.3%	?	?	3.7%	119	4.9%	125
Multi-family	16.2%	21.0%	29.9%	22.1%	718	6.0%	761
Manufactured homes	10.3%	16.3%	30.1%	24.0%	780	4.4%	815
Total	**98.8%**	**95.5%**	**95.2%**	**100.0%**	**3,245**	**4.4%**	**3,387**

Notes:
(1) Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.
(2) Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data and (3) below.
(3) data from building permit records and tabulated by the City of Prineville in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000).
(4) The City of Prineville does not track single-family attached units; it includes those units n the single-family detached count.

As shown in Table III.13b, taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 1,790 owner-occupied units and 1,598 renter-occupied units, for a total of 3,387 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.

Table III.13c Scenario C
Projected Housing Needs by Housing Type and Tenure

	Current Housing Mix (1990) % (1)	Current Housing Mix (July 2000) % (2)	New Housing from 1990-July 2000 (3)	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied							
Single-family detached	84.8%	-	-	108.9%	1,893	3.0%	1,949
Single-family attached	1.1%	-	-	3.8%	66	3.0%	67
Multi-family	1.6%	-	-	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	11.8%	-	-	35.1%	610	3.0%	629
Total	**99.3%**	**-**	**-**	**147.8%**	**2,568**	**3.0%**	**2,645**
% of housing mix	**46.6%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**53.6%**	**-**	**52.8%**
Renter-occupied							
Single-family detached	43.3%	-	-	34.1%	513	6.0%	544
Single-family attached	0.0%	-	-	7.3%	110	6.0%	117
Multi-family	0.0%	-	-	70.4%	1,061	6.0%	1,125
Manufactured homes	0.0%	-	-	36.0%	543	6.0%	575
Total	**43.3%**	**-**	**-**	**147.8%**	**2,227**	**6.0%**	**2,361**
% of housing mix	**53.4%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**46.4%**	**-**	**47.2%**
Total							
Single-family detached	69.0%	58.3%	35.3%	74.1%	2,406	3.6%	2,493
Single-family attached	3.3%	?	?	5.4%	176	4.9%	184
Multi-family	16.2%	21.0%	29.9%	32.7%	1,061	6.0%	1,125
Manufactured homes	10.3%	16.3%	30.1%	35.5%	1,153	4.4%	1,204
Total	**98.8%**	**95.5%**	**95.2%**	**147.8%**	**4,796**	**4.4%**	**5,007**

Notes:
(1) Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.
(2) Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data and (3) below.
(3) data from building permit records and tabulated by the City of Prineville in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000).
(4) The City of Prineville does not track single-family attached units; it includes those units n the single-family detached count.

As shown in Table III.13c, taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 2,645 owner-occupied units and 2,361 renter-occupied units, for a total of 5,007 units (total is not sum of components due to rounding), are projected to be needed over the next 20-year time period in Scenario C. The projected tenure is the same as in Scenarios A and B - 52.8 percent owner-occupied units and 47.2 percent renter-occupied units.

Table III.13d Scenario D - Year 2023
Projected Housing Needs by Housing Type and Tenure

	Current Housing Mix (1990) % (1)	Current Housing Mix (2000 Census) % (2)	New Housing from 1990-July 2000 (3)	Projected Need %	Projected Needed Units	Structural Vacancy Rate	Total Projected Needed Units
Owner-occupied							
Single-family detached	84.8%	-	-	108.9%	2,235	3.0%	2,302
Single-family attached	1.1%	-	-	3.8%	78	3.0%	80
Multi-family	1.6%	-	-	0.0%	0	3.0%	0
Manufactured homes	11.8%	-	-	35.1%	719	3.0%	741
Total	**99.3%**	**-**	**-**	**147.8%**	**3,032**	**3.0%**	**3,123**
% of housing mix	**46.6%**	**66.6%**	**-**	**-**	**53.6%**	**-**	**52.8%**
Renter-occupied							
Single-family detached	43.3%	-	-	34.1%	605	6.0%	641
Single-family attached	0.0%	-	-	7.3%	130	6.0%	138
Multi-family	0.0%	-	-	70.4%	1,253	6.0%	1,328
Manufactured homes	0.0%	-	-	36.0%	642	6.0%	681
Total	**43.3%**	**-**	**-**	**147.8%**	**2,630**	**6.0%**	**2,788**
% of housing mix	**53.4%**	**33.4%**	**-**	**-**	**46.4%**	**-**	**47.2%**
Total							
Single-family detached	69.0%	58.3%	35.3%	74.1%	2,840	3.6%	2,943
Single-family attached	3.3%	?	?	5.4%	208	4.9%	218
Multi-family	16.2%	21.0%	29.9%	32.7%	1,253	6.0%	1,328
Manufactured homes	10.3%	16.3%	30.1%	35.5%	1,361	4.4%	1,422
Total	**98.8%**	**95.5%**	**95.2%**	**147.8%**	**5,662**	**4.4%**	**5,911**

Notes:
(1) Totals do not add to 100% because the table does not include the "other" category in U.S. Census.
(2) Sum of 1990 U.S. Census data and (3) below.
(3) data from building permit records and tabulated by the City of Prineville in *Request for Reconsideration of Population Projections: City of Prineville Urban Area and Crook County* (dated May 22, 1998, with data updated to July 1, 2000).
(4) The City of Prineville does not track single-family attached units; it includes those units n the single-family detached count.

As shown in Table III.13d above, utilizing the distribution ratio of housing set forth in the original Benkendorf Report and taking into account structural vacancy rates, a total of 3,123 owner-occupied units and 2,788 renter-occupied units, for a total of 5,911 units (total is not sum of components due to rounding), are projected to be needed over the next 20-year time period in Scenario D (i.e. through year 2023). The projected tenure is the same as in Scenarios A, B and C; i.e. 52.8 percent owner-occupied units and 47.2 percent renter-occupied units.

Relative thereto, it is noted that such a ratio of owner-occupied units to renter-occupied units is significantly different that the current ratio of 66.6% owner-occupied to 33.4% renter-occupied as reported in the 2000 Census. It is also noted that the change of classification of manufactured homes instituted by PSU will undoubtedly result in a lower number of "manufactured" homes being reported than is projected as a needed above;

i.e. As stipulated to by PSU, Double-wide Manufactured homes installed on individual lots in accordance with City standards are now reported simply as single-family dwelling units; Only units placed in mobile/manufactured home parks are now reported as "manufactured homes." Therefor, for the purpose of projecting needed buildable lands for manufactured homes, it is concluded that those designated as owner-occupied (i.e. 741 units) should be considered single-family units on individual lots, and those designated as renter-occupied should be considered as being in mobile/manufactured home parks.

It is also noted that the number of multi-family units projected as needed is more than three(3) times the current number of total multi-family units in the Urban Area; Relative thereto, the private sector reports extreme difficulties in obtaining financing for non-government assisted multi-family units in the Prineville Area at the present time.

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

Table III.14 shows the plan designations for residential zoning districts in the City of Prineville, 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 *with all lots being that size which is not generally achievable in any development design* and also does 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 Prineville Zoning Districts

Residential Zone		Permitted Residential Uses	Conditional Residential Uses	Minimum Lot Size in Square Feet	Maximum Allowed Density (Dwelling Units) (DUs) Per Acre
City of Prineville Residential Zones					
Limited Residential	R-1	Single-family dwelling, excluding modular homes and manufactured homes	Type I – duplex Type II – condominium or townhouse complex not exceeding 4 units	6,500 sq. ft. for single-family unit 9,000 sq. ft. for duplex unit an additional 2,500 sq. ft. for each unit over 2	6.70 for a single-family dwelling on a minimum lot 9.68 for a duplex on a minimum lot 12.45 for a 4-unit dwelling on a minimum lot.

General Residential	R-2	Single-family dwelling, including modular homes and manufactured homes Duplex	Type I – multi-family dwelling up to 10 units, tri-plex or four-plex, including townhouses or condominiums up to 4 units Type II – multi-family dwelling complexes greater than 10 units, mobile home park	5,000 sq. ft. for single-family unit served by both public sewer and water 20,000 sq. ft. for single-family unit served by either public sewer or water 7,500 sq. ft. for duplex unit served by both public sewer and water 30,000 sq. ft. for duplex unit served by either public sewer or water an additional 1,500 sq. ft. for each unit over 2 served by either public sewer or water an additional 5,000 sq. ft. for each unit over 2 served by either public sewer or water up to 4 and an additional 2,500 sq. ft. for each unit over 4	8.71 - for a single-family dwelling on a minimum lot. 11.62 for a duplex on a minimum lot 16.59 for a 4-unit dwelling on a minimum lot. 22.34 for a 10-unit dwelling on a minimum lot.
Suburban Residential	R-3	Single-family dwelling, including manufactured homes Duplex	Type I – multi-family dwelling up to 4 units, including tri-plex or four-plex Type II – multi-family dwelling complexes greater than 4 units, mobile home park or subdivision	5,000 sq. ft. for single-family unit served by both public (or community) sewer and water 20,000 sq. ft. for single-family unit served by either public (or community) sewer or water 43,560 sq. ft. (1 acre) for single-family unit not served by either public (or community) sewer or water 7,500 sq. ft. for duplex unit served by both public (or community) sewer and water 30,000 sq. ft. for duplex served by either public (or community) sewer or water 54,540 sq. ft. (1.25 acre) for duplex not served by either public (or community) sewer or water 7,500 sq. ft plus an additional 1,500 sq. ft. for each unit over 2 in a multi-family dwelling served by both public (or community) sewer and water 20,000 sq. ft. plus an additional 5,000 sq. ft. for each unit over 2 in a multi-family dwelling served by either public (or community) sewer or water 54,540 sq. ft. (1.25 acre) plus an additional 7,500 sq. ft. for each unit over 2 in a multi-family dwelling not served by either public (or community) sewer or water	8.71 - for a single-family dwelling on a minimum lot. 11.62 for a duplex on a minimum lot 16.59 for a 4-unit dwelling on a minimum lot. 22.34 for a 10-unit dwelling on a minimum lot.

