

URBAN AND RURAL RESERVES



Public comment report

Phase 4 – January 2010

Find additional information on Urban and Rural Reserves at:

Metro

www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves

Marcia Sinclair, public involvement coordinator, 503-797-1814
reserves@oregonmetro.gov

Clackamas County

www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/reserves.htm

Ellen Rogalin, public involvement coordinator, 503-742-4274
ellenrog@co.clackamas.or.us

Multnomah County

www2.co.multnomah.or.us/reserves

Ken Born, planner, 503-988-5050
Ken.Born@co.multnomah.or.us

Washington County

www.co.washington.or.us/reserves

Mike Dahlstrom, public involvement coordinator, 503-846-8101
reserves@co.washington.or.us

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PHASE 4 OVERVIEW.....	6
LETTERS, EMAILS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.....	6
OUTREACH ACTIVITIES.....	6
OPEN HOUSES	6
PUBLIC COMMENT OVERVIEW	8
Section 1: REGIONAL RESERVES SYSTEM	9
1. Urbanize land that is more expensive and difficult to develop or urbanize higher quality agricultural land?	
2. Should one or more of these four areas be designated urban reserve instead of higher quality agricultural land in another part of the region?	
3. Are the proposed urban reserves located in the right places and at the right scale to meet the region’s future needs?	
4. Are the proposed rural reserves in the right places and at the right scale to protect farms, forests and natural areas?	
Section 2: SPECIFIC AREAS	15
Area 1: Clackanomah	15
Area 2: Damascus/Estacada.....	20
Area 3: Greater Oregon City	22
Area 4: Stafford/Canby	26
Area 5: Southwest Region.....	36
Area 6: West/Central Washington County	39
Area 7: West Washington County.....	42
Area 8: North Washington County	45
Area 9: West Multnomah County	48
Section 3: Testimony Before the Metro Council.....	54
Appendix (to be added).....	
Regional Core 4 Map	
Fact Sheets for Areas 1-9	
Surveys	
Spreadsheets of survey results including text responses	
Spreadsheet of testimony, emails and letters	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The fourth phase of the Urban and Rural Reserves designation process began with the mapping of proposed urban and rural reserves and option areas by the Core 4 following months of study and discussion.

In December 2009, the Core 4, in consultation with their respective commissions and council, came to a decision on a map of proposed urban reserves, proposed rural reserves and options areas to present to the public for review and comment in January 2010. And the public did respond.

- More than 850 people attended open houses
- 237 people signed up to speak at Metro Council public hearings
- There were more than 11,000 individual hits on the online open house web pages
- More than 400 people completed all or part of surveys at open houses or online

One of the goals for the Phase 4 public outreach process was to reach people who hadn't been involved in the process before. While specific data was not gathered on this point, it was very apparent that a significant number of people who attended the open houses were coming in for the first time with questions about the potential impact reserves decisions might have on their property.

Overall, approximately half of survey respondents live in urban areas and half in rural, although these percentages fluctuated depending upon the area of focus of the survey question. The majority of respondents commented on the area in which they live or own property, noting particularly whether they agree with the proposed designated, disagree with it or, in the case of options areas, expressing which option they prefer. Many people expressed views in support of protecting rural areas, preserving high value farmland and/or filling up current unused or under-used land inside the urban growth boundary before expanding the UGB. A significant number also specifically expressed support for using the reserves map prepared by the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition.

The response rate by area reflected the level of interest and concern in the area. The response rate for the nine areas, from most to least, was:

433 respondents:	Area 9, West Multnomah County
355 respondents:	Area 4, Stafford/Canby
173 respondents:	Area 5, Southwest Region
137 respondents:	Area 8, North Washington County
72 respondents:	Area 1, Clackanomah
62 respondents:	Area 3, Greater Oregon City
60 respondents:	Area 6, West/Central Washington County
41 respondents:	Area 7, West Washington County
29 respondents:	Area 2, Damascus/Estacada

The general opinion from the majority of respondents was to maintain or increase rural reserve areas, not add urban areas or only after developing land inside the UGB (fill in inside the UGB, especially Damascus, first), and protect farmland, forests and natural resource lands that cannot be replaced once gone. Just over half felt the amount of urban land designated was appropriate; nearly three fourths (71%) thought the proposed rural reserves do not protect the right lands across the region.

Areas 3A, 4A, 4D and 5E -- Similarly, of the respondents who addressed the question about whether one or more of the four options areas (3A, Clackamas Heights; 4A, Stafford Basin; 4D, east of Wilsonville, and 5E, South of Sherwood) should be developed, 44 % said no, 37% said it was okay to designate one or more an urban reserve in trade for protecting high quality farm land and only 19% advocated for developing one or more of the areas regardless of whether it would protect farmland. The four areas

ranked as follows in terms of priority for urbanization, with the first area being highest: 1) Clackamas Heights; 2) east of Wilsonville, 3) Stafford Basin, and 4) south of Sherwood.

Area 1F Options -- Another option area was 1F along Highway 26 near Highway 212. Of the people who responded to the question about whether to designate the area as a rural or urban reserve, 63% opted for rural reserve and 37% opted for urban reserve. In answering whether to allow commercial development adjacent to Highway 26, respondents were fairly evenly divided, with 54% supporting no commercial development and 46% favoring a visual buffer along Highway 26.

Area 5E Options – The vast majority of people who responded to the question on whether the area north of Rock Creek and Morgan roads should be designated urban reserve *or* should be designated urban reserve except for the Tonquin Geologic Area, expressed support for rural reserve for the entire area. More than 86% of the 140 people who responded and/or commented support rural designation for all of 5E, four percent supported urban designation for the entire area and eight percent opted for urban for all but the Tonquin Geologic Area. Nine people took the time to comment on the proposed I-5/99W connector – five oppose it, three support construction of the connector and one expressed support for the connector as long as it wasn't built on farm lands.

Area 8D Options – Around the City of North Plains, public sentiment also favored rural reserves. Of the 84 people who responded to the question, 45 (54%) said the area south of Highway 26 should be designated as a rural reserve; 39 (46%) prefer the area be undesignated. People who opted for rural reserve commented on Highway 26 serving as an effective edge, the high quality soils around North Plains and added stress to the interchange with additional growth to the south. Those preferring the area be undesignated cited such reasons as the area being better suited for industrial use, services already available and not fair to limit growth of a city outside Metro's jurisdiction.

Area 9A, 9B, 9C and 9F Options – The pattern continued in Area 9, with all four options areas overwhelmingly responded to by people who support rural reserves.

- Area 9A: 73% favor rural reserve, 14% recommend no designation and slightly less than 14% support urban reserves. Major reasons given for choosing rural designation included valuable wildlife habitat, lack of high capacity public transit, topography that makes the area difficult to develop. Urban reserve proponents noted the area is near existing services, limited development would improve services, it is not suitable for farming, is surrounded by development, wildlife are already diminishing and it needs to be available for future growth.
- Area 9B: 74% favor rural reserve; and 13% each support either urban reserve or no designation. Reasons for supporting rural reserve include the value of a buffer between urban Washington County and Forest Park, roads and schools are already overcrowded, infrastructure would be expensive, no transit options and valuable wildlife and habitat areas. Reasons for supporting urban reserves included the proximity to urban Washington County, pedestrian connectivity and services already available, and conflicted agriculture land.
- Area 9C: 86% favor rural reserve and 14% support no designation. Rural reserve supporters cited steep slopes and landslide danger, numerous watersheds and wildlife habitats and a buffer for Forest Park. People supporting no designation noted existing protections are adequate if not needed for future urban development, steep slope development is more possible because of progress made by engineers/architects and road improvements are needed.
- Area 9F: 74% favor rural designation for the entire area; 13% expressed support for a rural reserve near Scappoose with the remainder not designated, and another 13% opted for no designation for the entire area. People advocating a rural reserve pointed to the threat of urbanization from Highway 30 and the Multnomah Channel, the need to protect local farmers, terrain and wildlife habitat not suitable for development.

PHASE 4 OVERVIEW

The reserves process has been in the news, under discussion in community and stakeholder meetings, and considered in the context of regional and local planning processes for more than two years. From September 2008 through December 2009, staff and elected officials from all four jurisdictions distributed information at community events and made presentations to citizen groups as well as professional, agriculture, business and commerce organizations. Members of the regional Reserves Steering Committee (RSC) and county advisory committees conducted outreach and advocacy through their respective networks.

The regional Reserve Steering Committee completed its work October 14, 2009 with recommendations presented to the Core 4. Since then the Core 4 members have studied and reviewed vast amounts of information prepared by staff, visited with people and organizations throughout the region and met regularly to discuss and deliberate potential urban and rural reserve lands throughout the three-county area.

The reserves process has been regularly covered by the *Oregonian* and a variety of community papers, the Capital Press, the leading Pacific Northwest agricultural weekly, and national magazines as well as on Oregon Public Broadcasting radio. Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington counties and Metro have solicited and welcomed comment from the public throughout this phase with outreach, meetings, public hearings and other communications with their constituencies.

LETTERS, EMAILS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The high volume of phone inquiries, email and letters indicated a growing community awareness of, and interest in, the process and its ramifications. In the last half of 2009 and first month of 2010, the three counties and Metro received hundreds of letters and emails related to the reserves process. Many of those focused on the debate between expanding the UGB and protecting foundation farmland. During January, many supported an alternative reserves map prepared by the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition. Others had comments about specific areas of the region, including the Helvetia region in Washington County, the West Hills in Multnomah County and the Stafford Basin in Clackamas County. And still others, who began to see lines drawn on maps that could affect their property, had questions, comments and concerns about the possible impact of reserve designation on themselves and their families

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Elected officials, staff and partners continued to present project information to organizations, agencies, interest groups, community and neighborhood organizations, and regional and county level planning coalitions and advisory committees; engaged in radio and newspaper interviews and taped community television programs. Project updates were regularly provided to partner organizations representing business, development, agriculture, environmental, and neighborhood interests.

OPEN HOUSES

The culmination of the Phase 4 outreach process came in January 2010 with six regional open houses, four Metro public hearings and a virtual open house hosted on the Metro web site. The chart below shows the number of people who signed in at each open house and the number of people who testified at each Metro public hearing.

