

Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
Employment Land Need Decision
Study Session
(Verbatim Transcription)

Presentation Date: August 17, 2015, 10 AM

Attendees: Chair John Ludlow
Commissioner Jim Bernard
Commissioner Paul Savas
Commissioner Tootie Smith
Commissioner Martha Schrader
County Administrator Donald Krupp
[Treasurer Shari Anderson](#)
[District Attorney John Foote](#)
[Sheriff Craig Roberts](#)
[County Clerk Sherry Hall](#)
[County Assessor/Tax Collector Bob Vroman](#)
[Justice of the Peace Karen Brisbin](#)

Presenters: Dan Chandler, Martha Fritzie, Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens, Facilitator

Other Invitees Barb Cartmill, Gary Schmidt, Gary Barth

Chair John Ludlow: Gentlemen, I call back to order the Clackamas Board of Commissioners in a policy session. Mr. Krupp.

Mr. Krupp: Yes, good morning, Commissioners. This is a little bit different than our normal policy sessions. This is really kind of a roll up your sleeves work session regarding the subject of employment land needs. I'm going to invite Mr. Dan Chandler to give you a report and presentation and then invite him to introduce our other participants here; so, Mr. Chandler.

Mr. Chandler: Thank you. As Mr. Krupp said, we're here to talk about issues related to the County's employment land need, potentially to develop some background or even a potential ask that the County might make of Metro, the legislature and/or our other government partners. With me is Martha Fritzie, Senior Planner from the Planning Department. Martha did the mapping that you see up there at the side of the room and also the maps that you saw in any individual sessions that we had with each of you. She's done a great job. Also Kirstin Greene from Cogan Owens is here to help facilitate the discussion after we talk about the context and the individual pieces of property. The Board will recall this is Step 4 of a four-step process the Board agreed to in May to talk about our land need. The first step was we'd identify and reconcile the amount of land that we needed to meet our non-retail employment lands need. The second step was to talk about the nature of that need, which is a mix of a wide-variety of things; Clackamas County has a very diverse economy – includes large-lot industrial, businesses, and professional services, [advance metals](#), [01:44] many other things. Step 3 was to meet with each of you individually with these maps, go over them with you, find out whether there was more information that any of the Commissioners needed for themselves or other information they would like their colleagues to have in advance of making this decision. The order of events today is I'm going to provide some context and background. Martha Fritzie is going to summarize the areas of land. We talked with each of you about them individually a bit ago; she's

going to summarize those, and then Kirstin's going to help facilitate the discussion about the various areas and how we might move through a discussion of our land need. I guess we'll start with the Board's goal, which they adopted 11 months ago.

By 2020, Clackamas County will have and maintain a 20-year supply of serviceable non-retail employment land in the urban growth boundary; that was in the context of the area of focus of building a thriving economy. You recall there were other goals related to wages, land available in a six-year readiness time window. I'm going to talk about roles though a little bit. So the County here does reserves; that's really our role in the process. The urban growth boundary itself is really done by Metro and the cities under the current rules anyway and current IGA's, any city or any UGB expansion has to be preceded by a concept plan that has to include provisions for city governance. So again, we do reserves. The cities and Metro do the UGB. The urban reserves are intended to provide a 50-year supply of land from which the region can draw land into the UGB. As part of the deal that was made in Senate Bill 1011 in 2007, there also had to be designated rural reserves, which were intended to be lands – the best ag lands were to be protected also for 50 years. So there are 50 years of urban land, 50 years of rural land. How well it played out, you know, we don't really know.

Undesignated land – just to sort of clear up the confusion, undesignated land is just land that the County didn't put in a rural reserve and Metro didn't put in an urban reserve; so, there was no designation of undesignated; it's just land that didn't get put in either category.

Metro amends the UGB on a six-year cycle now; it used to be five years. It sounds like with the current Urban Growth Report, urban growth management decision, they may start now on a two or three year cycle for the next round. But by law, they're required every five years and now, six years to provide a 20-year supply of land for housing. There is some question about who's actually responsible for providing land for employment. Metro manages the boundary, but Goal 9, there's some argument about who's responsible for meeting our economic development goals. Metro says it's not; says it's with the cities and the counties, but yet Metro controls the boundary.