Source: City of Prineville Zoning Ordinance

The projected density range for each plan designation and 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, III.15b, III.15c, *and III.15d* below show net acreage needed by housing type in the Prineville Urban Area in 2020 for Scenarios A, B, C, *and D*. Net unit needs are calculated by taking the total projected needed units from Tables III.13a, III.13b, III.13c, *and III.13d* and subtracting the units that could be built on vacant platted or redevelopable land (see Tables I.5 and I.7; note: all of these units are assumed to be developed as single-family residences).

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.8. *as updated through October 2002.*

Projected development densities are estimated by taking into account current plan regulations and existing densities (median lot sizes as shown in Table II.2). As maximum allowed densities are relatively high in each plan designation, though, plan changes do not appear necessary to accommodate higher densities.

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

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Unit need met by vacant platted and redevelopable lots	Net Need	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	947	49.8%	163	784	5.00	156.8
Single-family attached	70	3.7%	0	70	7.50	9.3
Multi-family	427	22.5%	0	427	11.00	38.8
Manufactured homes	457	24.0%	0	457	9.00	50.8
Total	**1,901**	**100.0%**	**163**	**1,738**	**7.43**	**255.8**

Note: numbers may not add due to rounding.

In Scenario A, a total of 288.4 net acres of residential land are projected to be required over the next 20 years to meet the projected housing demand of 1,901 units, assuming that projected development densities are met and all redevelopable land is redeveloped at assumed densities.

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

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Unit need met by vacant platted and redevelopable lots	Net Need	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	1,687	49.8%	163	1,524	5.00	304.8
Single-family attached	125	3.7%	0	125	7.50	16.6
Multi-family	761	22.5%	0	761	11.00	69.2
Manufactured homes	815	24.0%	0	815	9.00	90.5
Total	**3,387**	**100.0%**	**163**	**3,224**	**7.04**	**481.1**

Note: numbers may not add due to rounding.

In Scenario B, a total of 513.7 net acres of residential land are projected to be required over the next 20 years to meet the projected housing demand of 3,387 units, assuming that projected development densities are met and all redevelopable land is redeveloped at assumed densities.

Table III.15c Scenario C Acreage Needed by Housing Type

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Unit need met by vacant platted and redevelopable lots	Net Need	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached	2,493	49.8%	163	2,330	5.00	466.1
Single-family attached	184	3.7%	0	184	7.50	24.6
Multi-family	1,125	22.5%	0	1,125	11.00	102.3
Manufactured homes	1,204	24.0%	0	1,204	9.00	133.8
Total	**5,007**	**100.0%**	**163**	**4,844**	**6.89**	**726.7**

Note: numbers may not add due to rounding.

In Scenario C, a total of 726.7 net acres of residential land are projected to be required over the next 20 years to meet the projected housing demand of 5,007 units, assuming that projected development densities are met and all redevelopable land is redeveloped at assumed densities.

Table III.15d Scenario D Acreage Needed by Housing Type-Year 2023

Type of unit	Allocated Housing Units	Housing Units %	Unit need met by vacant platted and redevelopable lots	Net Need	Projected Development Density (units/acre)	Net Acreage Needed
Single-family detached **1/**	3,684	62.3%	356	3,328	5.00	665.6
Single-family attached	298	5.0%	10	288	7.50	38.4
Multi-family	1,328	22.5%	40	1,288	11.00	117.1
Manufactured homes **2/**	681	11.5%	0	681	9.00	75.7
Total	**5,911**	**100.0%**	**406**	**5,585**	**6.53**	**896.8**

Note: numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ Includes manufactured homes on individual lots.

2/ Includes only mobile/manufactured homes in parks; Does not include manufactured homes on individual lots

In Scenario D (the selected Scenario), a total of 896.8 net acres of residential land are projected to be required through the year 2023 to meet the projected housing demand of 5,911 units, assuming that projected development densities are met and all redevelopable land is redeveloped at assumed densities. However, actually having some knowledge about many of the lands classified as redevelopable, this assumption is probably not going to be realized in the near future.

In addition, the foregoing projection of needed buildable lands of 896.8 net acres does not include housing units necessary to replace those which will potentially be displaced by the expansion of existing C-1 and C-2 Zones in order to accommodate additional needed commercial development as an expansion of existing commercial zones versus creating "new commercial zones." The planned expansion of said commercial zones and the corresponding development of such lands for commercial uses, will result in the displacement or conversion of an existing 75-80 dwelling units. The net buildable residential acres necessary to replace such housing units would be 15.5 acres for a ***total net buildable residential lands need of 949.3 acres.***

It is also important to note that the foregoing does not take into account the fact that, as reported by the 2000 Census, 2,233 housing units or 53.7 of the total housing units in the UGB are 50 or more years of age. In fact, 1,952 units or 47.4% of the total housing units are reported as being built prior to 1940. There will certainly be some need for the replacement of many of these units during the planning period.

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 Prineville for the next 20 years; *through the year 2023*. To do this, regional economic forecasts are examined in order to determine the land needed by industry sector and land use type, *and compared to the actual development patterns in the subject urban area.*

The employment data that is presented in this section is only available for the entire county and, in some cases, only for the region. Specific employment data is not available for the City of Prineville or its UGB. For this reason, the analysis treats larger county and/or regional trends as applying to the City of Prineville. While this is necessarily a generalization, it does provide some basis for estimating commercial and industrial land use needs.

A. Existing employment patterns by sector.

Table IV.1 provides a summary of recent population and employment data for Crook County for the 1990 through 1999 time period*, and updated through September 2002.*.

Table IV.1 Crook County Recent Employment Data - *Updated to 2002*

Year	Population	Per Capita Income	Annual Average Covered Wage	Annual Average Unemployment %	Total Employment	Nonfarm Payroll Employment
1990	14,100	$20,395	$14,987	7.0%	6,290	5,140
1991	14,600	$21,003	$15,075	7.8%	6,370	5,190
1992	15,000	$23,030	$16,250	8.5%	6,660	5,500
1993	15,300	$22,941	$16,798	9.7%	6,950	5,730
1994	15,700	$22,949	$16,708	7.6%	7,430	6,090
1995	15,700	$23,030	$18,007	7.8%	7,190	5,910
1996	15,900	$24,339	$18,612	11.6%	6,940	5,750
1997	16,250	$24,415	$19,471	10.1%	6,840	5,860
1998	16,650	$25,296	$19,905	9.5%	6,860	5,840
1999	16,800	n/a	n/a	9.1%	6,900	6,010
2000	19,182	n/a	n/a	8.3%	7,096	6,063
2001	19,850	n/a	$27,446	8.9%	7,262	6,388
2002 **1/**	20,545	n/a	n/a	12.2%	6,878	6,056

Source: *Oregon Data Sheets: Crook County*, Oregon Employment Department, September 2002.

1/ Data only available through September 2002; Unemployment rate reflects closure of last lumber mill, which may reopen in 2003.

As shown in Table IV.1, nonfarm payroll employment in Crook County increased by 870 (from 5,140 to 6,1010) or almost 17 percent over the 1990 to 1999 time period. The population in Crook County increased by 2,700, or 19 percent, over the same time period.

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

> *During the 1990s, unemployment rates in Crook County have been consistently higher than the statewide average. From 1995 to 1998, Crook County's annual unemployment rates were nearly twice those for Oregon. Compounding the problem is the fact that Crook's unemployment rate rose from 7.0 to 9.5 percent between 1990 and 1998. These consistently higher unemployment rates are the result of both the seasonality of the local economy (which limits availability of full-time jobs) and a growing population (which leads to an increase in the number of persons looking for work).*

As would be expected, the increase in Crook County's population resulted in a corresponding increase in its civilian labor force. From 1990 to 1998, Crook County's civilian labor force swelled by 12 percent, translating into 800 more labor force participants than in 1990. At the same time, those that found themselves in the ranks of the unemployed expanded, increasing by 250 individuals (+53%).

These high levels of unemployment have their roots in the economic structure of Crook County. A large part of Crook County's employment is concentrated in the lumber and wood products industry. This industry is subject to more severe business cycles than the general economy, and shows more seasonal variation in employment levels. Though Crook County has made strides to diversify its economy, it still remains heavily susceptible to the cyclical nature of this industry. Lumber and wood products employment, as a percent of total employment in Crook County, has changed some during the 1990s. In 1998, lumber and wood products represented about 24 percent of total employment and 90 percent of all manufacturing employment in Crook County. (This is a decrease from 1990, when it averaged about 37% and 95%, respectively.)

With close to 25 percent of jobs directly tied to the lumber and wood products industry, and many other jobs indirectly tied to the same, Crook County can experience wide fluctuations in its unemployment rate. An example in point was the downturn in this industry during the Asian financial crisis. Before its onset, this industry employed about 1,530 workers in Crook County. This figure steadily dropped during the crisis, bottoming out at about 1,370, for a decline of ten percent, a loss of 160 jobs.

