

DRAFT

TECHNICAL REPORT 2
WOODBURN RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS ANALYSIS

Prepared for:

CITY OF WOODBURN
270 Montgomery Street
Woodburn, OR 97071

Prepared by:

WINTERBROOK PLANNING
310 SW Fourth, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204



May 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS.....	3
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS	3
ADEQUACY OF THE EXISTING URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY.....	4
UPDATES TO THIS DOCUMENT.....	4
RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS.....	4
<i>Statutory Provisions Related to Residential Land Needs</i>	4
COORDINATED POPULATION PROJECTION.....	6
DETERMINE ACTUAL HOUSING DENSITY AND MIX	6
<i>Trends in the Housing Mix</i>	6
<i>Actual Development</i>	9
<i>Summary of Actual Housing Mix and Density</i>	9
<i>Woodburn Subdivisions 1998 to 2002</i>	10
PROJECTED 20-YEAR RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS BASED ON ACTUAL DENSITY	11
YEAR 2020 HOUSING AND BUILDABLE LAND NEEDS METHOD – ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT 1988-2002.....	11
HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS	12
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	12
<i>Education</i>	12
<i>Age</i>	14
<i>Household Size</i>	16
<i>Households by Type</i>	17
<i>Vacancy Rates</i>	19
<i>Nativity</i>	20
<i>Income</i>	21
<i>Employment</i>	23
<i>Housing Ownership Costs in Relation to Income</i>	25
<i>Housing Rental Costs in Relation to Income</i>	26
<i>Actual Housing Costs</i>	28
HOUSING NEED MODEL	29
HOUSING NEED CONCLUSIONS	31
<i>Measures</i>	32
DETERMINE PUBLIC AND SEMI-PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS	34
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND SEMI-PUBLIC BUILDABLE LAND NEEDS PROJECTION METHODS.....	34
<i>Residential and Public / Semi-Public Land Needs Conclusions</i>	36

ENSURE DESIGNATION OF SUFFICIENT BUILDABLE LAND FOR NEEDED HOUSING AND LIVABILITY (PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC) 37

INTRODUCTION

Technical Report 2, Woodburn Residential Land Needs Analysis, projects the land area needed for residential and public-semi-public uses for the 18-year planning period, from 2003 to 2020. This analysis is based on the *tentative* coordinated population projection of 34,919, which represents an increase of 14,059 persons from Portland State University's 2002 population estimate for Woodburn.¹

Residential Land Needs

In this document, we determine Woodburn's residential land needs based on the requirements of HB 2709 (ORS 197.196) and Statewide Planning Goals 10 (Housing) and 14 (Urbanization). We determine "actual housing mix and density" from 1988-2002, to arrive at a "base case" scenario. We then conduct a detailed housing needs analysis, wherein we examine demographic relationships and compare housing costs with household incomes in Woodburn. From this, we determine buildable land needs for specific housing types (detached single-family, attached single-family, manufactured homes on individual lots, manufactured dwelling parks, duplexes, and multi-family) and densities. Finally, we determine the need for parks, schools, and other public and semi-public land uses that typically are met on residential land. The result is the total residential land need to accommodate the 14,059 population increase over approximately the next 18 years.

Economic Opportunities Analysis

ECONorthwest prepared an Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) in May 2001 that considered Woodburn's comparative advantages and identified the types of employment and industries that Woodburn can reasonably attract during the planning period. To address ORS 197.212 (Economic Development) and Goal 9 (Economy of the State) requirements, ECONorthwest also determined the types of sites that will be needed to attract targeted industries, in a subsequent document entitled Site Requirements for Woodburn Target Industries (February 2003). These documents recognize the City's locational advantages and outline a strategy for the City to target specific high-wage industries for future growth. Both documents conclude the City will need additional land with specific size and access characteristics to achieve the City's economic development goals. These two ECONorthwest documents serve to determine Woodburn's employment land needs through 2020.

In March of 2003, ECONorthwest also analyzed the effects of a successful economic development strategy on household incomes, and therefore on housing needs, in a document called Woodburn Occupation / Wage Forecast (Attachment B). This analysis concluded that:

¹ ECONorthwest prepared Woodburn's Year 2020 population projection for review by Marion County in March, 2002. Via letter, Marion County Senior Planner Les Sasaki agreed that this projection was reasonable for planning purposes. The Marion County Board of Commissioners has not formally agreed to this population projection, which is why it is "tentative".

- *More than 50% of new jobs created between 2000 and 2020 are expected to pay less than \$30,000 annually on a full-time equivalent basis.² This is a range of \$7.00 to \$15.00 per hour expressed as an hourly wage. About 18% will pay between \$30,000 and \$39,000 annually, about 13% will pay between \$40,000 to \$49,000 annually, and about 12% will pay more than \$49,000 annually.*
- *The successful implementation of Woodburn's economic development strategy will have a significant impact on the city's wage distribution. The strategy will result in fewer low-paying retail and service jobs, and more high-wage manufacturing, construction, and skilled occupations.*

ADEQUACY OF THE EXISTING URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

In Technical Report 1, Buildable Lands Inventory, we determined the buildable land area, on a parcel-by-parcel basis, within the existing (2002) Woodburn Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). In this document we compare the buildable land supply with projected demand for residential and public/semi-public land. This will enable the City to determine whether comprehensive plan map amendments are necessary to meet long-term population and livability growth needs.

UPDATES TO THIS DOCUMENT

The 2005 revisions to this Residential Land Needs Analysis are based on comments by the Department of Land Conservation and Development, Marion County, and others regarding the methods and results of the 2003 Buildable Lands Inventory and 2003-04 Land Needs Analyses.

Residential Land Needs

Statutory Provisions Related to Residential Land Needs

Woodburn is required to provide a 20-year supply of buildable residential land within its Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Statewide Planning Goals 10 and 14, as well as ORS 197.295-197.312 and OAR 660-07, set forth requirements for residential land use planning. In 1995 the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2709 (ORS 197.296) which supplements existing state requirements for the analysis of long-term residential land needs and provision of buildable residential land within UGBs.³

² A full-time equivalent assumes 1980 hours annually. We recognize that many new jobs in Woodburn are likely to be part-time jobs that will not equate to the annual salary estimates. The base data, however, do not make a distinction between full-time and part-time employment.

³ This section reads as follows:

(3) As part of its next periodic review pursuant to ORS 197.628 to 197.650 following September 9, 1995, or any other legislative review of the urban growth boundary, a local government shall:
(a) Inventory the supply of buildable lands within the urban growth boundary;
(b) Determine the actual density and the actual average mix of housing types of residential development that have occurred within the urban growth boundary since the last periodic review or five years, whichever is greater; and

All jurisdictions over 25,000 are required to comply with the provisions of ORS 197.296 at periodic review or any other legislative review of an urban growth boundary. ORS 197.296 contains two key objectives:

Housing: Ensure that development occurs at the densities and mix necessary to meet a community's housing needs over the next 20 years, in accordance with ORS 197.303, Statewide Planning Goal 10 and OAR Chapter 660, Division 7, Housing.

Land: Ensure there is enough buildable land to accommodate the 20-year housing need inside the UGB.

HB 2709 set forth the following step-by-step requirements related to determine the amount of residential land needed within a UGB. Tasks in **bold** are addressed in order in this document:

1. **Reach agreement on a coordinated population projection with Marion County.**
2. **Determine actual housing density and mix for the last 5 years or since the last Periodic Review, whichever is greater.**
3. **Project 20-year residential land needs based on actual density.**
4. **Determine housing needs based on a comparison of housing costs and income – which may be different from actual housing density and mix. Then:**
 - a) **determine the extent to which actual housing types and densities in Woodburn have been responsive to Woodburn's housing needs; and**

(c) Conduct an analysis of housing need by type and density range, in accordance with ORS 197.303 and statewide planning goals and rules relating to housing, to determine the amount of land needed for each needed housing type for the next 20 years.

(4) If the determination required by subsection (3) of this section indicates that 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.

- b) **identify measures to increase densities within the UGB to minimize the need to expand the UGB to meet identified housing needs.**
5. **Determine residential land needs for school facilities. We have also determined residential land needs for parks.**
 6. **Determine the buildable land area⁴ available to meet housing needs, after considering infill and redevelopment potential.**
 7. **Ensure that sufficient buildable land is designated for needed housing types at density ranges likely to be achieved in the housing market, as well as for public needs that occur within a residential plan designation.**
 8. **Amend the UGB and/or adopt measures to provide sufficient buildable land to accommodate projected 20-year residential land need.**

Coordinated Population Projection

Winterbrook and ECONorthwest worked with the City, the County, and TGM administrators to determine a coordinated population projection for the purposes of this study. **The Interim – approved by County Planning Staff for planning purposes – Woodburn 2020 population projection is 34,919.** This is an increase of 14,819 from the 2000 U.S. Census population of 20,100 (Average Annual Growth Rate of 2.8%). This projection is the basis for projecting residential and public semi/public land needs.

Determine Actual Housing Density and Mix

This step determines the actual mix and density of housing development in Woodburn from 1988-2002⁵.

