

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO.10-1238A, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING URBAN RESERVES AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN AND THE URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN

Date: June 9, 2010

Prepared by: Ray Valone, x1808

BACKGROUND

A New Approach

Past Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) processes and results left few stakeholders satisfied. For a host of reasons, the application of the state's prime growth management tool resulted in very contentious and eventually unsatisfactory decisions for the metropolitan area. At the request of a consortium of governmental leaders in the region who wanted to change course of how we decide where to urbanize in the future, the Oregon Legislature authorized Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties to designate urban and rural reserves. Senate Bill 1011, passed in 2007, gave the region an opportunity to use a new approach within the framework of a more inclusive partnership for making such an important decision.

Oregon Administrative Rule 660 Division 27, the implementing rule for SB 1011, establishes procedures for the designation of urban and rural reserves, and requires agreements among the three counties and Metro to realize these reserves. It also prescribes factors that must be applied when choosing such designations. The intent of urban reserves is to facilitate long-term planning for urbanization and to provide greater certainty to the various stakeholders involved in these growth management decisions about the locations of future urban areas. The intent of rural reserves is to provide long-term protection for large blocks of agricultural land and forest land, and for important natural landscape features that limit urban development or define natural boundaries of urbanization.

An important objective of the rule is striking a "balance in the designation of urban and rural reserves that, in its entirety, best achieves livable communities, the viability and vitality of the agricultural and forest industries and protection of the important natural landscape features that define the region for its residents." The balance is to be achieved through weighing the urban and rural factors listed in the state rule.

The Journey

The undertaking to designate reserves commenced in late 2007 with the establishment of the Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee (RSC). The RSC, an assembly of regional and state stakeholders, met throughout 2008 and 2009, concluding their work in October 2009. The Core 4, composed of one member each of the Metro Council and the three counties commissions, continued to meet through February 2010 to work out an agreed-upon reserves map.

The technical work was performed by staff from all four partner jurisdictions. A Project Management Team led this effort and a Technical Team, comprised of several partner planners carried out a significant

portion of the analysis. This team structure supported the RSC and Core 4 throughout the process. This effort started with a study area of 405,000 acres surrounding the existing Urban Growth Boundary. The state administrative rule factors were applied to this study area through a series of high-to-lower level ‘screen’ analyses. This included technical assessments of the four major services defined in the rule – sewer, water, schools and transportation. As the level of analyses became more focused on smaller areas, the county staff took more of a lead for their respective jurisdictions.

Throughout the almost two and a half years of the reserves process, there was an extensive outreach effort to the region to help shape the final designations. It was a many-tiered approach, starting with the members of the RSC who represented social, economic, natural resource and governmental communities. A Coordinated Public Involvement Plan was completed in early 2008 to guide the outreach effort, including the approach, activities, messages, mediums and time lines. A public involvement team consisting of staff from each of the four governments was established to implement the plan. Committees were formed in each county to serve as a local venue for informing and reviewing county staff technical work and giving citizens an on-going avenue for participating in the process. At key junctures in the process, 20 open houses were held throughout the region. Two virtual ‘open houses’ were held on the Metro web site, and the web site was continually-updated throughout the project.

Elected officials and staff from every partner jurisdiction made presentations to various organizations, from planning to advocacy to chamber of commerce groups. They appeared on television, radio news broadcasts and talk shows, and cable video broadcasts. Displays and information was made available at public gathering places, such as farmers’ markets, libraries and retail outlets. Materials were made available in Spanish in all three counties.

The outreach effort resulted in more than 180 discrete opportunities for citizens to directly inform decision-makers of their views on the reserves process. For a complete account of this process, see Attachment 1.

Many local governments and agencies – cities, school districts, service districts and others – and nine state agencies participated in the reserves process as well. Representatives of some units of government served on the RSC. Other units were represented on standing advisory committees, including the Metro Policy Advisory Committee, Metro Technical Advisory Committee, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, participated at various stages during the process. For a record of comment from these government agencies and coordination with them, see Attachment 2.

The result of the above effort was the signing of three Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) among the four partners, one each between Metro and each county. Signed in February 2010, the IGAs contain language concerning policy actions that Metro will take, policy actions that each county will take, some considerations going forward for two of the counties, and most importantly, three maps showing the proposed urban and rural reserves within each county. The three maps represent 28,615 acres of urban reserves and 266,912 acres of rural reserves, with Clackamas and Washington counties accounting for 97% of the urban reserves split evenly between them.

The Ordinances & Findings

County Ordinances

Between the signing of the IGAs in February and the date of this staff report, the three counties have developed comprehensive plan amendments and held hearings to adopt ordinances to implement the agreements in the IGAs. Through these hearings, each county has considered changes to its IGA map.

Clackamas and Washington counties have proposed changes; Multnomah County has not done so. Clackamas County proposed changes totaling 163.6 acres including shifting 113.7 acres from rural reserve to urban reserve, 24.5 acres from undesignated to urban reserve, and 25.4 acres from rural reserve to undesignated. The Metro Council agreed to six of these changes, and on June 3 approved a resolution revising the original IGA to reflect this agreement. Washington County proposed two changes to the reserves map. First, a set of amendments that change how rights-of-way are mapped when they serve as reserve area boundaries and that make very minor changes to boundaries as a result of new property line data from the assessor's office. The second proposal was to change a 129-acre parcel on the west side of the North Bethany 2002 UGB expansion area from rural reserve to urban reserve. The Metro Council agrees with the first change and will discuss the second change during its June 10th meeting. The agreed upon acreage changes plus the 129-acre area adjacent to North Bethany are included in the summary of urban and rural reserve acreages below and on the reserves map in Exhibit A of Ordinance 10-1238A.

The status of the three counties' ordinances is as follows:

- On May 27, 2010, Clackamas County adopted ZDO-233, which designates 13,874 acres of urban reserves and 68,703 acres of rural reserves.
- On May 13, 2010, Multnomah County adopted Ordinance No. 2010-1161, which designates 857 acres of urban reserves and 46,706 acres of rural reserves.
- Washington County took action to Engross Ordinance No. 733 on May 25, 2010, and will take final action on the amendment on June 15, 2010. It includes 13,884 acres of urban reserves and 151,526 acres of rural reserves.

The total amount of urban reserve land is 28,615 acres, and the total amount of rural reserve land is 266,935 acres.

Joint Findings

The findings of fact and conclusion of law (Findings) for the designation of urban and rural reserves is a joint document among the four partner jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction adopted the overall Findings for the decision (Exhibit E, Sections I – V) and each county developed, and Metro adopted, the Findings for the individual urban reserve and rural reserve areas (Exhibit E Sections VI – IX). The overall Findings address the regional balance that was struck by the partner governments in designating a sufficient amount of urban reserves to accommodate the estimated urban population and employment growth in the Metro area for 30 years beyond the 20-year period from 2010-2030, or until 2060. It covers several important components of what constitutes this regional balance, including the following:

- A. *Amount of Urban Reserve Acreage:* Metro developed a 50-year range forecast, based on national and regional trends, for population and employment within the UGB. The partner governments ended up using the middle third of this forecast to increase the probability of it being accurate. This focused range translated to the need to accommodate from 484,800 dwelling units at the lower end of the middle third, given a 50-year time horizon, to 531,600 dwelling units at the higher end of the middle third, given a 50-year time horizon. Job estimates for this same range and years are estimated at 624,300 to 834,100.

The existing residential capacity within the UGB was calculated by Metro to accommodate 379,200 dwelling units over the next 50 years. This leaves 152,400 units to be accommodated within urban reserves over the 50-year time frame.

The employment analysis shows that there is sufficient capacity with the existing UGB over the same 50-year time frame. There is, however, a consensus among Metro and local governments that the region should provide larger-parcel areas for industrial uses within the urban reserves to

meet the preferences of some industries for large sites. Based on the analysis done in the Urban Growth Report for the 20-year time frame plus historical demand estimates, it is estimated that 100 acres per year would be appropriate over the 50-year urban reserves time period. Thus, approximately 3,000 net acres of large-lot land suitable for industrial use are warranted. For a more thorough discussion on ways to provide for large-lot industrial uses, see the final report of the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee Employment Subcommittee, Attachment 3.

Metro assumes that residential land will develop at higher densities and employment land will develop more efficiently in the urban reserves. The residential assumption is based on the following: The ‘great communities’ principles laid out in the Great Communities report¹ and that new urban areas would either complete such communities or create new ones; the fact that future development of urban reserves land would be on green field sites; and that demographic trends indicate increasing demand for smaller housing units. For these reasons, Metro thinks it reasonable to assume a density of 15 units per net acre overall on urban reserve land. The employment assumption is based on the emerging shift of industrial activity from production to research and development with the resultant higher floor area ratios, more demand for office-type building products and more of a focus on the smaller products being located along corridors and centers. Given the land analyses referred to above and the future change of development patterns, the proposed 28,615 acres of urban reserve land will be able to accommodate both the 152,400 new dwelling units needed outside the existing UGB and the approximately 3,000 acres of large-lot industrial land.

Metro conducted a preliminary buildable land analysis on the 28,615 urban reserve acres that resulted in approximately 12,850 acres of net buildable land.² Deducting 3,000 of these acres for large-lot industrial uses leaves approximately 9,850 net buildable acres for residential and non-industrial employment uses. Based on the assumption that new urban land from reserves will achieve 15 dwelling units per net acre, this amount of buildable acreage will accommodate approximately 148,000 units. Of the original 28,615 acres of urban reserve, an estimated 4,800 acres fall under Metro’s Title 13 restrictions and 500 acres fall under the category of over 25% sloped land. There is no way of determining a precise capacity of units for this combined 5,300 acres without performing a development-level analysis on Title 13 lands or establishing a local zoning code that addresses land with greater than 25% slopes. However, we do know that there will be some development capacity on these lands. Deducting 25% of this acreage for future roads, schools and parks, this leaves approximately 4,000 acres. Assuming only 25% of this acreage is developed at a reduced density (five dwelling units per net acre), an additional 5,000 units can be accommodated. Adding the capacity from the unconstrained land (148,000 units) and the capacity from the partially constrained land (5,000 units) yields the 152,400 dwelling units needed within the 50-year reserves period.

B. *Protection of Foundation and Important Agricultural Land*³: Based on the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) map, Foundation and Important Agricultural Land comprises approximately 13,981 acres, or 49%, of the 28,615 acres of proposed urban reserves. This represents only 5% of all such agricultural land studied within the three-county area. This percentage is even lower if the actual land zoned as Exclusive Farm Use is measured against the proposed urban reserve land

¹ “Great Communities Final Report”, December 2006, Cogan Owens Cogan, SERA Architects, et al

² The approach to arrive at this figure is to first deduct the following type of land: slopes equal to or greater than 25%, Title 3, Title 13, public tax-exempt, parks (also includes golf courses and home owner association land) and major utility easements. This leaves 17,154 acres. Next, a 25% reduction is applied to account for future roads and schools, resulting in the 12,865 acreage number.

³ As defined by the Oregon Department of Agriculture report of January 2007 entitled “Identification and Assessment of the Long-Term Commercial Viability of Metro Region Agricultural Lands.”

(Attachment 4). The rest of the proposed urban reserve land (51%) consists entirely of Conflicted Agricultural Land. In addition, almost all of the urban reserve land is bordered either by the existing UGB or rural reserve designated land, thus creating a 50-year ‘hard’ edge between future urbanizable land and Foundation and Important Agricultural Land. Of the 266,912 acres of proposed rural reserves, 249,116 acres are mapped as Foundation or Important Agricultural land.

Despite the relatively small amount of Foundation and Important Agricultural Land proposed as urban reserve, some such land is proposed to be used for future urbanization. In a very real sense, there is little choice to do so, given the nature of the land surrounding the existing UGB. Simply based on land suitability for urban uses and functions, such as creating walkable, mixed use neighborhoods, providing services in an efficient and cost-effective manner, developing a well-connected transportation system and realizing densities to support transit, the best geography is relatively flat, undeveloped and unencumbered land. See the *State of the Centers: Investing in Our Communities*, January, 2009 (Attachment 5). This type of land also contains some of the region’s best farmland. For example, comparison of the ODA map of agricultural land and the “Business Coalition Constrained Land for Development and Employment Map” (Attachment 7) shows that most of the land suitable for industrial use is Foundation and Important Agricultural Land.

Further, converting existing low-density rural residential development into compact, mixed-use communities through infill and re-development is not only very expensive, it is politically difficult. This has been borne out by the city of Damascus, which has been trying since its addition to the UGB in 2002 to gain acceptance of its citizens for a plan to urbanize a few flat areas among steeply sloping buttes and incised stream courses and natural resources. See Apostol and Yap, “The Damascus Story: A Great Oregon Experiment”, *Oregon Planners’ Journal*, July/August, 2009 (Attachment 6).

Given the above considerations, the four partner governments had a difficult decision to make to adequately serve both of these important functions. The reserves record and subsequent recommendation reflect this dilemma and the partners think a good balance has been struck that preserves the vast majority of farmland while accommodating the future projected population and employment growth for the next 50 years. Striking this balance translates to accommodating a 74% increase of population on an 11% increase of land, if all the urban reserves are used within the 50-year time frame and the region receives the projected growth.

- C. *Protection of Natural Landscape Features*: The state rule factors reflect the importance of protecting these features, which were initially identified in an inventory completed for Metro.⁴ However, due to how the rule addressed this protection, an on-going debate and discussion emerged among the four government partners. The most frequent discussion was whether it was better to protect some of the natural features through placing them in rural reserves or placing them in urban reserves and applying pro-active protection measures. Under the factors for designation of urban reserves part of the rule, two subsections address natural systems and the natural features in a way that can be interpreted to come down on the side of including them in urban reserves and using design, avoidance and mitigation for protection. Under the factors for designation of rural reserves section, it can be interpreted to consider using rural reserves to protect the natural features.

As the above discussion unfolded, staff of all four governments met with experts in the field to better inform the Core 4 and RSC in their deliberations. While most of the larger and more

⁴ “Natural Landscape Features Inventory”, February 2007

prominent natural features were never included within candidate urban reserves, others due to their location and relationship to possible urban areas were included at times during the process. Changes were made, however, as the reserve boundaries were refined. Therefore, based on the following facts and circumstances, the four partner governments believe a balance was struck that protects the natural landscape features:

- Of the 26 identified natural landscape features from the inventory, six are outside the original reserves study area and, therefore, weren't affected by the designation of specific urban and rural reserves.
- Of the 20 remaining features: 14 are entirely within rural reserves or almost all rural reserves with the rest of land left undesignated; 4 areas are mostly rural reserve with a small amount (3 of them less than 20%) in urban reserves; one is entirely left undesignated, though is within the Columbia River; and one is designated as urban reserve.

Metro Amendments

Metro Ordinance No. 10-1238A includes amendments to the Regional Framework Plan (RFP) and Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) to conform these policy and regulatory documents to the adoption of reserves. Under this ordinance, Policies 1.7 (Urban/Rural Transition), 1.9 (Urban Growth Boundary) and 1.11 (Neighbor Cities) of the RFP would be completely revised to reflect the establishment of reserves; Policy 1.12 (Protection of Agriculture and Forest Resource Lands) would be repealed (Findings, Exhibit B).

Title 5 (Neighbor Cities) of the UGMFP would be repealed under this ordinance as it is rendered out of date by adoption of reserves and amendments to RFP policies and functional plans (Findings, Exhibit C). Title 11 (Planning for New Urban Areas) would undergo changes to provide for concept planning for urban reserve areas prior to their coming into the UGB. It also contains a new section adding outcomes that must be achieved by the concept plan. Other changes include needed clarifications on the responsibilities of affected parties, annexation issues and the process of moving from concept plan to local plans (see Findings, Exhibit D).