Metro, as the Board knows, the urban growth management decision cycle starts with a forecast of population and employment needs, and if necessary, they adjust the boundary to meet the forecasted needs; that's called the Urban Growth Report. It is a study. The decision is called the urban growth management decision. Metro looks at land need on a regional basis, and since 2005, they can't consider a sub regional need without first considering the regional context. So, unless they find an overall regional need for land, for housing, or employment, they can't amend the UGB to meet a purely sub regional need. So, adequate land in Forest Grove, for example, might mean that Metro can't expand the UGB to meet a local need for a city like Wilsonville or a county like Clackamas County. Nonetheless, clearly we believe it's important for Clackamas County to maintain an adequate supply of employment land. We need to balance jobs and housing so we don't overburden the transportation system. We need to continue to increase our assessed value; that's how we provide public services, public safety, take care of our vulnerable citizens. And obviously, an adequate land supply is a key element in providing jobs, and the benefits of which are really too numerous to mention. Obviously, less demand for services – families are doing better; they're not tipping over. So, after the Board adopted the goal, we did a land needs study. We commissioned Johnson Economics and Group Mackenzie to do our Non Retail Land Demand Forecast. The study, interestingly, found that the overall acres of land needed were very close to what Metro had forecast in the Urban Growth Report. It's been criticized as being aspirational. It's not really true. The overall amount of land was very close to what Metro forecasted. However, it was broken out very differently. What the Johnson study did was look at how Clackamas County industries would fair specifically. Metro looked at how, for example, advanced metals manufacturing would fair regionally, and they made some predictions. The Johnson study looked at specific businesses in Clackamas County: who their customers were; what was their ecosystem, and how they would do. The best example of that was in the news recently. Metro forecast that the primary and fabricated metals manufacturing industry in the region would decline between a half a percent and one and a half percent a year.

Johnson forecast that it would grow at two percent a year because of the specific customers and the specific industries that our metals manufacturing industry served. Warren Buffett just bet \$37 billion on our side of the table on [Precision Cast Parts](#), so maybe he read the Johnson study, I don't know. But anyway, clearly our business, our industries may fair differently than those in the region generally, and that's what the Johnson study did. It wasn't aspirational; it wasn't aimed at a particular goal. It was a straight-up evaluation of our land need.

There are two key issues here in this ask. One is, we tried to answer the question "do we have enough land in our urban reserves to meet this 20-year land need?" The urban reserves are intended to provide for a 50-year land supply, but we first wanted to look, do we even have enough to meet 20 years, and we'll talk about that specifically. I'll let Martha and Kirstin talk about that. And the second question really that's on the table is "Are our urban reserves and rural reserves configured in a way that will provide us with a 50-year supply of land?" So there are two separate, but related questions, but we felt that the most important thing was to see whether we had enough land to even meet our 20-year need first.

I think with that, I'm going to turn it over to Martha, who's going to talk about the specific areas of land, and then I'll come back and just talk a little bit about some more process issues and some options on the table before I hand it over to Kirstin.

Commissioner Savas [9:30]: Okay, before she starts – Paul – I just want to clarify. I think I know the answer, but I think it's important that we all, at least be cognizant of that this morning. The rural designation and the undesignated designations are, for the most part, our responsibility and much less so Metro's, correct?

Mr. Chandler: The rural reserves are designated by the County. In order to designate either urban or rural reserves, there has to first be an intergovernmental agreement between Metro and each county as to what those reserves would be. But formally, Metro designates urban reserves, we designate rural reserves. Undesignated land is just land that didn't get designated by either one of those two bodies.

[Commissioner Savas](#): Right. So in essence, the opposite way to pose the question is that – and you kind of stated it – is Metro's responsibility is urban reserves. Correct? Of all the designations of three, even though undesignated is not a designation as you say, but of the three options of a piece of land being one of the three, Metro's responsibility is urban reserve more so than the other two.

Mr. Chandler: That's correct because Metro manages the UGB, but the way the rules and the statute are set up, by requiring an intergovernmental agreement between the two parties that specifies both, it's almost equal, and the responsibilities are almost equal. Although formally, again, Metro designates urban, the County designates rural.

[Commissioner Savas \[11:13\]](#): But whatever we decide to designate, we need the concurrence of Metro regardless of all three, right?

Mr. Chandler: Correct. And I'll talk about that process in a little bit. So, any changes to either urban or rural reserves would require a new intergovernmental agreement between the County and Metro. Martha?

[Commissioner \[11:43\]](#): So while she's working to get that on, right now you could say that there are no urban and rural reserves in Clackamas County?

Mr. Chandler: Correct. Although, we have designated rural reserves in our own Comprehensive Plan, it's all been remanded. I would say it is uncharted territory, but fair to say that there are neither today.

Commissioner [12:27]: So, it's really all undesignated?

Mr. Chandler [12:33]: Sure; from the basic term, I would agree.

Commissioner [12:37] It kind of took me aback.