Trends in the Housing Mix

The housing mix (i.e., percentage of single-family, attached single-family, single-family manufactured, duplex and multi-family dwelling units) is an important variable in any housing needs assessment. Distribution of housing types is influenced by a variety of factors, including the cost of new home construction, area economic and employment trends, and amount of land zoned to allow different housing types and densities.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 below, through analysis of data from the 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, give a snapshot of the *status quo* for housing development in

⁴ Technical Report 1: Buildable Lands Inventory, responds to the **buildable lands** requirements of ORS 197.296.

⁵ ORS 197.296 requires a time period of 5 years or the last periodic review, whichever is greater, for the purposes of this study. DLCDD issued Woodburn's periodic review notice in 1988.

Woodburn. Since 1990 is within the study period, Tables 2 and 3 determine actual development before and after the snapshot to examine trends.

Woodburn, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

In 1990, Woodburn had a total of 4,890 housing units. Of these, 3,504 (72%) were conventional “stick-built” single-family residences. Multi-family and duplex units were relatively rare, at 16% and 2% respectively, while the 513 manufactured homes comprised 10% of the total housing units.

Table 1: Woodburn, 1990 Housing Summary

Housing Type	Units	Percentage of Total
Single-Family Detached	3,504	72%
Multi-Family	772	16%
Duplex	101	2%
Manufactured Homes	513	10%
Totals	4,890	100%

Source: 1990 US Census

Woodburn, 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

By the Year 2000, Woodburn had a total of 6,784 housing units. Of these, 4,592 (68%) were conventional “stick-built” single-family residences. Multi-family units were second highest at 20%, while duplex units and manufactured homes stayed at 2% and 10% respectively.

Table 2: Woodburn, 2000 Housing Summary

Housing Type	Units	Percentage of Total
Single-Family	4,592	68%
Multi-Family	1,377	20%
Duplex	158	2%
Manufactured Homes	657	10%
Totals	6,784	100%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 3 describes the change in Woodburn’s housing composition from 1990 to 2000. Woodburn added 1,894 housing units from 1990 to 2000. Of these units, 57% were single-family, 32% multi-family, 3% duplex, and 8% manufactured home. The most significant changes occurred in a shift from single-family to multi-family development. Fully 32% of additional units between 1990 and 2000 were multi-family units, while in 1990, only 16% of the total housing stock was multi-family.

Table 3: Woodburn, 1990-2000 Housing Type Changes

Housing Type	1990 Units	2000 Units	Change in Units	Percent of Total Unit Change
Single-Family	3,504	4,592	1,088	57%
Multi-Family	772	1,377	605	32%
Duplex	101	158	57	3%
Manufactured Homes	513	657	144	8%
Totals	4,890	6,784	1,894	100%

Source: 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census

Actual Development

Actual development from 1988 to 2002 in Woodburn was determined through review of building permits – for the 1988-1997 period by the McKeever/Morris Woodburn Buildable Lands and Urbanization Project (February, 2000), and for the 1998-2002 period by Winterbrook Planning.

Woodburn, 1988-1997 Actual Development Mix

Of the 1,280 units approved between 1988 and 1997, 31% were single-family detached, 29% were multi-family, 2% were duplexes, and 38% were manufactured homes. New Woodburn housing during this period developed at an average density of about 6.6 dwelling units per net acre.

Table 4: Actual Development 1988-1997

Type	Units	Percent	Net Acres	Net Density
SFR	394	31%	72.2	5.46
MFR	377	29%	25.1	15.02
Dup	22	2%	1.4	15.71
MH	487	38%	95.1	5.12
Total	1,280	100%	193.8	6.60

Source: McKeever-Morris – Woodburn Buildable Lands and Urbanization Project, 2000

Woodburn, 1998-2002 Actual Development Mix

Of the 904 units approved between 1998 and 2002, 59% were single-family detached, 36% were multi-family, 1% were duplexes, and 36% were manufactured homes. New Woodburn housing during this period developed at an average density of about 8.4 dwelling units per net acre, due to a high proportion of high-density multi-family units and PUDs.

Table 5: Actual Development 1998-2002

Type	Units	Percent	Net Acres	Net Density
DSFR	556	59%	84.8	6.6
ASFR	0	0%	0	N/A
MFR	302	36%	16.5	18.3
Duplex	10	1%	1.1	8.71
MH	36	4%	5.0	7.26
Total	904		107.4	8.4

Source: Winterbrook Planning and McKeever/Morris.

Summary of Actual Housing Mix and Density

Table 6 summarizes the average actual housing mix and density in Woodburn for the years 1988-2002. Overall, Woodburn has averaged 7.2 dwelling units per net buildable acre:

- Detached single-family housing has accounted for about 43% of all new units in Woodburn. The average actual single-family residential density has been about 6 units per net buildable acre.

- We did not see any building permit information for attached single-family housing during this time period.
- Multi-family housing has accounted for about 31% of all new units in Woodburn since 1988. The average actual multi-family density in Woodburn has been about 16.3 units per net buildable acre.
- Duplexes have accounted for 1% of all new units in Woodburn. The average duplex density has been about 12.6 units per net buildable acre.
- Manufactured housing has accounted for 24% of all new units in Woodburn. The average actual manufactured housing density has been about 5.2 units per net buildable acre.

Table 6: Actual Development 1988-2002

Type	Units	Percent	Net Acres	Net Density
SFR	950	43%	157.0	6.05
MFR	679	31%	41.6	16.31
Dup	32	1%	2.5	12.56
MH	523	24%	100.1	5.23
Total	2184	100%	301.2	7.25

Source: City of Woodburn; Winterbrook Planning; McKeever-Morris

Woodburn Subdivisions 1998 to 2002

Winterbrook conducted a study of available subdivision and partition data for the years 1998 through 2002 as a comparison to the building permit data.

We were able to find complete information for 11 projects, comprising a total of 506 lots and about 105 acres. This gross density was approximately 4.8 lots per acre. To determine net area, we removed area dedicated for streets (Ded. Area), access easements (Access Area), and required open space (Tracts Area). Subdivisions and PUDs were determined to have an average of 26% of their area devoted to streets, access, and open space. This led to an average net density of almost 6.6 units per net acre for subdivisions and PUDs during the time period studied. It is important to note that a few of the major subdivision developments (Links at Tukwila, Ironwood at Tukwila) were associated in a large PUD with a golf course in the northern portion of Woodburn. This allowed high densities within the subdivisions, which Table 7 reflects below, but a much lower gross density if the golf course were to be included.

Table 7: Woodburn Subdivision and PUD Summary, 1998-2002

Tot. Projects	Tot. Area	# Lots	Gross Density	Ded. Area	Access Area	Tracts Area	% Unbuild	Net Area	Net Density
11	104.90	506	4.82	25.01	0.38	2.39	26%	77.12	6.56

Source: City of Woodburn; Winterbrook Planning

Projected 20-Year Residential Land Needs Based on Actual Density

The “Base Case Scenario” as described below is based on “actual housing densities” observed from 1988-2002 (Table 6), as prescribed by ORS 197.296(4)(a). Implementation of this base case scenario does not require additional plan policy or code text amendments. Implementation of this scenario would, of course, require comprehensive plan map, urban growth boundary and (eventually) zoning map amendments.

Year 2020 Housing and Buildable Land Needs Method – Actual Development 1988-2002

For the scenario based on actual development we:

1. Determined the actual mix and density of dwelling unit (DU) types in new developments (from 1988 to 2002).
2. Used ECONorthwest’s projected and Marion County interim planning population projection of 34,919.
3. Applied the 2000 US Census ratio of institutional population to projected population increase. Subtracted these 337 “institutional” people from the population growth for purposes of dwelling unit need.
4. Assumed a projected average household size figure of 2.9.⁶
5. Applied an average occupancy rate of 95% (or a vacancy rate of 5%⁷) to all housing types.

We determined the number of needed dwelling units (DU) by multiplying the actual mix by the population increase, dividing by household size, then dividing by occupancy rate. We determined needed acres by dividing the number of dwelling units by actual density. We then applied the above factors to create Table 8.

Table 8 shows a need for 4,968 dwelling units and about 680 net buildable residential acres, using the above methods. Table 8 shows the housing mix and density experienced in Woodburn over the last 14 years – one possible zoning allocation that can achieve 7.25 dwelling units per acre. Table 8 does not include need for Public and Semi-Public uses, which is discussed in the Public and Semi-Public section of this document.

⁶ The actual household size has risen sharply in Woodburn from 2.7 in 1990 to 3.1 in 2000. This increase can be attributed largely to in-migration of families with small children. We project a return in household size over the next 20 years (reflecting national trends and cultural shifts) to 2.9 persons per household. See discussion under Household Size in the Demographics section of this document.

⁷ The 2000 US Census shows overall vacancy rates in Woodburn of 8%. This is a substantial increase from 1990’s overall vacancy rate of 2.7%. We projected a midrange vacancy rate of 5%. See discussion under Vacancy Rate in the Demographic Information section of this document.