The Outcome

In the three years since the Oregon State Legislature passed Senate Bill 1011, this region has worked diligently and constantly on trying to make urban and rural reserves a reality. The establishment of committees, technical work, extensive outreach to the public and many various stakeholders, policy discussions and negotiations have taken a tremendous amount of time and energy on the part of many people. The number and, at times, intensity of the challenges throughout the process have been outweighed by the region's desire to put a long-term growth management strategy in place that will, hopefully, prove to be far superior to the old way of considering and bringing new urban land into the UGB.

The reserves legislation and administrative rule envisions a new way of deciding where to expand urban uses and where not to do so. The old state hierarchy of suitable land for expansion, defined to a great extent by the type of soil, is not the driving force for designation of reserves. What and where makes a great community and preservation of natural landscape features are co-equals with preserving valuable and viable farm land. The final outcome of the reserves process recognizes this new approach, and has struck a good balance among, at times, seemingly competing needs and desires. This proposed decision sets aside an adequate number of acres for future urbanization on land that meets the state factors for such uses, while preserving over 266,000 acres of land for farming, forestry and natural resource protection. So, while some good farmland, as defined by the ODA, is included within the proposed urban reserves, the percentage of such land is very small as compared to the overall land studied; and while not every part

of the natural landscape features were included in rural reserves, the adjacent urban reserve and undesignated land is situated in a way that will enable full protection of such features; and while a great deal of land that has good characteristics for urbanization was not included as urban reserve, there is enough land to accommodate the additional capacity needed beyond the existing UGB over the 50-year time frame of reserves.

In summary, the locations and final proposed urban reserve acreage of 28,615, the locations and final proposed rural reserve acreage of 266,912 and the size and location of lands that were designated as neither, create a mix that "...is a balance in the designation of urban and rural reserves that, in its entirety, best achieves livable communities, the viability and vitality of the agricultural and forest industries and protection of the important natural landscape features that define the region for its residents." [Oregon Administrative Rule 660, Section 660-027-0005(2)]

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** [identify known opposition to the proposed legislation]
Given a process and decision of this magnitude, some stakeholders will inevitably be dissatisfied with components of the final agreement. For example, the Council received testimony from One Thousand Friends of Oregon, some agricultural interests and individual property owners expressing dissatisfaction and indicating the intent to challenge the final decision.
2. **Legal Antecedents** [identify legislation related to the proposed legislation, including federal, state, or local law and Metro Code, using appropriate resolution or ordinance numbers, ballot measure numbers, etc.]
 - Senate Bill 1011 / Oregon Revised Statute 195.137 – 195.145
 - Oregon Administrative Rule 660 Section 27
3. **Anticipated Effects** [identify what is expected to occur if the legislation is adopted]
 - The legislation would create a 50-year reserve of potential urban land, providing more certainty for land owners, local governments, service providers and residents affected by UGB additions.
 - The legislation would create a 50-year reserve of rural land, protecting vital farmland, forest land and significant natural landscape features.
4. **Budget Impacts** [identify the cost to implement the legislation]
 - Metro's current growth management work program anticipates the adoption of urban and rural reserves. We expect the reserves to simplify the present growth management decision and those of future years, facilitating more efficient decision-making. If reserves are not adopted, any urban growth boundary expansions made as part of the 2010 growth management decision would need to be based on the "old rules" based on soil hierarchy, which would have a significant impact on the cost and timeline of the process.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends that the Metro Council adopt Metro Ordinance No. 10-1238, thus enacting urban and rural reserves for the entire region.

**Comparison of Coordinated Public Involvement Plan
for Urban and Rural Reserves (March 2008)
with Implemented Regional Public Involvement Processes**
Attachment 1 to Staff Report, Ordinance 10-1238A
June 1, 2010

Introduction

The following report compares the principles and activities directed by the Coordinated Public Involvement Plan¹ (CPIP) adopted by the regional Reserves Steering Committee (RSC), the Core 4, Department of Land Conservation and Development's (DLCD) Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee and county advisory committees in March and April of 2008 with the accomplishments of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and Metro.

The public involvement team (PI Team) included members from each county and Metro who worked collaboratively for two years. Team members cooperated in all regional efforts (20 open houses, three online surveys, development of presentation / printed materials and analysis / summaries of comments). Team members also implemented jurisdictionally-specific public engagement activities and shared methodologies, materials and results.

All public involvement efforts conducted throughout the process held to the intent and principles of the CPIP to provide clear and timely communications and multiple opportunities for community input. During each project phase, key efforts focused on creating and maintaining updated websites, hosting strategically located open houses, and conducting surveys. Input was compiled with summaries (and verbatim comments) provided to advisory committees, the Core 4 and the RSC.

Phase One: Informing Recommendations of Reserve Study Areas
Winter and Spring 2008

Abstract from CPIP:

Phase One will focus on providing an introduction to the urban and rural reserves process. This will include an explanation of the need for this approach, the process that will be undertaken to develop urban and rural reserves, and the outcomes that the region seeks to achieve. Public involvement events and activities during this phase will also discuss the analytical approach that will be applied in the identification of reserve study areas. These meetings will be the first of several rounds of meetings with community groups and it will be emphasized that staff and elected officials from the counties and Metro will return at different phases of the project to provide updates and seek public input that informs the study and analysis of proposed reserve areas.

Main messages will focus on:

- *The need for a new approach to managing urban growth in this region*
- *The advantages of designating urban and rural reserves*
- *A brief overview of the factors that will be considered in evaluating potential urban and rural reserves*
- *How the process of studying and designating urban and rural reserves will work*
- *The ultimate outcomes the region seeks to achieve*

Implementation

Phase 1 included the formation of advisory / coordinating committees for each county in addition to the regional Reserves Steering Committee². Advisory committee descriptions are provided in Addendum B to this report. The primary intent of public involvement activities for this phase was to solicit and summarize public comment

¹ Attached as Addendum A. Drafted in early 2008, the CPIP was reviewed and amended by LCDC's CIAC with refinements provided to and adopted by the regional Reserves Steering Committee in April, 2008.

² Attached as Addendum B, June 2, 2008 Report to Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee

on appropriate areas to be studied for potential urban and rural reserve designation; benefits/issues the community initially has with the project; and desired outcomes.

Key public involvement efforts included:

- Identified and created contact lists of stakeholder groups / organizations and interested parties
- Developed websites:
 1. Metro: www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves (site URL is updated to current name)
 2. Clackamas County: <http://www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/reserves.htm>
 3. Multnomah County: www2.co.multnomah.or.us/reserves
 4. Washington County: www.co.washington.or.us/reserves
- Developed outreach materials including:
 1. PowerPoint presentation illustrating the background (Shape of the Region studies, Senate Bill 1011, OAR factors, project timeline, intended project goals and intention to provide greater certainty)
 2. Summary publication *Shape of the Region*
 3. Project work program publication
 4. Reserves milestones graphic
 5. Counties' public involvement processes
 6. Decision-making graphic illustration
 7. Description of Reserves Steering Committee and members list
- Presentations to county planning organizations (CPOs), committees for citizen involvement (CCIs), and other key stakeholder groups (Westside Economic Alliance, Metropolitan Area Realtors Association, Washington County Farm Bureau, Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C-4), Clackamas County Economic Development Commission, Clackamas County Business Alliance, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce, Clackamas County Planning Commission, Publicized date/time/location of county advisory committee meetings and regional RSC meetings
- Provided public comment opportunities at county advisory committee and RSC meetings
- Developed media relations and provided media releases (and responded to media inquiries)

Utilization of public comments

A summary of input was provided to counties and regional advisory committees and Core 4 members. The summary included both highlights of issues/statements most often received and verbatim records of input.

Phase Two: Developing Reserve Study Areas

Summer 2008

Abstract from CPIP:

Phase Two will focus on the selection of reserve study areas for further analysis. As we continue to share information with the public on the importance of urban and rural reserves and describe the analytical approach being taken to evaluate potential reserve areas, we will outline proposed study areas on maps for review and comment by the public. These outreach activities will also include discussions on how growth may be accommodated in communities inside the existing UGB. In addition to the main messages provided in Phase One, this phase of the program will focus on addressing at least two primary questions:

- 1. Are these the areas that the Reserves Steering Committee should study and analyze further?*
- 2. What additional information should be considered in defining these study areas?*

Information received through various citizen involvement activities during this phase will inform the decisions of the Reserves Steering Committee to formally establish reserve study areas for further analysis.

Implementation

Phase 2 began with the RSC's June 9, 2008 reserves study area recommendation. All public involvement activities focused on the two identified questions above in addition to continued regional community awareness-building and expansion of partnering groups/organizations. Phase 2 public involvement activities were completed through delivery of a report to each jurisdiction's advisory committees and the RSC presentation³ on August 13, 2008.

Key public involvement activities included:

- Continued to expand contact list of stakeholders/organizations and interested parties
- Ongoing website updates
- Expanded outreach materials to include:
 1. Expanded PowerPoint presentation by adding the key questions
 2. Described on the web, in presentations and in the press, the processes each county proposed to analyze the Reserves Study Area utilizing the OAR Factors
 3. Developed, printed (5,000) and distributed "Shaping the Region for the next 50 years" four-color brochures
 4. Explained the OAR Factors for urban and rural reserves
- Presentations to CCIs, CPOs and at regional events (Tualatin Tomorrow Annual Town Hall, Washington County Fair, Clackamas River Water District, Clackamas County Coordinating Council (C-4), farmers markets, cities, hamlets)
- Created and distributed posters and press releases for open houses
- Prepared and hosted seven regional open houses (Beaverton, Forest Grove, Gresham, Tualatin, Oregon City, central Portland – Metro, and northwest Portland)
- Developed a survey used both in print (at the open houses, distributed through presentations) and online (with links on each website)
- Continued media relations development and provided article source materials, media releases
- Crafted and distributed newsletter articles and event notifications to CCIs, CPOs, Neighborhood Association Committee coordinators and expanding list of outreach partners (chambers of commerce, business, development, agricultural, environmental organizations and libraries/local businesses, special service districts, hamlets,)
- Conducted radio interview - KUIK
- Crafted and produced cable access television spot – Tualatin Valley Cable Television
- Produced and distributed postcards highlighting project websites (4000 printed and distributed through libraries, city offices and partner locations)
- Publicized date/time/location of county advisory committee meetings and regional RSC meetings
- Provided public comment opportunities at advisory committee and RSC meetings

Use of public comment

Periodic updates were provided to advisory committees throughout the process. At end of the phase, a summary of input was provided to counties and regional advisory committees and Core 4 members. The summary included both highlights of issues/statements most often received and verbatim records of input.

³ Included as Addendum C, Report to Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee, August 13, 2008

Phase Three: Analyzing Reserve Study Areas

Fall 2008 through Fall 2009

Abstract from CPIP

Phase Three, which follows the establishment of the reserve study areas by the Reserves Steering Committee in summer 2008, will be the longest and employ the most intensive analytical rigor leading to the development of preliminary recommendations for reserve designations. The analyses will apply the findings of the various elements of the Shape of the Region study and the factors to consider in the designation of urban and rural reserves as described in Oregon law and administrative rule. The analyses will incorporate information related to transportation and infrastructure needs, population and employment trends, and other inputs.

Public involvement events and activities during this phase will focus on educating the public about the application of these data and factors to the reserve study areas and will solicit citizen feedback on how the Metro Council and the boards of county commissions should weigh various factors in the designation of urban and rural reserves. Included in public outreach activities during this phase will be discussions about how additional growth can be accommodated in communities already inside the UGB. In addition to the main messages emphasized in the first two phases of this project, public involvement activities during this phase will seek input on the analysis provided by staff from Metro and the counties as well as the relative weight that should be given to different factors in the ultimate designation of urban and rural reserves.

Implementation

Phase 3 kicked off with county advisory committees' recommendations and successive RSC recommendation (September 8, 2008) for the final Reserve Study Area.

Outreach efforts focused on continuing to build project awareness and providing multiple opportunities and pathways for the community to review/understand and comment on the analysis process and the initial recommendations coming forth. Tools included county-specific and regional maps, a three-dimensional map (to provide topographical context), PowerPoint presentations, printed materials, online surveys, open houses, presentations to groups/organizations, and updated websites.

Key public involvement activities included:

- Continued expansion of contact list of stakeholders/organizations and interested parties
- Ongoing website updates
- Expanded outreach materials to include:
 1. Expanded PowerPoint presentation by adding the key questions
 2. Described on the web, in presentations and in the press, the approaches each county used in analyzing and preparing initial urban and rural reserve recommendations
 3. Developed and distributed individual county-specific four-color printed "Reserve Candidate Areas" brochures describing the Factors, how they were applied and rationale for initial recommendations
 4. Produced and distributed four-color maps indicating reserve recommendations and attributes that lead to those recommendations
 5. Posters describing "Great Communities" attributes illustrating different options of community design (24-hour community, 12-hour community, etc.)
 6. Population and employment projections for the seven-county region and Washington County specific
- Presented to CCIs, CPOs and regional events (Tualatin Tomorrow Annual Town Hall, Washington County Fair, American Association of University Women, Washington County Public Affairs Forum, Tualatin River Watershed Council, Washington County Farm Bureau, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce Forum luncheon, Washington County Managers and Supervisors quarterly meeting, North Clackamas

Chamber of Commerce, Stafford Hamlet, Hamlet of Beavercreek, Economic Development Commission, CPO Leaders, Clackamas County Planning Commission, Clackamas Stewardship Partners)

- Created and distributed posters and press releases for open houses
- Prepared and hosted seven regional open houses (Forest Grove, Gresham, Linnton, Tigard, Oregon City, central Portland – Metro, and Wilsonville)
- Developed surveys used both in print (at the open houses, distributed through presentations) and online (with links on each website) April – June 2009 and July – September 2009
- Continued media relations development and provided article source materials, media releases
- Crafted and distributed newsletter articles and event notifications to CCI, CPOs, Neighborhood Association Committee coordinators and expanding list of outreach partners (chambers of commerce, business, development, agricultural, environmental organizations and libraries/local businesses)
- Conducted radio interviews – Oregon Public Broadcasting, KEX
- Crafted and produced cable access television spot – Clackamas County Cable Television
- Produced and distributed postcards highlighting project websites and announcing upcoming public hearing (13,000 printed and distributed to unique addresses within the Reserves Study Area in Washington County plus one lot deep in existing UGB)
- Convened three Clackamas County Planning Commission public hearings (August 10, 17 and 24, 2009)
- Convened Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee public hearing (August 20, 2009 including all WCRCC advisory committee members, three Washington County commissioners and several Metro Councilors)
- Released Metro Chief Operating Officer recommendation for *Making the Greatest Place, Strategies for a Sustainable and Prosperous Region*, that included recommendations for reserves.
- Presented COO recommendation to, and solicited feedback from, over 40 stakeholder groups
- Hosted seven open houses in Hillsboro, North Portland, Beaverton, Gresham, Happy Valley, Oregon City and Metro Regional Center in Portland and convened five Metro Council public hearings.
- Created more than 100 counter-top displays with postcards and printed brochures and distributed them to farm supply stores, churches, city offices and gathering places such as cafes
- Publicized date/time/location of county advisory committee meetings, regional RSC and Core 4 meetings
- Provided public comment opportunities at advisory committee and RSC meetings

Utilization of public comment

A Phase 3 Public Comment Report⁴ was delivered to the county and regional advisory committees, Core 4 and county boards of commissioners in July 2009. The input informed ongoing discussions leading to revised final recommendations in August and September.

Phase Four: Recommending Reserve Designations

Fall and Winter 2009

Abstract from CPIP

Phase Four will seek public input on the preliminary urban and rural reserve designations recommended by the Reserves Steering Committee for adoption by the Metro Council and the boards of commissioners of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. Staff and elected officials from Metro and the three counties will continue to meet with the audiences and organizations that have been engaged in the study and designation of

⁴ Included as Addendum D, Report to county advisory committees, RSC and Core 4, July, 2009

the urban and rural reserves with the aim of illustrating how citizen input has contributed to the formation of the recommended reserve designations and seeking additional public comment to inform the decisions of the Metro Council and county commissions to designate reserve areas through intergovernmental agreements.