Mr. Chandler: One could argue that. On the other hand, one could argue "Well, the County has gone ahead and designated rural reserves and put it in its Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations, so those remain as rural.

Commissioner Bernard: Unless Metro agrees to that, they're still undesignated, right?

Commissioner [12:33]: So, just building on that a little bit, Jim, if nothing's designated, then the ruling here – I forgot where it's cited about changing it from one designation to another, that rule doesn't take effect – or that's not a factor until its approved. Because everything right now is a clean piece of paper; there are no recognized designations.

Chair Ludlow: Well, the IGA takes precedence; it's still in force in effect, so –

Unknown [13:25]: Yeah.

Unknown [13:29]: Well, which is it?

Mr. Chandler: It's fair to say that if the County and Metro were to end up at [loggerheads](#), and there were no new revised findings or no new joint submittal back to the Land Conservation Development Commission (LCDC), there would be no reserves in Clackamas County.

Commissioner [13:46]: Which means that we would go back to the old system.

Mr. Chandler: The region would have to apply the old system, which is an interesting situation because – recall the reserves are simply setting up a new category in the priority scheme, right? There's always been a priority scheme that said "You bring exception land in first," that's why Damascus came in – farmland last, and then when you go to farmland, you do it by soil type. This is the hierarchy. The new thing in the hierarchy, of course, is urban reserves, which are the first things to be brought in. Because of the grand bargain, Washington County has urban reserves. So, there are urban reserves in the Metro area that are available. It's an open question whether Metro would even have the authority to go to exception land in Clackamas County if there were urban reserves available in Washington County. I gotta say, much of this is uncharted territory.

Commissioner Savas: [14:45] Well, I think it's really important that we understand that clearly. So I'm going to go back to Page 3 of your staff report, and it says right there, "Changes to Reserves" – and it's underlined. So I'm just going to just test the water so I have a better understanding. It starts out "Any changes to the urban/rural reserves would necessitate a lengthy and involved process and would involve at least the following..." so on and so forth. So, it's fair to say that I could change that to read, "Any changes to the urban and rural reserves agreement, or urban/rural reserves map or designations, because they're really not reserves, right? I'm splitting hairs, but I just want to – because they're technically not reserves, but they are on the map, they are designated on the map and they are our proposal of 2009 that the Board approved.

Unknown [15:34]: The answer really is any change is the IGA; it's not changes to the urban/rural reserves.

Commissioner Savas [15:41]: But the word "reserves" by itself is kind of misleading, so it opens really that up to is if the map or IGA, whichever it may be, finding [15:47] clarity on what these 6, 5, actually, yeah, 4 and 5 repeated there, so actually you have seven bulleted items there. You have two 4's and two 5's on your page there, so that's to the IGA, the agreed upon, or that map, as it sits today.

Mr. Chandler: Correct. Correct. Another way to say this is that we have an IGA which is a necessary precedent to having reserves. The IGA is still valid. So if we were to agree that we're not going to make any changes to the maps, and what we're going to do is adopt revised findings in response to the remand, we would not need to go through Steps 1 through 7, we would instead, just come up with a process, an ordinance, a public hearing or two and adopt revised findings. So, that's sort of one path that would not involve a change and would not involve 1 through 7. Anything that would change the map would then necessitate this new process.

Chair Ludlow: We should probably go on with the presentation here because we could talk this – maybe this will generate even more questions or clarification needs. So Martha –

Mr. Chandler: Pardon me, Chair. This was part of the – we were going to discuss this after that.

Chair Ludlow: I was hoping so. Yes, Martha.

Martha Fritzie: Hi. Good morning. I'm going to get up because I'm going to be pointing at these maps. And I realize they are a little bit harder to see from where you're sitting, but there are copies of most of these maps in the 11 X 17 in your packet that was on your desk.

So, I'm going to go through the areas that we looked at very quickly because as Dan mentioned we already had individual meetings each of you to go through these maps in detail. There's also a table included at the very front of your packet and I'm actually going to go through these areas in the order that they appear on that table, which is slightly different than the over here; but we can [17:55] get to that. So, the first thing that we looked at was to identify areas to provide additional employment, or employment land inside the urban growth boundary. And the thought was, "Well, over the next 20 years by far the easiest things to serve, the easiest changes to make would be inside the urban growth boundary." There were two areas that we looked at. As you're aware up in north Milwaukie, there is a study that's proposed to look at the North Milwaukie Industrial Area with the intent of intensifying employment in that area. And you recall the Johnson Report did a forecast for employment, which then translated to a land need. It's really the employment that we need, that the land is to support the additional employment. So, to the extent that north Milwaukie is successful and can increase employment, just on a conservative estimate based on some preliminary information in the grant application that would equate to roughly the equivalent of 300 acres of land that would no longer be needed because of the increased employment in the area. That's based on employment densities that were used in the Johnson Report. So in other words, at the first study session, the Board agreed that there was a need to provide 1100 more acres of land for additional employment. To the extent that we can intensify employment in north Milwaukie, it could potentially reduce that need by up to 300 acres. And that's inside the UGB; that's the study that hopefully will be happening with the City of Milwaukie and our County economic development folks in the near future.