Table 8: Residential Land Need based on Actual Development

Type	Percent	Units	Net Density	Needed Net Acres
DSFR	43%	2,136	6.05	353.1
MFR	31%	1,540	16.31	94.4
Duplex	1%	49.68	12.56	4.0
MH	24%	1,192	5.23	228.0
Totals	100%	4,968	7.25	679.5

Source: City of Woodburn; McKeever-Morris; Winterbrook Planning

HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS

Demographic Information

While housing needs can be projected based on past trends, there are other factors that should be considered in a Housing Needs Analysis. Demographic information – statistics on age, education, income, employment, and housing costs – provides insight into the nature of need. The following sections compare Woodburn’s demographic information with some other Willamette Valley cities (Wilsonville, Salem, and Portland) as well as with Marion County and Oregon as a whole, describe recent trends for each demographic factor, and analyze the demographic information in relation to Woodburn’s short and long term objectives.⁸

Education

Overview. Tables 9, 10, and 11 below depict the educational achievement level of working-age residents of Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. Educational levels are important in a housing needs analysis, as education levels are related to potential income. An educated populace is also more attractive to potential employers, which can lead to more jobs and more money to spend on housing.

Comparison. Compared to the other cities, Marion County, and Oregon, educational levels in Woodburn are quite low. Woodburn has a much lower percentage of population with college education than any of the comparators. In addition, Woodburn has a much higher percentage of population with less than a high school degree.

Trend. From 1990 to 2000, the percentage of college graduates rose slightly in Woodburn – the percentage of population with a bachelors degree or higher rose by a total of 3% - but the percentage of persons with less than a 9th grade education increased from 20% to 26%. In all other comparators, education levels rose across the board. None of the other comparators showed an increase in population with less than a 9th grade education.

Interpretation. The general educational level of adults in Woodburn is relatively low, and the percentage of persons with no high school experience has risen over the last 10 years. These lower educational levels can be explained by the large numbers of recent immigrants

⁸ 1990 and 2000 data used in this analysis is from the 1990 and 2000 US Census.

(described in the Nativity section, and Tables 17, 18, and 19) who often are poorly educated. People with lower educational levels typically have lower incomes and generally cannot afford higher-priced housing. Part of Woodburn's economic development strategy is to provide improved educational and job training services. As educational levels increase, so will household incomes. Recent housing trends indicate an increase in multi-family housing, which generally is more affordable than single-family housing. As Woodburn's newer residents become better educated, they are more likely to afford homeownership, and to demand more traditional single-family housing.

Table 9: Educational Attainment, 1990

1990 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	1990 Woodburn	1990 Wilsonville	1990 Salem	1990 Portland	1990 Marion County	1990 Oregon
Less than 9th grade	20%	1%	7%	6%	9%	6%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	17%	8%	12%	11%	13%	12%
High school graduate	30%	23%	26%	25%	29%	29%
Some college, no degree	20%	28%	26%	26%	25%	25%
Associate degree	5%	6%	8%	6%	7%	7%
Bachelor's degree	6%	24%	14%	17%	12%	14%
Graduate or professional degree	3%	8%	8%	9%	6%	7%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 10: Educational Attainment, 2000

2000 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	2000 Woodburn	2000 Wilsonville	2000 Salem	2000 Portland	2000 Marion County	2000 Oregon
Less than 9th grade	26%	2%	8%	5%	9%	5%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	16%	5%	11%	9%	11%	10%
High school graduate	24%	20%	24%	22%	26%	26%
Some college, no degree	20%	28%	27%	25%	27%	27%
Associate degree	3%	7%	6%	6%	7%	7%
Bachelor's degree	7%	26%	15%	21%	13%	16%
Graduate or professional degree	4%	12%	9%	11%	7%	9%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 11: Educational Attainment Trends, 1990-2000

1990-2000 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT TREND	1990-2000 Woodburn	1990-2000 Wilsonville	1990-2000 Salem	1990-2000 Portland	1990-2000 Marion County	1990-2000 Oregon
Less than 9th grade	6%	1%	1%	0%	1%	-1%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	-1%	-3%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-2%
High school graduate	-6%	-3%	-2%	-3%	-3%	-3%
Some college, no degree	0%	0%	1%	-1%	2%	2%
Associate degree	-2%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%
Bachelor's degree	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	3%
Graduate or professional degree	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Age

Overview. Table 11 below depicts age distribution and median ages in Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. The age of a city's population is important in a housing needs analysis because different ages can indicate different types of housing requirements. For example, families with children are more likely to want single-family homes, while young people just entering the work force are more likely to be looking for rental housing. An older population is likely to desire smaller lot homes, townhouses, or condominiums, as their household sizes are smaller (1-2 persons) and yard work can become a burden.

Comparison. Woodburn has a high percentage of its population at the ends of the age spectrum. In 2000, 42% of Woodburn's population was under 25 years old, compared with 34% for Wilsonville, 37% for Salem, 31% for Portland, 38% for Marion County, and 34% for the state as a whole. Woodburn has retained a relatively large elderly population. In 2000, 18% of Woodburn's population was 65 years old or older, compared to 14% for Wilsonville, 12% for Salem, Portland, and Marion County, and 13% for Oregon.

Trend. Woodburn has become noticeably younger over the last decade. In 1990, 36% of the population was under 25 years old. In 1990, 26% of Woodburn's population was 65 years old or older. During the next 10 years, the under 25 cohort increased in Woodburn by 5%, while the 65 and older cohort decreased by 8%. As shown in Table 14, Woodburn's age distribution increased only in age groups between 10 and 44 years of age – by 8% total. This is quite different from all other comparators. Every other comparator showed a substantial increase (3-5%) in the 45-54 age cohort, while Woodburn remained the same at that age.

Interpretation. Woodburn has become relatively young city, with an unusually high proportion of young adults and families. This trend can be explained in terms of immigration of younger workers, who often have large families. However, Woodburn has retained a high percentage of retirement-age residents, which can be explained by the presence of a large senior housing development (Woodburn Senior Estates) and by long-term residents.

The lack of family wage jobs in Woodburn may have contributed to an out-migration of working age people who were born in Woodburn.

Typically, households at the bottom and top of the age pyramid have less disposable income to spend on housing, while households headed by middle-aged workers have higher-paying jobs and demand higher cost housing. Woodburn's policy is to provide more family-wage jobs, thus retaining younger and middle-aged workers in the community. This will have the effect of increasing demand for traditional single-family housing, and decreasing demand for more affordable housing types such as apartments and manufactured homes.

Table 12: Age Distribution, 1990

Age Distribution 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Under 5 years	9%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%
5 to 9 years	9%	6%	7%	8%	8%	7%
10 to 14 years	6%	6%	6%	3%	7%	7%
15 to 19 years	6%	6%	6%	4%	7%	7%
20 to 24 years	7%	7%	8%	5%	7%	7%
25 to 34 years	14%	19%	18%	20%	16%	16%
35 to 44 years	9%	18%	16%	15%	15%	17%
45 to 54 years	8%	9%	9%	10%	10%	10%
55 to 59 years	3%	3%	4%	5%	4%	4%
60 to 64 years	4%	4%	3%	6%	4%	4%
65 to 74 years	12%	8%	8%	11%	8%	8%
75 to 84 years	10%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%
85 years and over	4%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 13: Age Distribution, 2000

Age Distribution 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Under 5 years	9%	8%	7%	6%	8%	7%
5 to 9 years	8%	7%	7%	6%	8%	7%
10 to 14 years	7%	7%	7%	6%	7%	7%
15 to 19 years	9%	6%	7%	6%	8%	7%
20 to 24 years	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%
25 to 34 years	15%	16%	15%	18%	14%	14%
35 to 44 years	11%	15%	15%	16%	15%	15%
45 to 54 years	8%	12%	13%	15%	13%	15%
55 to 59 years	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%
60 to 64 years	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%
65 to 74 years	8%	7%	6%	5%	6%	6%
75 to 84 years	7%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%
85 years and over	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 14: Age Distribution Trends, 1990-2000

Age Distribution Trend 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Under 5 years	0%	1%	0%	-2%	0%	-1%
5 to 9 years	0%	1%	0%	-2%	0%	-1%
10 to 14 years	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%
15 to 19 years	3%	0%	1%	3%	1%	1%
20 to 24 years	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%
25 to 34 years	1%	-3%	-3%	-2%	-2%	-2%
35 to 44 years	2%	-3%	-1%	2%	-1%	-1%
45 to 54 years	0%	3%	4%	5%	3%	4%
55 to 59 years	0%	1%	1%	-1%	1%	1%
60 to 64 years	0%	-1%	0%	-3%	0%	0%
65 to 74 years	-4%	-1%	-2%	-6%	-2%	-2%
75 to 84 years	-3%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
85 years and over	-1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Household Size

Overview. Table 13 depicts the average household size, as well as the change in household size, for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon in 1990 and 2000. Changes in household size can have a significant affect on the number of housing units a community will need to house its population. There are two probable affects on housing demand from larger household sizes: first, families with many children typically have less disposable income to spend on housing; second, these same families are likely to spend a greater proportion of their incomes on housing, and prefer traditional single-family homes.