The questions to be addressed during this phase will focus on whether the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners should adopt the recommendations of the Reserves Steering Committee and, if amendments to the proposed reserve designations are desired, how those proposed reserve designations should be amended and why.

Implementation

Phase 4 began with the county advisory committees providing final recommendations to the RSC (October 14, 2009) for the urban and rural reserves. The RSC subsequently considered the counties' recommendations and forwarded them with suggested revisions to the Core 4 and county boards of commissioners for discussion.

Outreach efforts focused on continuing to build project awareness and providing multiple opportunities and pathways for the community to review/understand and comment on the analysis process and the recommendations. Tools included county-specific and regional maps, a three-dimensional map (to provide topographical context), PowerPoint presentations, printed materials, online surveys, open houses, presentations to groups/organizations, draft copies of the intergovernmental agreements and updated websites. During Phase 4 each county and the Metro Council convened public hearings.

Questions sought community opinion on appropriateness of the recommendations. The public was asked to express support for recommendations or suggest revisions to individual proposed areas along with rationale. Regionally a number of areas were still under consideration for urban or rural reserve consideration or neither. The public was asked for preferences regarding those undecided areas. The community also was provided draft language of the inter-governmental agreements to be signed between Metro and each county – again for review and comment.

Key public involvement activities included:

- Ongoing contact list expansion of stakeholders/organizations and interested parties lists
- Ongoing website updates
- Expanded outreach materials to include:
 1. Expanded the PowerPoint presentation by adding the key questions
 2. Described on the web, in presentations and in the press, the ongoing discussions among the RSC and Core 4 as determinations were being formed
 3. Created and distributed four-color maps showing reserve recommendations and highlighting areas remaining under discussion by the Core 4
 4. Distributed draft intergovernmental agreements and accompanying “Planning Principles” (providing additional clarification for future decision-making)
- Presentations to CCIs, CPOs, Hamlets, cities
- Created and distributed press releases for open houses
- Produced, emailed and mailed 27,000 postcards announcing upcoming open houses and Metro Council public hearings
- Prepared and hosted six regional open houses (Hillsboro, Gresham, Sherwood, Oregon City, central Portland – Metro, and Wilsonville)
- Created and hosted an online “virtual open house” experience that included regional and area-specific reference maps, an interactive map for looking up specific properties, and regional and area-specific surveys
- Hosted telephone information line with Spanish translation

- Convened four concurrent Metro Council public hearings with open houses in Gresham, Sherwood, Metro and Wilsonville
- Produced and mailed 3061 postcards to property owners announcing the Multnomah County Planning Commission August 10, 2009 public hearing.
- Held two Clackamas County Board of Commissioners public hearings (September 8 and 10, 2009)
- Held three Multnomah County Board of Commissioners public hearings (September 10 and December 10, 2009, and February 23, 2010.)
- Held two Washington County Board of Commissioners public hearings (December 8 & 15, 2009)
- Developed survey used both in print (at the open houses) and online (with links on each website) January, 2010
- Continued media relations development and provide article source materials, media releases
- Crafted and distributed newsletter articles and event notifications to CCI, CPOs, and outreach partners
- Publicized date/time/location of county advisory committee meetings, regional RSC and Core 4 meetings
- Provided public comment opportunity at advisory committee and RSC meetings
- Developed and distributed English – Spanish language announcements for open houses and public hearings

Use of public comment

A Draft Phase 4 Public Comment Report⁵ was delivered to the Core 4 February 1, 2010. Input provided public perspective on the Core 4's final recommendations including input on those areas still under discussion.

Additional Outreach Information

Public Outreach Goals

The ultimate goal would be that every community member understands this new process, provides suggestions for implementation and helps develop a durable outcome. The practical public involvement goals included:

- A multitude of communication channels to build awareness and capture feedback
- Engagement from a broad spectrum of social, political and economic interests
- Accessible avenues of information that could be updated frequently to respond to the dynamics of the process
- Reframed technical information to be understandable (or dare say enjoyable) to a mostly non-technical audience
- Decision-maker access to multiple perspectives
- A touch of levity to the process

It is always difficult to establish success-metrics. Several approaches were used including: the number of attendees at events and those taking online/printed surveys; the number of testimonies received or provided at hearings; the number of articles published in local and regional media; the success of grass-roots efforts to affect the outcome (which was determined by the affect on the final areas designated for urban or rural reserves versus grass-roots' outcome desires); the number of website hits at critical phases; and the general level of community member understanding towards the conclusion of the process.

Secondly, we were to provide decision-makers with the feedback obtained through the multitude of outreach channels. As there were multiple phases, and public input was desired at each stage, the feedback was compiled and presented in executive summaries, illustrative maps and verbatim compilations. These approaches allowed the decision makers opportunity to review in depth or in summary.

⁵ Included as Addendum E, Report to Core 4, January 2010

A third goal, although no less important, was establishing or enhancing relationships with partner organizations and the media. The jurisdictions partnered with more than 55 organizations representing interests from the development community, environmental and agricultural interests, chambers of commerce, schools and universities, city governments within the county, the farm community, neighborhood groups and Spanish-speaking leadership interests.

We provided the varied organizations with presentations, updated project information and relevant materials for their newsletters and outreach efforts. Providing channels of communications with grass-roots groups resulted in delivery of more than 750 signatures to the Washington County Board of Commissioners noting the group's preferences for a series of decisions.

Measuring Success

Measuring the success of citizen participation is difficult and the metrics used provide only a glimpse of the outcome. That being said, the following are some of the quantifiable outcomes of this process:

- More than 1800 community members attended 21 regional open houses
- More than 2000 finished surveys were received
- More than 350 people provided testimony in public hearings in Washington County, approximately 350 in Multnomah County and
- Local and regional newspapers published more than 200 articles, including dozens on the front page
- More than 1850 emails, letter and faxes were received in Washington County, approximately 1600 in Multnomah County
- More than 11,000 hits were recorded on the Metro website during the January 11-22, 2010 comment period

Grass-roots level efforts resulted in changing more than 1800 acres of proposed urban reserves to rural reserves in Washington County, protecting the agricultural lands and forests for the next 50 years. Regarding community understanding, there is no clear metric; however the questions being posed and the level of detail provided to the media indicates the public increasingly understood the trade-offs and policy-direction assumptions. During the last open house there was almost equal input in support for and in opposition to proposed designations, up from 90% plus opposition in the early phases.

Addendum A

Coordinated Public Involvement Plan Urban and Rural Reserves March 2008

This public involvement plan is the product of a coordinated effort of the staffs of Metro and of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties to incorporate citizen involvement into the study and designation of urban and rural reserves. Metro and the counties are implementing a reserves study and designation process that involves the clear communication of information and timely opportunities for meaningful involvement by local and state governments, interested organizations, and members of the public.

This plan is designed to illustrate the types of public involvement activities, messages and communications methods that will be utilized at different phases of this effort. It does not provide an exhaustive list of meetings and activities that will be scheduled, target audiences that will be engaged, or messages that will be employed. Staff from Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties will be working closely throughout this effort to coordinate public involvement activities and will keep the Reserves Steering Committee, the Metro Council, the boards of commissioners of the three counties, the respective Metro and county citizen involvement committees, and other policy advisory committees informed of and engaged with the implementation of various citizen involvement activities throughout the different phases of the urban and rural reserves effort.

This plan incorporates the requirements of Oregon law and administrative rules governing citizen involvement in land use planning decisions. This plan reflects comments and feedback received from the Metro Council, Core 4 members, the respective citizen involvement committees of Metro and the three counties, and other county-level advisory committees, as well as the Reserves Steering Committee. The Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) has also reviewed this plan as required by administrative rule.

Background Information on Urban and Rural Reserves

Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties are leading a regional effort to help determine the shape of this region over the next 40 to 50 years. Urban and rural reserves are intended to provide greater predictability for the region as to where future growth may take place both inside and outside the current urban growth boundary (UGB) over the next 40 to 50 years, while protecting important farmland and natural areas from urbanization for that same period of time. The process for designating these reserves offers the region greater flexibility in determining which areas are more suitable for accommodating growth than others.

The longstanding system for managing the region's UGB has produced less than desirable, and often impractical, urban development patterns. This system has also failed to provide long-term protection for the region's most productive agricultural lands or for important natural landscape features, and it leaves out any consideration of the types of communities the region seeks to create when the UGB is expanded. This approach, which requires Metro to start from scratch every five years, has led to conflict, uncertainty, and frustration for local governments, farmers, businesses, and landowners.

In 2007 the Oregon Legislature approved Senate Bill 1011. This bill enables Metro and the counties of the region to establish urban reserves—areas outside the UGB that, based on a number of factors, may be better suited to accommodate population and job growth over 40 to 50 years—as well as rural reserves, which are areas outside the UGB needed to protect valuable farm and forestland for a similar period. The

establishment of urban and rural reserves is intended to provide greater predictability for local governments and landowners for where future growth may be accommodated and where it will not be accommodated. The process of studying and designating urban and rural reserves is also designed to provide greater flexibility in considering multiple factors for determining which areas are suitable for future urbanization and which areas should be set aside to enhance the agricultural economy and protect natural areas.

Urban and Rural Reserves Study and Designation Process

A Reserves Steering Committee has been convened to oversee the study of urban and rural reserve areas and to make recommendations to the boards of commissioners of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and the Metro Council on the final designation of reserve areas. The Reserves Steering Committee is co-led by one Metro Councilor and one commissioner from each of the three counties (the “Core 4”). All decisions by the Reserves Steering Committee with regard to the establishment of study areas and recommendations of reserve designations must be made by a unanimous vote of the Core 4. The Core 4 members are:

- Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington
- Clackamas County Commissioner Martha Schrader
- Multnomah County Commissioner Jeff Cogen
- Washington County Chair Tom Brian

The Steering Committee also has seats for representatives from the two largest cities in each county, as well as one seat for each county representing the smaller cities of that county. One representative is designated to represent the neighboring cities outside Metro’s urban growth boundary. In addition, the Steering Committee includes representatives of the business community, the agricultural community, the natural resources community, social and economic equity organizations, and state agencies. A full list of Reserves Steering Committee members is included as “Attachment A” to this coordinated public involvement plan.

The Reserves Steering Committee is scheduled to meet monthly throughout 2008 and will continue to meet into 2009 when it will submit recommendations to the Metro Council and the county commissions on the designations of urban and rural reserves. Urban and rural reserve recommendations will be made through agreements between the Metro Council and the county commission in whose jurisdiction a reserve area is located. Following the signing of the intergovernmental agreements recommending reserve areas in summer 2009, the Metro Council will adopt the designation of urban reserves through amendments to the Regional Framework Plan, and the county commissions will adopt the designation of rural reserves through amendments to their comprehensive land use plans. The amendments to both the Regional Framework Plan and the county comprehensive land use plans will be submitted to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development for review and acknowledgement in late 2009.

A chart illustrating the process and key milestones for designating urban and rural reserves is included as “Attachment B” to this coordinated public involvement plan. This public involvement plan is organized around four important phases of this work, culminating in intergovernmental agreements between Metro and the counties in summer 2009. Public meetings and outreach efforts are part of every phase of this project.

Following the signing of the intergovernmental agreements, the Metro Council and county commissions will conduct public hearings and other public outreach required by Oregon law and administrative rules

prior to the formal designation of the reserve areas in the Regional Framework Plan and county comprehensive land use plans.

Principles of Public Involvement

The following principles will apply to all public involvement activities:

1. As the designation of urban and rural reserves are linked, public outreach and citizen engagement events should be coordinated by Metro and the counties and should discuss both urban and rural reserves.
2. At major public open houses or other events designed for broad participation, both the affected county and Metro staff should coordinate and carry out the activity. It is the goal to involve elected officials from the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners in as many activities as schedules will permit.
3. The effort of designating urban and rural reserves should be framed in aspirational terms: this is about shaping what this region will look like over the next 40 to 50 years. This will focus on protecting rural and natural areas that we treasure while determining which areas may be better suited to accommodate population and employment growth that will provide for a healthy economy.
4. Each public involvement activity related to the study of potential reserve areas should begin with a brief presentation of the need for a new approach to managing urban growth in this region, the advantages of designating urban and rural reserves, and information on the findings of the Shape of the Region Study and how those findings are applied to this work. These activities, at different phases of this work, will also feature study questions that will assist the Reserves Steering Committee in developing its recommendations.
5. Metro and the counties will seek to solicit public input through electronic means. Any public feedback solicited online or through other media should address the same study questions asked at public forums and other in-person meetings.
6. Public comments received by Metro and by the counties on matters related to urban and rural reserves will be recorded and responses published in a manner that supports the single, coordinated set of findings required by LCDC's Reserves Rule (OAR 660 Division 27).
7. Attendees at public meetings and forums who submit their names and contact information for the public record will be kept informed through written communications of the progress of the urban and rural reserve study and designation process.
8. Metro and each county may carry out their own processes for informing proposals on urban and rural reserves. Public involvement activities related to these processes are included in this coordinated public involvement plan. Input received through these processes will ultimately come to the Reserves Steering Committee to inform its recommendations on urban and rural reserve designations.

Phase One: Informing Recommendations of Reserve Study Areas

Winter and Spring 2008

Phase One will focus on providing an introduction to the urban and rural reserves process. This will include an explanation of the need for this approach, the process that will be undertaken to develop urban and rural reserves, and the outcomes that the region seeks to achieve. Public involvement events and activities during this phase will also discuss the analytical approach that will be applied in the identification of reserve study areas. These meetings will be the first of several rounds of meetings with community groups and it will be emphasized that staff and elected officials from the counties and Metro will return at different phases of the project to provide updates and seek public input that informs the study and analysis of proposed reserve areas.

Main messages will focus on:

- The need for a new approach to managing urban growth in this region
- The advantages of designating urban and rural reserves
- A brief overview of the factors that will be considered in evaluating potential urban and rural reserves
- How the process of studying and designating urban and rural reserves will work
- The ultimate outcomes the region seeks to achieve

Primary audiences and events will include:

- **Citizen organization meetings⁶:** Staff from Metro and the counties will attend regularly scheduled citizen organization meetings in selected areas to provide introductory information on urban and rural reserves and to hear concerns, ideas and other feedback for informing the process of developing urban and rural reserve study areas.
- **Citizen involvement committees:** Staff and elected officials from Metro and the counties will meet with their respective citizen involvement committees to describe plans and goals for soliciting and incorporating citizen involvement into the study and designation of urban and rural reserves. Ideas for enhancing citizen involvement throughout this effort will also be sought.
- **County Coordination and Policy Advisory Committees:** The counties will staff and facilitate their respective advisory committees to develop recommendations specific to the county. In addition, Metro staff and elected officials will brief the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) on the details of this citizen involvement plan and on the work of the Reserves Steering Committee.

Materials will include:

- A PowerPoint presentation that briefly explains, at a minimum:
 - Why urban and rural reserves are needed
 - The Shape of the Region study and how it informs the reserves study and designation process
 - The timeline for studying and designating urban and rural reserves
 - What the region hopes to achieve through this process
- A brochure that briefly describes the urban and rural reserves program and timeline
- A description of the county's public involvement process (if applicable)
- Summaries of the three components of the Shape of the Region Study
- A description of Reserves Steering Committee: who its members are and how it operates
- A timeline of events and decision points (Reserves Milestones Chart)
- Web sites maintained by Metro (www.metro-region.org/reserves) and the counties (specific Web addresses to be determined) that describe the need for urban and rural reserves and the process for studying and designating reserve areas

Maps that are utilized during this phase will illustrate the broader region outside of the Metro UGB that is being considered for study for potential reserve areas, both urban and rural. These maps will not identify areas as likely to be included in either rural or urban reserves. During this phase Metro and the counties will be gathering initial input from the public on issues and concerns regarding which areas should be studied for further analysis. There are no preconceptions as to which areas will be studied as potential urban reserves or rural reserves.