Date	Location		Participants
Jan 11	Multnomah County East Gresham	Open House	75
		Metro Public Hearing	23

Jan 14	Metro Regional Center Portland	Open House	86
		Metro Public Hearing	62
Jan 16	Wash County Public Services Bldg, Hillsboro	Open House	112
Jan 19	Clack County Development Services Bldg, Oregon City	Open House	180
Jan 20	Sherwood City Hall/Library, Sherwood	Open House	128
		Metro Public Hearing	79
Jan 21	Wilsonville City Hall, Wilsonville	Open House	277
		Metro Public Hearing	73
	TOTAL	Open Houses Metro Public Hearings	858 237
Jan 11-22	Virtual open house web site visits		1980

The heart of the open houses was a regional map of proposed urban and rural reserves that in December 2009 the Core 4, in consultation with their respective commissions and council, agreed to present to the public for review and comment (Appendix A). To help the public digest all the information in bite-sized pieces, the map was split into nine sub-regions, with areas of proposed urban reserves, rural reserves and optional areas within each. Starting at the region’s eastern edge and moving clockwise to the western edge, the nine sub-regions were:

1. **Clackanomah** – From Troutdale to Sandy, including portions of Multnomah and Clackamas County
2. **Damascus/Estacada** – The region’s southeastern corner, in Clackamas County, including Eagle Creek and the Clackamas River
3. **Great Oregon City** – From the Clackamas River to Beavercreek and Molalla, in Clackamas County
4. **Stafford/Canby** – In Clackamas County, including land east of Wilsonville and west of the Willamette River
5. **Southwest Region** – Southwest Clackamas County and southeast Washington County from Sherwood and Wilsonville to the Yamhill and Marion county lines
6. **West/Central Washington County** – South of Hillsboro, west of Beaverton
7. **West Washington County** – Including Forest Grove, Cornelius and Banks
8. **North Washington County** – Hillsboro, North Plains and Helvetia
9. **West Multnomah County** – The Tualatin Mountains to Sauvie Island and Scappoose

Large maps of each of the sub-regions were prepared to help the public get the “big picture” of each, and facts sheets (which included a small copy of the sub-region map) were prepared for each sub-region (Appendix B). In addition, the open houses featured table-sized aerial maps of the three-county region showing property lines and the proposed urban, rural and option areas. These maps were not available for distribution, but they were a very popular item at the open houses as residents and business owners could for the first time see their property in relation to the proposed reserves.

The third major component of the open houses was a survey that posed both multiple-choice and open-ended questions to give people a chance to express their views on the proposed reserves. Specific questions were asked for each of the areas that were designated as option areas on the maps to encourage meaningful and relevant input for each area.

There was also video information at the open houses. Google Earth was used to show the topography, vegetation and development in each of the sub-regions. In addition, the Core 4 members were the

narrators of a 10-minute video that discussed the reserves process and explained its importance to Portland area residents now and in the future.

All of these open house components, except for the table-sized property line maps, were also available online at the virtual open house. An interactive map served in place of the large aerials. Online visitors could zoom into their property or other area of interest to determine proximity to proposed reserves. They could also toggle to a terrain map layer to view topography.

Four of the open houses – one in each county and one at the Metro Regional Center – were followed by an opportunity for the public to give testimony to the Metro Council. Both spoken and written testimony was shared at these hearings.

PUBLIC COMMENT OVERVIEW

The regional open houses, questionnaires, online surveys and presentations focused on informing people about the proposed urban and rural reserves and options, and giving people the chance to ask questions and express their views. The questionnaires and online survey posed questions about the region in general, each of the sub-regions and each area in each sub-region. Multiple choice questions were asked about areas for which specific options were posed. Because of the complexity of the issues involved, the multiple choice questions were prefaced by explanatory paragraphs (Appendix C).

This report provides summaries of responses to questions asked. Scattered throughout are selected verbatim quotations that represent the sentiments expressed by many. The complete spreadsheets of responses will be posted on the Metro web site at www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves.

Survey Caveats:


- A number of responses included language referencing other sections of summaries such as “Same as 7B” or “Same as above” which could not be traced using the summary analysis process. These responses will be more thoroughly represented when the entire survey is compiled in a data-based spreadsheet to track individual inputs.
- No validation requirement was used in this process that would limit any one person from responding multiple times either online or both online and through written surveys.
- A number of respondents put the same response in all or many categories regardless of whether the response was relevant to that category.
- In the following summary, the survey questions are abbreviated for ease of reading. The complete questions can be found on the survey in the appendix.
- Numbers are used throughout this report, but often do not tally because of a variety of factors, including the many different ways questions were answered, answers that were not relevant to the question, questions that were not answered, etc.

Quotable Quote: *It is about time this process gets fixed. too many of these open houses. Let us get on with it! Let's get'er done!*

Section 1: REGIONAL RESERVES SYSTEM

Total Responses: 430

Where respondents live	Number	Percentage
Urban and inside a city	169	41.4
Urban and not inside a city	38	9.3
Rural and inside a city	38	9.3
Rural outside a city and outside the urban growth boundary	171	40.0




3. Urban reserves are lands that, if needed, could be developed efficiently to provide jobs, homes and shopping areas for future residents. Rural reserves are areas where farms, forests and natural areas are protected from the pressures of urbanization for the next 40 to 50 years. ...To meet our future land needs, after land inside the urban growth boundary is efficiently developed, we can urbanize more difficult areas at lower densities and greater expense or we can construct houses and businesses on higher quality agricultural land. Please indicate your preference by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box below. (328 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Make conservation of agricultural land the priority even if that means investing more public and private funds in developing more challenging areas.	249	75.3
Make cost effectiveness the priority even if that means developing higher quality agricultural land.	79	24.7

Summary of 154 additional comments

- 101 support conserving agricultural land
 - Can't replace farmland, agricultural sustainability is vital to future
 - Support ag/nat resources coalition map
 - Save prime farmland, use conflicted land
 - Save French Prairie

- Development near farmland needs to be compatible
- 18 support redevelopment inside the UGB first, spending limited money there
- 10 said there is a need for balance between cost-effectiveness and farmland conservation
- 5 said employment use should be the highest priority for urban reserves
- 4 recommend urbanizing Stafford
- 2 said cost-effectiveness is more important than saving farmland




Remaining comments addressed other issues such as specific proposed reserve designations, desire for open space and discomfort with the process.

4. Metro and the counties are considering four areas (3A Clackamas Heights, 4A Stafford Basin, 4D east of Wilsonville and 5E south of Sherwood) for employment and residential development. These are areas that offer some development opportunities but each poses challenges to efficient development. Elected officials are considering three alternatives. Please choose the alternative you prefer: Should one of more of these four areas be designated urban reserve instead of higher quality agricultural land in another part of the region? Please place a checkmark next to the alternative you prefer. (264 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Because none of these four areas can be efficiently developed, they should be left undesignated.	117	44.0
One or more of these four areas should be designated as an urban reserve in trade for protecting high quality agricultural land that is currently proposed in urban reserve elsewhere in the region.	92	37.1
One or more of these four areas should be designated an urban reserve and developed to the degree possible even though it may not reach the same density as many other parts of the region. This area should be added as an additional urban reserve.	47	19.0
Please prioritize among these areas by writing in a number with number 1 next to the highest priority area for urbanization and 4 next to the lowest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3A Clackamas Heights ○ 4A Stafford Basin ○ 4D east of Wilsonville ○ 5E south of Sherwood 	(Average rating)	
		2.30
		2.42
		2.34
		2.87

Summary of 100 additional comments:


- 12 said all option areas should be urban reserves
- 7 said some should be urban, did not specify which ones
- 7 said none of these options should be designated urban
- 7 said all option areas should be rural reserves
- 4 said some option areas should be rural reserves but did not specify which ones
- 3 said all option areas should be undesignated
- 5 wanted 5E designated rural
- 7 respect all farm land; maintain it



There were a number of single comments recommending specific designations for one or more of the areas either urban or rural. Two voiced agreement with Ag/Coalition map. Several recommended working with local people to determine the future of the area.

5. Urban reserves are intended to help “complete” existing cities by providing land for homes, shops or industries—whichever land use will best fulfill each community’s vision for its future. Some of the proposed urban reserves are intended to serve as industrial areas to provide jobs. Do you think the size and location of the proposed urban reserves shown on the map are appropriate to accommodate the region’s needs for the next 40 to 50 years? (208 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Yes, this looks like the right balance of housing and jobs to meet the needs of communities across the region after land within the existing urban growth boundary has been efficiently developed.	107	51.4
No, the proposed urban reserves do not provide the appropriate balance of housing and jobs to meet the needs of communities across the region after land within the existing urban growth boundary has been efficiently developed.	101	48.6



7. Looking at the regional map I would change the amount of land and its use in these locations (122 responses):

	More jobs land:	Less jobs land	More housing land:	Less housing land	Response Count
Area 1: Clackanomah	54.9% (28)	39.2% (20)	31.4% (16)	41.2% (21)	51
Area 2: Damascus/Estacada	35.3% (18)	51.0% (26)	27.5% (14)	51.0% (26)	51
Area 3: Greater Oregon City	59.6% (31)	30.8% (16)	36.5% (19)	40.4% (21)	52
Area 4: Stafford/Canby	30.5% (25)	51.2% (42)	36.6% (30)	54.9% (45)	82
Area 5: Southwest Region	37.3% (19)	47.1% (24)	23.5% (12)	52.9% (27)	51
Area 6: West/Central Washington County	41.1% (23)	42.9% (24)	28.6% (16)	55.4% (31)	56
Area 7: West Washington County	38.7% (24)	46.8% (29)	22.6% (14)	58.1% (36)	62
Area 8: North Washington County	36.5% (23)	46.0% (29)	38.1% (24)	49.2% (31)	63
Area 9: West Multnomah County	40.7% (22)	31.5% (17)	40.7% (22)	40.7% (22)	54

Summary of 60 additional comments

23 recommend reducing the scale of urban reserves and/or focus inside first

- o use existing developed areas
- o too much land proposed for urban reserves
- o reduce to 15,000 acres
- o save farm land
- o keep more land rural
- o use Agriculture Natural Resource Coalition map

5 recommend more urban reserve lands or more undesignated to provide flexibility


- o more land for jobs
- o more land south of the Willamette for jobs
- o more housing opportunities north and south of Hillsboro, not just jobs

Remaining comments addressed urbanization or protection of specific properties or areas, recommended creating a jobs-housing balance or urbanizing areas next to transportation corridors.

8. Rural reserves are intended to protect our best agricultural lands, working forests and significant natural features from urbanization for the next 40 to 50 years. Do you think the size and location of the proposed rural reserves shown on the map are appropriate to protect our most important natural resource lands? Please check one. (302 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Yes, it looks like the right rural and natural lands are protected across the region.	85	28.9
No, the proposed rural reserves do not protect the right lands across the region.	209	71.1

Are these the right locations and scale of rural reserves to protect our most important farms, forests and natural areas?



- Yes, it looks like the right rural and natural lands are protected across the region.
- No, the proposed rural reserves do not protect the right lands across the region.

