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ABSTRACT

Efforts to directly control the amount and timing of residential growth in Aumsville, Oregon, were unsuccessful in receiving approval from the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) at a series of public hearings in 1978. A review of the issues raised at the hearings suggests LCDC supports the right of local governments to manage growth, but requires those governments to coordinate growth management plans with a regional body and detail the plan in an implementing ordinance. Criteria for developing growth management ordinances include: techniques which relate directly to stated objectives; flexibility to accommodate market changes; and legal review of the ordinance prior to adoption.

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Oregon is growing rapidly. During the first seven years of the 1970s, the state's growth rate was about two and one half times the national average for the same period. The state's nonmetropolitan areas have experienced the greatest rate of growth, fifty percent larger than that for metropolitan areas over the same seven year period. Many communities have had problems absorbing the impacts of rapid growth, and have taken steps designed to alleviate future growth problems. Such efforts have been labeled "growth management strategies," which seek to control the rate, timing, amount, geographic pattern, or public cost of growth. The implementation of some strategies in Oregon, however, is
proving difficult, for it involves unprecedented procedural and legal questions. Similar experiences outside of Oregon indicate there are no easy answers for making growth management work, suggesting the Oregon experience may prove difficult. The problem, then, is to identify:

1) the problematic issues and concerns;
2) key decisions and policy statements;
3) guidelines for acceptable growth management ordinances.

Objectives

The objective of this research is to present a case study of recent growth management attempts by the city of Aumsville, Oregon. The approach is to examine the background, planning process, and current status of the first community in the state to include explicit growth management policy in its comprehensive plan. The research is designed to identify and discuss:

1) Aumsville's reasons for seeking to control growth;
2) the growth management techniques employed;
3) why Aumsville's techniques were unsuccessful in receiving approval from the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

This organization was selected to provide background for identifying implicit and explicit guidelines small communities might use in developing growth management ordinances. To this end, the paper concludes with a discussion of what is to be learned from the Aumsville case.
Study Area

Aumsville is located in southern Marion County, where the Willamette Valley floor merges with the lower slopes of the Old Cascades (Fig. 1). The city is eleven miles southeast of Salem, and currently has a population of about 1600. The study area for this research is primarily the 631 acres within Aumsville's urban growth boundary. Certain regional considerations broaden the area to include all of Marion County. The time of interest here is the decade 1970 to 1980.

This study area is of interest for at least two reasons. First, Aumsville was the first community in Oregon to present LCDC with a growth management plan seeking to directly limit the number of building permits to be issued annually. Aumsville's plan was discussed at LCDC hearings in October and December of 1978. These hearings were attended by several special interest groups, with more than one expressing concern for the precedent which would be set if the plan received approval.

Aumsville is also of interest because it is representative of other small communities with growth problems. Located in close proximity to a major urban center, Aumsville has recently emerged as a "bedroom community." From 1970 to 1980, Aumsville's population nearly tripled, with most of the increase occurring in the first five years of that period. This caused increased demand for city services improvements; two major sewer projects were undertaken, the school was expanded three times, and the city has been short of water since 1975. The ability of Aumsville, and other cities like it, to respond to the impacts of rapid growth is further complicated by a lack of professional staff to advise the city council and planning commission in growth matters.
Fig. 1. Aumsville and vicinity.
Research Procedure

The first step in gathering information was to contact and interview several persons who have been directly involved with Aumsville's growth management history. These interviews led to tapes and transcripts of LCDC hearings, communications between planning agencies, engineering studies, and other documents which have served as the data base for this research. These data have been supplemented and synthesized with information obtained in many conversations with planners, engineers, and citizens in Aumsville.

AUMSVILLE'S RESIDENTIAL GROWTH AND SERVICE EXPANSION

Interviews were conducted with city officials, regional planners, and state extension agents to obtain an understanding of why Aumsville became interested in growth management. Each of these citizens and professionals identified recent increases in city population and service demand as the primary motivation for interest in growth control. The purpose of this section is to document the history of these changes and the steps taken by the city to address them. Three city services are examined: sewer, water, and schools.