⁶ For purposes of this coordinated public involvement plan, the term "citizen organization" refers to citizen participation organizations (Washington County); community planning organizations, hamlets and villages (Clackamas County), and recognized neighborhood associations (in all three counties).

At the conclusion of Phase One, public comment will have informed the staff of Metro and the counties in the development of their preliminary recommendations to the Reserves Steering Committee on identifying reserve study areas for further analysis.

Phase Two: Developing Reserve Study Areas

Summer 2008

Phase Two will focus on the selection of reserve study areas for further analysis. As we continue to share information with the public on the importance of urban and rural reserves and describe the analytical approach being taken to evaluate potential reserve areas, we will outline proposed study areas on maps for review and comment by the public. These outreach activities will also include discussions on how growth may be accommodated in communities inside the existing UGB. In addition to the main messages provided in Phase One, this phase of the program will focus on addressing at least two primary questions:

3. Are these the areas that the Reserves Steering Committee should study and analyze further?
4. What additional information should be considered in defining these study areas?

Information received through various citizen involvement activities during this phase will inform the decisions of the Reserves Steering Committee to formally establish reserve study areas for further analysis.

Primary audiences and events will include:

- **Public open houses:** Metro and the counties will jointly sponsor and publicize public open houses during this period to describe the purpose of urban and rural reserves and illustrate potential study areas. These open houses will solicit public input on the scope of the reserve study areas and related considerations. Consistent messages and questionnaires will be used at all open houses.
- **Citizen organization meetings:** Staff and/or elected officials from Metro and the counties will attend citizen organization meetings in selected areas to illustrate potential study areas and solicit feedback on the scope of the proposed study areas and the factors to consider in evaluating those study areas.
- **County coordinating committee meetings:** Staff and/or elected officials from the counties and Metro will meet with coordinating committees in each of the three counties to describe the recommended study areas and solicit feedback on the scope of the proposed study areas and the factors to consider in evaluating those study areas.
- **Other stakeholder meetings:** Staff from the counties and Metro will present information and collect input from a range of other stakeholder groups, including but not limited to county planning commissions, agricultural organizations, local business groups, other interest groups and affected public agencies.

Communication materials utilized during this phase will include:

- A PowerPoint presentation that briefly explains, at a minimum:
 - Why urban and rural reserves are needed
 - The Shape of the Region study and how it informs the reserves study and designation process
 - The timeline for studying and designating urban and rural reserves
 - What the region hopes to achieve through this process
 - The questions to be addressed at this phase of the project
- Brochure that briefly describes the urban and rural reserves program and timeline
- Maps of potential study areas

- Summaries of the three components of the Shape of the Region Study
- A description of the processes being utilized by the county and Metro for gathering input on potential urban and rural reserves
- A description of Reserves Steering Committee: who its members are and how it operates
- Timeline of events and decision points (Reserves Milestones Chart)
- Written articles for publication in neighborhood and CPO newsletters, promoting attendance at open houses and describing the effort to study and designate urban and rural reserves
- Web sites maintained by Metro (www.metro-region.org/reserves) and the counties (specific Web addresses to be determined) that describe the need for urban and rural reserves and the process for studying and designating reserve areas, publicize upcoming open houses and other public forums for citizen involvement, include maps of recommended study areas, and solicit feedback from the public on the primary questions being addressed in this phase of the project
- News releases and notices in local newspapers publicizing the open houses.

At the conclusion of Phase Two, the Reserves Steering Committee will endorse study areas for further analysis.

Phase Three: Analyzing Reserve Study Areas

Fall 2008 and Winter and Spring 2009

Phase Three, which follows the establishment of the reserve study areas by the Reserves Steering Committee in summer 2008, will be the longest and employ the most intensive analytical rigor leading to the development of preliminary recommendations for reserve designations. The analyses will apply the findings of the various elements of the Shape of the Region study and the factors to consider in the designation of urban and rural reserves as described in Oregon law and administrative rule. The analyses will incorporate information related to transportation and infrastructure needs, population and employment trends, and other inputs.

Public involvement events and activities during this phase will focus on educating the public about the application of these data and factors to the reserve study areas and will solicit citizen feedback on how the Metro Council and the boards of county commissions should weigh various factors in the designation of urban and rural reserves. Included in public outreach activities during this phase will be discussions about how additional growth can be accommodated in communities already inside the UGB. In addition to the main messages emphasized in the first two phases of this project, public involvement activities during this phase will seek input on the analysis provided by staff from Metro and the counties as well as the relative weight that should be given to different factors in the ultimate designation of urban and rural reserves.

Primary audiences and events will include:

- **Public open houses:** Metro and the counties will jointly sponsor and publicize public open houses during this period to illustrate the study areas and describe the factors and findings being applied in the analyses of these study areas. These open houses, which will include the involvement of elected officials from the counties and Metro, will solicit public input on the application of the factors and additional issues and concerns to consider. Consistent messages and questionnaires will be used at all open houses.
- **County planning commissions⁷:** Staff from Metro and the counties will present information to county planning commissions describing the approach to designating urban and rural reserves,

⁷ As the counties will designate rural reserves through amendments to their comprehensive land use plans in 2009, and as staff resources are limited, the focus here is on county planning commissions. However, Metro and county

highlighting the reserves study areas, explaining the factors and analytical methodology being applied to the reserve study areas, and the effects that designating urban and rural reserves will have on growth management decisions at the local and regional level. Staff will seek input from planning commissions on the application of the factors.

- **Citizen organization meetings:** Staff from Metro and the counties will attend citizen organization meetings in selected areas to illustrate potential study areas and solicit feedback on the scope of the proposed study areas and the factors to consider in evaluating those study areas.
- **County coordinating committee meetings:** Staff and/or elected officials from the counties and Metro will meet with coordinating committees of the three counties to describe the recommended study areas and solicit feedback on the scope of the study areas and the factors to consider in evaluating those study areas.
- **Other stakeholder meetings:** Staff from the counties and Metro will present information and collect input from a range of other stakeholder groups, including those listed for Phase Two and others that are identified during the analytical work.

Materials will include:

- A PowerPoint presentation that briefly explains, at a minimum:
 - Why urban and rural reserves are needed
 - The process of establishing study areas up to this point
 - How public input received up to this point has informed the establishment of the study areas
 - The Shape of the Region study and how it informs the reserves study and designation process
 - What comes next in the process of studying urban and rural reserves
 - What the region hopes to achieve through this process
 - The questions to be addressed at this phase of the project
- Brochure that briefly describes the urban and rural reserves program and timeline
- Maps of study areas
- Summaries of the three components of the Shape of the Region Study
- A description of the processes being utilized by the county and Metro for gathering input on potential urban and rural reserves
- Technical information developed to address the factors for selection of study areas
- Timeline of events and decision points (Reserves Milestones Chart)
- Written articles for publication in neighborhood and CPO newsletters, promoting attendance at open houses and describing the effort to study and designate urban and rural reserves
- Web sites maintained by Metro (www.metro-region.org/reserves) and the counties (specific Web addresses to be determined) that describe the need for urban and rural reserves and the process for studying and designating reserve areas, publicize upcoming open houses and other public forums for citizen involvement, include maps of study areas, and solicit feedback from the public on the primary questions being addressed in this phase of the project
- News releases and notices in local newspapers publicizing the open houses.

At the conclusion of Phase Three, the Core 4 members of the Reserves Steering Committee will, by unanimous vote, formally recommend the designations of specific urban and rural reserves to the Metro Council and boards of county commissioners for their adoption through intergovernmental agreements.

staff will provide information to city planning staffs for their use to inform city decision makers and citizen organizations.

Phase Four: Recommending Reserve Designations Spring and Summer 2009

Phase Four will seek public input on the preliminary urban and rural reserve designations recommended by the Reserves Steering Committee for adoption by the Metro Council and the boards of commissioners of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. Staff and elected officials from Metro and the three counties will continue to meet with the audiences and organizations that have been engaged in the study and designation of the urban and rural reserves with the aim of illustrating how citizen input has contributed to the formation of the recommended reserve designations and seeking additional public comment to inform the decisions of the Metro Council and county commissions to designate reserve areas through intergovernmental agreements.

The questions to be addressed during this phase will focus on whether the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners should adopt the recommendations of the Reserves Steering Committee and, if amendments to the proposed reserve designations are desired, how those proposed reserve designations should be amended and why.

Primary audiences and events will include:

- **Public open houses:** Metro and the counties will jointly sponsor and publicize public open houses (at least two per county) during this period to illustrate the recommended reserve designations. These open houses, which will include the involvement of elected officials from the counties and Metro, will solicit public input on factors for the Metro Council and the county commissions to consider when determining urban and rural reserve designations.
- **Public hearings:** In addition to public open houses, public hearings will be held by the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners to receive public comment on the recommendations for reserve designations made by the Reserves Steering Committee and to provide feedback on the draft intergovernmental agreements to be negotiated between the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners.
- **County planning commissions:** Staff from Metro and the counties will present information to county planning commissions describing the recommended reserve designations and the factors and other considerations that contributed to those recommendations. Staff will also discuss the steps following the adoption of intergovernmental agreements designating the reserve areas, including the amendments to comprehensive plans and the Regional Framework Plan, and the roles and responsibilities of planning commissions relating to the zoning and planning of reserve areas.
- **Citizen organization meetings:** Staff from Metro and the counties will attend selected citizen organization meetings to illustrate the recommended reserve designations and solicit public feedback to present to the Metro Council and the county commissions prior to adoption of the intergovernmental agreements. The focus of this outreach effort will be on those citizen organizations serving areas in or nearest to the recommended areas for reserve designations.
- **County coordinating committee meetings:** Staff and/or elected officials from the counties and Metro will meet with coordinating committees from each of the three counties to describe the recommended reserve designations and solicit public feedback to present to the Metro Council and the county commissions prior to adoption of the intergovernmental agreements.

Materials will include:

- A PowerPoint presentation that briefly explains, at a minimum:
 - Why urban and rural reserves are needed
 - The process of establishing recommended reserve designations up to this point

- What was learned in applying the technical analyses and public input to the study areas, and how they inform the recommended reserve designations
- The next steps to be undertaken by the Metro Council and the county commissions
- What the region hopes to achieve through this process
- The questions to be addressed at this phase of the project
- Maps of recommended reserve designations
- A description of the processes being utilized by the county and Metro for gathering input on potential urban and rural reserves
- Technical information developed to address the factors for selection of study areas
- Written articles for publication in neighborhood and CPO newsletters, promoting attendance at open houses and describing the effort to study and designate urban and rural reserves
- Web sites maintained by Metro (www.metro-region.org/reserves) and the counties (specific Web addresses to be determined) that describe the need for urban and rural reserves and the process for studying and designating reserve areas, publicize upcoming open houses and other public forums for citizen involvement, include maps of study areas, and solicit feedback from the public on the primary questions being addressed in this phase of the project
- News releases and notices in local newspapers publicizing the open houses and public hearings.

At the conclusion of Phase Four, after receiving public comment through a variety of activities and events, the Metro Council and the boards of county commissioners will adopt intergovernmental agreements recommending the designations of urban and rural reserves. The formal designations of the reserve areas will take place in Phase Five, when the Metro Council will amend the Regional Framework Plan to designate urban reserves and the counties will amend their comprehensive plans to designate rural reserves. The amendments to these plans will be subject to review and acknowledgement by LCDC.

Phase Five: Formal Designations of Urban and Rural Reserves

Summer and Fall 2009

Phase Five will deal with the amendment of the Regional Framework Plan to designate urban reserves and the amendments to the comprehensive land use plans of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties to designate rural reserves. Specific public involvement activities related to these amendments will be planned in 2009 prior to the adoption of the intergovernmental agreements described in Phase Four of this coordinated public involvement plan. These activities will be conducted in accordance with requirements for public involvement established in Oregon law, Goal 1 of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals and Objectives, and other applicable administrative rules.

Attachment A**Reserves Steering Committee Members**

as of March 14, 2008

Core 4

Metro Council	Kathryn Harrington
Clackamas County	Martha Schrader
Multnomah County	Jeff Cogen
Washington County	Tom Brian

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
Portland	Gil Kelley	Bob Clay
Beaverton	Rob Drake	
Gresham	Shane Bemis	
Hillsboro	Tom Hughes	Aron Carleson
Lake Oswego	Judie Hammerstad	Donna Jordan
Oregon City	Alice Norris	Doug Neeley
Other cities – Clackamas County	Charlotte Lehan, Wilsonville mayor	Norm King, West Linn mayor
Other cities – Multnomah County	David Fuller, Wood Village mayor	Julie Odell, Wood Village
Other cities – Washington County	Chris Barhyte, Tualatin city councilor	Richard Kidd, Forest Grove mayor
Neighbor cities	Bob Austin, Estacada mayor	Kathy Figley, Woodburn mayor
<u>Non-governmental stakeholders</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
Business	Greg Manning	
Construction/Real Estate	Greg Specht	Bob LeFeber
Urban Development	Craig Brown	Drake Butsch
Agriculture	Jeff Stone	Shawn Cleave
Natural Resources	Mike Houck	Jim Labbe
Land Use	Mary Kyle McCurdy	
Social/Economic Equity	Sue Marshall	Ron Carley
<u>State Agencies – serving in coordination roles</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
Department of Land Conservation and Development	Richard Whitman	Bob Rindy
Department of Transportation	Lainie Smith	Lidwien Rahman
Department of Forestry	David Morman	Doug Decker
Economic and Community Development Department	Karen Goddin	John Rakowitz
Water Resources Department	Bill Ferber	
Department of State Lands	Kirk Jarvie	Peter Ryan
Department of Environmental Quality	Keith Johnson	
Department of Agriculture	Katy Coba	Jim Johnson
Department of Fish and Wildlife	Jeff Boechler	Susan Barnes

June 2, 2008
Report on Activities in Phase 1 of the Reserves Work Program
And Coordinated Public Involvement Plan

MEMORANDUM



DATE: June 2, 2008

TO: Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Metro
Commissioner Martha Schrader, Clackamas County
Commissioner Jeff Cogen, Multnomah County
Chair Tom Brian, Washington County
Reserve Steering Committee Members

FROM: Reserves Core 4 Technical and Public Involvement Staff

SUBJECT: Report on activities in Phase 1 of the Reserves Work Program and Coordinated Public Involvement Plan

Summary

The Reserves work program is divided into five phases. Each phase is accompanied by a key milestone which, when accomplished, signals transition into a new focus of activities. This report is intended to summarize Phase 1 activities and document the completion of the Phase 1 key milestone: "Agreement on analytical approach and the public involvement process." As noted on the "Coordinated Work Program Overview" document, Phase 1 activities include:

- Establish Reserves Steering Committee
- Create Coordinated Public Involvement Plan
- Establish County coordinating Committees
- Develop analytical approach

This memo summarizes activities related to each of these items and includes a summary of public comments gathered to this point. This memo is for informational purposes only; no formal decision is required.

Establish Reserves Steering Committee

To assist with the study and development of urban and rural reserves, a Reserves Steering Committee has been formed, consisting of officials from local cities, counties and Metro, as well as representatives of various business sectors, the agricultural community, the environmental conservation community, and social and economic equity organizations.