***Update Note:** As a result of the closure of the last primary lumber mill in the community (i.e. Ochoco Lumber), employment in lumber & wood products in September 2002 had decreased to a new low of 1,250 jobs; There is a possibility, however, that a portion of these jobs will be recovered if Ochoco Lumber Company can negotiate the purchase of timber from New Zealand. The overall wood products industry would also be benefited if the federal agencies would actually implement the Northwest Forest Management Plan.*

However, this situation presents opportunities to businesses that offer wage and benefit packages comparable to the local wood products industry. Particularly, businesses without the seasonal fluctuations typical of the wood products industry can find a readily available pool of labor with a proven work ethic. Such businesses need not be limited to the manufacturing sector, but can include those in sectors such as trade, which grew by 50 percent during the same period.[1]

***Update Note:** Not less than three new industries are currently operating in the City's Baldwin Industrial Park, and three more are currently under construction; These six new firms represent a total of approximately 150 new jobs for the community that should result in improved employment opportunities in 2003. Plans are currently being processed for another firm in the Airport Development Area that estimates employment at 100 and one in the Pine Products area that will employ 100-150; If all "goes well", both of these companies could be in operation some time in 2003.*

Tables IV.2 *and IV.3* provide summaries of the most recently available figures for employment by industry in Crook County.

---

[1] Oregon Employment Department, *2000 Regional Economic Profile - Region 10*.

Table IV.2 Crook County Nonfarm Payroll Employment By Industry - September 2000

	September 2000 (1)	% of Total
Total Employment (2)	**7,250**	**-**
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	**6,100**	**100.0%**
Goods Producing (3)	1,590	26.1%
Service Producing (4)	4,510	73.9%
Manufacturing, Total	**1,420**	**23.3%**
Lumber & Wood Products	1,310	21.5%
Other Manufacturing	110	1.8%
Nonmanufacturing, Total	**4,680**	**76.7%**
Construction & Mining	170	2.8%
Transportation & Public Utilities	340	5.6%
Wholesale and Retail Trade	1,840	30.2%
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	170	2.8%
Services	910	14.9%
Government	1,250	20.5%
Federal	310	5.1%
State	160	2.6%
Local	780	12.8%

Source: *Central Oregon Labor Trends*, Oregon Employment Department, December 2000.
Note: Estimates are subject to revision.
(1) Revised.
(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.
[1] Oregon Employment Department, *2000 Regional Economic Profile - Region 10*.

Table IV.3 Crook County Nonfarm Payroll Employment By Industry - September 2002

	September 2002 (1)	% of Total
Total Employment (2)	**7,136**	**-**
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	**6,170**	**100.0%**
Goods Producing (3)	1,670	27.1%
Service Producing (4)	4,500	72.9%
Manufacturing, Total	**1,380**	**22.4%**
Lumber & Wood Products	1,250	20.3%
Other Manufacturing	130	2.1%
Nonmanufacturing, Total	**4,790**	**77.6%**
Construction & Mining	290	4.7%
Transportation & Public Utilities	290	4.7%
Wholesale and Retail Trade	1,740	28.2%
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	150	2.4%
Services	980	15.9%
Government	1,340	21.7%
Federal	410	6.6%
State	140	2.3%
Local	790	12.8%

Source: *Central Oregon Labor Trends*, Oregon Employment Department, December 2002
Note: Estimates are subject to revision.
(1) Revised.
(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.
[1] Oregon Employment Department, *2000 Regional Economic Profile - Region 10*.

As shown in Table IV.2, in 2000, manufacturing accounted for 23.3 percent of the payroll employment in Crook County (with Lumber and Wood Products accounting for 93 percent of manufacturing employment), with nonmanufacturing-related employment accounting for the remaining 76.7 percent. *In 2002 (Table IV.3), manufacturing had decreased to 22.4 percent of total employment, and lumber & wood products had decreased to 90% of total manufacturing employment; Non-manufacturing employment accounted for the remaining 77.6% of total employment, or an increase of nearly 1.0%.*

Of the major nonmanufacturing employment sectors in 2000, Trade accounted for 30.2 percent of total employment, Services accounted for 14.9 percent, and Government accounted for 20.5 percent. *In 2002, Trade accounted for 28.2% of total employment, Services accounted for 15.9%, and Government 21.7%; Therefor, a small decline in Trade is noted, with small offsetting increases in Services and Government.*

B. Sector-level employment forecasts.

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

The following long-term employment forecast for Crook County was prepared by the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) in 1997. As shown in Table IV.4 below, employment is projected to increase by 1,326 over the 10-year period from 2000 to 2010. It is projected to increase by another 1,106 over the next 10 years to the year 2020, for a total increase of 2,432 from 2000 to 2020. ***Note:*** *Corresponding population projections by OEA utilized very similar population AAGR's for Crook County; Relative thereto, actual population growth has already exceeded the year 2013 projections.*

The projected increase of 2,432 in employment from 2000 to 2020 represents a total increase of 35.6 percent, or an annual average growth rate (AAGR) of 1.53 percent for the twenty-year period (1.79 percent AAGR for 2000-2010 and 1.28 percent AAGR for 2010-2020) compared to the 2.64 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.4 Crook County Employment Forecast

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Crook County	5,267	5,974	6,834	7,530	8,160	8,703	9,266

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; *however, these employment forecasts were made based on a population level and forecast that has already been exceeded through the year 2013, and the employment forecast set forth above for 2005 was nearly achieved in 2000.*

These projections were also only made on a regional basis. Crook County is part of Region 10, which includes Crook County and neighboring Jefferson County and Deschutes County.

Note: *Actual total employment in 2000 was 7,250, exceeding the forecasts in Table IV.4 for year 2000 by 6.1%.*

Table IV.5 Employment Projections by Industry, 1998 – 2008
Region 10: Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties

	1998	2008	Change	% of Change	Annual Average Growth Rate (AAGR)
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	**57,530**	**68,330**	**10,800**	**100.00%**	**1.74%**
Goods Producing	12,370	13,600	1,230	11.39%	0.95%
Service Producing	45,160	54,730	9,570	88.61%	1.94%
Manufacturing, Total	**8,470**	**9,130**	**660**	**6.11%**	**0.75%**
Durable Goods	7,510	8,120	610	5.65%	0.78%
Lumber & Wood Products	4,620	4,630	10	0.09%	0.02%
Other Durables	2890	3490	600	5.56%	1.90%
Nondurable Goods	960	1,010	50	0.46%	0.51%
Food Products	140	140	-	0.00%	0.00%
Other Nondurables	820	870	50	0.46%	0.59%
Nonmanufacturing, Total	**49,060**	**59,200**	**10,140**	**93.89%**	**1.90%**
Construction & Mining	3900	4,470	570	5.28%	1.37%
Transportation, Comm. & Utilities	2,000	2,420	420	3.89%	1.92%
Trade	15,050	18,330	3,280	30.37%	1.99%
Wholesale Trade	2,650	3,070	420	3.89%	1.48%
Retail Trade	12,400	15,260	2,860	26.48%	2.10%
Eating & Drinking Places	4,440	5,220	780	7.22%	1.63%
Other Retail	7,960	10,040	2,080	19.26%	2.35%
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	3790	4,300	510	4.72%	1.27%
Services	14,390	18,720	4,330	40.09%	2.67%
Personal Services	1,780	2,050	270	2.50%	1.42%
Business Services	1,510	2,160	650	6.02%	3.64%
Other Services	3520	4180	660	6.11%	1.73%
Government	9,930	10,960	1,030	25.46%	0.99%
Federal	1300	1280	-20	9.54%	-0.15%
State	940	1,170	230	-0.19%	2.21%
Local	7,690	8,510	820	2.13%	1.02%
				7.59%	

Source: *State of Oregon Workforce Analysis,* Oregon Employment Department, July 1999.

As shown in Table IV.5, nonfarm payroll employment is expected to increase by 10,800 jobs in Region 10 over the 1998-2008 period - an AAGR of 1.74 percent. This is comparable to the 1.79 percent AAGR for employment for 2000-2010 for Crook 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.5 shall be used as the basis for projections for the Prineville rather than the OEA projections. This is because the OED projection: 1) has a short-term (10 year) growth rate projection very similar to the OEA projection; 2) is more recent; and 3) breaks down employment projections by industry.

Note: *The actual employment in the region in 2002 of 76,580 (in spite of a national recession) has already exceeded employment projections set forth in Table IV.5 for theyear2008, and actually represents an annual growth rate of 8.3% from 1998 to 2002 versus the states projected AAGR of 1.74%.*

As shown in Table IV.5, manufacturing employment in Region 10 is expected to grow at a much lower rate than overall employment, with only a 7.8 percent total projected growth. The industry sectors with the greatest projected relative increases in employment are: Business Services (43.0%), Retail Trade (other than Eating and Drinking Places) (26.1%), State Government (24.5%), and Transportation, Communication, and Utilities (21.0%). The industry sectors with the largest projected employment gains are: Retail Trade (other than Eating and Drinking Places – 2,080 jobs), Local Government (820 jobs), and Retail Trade (Eating and Drinking Places – 780 jobs).

Table IV.6 below shows the 1998-2008 OED employment projection for Region 10. It also shows a projected 2018 employment projection extrapolated from the growth rate for the 1998-2008 period.