Population

From 1920 to 1960, Aumsville's population increase was slow and somewhat erratic, with the number of residents increasing from 171 to 300 in the forty year period (Fig. 2). The city's percentage of the total county population remained fairly constant, averaging .26 percent.
Fig. 2 Population Growth in Aumsville, 1920-1980.
source: Mid-Willamette Council of Governments

Fig. 3 Approved Building Permits in Aumsville, 1966-1979.
Each circle marks the number of residential building permits at the end of each year. na = data not available.
source: Aumsville City Hall
About 1960, however, the city began to grow faster, with the 1960 to 1970 period showing a 96.6 percent increase in residents. Population growth from 1970 to 1975 accelerated, with the number of residents increasing from 590 to 1450 (145 percent). In this period, the city's share of the county total increased from .38 to .87 percent.

Two reasons explain the rapid changes experienced from 1970 to 1975. The first is the emergence of Aumsville as a desirable residential location for many commuters to Salem. This is part of a larger state and national trend showing a migration of people to the rural fringe of urban centers and to small towns that are within commuting distance. From 1970 to 1977, Oregon's metropolitan counties grew more outside their central cities than inside, and increases in nonmetropolitan counties were greater still (see Appendix 1).\(^2\) In this period, cities in the 500 to 999 population size class had the highest average percentage increase of all size classes (52.9 percent).

The second reason for Aumsville's rapid growth was a large block of housing subsidized by the Farmers Home Administration in 1973 and 1974. Federally subsidized housing in 1975 represented thirty-eight percent of the total housing stock in Aumsville.\(^3\) This was the highest proportion of all thirty-three cities in the Marion-Polk-Yamhill County area. The Mid-Willamette Council of Governments (COG) considers a figure of twenty-one percent or higher "excessive."\(^4\)

Population growth since 1975 has been markedly slower due to building moratoriums and market changes. A review of approved building permits shows seventy dwelling units were approved from Jan. 1, 1976, to Jan. 1, 1980 (Fig. 3). Assuming all were built and occupied with an
average of 3.6 residents, the year end 1979 population of Aumsville would be 1702 persons. However, not all permits have been built or occupied due to the recent swelling of home loan interest rates. The official 1979 population for state revenue distribution was placed at 1540, but city officials estimate this as probably low, with a figure of 1600 being more likely.

Wastewater Treatment

Prior to 1971, Aumsville's residents utilized septic tank systems for disposal of wastes. In 1967, a number of failing systems were noted by the Oregon State Sanitary Authority (now the Dept. of Environmental Quality). These were reported to be a "...nuisance and health hazard due to septic tank effluent breaking out and draining into ditches, etc." The city took action to correct the problem by contracting for a sewer system feasibility study. The preliminary study, dated November 1967, proposed a system designed to accommodate 850 users, which was projected to be reached in 1983. This population was actually achieved in 1973, exemplifying the difficulty in projecting populations in small communities.

The final design population for the facility, however, was much larger than the preliminary proposal. It is not clear whether the city was aware of the design life of the system when it was built, for two years later (Oct., 1973) the City Council suspended building permits pending a sewer capacity report by Clark and Groff Engineers of Salem. This report placed sewage capacity at 1700 persons. Shortly thereafter, a COG subdivision review noted the pressure that was being placed on the
new facility by rapid residential growth:7

"The type and amount of new construction has placed the sewage treatment capacity in a marginal situation at best...It is apparent that the city could accommodate about 400 more people based on a Clark and Groff estimate."