As urban and rural reserves will be formally designated through agreements between the Metro Council and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, the representatives of the Metro Council and the

three counties are the only voting members of the Reserves Steering Committee. These four representatives, who co-chair the Reserves Steering Committee, are:

- [Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington](#)
- [Clackamas County Commissioner Martha Schrader](#)
- [Multnomah County Commissioner Jeff Cogen](#)
- [Washington County Chair Tom Brian](#)

The steering committee also has seats for representatives from the two largest cities in each county, as well as one seat apiece representing the smaller cities of each county. There is also one representative for the neighboring cities outside Metro's urban growth boundary. The city representatives are:

- **Portland:** Gil Kelley, Planning Director (Bob Clay, Chief Planner, alternate)
- **Gresham:** Shane Bemis, Mayor
- **Beaverton:** Rob Drake, Mayor
- **Hillsboro:** Tom Hughes, Mayor (Aron Carleson, Councilor, alternate)
- **Lake Oswego:** Judie Hammerstad, Mayor (Donna Jordan, Councilor, alternate)
- **Oregon City:** Alice Norris, Mayor (Doug Neeley, Commissioner, alternate)
- **Clackamas County's other cities:** Charlotte Lehan, Wilsonville Mayor (Norm King, West Linn Mayor, alternate)
- **Multnomah County's other cities:** David Fuller, Wood Village Mayor (Julie Odell, Wood Village staff, alternate)
- **Washington County's other cities:** Chris Barhyte, Tualatin City Councilor (Richard Kidd, Forest Grove Mayor, alternate)
- **Neighboring cities:** Bob Austin, Estacada Mayor (Kathy Figley, Woodburn Mayor, alternate)

In addition, the representatives of various non-governmental stakeholder groups include:

- **Business:** Greg Manning, First Horizon Construction Lending
- **Construction/Real Estate:** Greg Specht, Specht Development, Inc. (Bob LeFeber, Commercial Realty Advisors, LLC, alternate)
- **Urban Development:** Craig Brown, Matrix Development (Drake Butsch, First American Title Insurance Co., alternate)
- **Agriculture:** Jeff Stone, Oregon Association of Nurseries (Shawn Cleave, Oregon Farm Bureau, alternate)
- **Natural Resources:** Mike Houck, Urban Greenspaces Institute (Jim Labbe, Audubon Society of Portland, alternate)
- **Land Use:** Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon
- **Social and Economic Equity:** Sue Marshall, Coalition for a Livable Future (Ron Carley, Coalition for a Livable Future, alternate)

State agencies are also working closely with the Reserves Steering Committee to provide policy and technical expertise. These agencies and their representatives are:

- **Department of Land Conservation and Development:** Richard Whitman (Bob Rindy, alternate)
- **Department of Transportation:** Lainie Smith (Lidwien Rahman, alternate)
- **Department of Agriculture:** Katy Coba (Jim Johnson, alternate)
- **Department of Forestry:** David Morman (Doug Decker, alternate)
- **Economic and Community Development Department:** Karen Goddin
- **Water Resources Department:** Bill Ferber (Sabrina White-Scarver, alternate)
- **Department of State Lands:** Kirk Jarvie (Peter Ryan, alternate)

- **Department of Environmental Quality:** Keith Johnson
- **Department of Fish and Wildlife:** Jeff Boechler (Susan Barnes, alternate)

The Reserves Steering Committee meets once each month and has met four times to date. All meetings of the Reserves Steering Committee are open to the public and held at [Metro Regional Center](#), located at 600 NE Grand Avenue in Portland. More information regarding schedules and meeting materials is available on Metro’s web site.

Create Coordinated Public Involvement Plan

DLCD’s administrative rules on reserves and the reserves work program call for the creation of a Coordinated Public Involvement Plan (PIP) to illustrate the types of public involvement activities, messages and communications methods that will be utilized at different phases of the reserves program. This document was developed jointly by Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties and Metro as part of Phase 1 activities. The plan incorporates the requirements of Oregon law and administrative rules governing citizen involvement in land use planning decisions. The PIP also reflects comments and feedback received from the Metro Council, Core 4 members, the respective citizen involvement committees of Metro and the three counties, and other county-level advisory committees, as well as the Reserves Steering Committee. The Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) also reviewed and endorsed the plan as required by administrative rule.

The Coordinated Public Involvement Plan does not provide an exhaustive list of meetings and activities that will be scheduled, target audiences that will be engaged, or messages that will be employed. Staff from Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties will be working closely throughout the reserves effort to coordinate public involvement activities and will keep the Reserves Steering Committee, the Metro Council, the boards of commissioners of the three counties, the respective Metro and county citizen involvement committees, and other policy advisory committees informed of and engaged with the implementation of various citizen involvement activities throughout the different phases.

Establish County Coordinating Committees/conduct Phase 1 outreach

This section summarize the public involvement activities and outcomes of those activities for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties and Metro for Phase 1 of the Coordinated Public Involvement Plan.

Phase 1 of the PIP was designed to focus on the need for urban and rural reserves and introduce members of the public to the process. It was intended to be completed in the winter and spring of 2008. The messages associated with this phase are relevant and necessary to inform the Phase II work, therefore the outreach will continue through the summer of 2008. The PIP says (text in italics is quoted):

Phase One will focus on providing an introduction to the urban and rural reserves process. This will include an explanation of the need for this approach, the process that will be undertaken to develop urban and rural reserves, and the outcomes that the region seeks to achieve. Public involvement events and activities during this phase will also discuss the analytical approach that will be applied in the identification of reserve study areas. These meetings will be the first of several rounds of meetings with community groups and it will be emphasized that staff and elected officials from the counties and Metro will return at different phases of the project to provide updates and seek public input that informs the study and analysis of proposed reserve areas.

Main messages will focus on:

- *The need for a new approach to managing urban growth in this region*
- *The advantages of designating urban and rural reserves*

- *A brief overview of the factors that will be considered in evaluating potential urban and rural reserves*
- *How the process of studying and designating urban and rural reserves will work*
- *The ultimate outcomes the region seeks to achieve*

The plan identified primary audiences and events:

- Citizen Organizations
- Citizen involvement committees
- County Coordination and Policy Advisory Committees

The plan lists a series of materials that were to be developed cooperatively by the four jurisdictions and used in public outreach processes. The materials used extensively during Phase 1 public involvement activities are contained in the attachments to this document.

Public Involvement Activities

Each jurisdiction responded to their community needs and priorities in their activities for Phase 1 public involvement. To disseminate information broadly, each jurisdiction created a website that is linked to each of the others. These are:

- Metro website: www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves
- Clackamas County website: www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/urban.htm
- Multnomah County website: www2.co.multnomah.or.us/reserves.
- Washington County website: www.co.washington.or.us/reserves

More details on each county's public involvement activities are discussed below.

Clackamas County

Clackamas County worked extensively with citizen organizations, the county citizen involvement office and city coordination groups, and developed a Policy Advisory Committee for the process. Contacts with several of these groups actually began before 2008, but work began in earnest early in the calendar year.

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4) is a group of city and county elected officials who meet to coordinate a wide range of issues. This group requested several updates about the Reserves process prior to the beginning of the Phase One work, and was part of the discussions that led to development of the regional process and the county coordination process. This group recommended seven members to the county's Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) to represent the cities.

Clackamas Community Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) is a group of residents who coordinate the county's extensive Citizen Planning Organizations (CPO), Hamlets and Villages. This group and the CCI staff worked together to recommend seven members to the PAC to represent CPOs and Hamlets. CCI's monthly meetings are attended by project staff, and they are regularly updated on the Reserves process.

County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for Urban and Rural Reserves is a committee appointed by the county commissioners to advise the commissioners on selection of urban and rural reserves. This group has 21 members – seven from cities, seven from CPOs/Hamlets, and seven representing agriculture, homebuilders, forestry and other stakeholders. This group met for the first time on April 22nd. The PAC roster is included in the appendix.

Citizen Planning Organizations and Hamlets – Project staff for Clackamas County emailed the 18 CPOs and Hamlets most likely to be impacted by Urban or Rural Reserves and encouraged them to invite staff to come to one of their meetings to discuss and answer questions about urban and rural

reserves. To date, 10 CPOs and Hamlets have requested a presentation. Many of these presentations will occur in May or June. If appropriate, staff will include information from Phase Two of the PIP in the later presentations. Attachment 4 lists the CPO visits and summarizes the outcomes.

Multnomah County

Multnomah County's efforts in phase 1 focused on the formation of their Citizens Advisory Committee and conducting targeted outreach as described below.

Citizens Advisory Committee for Urban and Rural Reserves is made up of 19 volunteer community members appointed by the Multnomah County Board of County Commissioners to a land use committee to advise the commissioners on selection of urban and rural reserves. Meetings will be held monthly at the County's Multnomah Building in Portland. The first meeting was held May 1. The membership roster is included as an attachment to this report.

CPOs – Project staff for Multnomah County have begun meeting with community planning organizations to discuss urban and rural reserves. These meetings will continue throughout the reserves effort.

Washington County

Washington County placed emphasis along several tracks to develop outreach and provide avenues for input. One track created a county-wide forum for discussion (Washington County Urban and Rural Reserves Coordinating Committee) which will consider the potential effects of reserves designations. Another track identified and developed partnerships with county-wide organizations and agencies to outreach to their individual constituencies, to provide up-to-date information and solicit input. A third track is developing a key stakeholders group to discuss the designation process and provide input at periodic milestones.

Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee

Washington County worked extensively in Phase I establishing and informing the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee (RCC). The RCC was created to provide a forum for cooperative participation between and among the County, its cities and service providers regarding urban and rural reserves designations within the county. The committee's primary function is to review policy related issues and develop consensus-based recommendations to the regional Reserves Steering Committee. The committee also will address other growth management issues related to the Reserves planning process, including: performance-based growth management, investing in our communities and the urbanization forum (provision of urban services.)

RCC members are the chief officer or designate of each member's elected governing body. The committee is chaired by the Washington County Core-4 representative (Commissioner Tom Brian) and the vice-chair position is shared among three Reserves Steering Committee members representing cities in Washington County (Mayor Rob Drake – Beaverton, Mayor Tom Hughes – Hillsboro, Councilor Chris Barhyte – Tualatin City Council.)

Member governments, agencies and special districts represented include:

- Washington County
- Cities: Banks, Beaverton, Cornelius, Durham, Forest Grove, Gaston, Hillsboro, King City, North Plains, Sherwood, Tigard, Tualatin
- Clean Water Services
- Special Districts (one position representing all other special service districts)
- Metro (two ex-officio positions for Councilors representing Washington County)

The RCC meets monthly and meetings are open to the public - all meeting agendas will include scheduled comment periods. The RCC is served by a technical advisory committee comprised of Planning Directors or designated staff. The Washington County Planning Directors group meets monthly prior to each RCC meeting - these meetings are open to the public as well.

Schedules for both the RCC and the Planning Directors meetings are available on the Washington County reserves website.

Building Outreach Partnerships

Based on the Washington County Public Involvement Plan and addendum Communications Plan, county staff is developing partnerships with organizations, interest groups and other agencies to provide affected stakeholders and interested parties current project information and multiple avenues to provide input. Partnerships have been established with more than 20 county-wide organizations representing business, agricultural, environmental and service delivery interests.

County staff, in collaboration with regional partners, is identifying broad public input opportunities through geographically diverse open houses to discuss the initial Draft Broad Urban and Rural Reserves Study Area and related project activities in mid- to late-June. That outreach effort is supported with special presentations to groups and organizations, news releases, up-to-date websites information and several announcement venues.

Key Stakeholder Discussions

Identified key stakeholders will be provided periodic opportunities to discuss the designation process including draft study areas, analysis criteria and process refinements.

Metro

Metro utilized existing committee structures (such as the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee, Metropolitan Technical Advisory Committee, and Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement) and attendance at various City Council and citizen organization meetings in Phase 1. Metro councilors and staff attended City Council and County Commission meetings around the region as well as CPO, neighborhood association, and stakeholder group meetings. Metro also invited neighboring cities and counties to attend two “Neighbor Cities” meetings to share information on reserves and maintain communication channels to these jurisdictions.

Phase 1 desired outcomes and comments received to date

The desired outcome of Phase 1 public involvement activities is basic education of the public and stakeholders about the urban and rural reserves project. This includes an explanation of the need for a new approach, the process that will be undertaken to develop urban and rural reserves, and the outcomes that the region seeks to achieve.

In Phase 1 Metro and the counties gathered initial input from the public on issues and concerns regarding which areas should be studied for further analysis (remembering that there are no preconceptions as to which areas will be studied as potential urban reserves or rural reserves). Public comment in Phase 1 informed the staff of Metro and the counties in the development of their preliminary recommendations to Core 4 and the Reserves Steering Committee on identifying reserve study areas for further analysis.

Comments and questions received to date are summarized below, grouped by general categories:

Amount of land needed:

- What is the minimum number of acres needed for Urban Reserves?

- What will be the impact of the recent election in Damascus on reserves? If growth can't take place in Damascus, does that mean more growth will have to take place somewhere else, e.g., Stafford?
- Does each county have to put aside a certain amount of land?
- Does the same amount of urban and rural land need to be designated in each county?
- Is there a specific amount of land that has to be designated urban and/or rural reserves? Do urban and rural reserves have to be a 50/50 match?
- How do lands outside of the 3-county Metro area fit into our land need assumptions?
- Improved technology provides increased farm harvest levels. How much agricultural lands are needed to support anticipated growth in the region?
- How does the question of *where people want to live* versus where this process identifies they *should* live be addressed?

Technical /project methodology:

- Combine transportation information with reserves information – roads and other transportation infrastructure make a big difference for urban and rural areas. For example, use map overlays that show the impact of transportation needs on the area.
- Where we can see the maps that go with the Shape of the Region study?
- The maps the study is based on should reflect topographic and wetland information – otherwise people can't really see what the land is like and what it can be used for. Someone should drive by and look at areas before they designate them urban reserves.
- What is the definition of urban density (e.g., how many houses/acre)? Look at density as well as population.
- How accurate were past population projections? The perception is the projections are always wrong.
- What are the assumptions behind the projection that the metro area population will grow by one million by 2030? Don't just look at population trend lines; look at what the region wants. If the projection is wrong, major land use decisions will have been made based on erroneous information.
- How will the factors apply? How flexible are they?

Urban Design:

- People want open, rural land near where they live, like Central Park in New York City. Rural reserves add value to the nearby urban reserves, and shouldn't be so far away that urban people can't easily enjoy them.
- How will plans for sustainable living (areas kind of “in between” urban and rural) fit into the reserves?
- Very concerned about density impacts in existing urban areas
- How will the big look affect this study?
- Try to account for and acknowledge areas in Clackamas County (CPOs, Villages, Hamlets) that are doing their own visioning processes.

Consequences of designations:

- If your property is designated a rural reserve, will there be any change in land use regulations?
- If your property is designated an urban reserve, you will eventually be urbanized, but will there be any changes in land use regulations right now? Will a designation of “urban reserve” carry any additional restrictions?
- What are the consequences if your property remains undesignated?

- What happens to lands not designated as either urban or rural reserves? Might they be pressured to develop in 20 years or so if the urban reserves are used up?
- Will the current law limiting land divisions within one mile of the UGB go away?
- How will individual property owners be affected by having their property being in an urban reserve or in a rural reserve?
- The combination of designations + population/employment forecasts = speculation. How can a “land rush” of speculative buying be addressed to minimize the rapid valuation disparity of neighboring properties when one falls within an urban reserve vs. the adjoining property outside that designation?
- How can the near-term effects of possible reduced property value and homeowner equity be addressed when large tracts of land are designated urban reserves and brought inside the UGB?

How this project relates with neighboring/“outlying” cities:

- If we have land inside the city of Sandy’s Urban Reserve Area, are we part of the process?
- What is the relationship between this project and any decision by the City of Molalla to establish Urban Reserves or expand the City’s UGB?
- What happens to Canby and other cities that are outside Metro but within the 5-mile buffer?
- Concern about areas and cities not represented on the Clackamas County PAC, especially Sandy
- Is there any consideration for mergers of cities to increase efficiency of service delivery and reduce redundancies?

Public involvement:

- When you talk about this issue with the public, use lots of maps.
- How will we know about public input opportunities?
- What’s the point of public hearings scheduled at the end of the process, after the decisions have been essentially made?
- Provide info on the website.
- When you send out written notice, make sure the print is big, easy to read
- What’s the difference between adopting IGAs and approving recommendations? Perhaps the Planning Commission could do the first step and BCC do the second?
- What’s the role of the Planning Commission in the process?
- What’s the relationship between the Clackamas County PAC, the Reserves Committee and Core 4?