Comparison. In 1990, Woodburn had a larger average household size (2.7 persons per household) than Wilsonville (2.3), Salem (2.4), Portland (2.3), Marion County (2.6), and Oregon as a whole (2.5). By 2000, Woodburn's household size had increased to 3.11 while Wilsonville and Portland stayed basically the same. Salem and Marion county increased to 2.5 and 2.7 persons per household respectively. The state of Oregon as a whole actually declined very slightly in household size during this time period, from 2.52 to 2.51 persons per household.

Trend. The state of Oregon as a whole was the only comparator to decline in household size during this time period. Woodburn increased household sizes by 15%, while Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, and Marion County increased by 1-5%.

Interpretation. The rise in household size in Woodburn can be explained largely by immigration of young and growing families, who typically have low educational levels and low incomes (see discussion of Age, Education, and Income in this document). Woodburn's immigrant families have been mostly of Central European or Hispanic heritage, two groups that typically have more children and therefore larger household sizes. However, based on the experience of other immigrant groups in America, household size can be expected to more closely approximate County-wide averages as young families mature, children create

their own households, educational and income levels increase, and the cultural expectations change.

Part of Woodburn’s economic development strategy is to provide improved educational and employment opportunities. Thus, it is reasonable to project that household sizes will remain high, but will more closely approximate household sizes in Marion County as a whole by the Year 2020. Woodburn should plan both to provide affordable single family homes, and maintain a supply of affordable multi-family housing opportunities, such as provided by Nuevo Amanacer and Esperanza Court.

Table 15: Persons per Household 1990-2000

Household Size 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Average household size 1990	2.7	2.29	2.41	2.27	2.6	2.52
Average household size 2000	3.11	2.34	2.53	2.3	2.7	2.51
Trend	115%	102%	105%	101%	104%	100%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Households by Type

Overview. Tables 16, 17, and 18 below show the type of households in Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and the state of Oregon, for 1990 to 2000. Household type tells us the components of households – whether the households are serving families, unrelated persons, a single householder, or if the householder is age 65 or older. Household type is important to know in a housing needs analysis, as it explains what sectors of the population are using the housing available.

Comparison. In 1990, Woodburn had a comparatively high percentage of family households at 69%. Wilsonville was also at 69%, and Marion County was slightly higher at 70%, but Salem was at 63%, and Portland was lowest at only 56%. The state as a whole was slightly lower than Woodburn for family households, at 68%. In 1990, 28% of Woodburn’s households were occupied by one person, compared to 24% in Wilsonville, 30% in Salem, 35% in Portland, and 25% in Marion County and Oregon. Woodburn had a large proportion of householders aged 65 and above at 20%, substantially higher than the comparators, which ranged from 8% in Wilsonville to 12% in Salem and Portland.

In 2000, Woodburn had the highest percentage of family households among the comparators at 72% - 3% higher than Marion County, 6% higher than Oregon as a whole, 8% higher than Wilsonville and Salem, and 19% higher than Portland. Woodburn had a comparatively low percentage of householders living alone (24%) – equal to Marion County, 2% lower than Oregon as a whole, 4% lower than Wilsonville and Salem, and 11% lower than Portland. Woodburn still had the highest percentage of householders aged 65 and above in 2000, at 16% compared to 9-10% for other comparators.

Trend. Woodburn moved from a high percentage of family households in 1990 (69%), to a higher percentage (72%) in 2000. This is in opposition to trends among the comparators, where Wilsonville dropped 6%, Salem remained constant, Portland dropped 3%, Marion County dropped 1%, and Oregon as a whole dropped 2%. Woodburn decreased substantially (by 4%) from 1990 to 2000 in its percentage of householders living alone, compared to an increase of 4% in Wilsonville, a decrease of 2% in Salem, no change in Portland, a decrease

of 1% in Marion County, and an increase of 1% in Oregon as a whole. Woodburn's percentage of householders age 65 and above also decreased more than all other comparators – a 4% drop – compared to a 2% increase in Wilsonville, a 2% decrease in Salem, a 3% decrease in Portland, a 1% decrease in Marion County, and a 1% decrease in Oregon as a whole.

Interpretation. Woodburn increased from 69% to 72% in family households, and dropped in all other categories. This means that a vast majority (calculated to 79%) of new households between 1990 and 2000 in Woodburn were occupied by families. The 4% drop in householders aged 65 and above in Woodburn reflects the younger age of new Woodburn residents (see discussion under Age in this document). Woodburn should plan to meet the needs of these young families as they become more established in the community and integrated into the workforce. Woodburn should not just plan for development to serve the existing and future young families, but realize many of the families now in Woodburn will a) be able to develop wealth to afford ownership housing; and b) will have young adults moving out of the family home and needing affordable rental housing.

Table 16: Households by Family Status 1990

HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Family households (families)	69%	69%	63%	56%	70%	68%
Nonfamily households	31%	31%	37%	44%	30%	32%
Householder living alone	28%	24%	30%	35%	25%	25%
Householder 65 years and over	20%	8%	12%	12%	11%	10%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 17: Households by Type 2000

HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Family households (families)	72%	64%	64%	53%	69%	66%
Nonfamily households	28%	36%	36%	47%	31%	34%
Householder living alone	24%	28%	28%	35%	24%	26%
Householder 65 years and over	16%	10%	10%	9%	10%	9%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 18: Households by Type 1990-2000

Households by Type Trend 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Family households (families)	2%	-6%	0%	-3%	-1%	-2%
Nonfamily households	-2%	6%	0%	3%	1%	2%
Householder living alone	-4%	4%	-2%	0%	-1%	1%
Householder 65 years and over	-4%	2%	-2%	-3%	-1%	-1%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Vacancy Rates

Overview. Tables 14, 15, and 16 depict vacancy rates for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon in 1990 and 2000. Vacancy rates are important in determining future land needs, as they can affect market choice as well as development trends.

Comparison. Woodburn in 1990 had the lowest overall vacancy rate of all comparators. Woodburn’s homeowner vacancy rates were fairly comparable at 1.3% to Wilsonville (1.2%), Salem and Portland (1.6%), Marion County (1.1%), and Oregon (1.4%). Woodburn’s rental vacancy rate in 1990 was less than half the rate of the other comparators – at 1.6%, compared to 3.7% for Marion County, all the way to 9.9% for Wilsonville. In 2000, Woodburn’s homeowner vacancy rate was over twice as high as the other comparators – 5.9% compared to 2.3-2.6% for the others. Woodburn’s rental vacancy rate was still fairly low at 6.4%, compared to 9.5% in Wilsonville, 7% in Salem, 6.8% in Marion County, and 7.3% in Oregon as a whole. Only Portland came in lower, at 6.2%.

Trend. Woodburn’s vacancy rates for both ownership and rental housing units rose substantially between 1990 and 2000. The homeowner vacancy rate in Woodburn rose by 4.6% over the 10 years, compared to 0.7-1.4% rises in the comparators. The rental vacancy rate in Woodburn rose by 4.8%, compared to a slight decline in Wilsonville (-0.4%) and rises between 1.5-3.1% in the comparators.

Interpretation. In 1990, Woodburn had a very low vacancy rate, which indicates lack of choice in the market for both ownership and rental housing units at that time. Since 1990, Woodburn’s population grew substantially (from 13,404 to 20,100), and Woodburn’s housing market responded by increasing housing unit supply by nearly 2,000 total units (4,922 to 6,824). As explained in the Age, Household by Type, and Household Size sections, the increase in population between 1990 and 2000 was mostly young families, with a high average household size. This phenomenon has led to a fairly high vacancy rate among ownership units in 2000, compared with Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon.

However, one of Woodburn’s goals is to increase the education and wage levels of its residents by increasing educational and employment opportunities. As described in the Age and Household Size sections, this policy direction taken by Woodburn should act to decrease average household sizes, increasing the demand for housing units. It’s important to maintain choice and competition in the housing market, both to lower prices and to meet the wide-ranging housing needs of Woodburn’s diverse population, so the current vacancy rate should not be considered a “problem”. Nonetheless, we find it likely that Woodburn’s vacancy rate will move toward Marion County’s overall vacancy rate over the next 20 years, due to projected changes in age, income, employment, and culture.

Table 14: Vacancy Rates, 1990

Vacancy Rates 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.3%	1.2%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.4%
Rental vacancy rate	1.6%	9.9%	4.0%	4.7%	3.7%	5.3%
Overall Vacancy Rate	2.7%	6.7%	3.9%	5.6%	3.9%	7.6%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 15: Vacancy Rates, 2000

Vacancy Rates 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Homeowner vacancy rate	5.9%	2.6%	2.5%	2.3%	2.5%	2.3%
Rental vacancy rate	6.4%	9.5%	7.0%	6.2%	6.8%	7.3%
Overall Vacancy Rate	8.1%	7.3%	5.8%	5.7%	6.0%	8.2%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 16: Vacancy Rates Trend, 1990-2000

Vacancy Rates Trend 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Homeowner vacancy rate	4.6%	1.4%	0.9%	0.7%	1.4%	0.9%
Rental vacancy rate	4.8%	-0.4%	3.0%	1.5%	3.1%	2.0%
Overall Vacancy Rate	5.3%	0.6%	1.9%	0.1%	2.2%	0.6%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Nativity

Overview. Tables 17, 18, and 19 describe nativity and place of birth for residents of Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon as a whole from 1990 to 2000. Nativity is an important factor to look at in a housing needs analysis, as past and current population stability can be used to make assumptions regarding future population stability, as well as social and economic stability, over the next 20 years.