Looking at the regional map, I would change the amount of land designated rural reserve in these locations to protect these resources: (71 responses)

	Agriculture	Forest	Natural features	Response Count
Area 1: Clackanomah	73.1% (19)	23.1% (6)	61.5% (16)	26
Area 2: Damascus/Estacada	63.6% (21)	54.5% (18)	54.5% (18)	33
Area 3: Greater Oregon City	62.1% (18)	41.4% (12)	65.5% (19)	29
Area 4: Stafford/Canby	86.8% (33)	47.4% (18)	50.0% (19)	38
Area 5: Southwest Region	70.4% (19)	37.0% (10)	59.3% (16)	27
Area 6: West/Central Washington County	83.3% (30)	36.1% (13)	47.2% (17)	36
Area 7: West Washington County	90.2% (37)	36.6% (15)	43.9% (18)	41
Area 8: North Washington County	87.5% (35)	35.0% (14)	52.5% (21)	40
Area 9: West Multnomah County	54.1% (20)	64.9% (24)	64.9% (24)	37

Summary of additional 178 comments

- 81 expressed support for the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition map
- 14 recommended protecting all farms that were zoned exclusive farm use (EFU), or foundation, prime or Class 1,2 soils
- 11 recommended more rural reserve lands in Area 5, primarily to protect the Tonquin Geological Area
- 10 recommended expanded rural reserves in Area 4, Stafford.

Several recommended expanding the amount of rural land in various parts of Clackamas County. The remaining comments recommended rural designation for individual areas or properties or addressed other aspects of the reserves process.

Additional comments on the regional reserves system (223 comments)

- 66 requested that elected officials complete the reserves process
- 42 focused on an urban or rural recommendation for a specific reserve
 - 3 focused on specific areas of the region
- 19 want protection for farms and forests and natural areas generally
- 11 support the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition map
- 10 said there needs to be more land designate urban
- 2 said more industrial/jobs land
- 9 want the focus to be on redeveloping lands already inside UGB
- 5 want compact development
- Several thanked officials for the process and hard work. A few focused on specific areas/ properties.
 - More emphasis should be placed on policies to strengthen communities--whether for struggling communities in the region such as Cornelius and Forest Grove or the agricultural community.
- 8 commented on aspects of the process
 - Realize that this is an extremely complex and difficult process.
 - Officials should look at the lands personally rather than just rely on maps. One can not get a feel of a location by reviewing a map.

Section 2: SPECIFIC AREAS


Area 1: Clackanomah

Number of responses: 106

Urban inside a city:	50
Urban not inside a city:	4
Rural inside a city:	4
Rural outside city/UGB:	38

Summary of General Comments (9)

- “I applaud the proposed creation of the new Clackanomah County. All West Multnomah County lands should be ceded to the City of Portland. It is my fervent hope and belief that Multnomah County will cease to exist as a political entity by the year 2040. That would truly make ‘The Best Place!’”
- “This area is beautiful and rich in agricultural lands. As a resident farmer, I believe in the importance of keeping land available for farms that grow food. Does the need for locally grown food enter into discussions, or only the need for home building?”
- “I disfavor urban designations at the finger fringes of the metro area (east and west), especially east given the Damascus situation.”
- “Area 1, especially, 1F, not needed for urban reserves because Damascus needs 50 years to develop. Don’t add conflicts/competition from east of the city.”
- “Our 37 acres would make great industrial land, it has good access to roads and would be cheap and easy to develop. If the rule with Sandy is broken, then we should have the same privileges as our neighbors.”



Comments on Proposed Reserve Area 1A (13 answered question, 19 commented)

- 12 support rural reserves
 - Foundation land with great soil, no water limitation, close to the urban area for local food security. Troutdale has room for infill.
 - No housing need, urban will be expensive to build, serve and difficult for transit.
 - No urban reserve on high-value farmland.
 - Why doesn't Multnomah County value its foundation farm land?
- 7 recommend urban reserves
 - Best location to bring into the UGB for compact urban form - near existing services.
 - Include entire proposed UR area as UR and add SWC of 212/26 to UR as well.

- Maintain green space separation between Gresham and Sandy as forest, farm, or habitat.
- All land should be studied individually. Farmers should farm the best land and developers should build where suitable.
- Reluctantly support inclusion of this as an urban reserve

Comments on Proposed Reserve Area 1B (8 answered question, 14 commented)

- 5 support rural reserves
 - Rural to protect nurseries, creeks, and adequate services.
 - MUCH bigger rural reserve. Why be stingy about protecting Sandy River Gorge and high value farmland west of the river?
 - Sandy River Gorge is a regional landmark and most valuable wildlife habitat in Mult County
 - Include all farmland to the west of the gorge.

Comments on Proposed Reserve Area 1C (8 answered question, 14 commented)

- 1 supports urban reserves
 - Allow growth for Gresham – larger parcels with easily developable slopes and sewer along Kelly Creek. The three schools should be in urban area.
- 4 support rural reserves
 - Most is EFU and actively farmed, except for Orient area, same as other property. Proposal creates near urban island with no freeway access for industrial, no Springwater connection
 - Rural reserve on this foundation ag land.
 - Adopt Agriculture and Natural Resource Coalition map – don't lose this farming area; Gresham has much room for infill
- Specific Suggestion
 - This urban reserve should be smaller and not include the Johnson Creek watershed.

Comments on Proposed Reserve Area 1D (11 answered question, 17 commented)

- 4 support urban reserves
 - Support urban reserve after adjacent Damascus areas urbanize.
 - Boring should be urban, has a major traffic exchange.
 - Urban planning will protect the buttes and there is flat land for employment and residential.
- 5 support rural reserves
 - Adopt recommendations of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition – Boring expansion not needed.
 - Keep butte in rural reserve unless we know the butte will be protected in the urban area.
 - Bad idea to put housing & businesses on foundation ag land.
 - Urban unnecessary given redevelopment potential in east metro -- Damascus was unnecessary.

Comments on Proposed Reserve Area 1E (13 answered question, 19 commented)

- 3 recommend urban reserves
 - Urban on both sides of 212, up to 26 – help finance road improvements, corridor development.
 - Damascus traffic will travel along Highway 212, even if 1E and 1F are designated as rural.
- 10 support rural reserves
 - Designate rural due to proximity to Highway 26, foundation farm land. Find other areas for jobs.
 - Keep UGB from Sandy. What happened to no development/ag between Gresham and Sandy?
 - Protect the good-sized nurseries, rolling fields and creeks.
 - Adopt the Agriculture and Nat Resources Coalition map.
 - Foundation agricultural land more important than urban; vacant land in Damascus.
- Specific Suggestions
 - Extend east to 312th or Highway 26


Quotable Quote: *It's impossible to wrongly reserve valuable rural resources for rural use. We or posterity can correct any error if a rural reserve choice may prove to have been wrong. But err in designating such land for urban use, and there will be no practical remedy, only regret.*

Option 1F

1. Should Option 1F along Highway 26 near Highway 212 be designated urban or rural?

Clackamas County has plenty of land for housing but not for jobs. There are few places outside the current urban growth boundary in Clackamas County that offer opportunities for future industrial development. This triangle-shaped area at the junction of Highway 26 and Highway 212 is one of the few places in Clackamas County that could serve as an industrial or manufacturing site. It is big enough and has easy access to a major highway. It is also foundation farmland. Please place a checkmark next to the alternative you prefer. (73 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Designate the area an urban reserve to provide additional employment land for Clackamas County.	27	37.0
Designate the area as a rural reserve to protect high quality agricultural land.	46	63.0



Summary of Comments

- Urban reserves
 - Support an employment center in Clackamas County, and allow Clackamas to compete with Washington County.
 - Add jobs land along existing road infrastructure – help Damascus grow. Visual buffer ok although view between Gresham and Sandy isn’t spectacular enough to give up jobs or tax base.
 - OK for limited urbanization
 - Urban because of existing significant non-farm uses occupy portions of the area and need for industrial development.
 - This area already has a wrecking yard, very large church, horse stable and a nursery on a hillside -- not much farm ground.

- Favor urban reserve option that allows property owners both clarification of their standing, and avoids the indefinite "undesignated" status. The Green Corridor agreement shouldn't punish property owners with an ambiguous definition.
- Rural reserves
 - Rural to avoid urban sprawl and limited separation between the cities.
 - Any arguments for preservation of farmland in the Stafford Triangle apply even more to this area. Unlike Stafford, all the surrounding land is in agricultural use, so continued farming is more viable. If "employment land" is needed, expand Sandy's urban reserve to the north or south; there is no compelling reason to add this to the Metro UGB. If property (profit) interests win out, however, there MUST be a large planted buffer to at least give the visual impression of separation between Sandy and Gresham.
 - Local farms and food more important as food transportation costs rise.
 - The point is not the visual effects; the point is the land use -- rural.


2. There is an agreement between Metro, Clackamas County and the City of Sandy to retain a greenbelt along Highway 26 east of Gresham to maintain a visual buffer between the Portland metropolitan area and Sandy. If this area is designated an urban reserve how might the visual buffer be retained between the communities? (72 responses)

Answer options	Number	Percentage
Do not allow commercial development directly adjacent to Highway 26. Keep commercial development several hundred feet back and provide vegetation to block the view.	39	54.2
If it is designated a rural reserve, the stretch of Highway 26 from the Highway 212 interchange (the outer edge of the proposed urban reserve) to Sandy's urban reserve boundary at Kelso Road will serve as a visual buffer.	33	45.8

Summary of Comments and Suggestions

- Keep commercial development 250 feet back from Highway 26.
- Smart economically to develop this land, but keep the buffer for Sandy.
- Place industrial near noisy highways rather than housing.
- Allow development up to Hwy 26 and 212 to increase tax base for roads.
- 1F is already developed with urban-like uses (wrecking yards etc.); there is no "green belt" to protect. Urban redevelopment rules will improve built area, but as rural there will be no improvement.
- A "visual buffer" not needed if there are landscaping requirements – 100' width.
- Hwy 212 can provide points of entry for future corporate park or additional business entities. Hwy 212 can be expanded from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from where 26 and 212 intersect and 282nd.

Quotable Quote: *Both my academic and professional experience have taught me that in planning there are two things that people find most troubling and truly turns them out in droves – sprawl unless it's their sprawl, and density only if its applied in someone else's neighborhood.*



Area 2: Damascus/Estacada

Summary of General Comments

Number of responses: 29

Urban inside a city:	10
Urban not inside a city:	1
Rural inside a city:	0
Rural outside city/UGB:	9

Comments: 15

8 – Protect farm and forest land

5 -- Keep area rural

- Moved here for rural life, clean air, open spaces
- Need more agricultural land
- Poor transportation connections
- Protect wildlife corridors, fish habitat

1 – Infill inside UGB

Quotable Quote: *Conflicted ag land is conflicted because land surrounding it has been allowed to split and develop.*

AREA 2A – URBAN (20 comments)

9 – Support rural reserves

- Lots of undeveloped land in Damascus; don't need more
- Keep rural areas rural – clean air, open spaces
- Topography would make infrastructure difficult
- Keep growth in Oregon City

8 – Protect farm and forest land

2 -- Support some urban, some rural

- Add land already in Damascus to urban; keep rest rural
- Make farmland portions rural

1 – Support urban reserves

Quotable Quote: *Though most is conflicted agricultural land, I disapprove of UGB expansion at the finger fringes of the metro (east and west) given the redevelopment potential of areas within the UGB.*

AREA 2B – RURAL (14 comments)


8 – Protect farm and forest land

6 – Support rural reserves

- Need more rural/agricultural areas
- Estacada doesn't need any more housing pockets

Specific Suggestions

- Add all land between Springwater Rd & Fischer's Mill Rd. Use Clear Creek drainage as guide.