Impact of individual and neighborhood preferences:

- Mulino sent a letter to the Clackamas County BCC asking that the entire hamlet be designated as a rural reserve. They know it’s a little early in the process to get a response.
- Should our hamlet do what Mulino did (and ask the Clackamas County BCC to be designated as a rural reserve)?
- What if we don’t want to be designated as either an urban or rural reserve?
- Will areas that want to be designated as an urban or rural reserve have any say?

Decision-making / process:

- What if the Core 4 members don’t agree and/or if the deadline isn’t met?
- How much power will Metro have in this process?
- Since the BCC gets the final vote on rural reserves, could that be different than what is agreed to with Metro?
- Are there any indications that this law/process will be challenged?
- If reserves are set for next 40-50 years, when during that time will they be reviewed?
- How will reserves be implemented? How will reserves be protected?

- What's the relationship between reserves and Measure 49? Will Measure 49 apply in Urban Reserve areas?

People/groups selected to make the recommendations/decisions:

- If part of the purpose is to provide consistency for agriculture, then why are representatives of all these other interests (landscape, recreation, cities, CPOs) making the decision? There is never any shortage of people willing to speak for farmers.
- How do we make sure rural people are really heard?
- It looks like all the power is in just four people – this is just a way to cut individuals and voting out of the process.
- Industrial land interests are inadequately represented on Clackamas County's PAC.
- Agricultural interests are inadequately represented throughout the process
- Forestry interests are inadequately represented throughout the process

Develop Analytical Approach

The final task scheduled for Phase 1 was the development of an overall approach to developing reserve areas. This work was completed by development and review of a "Coordinated Reserves Work Program Overview" document, which outlined the proposed approach and timelines for the Reserves project. The Reserves Steering Committee has discussed the work program overview and approach at several meetings. Generally stated, the process includes the development of Reserves Study Areas in Phase 2 of the work program, with the main technical analysis occurring in Phase 3. The factors established under administrative rule will be utilized broadly in Phase 2 and with increasing refinement in Phase 3. More detailed information on the technical analysis process will be presented at Reserves Steering Committee meetings in July and August 2008.

DOCUMENTS REFERENCED

A number of attachments are referred to in this memorandum; all have been provided previously or are available on reserves web sites. To avoid duplication some of these have not been included in this packet. Please contact Core 4 staff if you are not able to locate any of these documents.

1. Coordinated Public Involvement Plan (includes Reserves Steering Committee membership list) & comment letter on Plan from State of Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee
2. Phase One Public Involvement Materials
 - a. Coordinated Reserves Work Program Overview
 - b. Key Milestones for Designating Urban and Rural Reserves
 - c. Clackamas County PowerPoint Presentation
 - d. Clackamas County Flyer
 - e. Summary: Shape of the Region Study
 - f. Washington County Coordinated Public Involvement Plan
 - g. Washington County Communications Plan addendum to the Public Involvement Plan
 - h. Washington County PowerPoint presentation
 - i. Senate Bill 1011
 - j. DLCD Administrative Rules OAR 660-027
 - k. Making the Greatest Place – Winter 2008 Metro Newsletter
3. Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee Roster
4. Clackamas County CPO Meeting Schedule/Summaries
5. Multnomah County Public Advisory Committee Roster and meeting notes
6. Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee Roster and meeting notes
7. Public Involvement Team contact information (attached)

ATTACHMENT 7

Coordinated Public Involvement Team, Urban and Rural Reserves

Clackamas County www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/urban.htm

Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist
503-353-4274
ellenrog@co.clackamas.or.us

Maggie Dickerson, Principal Planner
503-353-4534
maggied@co.clackamas.or.us

Multnomah County <http://www2.co.multnomah.or.us/reserves>

Shawn Cunningham, Multnomah County Public Affairs Office
503-988-4369
shawn.d.cunningham@co.multnomah.or.us

Chuck Beasley, Senior Planner
503-988-3043 ext 22610
charles.beasley@co.multnomah.or.us

Washington County www.co.washington.or.us/reserves

Mike Dahlstrom, Public Involvement Coordinator
503-846-8101
mike_dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us

Steve Kelley, Senior Planner
503-846-3593
steve_kelley@co.washington.or.us

Metro www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves

Ken Ray, Senior Public Affairs Coordinator
503-797-1508
ken.ray@oregonmetro.gov

Marcia Sinclair, Senior Public Affairs Specialist
503-797-1814
marcia.sinclair@oregonmetro.gov

John Williams, Regional Planning Manager
503-797-1635
john.williams@oregonmetro.gov

August 13, 2008
Report on Activities in Phase 2 of the Reserves Work Program
Including Preliminary Summary of Public Input
and Coordinated Public Involvement Plan Updates

MEMORANDUM



DATE: September 8, 2008

TO: Commissioner Martha Schrader, Clackamas County
Commissioner Jeff Cogen, Multnomah County
Chair Tom Brian, Washington County
Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Metro
Reserve Steering Committee Members

FROM: Reserves Core 4 Technical and Public Involvement Staff

SUBJECT: Report on activities in Phase 2 of the Reserves Work Program and Coordinated Public Involvement Plan including a summary of public input.

Summary

The Reserves work program is divided into five phases. Each phase is accompanied by a key milestone which, when accomplished, signals transition into a new focus of activities. This report is intended to summarize Phase 2 activities of the adopted Coordinated Public Involvement Plan and Phase 2 public input. Phase 2 focuses on a DRAFT Reserves Study Area recommended by the Reserves Steering Committee at the June 9, 2008 meeting and two key questions:

- Are these the areas that the Reserves Steering Committee should study and analyze further?
- What additional information should be considered in defining these study areas?

This information is being provided well in advance to make it easier for committee members to act in their role as representatives of broader constituent groups, as outlined in the Reserves Steering Committee Operating Principles.

Phase 2 Public Involvement Plan Update

Between June 16 and August 15, 2008 Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and Metro collaborated on a variety of activities to engage citizens in a discussion of urban and rural reserves including hosting seven public open houses. These events were planned and executed by a team of public involvement and planning staff from all four jurisdictions. Recognizing that there was limited public awareness that a reserves designation process was under way, the public involvement team identified two primary purposes to these events:

1. Help citizens unfamiliar with the designation process grasp the history, purpose, decision structure, timeline and import of reserves designation within a context of simultaneous regional planning processes (Making the Greatest Place)
2. Ask for citizen guidance on whether the proposed reserves study area is the appropriate area to consider for reserves designation.

The open houses were strategically placed in locations across the region in which people from surrounding areas regularly conduct their business. The intent was to attract people both inside and outside the urban growth boundary to a regional conversation in a convenient and familiar location. The content of open house materials and presentations was essentially identical to the others so that people across the region could choose a convenient location, date and time in which to participate and be assured of receiving the same information and having the same opportunity to weigh in.

Additional outreach activities included public involvement team members' presentations to neighborhood, business, agricultural and environmental groups. The team created a questionnaire used extensively throughout the phase and developed and launched an online survey (also based on the questionnaire). Displays were created and placed at other county-wide events including the Washington County Fair. More than 50% of responses were received through mail-in and online input.

Publicity

A variety of methods were employed to publicize these events and build awareness including press releases, announcements at meetings, flyers and posters, invitations sent by email and circulated on email networks, postings on blogs and community calendars. News coverage included articles in the Oregonian, the Forest Grove News Times, Hillsboro Argus, Portland Tribune, Damascus Observer, and stories on Oregon Public Broadcasting and KATU Channel 2. A key component to providing project awareness is maintaining up-to-date project websites.

Open House Format

Seven regionally spaced open houses were held: Beaverton, Forest Grove, Gresham, Tualatin, Oregon City, central Portland (Metro) and NW Portland. All but the Metro open house were held in the evenings and the central Portland event was held on a Saturday morning. Open houses included a brief informal period followed by a formal presentation at which elected officials from the hosting city, county and/or Metro greeted guests and provided a few comments. After questions and answers, attendees were encouraged to explore materials at each station and provide feedback on the proposed reserve study area. Citizen comments were captured on flip charts, large and small maps and questionnaires.

Attendance

Altogether more than 340 people attended the open houses. Also the team has presented to more than 650 additional attendees at group and organizational discussions.

Summary of Public Input to Phase 2 Key Questions

What we heard:

A compilation of verbatim comments accompanies this memo.

In general, people asked questions and raised issues ranging from very broad (save farmland or make better use of industrial land inside the UGB) to very specific (my land cannot be farmed). People's interests in the process ranged from global to preservation of individual lifestyles.

The comments on maps will provide helpful information in identifying specific attributes of the landscape and understanding attitudes toward rural or urban designation.

People suggested additional things to consider; made recommendations or asked questions about the designation process, asked how economic trends and population are factored in, asked for additional public education and wanted to know how they might remain involved.

With regard to changes in the proposed study area boundary, there were a few recommendations to expand into Yamhill, Marion or Clark counties.

With regard to Clackamas County PAC recommendation to expand the study area to 211 there were 6 for and 12 against. The reasons were varied.

What we learned:

For the most part, there was little substantive feedback on the study area itself.

People were drawn to the public events and presentations for a variety of reasons. Many expressed a concern for the region, land use and future lifestyle in broad terms and from an abstract philosophical perspective. Some attended in order to champion a specific designation for a portion of the region. A few championed a specific designation for a parcel.

People raised questions about the reserves process and the aftermath including the lifespan of reserves (such as when will we revisit the decisions we make in 2009); the process for weighing factors and how this process fits with other planning efforts. These questions need to be resolved as soon as feasible as their resolution will be valuable to the designation process itself. Some of the answers can be provided in a revised FAQ while others will take time to resolve.

To the extent possible, we will want to have process questions clarified for future outreach materials, presentations and events. There is a need to bring up citizen understanding of broad areas of land use planning and link other elements of regional planning including transportation and infrastructure investment. Many people said the events were useful and informative.

While the public involvement team had hoped for greater open house turnout, these events provided a number of side benefits. They brought together staff from four jurisdictions and helped jell the team to more easily capitalize on each other's strengths. The events provided a basis for earned media that would have otherwise been difficult to generate. The open houses provided a deadline under which the four jurisdictions crafted outreach materials including web sites with interactive features, publications and presentations and a well-honed collection of supporting documentation.

Next steps

Once the Reserves Study Area is defined, the next, analysis, phase begins to address how the guiding Department of Land Conservation and Development urban and rural reserves factors are applied. The Reserves Steering Committee, Project Management Team and technical advisory team, along with each of the partner's advisory committees will spend the next several months refining the Reserves Study Area and bringing back to the community initial considerations for reserves designation.

Coordinated Public Involvement Team, Urban and Rural Reserves

Clackamas County www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/urban.htm

Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist
503-353-4274
ellenrog@co.clackamas.or.us

Maggie Dickerson, Principal Planner
503-353-4534
maggied@co.clackamas.or.us

Multnomah County <http://www2.co.multnomah.or.us/reserves>

Shawn Cunningham, Multnomah County Public Affairs Office
503-988-4369
shawn.d.cunningham@co.multnomah.or.us

Chuck Beasley, Senior Planner
503-988-3043 ext 22610
charles.beasley@co.multnomah.or.us

Washington County www.co.washington.or.us/reserves

Mike Dahlstrom, Public Involvement Coordinator
503-846-8101
mike_dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us

Steve Kelley, Senior Planner
503-846-3593
steve_kelley@co.washington.or.us

Metro www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves

Ken Ray, Senior Public Affairs Coordinator
503-797-1508
ken.ray@oregonmetro.gov

Marcia Sinclair, Senior Public Affairs Specialist
503-797-1814
marcia.sinclair@oregonmetro.gov

John Williams, Regional Planning Manager
503-797-1635
john.williams@oregonmetro.gov