Comparison. In 1990, Woodburn had a much lower percentage of native population (as opposed to foreign born) than all the other comparators – 81% native population in Woodburn, compared to 92-96% in Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. In 1990, 11% of Woodburn’s population had entered the United States in the previous 10 years, compared to 1-4% for the rest of the comparators. In 2000, only 65% of Woodburn’s population was “native”, while Portland and Marion County were at 87%, Salem at 88%, and Wilsonville and Oregon were at 92%. In 2000, 22% of Woodburn’s population entered the United States in the previous 10 years, while the rest of the comparators ranged from 4-7%.

Trend. All the comparators studied in this document decreased in native population as a percentage of the whole – Woodburn decreased by 17%, Wilsonville and Oregon by 4%, Portland by 5%, and Salem and Marion County by 6%. The overall trend was also a higher percentage of recent US immigrants – Woodburn’s population that entered the US over the previous 10 year period increased by 11%, while the other comparators rose by 2-4%.

Interpretation. Woodburn’s foreign-born population has been increasing at a much higher rate than Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon as a whole. Much of the increase is comprised of recent immigrants to the US. These recent immigrants bring with them a different culture and lifestyle – a diversity that is valued in Woodburn – that also includes such demographic impacts such as higher household sizes and lower educational levels (see discussions under Household Size and Education). Over the next 20 years, Woodburn intends to increase opportunities for education and employment, which should allow recent immigrants and their growing children an opportunity to adapt to a lifestyle that is more akin to native and long-term Oregon residents.

Recent substantial nativity changes and trends in Woodburn residents indicate a population currently in flux – we expect the large scale immigration will slow as a percentage of population growth over the next 20 years, which should bring such demographic statistics as household size and vacancy rates back toward Marion County norms.

Table 17: Nativity and Place of Birth, 1990

Nativity and Place of Birth 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Native population	81%	96%	94%	92%	94%	95%
Foreign-born population	19%	4%	6%	8%	6%	5%
Entered the U.S. 1980 to 1990	11%	1%	3%	4%	3%	2%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 18: Nativity and Place of Birth, 2000

Nativity and Place of Birth 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Native	65%	92%	88%	87%	87%	92%
Foreign born	35%	8%	12%	13%	13%	8%
Entered 1990 to March 2000	22%	4%	6%	7%	7%	4%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 19: Nativity and Place of Birth Trends 1990-2000

Nativity and Place of Birth Trend 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Native population	-17%	-4%	-6%	-5%	-6%	-4%
Foreign-born population	17%	4%	6%	5%	6%	4%
Entered the U.S. Previous 10 Years	11%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Income

Overview. Tables 20, 21, and 22 depict household income for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon in 1989 and 1999. Goal 10 requires local governments to provide affordable housing opportunities for existing and future residents. This is done by comparing household income with housing costs, to determine the type and density of housing types that are needed in a community.

Comparison. In 1990, Woodburn had a substantially lower median household income than the other comparators - \$22,253, compared to \$38,456 for Wilsonville, \$25,236 for Salem, \$25,592 for Portland, \$26,876 for Marion County, and \$27,250 for Oregon as a whole. The breakdown of income brackets for 1989 shows that 57% of Woodburn’s households were earning incomes of less than \$25,000 at that time. The comparators had substantially lower percentages of householders in the lower income ranges – 29% in Wilsonville, 50% in Salem, 50% in Portland, 46% in Marion County, and 46% in Oregon as a whole.

In 1999, median household incomes in Woodburn rose to \$33,722, compared with \$52,515 in Wilsonville, \$38,881 in Salem, \$40,146 in Portland, \$40,314 in Marion County, and \$40,916 in Oregon. Woodburn maintained the highest percentage of households earning under

\$25,000, with 33% - compared to 19% in Wilsonville, 30% in Salem, 29% in Portland, 27% in Marion County, and 28% in Oregon as a whole.

Trend. Median household income in Woodburn grew by 152% between 1989 and 1999, compared with 137% for Wilsonville, 154% for Salem, 157% for Portland, and 150% for Marion County and Oregon as a whole. The increase in median household incomes was generally on pace with income growth in the comparators, but Woodburn started at a much lower base, so incomes rose less in actual dollars for Woodburn residents than for all other comparators.

Interpretation. Household incomes in Woodburn are low, compared with Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon as a whole. Woodburn has kept pace with income growth trends (from a percentage standpoint), but started with and maintains a lower base income. Discussion of housing costs to income levels in the Owner Costs and Rental Costs sections will allow us to determine if housing costs are out of range for Woodburn residents.

Of note, Woodburn's Economic Opportunities Analysis (ECONorthwest, 2000) prescribes specific steps for Woodburn to increase education and household income by allowing for and encouraging higher-paying jobs to locate in Woodburn. The economic effects of achieving the program outlined in the EOA were described in the Woodburn Occupation / Wage Forecast (ECONorthwest, 2003). Woodburn residents are forecast to shift into higher income ranges, due mainly to development of more manufacturing job opportunities as opposed to minimum-wage retail. To the extent that Woodburn's economic strategy is successful, the greater income should lead to greater demand for traditional single-family housing ownership and its potential for wealth accumulation, and relatively less demand for rental housing.

Table 20: Income Comparison, 1989

Household Income 1989	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than \$5,000	7%	2%	6%	7%	5%	6%
\$5,000 to \$9,999	12%	6%	11%	11%	9%	10%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	12%	7%	11%	11%	10%	10%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	26%	14%	22%	21%	22%	20%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	20%	15%	17%	17%	18%	18%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	15%	23%	17%	16%	19%	18%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	8%	21%	12%	11%	12%	13%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	0%	4%	1%	2%	1%	2%
\$150,000 or more	0%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Median household income (dollars)	22,253	38,456	25,236	25,592	26,876	27,250

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 21: Income Comparison, 1999

Household Income 1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than \$10,000	9%	4%	9%	10%	8%	9%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	8%	4%	7%	6%	6%	6%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	16%	11%	14%	13%	13%	13%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	20%	13%	15%	14%	15%	14%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	19%	16%	18%	17%	19%	18%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18%	20%	20%	20%	21%	20%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	6%	15%	9%	9%	9%	10%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	3%	12%	5%	7%	5%	7%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%
\$200,000 or more	0%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Median household income (dollars)	33,722	52,515	38,881	40,146	40,314	40,916

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 22: Income Comparison Trends, 1989-1999

Household Income Trend 1989-1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than \$10,000	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	-3%	-2%	-4%	-5%	-3%	-3%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	-6%	-2%	-7%	-7%	-7%	-6%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	-1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	4%	-2%	3%	3%	3%	2%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	-2%	-6%	-3%	-2%	-2%	-3%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	3%	7%	3%	3%	3%	3%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	0%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
\$200,000 or more	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Median household income	152%	137%	154%	157%	150%	150%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Employment

Overview. Tables 23, 24, and 25 below depict the percentage of working age (16 and older) population in the labor force, and levels of unemployment for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. Labor force statistics can aid in a Land Needs Analysis by helping to describe both the economic status of a community and age-related factors, as most persons age 16 and above and not in the labor force are either involved in education (high school / college) or retired.

Comparison. In 1990, only 50% of Woodburn residents age 16 and above were in the labor force, compared with 69% in Wilsonville, 59% in Salem, 67% in Portland, 62% in Marion County, and 64% in Oregon as a whole. Woodburn in 1990 had a fairly low unemployment

rate, at 3%, compared with 4% for Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon as a whole. Wilsonville had a lower unemployment rate in 1990 of 2%.

In 2000, 56% of Woodburn residents age 16 and above were in the labor force, compared with 72% in Wilsonville, 63% in Salem, 69% in Portland, 64% in Marion County, and 65% in Oregon as a whole. Woodburn's unemployment rate was fairly standard among the comparators, at 5% - the same as Salem, Portland, and Marion County, but slightly higher than Wilsonville (3%) and Oregon (4%).

Trend. From 1990 to 2000, Woodburn had the highest increase of population in the labor force of any comparator, with a 5% shift – substantially higher than Wilsonville and Salem (3%), Portland (2%), or Marion County and Oregon (1%). Unfortunately, Woodburn's unemployment rate also increased more than any comparator during this time period – an upwards shift of 2% - compared to 1% in Wilsonville, Salem, and Marion County, and 0% in Portland and Oregon as a whole.