Quotable Quote: *To bring more people into our system that is already overloaded with people 'in need' -- who can't/don't take care of themselves is a DRAIN on the TAXPAYERS of our community. ...Let those folks move to the state of Washington or Alaska.*

AREA 2C – RURAL (14 comments)

8 – Protect farm and forest land

6 – Support rural reserves

Quotable Quote: *We overbuilt greater Clackamas in the Happy Valley, Damascus, and Boring areas already. Vacant, overbuilt crappy houses crammed together.*

Area 3: Greater Oregon City

Number of responses: 62

Urban inside a city:	6
Urban not inside a city:	5
Rural inside a city:	0
Rural outside city/UGB:	42

General Comments: 18

- 3 – Delay final decision. . .
 - Until LIDAR maps are available
 - Until decision-makers physically examine boundaries
 - Until all land is ground-truthed
- 3 – Support mix designation
 - More urban and undesignated
 - Some urban, some rural
 - Jobs land for Oregon City; no more housing land
- 10 – Support rural
 - Preserve farm, timber and resource land
 - Too many urban reserves proposed in the area


Specific Suggestions

- Have a higher level of government permanently protect Newell Creek Canyon, the streams, fish, salmon and wildlife corridors.
- Drive down Pam or Hilltop and see that it is not a candidate for inclusion in Urban Reserves. Three Rivers Land Conservancy would accept this prime habitat as conservation easements.
- Pam Drive and Morel Drive need to be removed from 3B and included in 3E

Quotable Quote: *Compared to Washington County, Clackamas County has too little farmland for local food production. That remaining should be protected.*

AREA 3A – OPTIONS (URBAN OR ALL OR PART UNDESIGNATED) (24 comments)

- 8 – Protect farm and forest land
- 6 – Support rural reserve
 - Too hilly; difficult topography to build on
 - Cannot be integrated well into the area
- 5 – Support urban reserve
 - Trade off for some property in 3B
 - Bordered on two sides by UGB and Oregon City
 - Services are OK
- 3 – Part urban
 - At least that portion up Forsythe Road from Swan Ave to Brunner Road
 - At least southwestern portion
- 2 – Specific property requests



Specific Suggestions

- Consider a connector road between Holcomb Rd and Forsythe Rd dumping onto Forsythe at Gerkman Rd (private road) to help with any transportation issues (and the road is already there).
- Encourage Metro and Clackamas County Commissioners to physically tour the properties that are to be included in these new reserves, rather than relying on maps or aerial photographs.

Quotable Quote: *Not every nook and cranny needs to be developed!*

AREA 3B –URBAN (20 comments)

11 – Support all or part rural

- Landslide area
- Steep hills
- Floodplains
- Class A wildlife habitat
- Physically divided with no access from Highway 213

8 – Protect farm and forest land

1 – Support urban reserves (reluctantly)

Specific Suggestions

- Remove Pam Drive and Morel Drive from 3B
- Use LIDAR maps
- Have a higher level of government permanently protect Newell Creek Canyon, the streams, fish, salmon and wildlife corridors.
- Good developable property along South Holcomb

Quotable Quote: *I like the way the Urban/Rural line bisects a dead end street. My next door neighbor can remain rural? Nice planning.*

AREA 3C –URBAN (14 comments)

8 – Protect farm and forest land

5 – Urban reserves not appropriate

- Doesn't meet urban reserve factors
- Meets some rural reserve factors
- Holly Lane not suitable for more development; too much traffic already

1 – Support urban reserves

Specific Suggestions

- Check LIDAR maps before making any decisions

Quotable Quote: *The area sorely lacks the many arterials necessary to efficiently move traffic.*

AREA 3D –URBAN (14 comments)

8 – Protect farm and forest land

4 – Urban not appropriate in landslide areas (parts of Maplelane and Thayer Road)

1 – Good close-in farmland

1 – Support urban (reluctantly)

Specific Suggestions

- Check LIDAR maps before making any decisions
- Include Thayer Lane in UGB – it is surrounded by UGB

Quotable Quote: *With the current landslide maps Metro is using, and without a hazards program in place, Metro is unable to identify the plethora of landslides in this area.*

AREA 3E –RURAL (21 comments)

- 8 – Protect farm and forest land
- 7 – Expand this rural reserve area
- 5 – Support rural reserve
- 2 – Seek Metro protection for Newell Creek, Newell Creek Canyon and related areas

Specific Suggestions

- Expand area to include
 - Pam Drive neighborhood
 - Beavercreek
 - More riparian and wildlife habitat around Holcomb/Abernethy Creek drainages
- Continue rural area to 3H

Quotable Quote: *My professional way of life wouldn't mix well with subdivisions and the consequences of population explosions and the traffic.*

AREA 3F –URBAN (16 comments)

- 8 – Protect farm and forest land
- 4 – Support rural reserves
 - Urban reserve opposed by Oregon City and Hamlet of Beavercreek
 - Not needed for connectivity
- 4 – Support some urban, some rural
 - Some areas too steep, landslide-prone, for development
 - North of Henrici Road OK for urban; already developed.
- 1 – Support urban reserves

Specific Suggestions

- Check LIDAR data for specific information on landslides, steep slopes, etc.
- Draw a southern boundary along Carus Road between Kamrath and Beavercreek so the area between 3H and 3E can be rural to form a contiguous rural band separating Oregon City and land south of Carus.

Quotable Quote: *The Henrici Road area, between Beavercreek Rd and Redland Rd, is very constrained. Even preliminary landslide maps show this to be an area of difficult terrain, filled with many slides and very challenging to development.*

AREA 3G –URBAN (12 comments)

- 8 – Protect farm and forest land
- 2 – Support all or partially rural reserve
 - Protect beavers and other small wildlife
 - Don't/shouldn't develop on steep slopes, Jory soil good for viti-culture
- 1 – Support urban reserve, maybe
- 1 – Support urban reserve
- 1 – Specific property request

Quotable Quote: *It would be a shame to lose viti-culture potential for the sake of very few more home sites.*

AREA 3H –RURAL (15 comments)

- 8 – Protect farm and forest land
- 4 – Support rural reserve
- 3 – Support expanded rural reserve

Specific Suggestions

- More rural reserves east of Canby
- Extend rural reserves to 3E
- Expand rural into undesignated area of Beavercreek

Quotable Quote: *Too much urbanization will destroy the trees we need for their life giving oxygen.*

AREA 3I –RURAL (11 comments)

8 – Protect farm and forest land

2 – Support rural reserve

1 – Specific property request

Specific Suggestion

- Enlarge and extend this rural reserve northeasterly to the Molalla River and northerly to State Highway 213 to prevent urban encroachment from the south by the city of Molalla

Quotable Quote: *This would create a buffer zone to prevent urban encroachment by the city of Molalla.*

Area 4: Stafford/Canby

Number of responses: 355

Urban inside a city:	155
Urban not inside a city:	15
Rural inside a city:	22
Rural outside city/UGB:	121

General Comments: 84

23 – Do not urbanize the area

- Make use of existing urban, undeveloped land first, including in neighboring cities
- Already too much undeveloped land in UGB, e.g., Damascus
- Protect natural areas, rural life
- Needed infrastructure would be too expensive
- No surrounding cities want the area
- Don't urbanize in Clackamas County just to offset foundation land in Washington County

17 – Support rural reserve for entire area

- Agree with Clackamas County's original recommendation
- Urbanization would be expensive
- Support wishes of surrounding cities
- Unique ecological and historic area that should be preserved
- Fits rural reserves criteria
- Don't give in to people/developers who just want to enrich themselves


14 – Support urban reserve for Areas A, B and C

- All land inside I-205 should be urban
- Urban designation will provide the most protection for tree canopies and stream corridors
- Development in this area is overdue; surrounded by urban areas
- Consider vision of Stafford Hamlet

8 – Protect farm and forest land

11 – Support a mix of designations for the area

- Urban around Borland Road; rural or undesignated for the rest
- No urban south of I-205
- No urban south of Tualatin River



4 – Support undesignated for entire area

- Need flexibility for the future
- Support Stafford Hamlet
- Protect as much natural space and habitat as possible
- City of Canby needs room for healthy growth

4 – Thanks for your work/good luck

3 – Road construction suggestions

Specific Suggestions

- Use drainage basins as dividing lines between urban and rural reserves.
- Develop parks and wildlife refuge areas along the Tualatin River.

Quotable Quote: *The reserves designations need to be based upon a realistic assessment of how urban services will be delivered. We don't need more land that ultimately comes into the UGB to languish.*

AREA 4A –OPTIONS (URBAN, PART URBAN AND/OR RURAL AND/OR UNDESIGNATED) (112 comments)

39 – Support rural reserve

- Adding infrastructure would be difficult and expensive
- Steep slopes with landslide potential
- Important wildlife corridors, riparian areas, vistas
- Local agriculture/food system opportunities
- Listen to voters of Stafford Hamlet who predominantly want rural reserve
- Does not meet most urban reserve criteria; does meet rural reserve criteria
- Neighboring cities and county do not want urban
- Development would destroy way of life that has existed for nearly 100 years

36 – Support urban reserve

- Good non-farm ground that can be developed; poor soils and small farms
- Can have residential and employment land with green set-asides for streams, rivers and wildlife
- Support Stafford Hamlet vision for long-term development
- Preserve true sustainable agricultural production on foundation farmland elsewhere in region
- Target population density inside the I-205 corridor, with preservation outside of it.
- Residents would benefit from local services
- Decide based on state law, not emotional rhetoric
- Close to existing transportation and services
- Already adequate provisions for preserving natural areas in Wilson Creek drainage
- Logical extension of the Metro area; no reason to have a hole in the UGB

14 – Do not urbanize

- Very expensive to develop
- Good close-in land for food
- Not wanted by neighboring cities
- Development would increase traffic, crime, pollution and stress
- Low percentage of buildable acres
- Surface water run-off from urbanization would be a disaster

8 – Protect farm and forest land

5 – Support having options

- Let the people in the area choose
- Good to have options

4 – Support undesignated

1 – Support combination of urban and undesignated

1 – Support combination of rural and undesignated

Specific Suggestions

- Combine 4A, 4B and 4C to make one contiguous area.
- Designate the area urban and develop it as a model community integrating open space, mixed density living, recreation and business.