In 1975, the city contracted for additional study of the population limits of the facility, this time by Kraus and Daulke Consulting Engineers of Albany. Their analysis identified the chlorination detention chamber as the limiting component of the system, having a capacity of 1792 users. This study was followed by a facilities plan for expansion and financing of the system. Other action by the city at this time included repairs in the collection system and interim growth management. The latter limited building permits to twenty-four per year so that the system would not reach capacity before expansion could be planned and constructed.

In November of 1979 the expanded facilities came on line. Two new stabilization ponds were added along with other improvements. The present system has a design population of 3350 (3150 residents, plus a residential equivalent of projected school enrollment). Assuming Portland State population projections are realized, the design life of the system is about twenty years.

Water Supply and Storage

Aumsville receives its water from four wells that tap a major aquifer of sand and gravel. A fifth well is leased to the school, but is used only for irrigation due to poor water quality. Water storage is provided by a single elevated tank (100,000 gal.). Until January, 1979, not all the wells were metered, and although some of the 447
service connections do have meters, these are seldom read. Therefore, the amount of historical data pertaining to system demands and city consumption are extremely limited.

Data are available, however, on the adequacy of water supply and storage facilities for fire fighting. Periodic reviews made by the Insurance Services Organization (ISO) are used to establish basic fire insurance rates. ISO last reviewed Aumsville in 1975 and found a number of deficiencies, the greatest of which were in the water supply category. Of five hydrants sampled in a fire flow test, none were capable of delivering the recommended fire flow. Shortages ranged from 340 gpm to as much as 3350 gpm.

In the summers of 1976 and 1977, high consumption and the lack of automatic switching devices on well pumps resulted in severe drawdowns of water in the reservoir. The City Council authorized the preparation of a water system master plan by Westek Engineering of Salem. This study, dated October, 1979, supports the ISO findings:

"System demands are expected to exceed reliable supplies unless rationing is enforced during critical periods. Additional water supply will be needed particularly if the City is to continue to grow or encourage industrial growth in the City. If problems were to develop, or if flows were to decrease in any of the existing wells, the present situation would become even more critical."

Thus, it is clear that Aumsville was short of water as early as 1975 and during the development of its growth management plan. Recent improvements and summer conservation efforts have helped, but the city is still (May, 1980) in need of additional water supply and storage.
School Capacity

The Aumsville Elementary School was originally constructed in 1966 with twelve classrooms to accommodate 300 students. By 1970, student enrollment had reached 323, and four new classrooms were added. Further additions were made in 1974, providing space for 500 students, but the year-end enrollment of 525 exceeded this capacity. The school currently has twenty-four classrooms to accommodate 600 students.

Summary

It is clear that Aumsville has faced the need for many improvements in city services in recent years. During the years Aumsville was experiencing these "growing pains," it also developed the city's first comprehensive plan. It is not surprising, then, that the plan included a growth management proposal. The following sections examine the proposal and the planning process which surrounded it.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT

The Planning Process

In 1973, the Fifty-seventh Legislative Assembly adopted Senate Bill 100 (ORS197), known as the 1973 Land Use Act. The act created, among other things, the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). This state level citizen commission was initially charged with developing state-wide goals and guidelines to guide local comprehensive planning. The goals and guidelines were finalized in 1975 and LCDC now functions as a quasi-judicial body, reviewing comprehensive plans for compliance
with the aforementioned goals. The Commission is quasi-judicial because the plans it approves serve as the legal policy for city and county land use decision making.\textsuperscript{11}

In response to the state mandate, Aumsville began an evaluation of community needs and desires in preparation of the city's first comprehensive plan. In July of 1976, the city contracted with COG for assistance in its planning program. Citizen involvement was a part of the program, but was generally limited to a small group of dedicated citizens. Aumsville received planning assistance grants from LCDC totaling $14,651.\textsuperscript{12}

From this process, then, community needs and desires were translated into goals, objectives, policies, and a draft land use plan in November, 1977. An urban growth boundary agreement was reached with Marion County in May, 1978, and the plan was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for review on July 24, 1978.