The second area that we went to look at is Damascus. There are two small areas in Damascus. The reason we looked at Damascus was on Map 3 in your packet which is a little complicated, there were a couple of areas that are adjacent to the City of Happy Valley that, at this point in time, we are assuming are going to be going into the City of Happy Valley. There are adjacent two areas that

Happy Valley has already planned for employment. When Damascus did some planning, this area was designated as residential and therefore, it was not counted in the supply of land that was used for calculation of the demand supply to identify the need gap. And in this area south of, like the [Windswept Waters \[20:55\]](#) area toward Carver, but not in Carver, I don't believe, there's between 350 to 400 acres of additional land that could reasonably be considered employment land inside the City of Damascus. And we've had some conversations with the City of Happy Valley, who seem pretty supportive of this idea [\[inaudible 21:22\]](#) that there's a large portion of the western side of Damascus that will probably, in the foreseeable future, end in the City of Happy Valley.

So, those are two areas, A and B on your table that were identified inside the urban growth boundary. The next place that we looked was outside the urban growth boundary in the existing urban reserves. So, in the existing urban reserves, doing rough calculations of buildable land – this is not a detailed buildable land inventory. The rough calculations of acreages first took out any actual constrained land, floodway, [\[inaudible 22:05\]](#), flood plain, steep slopes over 25 percent, regulated stream buffers; the resulting acreages that you see in these various areas account for the – subtract that land, which is from your first buildable land inventory. It does not go further to take a look at existing development, necessarily; there's rural development involved in all of these areas. It's not expected to be very intensive; so these are rough numbers and these are sort of gross numbers.

The first one we looked at is in the Stafford/Borland area. There's been a lot of conversation over the last many years about this area. It's also over here, it's [\[inaudible 22:53\]](#) C. There is, based on several other studies that had been done for this area, there's an estimated 260 acres of buildable land. The understanding is that land – there are a couple of large parcels in that area, but given access, topography, adjacent uses, it's understood that that land could probably be more suited for, like a Kruse Way-type of development: Class A office, light industrial, R&D, that sort of development. So, that's about 260 acres over here.

The next area, Area D is outside of Oregon City. You'll see there's quite a few reserve areas outside of Oregon City. This area down here, which is adjacent to the Beaver Creek Concept Plan Area in Oregon City, it's really the only area that would likely have employment land suitability, and the rest of this would probably be largely residential. The Beaver Creek Concept Plan area does have a fairly large employment area plan. Just looking at the land outside of it that would perhaps, [logically](#) connect, we were we found maybe 60 to 70 acres; it's not a whole lot down in that area.

Over here, outside of Wilsonville, again there are several reserves. Wilsonville is actively planning this area to the northeast. It's going to be largely residential. So these areas here were not looked at as potential employment land because they would not logically be planned as that. There are some large parcels up here northwest of Wilsonville that amount to about 125 acres. The City has indicated that it's being looked at as one of two things: it could be looked at as an extension of the Coffee Creek employment area or as an extension of Villebois, which would largely be residential. So, this 125 acres, you know, could be an option. Certainly it's not – it's something that's feasible and something that Wilsonville may be amenable to.

So, other urban reserves that we looked at were not included in the table because they weren't determined to be areas that could logically provide employment land in the 20-year time period that we're looking at to provide the 1100 acres. That would include this area over in here. After conversations with Washington County, who is working on a study with Wilsonville and Tualatin, the assumption is that will be mostly residential land, at least at this point on this side of the border in those urban reserves. So, I don't believe that this would be a logical choice to provide employment land, and certainly not within the next 20 years. And then again, when you look at the parts of Damascus that we are assuming could develop within 20 years, it's only the western portion; the eastern portion is not expected to develop within the 20-year time frame. So, it's not really reasonable to expect that this would develop in the 20-year time frame either. So there would potentially be more employment lands out here, but this is not considered on the table to provide land for a 20-year need.