Quotable Quote: *We do not want to look all the same along our freeways and roads . . . developed, commercial and Californian.*

AREA 4B –URBAN (54 comments)

25 – Support urban reserve

- Services exist nearby and providing more could be done at a reasonable cost
- School district recently had a nearby site approved for annexation into West Linn
- Close to I-205
- No foundation farmland
- No reason to have a hole in the UGB
- Great opportunities for jobs and housing

21 – Support rural reserve

- Steep slopes, landslide potential, wildlife corridors, riparian areas
- Infrastructure would be expensive
- No access to transportation – roads are too small
- Don't give developers a "foot in the door" for Stafford
- Surrounding cities don't want it.
- Don't need more houses in an already glutted market
- Respect the wishes of the people who live here

8 – Protect farm and forest land

7 – Do not urbanize

- Area is too pretty to develop
- No transit
- Successfully sued twice in the past to keep urbanization away
- Protect people who elected you, not people who are coming in the future

4 – Support undesignated

- Need to solve infrastructure problems before adding to urban reserve
- Cities don't want urban; leave undesignated until cities change their minds

9 – Miscellaneous

- Only make urban under certain conditions
- Ask West Linn
- School district has proposed elementary school in the area

Specific Suggestions

- All land east of Wisteria and Woodbine should be urban with large lot sizes and green space and tree canopy

- East of Wisteria Road should be urban
- Develop area adjacent to Tanner Basin neighborhood

Quotable Quote: *This area should be earmarked urban. Any other designation would go against the basic successful growth guidelines Metro has been using for many years.*

AREA 4C –URBAN (109 comments)

26 – Support urban reserve

- Natural for urbanization because of location and proximity to freeways
- Need more jobs in this area
- We need public utilities in this area
- Urbanize along with entire Stafford area
- Area is already being urbanized

24 – Support rural reserve

- Congestion already a problem.
- West Linn already exceeds required density.
- Needed transportation infrastructure would cost billions of dollars.
- The surrounding cities don't want it.
- Urbanization would hurt the Tualatin River.
- Maintain character and integrity of Stafford Basin.
- Support existing local businesses – don't add new ones to compete.

24 – Do not urbanize

- Already too much traffic with addition of churches; too much congestions; Willamette Falls Drive is backed up; people drive through and destabilize Historic Willamette area of West Linn
- Protect rural open spaces
- Concerned about impact on the environment
- Should be enough that it's a beautiful place to live without being developer-ready or commercial farmland
- Urbanization would destroy this happy, peaceful community
- Listen to the people who live here

8 – Protect farm and forest land

6 – Separate area south of I-205 and Tualatin River from the rest– make south rural, north urban

- Don't develop right by the Tualatin River
- The northern part is relatively flat and the residents want it to be urban

4 – Support urban or undesignated

- Already many urban/industrial uses– schools, churches, traffic, industrial, commercial

3 – Support undesignated

- I'm a business owner and rezoning the land would put me out of business
- Numerous other area in the region can be used for urban growth; doesn't have to happen here

2 – Nobody notified us this was going on

Specific Suggestions

- South Borland Road below I-205 should be rural, not urban, because of negative urban impacts and fertile farmland.
- Fix leaky septic systems.
- Protect natural areas along the river
- Place a wide buffer between development and the Tualatin River, not just a 200-foot setback.

Quotable Quote: *There is great opportunity for jobs and housing here. Don't let the cities make this planning decision. It's important that when looking at a 50-year horizon current bickering not get in the way of good land use.*

AREA 4D –URBAN OR UNDESIGNATED (77 comments)

26 – Support rural reserve

- Difficult to develop because of farms, small lots, topography
- Cost-prohibitive to develop the area
- Maintain integrity and character of Stafford Basin
- Urbanization will increase congestion; reduce quality of life
- Don't lose viable farmland to development
- Surrounding cities don't want it
- Starting a new city doesn't make sense because of the nearby county border

12 – Support urban reserve

- Mostly marginal terrain and many small lots
- Close to I-205 and I-5
- Leaving the land undeveloped would create a very expansive area for the very wealthy, which would drive up land costs even more
- Cities may not want the area now, but might want it 10 years from now
- Already becoming residential
- Great opportunity for jobs and housing

10 – Do not urbanize

- Preserve the forests.
- Not easy to add infrastructure.
- Develop at higher density without city water and sewer.
- We don't need any additional urban land – we already have Damascus
- Many active small farms and undulating topography
- Develop closer to I-5 corridor
- Without road improvements, development would be a disaster
- Consider the wishes of people who live in the area

8 – Protect farm and forest land

8 – Support undesignated

- Some minor development with light agriculture and greenspaces
- Development challenges
- Keep as rural agricultural
- Don't need more urban land
- Inefficient for the level of urban densities desired
- Pete's Mountain has poor farmland, too windy and colder than surrounding area

3 – Support urban reserve after areas 4A, 4B and 4C are urbanized

2 – Would rather not go urban, but prefer urbanizing 4D rather than 4A

Specific Suggestions

- Drainage basins should be the natural criteria for urban/rural boundaries.
- Recommend village-type development with houses clustered in specific locations – human footprint is evident but not overwhelming
- Concentrate employment center within Wilsonville city limits

Quotable Quote: *Why not encourage more small organic farming? Now that Wilsonville and Tualatin have changed their water supply, it should be possible to grant more water rights.*

AREA 4E –URBAN (34 comments)

18 – Support rural reserve

- Productive farms operate here
- Maintain integrity and character of Stafford Basin
- Urbanization, resulting in increased congestion and decreased quality of life, doesn't fit with Metro mission of promoting sustainability
- Don't sacrifice quality of life for developers' profits
- Surrounding cities don't want the area

16 – Support urban reserve

- Makes sense to develop along I-5
- Great jobs and housing opportunities
- Looks like urban near freeway

8 – Protect farm and forest land

5 – Mixed

- Support urban south of Tualatin
- Areas further out from I-205 should be rural or undesignated
- Has potential, but needs road improvements and has some farming
- Add to urban after the rest of Stafford is urbanized
- Protect streams

4 – Do not urbanize

- We have enough urban land
- Good farmland
- Listen to the people who live here

1 – Support undesignated

1 – People should have options

1 – Is this area needed to force the bypass to I-5 from Washington County?

Specific Suggestions

- Reduce all proposed urban areas to 15,000 acres by taking a little off each area.

Quotable Quote: *As our society transitions away from fossil fuels, agricultural land near our urban centers will become more and more important.*

AREA 4F –URBAN OR UNDESIGNATED (45 comments)

17 – Support rural reserve

- Maintain integrity and character of Stafford Basin
- Urbanization doesn't coincide with Metro's mission of sustainability
- Surrounding cities want the area to be rural
- Viable farmlands

11 – Support urban reserve

- Mostly marginal terrain and many small lots
- Great opportunities for jobs and housing

8 – Protect farm and forest land

5 – Do not urbanize

- Already enough land in existing UGB
- Many large plots of land with houses, some with farms
- Difficult to add city infrastructure
- Listen to the people who live in the area

1 – Support undesignated

1 – Urbanize after the rest of Stafford is developed

Quotable Quote: *Urbanization could only be justified if use was restricted to high density job creation, not residential, retail and professional services.*

AREA 4G –URBAN (59 comments)

22 – Support urban reserve

- So the Oregon Veterans Center can be built here
- Great job and housing opportunities

19 – Support rural reserve

- Important agriculture land
- Maintain integrity and character of Stafford Basin
- Surrounding cities don't want the area.

8 – Protect farm and forest land

4 – Do not urbanize

- Need buffers and barriers to protect the hoot owls that are here late fall through spring
- Important agricultural land
- Have enough urban land already
- Listen to the people who live here

1 – Support undesignated

- Marginal farm properties

1 – Give people options

Quotable Quote: *Keep development along the I-5 corridor and get light-rail running into Portland!*

AREA 4H –URBAN (51 comments)

23 – Support rural reserve

- Only one road into area – bad access
- Expensive to develop due to water limitations in Wilsonville area
- Large working farms
- Difficult to serve with water, sewer and transportation
- Maintain rural character
- Area cities don't want the land

12 – Support urban reserves

- Adjacent to Wilsonville
- No water for agriculture

8 – Protect farm and forest land

4 – Do not urbanize

- Already enough urban land
- Listen to people who live here

1 – Support rural reserve or options

Specific Suggestions:

- Also include undesignated area to the north of 4H in urban reserve.
- Metro should force the school district to look for land to build new schools inside the UGB and force Wilsonville to build baseball and soccer fields inside its current UGB.
- Reduce all proposed urban areas to 15,000 acres by taking a little off of each.

Quotable Quote: *The transportation issues together with the area's size, only about 170 acres of land available for development, will limit the type of development possible in this area.*

AREA 4I –RURAL (70 comments)

44 – Support rural reserve

- Meets rural reserve factors
- Habitat for threatened and endangered species
- Protect agricultural land
- Recreational opportunities for people from throughout the region
- Good buffer between West Linn and Wilsonville and Tualatin
- Recommended as rural by Clackamas County

8 – Protect farm and forest land

6 – Do not urbanize

- Many historic farms and buildings
- Beautiful area with irreplaceable natural resources and important watershed

4 – Support urban reserve

- May be needed for expansion for Wilsonville for housing

3 – Support undesignated

- Not high-value farmland, especially those on the hill by or off Schaeffer Road
- Too much rural designation – need more undesignated

Specific Suggestions

- Leave area east of Schaeffer Road, north side of Pete’s Mountain Road, undesignated
- Have 10-20-acre lots for smaller hobby farms and specialty crops – area is rural in nature, but no water for farmers.
- Combine the undesignated area north of Schaeffer Road into rural with the 4I Pete’s Mountain
- Give thought to urban edges as they divide some farms – follow the natural divides and property owners’ needs.

Quotable Quote: *This is a remarkably beautiful area of the county that has irreplaceable natural resources. It includes a historically important corridor along the Willamette River and two areas sufficiently unique that the Nature Conservancy has invested in preservation.*

AREA 4J–RURAL (152 comments)

114 – Support rural reserve

- Don’t pave over good alluvial soil
- Keep French Prairie as rural reserve
- No infrastructure available to handle development
- We have enough traffic already
- Cities need to build up, not take valuable food land
- We are stewards of the land, not owners

12 – Support undesignated

- I-5 corridor is too valuable to urban development to be locked up for 50 years as a rural reserve
- Leave land undesignated between Canby and Willamette River – City of Canby will need it for future growth
- Logical area for City of Canby expansion
- Leave options for farmers in the area; not great farmland – farmers may want to leave and let Canby expand
- Conflicted farmland
- Do not develop land between Aurora and Wilsonville

9 – Do not urbanize

- Put people over profits
- Existing roads can’t handle development
- Maintain excellent farmland

- Protect farmland from development
- Don't let Canby expand boundaries onto world-class productive soils

8 – Protect farm and forest land

4 – Support urban reserve

1 – Do not remain rural

- Landlocked farmland; conflicts coming with urban growth

Quotable Quote: *I don't know why everyone is so worried about saving farmland when they should worry about saving the farmer.*

Area 5: Southwest Region

Number of responses: 173

Responses from:

- Urban and inside a city – 59
- Urban and not inside a city – 8
- Rural and inside a city – 15
- Rural, outside a city and outside UGB - 51


Area 5 – Additional Comments (28)

- 5 support rural reserves and/or expansion
 - 5G should be rural
 - 2 suggest 5E be completely rural
 - 5E undesignated area should be rural
 - All undesignated lands should be rural
 - Extend rural reserve to Baker/Tooze Rd
 - Use Agricultural/Natural Resources Coalition Map – all French Prairie and lands south of Willamette should be rural
- 3 support urban reserves and/or expansion
 - Need more urban and undesignated lands
 - More undesignated – less urban

General

- Protect farm and forest land
- Do not support expansion around Sherwood – will not prove sustainable (single-family subdivisions distant from urban core)
- Not a lot of top quality farmland, and what there is needs to be protected to preserve the agricultural industry in Washington County. If a city does not have less desirable land to expand, then some ingenuity must be used to provide housing/jobs with existing footprint.
- Farms too small to be productive and are restricted by County regulations to a point they can't effectively operate. Urban expansion has made us open to complaints about farm activities; more traffic has left us with cars driving through fences into pastures, fireworks disturb livestock and increased liability of neighborhood kids climbing into pastures to play with livestock.
- Consider the positive contribution that our conservation areas, rivers and wetlands and rural communities give to the metro area.
- Limit urban development to communities that already have good transportation, not on important agricultural lands. If you develop these areas the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge will become an island, which will severely impact wildlife corridors and habitat.
- No on 5A, 5B, 5D, 6D urban!