The Growth Management Proposal

Aumsville's specific growth management proposals are reproduced here so that the controversy they drew may be fully understood. The following statements are drawn from the Public Facilities and Services element of the draft comprehensive plan, dated September, 1977.

Under "Sewer System," the plan stated:\textsuperscript{13}

"Due to the existing limited sewage treatment capacity and water supply, a recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan is for the city to annually allocate a specified number of building permits for residential, and commercial and industrial development. It is also recommended that the allocation approach be continued even after the sewer and water system is upgraded, and therefore
allowing the city to manage growth and insure the designed life of the sewer system and water system extends throughout the planning period...

Residential
1. Allocate 24 building permits annually, of which 5 are to be reserved for individual lots that are not part of subdivision development but may be released for general residential use if not used at the end of each year.
2. Fifteen of the 24 permits can be issued during the first six months of each year, and the balance can be issued during the second six months of the year.

Reactions to the Proposal

Oregon's statewide land use planning program is one with many opportunities for public input. In preparing comprehensive plans, cities and counties are required to form citizen participation committees and publicize all meetings and hearings. Many local governments have gone beyond these minimum requirements giving citizens additional opportunity to participate in the planning process. Plans are also required to conform with those of other governmental agencies, which often leads to additional public forum. Once draft comprehensive plans are completed, they are again made available for public comment while being reviewed by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The next step is the LCDC hearings, where interested parties may present comments and questions concerning the plan under review. Aumsville's growth management proposal received numerous comments in the review and hearings stages.
The LCDC Hearings

Following the draft plan review, Aumsville's comprehensive plan went before LCDC for public hearing. The growth management proposal generated many hours of discussion and carried the Commission's review to three hearings: October 20, and December 1, 1978, and May 19, 1979. At the October hearing, LCDC did not approve the plan, but rather granted a continuance order. This was to allow time for Marion County to review in detail the city's building permit allocation system. In addition, DLCD was to review growth management techniques with respect to the goals and guidelines.

In December, the Commission heard the response from Marion County and DLCD. Following discussion, the plan was again denied approval, with LCDC stating it could not acknowledge a plan which was not sufficiently detailed. In ordering the request continued to April 1, Aumsville was directed to again re-examine the operation of the permit system and develop an ordinance to implement it.

Over the course of these two meetings, testimony was heard from DLCD, Oregon State Home Builders Association (HBA), the city of Aumsville, Association of Oregon Industries (AOI), and Aumsville developer, Mid-Willamette COG, Marion County, and the State Housing Division.

Four Issues

LCDC's repeated refusal of the plan was predicated upon a number of problematic issues raised at the hearings. Four key issues have been identified which capsulize the arguments that were raised.
1) Aumsville's plan would set a precedent for an acceptable growth management technique that would be followed by other communities;

2) The regional impacts of controlled growth in one community are unknown;

3) The plan would place constraints on housing developers and the city's ability to encourage industry; and,

4) The plan was vague on a number of important procedural and legal points.

The issue of a growth management precedent was the major concern of the Home Builders Association. HBA's representative granted that twenty-four building permits per year may be an "appropriate" growth rate for Aumsville in the context of city services. The approval of this technique would, however, lead the way for all urban areas in the state to set a fixed rate of growth permitted. The Commission agreed that the issue was larger than Aumsville and it was time for policy on what are acceptable growth management techniques under the goals and guidelines. They referred the matter to DLCD, who concluded that Aumsville's approach did, indeed, comply with the goals. They recommended approval of the plan. This reiterated the department's original finding that the city's use of annual permit allocations is a technique "available to it in dealing with their projected growth."15

The second issue concerns the regional impacts of the growth management proposal, i.e., how population growth would be redistributed in other parts of Marion County. HBA cited the example of Sonoma County, California, where the growth rate outside the city of Petaluma has increased following that city's use of annual permit limitations.
The Commission's stand on this issue was clear: if the plan was well coordinated and agreed to by the county, then its possible regional impacts were not a basis for denying approval. Marion County was asked to review the permit allocation system. In a letter from the Marion County Board of Commissioners, the Board stated no objection to the plan because its numbers were derived from an agreed-upon population projection. Moreover, "the original population projection for Aumsville was, in fact, increased at the City's request, thus indicating their willingness to accommodate their share of the growth anticipated by the county."