And again, I'm going through this really fast, and I'm happy to answer questions afterward, but that kind of clears up our urban reserves. There were a couple of other areas that we looked at. When you look at the map and the constraints, looking at some large parcels, a couple of areas do jump out at you. And again this will be on the back side of your table. The areas that we're calling satellite areas are important because they provide options that may require changes to the reserves maps – they may be changes that are doable and may not be as controversial. The first satellite area – this Area F over here, A, B, C, D, E, F – eastern Canby. This is a little bit of a different conversation. If you recall the demand analysis that Johnson did was really for the Metro urban growth boundary. The need that we found was for the Metro urban growth boundary. But when you look at the map there is some very good employment land, or potentially good employment land east of Canby, adjacent to their employment area. And, to the extent that the County could support Canby in helping develop this land could alleviate some of the pressure [inaudible 28:09] in the Metro urban growth boundary. Even though Canby is in charge of their own UGB, they have their own analysis that they need to do and they do not have any urban reserves, but they cannot go into the rural reserve areas. So, if there is a way to provide them with a little bit more land for potential expansions east of the city, again it could provide some good employment land for the County that would alleviate some of the pressure to develop Metro UGB if we can't find sufficient land up in there. So, that's Area F. To expand this a little bit large, it would require a change to the rural reserves. There's just under 400 acres in this area that is not in the reserve. The City has indicated that they would be interested, potentially, in about the same amount for a total of around 800 acres east of Canby, so you could potentially change the rural reserve over there to provide a few more large parcels, but then continue to provide this buffer between Canby and the rest of the farmland.

Commissioner Schrader: Martha, can you just point out on that map where their industrial area is now; it's kind of north, isn't it?

Ms. Fritzie: Some of this is not inside of the city yet; their industrial area is down in here.

Commissioner Schrader: So, they've already got an expansion area there I know with a number of businesses.

Ms. Fritzie: Yes. There's about 400 acres they can expand into, perhaps a little bit less than that.

Mr. Chandler: [30:04] Yeah, there's 150 acres inside their UGB right now and 150 outside for a total of 300.

Ms. Fritzie: So that's Canby, which again is a little bit more nuanced; a little bit different of a conversation, but we thought it was important to identify because when you look at the map, when you look at all the constraints on the map, there really are a lot of constraints in Clackamas County, and there's potentially some good land over here.

Moving on to Area G, which falls under the satellite area changes because what was being considered was a change from rural reserve to undesignated, not necessarily to an urban reserve for Metro. The Springwater Road area, again, has some large, flat parcels out in here. There's been some interest in this area that's been discussed: the Economic Development Commission discussed this area when they were discussing employment lands about a year ago. There are some large, flat parcels. There's as much as 1500 acres out here. This area has a lot of potential constraints in terms of access, infrastructure – the Carver Bridge, being one of the biggest constraints, is right about here. It really currently provides the only access from the urban area. So this area is certainly interesting. There are, like I said some large, flat parcels. In terms of the timing, again, you've got the issues of the Carver Bridge; there's Happy Valley, Damascus, whatever's going on up in here. I'm not sure it's reasonable

to assume that this could develop within the 20-year time frame either, similar with these areas east of Damascus, but it's certainly an area that we're interested in.

Commissioner: [32:27] You mentioned an error in the Staff report that some of those were Metro owned. Could you just point, if you have an idea where or which properties that Metro owns?

Ms. Fritzie: Well, I had it on the map.

Chair Ludlow: [32:41] Somewhere along the Clackamas River there, I believe.

Ms. Fritzie: I noticed some along the Clackamas River that actually wasn't included in the area that I'm at, that sort of pulled the corridor out— just in this rural reserve. Metro owns some land over in here and it was about 150 acres that was inside our area.

Unknown: Is that the elephant land? [33:19]

Ms. Fritzie: That's somewhere else. I'll have to find it but it was over on this side of the area. There's about 150 acres that were inside the area of the corridor that I mapped and a couple hundred that were outside the area.

Commissioner: [33:46] I know when the EDC discussed this, and I've been out there to look from the windshield perspective, that a lot of properties that were closer to the Carver Bridge along Springwater Road were either for sale or had a lot of rock in the ground as opposed to being farmable land. And the circle you drew is quite a bit south, so the area where the Springwater Road kind of makes a right-hand turn, so to speak or veers right, I think the emphasis was from that area where it goes right back up to the Carver Bridge as being a target area.

Ms. Fritzie: This, sort of right here [34:24] –

Unknown: Yeah, that it would go from there to the Car – yeah – as opposed to even farther south or even near the Metro property.

Ms. Fritzie: Okay, so I did include that land. There are some smaller parcels down in there. There's also some pretty steep slopes, so some of that acreage probably came out of the calculation. The larger pieces up here were included in the calculation. But yeah, about 150 acres that I included in that calculation of 1500 is Metro land.