Quotable Quote: We need a symbiotic approach to progress, blending work, housing, agriculture, parks open space and shopping into an environmentally friendly and livability friendly picture.



Area 5A – Urban (23 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 5 support urban reserve
- 5 opposed to urbanization of this area
 - 2 cite need to protect Foundation agricultural land
 - 2 cite need to protect Wildlife Refuge
 - Sherwood cannot support additional growth

Area 5B – Urban (28 comments)

- 12 support urban reserve designation
 - 8 fully support
 - 4 partial or conditional support
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 6 oppose urban reserve designation
 - 4 cite need to protect farm lands
 - 2 recommend rural reserve designation

Area 5C – Rural (23 comments)

- 12 support rural reserve designation
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- The undesignated lands to the north should also be designated rural reserve

Area 5D – Urban (26 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 7 support proposed urban reserve designation
- 7 oppose urban reserve designation and support rural
- A farmer who manages 60 acres of hazelnuts recommends rural reserve designation

Area 5E – Options (140 comments)

- 6 support urban reserve designation for entire area
- 12 support urban reserve designation of all but the Tonquin Geologic Area
- 114 support rural reserve designation for this entire area

72 people provided additional comments:

- 33 support rural reserve designation of entire area
- 29 support protection of Tonquin Geologic Area
- 9 commented on the I-5 / 99W connector
 - 5 oppose building the connector in this area
 - 3 support construction of the connector
 - Support construction of the connector, but not on farm lands.
- 8 recommend designation of at least a portion of the area as urban reserve
- 8 supported protecting farm and forest land
- 4 also support urban reserve designation of remainder of area

Area 5G – Urban (26 comments)

- 8 support proposed urban reserve designation
- 8 support farm and forest land
- 7 recommend protecting area for farming or designating it rural reserve
- Size of area should be smaller

Area 5H – Urban (24 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 7 support urban reserve designation
- 4 recommend maintaining area as rural or note importance of agricultural lands
- Urban development should not go south of the Willamette River

Area 5I – Rural (52 comments)

- 24 support protecting all of French Prairie including Champoeg/Butteville area
- 14 support the proposed rural reserves designation
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- Concerned about limited groundwater/domestic water supply
- This area is not high value farmland – no water
- More needs to be undesignated

Quotable Quote: *Tread lightly on further restricting individual property rights. They are the backbone of this country.*

Area 6: West/Central Washington County


Number of responses: 60

Responses from:

- Urban and inside a city – 20
- Urban and not inside a city – 6
- Rural and inside a city – 1
- Rural, outside a city and outside UGB – 23

Specific comments to the areas for Area 6 (6A-6D) range from 17 to 24 per area with an overall average of 20.3 responses for all combined sub-areas. Nineteen comments were submitted in the overall comments for Area 6. Each of the four areas generated

detailed comments. Summaries from each area are provided below.



Area 6 – Additional Comments (27)

- 12 support recommended rural reserves and/or expansion
 - 2 suggest all of Cooper Mountain be in rural reserves
 - Establish rural reserves to minimize run-off, erosion and stormwater
 - Several suggest restraining urban sprawl and protecting foundation farmland
- 2 support recommended urban reserves and/or expansion
 - It's time to move forward with 6A providing intelligent development along TV Highway and Farmington areas
 - Density near transportation is a good thing
 - Area should be developed but to low density due to capacity constraints.

General

- Protect farm and forest land
- Development of large parcels (6A & 6B) will make things worse for current residents and will not draw future residents without massive investments in education and infrastructure – money the state does not have
- No No No and No! By your own admission this is primarily foundation land
- Economy is in a free fall, businesses are laying off or shuttering every day and no one has any idea how long it will take to recover from this mess. I can't justify taking away land that has been in some people's families for generations and attempting to give it to a business community that doesn't want it and couldn't afford it even if they did. There is already too much urban sprawl in Washington County
- Disagree with any concept that locks up land and prevents development for 40 years. The Oregon State LCDC rules required land use trends be evaluated every 5 years for a reason. Evaluating development needs for a 40 year look ahead is impossible. Negative consequences of inadequate evaluation are tremendous. Do not restrict evaluation to every 40 years.

- A 40-50 year lock up of land is not in the best interest of the people of the area, tying up land my grand children could not use to the fullest extent as a property owner. If you want to limit development, buy the rights.

Quotable Quote: *Be leaders in putting people and the environment first.*

Area 6A – Urban (32 comments)

- 10 support urban reserve designation. Three call out the South Hillsboro Planning Area only for urban designation
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 7 support rural reserve designation
 - Limit development of St. Mary's property without Reserves Golf Course
- Remaining comments lacked direct reference to reserves but could be categorized as supporting or not supporting urban development. 7 answers were evenly split. Key themes were:
 - Protect the former St. Mary's property for agriculture
 - Protect Butternut Creek, the Tualatin River and foundation farmland
 - Constraints on existing infrastructure preclude further development
 - The need for quality jobs the area could be provided through development
 - Areas along 209th and to the west could accommodate urban development without interfering with major agriculture

Area 6B – Urban (31 comments)

- 12 support rural designation
 - Protect foundation farmland
 - Worry about future urban expansions to the west
 - Concerned over flooding and erosion of hilly areas
 - Redevelop existing land more effectively before expanding
 - Large portions of the area are on Metro's inventory
 - Farmland is vital to our health, well-being and future food security.
- 8 support urban designation
 - The area is already relatively well developed, creating a hindrance to farming activities
 - Extension of services can be easily facilitated
 - Smaller parcel sizes limit agricultural blocks
 - Lack of a viable farm community for many years
 - Land should be used for its best purpose
 - Challenge the notion of foundation farm land being descriptive of the best soils
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land

Area 6C – Urban (25 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 7 felt the area should be designated rural
 - Protect Tualatin NWR with buffer; urbanize east of Roy Rogers and north of Beef Bend
 - A larger buffer to the Tualatin River
 - Foundation soils need protection
 - Small farms and farmland need agricultural protection
- 4 called for urban designation
 - Could support urban if area's west boundary stopped at Roy Rogers Rd rather than the river

Area 6D – Urban (25 comments)

- 8 called for rural reserve designation
 - Add rural reserve to better protect the floodplain
 - Redevelop more efficiently within the existing UGB
 - A larger buffer to the Tualatin River
 - Foundation soils need protection
 - Small farms and farmland need agricultural protection
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 5 called for urban designation

Area 7: West Washington County

Number of responses: 41

Responses from:

- Urban and inside a city – 16
- Urban and not inside a city – 1
- Rural and inside a city – 1
- Rural, outside a city and outside UGB – 13

Specific comments range from 10 to 16 per area with an overall average of 11.4 responses. Fifteen comments were submitted in the overall comments for Area 7. Area 7C (northeast of Cornelius) and overall comments for Area 7 generated the most detail. Summaries from each area are below.

Area 7 – Additional Comments (23 comments)


- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- Most support no further urbanization
- 2 support more urban reserves and/or undesignated land; an additional comment stated "All ok as labeled."
- Several mentioned high soil quality and preservation of flood plains
- 2 noted the need to redevelop existing land prior to expanding onto new lands
- 2040 centers in Aloha, Cedar Mill, Raleigh Hills have not been developed adequately
- Lands around Forest Grove and Cornelius should not be developed inasmuch as those cities "are the outmost finger of the Metro region."
- Cornelius should merge with Forest Grove or Hillsboro to preserve farmland
- The mitigated wetlands from the Barney project south of Forest Grove and Cornelius should be rural, and stream corridors and headlands should have a ¼-mile buffer on either side

Area 7A – Urban (19 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 6 support urban reserve designation
- 2 support rural reserve designation
- 2 noted Gales Creek has been designated critical habitat for steelhead

Area 7B – Urban (18 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 2 specifically supported urban designation



- 2 addressed the issue of set-asides for jobs/housing, believing the area will simply be suburban development without a jobs mix
- Comments generally were not in favor of this area being designated as an urban reserve, with four comments specifically requesting rural reserve designation
- Loss of "prime" soils was a concern for several

Area 7C – Urban (24 comments)

- Comments predominantly against urban designation and for a rural reserve.
 - 8 favor protecting farm and forest land
 - Leave undesignated
 - 2 noted its suitability for the future growth of Washington County and Cornelius in particular, noting a lack of employment opportunities in that city
 - 2 preferred rural designation due to the confluence of the main creeks
 - 1 have a petition with 34 signatures requesting rural reserve status
 - Farm uses in the area, the extent of the inputs on our 52-acre century farm and wildlife we have seen in the area
 - 2 stated Council Creek should define the limits to urban growth
 - 2 said Cornelius should use up its available vacant land first

Area 7D – Urban (20 comments)

- 6 agree with the proposed designation of urban
 - Originally included in urban reserve and since removed - they want to urbanize
 - Urban reserve boundary should go from 334th & TV Hwy west to 345th, not just 345th
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 4 comments specifically requested rural reserve status for the area, noting it being foundation farmland

General

- Be careful

Area 7E – Urban (18 comments)

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- 6 support proposed designation
- 2 propose rural reserve with the identical language as other sub-sections responses.
 - Reluctant acceptance of urban designation given the small size
 - Urbanize, but control runoff

Area 7F – Rural (22 comments)

Most input conveying support was concise, one-line answers

- 9 indicated strong preference for rural designation
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- Gales Creek as critical habitat for federally listed steelhead
- More land should be left undesignated, particularly the mountainous area around Hagg Lake

Area 7G – Rural (18 comments)

- 9 support the rural reserve designation on the Hosticka map.
 - Wapato Lake vicinity should also be in the reserve due to its value to wildlife, particularly migratory ducks, geese and swans
 - All undesignated in this should be in a rural designation
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land