Table IV.6 Employment Projection Summary, 1998 – 2018
Region 10: Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties

	1998 employment	2008 employment	change 1998-2008	AAGR 1998-2008	estimated 2018 employment	estimated employment growth 1998-2018
Region 10	57,530	68,330	10,800	1.74%	81,157	23,627

Source: Oregon Employment Department (OED)

Note: *Total employment in the region in 2002 was 76,580 which would be nearly equal to the above projections for the year 2014.*

In order to apply these regional projections to the City of Prineville, several assumptions are made (i.e. in the original Benkendorf Report). These are listed as follows:

- The estimated employment growth for 1998-2018 for Region 10 is assumed to apply to the 2000 to 2020 time period.
- The Prineville 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 Prineville 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 necessary assumption probably overestimates employment projections for the City of Prineville for sectors such as retail and services, which are more likely to locate in the larger population centers of the county such as Bend. Still, this assumption provides a useful assessment of the land necessary for employment growth *if* the City of Prineville 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 Prineville (or indeed for any other sub-county area).

Table IV.6 shows estimated 2000 (Scenario B City of Prineville estimate) and projected 2020 population levels in Region 10 and the Prineville Urban Area in order to determine the share that the Prineville Urban Area represents of the Region 10 population.

Table IV.7 Crook County and Prineville Population – 1999, 2000 & 2020

	1999 Population	2020 Projected Population	1999-2020 Growth
Scenario A			
Region 10 Total	**146,350**	**235,950**	**89,600**
Crook County	18,150	23,678	5,528
Deschutes County	109,600	181,448	71,848
Jefferson County	18,600	30,824	12,224
Prineville UGB	9,635	13,733	4,098
Prineville UGB as % of Crook County	53.09%	58.00%	74.13%
Prineville UGB as % of Region 10	6.58%	5.82%	4.57%
Scenario B			
Region 10 Total	**148,736**	**243,657**	**94,921**
Crook County	20,536	31,385	10,849
Deschutes County	109,600	181,448	71,848
Jefferson County	18,600	30,824	12,224
Prineville UGB	10,902	18,203	7,301
Prineville UGB as % of Crook County	53.09%	58.00%	67.30%
Prineville UGB as % of Region 10	7.33%	7.47%	7.69%

Source: ?

As shown in Table IV.7, under Scenario A, the population in the Prineville Urban Area was estimated at 6.6 percent of the total Region 10 population for 2000 and projected to decline to 5.8 percent of the total Region 10 population for 2020. The projected population growth from 2000 to 2020 for the Prineville Urban Area represents 4.6 percent of total Region 10 population growth under Scenario A.

Under Scenario B. the population in the Prineville Urban Area was estimated at 7.3 percent of the total Region 10 population for 2000 and projected to increase slightly to 7.5 percent in 2020. The projected population growth from 2000 to 2020 for the Prineville Urban Area represents 7.69 percent of total Region 10 population growth under Scenario B.

Scenario B represents a much more accurate picture of 2000 population levels than Scenario A as documented in Section III(A) of this report *(i.e. as stated in the original TBAC Report, however, the 2000 Census and other updated data clearly indicates that TBAC's Scenario C was the most accurate estimate of 2000 population)*. If Scenario B figures for both existing and projected population are accepted, it is reasonable to assume that Prineville's population growth in the region will increase slightly from the 7.3 percent share that Prineville's current population represents of regional population. Therefore, the 7.69 percent figure is used to project Prineville's share of regional employment growth. The employment projections for the region are multiplied by this in order to estimate employment growth for the Prineville Urban Area.

In comparison to the foregoing data set forth in Table IV.7, the following information is provided for 2000 and 2001:

- *The Region's total population for 2000 (US Census) of 153,558 is much more comparable to the population projections set forth in Scenario's C and D versus Scenario's A and B.*

- *2000: Crook County population was 19,182 or 12.5% of the Region's population of 153,558; Prineville UGB population was 10,600 or 55.3% of the County's population and 6.9% of the Region's population.*
- *2001: Crook County population was 19,850 or 12.3% of the Region's population of 161,300; Prineville UGB population was 10,995 or 55.3% of the County's population and 6.8% of the Region's population.*
- *Crook County's growth rate from 2000 to 2001 was 3.48% and the Region's growth rate was 5.0% (Deschutes County's rate was 5.79; Jefferson County's rate was 2.06%).*
- *The current ratio of employment to population for the County is 35.3, and the projected ratio for the year 2020 is 39.1; Utilizing that ratio for the Prineville UGB, the current employment (2002) for the UGB would be 4,024, and the projected employment for the UGB for 2020 would be 5,370 for Scenario A, 7,117 for Scenario B, 8,482 for Scenario C, and 8,609 for Scenario D.*
- *Therefor, Scenarios C and D represent a more accurate picture of the 2000 and 2001 population levels for Crook County and the Prineville UGB than either Scenario A or B.*

As set forth in the Benkendorf Report, Table IV.8a below shows the employment projections for Region 10 converted to the Prineville Urban Area. The 2000 employment figure for the Prineville Urban Area was estimated by taking the current Crook County nonfarm employment of 6,100 (see Table IV.2) and multiplying by the Urban Area share of the county population of 53.1 percent (see Table IV.7). The employment growth from 2000 to 2020 was estimated by multiplying the 2000-2020 Region 10 job growth of 23,627 (see Table IV.6) by the Urban Area share of the Region 10 population growth for 2000 to 2020 of 7.69 percent (see Table IV.7).

Table IV.8a Employment Projections, 2000-2020 Prineville Urban Area

	2000	Job growth 2000-2020	2020 employment	% growth 2000-2020	2000-2020 AAGR
Prineville UGB	3,238	1,817	5,056	56.1%	2.25%

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 Crook County, July 2000*.

As shown in Table IV.8a above, a total of 1,817 new jobs were projected for the Prineville Urban Area for 2020 for a total employment of 5,056. This is equivalent to a 2.25 percent annual average growth rate (AAGR). The projected employment for the Prineville Urban Area of 5,056 is 56.1 percent of the OEA employment projection of 9,266 for Crook County for 2020 (see Table IV.4). This share is less than the 58.0% share that the projected 2020 Prineville Urban Area population represents of the projected 2020 Crook County population (see Table IV.6).

However, an evaluation of the foregoing analyses and projections results in the following basic findings:

- *Year 2000 beginning employment in Table IV.8a is significantly lower than what would result from calculations utilizing current employment-population ratios and current population data; i.e. The 2000 employment-population*

ratio for the County was 37.8; With a UGB 2000 population of 10,600 @ an employment-population ratio of 37.8 would equal a total employment in the UGB of 4,006 in 2000.

- *Because the national and state recession has also had its effects on Prineville and Crook County, the 2002 employment-population ratio has been reduced to 35.3; Therefor, based on a UGB population of 11,400 in 2002, the calculated employment in the UGB would be 4,024. Projecting employment through the year 2023 utilizing the TBAC AARP of 2.25% would result in a UGB 2023 employment of 6,420.*
- *However, a 2023 UGB employment of 6,420 would result in an employment-population ratio of only approximately 26.2± utilizing the UGB population projections set forth in Scenarios C and D; Such a ratio is significantly less the current ratio of 35.3 and also significantly less than the average over the past two decades and less than those projected by State population and employment agencies through the year 2020 (average ratios of 36.0+ to 39.0+).*

Table IV.8b below shows the employment projections for the Prineville UGB from 2003 to 2023 utilizing current 2002 data, and taking into account the foregoing findings, including a reduction in the employment-population ratio to 35.0.

Table IV.8b Employment Projections, 2003-2023 Prineville Urban Area

	2003	Job growth 2003-2023	2023 employment	% growth 2003-2023	2003-2023 AAGR
Prineville UGB	4,024	4,533	8,557	112%	5.0%

As shown in Table IV.8b above, a total of 4,533 new jobs are projected for the Prineville Urban Area for 2023 for a total employment of 8,557. This is equivalent to a 5.0% annual average growth rate (AAGR) which would actually result in a reduction in the employment-population ratio of the average of the past decade of 37.5 to 35.0. Such an employment growth would only maintain the current recessionary period ratio of 35.3. In order to maintain the average employment-population ratio of the past two decades of 37.0+ or the average of that projected by the State of 38.0+ through the year 2023, employment growth would have to total 5,145+ jobs for a 2023 employment level of 9,169 or greater.

To attain the projected job total of 8,557 by the year 2023 will require an average annual job growth of approximately 225 jobs, which is concluded to realistic; In fact, the announced corporate plans of just one of the community's existing major employers for a 10% annual growth rate over the next decade would result in an average annual job growth of approximately 90-100 jobs just for that company, not taking into account any other commercial or industrial developments. It is also important to note that, within the UGB, current developments under construction, but not yet operational, will result in an estimated 100-125 jobs, and developments currently undergoing development review would result in an estimated 125-150 jobs; All of these firms plan to (and should) be operational in 2003.

Table IV.9 below, as set forth in the original TBAC report, shows the projected new employment by industry for the Prineville Urban Area for 2020. The relative percentages of the industry employment sectors are identical to those of the new employment shown ("% of change") in Table IV.5.