Then moving on to H on your list. This would require a change to the urban/rural reserves map, which Dan will go through the process again after I finish talking. South of Wilsonville, also known as French Prairie, when you look at the constraints in the area, there's a large flood plain to the east, there's the river and some steep slope and flood plain to the west. If you encompass the area in between those, it's about 1800 acres, there are some large, flat parcels in that area, including a golf course, a large County owned property [inaudible 35:38] extension, some privately-owned property, some farms, some property not being farmed; it's all right along I-5. There is the potential certainly, for some good employment land down in there. There are questions – there's an unwillingness from the City of Wilsonville to serve it, and there are questions about how easily that could be served over the Boone Bridge, which there perhaps is some disagreement among the parties about how easily that could actually happen. So, I know we've all had a lot of the conversations about this property down here. Again, this would be certainly a controversial change to the map. There are a lot of parties interested in not seeing that happen.

And then finally, the last area that I looked at outside the urban growth boundary was this area southeast of Oregon City. I just looked at it because it's undesignated, and there are a few large parcels down in here, if you go out Beavercreek or maybe out 213, it's this undesignated area. You can find 400 or more acres out there. It could possibly be an extension of Oregon City's Employment Areas up in here. There is, again, potentially a lot of controversy in this area because you're getting close to the Beavercreek Hamlet. There's a lot of mixed feelings about whether or not this area should be developed. But it is currently in an undesignated that would have to change to an urban reserve if we were going to look at it as being able to provide employment land within the 20-year time frame. The City of Oregon City also has some well-known issues with having some trouble annexing properties because of the vote on [37:41] annexation, a lot of this Beavercreek Concept Plan Area has not actually been annexed into the city yet, so there are some potential issues with going this direction as well. I was going to try to go a bit faster, but that is my sort of quick summary of map. Basically from A through I, sort of the easier, less controversial pieces to the bigger, more controversial requiring changes to the urban reserves map, in that order.

Commissioner Tootie Smith: Martha, thank you for the good work you've done on these maps. I think it helps us a lot in determining what's available. There's a lot of assumptions being brought forward with the proposal today, and I'm going to save my comments on that as we finish with the presentation. But thank you, I just want to acknowledge your work on this.

Commissioner Savas: So, Martha, I think you understand the lay of the land there pretty well. Is there anything on the current designations on the map that's, you know, urban reserve, for example; is there anything there that we know we can actually ask to be brought in with a willing city, willing governance? I mean, what's the first thing we could pick off there right now and say "add this because we're short on large lot industrial"? What's on that map that we can use today?

Unknown: Damascus

[39:19]

Unknown: Well, Canby

Ms. Fritzie: Well, certainly the pieces inside the urban growth boundary. Wilsonville has proved to be a pretty willing city. Right now, they're focusing on planning this area, but they certainly are interested in developing employment lands, right now, a lot of them are on this side of the Washington County line. And –

Commissioner: [39:42] Right. I thought those areas were housing for the most part – those blue areas.

Ms. Fritzie: These over here are, but I would think potentially they would be willing to work on that at some point. I don't know the time frame. And there are continually conversations about the Stafford area. Obviously, the three cities are not willing, and we're working on a – we're having a conversation related to remand of [inaudible 40:11] possibly. I think there's a common understanding that if anything's going to happen in this area, that this Borland area would probably be the first one to go.

Commissioner Bernard: Well, one important thing that is lacking from this chart is access to infrastructure; sewer/water for one. I don't know if you've been driving the freeways lately, transportation's the other. So, I think that one of the things that, you know, north Milwaukie, Damascus, Happy Valley, that piece near that area, and Oregon City, and Wilsonville, there are possibilities because there is some potential access to all those things. But one of the things that Dan actually mentioned was a balance of jobs and housing and – the important thing that, I think all of us know, is that driving to Wilsonville from Oregon City or anywhere, other than Wilsonville itself

means you have to drive on a freeway, and you have to go across some bridges. And so, there are a lot of opportunities in Clackamas County to look at areas where there is adequate sewer/water infrastructure, but I would say that, generally speaking, you could say there is no area in Clackamas County where there's adequate transportation.