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
9/10/2008	Letter request by the City of Molalla to change the study area boundary	TO: Reserves Steering Committee FROM: Joanne Rigutto	Clackamas County and Metro agreed to revise the study area boundary to recognize Molalla's growth aspirations.
3/12/2009	Email from Pete's Mountain Water Co., that company has capacity for growth	TO: Tim O'Brien, Maggie Dickerson; FROM: Suzanne C. Webber, Pete's Mountain Water Co., Inc.	Metro and Clackamas County agree to leave the northern portion of Pete's Mtn undesignated to allow future UR designation and to designate the southern portion rural reserve due to Important Agricultural Land and landscape features.
4/8/2009	Letter from city of Sandy regarding designation of urban and rural reserves between Sandy and the Multnomah County line and Sandy and Eagle Creek, and preservation of Sandy and Gresham as separate cities (dated April 6, 2009)	TO: Reserves Steering Committee; FROM: Linda Malone, Mayor, City of Sandy	Metro and Clackamas County are working with the city of Sandy to revise the three-party agreement on the green corridor along Hwy 26 between the UGB and Sandy to recognize urban reserves and improve protection of the corridor.
4/13/2009	City of West Linn resolution on Stafford, including West Linn Resolution no. 09-05 - Stafford - 3-23-09, forwarded by Councilor Teri Cummings	TO: Laura Dawson-Bodner, John Williams FROM: Ken Ray	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
8/14/2009	Letter from city of Tigard asking the area identified on maps provided to the county (west of Bull Mountain and areas 63 and 64) to be urban reserves	TO: Washington County Board of Commissioners, Kathryn Harrington, Members of the Tigard City Council FROM: Craig Prosser, City Manager, City of Tigard	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 6B, 6C and 6D west of Tigard to accommodate regional growth in the vicinity of Tigard. Metro and the county decided to designate as rural reserve some of the land recommended by the city for urban reserve in order to protect the farmland in the area.
9/17/2009	Letter from city of Tualatin regarding Stafford Basin (dated August 10), included in Clackamas County packet of 9/17)	TO: Reserves Steering Committee, Core 4 FROM: Lou Ogden	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.
10/9/2009	Letter from Mayors of Cities of Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Banks, Cornelius, and North Plain	TO: Regional Reserves Core 4 Committee, Washington County Board of Commissioners, and Regional Reserves Steering Committee, and Metro COO,	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate extensive areas of urban reserve that are suitable for industrial use adjacent to the cities of Hillsboro, Forest Grove and Cornelius. The two governments also agree to leave land east, west and south of the city of North Plains and on all sides of the city of Banks to accommodate their future growth.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
10/13/2009	Letter from city of Lake Oswego opposed to making the whole Stafford Basin an urban reserve area	TO: David Bragdon, Metro Council; FROM: Jack Hoffman, Lake Oswego City Council	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.
10/13/2009	Comment from city of Fairview supporting Troutdale's request for addition of 759 acres to the urban reserve	TO: Metro Council; FROM: Mike Weatherby, Mayor of Fairview	Metro and Multnomah County considered the Troutdale request, but decided not to designate urban reserves in the area due to its value as agricultural land and the opportunities to accommodate growth in the UGB in this part of the region.
10/13/2009	Comment from city of Wilsonville supporting urban reserves immediately adjacent to Wilsonville and designation of the French Prairie area as a rural reserve	TO: Metro Council; FROM: Stephan Lashbrook	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate areas 4G, 4H, 5G and 5H as urban reserves adjacent to Wilsonville.
10/14/2009	Letter from neighboring cities of Yamhill and Marion Counties requesting the maintenance of separation of the metro area	TO: Core 4From Kathy Figley, Mayor of Woodburn	The four reserves partners designated urban reserves with neighboring cities of Yamhill and Marion counties in mind. Several miles of rural reserve designations or undesignated land maintain the separation of the cities from the metropolitan region.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
10/14/2009	Letter from Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development; Oregon Dept of Agriculture; Oregon Business Development Dept; Oregon Dept of Forestry; Oregon Dept of State Lands; Oregon Dept of Transportation; Oregon Dept of Environmental Quality; Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife; and Oregon Water Resources	TO: Metro Regional Reserves Steering Committee; Core Four	Differences noted by the agencies between the need estimated by Metro and by Washington County have been reconciled as set forth in the findings. The four governments chose a 50-year supply rather than the 40-year supply recommended by the agencies in order to provide longer-term protection to resources land. Allocation of urban reserves was based more upon the factors in LCDC rules than an allocation based upon policies in the RFP or modeling. Nonetheless, URs are well-distributed around the region. Title 11 will ensure that concept plans will protect state highway interchanges [3.07.1110C(2) and 1120C(8)] and that the region is aware of costs of infrastructure prior to addition of land to the UGB [3.07.1110C(1) and C(2)]. The four governments took agency comments about particular areas into account as set forth in the findings.
10/14/2009	Letter from city of Tualatin recommending that Stafford area be designated a rural reserve with the exception of the 840 acres located in Washington County within the Stafford Basin (I-5 on the west, I-205 on the north, 65th Ave on the east and Frobase Rd on the south); also recommending urban reserve in the Sherwood/west Wilsonville area	TO: Michael Jordan; FROM: Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Urban reserve areas 4E and 4F conform generally to the areas suggested by the city of Tualatin for urban reserve. Metro and Clackamas and Washington County, consistent with Tualatin suggestions, designated Areas 5F and 5G as urban reserve.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
10/15/2009	Letter from city of Forest Grove recommending area south of Purdin Rd and west of hwy 47 be designated urban reserve, and that area from hwy 47 to McKibbon Rd, south of Verboort Road (305 acres) be added for employment	TO: Reserves Core 4, Washington County Board of Commissioners, Michael Jordan FROM: Peter Truax, President of Forest Grove City Council	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7A and 7B urban reserve adjacent to Forest Grove to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county decided to designate as rural reserve some of the land recommended by the city for urban reserve (east of Hwy 47) in order to protect the farmland in the area.
10/15/2009	Comment from city of Cornelius regarding designation of urban reserve for area subject to Washington County Omnibus Pre-Qualifying Concept Reserves Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bill Bash, City of Cornelius	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7C, 7D and 7I to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county did not designate as urban reserve all of the land subject to Cornelius' pre-qualifying concept plan in order to protect the farmland in the area.
10/15/2009	Letter from Bill Wyatt, Executive Director of Port of Portland urging designation of suitable industrial land as urban reserve	TO: David Bragdon, President; Metro Council	The four governments designated thousands of acres as urban reserve with the characteristics emphasized by the Port of Portland, relying in part on the analysis of suitability by NAIOP.
10/15/2009	Comment from city of Cornelius regarding city's ability to provide infrastructure to proposed urban reserves	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dave Waffle	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7C, 7D and 7I to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. It was important to both governments that the city is willing to provide urban services to the areas.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
10/16/2009	Letter from Sam Adams, Mayor, City of Portland	TO: Core 4 Members; Attn John Williams, Metro	As requested by the city of Portland, Metro and Multnomah County agreed to designate most of the area (9A, 9B and 9C) between Forest Park and the UGB to the southwest as rural reserve to protect important landscape features in the area. Metro will support efforts by the city of Portland to accommodate growth in a compact, mixed-use, pedestrian and transit supportive development pattern to avoid expansion of the UGB onto urban reserves.
10/20/2009	Letter from city of Sherwood regarding growth need and community support for designation of UR 7, UR 8 and UR 9 as urban reserves	TO: Metro Council, Core 4 FROM: Keith Mays, Mayor of Sherwood	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 5A, 5B, 5D and 5F adjacent to Sherwood to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Although these areas are not all the city requested, Metro believes the designated urban reserves are sufficient to accommodate growth in this part of the region.
10/20/2009	Letter from city of Tualatin opposing designation of certain areas near city as urban reserve due to prohibitive infrastructure cost	TO: Chair Brian, MPAC members FROM: Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro understands it will be difficult and expensive to provide infrastructure to portions of the area. But given that urban reserves are intended to be urbanized over the next 50 years, and that infrastructure is expensive everywhere, infrastructure cost was not sufficient reason to leave this area undesignated.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
10/27/2009	Letter from city of Canby asking regarding rural, urban and undesignated lands near the city (includes letter to Maggie Dickerson dated April 1, 2009)	TO: Chair Lyn Peterson and the Board of County Commissioners, Canby City Council, Maggie Dickerson, Kathryn Harrington, Charlotte Lehan, Jeff Cogen, Tom Brian FROM: Bryan C. Brown	Metro and Clackamas County agreed to revise their designations of rural reserves in the vicinity of Canby to more closely accord with the city's preferences for it own long-term growth.
11/4/2009	Letter from city of Canby requesting no urban or rural designation for land to the northwest of the city	TO: Chair Lynn Peterson FROM: Bev Doolittle, Canby Chamber of Commerce	Metro and Clackamas County agreed to revise their designations of rural reserves in the vicinity of Canby to more closely accord with the city's preferences for it own long-term growth.
11/17/2009	Letter from city of Hillsboro responding to state agency comments on urban and rural reserves and supporting urban reserve designation for land south of Hwy 26 bounded by Hwy 26, Meek Rd and Waibel/McKay Creeks	TO: David Bragdon, Metro Council Members, Reserves Core 4, Richard Whitman and state agencies FROM: Jerry Willey	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 8A adjacent to Hillsboro, including the area south of Hwy 26 noted by the city, as urban reserve, in part due to its suitability for industrial use.
12/10/2009	Letter: Urge Metro Council that the area between the City of Sandy and Metro UGBs be designated as a rural reserve or extend rural reserve 200 feet south of hwy 26 and include a condition for future development that this buffer be planted with a thick screen of native conifers. Includes Map with suggested compromise modification to Metro proposed map.	TO: President Bragdon, Councilor Hosticka, Charlotte Lehan, Reserves Steering Committee FROM: Linda K. Malone, Mayor of Sandy	Metro and Clackamas County are working with the city of Sandy to revise the three-party agreement on the green corridor along Hwy 26 between the UGB and Sandy to recognize urban reserves and improve protection of the corridor.
12/23/2009	Email from city of Cornelius supporting urban reserves north of Council Creek	TO: Carlotta Collette, Dave Waffle FROM: Richard Meyer, City of Cornelius	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate Area 71 north of Cornelius to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
	Attachment 2 to Staff Report Ordinance No. 10-1238A		
1/11/2010	Comment from city of Portland with specific recommendinf rural reserve designation for the south NW Hills area in Multnomah County Powerline/Germantown Rd./ Lower Springville Rd including areas known as East Bethany and Bonny Slope East	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sam Adams, Mayor of Portland	As requested by the city of Portland, Metro and Multnomah County agreed to designate most of the area (9A, 9B and 9C) between Forest Park and the UGB to the southwest as rural reserve to protect important landscape features in the area.
1/13/2010	Letter from city of Portland to Metro Council regarding Rural Reserves between Forest Park and North Bethany, dated 1/11/2010.	TO: David Bragdon & Metro Councilors FROM: Mayor Sam Adams & Commissioner Amanda Fritz	As requested by the city of Portland, Metro and Multnomah County agreed to designate most of the area (9A, 9B and 9C) between Forest Park and the UGB to the southwest as rural reserve to protect important landscape features in the area.
1/14/2010	Comment from city of Canby supporting negotiated position between city and Clackamas County board with regard to designation of rural reserves north of Canby and lack of rural reserve designation to the east	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bryan Brown, City of Canby Planning Director	As requested by the city of Canby, Metro and Clackamas County agreed to revise the boundaries of rural reserves north and east of the city.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/14/2010	Comment from city of Lake Oswego that Stafford area (particulary UR 4a) does not meet criteria for either urban or rural reserves and should maintain as undesignated status	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sally Moncreiff, City Councilor, City of Lake Oswego	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.
1/14/2010	Comment from city of Cornelius that it needs land and has chosen areas that are not the best farmland to accommodate future growth	TO: Metro Council FROM: Richard Meyer, staff, City of Cornelius	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7C, 7D and 7I to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county did not designate as urban reserve all of the land subject to Cornelius' pre-qualifying concept plan in order to protect the farmland in the area.
1/14/2010	Comment from city of West Linn view that Stafford area should remain rural consistent with hamlet vision	TO: Metro Council FROM: Teri Cummings, Councilor, City of West Linn	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Tualatin opposing urban reserve designation of land east of 65th and in the Stafford Basin; supporting land east of I-5 and west of 65th as an urban reserve; supporting land south of Sherwood and Tualatin as an urban reserve	TO: Metro Council FROM: Monique Biekman, City of Tualatin	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Urban reserve areas 4E and 4F conform generally to the areas suggested by the city of Tualatin for urban reserve. Metro and Clackamas and Washington County, consistent with Tualatin suggestions, designated Areas 5F and 5G as urban reserve.
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Cornelius supporting Core 4 compromise map	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jeff Dalin, Councilor, City of Cornelius	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7C, 7D and 7I to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county did not designate as urban reserve all of the land subject to Cornelius' pre-qualifying concept plan in order to protect the farmland in the area.
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Tigard requesting change to map in area 6C; supporting city of Sherwood regarding area 5E; noting that area 6B would connect with Scholls Ferry Rd	TO: Metro Council FROM: Craig Dirksen, Mayor, City of Tigard	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 6B, 6C and 6D west of Tigard to accommodate regional growth in the vicinity of Tigard. Metro and the county decided to designate as rural reserve some of the land recommended by the city for urban reserve in order to protect the farmland in the area.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Canby supporting a larger area of undesignated land to the north of Canby (letter of same date)	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bryan Brown, City of Canby	As requested by the city of Canby, Metro and Clackamas County agreed to revise the boundaries of rural reserves north and east of the city.
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Beaverton regarding city growth plans and accommodation of higher densities within city	TO: Metro Council FROM: Don Mazziotti, City of Beaverton	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate Area 6B west of Beaverton as urban reserves in the event efforts by the city and the region as a whole cannot accommodate growth to the year 2060.
1/20/2010	Comment from city of Tualatin opposing urban reserve east of 65th or in Stafford; supporting land south of Tualatin (5E) and 5F as urban reserve except for one area as urban reserve	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor Bateman, City of Tualatin	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Urban reserve areas 4E and 4F conform generally to the areas suggested by the city of Tualatin for urban reserve. Metro and Clackamas and Washington County, consistent with Tualatin suggestions, designated Areas 5F and 5G as urban reserve.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/21/2010	Comment from city of Cornelius upporting the regional proposed map as a compromise	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bill Bash, Mayor of Cornelius	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7C, 7D and 7I to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county did not designate as urban reserve all of the land subject to Cornelius' pre-qualifying concept plan in order to protect the farmland in the area.
1/21/2010	Comment from city of Lake Oswego opposing urbanization of the Stafford Area and expressing city aspiration to redevelop centers and corridors and preserve neighborhood character; supporting some urban designation along the Borland Corridor	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mary Olson, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland, and in the event efforts by the city of Lake Oswego and the region as a whole cannot accommodate growth to the year 2060.
1/21/2010	Letter from city of Sherwood urging designation of 5E as Urban Reserve to provide a complete balanced community	TO: Metro Council, Core 4, Jim Patterson, Tom Pessemier & Julia Hajduk FROM: Keith Mays, Mayor of the City of Sherwood	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Area 5E would remain undesignated because designation of areas 5A, 5B, 5D and 5F provided sufficient land to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Leaving 5E undesignated will allow re-designation to urban reserve if the regional forecast proves low.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/21/2010	Comment from city of Wilsonville packet supporting rural reserve designation for the eastern portion of area 5E	TO: Metro Council FROM: Steve Hurst, Councilor, City of Wilsonville	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that most of Area 5E would remain undesignated to allow re-designation to urban reserve if the regional forecast proves low. However, the two governments agreed to designate a portion of 5E as rural reserve to protect the important natural landscape features in the area.
1/21/2010	Comment from city of Wilsonville urging designation of Areas 5E (eastern portion) and 4F as rural reserve and 4G and 4H as urban reserve	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michele Ripple, Councilor, City of Wilsonville	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that most of Area 5E would remain undesignated to allow re-designation to urban reserve if the regional forecast proves low. However, the two governments agreed to designate a portion of 5E as rural reserve to protect the important natural landscape features in the area. Metro and Clackamas County also agreed to designate areas 4G and 4H as urban reserves, as the city of Wilsonville requested.
1/21/2010	Comment from city of Forest Grove urging urban reserve designation near Thatcher Rd, Hwy 27 (area 7B) to allow for future industrial and commercial growth and 1,600 dwelling units and 4,000 jobs	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mayor Peter Truax, City of Forest Grove	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 7A and 7B urban reserve adjacent to Forest Grove to accommodate regional growth in this part of the region. Metro and the county decided to designate as rural reserve some of the land recommended by the city for urban reserve (east of Hwy 47) in order to protect the farmland in the area.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
1/21/2010	Comment from city of West Linn asking that the Stafford area remain rural	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mayor Patti Galle, City of West Linn	Metro and Clackamas County agreed that Metro would designate portions of the Stafford area as urban reserves notwithstanding objections from the cities in the region in order to avoid having to designate more urban reserves on the region's best farmland. Metro agreed with Clackamas County goals for planning the area to ensure protection of natural resources in the Stafford area.
1/22/2010	Letter from Beaverton School District seeking school sites in the SW area of the district, particularly south of SW Scholls Ferry Rd.	TO: Michael Jordan, Brent Curtis FROM: Richard Steinbrugge, Beaverton School District	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 6B and 6C on the north and south sides of SW Scholls Ferry Road. These areas should offer school sites.
1/27/2010	Letter from Sherwood School Districts seeking land for a school southeast of Sherwood	TO: Kathryn Harrington, Carl Hosticka, Charlotte Lehan, Keith Mays and Jim Patterson FROM: Dan C. Jamison, Superintendent, Sherwood School District	Metro added the Brookman Road area to the UGB south of Sherwood in 2002. The school district participated in that effort. Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 5A, 5B, 5D and 5F adjacent to Sherwood. These areas, totalling more than 2,400 acres, provide opportunities for siting schools.
2/25/2010	Comment from city of Beaverton that city will be careful steward of land coming into the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate Area 6B west of Beaverton as urban reserves in the event efforts by the city and the region as a whole cannot accommodate growth to the year 2060.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
2/25/2010	Comment from city of Hillsboro supporting protection of land added to the UGB for industrial uses	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mayor Jerry Willey, City of Hillsboro	Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 8A adjacent to Hillsboro, including the area south of Hwy 26 noted by the city, as urban reserve, in part due to its suitability for industrial use.
2/25/2010	Comment from city of Portland expressing support of the Multnomah County revised IGA and map	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bob Clay, City of Portland	As requested by the city of Portland, Metro and Multnomah County agreed to designate most of the area (9A, 9B and 9C) between Forest Park and the UGB to the southwest as rural reserve to protect important landscape features in the area.
5/13/2010	Letter from Special Districts Association of Oregon seeking option in Title 11 to urbanization only upon annexation to a city.	TO: Metro Council FROM: Greg Baker, Executive Director	Metro recognizes the potential obstacles in the path to urbanization in parts of the region where annexation to cities has proved difficult. Nonetheless, the policy objective – that urban areas be part of cities – is sound. Metro and the cities of the region will monitor the implementation of Title 11 and consider optional methods of urbanization if concerns raised by SDAO are realized.
5/17/2010	Letter from Linda K. Malone, Mayor of City of Sandy	TO: Metro Council FROM: Linda K. Malone, Mayor	Metro and Clackamas County are working with the city of Sandy to revise the three-party agreement on the green corridor along Hwy 26 between the UGB and Sandy to recognize urban reserves and improve protection of the corridor.

**Attachment 2 to June 3, 2010, Staff Report
Responses to Comments by Local Governments**

	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	TO/FROM	RESPONSES
5/20/2010	Memo from Sherwood School District regarding potential school sites southeast of Sherwood	TO: Metro Council; FROM: Dan Jamison, Sherwood School District	Metro added the Brookman Road area to the UGB south of Sherwood in 2002. The school district participated in that effort. Metro and Washington County agreed to designate areas 5A, 5B, 5D and 5F adjacent to Sherwood. These areas, totalling more than 2,400 acres, provide opportunities for siting schools.