Table IV.9a Employment Projections by Industry, 2000-2020 Prineville Urban Area

	% of Total	Employment Growth
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	**100.00%**	**1,817**
Goods Producing	11.39%	207
Service Producing	88.61%	1,610
Manufacturing, Total	**6.11%**	**111**
Durable Goods	5.65%	103
Lumber & Wood	0.09%	2
Other Durable Goods	5.56%	101
Nondurable Goods	0.46%	8
Food Products	0.00%	0
Other Nondurable Goods	0.46%	8
Nonmanufacturing, Total	**93.89%**	**1,706**
Construction & Mining	5.28%	96
Trans., Comm. & Utilities	3.89%	71
Trade	30.37%	552
Wholesale Trade	3.89%	71
Retail Trade	26.48%	481
Eating & Drinking Places	7.22%	131
Other Retail	19.26%	350
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	4.72%	86
Services	40.09%	728
Hotel & Lodging Places	2.50%	45
Amusement and Recreation	6.02%	109
Health	6.11%	111
Other Services	25.46%	463
Government	9.54%	173
Federal	-0.19%	-3
State	2.13%	39
Local	7.59%	138

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp. based on Oregon Employment Department, *Industry Projections, 2008, Workforce Region: Crook / Deschutes / Jefferson, Issue Date: July 1, 1999*

Note: *The foregoing employment projections by industry are based on the "lower" job projections based on a beginning employment level that is lower than actually exists and on population Scenarios A and B. Therefor, even though beginning employment levels have been adjusted to actual levels and Scenarios C and D for population growth have been chosen as more realistic, it is assumed that the growth by industry will be at the same percentages of total employment growth but at a total job growth of 4,533 versus the 1,817 set forth in Table IV.9a above. These revised employment projections by industry are set forth in Table IV.9b that follows:*

Table IV.9b Employment Projections by Industry, 2003-2023 Prineville Urban Area

	% of Total	Employment Growth
Total Nonfarm Payroll Employment	**100.00%**	**4,533**
Goods Producing	11.39%	516
Service Producing	88.61%	4,017
Manufacturing, Total	**6.11%**	**276**
Durable Goods	5.65%	256
Lumber & Wood	0.09%	4
Other Durable Goods	5.56%	252
Nondurable Goods	0.46%	20
Food Products	0.00%	0
Other Nondurable Goods	0.46%	20
Nonmanufacturing, Total	**93.89%**	**4,256**
Construction & Mining	5.28%	239
Trans., Comm. & Utilities	3.89%	176
Trade	30.37%	1,377
Wholesale Trade	3.89%	176
Retail Trade	26.48%	1.200
Eating & Drinking Places	7.22%	176
Other Retail	19.26%	873
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	4.72%	214
Services	40.09%	1,817
Hotel & Lodging Places	2.50%	113
Amusement and Recreation	6.02%	273
Health	6.11%	277
Other Services	25.46%	1,154
Government	9.54%	432
Federal	-0.19%	-9
State	2.13%	96
Local	7.59%	344

* Totals may not balance due to rounding.

C. 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 Prineville area. There is no data available at the local level for employee per acre ratios.

The coverage ratios listed in Table IV.10 by TBAC 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.

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. *However, the known dominate vehicle types in the Prineville area are generally not favorable for reducing parking lot size requirements!*

In this analysis for Prineville, 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.10 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 *1/*	750		11.62
Construction and Mining *2/*	750		11.62
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities *3/*	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 *4/*	300		29.04
Office			
Manufacturing	225		48.40
Construction and Mining	225		48.40
T.C.P.U.	250		43.56
Wholesale Trade	225		48.40
Retail Trade	225		48.40
F.I.R.E. *5/*	225		48.40
Services	250		43.56
Government	200		54.45
Retail	-	**20%**	
T.C.P.U. *3/*	300		29.04
Retail Trade	500		17.42
F.I.R.E	300		29.04
Services	300		29.04

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

Notes:

1/ *A survey of the majority of manufacturing industries in the UGB area indicates that the average employee-per-acre ratio is only about 9 employees per acre.*

2/ *A survey of the existing major construction and mining firms operations in the UGB area indicates that the average employee-per-acre is less than 2 employees per acre*

3/ *None of the T.C.P.U. uses within the UGB have office facilities on site, and none are likely in the foreseeable future; The average employee-per-acre for such uses is less than 5.*

4/ *The "industrial" operations of government in the UGB (i.e. the City, County, US Forest Service & BLM) report employee-per-acre averages of less than 10.*

5/ *The different classifications of Office and Retail for F.I.R.E. is questioned, as is the different employees-per-acre ratios of 48.4 versus 29.04; Local firms in this classification report average employees-per-acre ratios of approximately 25.*

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

Table IV.11 applies the employee/acre ratios presented in Table IV.10 to the employment projections by sector for Prineville presented in *Table IV.9b as adjusted from Table IV.9a to represent the revised total employment projections set forth in Table IV.8b*. 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, 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 average.

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.10. Land requirements are calculated by dividing the required floor area by the coverage ratio listed in Table IV.10, *even though it has been noted that certain existing industry types have employee-per-acre ratios different (lower) than set forth in Table IV.10*.

Table IV.11 Projection of Land Required by Employment Sector
Prineville Urban Area, 2003-2023

Land Use and Industry Type	New Jobs - 2003-2023	Capture Factor	New Jobs - 2002-2023 (adjusted)	Floor Area Required (sq. ft.)	Land Required (net acres)
Industrial	**-**	**-**	**1,239**	**1,068,938**	**122.6**
Manufacturing	276	85%	235	176,967	20.3
Construction and Mining	239	60%	144	107,140	12.4
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	176	60%	106	149,800	17.2
Wholesale Trade	176	85%	150	165,170	19.0
Retail Trade	1,200	10%	120	300,730	34.5
Financial, Insurance and Real Estate	214	10%	21	7,007	0.7
Services	1,817	25%	454	159,004	18.2
Government	432	2%	9	3,120	0.3
Office	**-**	**-**	**988**	**230,522**	**21.1**
Manufacturing	276	15%	41	9,039	0.7
Construction and Mining	176	40%	70	15,899	1.5
T.C.P.U.	176	30%	53	13,376	1.3
Wholesale Trade	176	15%	26	5,637	0.5
Retail Trade	1,200	2%	24	5,196	0.5
F.I.R.E	214	80%	171	38,277	3.5
Services	1,817	25%	452	113,072	10.4
Government	432	35%	151	30,026	2.7
Retail	**-**	**-**	**2,003**	**815,557**	**92.8**
T.C.P.U.	176	10%	18	5,451	0.5
Retail Trade	1,200	88%	1,056	528,528	60.6
F.I.R.E	214	10%	21	6,006	0.7
Services	1,817	50%	908	272,572	31.1
Total	**-**	**-**	**4,230**	**2,112,017**	**236.5**

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

As shown in Table IV.11 *(as revised with new data for years 2003-2023),* a total of 122.6 net acres of industrial land, 21.1 net acres of office land and 92.8 net acres of retail land, for a total of 236.5 acres of non-residential land is estimated to be needed over the next 20 years for the year 2023 in the Prineville Urban Area. 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 land zoned for public facilities and community services (such as schools) and is beyond the scope of this study.

Table IV.12 *(as revised)* provides a summary of land needs for industrial, office, and retail land. The job growth and the net acreage figures are from Table IV.11 *as revised*. 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.

Table IV.12 Employment Land Needs—2023, Prineville Urban Area

	Industrial	Office	Retail	Total
Job growth	1,239	988	2,003	4,230
Jobs/net acre	10.1	46.6	21.5	17.9
Preliminary buildable acres (net) needed by 2023	122.6	21.1	92.8	236.5
Vacancy rate	10%	10%	10%	10%
Total net buildable acres needed by 2020	**134.9**	**23.2**	**102.1**	**260.2**

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

As shown in Table IV.12, a total of 134.9 net acres of industrial land, 23.2 net acres of office land and 102.1 net acres of retail land (for a total of 125.3 net acres of commercial land (after rounding)) are projected to be needed for new employment needs in Prineville in 2023, 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 *(i.e. year 2003-2023)*; 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 *(i.e. through the year 2023)* for the Prineville Urban Area.

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

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

Table V.1 Existing and Projected Residential Mix (updated 10/02)

	1990 Housing (1)		Existing Housing (2000) (2)		Recent Housing Construction Only (1990-2000)		Projected New Needed Housing – Scenario A (2000-2020) (3)		Projected New Needed Housing – Scenario B (2000-2020) (4)		Projected New Needed Housing – Scenario C (2000-2020) (5)	
Housing type	**Units**	**Mix**	**Units**	**Mix**			**Units**	**Mix**	**Units**	**Mix**	**Units**	**Mix**
Single-family detached and attached	1,644	71.9%	2,737	65.8%	367	35.3%	1,017	53.5%	1,812	53.5%	2,678	53.5%
Single-family detached	1,572	68.7%	n/a	N/a	n/a	n/a	947	49.8%	1,687	49.8%	2,493	49.8%
Single-family attached	72	3.1%	n/a	N/a	n/a	n/a	70	3.7%	125	3.7%	184	3.7%
Multi-family units	387	16.9%	676	16.3%	311	29.9%	427	22.5%	761	22.5%	1,125	22.5%
Manufactured homes in parks	229	10.0%	702	16.9%	313	30.1%	457	24.0%	815	24.0%	1,204	24.0%
Other	27	1.2%	45	1.0%	50	4.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	**2,287**	**100.0%**	**4,160**	**100.0%**	**1,041**	**100.0%**	**1,901**	**100.0%**	**3,387**	**100.0%**	**5,007**	**100.0%**

(1) From Table II.1 and III.6; 1990 Census Data.

(2) From Table II.1; 2000 Census Data.

(3) From Table III.15a

(4) From Table III.15b

(5) From Table III.15c

As shown in Table V.1 *(as updated to include 2000 Census data)* above, the projected new housing mix is roughly equivalent to the existing (2000) housing mix *(i.e. as estimated by TBAC but different from 2000 Census data)*. A higher percentage of manufactured homes are projected to be needed to meet housing demand. Single-family detached homes are projected to be needed at lower rates *(even though recent housing trends do not indicate a lower demand for single-family detached homes)*.