Area 7H – Rural (18 comments)

- 9 support the rural reserve designation on the Hosticka map

- 8 support protecting farm and forest land
- The undesignated areas around Banks are too large and should be in a rural reserve

Quotable Quote: *God only made so much land that is fit to raise crops on and when it is covered with cement and asphalt what will we eat?*

Area 8: North Washington County

Number of responses: 137

Responses from:

- Urban and inside a city – 55
- Urban and not inside a city – 22
- Rural and inside a city – 3
- Rural, outside a city and outside UGB – 39

Area 8 – Additional Comments (48)


- 33 support recommended rural reserves and/or expansion
 - 9 suggest all undesignated lands be included in rural reserves
 - 8 support protecting farm and forest lands
 - 8 suggest all lands north of Hwy 26 be rural except for 8C which should be urban
 - Placing land just west of Helvetia and north of West Union in undesignated is illogical
 - The infrastructure it would take to open up these areas is too expensive for the urban and rural citizenry
 - If class 1 land and land with hydric soils are put into the urban designation, you risk national security. There is land around the Metro area that is not class 1, is not hydric and is not prime agriculture – should be considered for urban and commercial growth
- 8 support existing urban reserve areas
 - 4 suggest expanding urban reserves and/or undesignated areas
 - This land has the capacity to be the next Intel or Nike. Keep homes near the jobs
 - We need more urban reserves and undesignated areas for potential growth
 - Those living in 8A have become keenly aware of population pressure. It seems practical and just to make this area urban reserve because of access to Hwy 26, a 6-foot diameter pipeline, a gas line and proximity to the airport and Intel

General

- Washington County is worried about huge influxes of people coming our way. Those people were coming for cheap jobs. The cheap jobs are gone. The tide is flowing away from our shores. I lived through this reverse population cascade in NY. We do not need to get ready for a future that is not coming when we have never gotten ready (transportation-wise) for what we already have. Before adding 1 more inch of developable land, do something realistic about moving people and supplies.

AREA 8A –Urban (65 comments)

- 30 recommend rural reserves
 - Protect farmland
 - Protect family history
 - Too much urban pressure
- 22 support urban reserves



- Need for jobs
- Large industrial availability
- Farming is impractical (a few)
- 8 supported protecting farm and forest land
- 5 suggest smaller urban reserves and preserving the rest through rural designation

Area 8B – Urban (32 comments)

- 31 recommend rural reserves
 - Don't add "pockets" of urbanization
 - Better to keep Hwy 26 as an impenetrable boundary
 - UR designation unnecessary as place-holder for interchange – examples of other interchanges on EFU at Jackson School Road
 - Interchange can be built compactly and not take much farm land
 - County interpretation that interchange requires industrial site could be challenged by Metro and LCDC
 - If [interchange] is designated urban, it could be appeal-able
 - Urban designation opens door to eventual loss of huge amount of foundation farmland, especially if adjacent land is left un-designated
 - Protect Oregon Oak woodland and riparian habitat for Waible Creek
- 8 supported protecting farm and forest land
- 7 support urban reserves recommendation
 - Not even as much land as added last time and this is supposed to last 50 years?
 - Makes efficient use of expensive infrastructure

General

- This area is appropriate once existing capacity is efficiently used
- Leave the area undesignated and allow current owners to decide

Area 8C – Urban (58 comments)

- 31 support urban reserves recommendation
 - 12 support only with urban reserve limits being south of Rock Creek floodplains
 - Infrastructure already to support development
 - With tightly controlled planning this area could provide a nice mix of housing, parks and light industry
 - Abbey Creek and Rock Creek stream corridors should be urban so they can transfer to public ownership for parks, trails and other public recreation
 - Near areas where investments are in planning or committed – logical step towards making the most efficient use of public and private investment
 - Excellent opportunity to get part of Bethany Lake to Forest Park trail system
- 11 recommend rural reserves
 - Most listed on Metro's Natural Resources Inventory
 - Headwaters of Rock Creek
 - Contains foundation agricultural land
 - Traffic is bad, more homes will make it worse
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land


General

- Leave Area 8C rural between existing UGB and Cornelius Pass Road makes no sense
- More urban reserve around 8C – less urban reserves in foundation lands elsewhere
- Shift 8C to possibly connect Bethany/North Bethany with Cornelius Pass Road
- No undesignated areas – they will be treated as urban reserves by speculators
- Allow rural landowners to develop and use their land how they wish

Quotable Quote: *While the choice is difficult, growth is required. A "broad brush stroke" decision will not serve the public needs for farm land or housing.*

Area 8D – Options -- City of North Plains (47 comments)

- 39 support area south of Hwy 26 being undesignated
- 45 support area south of Hwy 26 being rural reserves
- 23 recommend rural reserves
 - Highway 26 is an effective edge/buffer
 - Most land around North Plains contains more than 20% Class 1 soils
 - Will create a divided town
 - North Plains wants to stay separated from Hillsboro, so should not go south of highway
 - Growth on south side will stress interchange
- 10 support leaving the area with no designation
 - 8 supported protection of farm and forest lands
 - 3 support no designation but suggest Beech Road and Glenco Roads as boundaries
 - Area will be better served for industrial use – services already available
 - This makes more sense than going north
 - Not fair to limit growth of a community outside of Metro’s jurisdiction



General

- Leaving an area undesignated defeats the whole purpose of this process

Area 8E – Rural (48 comments)

- 38 support rural reserves recommendations
 - 8 suggested extending rural reserves to undesignated areas around North Plains and Banks
 - Areas 8E and 8F should meet with no un-designated lands left to protect drainages and riparian zones
- 8 suggest protecting farm and forest lands
- 2 suggest urban reserve designation

Area 8f – Rural (49 comments)

- 40 support rural reserves recommendations
 - 13 suggest that all undesignated lands in the area also become rural reserves
 - Vast acreages of undesignated land was a mistake by planners because they thought without irrigation this land was not prime
- 8 suggest protecting farm and forest lands
- More urban reserve designation

General

- Why are undesignated areas not given a separate comment box? They are not part of the rural or urban reserve areas.

Area 9: West Multnomah County

Number of people who answered at least one question: 433


Total comments on all questions: 731

Responses from:

- Urban and inside a city – 207
- Urban and not inside a city – 81
- Rural and inside a city – 46
- Rural, outside a city and outside UGB – 76

General Comments (126)


- 273 support rural reserves
 - Model Portland after efficient higher density US/European cities – NY, Chicago, Paris
 - Once urbanized, can't return to rural, but rural can be used as urban in the future if needed.
 - Areas 9B and C were recommended for rural by CAC, neighborhood association, Planning Commission, and many affected residents – these should be followed.
 - Area roads (Cornell is example) connecting to the urban area cannot handle more traffic
 - Use existing urban areas on west side, and keep this area rural to give green space
 - Natural area gives Silicon Forest a sense of place that helps recruit industries
 - We can't make farmland or wildlife corridors and so should preserve what we have.
 - Of critical concern is protecting headwater streams, winter migration connection routes that elk, deer, bear and other species use to migrate from coastal areas into Forest Park area.
 - Portland can accommodate long-term growth – so no more land is needed for urbanization. Rural allows landscape functions (growing food and fiber, keeping streams clean and cooled, fixing CO2, and providing habitat for native plants and animals.
 - Urbanize existing areas with access to public transportation.
 - Important for wildlife habitat, water quality, sense of place and forestry, subject to slope hazards and lacks pre-existing urban infrastructures. Not possible to develop cost effective urban infrastructures that preserve important natural landscape features, and minimize adverse effects on farm and forest practices, as required by the urban reserve factors
 - Dismayed that undesignated/urban still under consideration despite thorough work of Multnomah County Reserves Citizens Advisory Committee and its recommendation for rural reserve status, as well as the input received from multiple hearings.
 - Family owned property on Old Germantown Road since 1956, lived here 30 years.
 - Pockets of easy-to-develop farm land within the 9A, B, C area should not doom the entire 9A, B, C area to urban or undesignated status.



- In addition to supporting sustainable agriculture, farmland in 9A, B, C buffers urban Washington County and rural reserves of Multnomah County.
- Meet future housing needs within the existing UGB as European cities have. Accept limits to expansion around cities and use existing urban resources with more creativity.
- Undesignated passes leadership choices to the future and leaves land vulnerable to continued speculation.
- 52 recommend no designation
- 50 recommend urban reserves
 - Designate area out to Cornelius Pass Rd. urban with conditions for unique opportunity to demonstrate ability to accommodate population growth and protect natural landscapes.
 - Area 9 should be incorporated into the City of Portland
 - Take long-term regional look, proximity to infrastructure, jobs and conflicted farmland make it logical for urban. Main opposition is NIMBY in West Portland.
 - Politics and special interest groups are departing from common sense and planning logic to designate the southernmost area abutting a huge development as rural.
 - This seems like a one-sided survey produced by people who already made up their minds.
- 8 support protecting farm and forest lands

Option Area 9A – designate urban, rural, or no designation (375 answered question, 185 commented)


- 273 support rural reserves
 - Area can be a wildlife habitat extension of Forest Park
 - High value natural features; difficult to serve for urban
 - Adequate commercial services in the area
 - Area 93 should be fixed; designate 9A rural.
 - Roads are over capacity now – don't increase problems
 - No high capacity transit corridor in the area
 - Focus dollars in higher density walkable neighborhoods with transit
 - Build up, not out
 - Low urban development potential and Portland/Multnomah County don't provide urban services – why leave it open to development?
 - Mud slides in the 90's, geologically fragile with streams and fault lines, too hilly to develop
- 52 recommend no designation
 - Logical connection for Area 93, Portland decision makers will change in future.
- 50 recommend urban reserves
 - Near existing services
 - Limited development would improve local services for existing/future residents
 - A small urban reserve would be acceptable
 - Not suitable/viable for farming and surrounded by development
 - Wildlife is already diminishing, less important to protect



- Keep available for future growth
- Good area for estate style homes
- 8 support protecting farm and forest land

Option Area 9B – designate urban, rural, or no designation (372 answered question, 132 commented)

- 49 recommend urban reserves
 - Incorporate into Portland
 - Urban Washington County is less than a mile away
 - 10 minute walk to Bethany Village Town Center
 - Pedestrian connectivity and other services available
 - A good place to leverage infrastructure investments, a key principle of reserves




- Transportation circulation and adjacent city services sufficient for moderate development
- Would help much needed north/south Saltzman to Springville Rd. connection, connectivity to N. Bethany, and reduce trips on Kaiser Rd. Skyline Blvd.
- Adjacent to Bethany, N. Bethany, and is conflicted ag land – preserve foundation ag land and urbanize conflicted areas
- Designate urban because of Washington County willingness to serve, leverage public investments for N. Bethany, proximity to Bethany Town Center and PCC creates a more complete community, developing conflicted ag land saves foundation land.
- Undesignated leaves the area in limbo and reduces use of planned middle school.
- Area would have been in N. Bethany if not for the Washington/Multnomah County line.
- Provide for suburban development – too expensive for most people to live in high density residential
- Undesignated too uncertain for planning and land valuation, and N. Bethany will result in profound changes in the area. Either extend urban to Germantown Rd. or leave all rural