 Metro | Memo

Date: May 5, 2010

To: MPAC

From: MPAC employment subcommittee:
Robin McArthur, Metro, Chair of Subcommittee
Mayor Shane Bemis, City of Gresham, Chair of MPAC
Mayor Sam Adams, City of Portland
Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton
Councilor Carl Hosticka, Metro
Councilor Rod Park, Metro
Mayor Jerry Willey, City of Hillsboro
Richard Whitman, Director of DLCD
Charlie Allcock, PGE
Gary Barth, Clackamas County
Steve Dotterer and Bob Clay, City of Portland
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland
Steve Peterson, CH2M Hill
Patrick Quinton, PDC
Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro
Doug Rux, City of Tualatin
Mike Wells, Cresa Partners; Mark Clemons, Group Mackenzie

Re: Final report to MPAC on addressing large-industrial-site demand

Background:

Attracting and retaining traded-sector industrial companies is critical to the region's economic prosperity. Traded-sector companies sell goods to buyers outside of the Metro region, bringing additional wealth into the region. The 2009 Urban Growth Report (UGR) identified demand for an additional 200 to 1,500 acres in large lot configurations (more than 50 buildable acres in a single site) for traded-sector industrial uses. The MPAC employment subcommittee was formed to consider how the growth management decisions that will be made in December 2010 can address large lot demand and help the region to achieve its desired outcomes.

The subcommittee's recommendations to MPAC include short-term and long-term strategies, which are elaborated on in the body of this memo:

Short-term strategies for providing large sites

- Strengthen Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to protect against specific conflicting uses (parks, schools, churches) in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas
- Create a large-site-metering system
- When making a growth management decision in 2010, consider factors such as the current trend in unemployment rates, the employment forecast, the need for site choices, and the region's history of developing large lots added to the UGB.

Long-term strategies for providing large sites

- Pursue new infrastructure funding strategies to make sites development-ready
- Elevate brownfield cleanup to a regional priority
- Require concept planning of urban reserves before UGB expansion
- Revamp Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to recognize blurry boundaries between employment uses
- Explore the concept of large-lot industrial tax deferral

This memo is organized under two broad themes:

- Recommendations for large sites already inside the UGB
- Recommendations if UGB expansions are made to provide additional large sites

Subcommittee recommendations for large sites already inside the UGB

1. Strive to make the region's large lot inventory development-ready:

An inventory of vacant sites is, alone, inadequate for attracting traded-sector industrial employers. The region should have a goal to increase its supply of development-ready sites. This would better align local and regional efforts with Statewide Planning Goal 9 (Economic Development), which calls for maintaining a competitive short-term supply of land for employment uses. Multiple public and private entities must collaborate to achieve a goal of making a site development ready within 180 days of approval of a development application. Infrastructure must be available, zoning must be adopted, and the site must be annexed into a city. The actions recommended in this memo would help to increase the number of development-ready sites in the region.

2. Protect unique industrial areas from conflicting uses:

Regulations are essential for protecting large industrial sites from conversion to non-industrial uses. However, there is a need to tailor land use regulations and other strategies to achieve a better balance of public and private sector benefits and burdens. The subcommittee recommends further work on two possible options:

Balance public and private interests with a large-lot industrial tax deferral program

Oregon's farm use tax assessment program could serve as a model for tax assessment of large, vacant industrial sites. Under the farm use assessment system, lands kept in active farm use are assessed at a lower rate through use of a tax deferral. The subcommittee recommends Metro staff research the feasibility of an industrial tax deferral program. Such a system could offset the

use restrictions placed on these sites as they await industrial development. The program would also seek to ensure that public infrastructure investments serve their intended purpose (to serve future industrial areas). Depending on the circumstances, market-rate back taxes could be collected on properties that get used or rezoned for non-industrial purposes.

The subcommittee recommends further exploration of the applicability of this concept for large, vacant industrial sites. Because this type of program would require legislative changes, it is a longer-term recommendation.

Issues for further discussion regarding a large lot tax deferral system

1. How much foregone tax revenue would such a system entail? Are there other funding mechanisms that could limit the fiscal impacts to cities if this program were instituted?
2. What are the financial incentives and disincentives that would need to be created in order for the program to work? For example, what level of back taxes may need to be incurred to discourage conversion of industrial land to non-industrial uses?
3. Is there a way to use this type of program as an incentive to encourage lot assembly?
4. What legislative changes would be necessary and how likely is it that efforts to change the law would be successful?

Focus Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan on protecting Regionally Significant Industrial Areas

Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan seeks to provide and protect a supply of sites for employment by limiting the types and scale of non-industrial uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas, Industrial and Employment Areas.

In the short-term (before any UGB expansions are made in 2010), the subcommittee recommends that Title 4 be amended to prohibit new schools, places of assembly, recreation facilities and parks (with exceptions for habitat protection) in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas.

In the long-term (2011), the subcommittee recommends more significant changes to Title 4 and the Title 4 map. These changes would implement the recommendations of the 2004 Greater Metropolitan Employment Lands Study (GMELS). Generally, the proposed changes are:

- Work with jurisdictions in the region to identify key industrial sanctuaries with unique site characteristics or infrastructure facilities.
 - Focus regulations on protecting the region's most important industrial areas and their associated public facilities (e.g. transportation facilities)
 - Loosen regulations in other employment areas to allow for a wider range of uses that reflects the sometimes blurry lines between industrial and non-industrial uses
3. Prioritize brownfield cleanup as a strategy for increasing the region's supply of development-ready sites:
Some traded-sector industrial uses require large sites with marine or other specialized terminal access or, more generally, locations in existing urban areas. These needs cannot be accommodated through UGB expansions. However, some of the region's large industrial sites are contaminated. Brownfield cleanup will be essential in order to accommodate some priority sectors.

The subcommittee recommends that brownfield cleanup be elevated to a regional priority. Brownfield cleanup should be as much of a funding priority as paying for the infrastructure necessary to make greenfield sites development-ready. New sources of funding are needed for cleanup. Federal and State legislative changes are needed to reduce future property owner liabilities.

The subcommittee suggests identifying the large sites that are regional priorities for cleanup. This could be accomplished through the use of a tiered list of priority sites. The subcommittee also recommends documenting the potential cleanup costs for high-priority brownfield sites.

4. Pursue new infrastructure funding strategies to make sites development-ready:

Sites will not be development-ready if public facilities are not available. Existing infrastructure funding mechanisms are inadequate for ensuring the region's economic competitiveness. According to Metro's 2008 Regional Infrastructure Analysis, the estimated cost of building the public and private facilities needed to accommodate growth in jobs and housing in the three-county Portland region through 2035 is \$27-41 billion. Traditional funding sources are expected to cover only about half that amount. Even if the region does not experience this projected growth, \$10 billion is needed just to repair and rebuild our existing infrastructure. The subcommittee recommends that new collaborative funding strategies be explored at the local, regional, and state level.

Subcommittee recommendations if UGB expansions are made

5. Require concept planning of urban reserves before UGB expansion:

A critical step towards providing development-ready sites is to complete some level of concept planning for urban reserve areas. The intergovernmental agreements that were signed by Metro and the three counties on urban and rural reserves require that concept planning be completed. These concept plans¹ will provide more certainty for how an area will be developed, could be used to market sites to potential firms, and would provide the means for making UGB expansions that intentionally accomplish regional and community goals. Pre-expansion concept planning would be necessary to make the UGB metering process, summarized in recommendation six, function properly.

The subcommittee recommends that pre-UGB-expansion concept plans be specific enough to inform UGB expansion decisions, but not be overly-prescriptive such that they become immediately outdated or preclude some degree of flexibility with future land uses.

Recommended contents of a concept plan for large lot industrial uses

A pre-expansion concept plan for large lot industrial uses should describe the following.

1. The suitability of the site for particular industry sectors.
2. The general locations of the types of uses desired for the area.
3. The general locations of sewer, water and storm-water systems and transportation facilities, and a description of either connections of these systems to existing systems within the UGB or a description of how decentralized infrastructure systems may be

¹ Note - if UGB expansions are made in 2010, there will not be time for pre-expansion concept planning; this is a longer-term recommendation for future UGB expansion areas.

configured on site. These descriptions should include preliminary estimates of the costs to provide the facilities and services.

4. Natural features that will be subject to protection under Titles 3 and 13 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.
5. An understanding between or among the county, the city or cities that will provide any urban service to the area, and other service providers that determines which city, cities or special districts will be the eventual providers of urban services.
6. An understanding between or among the county and the city or cities that determines the city or cities that will have authority to annex the area, or portions of it, following addition to the UGB.
7. An evaluation of possibilities for the assembly of smaller taxlots.

Issues for further discussion regarding concept planning

The subcommittee recommends further discussion of the following issues regarding pre-UGB-expansion concept planning:

1. Who will pay for concept planning?
2. What level of plan specificity is appropriate?
3. Before UGB expansions are made, cities have a greater leverage to encourage cooperation amongst landowners to assemble larger sites for industrial uses. After UGB expansions are made, it is more likely that there will be landowners that will hold out for high sales prices. Because cities are unable to provide landowners with any certainty that their properties will be included in the UGB in the near term, devising a strategy for lot assembly before UGB expansions are made would be challenging. To address this challenge, the subcommittee proposes the following ideas for further consideration:
 - a. Cities could enter into option agreements with landowners to assemble large sites.
 - b. Service providers could withhold services to properties until a taxlot assembly plan or agreement is in place for a UGB expansion area.
6. Create a land-metering mechanism to maintain the region's inventory of large industrial sites: Growth management decisions made in 2010 will provide an additional 200 to 1,500 acres in large site configurations. In order to ensure that the region maintains a supply of large industrial sites that is competitive with other regions, the MPAC employment subcommittee recommends the creation of a land-metering process that operates in the intervening years of the five-year growth management decision cycle.

With a land-metering mechanism, as large sites inside the UGB get developed, they would be replenished through fast-track UGB expansions or through an action that makes land inside the UGB available (e.g. taxlot assembly or brownfield cleanup²).³ The Metro Council would return the region's large-site supply to its baseline target within a year of notification that ground has been broken on a large site.

² Standards need to be developed to determine whether a brownfield has been cleaned sufficiently to make it part of the large site inventory. An example of possible standards for brownfield cleanup are those that DEQ applies.

³ To satisfy state law, before expanding the UGB, Metro would first need to determine whether efficiency measures can be taken.

Regional large-lot demand and supply would again be reassessed in the 2014 urban growth report, which would be the basis for a growth management decision in 2015. The large lot supply that results from those decisions would be the new baseline inventory inside the UGB to maintain through 2030. The metering process would again be used in those intervening years to maintain a competitive supply within the UGB.

Elements of large-site-metering mechanism

1. With the 2010 growth management decision, the Metro Council establishes a baseline target for the number of vacant, buildable large sites to be maintained inside the UGB.
 2. Metro and local governments identify the urban reserves with potential to provide large sites once inside the UGB.
 3. Metro and local governments monitor the large-site supply inside the UGB.
 4. The Metro Council adopts a fast-track process for adding industrial land to the UGB from urban reserves.
 5. When the supply drops below the target (large sites are no longer vacant or buildable), the Metro Council has one year to return the baseline supply of large sites to its target. This can be accomplished either through efficiency measures such as brownfield cleanup and taxlot assembly or through a UGB expansion. If the UGB is expanded, use the fast-track process between five-year capacity cycles, or the legislative process associated with the next cycle if the drop occurs within one year of the capacity analysis. In making UGB expansions, consider the efficient distribution of employment opportunities throughout the region.
 6. The Metro Council reviews the target to adjust to market changes at each five-year capacity cycle.
7. Aim to accommodate priority traded-sector industries when making growth management decisions:
- A number of cities in the region have recently completed economic opportunity analyses (EOAs) that describe their economic development priorities⁴. These priorities include attracting several industries in traded sectors that have preferences for large lots. The specific site preferences of priority sectors listed in EOAs as well as the freight facilities that support those sectors should be a particular focus in upcoming growth management decisions.
8. Location matters: policy considerations to guide where within the 200-to-1,500-acre range to plan: Individual industry sectors and clusters have specific site size, transportation network, infrastructure, and labor needs. Efforts to attract firms in these sectors could be more successful if there are a variety of sites in a variety of locations from which to choose. When deciding where within the 200-to-1,500-acre range to plan, MPAC and the Metro Council should plan for a point in the range that provides future firms with adequate site choices.⁵

⁴ Note – other sectors are also economic development priorities for cities in the region. This short list only includes traded-sector industries that have historically had a preference for large sites and that are mentioned in EOAs. Included are manufacturing (especially high-tech, solar, medical devices, and advanced manufacturing) and logistics, warehousing, and distribution (including marine and air terminal uses).

⁵ If a land-metering process is adopted, as described in recommendation number six, it could reduce the risk of making more modest cyclical UGB expansions.

Examples of factors that influence demand and potential supply include:

- Current unemployment rates
- Employment forecast
- Potential adoption of a large-site-metering mechanism
- Potential adoption of additional protections for industrial areas
- Need for site choices to attract traded-sector firms and clusters
- History of development in past UGB expansion areas
- Current industrial building vacancy rates

RESERVES ACREAGE BREAKDOWN

Attachment 4 to Staff Report for Ordinance No. 10-1238A

Total Reserves Acreage

	Rural	Urban	Total
Clackamas	68,713	13,874	82,587
Multnomah	46,706	857	47,563
Washington	151,536	13,884	165,419
Total	266,954	28,615	295,569

Total Reserves Acreage by ODA Designations

	Conflicted	Foundation	Important	No Ag Status	Total
Clackamas	21,757	26,213	34,422	194	82,587
Multnomah	1,833	37,193	7,727	809	47,563
Washington	7,837	130,944	26,597	42	165,419
Total	31,427	194,350	68,747	1,045	295,569

Rural Reserves and Urban Reserves by ODA Designations

	Conflicted		Foundation		Important		No Ag Status		Total
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	
Clackamas	10,156	11,602	24,889	1,323	33,588	835	80	114	82,587
Multnomah	1,833		36,336	857	7,727		809	0	47,563
Washington	4,948	2,889	121,214	9,730	25,361	1,235	12	29	165,419
Total	16,937	14,490	182,439	11,911	66,677	2,070	901	144	295,569

Total Reserves by EFU Zoning

	EFU	Other Zoning	Total
Clackamas	40,812	41,774	82,587
Multnomah	16,785	30,778	47,563
Washington	86,507	78,913	165,419
Total	144,104	151,465	295,569

Rural and Urban Reserves by EFU Zoning

	EFU		Other Zoning		Total
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	
Clackamas	37,494	3,318	31,218	10,556	82,587
Multnomah	16,372	413	30,334	444	47,563
Washington	79,470	7,036	72,065	6,847	165,419
Total	133,336	10,768	133,618	17,847	295,569

Total Reserves by ODA Designations & EFU Zoning

	EFU				Other Zoning				Total
	Conflicted	Foundation	Important	No Ag Status	Conflicted	Foundation	Important	No Ag Status	
Clackamas	3,452	17,869	19,397	94	18,305	8,344	15,025	100	82,587
Rural	1,329	17,314	18,795	56	8,826	7,576	14,792	24	68,713
Urban	2,123	555	602	38	9,479	768	233	77	13,874
Multnomah	520	14,826	1,435	4	1,314	22,367	6,292	805	47,563
Rural	520	14,413	1,435	4	1,314	21,923	6,292	805	46,706
Urban		413		0		444		0	857
Washington	652	83,691	2,157	6	7,185	47,253	24,439	36	165,419
Rural	0	78,019	1,449	1	4,948	43,194	23,912	11	151,536
Urban	651	5,672	708	5	2,237	4,058	527	25	13,884
Total	4,623	116,387	22,990	103	26,804	77,963	45,756	942	295,569