At the December hearing, however, Marion County "qualified" its position by suggesting the city delay its implementation of the plan until all the implications of it were considered. This shift apparently precipitated from their learning of three other cities in the county which were considering similar techniques. Further, even though the long term impacts were believed to be consistent with anticipated county growth, the short term impacts on nearby communities and rural areas were largely unknown.

The third major issue centered on the constraints that would be placed on housing developers and industrial growth in Aumsville. Both HBA and the Association of Oregon Industries stated that a rigid permit allocation system would not accommodate the cyclical nature of housing demand. Such demand, holds this view, is conditioned by influences beyond local control, such as federal regulation of interest rates. When conditions are favorable, and housing demand is high, the industry
needs to be able to respond quickly. Building permit limitations serve as a constraint on this ability to respond.

HBA also held that the plan would place constraints on the scale of subdivision activity. It was stated that developers need to operate in the forty- to fifty-lot range to make the kind of profit their lenders are willing to loan money for. Financing therefore becomes difficult when there are limits on how fast the lots in a subdivision will receive building permits.

A third constraint relates to the city's ability to attract industry. AOI contended Aumsville's plan had clear goals for encouraging industrial development, but these goals were contradicted by the growth management proposal. LCDC responded by noting the contradiction only arises in the case of large industries, and the city may desire to attract smaller industries rather than large ones. In addition, the plan is amendable for unusual conditions, such as the addition of a desirable large industry.

The fourth issue of note resulted from a number of wording problems in Aumsville's proposal. The major problem was in the use of the word "building permits." If the underlying reason for controlled growth was the provision of sewer services, then "building permits" should not have been used when "sewer hookups" was actually intended. This intention was verified in the city's testimony at the December hearing. One building permit can be issued for a multi-family development, whereas sewer hookup permits are specific to the number of dwelling units involved. The plan also stated that after three years, the amount of approved building permits was not to exceed fifteen percent of the rate
of twenty-four per year. Again, testimony showed that 115% and not fifteen percent was actually intended.

The result of the December meeting was that Aumsville needed to clarify its wording in the plan and develop an ordinance that would implement the growth management recommendation. At that time, it was anticipated the city would receive help from the Bureau of Governmental Research and possibly Marion County, DLCD, and COG. It is not clear why these agencies did not pursue the development of the ordinance, but the city never received the help it needed. On March 18, 1979, Aumsville's City Council amended its plan to omit all reference to a building permit allocation system. The amendment, however, did indicate intentions to develop a growth management system and correct weaknesses identified previously by LCDC. In May of 1979, LCDC granted Aumsville acknowledgment of compliance and the comprehensive plan was finally approved.

CURRENT STATUS

The city has taken a number of steps towards developing a growth management ordinance. They have contacted at least two firms about a consultant to work with the City Council and Planning Commission. Funds are limited, but the city plans to continue its efforts to manage residential growth.
Guidelines for Implementing Growth Management Policy

In spite of the failure of Aumsville's permit allocation system to receive LCDC approval, it is clear the Commission and its staff support the right of a local government to control residential growth. What, then, are the requirements that a small Oregon city must meet to acceptably implement a growth management program? The purpose of this section is to identify those requirements which can be concluded from the Aumsville case. Five conclusions are discussed below. The first two are drawn from LCDC decisions, and thus may be considered "implicit requirements;" the Commission does not, however, have explicit growth management policy. The latter three are concluded from general discussion at the hearings, and may be considered "suggested criteria" for implementing growth management policy. Although all of these conclusions result from one case study, they are stated generally and may apply to other cities interested in growth management.