Interpretation. Woodburn's labor force has grown at a much higher rate than any of the comparators. Although Woodburn has a high, but declining, percentage of retired residents, the working age population in Woodburn is growing younger, so the labor force is growing and expected to grow further. These young workers need jobs near where they live, so Woodburn has made the policy choice to increase job opportunities in its UGB, consistent with the Woodburn Economic Opportunities Analysis. Otherwise, Woodburn's increasing labor force will face three unacceptable options: (a) join the unemployment roles, (b) commute to jobs outside of Woodburn, or (c) leave the area. Because Woodburn is taking active steps to increase local employment opportunities, Woodburn residents are expected to enjoy increases in income that will allow for better choice in housing options.

Table 23: Labor Force Status, 1990

Labor Force Status 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
In labor force	50%	69%	59%	67%	62%	64%
Unemployed	3%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Not in labor force	50%	31%	41%	33%	38%	36%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 24: Labor Force Status, 2000

Labor Force Status 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
In labor force	56%	72%	63%	69%	64%	65%
Unemployed	5%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%
Not in labor force	44%	28%	37%	31%	36%	35%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 25: Labor Force Status Trends, 1990-2000

Labor Force Trend 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
In labor force	5%	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%
Unemployed	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Not in labor force	-5%	-3%	-3%	-2%	-1%	-1%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Housing Ownership Costs in Relation to Income

Overview. Tables 26, 27, and 28 depict total owner costs as a percentage of monthly household income for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. The relation of owner costs to income is very important in a housing needs analysis, as it indicates the affordability of the homeownership housing mix in a community.

Comparison. In 1989, 59% of Woodburn's homeowner households were paying less than 20% of their income on housing. This was less than the comparators, as 51% of households in Wilsonville and 56% of households in Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon could say the same. The percentage of households paying 30% or more of their household income on homeownership was 17% in Woodburn in 1989. This also was lower than all comparators – Wilsonville was at 20%, Portland at 19%, and Salem, Marion County, and Oregon were at 18%. In 1999, 52% of Woodburn households had home ownership costs that amounted to less than 20% of total household income. This was still higher than all the comparators, which ranged from 46-49%. However, 28% of Woodburn's owner households were paying 30% or more of their income, compared to 23% in Wilsonville, 26% in Salem, 28% in Portland, and 25% in Marion County and Oregon.

Trend. From 1989 to 1999, Woodburn's housing ownership costs have increased in relation to household income, as have all the comparators. Woodburn started at a lower base in 1989, so the percentage increases are more substantial than in the comparators. The percentage of Woodburn homeowners paying 30% or more of their household income on housing increased by 11%, compared to 3% in Wilsonville, 8% in Salem, 9% in Portland, and 7% in Marion County and Oregon as a whole.

Interpretation. The high percentage of Woodburn homeowners in the highest cost bracket indicates a need for either lower cost homeownership options or an increase in household income. Woodburn's demographics are undoubtedly responsible for some of the relatively high costs. As described in the sections related to Age, Household Size, and Income, Woodburn grew rapidly from 1990 to 2000, and much of the growth consisted of young families. A high proportion of young homeowners at the beginning of their mortgages will tend to lead to higher ownership costs. As the households and the mortgages mature, and better employment options are available, housing costs in relation to household income will naturally decline.

Table 26: Owner Costs, 1989

Monthly Owner Costs as Percentage of Household Income 1989	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	59%	51%	56%	56%	56%	56%
20 to 24 percent	13%	16%	16%	15%	16%	15%
25 to 29 percent	9%	13%	10%	9%	10%	10%
30 to 34 percent	3%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%
35 percent or more	14%	14%	13%	13%	13%	12%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 27: Owner Costs, 1999

Monthly Owner Costs as Percentage of Household Income 1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	52%	49%	46%	46%	48%	49%
20 to 24 percent	12%	16%	17%	15%	16%	15%
25 to 29 percent	7%	12%	12%	11%	11%	11%
30 to 34 percent	6%	9%	8%	8%	7%	7%
35 percent or more	22%	14%	18%	20%	18%	18%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 28: Owner Costs Trends, 1989-1999

Monthly Owner Costs as Percentage of Household Income Trends 1989-1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	-7%	-2%	-9%	-11%	-8%	-7%
20 to 24 percent	-1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
25 to 29 percent	-1%	-2%	2%	2%	1%	1%
30 to 34 percent	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%
35 percent or more	8%	0%	5%	7%	5%	5%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Housing Rental Costs in Relation to Income

Overview. Tables 29, 30, and 31 depict gross monthly rent as a percentage of monthly household income for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. This is important in determining housing needs, as it portrays the affordability of the rental housing mix in comparison to household income for a community.

Comparison. In 1989, Woodburn rental housing was not very affordable to Woodburn residents – 26% of Woodburn renter households were spending less than 20% of their income on housing, which was less than Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon as a whole (32-34%). On the other side of the scale, 34% of Woodburn rental

households were paying over 35% of their income on housing – compared to 21% in Wilsonville, 31% in Salem and Portland, and 30% in Marion County and Oregon. In 1999, 30% of Woodburn renter households were spending less than 20% of their income on housing, which was fairly close to the comparators – Portland and Oregon as a whole were lower (28% and 29%), while Marion County, Salem, and Wilsonville were higher (31%, 32%, and 36% respectively). Woodburn retained a slightly higher percentage of renter households paying over 35% of their income on housing – 34% compared with 29% for Wilsonville, 31% for Marion County, 32% for Salem and Oregon as a whole, and 33% for Portland.

Trend. Woodburn rental costs as compared to income remained fairly constant from 1989 to 1999. The percentage of Woodburn renters paying the lowest amount (under 20%) of their income on rent grew from 26% to 30%. Salem remained stable. The other comparators generally increased rental costs in relation to household income – Wilsonville’s percentage of renters paying 35% or more of household income on housing increased by 8%, Marion County by 1%, and Portland and Oregon as a whole by 2%.

Interpretation. Compared to the listed comparators, Woodburn renters pay a slightly higher percentage of household income for their housing costs. However, as rental housing trended toward less affordable among the other comparators, Woodburn remained fairly stable from 1989-1999. Considering the demographic changes described in the Age, Income, Labor Force, and Nativity sections – a younger population of recent immigrants, with relatively high unemployment – that Woodburn did not lose rental affordability from 1989-1999 indicates a success of the housing mix provided. The increase in rental units and choice described in the Vacancy Rates section has allowed the market to provide relatively affordable rental units to Woodburn’s population growth. Woodburn’s economic strategies, consistent with the Woodburn Economic Opportunities Analysis, should increase household incomes, thereby increasing rental affordability further in Woodburn.

Table 29: Rental Costs, 1989

Gross Rent as Percent of Household Income 1989	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	26%	34%	32%	32%	33%	32%
20 to 24 percent	16%	22%	14%	15%	14%	14%
25 to 29 percent	13%	13%	12%	11%	12%	11%
30 to 34 percent	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%
35 percent or more	34%	21%	31%	31%	30%	30%

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 30: Rental Costs, 1999

Gross Rent as Percent of Household Income 1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	30%	36%	32%	28%	31%	29%
20 to 24 percent	13%	15%	14%	14%	15%	14%
25 to 29 percent	11%	10%	12%	13%	11%	12%
30 to 34 percent	8%	8%	7%	8%	7%	8%
35 percent or more	34%	29%	32%	33%	31%	32%

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 31: Rental Costs Trends, 1989-1999

Gross Rent as Percent of Household Income Trends 1989-1999	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Less than 20 percent	4%	2%	0%	-4%	-2%	-3%
20 to 24 percent	-3%	-7%	-1%	-1%	1%	-1%
25 to 29 percent	-2%	-3%	0%	1%	-1%	0%
30 to 34 percent	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
35 percent or more	0%	8%	0%	2%	1%	2%

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Actual Housing Costs

Overview. Tables 32, 33, and 34 depict median rent and home prices for Woodburn, Wilsonville, Salem, Portland, Marion County, and Oregon. These raw numbers are also important to look at for a Housing Needs Analysis, as they depict real (not purely relative) housing cost differences between communities.

Comparison. In 1990, Woodburn's median rent was fairly midrange at \$402 per month – compared to \$494 in Wilsonville, \$387 in Salem, \$397 in Portland, \$401 in Marion County, and \$408 for Oregon as a whole. Median home value in Woodburn for 1990 was comparatively quite low at \$51,900 – compared to \$121,400 in Wilsonville, \$60,300 in Salem, \$59,200 in Portland, \$59,900 in Marion County, and \$67,100 for the state of Oregon.

In 2000, Woodburn's median rent was still fairly midrange at \$599 per month – compared with \$746 in Wilsonville, \$560 in Salem, \$622 in Portland, \$574 in Marion County, and \$620 for Oregon. Woodburn's median home price remained the lowest among the comparators at \$114,800 – compared with \$227,900 in Wilsonville, \$131,100 in Salem, \$154,900 in Portland, \$132,600 in Marion County, and \$152,100 in Oregon as a whole.