Commissioner Smith: [41:54] I disagree with that, Jim. I think that's a very broad statement and –

Commissioner Bernard: Well, of course it is, but I'm speaking and, you know, I think that the map – one of the problems we're talking about doesn't actually exist and that's reserves because they don't actually exist yet. And those are the problems that we need to address and move forward on all those other things. I mean voter annexation in Oregon City's a huge problem. That piece of land that's a little southeast, there's a big gap in between that so far the voters haven't agreed to annex; so, voter annexation's another problem. Third issue is that, frankly Clackamas County does not just represent this area; we represent the whole County and we don't focus on enough, I think, those areas outside the Metro region – and I know we're trying to address employment lands near the Metro region, but we also have other communities that are trying to develop their employment land and we are trying to work with Estacada and other communities to try and help. But we've got a long way to go and we need to really get going and really start focusing on other areas. McLoughlin Boulevard's another area that has great opportunity, full of parking lots where they're selling cars and we're just totally ignoring McLoughlin Boulevard. So, I just think – and 212, I drove through that this weekend at least twice, kind of checking out our [caps road \[43:53 capital\] project](#) to see how it's going, and there's actually some development going on in other areas behind I think it's Fred Meyers. There's a bunch of land out there that's available. Are we counting land that currently is in the UGB and exists?

Ms. Fritzie: Yes. So, the analysis that was initially done, both in the Urban Growth Report and the Johnson Study looked at forecasted need and then looked at what's available. And there was a buildable land inventory done by Metro that accounted for vacant land, redevelopable land based on certain criteria. That inventory was given to each of the local jurisdictions to review and it's not expected that it was 100 percent correct, but it got to a good estimate and if anything, it really was very generous about estimating the redevelopable lands, it may have overestimated them. So, any vacant land in that area should have been accounted for already in that supply and demand reconciliation, which in the Johnson Report showed that there was still a need for an additional [1100 acres. \[45:19\]](#)

Commissioner Bernard: So not redevelopable land, just empty, vacant.

Ms. Fritzie: Empty and redevelopable.

Commissioner Bernard: So McLoughlin Boulevard was considered in that study?

Ms. Fritzie: Whichever parcels met the criteria that were put in there for redevelopable or if they were flat out vacant [lots](#).

Chair Ludlow: Let me say something about traffic. This region has disproportionately invested into mass transit, specifically light rail, and given up the Mount Hood Freeway, the Western Bypass, and now we're starting to really see – I think it's exacerbated itself in the last year specifically – lots of congestion. I'm not willing to say we're so full of transportation, we should draw the line and say we can't develop because, hey, drive the Columbia River to the Rose Quarter sometime. Or drive 205 from Oregon City north after 2:30 in the afternoon. We cannot, you know, zip it up simply because there is congestion because that's the way Metro wants it, so we'll quit being selfish SOB drivers and

jump on mass transit, so we're going to have to live with that. If transit or traffic itself is a measuring stick, then Wilsonville should be done. Because you try it at anything from 2:30 on going south and in the morning going north, it's locked up, it's too tough to navigate. Paul.

Commissioner Savas: So, you brought McLoughlin Boulevard up a couple times, Commissioner, and there's no really large lot, I mean, sure, I think it's prime for redevelopment, but as far as the Johnson Study, that was 25 acres and above primarily, I believe, as far as looking for lots, as far as that recommendation, and there just aren't – it's just the nature of the boulevard. Redevelopment? Sure, but as far as being some big employment center that's got high-paying jobs for manufacturing or some of our target areas and our [trans sector](#) areas, I don't think there's a lot of that. I think north of Milwaukie, that industrial area, that's got some large lots that could, indeed, become that.

[Commissioner Bernard: \[47:37\]](#) Not 25 acres, owned by one person.

Commissioner Savas: Well, I'm just – that's depth of the – if you look at the commercial strip along McLoughlin, it's very shallow. They're 100 to 200 feet deep for the most part.

[Commissioner Bernard:](#) So you're saying this study is about 25 acre lots or more?

[Commissioner Savas:](#) Well, I was looking at Dan for – but I thought when he presented that study, that they were focusing on acreage – not 1 acre lots, 2 acre lots, because that's primarily what McLoughlin really is. Dan

Mr. Chandler: They looked at 25 acres and plus and called it large lot, but the point of their study, and I think that what the [Board is \[48:16\] reconciled with in](#) Step Two, was we have a really wide variety of need for employment land, including some large lot, but businesses and professional services – a whole wide variety of things, including some large lot.

Chair Ludlow: I'm going to give the floor to you, but I think we have to get back on task. Kirstin, we really appreciate you attending, you might be able to say something here in a little while.

Commissioner Smith: That's what I was going to say. I think we're trying to get real anxious to get in the queue and lay down our ground. I think we need an entire presentation and then we can move on, because, you know what? It's almost 5 minutes until 11:00, and we're supposed to be done with this and make a decision by 12:00.

Chair Ludlow: So Martha, are you doing a hand-off to Dan?