First, growth management plans must be empirically based with respect to population projections, and coordinated with a regional body. LCDC's decision to continue Aumsville's "request for compliance" at the October hearing was to allow time for "Marion County to review in detail the City's building permit system..." The Commission wanted to be sure the plan addressed the question of long term regional population impacts. In effect, LCDC was asking whether Aumsville was accommodating its long term fair share of regional, i.e., county, population growth. A procedure for the consideration of short term impacts did not emerge from the Aumsville case.
Second, the plan must be detailed in the form of an implementing ordinance which can be reviewed by LCDC prior to approval of the comprehensive plan. This conclusion is drawn from the Commission's rationale for denying approval at the December hearing. Aumsville was to "Develop and adopt an ordinance to implement the permit system identified in the amended plan."19 Prior to this hearing, LCDC required implementing ordinances in the cases of subdivision and zoning policy. The requirement has now been extended to include growth management. The wording problems in Aumsville's plan (see p. 17, above) suggest that the ordinance must be clear, unambiguous, and have techniques which fall directly from stated objectives. For example, if meeting the design life of a public facility is the objective, the technique must be clearly linked to that facility. When multiple objectives are to be met, the implementation techniques will likely be more complex.

Third, a growth management plan should be flexible. HBA, AOI, and the State Housing Division repeatedly objected to the rigidity of fixed rate of annual residential growth. If, however, the plan allowed for surges of growth followed by periods of limited growth, the perceived constraints placed on builders and industry might be diminished. If indeed the nature of housing demand and building activity is cyclical, a flexible ordinance would allow for the expansion phase and simply ensure the recession phase. The objective here is to allow the market to control growth (as it is currently) whenever possible.

Fourth, a growth management ordinance should have input from potentially affected parties while it is being developed. This would serve to make the ordinance address a wide range of growth impacts and
interest groups from the beginning, and head off confrontation at the 
public hearing stage. Inviting input from potentially affected parties 
is not only politically expedient, it also improves the information base 
from which decisions are made.

Finally, a growth management ordinance should have legal review 
prior to its adoption. The legal considerations center upon a local 
government's proper use of the police power. Objectives and implement-
ing techniques must be "reasonable," nonconfiscatory, and nondis-
criminatory. In the courts, the test of "reasonableness" involves a 
great deal of interpretation.

Concluding Remarks

As was stated initially, the future of growth management in Oregon 
may prove difficult. Major legal considerations have yet to be addressed 
by the Oregon courts, such as whether a single community's growth con-
trols may have negative impacts on the regional "general welfare."
LCDC's lack of policy on acceptable growth management techniques indi-
cates the Commission will continue to review each system individually.

There is a broad range of techniques available to communities de-
siring to control their growth (see Appendix 2). Some are very direct 
methods, such as the Limited Growth Ordinance of the city of Woodburn. 
This ordinance utilizes a permit allocation system modeled after that 
of Petaluma, California, and is currently under review by DLCD. Other 
techniques are less direct, such as controls on the amount of land 
available for "growth promoting" land uses. Corvallis, in Benton 
County, currently has draft policy recommendations which would
effectively discourage further industrial development. The intent is to "Strengthen Corvallis' role as a regional center for shopping, education, service and culture, while maintaining its character as a vigorous, healthy small city" (emphasis added).

To meet Aumsville's objective of maintaining sewer services over a planning period, the city will likely have to continue efforts toward direct control of residential growth. Clearly, there will be problems with stepping from objectives to methods to ordinance, but these are not insurmountable. Whether or not Aumsville does implement a growth management ordinance, the city will benefit from its foresight and anticipation of the future.
FOOTNOTES


5 3.6 Residents per household is figure used by the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census.


7 Personal communication between Mid-Willamette Council of Governments and the Dept. of Environmental Quality, April 14, 1974.