Trend. Woodburn's median rent increased by nearly \$200 from 1990-2000. This was higher than Salem or Marion County (increases of \$173), but lower than Wilsonville (\$252), Portland (\$225), and Oregon (\$212). Home prices in Woodburn, already the lowest among the comparators in 1990, increased by the lowest amount from 1990-2000. Home prices increased only about \$63,000 in Woodburn, compared with about \$107,000 in Wilsonville, \$71,000 in Salem, \$96,000 in Portland, \$73,000 in Marion County, and \$85,000 in Oregon as a whole.

Interpretation. Median rent in Woodburn, while lower than several comparators, including Oregon as a whole, is slightly higher than median rents in Salem and Marion County, its two closest comparators. This seems incongruous at first glance, considering the lower income levels of Woodburn (see section on Income in this document). However, there are two other factors that are likely to influence median rent in Woodburn – the amount of new rental housing, and household size. Woodburn has increased its supply of rental housing recently (see sections on Vacancy Rate as well as Actual Development). New housing is usually more expensive than older housing, and logically will lead to higher rents unless there is a substantial oversupply of rental units. Woodburn also has the largest household size among the comparators, and most of the household growth is in the form of families (see sections on Household Size and Households by Family Status), which leads to a higher need for larger rental units (2-3 bedroom rather than 1 bedroom). Larger rental units logically cost more than smaller rental units. These two factors may be skewing the rent upward in Woodburn. As household sizes begin to decline in Woodburn over the next 20 years (see section on Household Size), and the recently developed apartments become older, median rent can be expected to drop relative to comparator communities.

Median home value in Woodburn has been low and continues to be comparatively far lower than other communities in this analysis, as well as the county and state. This means that Woodburn is providing relatively affordable housing. Woodburn residents can expect to pay less for a house than in most other places around the state. In addition to planning for economic stimuli as indicated in the Economic Opportunities Analysis, Woodburn should continue to encourage low cost housing options.

Table 32: Housing Costs, 1990

Housing Costs 1990	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Median Rent (dollars)	\$ 402	\$ 494	\$ 387	\$ 397	\$ 401	\$ 408
Median Home Value (dollars)	\$ 51,900	\$ 121,400	\$ 60,300	\$ 59,200	\$ 59,900	\$ 67,100

Source: 1990 US Census

Table 33: Housing Costs, 2000

Housing Costs 2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Median Rent (dollars)	\$ 599	\$ 746	\$ 560	\$ 622	\$ 574	\$ 620
Median Home Value (dollars)	\$ 114,800	\$ 227,900	\$131,100	\$154,900	\$ 132,600	\$152,100

Source: 2000 US Census

Table 34: Housing Costs Trends, 1990-2000

Housing Costs Trends 1990-2000	Woodburn	Wilsonville	Salem	Portland	Marion County	Oregon
Median Rent (dollars)	\$ 197	\$ 252	\$ 173	\$ 225	\$ 173	\$ 212
Median Home Value (dollars)	\$ 62,900	\$ 106,500	\$ 70,800	\$ 95,700	\$ 72,700	\$ 85,000

Source: 1990 & 2000 US Census

Housing Need Model

The ODCED has developed a Residential Land Needs model that bases housing needs on projected income by age cohort, related to assumptions of types and cost for various housing types over the next 20 years. As described in the brief summary below, it is a complex and sophisticated model:

The Housing/Land Needs Models utilize Excel spreadsheets containing components such as templates for inputting specific data that is relevant to a community's housing and/or land needs and graphs for displaying model results. There are two models - one for housing need only and one for housing and the land needed to support that housing - with three versions of each model using parameters appropriate to urban, college or resort (U), medium size rural (M), or small rural (S) communities.

The models and their associated templates are designed to use inputted data to calculate, analyze, and display the housing and/or land needs for each community. These files have up to 21 worksheets containing 19 templates and 11 graphs that perform different functions in the needs analysis.

The model requires a large number of user assumptions to complete many of the 21 worksheets. These assumptions range from those that are fairly standard in a needs analysis (e.g. projected population, vacancy rates, household size) to some that may be unique to the model (e.g. the user must determine what percent of each of five rental housing types will be in each of six rent ranges for the next 20 years). One of the most difficult aspects of the model is that it uses different rental and price ranges than the Census, so the user either has to make assumptions regarding splits in price and rental ranges, or must perform a complete rental survey (including single family house rentals) combined with a full analysis of tax assessor price data. Since we did not have a budget to do a complete rental survey as part of this process, the inputs we used could not be backed by on-ground data. A full copy of the Residential Land Needs Model is provided as **Attachment A** to this document.

Winterbrook ran the model using the tentative coordinated population projection of 34,919, a 20-year timeframe, household size of 2.9, and approximately 100 other assumptions related to housing type, rental status, and price/rent levels (See Attachment A). Projected income by age cohort inputs for the Model were provided by ECONorthwest. The Model produced the result shown on Table 35. Approximately 385 net acres are needed for Low Density Single Family (LDSF), 116 for Medium Density Single Family (MDSF), 94 for High Density Single Family (HDSF), 15 for Manufactured Dwelling Park (MDP), 27 for Low Density Multi-Family (LDMF), 57 for Medium Density Multi-Family (MDMF), 14 for High Density Multi-Family (HDMF), and 6 for Mixed-Use (MU). The total acreage needed to serve the 2020 dwelling unit growth of approximately 5,000 units was indicated to be about 714 net acres. When compared with existing housing supply, the total *additional* acreage needed for 2020 was indicated to be about 339 acres, as shown on Table 36.⁹

⁹ Note that this does not include land for public uses such as parks and schools, as it is purely dwelling units.

Table 35: 2020 Needed Net Acres for Housing

	LDSF	MDSF	HDSF	MDP	LDMF	MDMF	HDMF	MU	Total
Acres Needed	385.1	115.8	94.0	15.4	27.4	56.7	14.0	5.5	713.7

Source: The Housing/Land Needs Model; Winterbrook Planning

Table 36: 2020 Additional Net Acres Needed for Housing

	LDSF	MDSF	HDSF	MDP	LDMF	MDMF	HDMF	MU	Total
New Acres Needed	102.1	114.8	94.0	15.4	27.4	(34.3)	14.0	5.5	338.7

Source: The Housing/Land Needs Model; Winterbrook Planning

Winterbrook used the Housing Needs Model results as a base and a guide for this Housing Needs Analysis. Discussions with Woodburn staff, review of the Woodburn Economic Opportunities Analysis, and demographic factors analyzed above were also factors in the Housing Needs Conclusions we reached below.

Housing Need Conclusions

Woodburn has two major cohorts: a rapidly growing young population that will continue to grow and mature over the next 20 years, and an elder population that should remain fairly stable. Currently, Woodburn is doing fairly well, but can improve in providing opportunities for affordable housing. Part of the affordable housing “problem” is that the new, young population lacks the financial resources of established families.

A major part of Woodburn’s economic opportunities analysis is to take advantage of its growing workforce by offering the opportunity for jobs to locate in the area. If Woodburn is successful in attracting these jobs, the buying power of residents will improve in relation to housing needs. So, while Woodburn can benefit from a wider range of housing types, and should allow the opportunity for multi-family and small lot single-family residences to develop, it is important to continue to supply traditional single-family housing as well.

Currently, Woodburn has two residential plan designations: Low Density Residential and High Density Residential. These designations are implemented by three zones: Residential Single Family, Retirement Community Single Family Residential, and Medium Density Residential.

In order to better represent and implement the housing types indicated as needed by the Land Needs Model and by our demographic analysis, we created two new plan designation overlays: a Nodal overlay and Vertical Mixed Use overlay. The nodal overlay would be applied to Single Family Residential, producing Nodal Low Density Residential (Nodal LDR) or Medium Density Residential, producing Nodal Medium Density Residential (Nodal MDR). The Vertical Mixed Use (VMU) overlay would be applied to downtown commercial areas. The two original plan designations, plus the overlays produce five distinct plan areas:

- Low Density Residential: This plan designation allows stick-built single-family homes, manufactured dwellings (not parks), and some duplexes. Approximately 30% of new

dwelling units would fall into this designation. *Capacity of residential exceptions areas adjacent to the 2002 Woodburn UGB totaling 295 units was subtracted from this need.*

- Nodal Low Density Residential: This overlay would allow smaller lot single family homes, zero lot line single family dwellings, and manufactured homes in Low Density Residential areas. Approximately 30% of new dwelling units would fall into this designation.
- Medium Density Residential: This plan designation allows duplexes, manufactured dwelling parks, and medium density multi-family dwellings. Approximately 20% of new dwelling units would fall into this designation.
- Nodal Medium Density Residential: This overlay would allow slightly higher densities than MDR, and would allow condominiums, townhouses, and rowhouses. Approximately 20% of new dwelling units would fall into this designation.
- Vertical Mixed Use: Housing is allowed above retail in Woodburn’s downtown commercial area and the proposed nodal commercial area. Approximately 1% of new dwelling units would fall into this category.¹⁰

As shown in Table 37 below, this proposed implementation of the new Nodal overlays results in a residential land need of 527 net acres through 2020 – about 150 net acres less than would be needed if actual development trends were extended without measures (as shown in Table 8), and about 180 net acres less than the Housing Needs Model indicated (as shown in Table 35).