Whereas the City and County have jointly selected Scenario D as the most likely population projection for the Prineville Urban Area, the following would be the resulting Projected net need for New Housing for Scenario D (re: Table III.15d):

Housing Types	*# New Units*	*% Total*
▪ *Single-family detached*	*3,328*	*56.8%*
▪ *Single-family attached*	*288*	*4.9%*
▪ *Multi-family*	*1,288*	*22.0%*
▪ *Manufactured home in Parks*	*681*	*11.6%*
Totals:	***5,585***	***100.0%***

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 was obtained from Table II.2. Projected density figures were obtained from Tables III.15a, III.15b and III.15c.

Table V.2 Existing and Projected Residential Mix

Housing Type	Existing Density (2000)	Maximum Allowed Density (Current Zoning Districts)	Projected Density for New Housing (2000-2020) – Scenario A	Projected Density for New Housing (2000-2020) – Scenario B	Projected Density for New Housing (2000-2020) – Scenario C
Single-family detached	5.0	R-1 zone: 6.70 R-2 & R-3 zones: 8.71	5.0	5.0	5.0
Single-family attached	n/a	R-1 zone: 9.68 R-2 & R-3 zones: 11.62	7.5	7.5	7.5
Multi-family units	11.0	R-1 zone: 12.45 for 4-unit R-2 & R-3 zones: 16.49 for 4-unit, 22.34 for 10-unit	11.0	11.0	11.0
Manufactured homes in parks	9.8	R-2 & R-3 zones: 18.00	9.0	9.0	9.0
Total	**6.1**		**7.4**	**7.0**	**6.9**

Source: The Benkendorf Associates Corp.

As shown in Table V.2 above, the projected housing densities for new housing are identical or close to existing housing densities. *Relative thereto, the same densities are utilized as the projected density for new housing for Scenario D for that period from 2003 to 2023 as set forth in Tables III.5a, III.5b, III.5c and III.5d.*

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

Table V.3 *(as revised to include Scenario D)* below shows the a comparison of net buildable acreage needed to net buildable acreage available in the Prineville Urban Area for the next twenty years. The figures for net buildable acreage available are from Table I.8. *as updated through October 2002.* The figures have been broken down by land use type (commercial, industrial, or residential), jurisdiction (City of Prineville or Crook County zone), and, for non-residential land, whether the land has lease-only restrictions.

The figures for net buildable acreage needed are from Tables III.5a, III.5b, III.5c, III.5d, IV.11, and IV.12. Need for lease-only commercial and industrial land has been estimated at 10 percent of the total, with the remaining 90 percent assumed to require non-lease-only land.

Table V.3 Comparison of Net Buildable Acreage Needed to Net Buildable Acreage Available, Prineville Urban Area, 2003 to 2023

		Net Buildable Acreage		Net Buildable Acreage Needed			
Zone	**Code**		**notes**	**Scenario A**	**Scenario B**	**Scenario C**	**Scenario D**
Non-Residential							
Commercial							
City of Prineville commercial zones	C-1 & C-2	7.58					
Airport Commercial	A-C	18.75	all of this acreage (18.8) is FAA lease-only				
Crook County zones	L-C & R-C	5.29					
Total Commercial - non-lease-only		**12.87**		**45.7**	**45.7**	**45.7**	**112.8**
Total Commercial - lease-only		**18.75**		**5.1**	**5.1**	**5.1**	**12.5**
Total Commercial		**31.62**		**50.8**	**50.8**	**50.8**	**125.3**

Industrial							
City of Prineville zones	M-1, M-2 & M-3	2.8					
Airport Business-Industrial	A-M	113.02	all of this acreage is FAA lease-only				
Crook County zones	L-M & H-M	30.77					
Total Industrial - non-lease-only		**33.57**		**48.6**	**48.6**	**48.6**	**121.41 (**90**%** total industrial need)
Total Industrial - lease-only		**113.0**		**5.4**	**5.4**	**5.4**	**13.5** (10% of total industrial need)
Total Industrial		**146.57**		**54.0**	**54.0**	**54.0**	**134.9**
Other							
City of Prineville zones							
Airport Development	A-D	97.5	all of this acreage (97.5) is FAA lease-only; uses permitted outright in this zone only include airport facilities and public facilities				
Crook County zones	EFU-2	0.0					
Total Other		**97.5**		-	-	-	-
Residential							
City of Prineville zones	R-1, R-2 & R-3	10.14					
Crook County zones	SR-1 & SRM-1	487.1					
Total Residential		**497.2**		**255.8**	**481.1**	**726.7**	**949.3** (includes land for replacement units displaced by commercial uses

Table V.4 that follows (as set forth in the original TBAC Report and *as revised to include Scenario D),* compares the net buildable acreage available and needed as shown in Table V.3, and converts this to a net need or surplus of gross acreage for the next twenty years in the Prineville Urban Area. The first column shows "unadjusted net buildable acreage" from Table V.3. The second column converts this to "unadjusted net buildable acreage" by adding 25 percent. The third column shows additional gross acreage needed. This figure has been set at 80 gross acres of non-lease-only commercial land and 160 acres of non-lease-only industrial land to allow for the potential attraction of large-scale commercial or industrial development that is unaccounted for in employment projections. The fourth column shows "total adjusted gross buildable acreage needed" and is the sum of the second and third columns. The fifth column shows "net buildable acreage available" from Table V.3. The sixth column converts this to "gross buildable acreage available" by adding 25 percent. The final column shows the net need (or surplus in parentheses) gross acreage for land in 2020. It is calculated by subtracting "gross buildable acreage available" from "total adjusted gross buildable acreage needed."

Table V.4 2020 Land Need by Development Type, Prineville Urban Area

	Unadjusted Net Buildable Acreage Needed (from Table V.3)	Unadjusted Gross Buildable Acreage Needed (1)	Additional Gross Acreage Needed (2)	Total Adjusted Gross Buildable Acreage Needed	Net Buildable Acreage Available (from Table V.3)	Gross Buildable Acreage Available (1)	2023 Net Need (or Surplus) - Gross Acreage
Commercial - non-lease only							
Scenarios A, B & C	45.7	57.1	80.0	137.1	12.87	16.1	121.0
Scenario D	112.8	141.0	80.0	221.0	33.57	41.9	179.1
Commercial - lease-only							
Scenarios A, B & C	5.1	6.3	0.0	6.3	18.8	23.5	(17.2)
Scenario D	12.5	15.6	0.0	15.6	18.8	23.5	(7.9)
Industrial - non-lease only							
Scenarios A, B & C	48.6	60.7	160.0	220.7	54.0	67.6	153.2
Scenario D	121.41	151.76	160.0	311.76	33.57	41.96	269.8
Industrial - lease-only							
Scenarios A, B & C	5.4	6.7	0.0	6.7	113.0	141.3	(134.5)
Scenario D	13.5	16.88	0.0	16.88	113.0	141.3	(124.4)
Residential - Scenario A	255.8	319.7	0.0	319.7	497.2	621.9	(302.2)
Residential - Scenario B	481.1	601.4	0.0	601.4	497.2	621.9	20.4
Residential - Scenario C	726.7	908.4	0.0	908.4	497.2	621.9	286.5
Residential - Scenario D	949.3	1,186.6	0.0	1,186.6	497.2	621.9	564.7

Notes:

(1) Net acreage converted to gross acreage by adding 25%

(2) 80 additional gross non-lease commercial acres needed (to allow, for example, one 80-acre site or two 40-acre sites) to attract large-scale commercial development.

160 additional gross non-lease industrial acres needed to attract large-scale industrial development.

As shown in Table V.4 *(as revised and updated)*, under Scenarios A, B & C, there is a need for 121.0 gross acres of non-lease commercial land and 153.2 gross acres of non-lease industrial land in the Prineville UGB for the next twenty years; *however, under Scenario D there is a need for 179.1 acres of non-lease commercial land and 269.8 acres of non-lease industrial land through the year 2023.* There are surpluses of both lease-only industrial and lease-only commercial land under all Scenarios; Therefor, there is no need to add additional lease-only commercial or industrial land to the UGB.

There is a surplus of 302.2 gross acres of residential land under Scenario A and only 20.4 additional gross acres of residential land needed under Scenario B in the Prineville UGB for the next twenty years. Scenario C shows a need for 286.5 gross acres of residential land through the year 2023, *and the selected Scenario D shows a need for 564.7gross acres of residential land through the year 2023.*

D. Recommended measures or plan map changes

The following measures are recommended to address the land needs for the next 20 years for the Prineville Urban Area:

1) Take measures to restrict development in Crook County zones and to allow development in areas only after annexation and rezoning to City zones, to ensure that residential development meets projected densities. Only 52.2 acres out of 705.2 net developable acres of residential land are in City of Prineville R-1, R-2, or R-3 zones. The remainder (653.1 acres are in Crook County SR-1 and SRM-1 zones). As shown in Table III.15a, Scenario A requires 38.8 net buildable acres for multi-family units and 50.8 acres for manufactured home units in parks out of a total need of 255.8 net buildable residential acres. As shown in Table III.15b, Scenario B requires 69.2 net buildable acres for multi-family units and 90.5 acres for manufactured home units in parks out of a total need of 481.1 net buildable residential acres. As shown in Table III.15c, Scenario C requires 102.3 net buildable acres for multi-family units and 133.8 acres for manufactured home units in parks out of a total need of 255.8 net buildable residential acres.

2) Add land to the UGB for residential uses under Scenario C. If Scenario C is accepted, there is a deficit of 26.8 gross acres of buildable residential land (see Table V.4). There are large surpluses of residential land under Scenarios A and B.