- 274 support rural reserves
 - Close-in forest and farmland improves Portland livability
 - Part of a buffer between urban Washington County and Forest Park
 - Contains important watershed and valuable wildlife including elk, migratory and threatened birds, mammals, and connections to Forest Park
 - Support the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition map
 - Provides recreation and small farm access for people who live in crowded neighborhoods
 - Malinowski Farms is a valuable local food source
 - Farms needed for food and land security if shipping food becomes a challenge
 - Multnomah County CAC found it unsuitable for urban
 - Roads overburdened and not suitable for urban traffic – Skyline has limited improvement potential, Germantown already dangerous and frequently closed due to weather
 - Schools crowded

- No nearby services such as grocery or neighborhood commercial
- Area requires expensive infrastructure and so is not cost effective
- Undesignated is same as urban, leaves the door open for development
- No adjacent city and no transit options
- Not adjacent to a city, Beaverton is 2 miles away and unlikely service provider through annexation, Bethany residents don't want to pay higher city taxes
- 49 recommend no designation
 - Area too politicized for urban or rural – leave undesignated while further study take place
 - People without financial interest recognize it doesn't meet urban or rural factors
- 8 support protecting farm and forest lands

Option Area 9C– leave undesignated, designate rural reserve (353 answered question, 93 commented)

- 304 recommend rural reserve
 - Area borders the UGB and must be designated per this process
 - Undesignated doesn't guarantee protection, close the door to expensive development
 - Undesignated is hardship for farmers to plan, obtain loans – let farmers invest in their farms.



- Steep slopes, landslides indicate development would further destabilize. Steepness has prevented development for the last 100 years -cost.
- Contains active forestry operations
- Tualatin Mountains are a popular landscape feature, keep regional character with rural
- Many watersheds and much wildlife habitat – preserve Forest Park connections
- Provides a retreat from the pressures of life in an urban environment
- Access to local organic food produced through careful stewardship
- Protect for us and for the next generation to remind of the value of our food/nature
- Area contributes to livability of Portland, close to farm, forests, wildlife
- Unsuitable road system for urban traffic – roads now dangerous, overloaded
- No high capacity transit corridor
- Development would pollute streams, vehicles would clog roadways, and more hillsides would be pocked and scarred by houses and shopping centers we don't need
- Rural for Forest Park buffer.
- 49 recommend no designation
 - If not needed for urban in future, existing protections are more than adequate
 - Modern engineers and architects have solved many problems for steep slope development
 - Urbanize to force needed road improvements
 - Creative development with access to trails and buffering edges is worth discussing – crises in the next 15-40 years could be avoided with insight/rational planning

- 8 recommend protecting farm and forest land

Quotable Quote: *Immediacy of farms, local produce, natural reserves, and buffers for clean air are not only some of Portland's prides, but will also be hallmarks for any great city in the next few decades. Let's stay ahead of the curve and not give away our greatness so easily.*

Area 9D Comments – (117 answered question, 125 commented)

- Support for urban reserves
 - South part at Kaiser/Germantown road should be urban– abuts UGB and planned community of 15,000
 - South part is suitable for urban, adjacent to the current UGB, accessible to downtown Portland, the Silicon Forest, Scappoose and St. Helens. Has a Portland K-8 school and less significant farmland.
 - Kaiser and Germantown will have tremendous congestion from new development
 - Multnomah County should provide more urban reserve.
 - 62 acres in the family for over 100 years should not be considered farm land or designated rural under safe harbor. This is land taking - the same issues we faced during the mid 70's.
 - Germantown/Kaiser Rd should be urban, proximity to UGB, N. Bethany, streams and creeks can be better maintained in urban, parks and trails are more likely within an urban designation. It makes no sense for rural.
 - Too much urban pressure to keep rural.
 - Areas 9B, 9C and 9D should be urban due to problems with low aquifer, upgrades to existing transportation needed (Germantown/Kaiser exceed capacity now) and 15,000 people in Bethany/N. Bethany will increase need, area is no longer rural. Putting N. Bethany sewer into Abbey/Alder creek for gravity flow will save a lot of money.
 - SE corner of 9D should be urban to finance improvement of Germantown/Kaiser Rd. intersection, bring in water, bicycle lanes and parks. Rural would not provide this funding.
- Support for rural reserves
 - Need wild areas by urban for aesthetics, recreation, maintenance of sustainable ecosystem
 - Protect wildlife corridors connecting Forest Park to rural lands west and north
 - Increased traffic on rural roads impact wildlife. Elk habitat being reduced
 - Contains important farm and forestland
 - Protect farmland – it is finite and can't be manufactured
 - Rural allows for direct-to-consumer local food; Malinowski Farm is example of sustainable agriculture that attracts people to this part of the country.
 - Protect close-in farms, forests, and natural resources - support Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition reserves map.
 - Beautiful area is a retreat from pressures of urban life; keep Portland livable
 - Rural reserve encourages alternative ways to urbanize and increase urban density
 - Maintain livability of existing residents by keeping it rural
 - Should remain a rural reserve. Forest Park is critical habitat for animals, plants and people


Area 9E Sauvie Island Comments – (103 answered question, 111 commented)

- Support for urban reserves
 - Multnomah County should provide more urban reserves
- Support for rural reserves
 - Foundation agricultural land
 - Should be highest priority for rural reserve
 - Wildlife habitat, migratory and resident birds

- Urban would require one or two large bridges for access and shipping channel. Given limited funding, there are many places where the relative payback dwarfs the value
- Sauvie Island is one of our state treasures - definitely designate rural reserve
- Opportunity it affords for the urban population to experience the rural area
- Development of Sauvie Island would be a travesty. Considering the geology, natural resources and established community, adhere to the rule to "tread lightly on the land".

Option Area 9F – leave undesignated, entire area rural, or make the small near Scappoose rural and the rest undesignated (332 answered question, 75 commented)

- 42 recommend no designation
 - Don't use reserves to stop anything, only to protect best farm land.
 - Growth near Scappoose not nearly as prevalent as Multnomah County and City of Portland. Scappoose needs to justify expansion based on population density.
- 247 support rural reserves
 - Leaving undesignated invites abuse, doesn't protect the land – designate rural.



- Why only designate part of it? What is the downside of designating it all rural?
- The argument about not being subject to urbanization due to being more than 3 miles from a current urban area ignores the existence of cars that travel 50+ miles an hour.
- Foundation forest land, high value wildlife habitat, part of critical connection between Forest Park and the Coast Range, protect headwater streams critical to watershed health
- Mountains are a regional landmark, define Portland region and are critical to our sense of place.
- Terrain, wildlife habitat -- not fit for urban development, designate rural reserve
- Protect a minimum out 3 miles from the Scappoose UGB. The entire area is a better idea
- Area threatened by Multnomah Channel marinas adding floating homes at urban density
- Hwy 30 adds significant threat. Rural areas between Columbia County and Scappoose are defacto commercial/urban.
- Urban pressures could come from the north -- wiser to designate the area rural reserve than to try to fence in Scappoose in such an obvious (and somewhat insulting) manner
- Rural reserve enables farmers, foresters to plan long-term; discourages speculative land acquisition which keeps lands tied up and unproductive
- Folks live here because of the rural setting; don't ruin it by urbanizing it!
- Endorse the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition map
 - 3 miles beyond UGB doesn't seem at risk today but in 20-40 years it could be. Complete rural reserves in NW Multnomah Co. makes intent and character of area clear
 - Subject to landslides and earthquake risks
 - Rocky Point Road and Skyline are heavily biked, recreationally.
- 43 rural near Scappoose, balance no designation
 - Support rural, but smaller to prevent Scappoose expansion into natural resource areas.

Section 3: Testimony before the Metro Council

During the Phase 4 comment period, the Metro Council held four public hearings at locations in Gresham, Portland, Sherwood and Wilsonville. This provided residents of each of the counties, as well as those in the urban center, opportunities to share their views on reserves with the entire council. The number of people testifying was as follows: Gresham – 23; Portland – 62; Sherwood – 79; Wilsonville – 73.

Some people addressed regional issues, some county concerns, and many made comments on specific proposed reserves or on a specific property.

The mayors of Portland, Beaverton, Cornelius, Canby, West Linn, Sherwood, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, and Tigard, in many cases joined by one or more of their city councilors, commissioners and professional staff, made their case for larger, smaller or different configuration of reserves adjacent to their cities and across the region. Several asked that boundaries be modified or that land be made available for specific purposes. For example, Hillsboro Mayor Willey noted he is in agreement with 99% of the Core 4 map but seeks additional industrial land north of his city while Portland Mayor Sam Adams testified that 15,000 acres was enough urban reserve land to serve the region. Several people spoke on behalf of advocacy organizations. Among these were several members of the regional Reserves Steering Committee. In addition, views were shared by representatives from chambers of commerce, neighborhood and homeowner associations, retirement communities, friends groups, economic and business coalitions, environmental organizations, soil and water conservation districts and farm bureaus. The most frequently repeated comments are as follows:

- 25 support the Agriculture and Natural Resources Coalition map
- 6 support the current Core 4 map or agree with most of it
- 2 support the Bragdon/Hosticka map
- 13 support generally protecting farmland
- 5 request more land generally in rural reserves
- 10 request more jobs and industrial land
- 8 support compact growth
- 3 request more land in urban reserves

Much of the rest of the testimony focused on specific areas of the region (counties or landscapes) and specific proposed reserves. Several recommended specific boundary changes. Twenty people testified in favor of one designation or another for their specific property.

- **Area 4, specifically Area 4A (Stafford Basin)** was the most discussed area with 56 people testifying. Of these 8 wanted it rural. One of these speakers brought a petition signed by 203 West Linn residents requesting that Stafford remain rural. Ten wanted the basin to remain undesignated, 7 not urban, 3 urban and 1 wanted to establish transfer of development rights. Additionally, 16 people testified regarding Canby, 12 of whom requested that the area to the north be undesignated.
- **Area 5E** was discussed by 14 people who mostly recommended that it be rural or at least not urban citing topographic challenges and protection of the Tonquin Geological Area.
- **Area 8A** was addressed by seven individual property owners and the City of Hillsboro was primarily in favor of urban designation with one representative of nine area farming families requesting that it be rural. Five people requested that 8B be rural or undesignated and five also sound rural designation for 8F.

- **Area 9** as a whole was discussed by 17 speakers who requested rural reserve designation. One of them represented the 650-member Oak Hills Homeowners Association, north of Beaverton.
- **Area 9B** was addressed by seven property owners requesting that the area be in urban reserve. One of these speakers presented a petition with 25 signatures supporting urban reserve designation for greater Bethany. One representative spoke on behalf of the 900-member Clairemont Retirement Community asking that 9B be designated rural, citing concerns for safety of community residents.