Table 37: Residential Land Needs

Plan	Net Density	Percent	DU	Net Acre Need
LDR	5.5	30.0%	1195	217
Nodal LDR	8	30.0%	1490	186
MDR	14	19.5%	969	69
Nodal MDR	18	19.5%	969	54
VMU	16	1%	50	0
Total	8.9	100%	4673	527

Source: Winterbrook

Measures

Table 38 provides more detail on the proposed distribution of housing by type and comprehensive plan designation, with projected net density. In order to achieve the densities projected for each housing type, amendments to the Woodburn Comprehensive Plan and Development Code are required. Thus, Woodburn will need to adopt “measures” to increase density and provide for more affordable housing, as proscribed by ORS 197.296. These

¹⁰ Over 100% due to rounding.

measures are addressed in detail in the Comprehensive Plan and Code Amendments proposed in the 2005 Plan, and briefly outlined as follows:

- **Plan for higher density** – Woodburn planned for new development through 2020 to come in at an overall density of 8.3-8.9 dwelling units per net buildable acre. This is significantly higher than the actual density of about 7.3 dwelling units per net buildable acre developed between 1988 and 2002.
- **Multi-Family Mix** – Woodburn planned for a ratio of 65% single-family, manufactured home, or attached single family (with nearly 50% of the single-family as “small lot” single-family) and 35% duplex or multifamily for new development in Woodburn through 2020.
- **Modify Plan and Zones** – Woodburn created two new overlay designations, Nodal and Vertical Mixed Use, in order to better fit housing type needs and allow for higher density in mixed-use node areas. We also modified the small lot single-family zone to apply to more than just the “Retirement Community” and created a new high density residential zone.
- **Mixed-Use Node** – Woodburn has designated a nodal development area, in the southwest portion of Woodburn near Parr Road. This area will have a mix of multi-family, small lot single-family, and rowhouses, as well as a small neighborhood commercial center and a location fairly near new industrial jobs.
- **Minimum Density Standards** – Woodburn has incorporated minimum density standards for new subdivisions and planned developments in each of its residential zones. This standard is designed to achieve approximately 80% of maximum permitted densities.

Table 38: Housing Need by Type and Density Table and Explanation

Housing Type	Number of New Units	Percentage of New Units	Projected Net Density	Woodburn Plan District
LDR and MH (Standard Lot)	1378	29%	5.5	SFR *
NodalSF (Small Lot)	1426	30%	8	SFR Nodal *
Duplex	48	1%	8	SFR
Duplex	48	1%	8	RM *
MH in MHP	190	4%	8	RM
Attached Single Family	95	2%	12	RM / Nodal *
Multi-Family	808	17%	14	RM
Multi-Family	618	13%	18	RM / Nodal *
Multi-Family	24	0.50%	16	VMU *
Multi-Family	24	0.50%	16	CN / Nodal *
Totals / Percentages / Cumulative Density	4753	100%	8.4	

* Indicates measures needed.

DETERMINE PUBLIC AND SEMI-PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL LAND NEEDS

Public and semi-public facilities such as schools, hospitals, churches, government buildings, and parks will expand as population increases. Such lands are necessary to address Goal 14, Factor 2 “livability” requirements.¹¹ Such uses typically locate on land designated for residential use. We have analyzed such need in conformance with ORS 197.296(4)(a).

Public and semi-public land needs are shown on Table 39 below. Park standards described in the 1999 Woodburn Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan Update were used to determine the need for buildable and unbuildable (natural area parks) land to accommodate parks and schools.

Summary of Public and Semi-Public Buildable Land Needs Projection Methods

- **Schools** – The Council used the ratio of developed school land to population in the 1999 *Woodburn Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan Update*, about 5 acres per 1,000 residents, and extended that ratio to the Year 2020 Woodburn population to determine land needed for schools. Woodburn School District reviewed our projection and determined that Woodburn needed approximately 48 additional acres beyond our projection to meet school needs through 2020.¹² Woodburn currently has about 115 acres of land for schools, and needs approximately 223 acres by 2023. This leaves an unmet need of 108 acres for schools to accommodate a new high school, a new middle school and two new elementary schools.
- **Parks** – Winterbrook used the 1999 *Woodburn Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan Update* to project park needs through 2020. The 1999 Update recommended a ratio of 7 acres per 1000 population to project need for neighborhood and community parks. The Council took a 2020 population of 34,919, applied the ratio, and then subtracted existing park lands to determine needed park acreage. The Parks Plan indicates that some of Woodburn’s park needs will be met on school lands. The Council assumed 50% of all needed 2020 school lands would also serve to meet park needs, and added that to the parks supply. Woodburn currently has about 87 acres of parks and recreational land in use (plus about an additional 112 acres of 2020 school lands), and needs about 262 acres total to meet the recommended ratio. This leaves an unmet need for about 63 acres of park lands.

¹¹ Goal 14, Factors 1 and 2 read as follows:

1) *Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC Goals;*

2) *Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability.*

¹² August 30, 2004 letter from Woodburn School District. The District has a 20-year planning horizon. In order for the second new high school to be operational by 2023, the land will need to be purchased in or before 2020.

- **Institutional** – Woodburn currently has 500 residents who live in “institutions”, according to the 2000 US Census, and has had no additional institutional development from 2000-2002. The Council applied the existing ratio to a projected 2020 population of 34,919, to determine an institutional population growth of approximately 337 through 2020. The Council applied a ratio of 30 residents per net acre (the maximum allowed under current zoning), which translated to an 11-acre need in this category.
- **Religious** – The Council applied a ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 population growth for religious uses. The 2002-2020 population growth forecast of 14,059 translated to a need for approximately 28 acres for religious use.
- **Natural Areas** - The Council put protected greenways and wildlife corridors into this category. The 1999 Woodburn Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan Update did not project a need for natural areas. Since these uses most often occur on constrained (unbuildable) land, the Council did not identify a separate buildable land need for natural areas.
- **Government** – The Council assumed that public and government employment growth would be accommodated through intensification of existing government employment areas. Projected government employment growth through 2020 is 252 employees. Using similar employee/acre ratio as commercial employment would yield a land need of slightly less than 13 acres. Since this need is assumed to be accommodated in existing government employment areas, no additional residential land need results from government land need.

Supply of public land was determined in Technical Report 1, Buildable Lands Inventory. Since public/semi-public uses typically locate on residential land, Woodburn needs approximately 210 additional net buildable acres of residential land to meet its 2020 Public and Semi-Public Land Needs.

Table 39: Year 2020, Public and Semi-Public Land Needs

Type	Supply	Need	Difference
Schools Net Acres	115	223	-108
Parks Acres	199	262	-63
Institutional Net Acres	0	11	-11
Religious Net Acres	0	28	-28
Natural Areas Acres*	129	92	37
Government Net Acres*	5	13	-8
Total Net Buildable Residential Deficit			-210

Source: Woodburn Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan Update; 2000 US Census; Winterbrook Planning

* These acreages are not counted toward total residential deficit.

Based on Woodburn’s plans, and actual ratios compared to population growth, Woodburn will need about 108 net buildable acres for schools, about 63 acres for parks, 11 acres for

institutional uses, and about 28 acres for religious uses between 2000 and 2020. Since parks, schools, institutional uses, churches, fire stations and similar public/semi-public uses typically require a location in a residential zoning district, such public and semi-public needs add to the demand for vacant buildable residential land within Woodburn's Year 2020 UGB.

Residential and Public / Semi-Public Land Needs Conclusions

Table 6 shows a comparison of residential supply (dwelling unit capacity) versus dwelling unit demand through 2020. Public/Semi-Public lands are included in the residential need totals as described in the Public/Semi-Public section in this document. Dwelling unit capacity was determined in Technical Report 1, Buildable Lands Inventory. Woodburn requires approximately 210 additional net buildable acres of Residential land to meet its 2020 housing and public/semi-public land needs for "housing and livability".

ENSURE DESIGNATION OF SUFFICIENT BUILDABLE LAND FOR NEEDED HOUSING AND LIVABILITY (PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC)

Table 40 shows a comparison of residential supply (dwelling unit capacity) versus dwelling unit demand through 2020. Public/Semi-Public lands are included in the residential need totals as described in the Public/Semi-Public section in this document. Dwelling unit capacity was determined in Technical Report 1, Buildable Lands Inventory. Woodburn requires significant redesignation of land inside the UGB, and approximately 225 additional acres of Residential land outside the UGB (after applying the capacity of all adjacent residential exceptions areas toward LDR needs) to meet its 2020 housing and public/semi-public land needs for “housing and livability”.

Table 40: 2020 Residential Land Needs with Measures

Plan	Acres Available	Acres Needed	Acres Surplus (deficit)
LDR	403	217	186
Nodal LDR	0	186	(186)
MDR	108	69	39
Nodal MDR	0	54	(54)
VMU	0	0	0
Public	-	210	(210)
Totals	511	736	(225)