3) Add land to the UGB or redesignate land within the UGB for non-lease commercial uses under Scenario B. If Scenario C is accepted, there is a deficit of 111.5 gross acres of buildable non-lease commercial land (see Table V.4). The land added to the UGB should allow for large-scale (one 80-acre site or two 40-acre sites) commercial development.

4) Add land to the UGB or redesignate land within the UGB for non-lease industrial uses under Scenario B. If Scenario B is accepted, there is a deficit of 153.2 gross acres of buildable non-lease industrial land (see Table V.4). The land added to the UGB should allow for large-scale (one 160-acre site or two 80-acre sites) industrial development.

5) Projected densities have been set lower than maximum allowed densities to correspond with recent development patterns, so the City should examine measures to encourage residential densities to approach the maximum allowed in each zone. Also, the overall housing density for the city will be an issue if not enough multi-family units are developed. This will result in an overall housing density lower than the total projected density and more land will be required than now projected.

6) If the City of Prineville wishes to influence the nature of future development (i.e., creating a more pedestrian friendly environment, revitalize the downtown area, limit the amount of sprawl), it must go beyond merely ensuring that appropriate land is available for development by plan designation.

7) Further measures are necessary to meet the requirements that government-assisted housing needs are addressed and that land zoned for higher densities is in locations appropriate for the housing types needed. There are several

measures that the City of Prineville could take which would increase the likelihood that this need is met:

a) Require future multi-family development to reserve a certain percentage of units for households with government assistance (Section 8, etc.). Rental rates on these units may need to be kept down to ensure eligibility under U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines. Multi-family units need to be available to low-income households.

b) Provide financial incentives to developers of multi-family units to build more low-cost units. This could be done as a part of the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program or as an additional municipal subsidy.

c) Assist in the application (with a Housing Authority, non-profit organization or private developer) for additional housing assistance for the construction of low-cost units from federal and/or state sources. The data presented in this document can be used to document the future need for such housing.

8) LCDC requires an examination of the location of land zoned for higher densities to make sure it is in locations appropriate for the housing types needed. Recommendations for the location of zoning for higher density housing are listed below. The City should follow these guidelines when it rezones Crook County-zoned land for residential development (see #1 above).

a) Needed higher-density housing should be located near employment centers, neighborhood commercial centers, schools, and community parks.

b) Higher-density housing should be dispersed across the community as oppose to being concentrated in one area

VI. Summary of Measures to Meet 20-Year Land Need

A. Summary of comprehensive plan map changes

ORS 197.296(4) states that "if the … urban growth boundary does not contain sufficient buildable lands to accommodate housing needs for 20 years at the actual developed density that has occurred since the last periodic review, the local government shall take one of the following actions:

> (a) Amend its urban growth boundary to include sufficient buildable lands to accommodate housing needs for 20 years at the actual developed density during the period since the last periodic review or within the last five years, whichever is greater. As part of this process, the amendment shall include sufficient land reasonably necessary to accommodate the siting of new public school facilities. The need and inclusion of lands for new public school facilities shall be a coordinated process between the affected public school districts and the local government that has the authority to approve the urban growth boundary;
>
> (b) Amend its comprehensive plan, functional plan or land use regulations to include new measures that demonstrably increase the likelihood that residential development will occur at densities sufficient to accommodate housing needs for 20 years without expansion of the urban growth boundary. A local government or metropolitan service district that takes this action shall monitor and record the level of development activity and development density by housing type following the date of the adoption of the new measures; or
>
> (c) Adopt a combination of the actions described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection."

Because of the significant shortfall of commercial and industrial land projected under Scenario B. it is recommended that the City undertake the following modifications of its UGB to provide an adequate supply of vacant industrial land:

1) Redesignate and rezone residential and industrial parcels for commercial use

See Table VI.1 below and Attachment A for a description of land proposed to be redesignated and rezoned for commercial use. As a result of the proposed changes, there will be an increase of 239.9 acres of land to the commercial land inventory, 113.9 gross acres of which will be available for development. These rezonings will remove 116.6 acres of land from the residential land inventory, 42.4 gross acres of which is developable; and remove 123.4 acres of land from the industrial land inventory, 71.4 gross acres of which is developable.

Table VI.1 Land Proposed for Redesignation within the Prineville Urban Area

Parcels	notes	existing designation	proposed designation	total acres	develop-able acres (gross)
14-15-36-Index TL 202 & 203	all floodplain; 70% developed	M-1 (industrial)	commercial	19.10	0.50
14-15-36-Index multiple tax lots		n/a (residential)	commercial	66.83	15.23
14-15-36AC TL 1100	floodplain	L-M (industrial)	commercial	11.42	5.00
14-16-24-Index TL 2100 & 2202		R-1 (residential – 2/3 of site) and M-1 (industrial – 1/3 of site))	commercial	44.85	34.26
14-16-31A TL 100	developable acreage figure from City inventory used	L-M (industrial)	commercial	47.56	44.53
14-16-32-Index TL 201 (part)	developable area based on 5 of developable area of entire parcel shown in City inventory	SR-1 (residential)	commercial	8.10	4.40
14-16-32BC TL 3800	County Road Dept.; developed	n/a (industrial)	commercial	14.89	0.00
15-16-4B TL 7200 (part), 7801, 7800, 7600, 7400 & 7300		n/a (industrial)	commercial	15.44	9.98
15-16-4B multiple tax lots	29 tax lots, 33 DUs; only north part zoned R-2 is now in GIS; entire R-2 portion is developed; residential area proposed for redevelopment as commercial	n/a (residential)	commercial	11.74	0.00
Total				**239.92**	**113.90**
Total residential land to be redesignated				**116.57**	**42.47**
Total industrial land to be redesignated				**123.35**	**71.43**

Note: n/a = data not available from the City.

Table VI.2 below shows the net impact of these proposed redesignations of land on the vacant buildable land inventory.

Table VI.2 Land Inventory After Proposed Redesignation

	Total Adjusted Gross Buildable Acreage Needed (1)	Gross Buildable Acreage Available (1)	2020 Net Need (or Surplus) - Gross Acreage (1)	Proposed redesignated land in gross developable acres - additions (subtractions)	2020 Net need (or surplus) after redesignation
Commercial - non-lease-only	137.1	25.6	111.5	113.90	(2.38)
Commercial - lease-only	6.3	23.5	(17.2)	0.00	(17.16)
Industrial - non-lease-only	220.7	67.6	153.2	(71.43)	224.59
Industrial - lease-only	6.7	141.3	(134.5)	0.00	(134.50)
Residential - Scenario A	319.7	881.5	(561.8)	(42.47)	(519.36)
Residential - Scenario B	601.4	881.5	(280.1)	(42.47)	(237.62)
Residential - Scenario C	908.4	881.5	26.8	(42.47)	69.32

Notes:
(1) From Table V.4

As shown in Table VI.2, the redesignations will provide just enough non-lease commercial land for the projected need for the next twenty years (2.4 acre surplus). There will be a need for 224.6 gross acres of developable industrial land and 69.3 acres of residential land (under Scenario C).

2) Add land to the UGB

ORS 197.298 establishes a hierarchy for consideration of addition of various types of land adjacent to UGBs. Under this hierarchy, farm and forest land cannot be added to a UGB until all adjacent land in other land categories is considered and either rejected or exhausted. The ability to reject certain categories of land to serve identified land needs is allowed, but for certain specified reasons only.

The categories of land are, in priority order, as follows:

1. Land designated as "urban reserve;"
2. Nonresource land and "exceptions land;"
3. Marginal land (available to Lane and Washington County only); and
4. Farm and forest resource land, with the most productive resource land given the lowest priority for inclusion in a UGB.

Land of lower priority may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated to be required for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
2. Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
3. Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands.

See Attachment A for a description of land proposed to be added to the Prineville UGB. The proposed additions are summarized as follows.

Table VI.3 Land Proposed for Addition to the UGB

Site name	Subarea	Priority	Notes (existing use/designation)	Proposed designation	Total acres	Gross developable acres
exception area #1-alternative #3	Tax Lot 100, Sec. 29 & TL 300,	high	n/a	residential	166.09	n/a
exception area #2		high	n/a	open space – park reserve	147.73	0.00
exception area #3a	Tax Lot 2500	high	n/a	residential	55.58	n/a
exception area #4	Tax Lot 100	high	n/a	commercial (15 acres), residential (remainder)	37.19	n/a
exception area #5	north half	high	n/a	commercial (25 acres), residential (remainder)	74.86	n/a
exception area #6a		high	n/a	industrial	262.39	n/a
exception area #6b		high	n/a	industrial	47.68	n/a
exception area #6c		high	n/a	industrial	61.33	n/a
exception area #1-alternative #2	Tax Lots 200, 201 & 300, Sec.	medium	n/a	residential	37.92	n/a
exception area #3b	Tax Lot 2700	medium	n/a	residential	32.37	n/a
exception area #4	Tax Lot 1801	medium	n/a	residential	34.15	n/a
exception area #4	Tax Lot 801	medium	n/a	residential	27.79	n/a
exception area #5	south half	medium	n/a	residential	185.62	n/a
exception area #1-alternative #1	multiple tax lots	low	n/a	residential	53.03	n/a
exception area #3c	Tax Lot 2701	low	n/a	residential	1.02	n/a
exception area #4	Tax Lot 800	low	n/a	residential	192.13	n/a
exception area #4	Tax Lot 108	low	n/a	residential	11.97	n/a
Total					**1,428.86**	**n/a**
SUMMARY						
High priority						
residential					293.72	n/a
commercial					40.00	n/a
industrial					371.40	n/a
open space/ park reserve					147.73	0.00
Total					**852.86**	**n/a**
Medium priority						
residential					317.85	n/a
Low priority						
residential					258.15	n/a

Note: n/a = data not available from the City.