9 Westech, op. cit., footnote 8, p. 5-6.

10 Westech, op. cit., footnote 8, p. 5-7.

11 See Fasano vs. Board of County Commissioners 364 Or 574, 507 P2d 23 (1973) and Baker vs. City of Milwaukie 271 Or 500, 533 P2d 772 (1975). These two court cases reiterated a long standing,
although only recently acknowledged land use policy in Oregon. This policy says zoning must be in accordance with the comprehensive plan at both county and municipal levels.


14. These issues were identified by reviewing tapes and transcripts of the LCDC hearings.


18. Marion County Board of Commissioners, op. cit., footnote 16.


OREGON'S POPULATION SHIFTS IN THE SEVENTIES

The following tables come from the Executive Summary of Oregon's Population Shifts in the Seventies, published by the Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, University of Oregon, in June, 1978. Note that Oregon's growth rate is two and one half times the national rate for the seven year period. Also of note is high percentage increases that have occurred in the state's nonmetropolitan areas. The summary identifies four phenomena which explain this distribution:

1) the business expansion and energy developments in the Northern Columbia Basin;
2) the influx of recreation developments and retirement population in Central and Southern Oregon and along the coast;
3) the "revival" of the small towns near urban centers due to manufacturing industries located in these small towns; and,
4) the transformation of rural fringe suburbs into high status bedroom communities.
## Metro and Nonmetro Population Growth

### Oregon and the United States, 1960-1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon Population</th>
<th>Oregon % Change</th>
<th>U.S. % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>2,091,385</td>
<td>2,396,100</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Central Cities</td>
<td>554,308</td>
<td>605,620</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Central Cities</td>
<td>1,537,077</td>
<td>1,790,480</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmetropolitan</strong></td>
<td>810,694</td>
<td>955,700</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Oregon’s metropolitan areas include Clackamas, Lane, Marion, Multnomah, Polk and Washington Counties. The central cities are Eugene-Springfield, Portland and Salem.


### Population Change in Oregon Cities

#### By Size Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Class</th>
<th>Number of Cities</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>1970-1977 Change</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17,296</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34,849</td>
<td>18,451</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,499</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74,662</td>
<td>24,298</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-4,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89,628</td>
<td>26,687</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>129,671</td>
<td>54,734</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-24,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>208,583</td>
<td>44,037</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-49,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90,654</td>
<td>22,484</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 and More</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>527,361</td>
<td>40,859</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,172,404</td>
<td>236,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes the number of cities in each size class in 1970.

Source: 1970 U.S. Census of Population, Number of Inhabitants; and Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census.

### Oregon Population Change

#### By Major Substate Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>1970-1977 Change</th>
<th>Proportion of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Oregon</strong></td>
<td>1,819,085</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Valley</td>
<td>1,475,384</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Oregon</td>
<td>202,022</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>141,679</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Oregon</strong></td>
<td>272,300</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon</td>
<td>140,798</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Oregon</td>
<td>101,118</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Oregon</td>
<td>30,384</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Oregon</strong></td>
<td>2,091,385</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1970 U.S. Census of Population, Number of Inhabitants; and Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census.
APPENDIX TWO

SUMMARY OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

Controls on Land Availability

1. Land Banking
2. Zoning
3. Annexation Policies
4. Urban Growth Boundary

Controls on Urban Services

1. Extension of Services
2. Exactions (developers fees)

Direct Controls on the Amount of Growth

1. Interim Development Controls (moritoria)
2. Annual Permit Limitations
3. Population Ceilings
APPENDIX THREE

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT LITERATURE

The references cited below that include an asterisk (*) are works that have excellent bibliographies or literature reviews.


4. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, Managing Growth in the Small Community, part III, EPA908–78–005, Denver, CO.


9. Western Regional Development Center, *Coping with Growth*, a series available from Western Regional Development Center Extension Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, 97331.