The high priority additions would add, 371.4 acres of land to the industrial land inventory; 40.0 acres of land to the commercial land inventory; and 293.7 acres of land to the residential land inventory. They would also add 147.7 acres of land as open space – park reserve.

The medium priority additions would add 317.8 acres of land to the residential land inventory.

The low priority additions would add 258.2 acres of land to the residential land inventory.

Those recommendations involving the rezoning of property within the UGB can be undertaken by the City without further approval. However, the expansion of the UGB does require State approval, based on a Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and, due to the designation of these sites for agricultural use, a Statewide Planning Goal 2 (Agricultural Exception) analysis. As detailed below, the City may also wish to establish an urban reserve area as a "holding area" for proposed urbanizable land that cannot be justified to be added to the UGB by the net land needs shown in Table VI.2.

B. Summary of comprehensive plan policy changes

ORS 197.296(7) requires that "in establishing that actions and measures … demonstrably increase the likelihood of higher density residential development, the local government shall at a minimum ensure that land zoned for needed housing is in locations appropriate for the housing types … and is zoned at density ranges that are likely to be achieved by the housing market ... Actions or measures, or both, may include but are not limited to:

(a) Increases in the permitted density on existing residential land;

(b) Financial incentives for higher density housing;

(c) Provisions permitting additional density beyond that generally allowed in the zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the developer;

(d) Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures;

(e) Minimum density ranges;

(f) Redevelopment and infill strategies;

(g) Authorization of housing types not previously allowed by the plan or regulations; and

(h) Adoption of an average residential density standard."

The following are the recommended comprehensive plan policy changes for Prineville to ensure that needed density ranges and housing types are produced:

1) The City should adopt measures to create a new multi-family residential designation and zone. Currently, multi-family housing is allowed in residential zones only with a conditional use permit. Adopting a new multi-family designation and zone will help to ensure that needed higher density housing is available.

2) The City should examine measures to encourage residential densities to approach the maximum allowed in each zone. Such measures could include density bonuses (allowing increased densities in exchange for a certain percentage of housing in a development reserved for lower-income groups), inclusionary zoning (requiring a certain percentage of smaller-lot housing affordable to lower-income groups in each new subdivision) required minimum densities, easing of restrictions on second units ("granny flats") on single-family lots, easing of

parking restrictions for senior housing complexes, and easing of regulations and/or fees to encourage infill development;

3) The City should examine measures that would increase the likelihood that the need for very low-income and/or government-assisted housing is met, as follows:

a) Require future multi-family development to reserve a certain percentage of units for households with government assistance (Section 8, etc.). Rental rates on these units may need to be kept down to ensure eligibility under U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines. Multi-family units need to be available to low-income households.

b) Provide financial incentives to developers of multi-family units to build more low-cost units. This could be done as a part of the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program or as an additional municipal subsidy.

c) Assist in the application (with a Housing Authority, non-profit organization or private developer) for additional housing assistance for the construction of low-cost units from federal and/or state sources. The data presented in this document can be used to document the future need for such housing.

4) The City should implement the following principles to ensure that land zoned for higher densities is in locations appropriate for the housing types needed when it rezones Crook County-zoned land for residential development:

a) Higher-density residential designations should be located near existing or planned employment centers, neighborhood commercial centers, schools, and community parks;

b) Higher-density residential designations should be dispersed across the community as opposed to being concentrated in one area.

5) The City should adopt measures to create a new mixed-use zone allowing higher density residential development combined with commercial uses.

C. Statewide planning goal compliance

Whenever a change in an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is considered, the governing body proposing such change shall address the factors found in Goal 14: Urbanization. Because the City of Prineville is proposing to include inside its UGB land which is currently designated for agricultural use, an exception to Goal 3: Agricultural Lands, must be addressed through the criteria found in Goal 2: Land Use Planning.

1. Goal 14: Urbanization

Urban growth boundaries shall be established to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land. Establishment of and change to the boundary shall be based upon consideration of the following factors:

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

b) Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability.

c) Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services.

d) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.

e) EESE (Environmental/ Economic/Social/Energy) consequences

f) Retention of agricultural land, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.

g) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural uses.

See Attachment A for a Goal 14 analysis of all sites proposed for inclusion in the UGB.

In addition to this individual site analysis, in order to be consistent with Goal 14, the City of Prineville must also develop overall strategies for the efficient and orderly conversion of urbanizable land to urban. Recommended policies for addition to the City of Prineville Comprehensive Plan are listed as follows:

Factors for evaluating UGB expansion areas

1) The City shall use the seven Goal 14 factors along with the hierarchy for consideration of addition land as described in ORS 197.298 to evaluate the priority of expansion areas to the Urban Growth Boundary.

2) The City shall consider other additional factors in evaluating proposed expansion areas to the UGB, as follows:

a) Feasibility to serve the expansion area at reasonable cost and with minimum impacts on existing development. Development should not conflict with planned public facilities on urbanizable land.

b) Topography of the proposed expansion area and implications for requirements for sewer service (gravity flow vs. pumping stations).

c) Groundwater resources within the proposed expansion area that could be developed for addition to the City's water system at reasonable cost.

d) Existing or planned capacity of transportation systems to serve the proposed expansion area.

e) Proximity and access of the proposed expansion area to schools, parks, bikeways, recreational resources, shopping , and employment.

f) Environmental and/or natural resource limitations or hazards.

g) Impact of proposed expansion area on prime agricultural lands, irrigation districts, and agriculture industry facilities.

h) Impact of proposed expansion area on open space and other natural resource features such as the rimrock area.

i) Consideration of potential land use conflicts created by proposed expansion areas and compatibility with existing land use pattern.

j) Visual impact of development of the proposed expansion area.

Conversion of urbanizable land based on provision of adequate public services and facilities

1) The conversion of urbanizable lands to urban uses shall take into account the carrying capacities of public facilities and services, and no such conversion shall be permitted that exceeds such capacities.

2) The City shall require full urban services to be provided to all urban-level development within the UGB.

3) The City shall require annexation prior to providing urban services and permitting urban-level development.

4) The City shall provide detailed land use and public facilities plans for conversion areas prior to approval of and as part of the conversion plan amendment.

UGB Management Agreement

The City should adopt an agreement with Crook County regarding land use responsibilities within the Urban Growth Boundary. A proposed *UGB Management Agreement* dated January 29, 2001 has been put forward by the City. The agreement sets forth clear and objective standards for service provision within the urban growth area, annexation, extension of urban services, and for changing zoning regulations. The following are the major provisions of the agreement:

1) The County shall have jurisdiction over land use applications for unincorporated, urbanizable property within the UGB that do not request or require urban services provided by the City.

2) The County shall require compliance with City land use and public facility development standards for land uses and developments located on unincorporated urbanizable lands within the UGB.

3) The City shall have jurisdiction over land use and development proposals for unincorporated urbanizable lands within the UGB that require City water and/or sewer services. Extension of such services requires annexation of the property by the City.

4) As part of an annexation process, the City shall rezone unincorporated land within the UGB from the County zoning to the appropriate City zoning, as follows:

County zone	**City zone**
SR-1	R-1 or R-2
SRM-1	R-2 or R-4
L-C	C-2
N-C	C-4
R-C	C-5
L-M	M-1
H-M	M-2

The following conditions are proposed to be added to the UGB Management Agreement, based on DLCD comments as of May 2001.

Holding zones in urban fringe

The City should consider adopting an urban reserve area outside of its Urban Growth Boundary in order to preserve land for eventual urbanization and to restrict development from limiting eventual urban uses. The urban reserve area must meet the following requirements:

1) The City and Crook County need to adopt an urban reserve boundary with a County-adopted implementing zone and with the City and County signing an urban reserve agreement. This could be part of the UGB Management Agreement or adopted as a separate agreement.

2) The urban reserve area must provide for at least a ten year, but not more than thirty year supply of land beyond the twenty-year urban growth boundary.

3) The urban reserve area must meet the seven factors of Goal 14 and the exceptions standards in OAR 660-04-101.

4) Exception areas and non-resource land must be given first priority for inclusion in the urban reserve area.

5) The urban reserve area shall have a minimum lot size of 10 acres.

6) The urban reserve area shall have requirements for the clustering of new parcels, pre-platting of future lots or parcels, and siting standards for development on existing lots.

7) The urban reserve area shall have requirements for waivers against remonstrance against annexation.

2. Goal 2: Land Use Planning

For all of the potential UGB expansion areas under study, a goal exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3, Agricultural Lands, is required. Each site which is recommended to be included in the UGB has been analyzed against the criteria for a goal exception as set forth in Statewide Planning Goal 2, Land Use Planning:

a. The land subject to the exception is physically developed to the extent that it is no longer available for uses allowed by the applicable goal;

b. The land subject to the exception is irrevocably committed to uses not allowed by the applicable goal because existing adjacent uses and other relevant factors make uses allowed by the applicable goal impractical; or

c. The following standards are met:

(1) Reasons justify why the state policy embodied in the applicable goals should not apply;

(2) Areas which do not require a new exception can not reasonably accommodate the use;

(3) The long-term environmental, economic, social and energy consequences resulting from the use of the proposed site with measures designed to reduce adverse impacts are not significantly more adverse than would typically result from the same proposal being located in areas requiring a goal exception other than the proposed site; and

(4) The proposed uses are compatible with other adjacent uses or will be so rendered through measures designed to reduce adverse impacts.

See Attachment A for a Goal 2 analysis of all sites proposed for inclusion in the UGB.