[Mr. Chandler: \[48:57\]](#) Well, I just want to make sure we wrap up the discussion about – we started into on the process. So Process 1 is – let's assume that we either reach an agreement around Stafford or the County decides to just go ahead with Metro, do the revised findings and move it forward. That's Process 1 that would involve no changes. At the end of that process, if it's successful, we'd have reserves, both urban and rural as designated today and we'll be able to move forward. The other process, the process of changes – I just want to make sure that the Board's clear about what it would take: a revised IGA with Metro; you'd have to have a new joint County/Metro public process. The rules actually here provide – there has to be specific approved public process with broad noticing opportunities for public comment. They weren't content to rely on the certain Goal 1 normal public process, whatever that means. And, we have to reconsider and reapply the urban and rural reserves factors by the County, so the regional balance; I think all the factors would come into play. In other words, we can't amend the map because we think specifically that it would be a good idea to

do so, we have to apply the factors for every piece of property we look at. It would require consultation and coordination with both Multnomah and Washington Counties. For new urban reserves, the rules require coordination with cities, special districts, and school districts that might be expected to provide urban services, so they would have to be in the loop, consulted, and coordinated with, not necessarily yielded to, but certainly coordinated with and brought into the process. And then at the end of the day, a new joint submittal between Metro and the County to LCDC and then the appeal route that we've been living through for the last five years. I just want to make sure the Board knows that's the process that we would have to go through to make changes.

Commissioner: [50:52] Is there a Vegas rating on the possibility of this happening?

Commissioner Savas: So getting back to my earlier conversation under that title, "Changes to Reserves and [inaudible 51:03], #5 there or the first 5, the OAR, when it says "new urban reserves", is that OAR there in the context of after there's, let's say, Washington County has approved reserves, so they would have to follow these rules. But being that we don't have any reserves – and that was the point of me drawing that distinction out earlier on in this session. We didn't do that before when we did the map designations. We didn't consult like this before; we didn't have that level of detail. So I'm assuming it's still a clean slate. We're starting, potentially with the remand, that that rule doesn't apply until there are some official designations. So, which is it?

Mr. Chandler: [51:49] Well one, we did do it before. This rule was in place the first time we did this, and the cities were certainly consulted with. Obviously, it didn't go the way the cities wanted it to go in every instance, but they were certainly coordinated with in the process or we would have heard about it in an appeal. The rule would apply, now, to any new urban reserves. So I think if we were to change undesignated land to urban, or rural to urban, we have to make sure that we complied with that coordination requirement, which exists in a sense anyway in Statewide Planning Goal 2; so, really, any changes would have to be coordinated, and I think this just calls that a heightened level of coordination for urban reserves.

Chair Ludlow: So, we have got to get going with the presentations, so let's do that.

Kirstin Greene: Thank you, Commissioners. Our assignment today is the two-parts you've been hearing about, the 20-year supply and also the 50-year supply. The cheat sheet we've been working from is this chart on Page 5 in your Staff report. I want to just walk you through land inside the UGB, totaling approximately 700 acres, the land we've all been calling the existing urban reserves, the 455 acres, and then this nuance east of Canby [inaudible]. [53:03 - 53:20] In terms of complexity, Martha reviewed those as well. The satellite area changes east of Canby and Springwater Road, and then the changes [inaudible] Metro Reserve, French Prairie, and **Beavercreek, which would total over 4,000 acres there.** So, on the 20-year supply, if there are any additional remarks the Commission would like to make that they consider this – we're going to find the 20-year supply **in the 1100 acres inaudible.** [53:33 – 53:57]

Chair Ludlow: Well, according to that chart, I think we need to approach that separately, and so, Borland, Oregon City, North Wilsonville, etc. you know, that's kind of the low-hanging fruit in a sense. And then approach the next one. Because the votes may be different from this Commission on different ones, in fact they will be, probably. And then the inside the UGB: Damascus, North Milwaukie deserves a separate discussion, and then of course east of Canby, currently. And then the big, hairy, audacious goals to the right, certainly each one of those could be done absolutely separately, too. So we should probably, subject to your recommendation here, talk about that one – that column first. Paul.

Commissioner Savas: So, I was going on the Staff presentation and her question was, I think the first bullet, right? So with that, can you better define, Dan or Martha, the meaning and as it applies 1011 [55:00] with regard to the 20-year need and the 50-year need? Because I think we need to have some context.

Mr. Chandler: Certainly. The question we were asking on the 20-year need was, there's been a lot of controversy about our urban/rural reserves. So, the first question we wanted to answer was "well, are the rural and urban reserves configured in a way that we can," even before we ask to change them or not, let's first look and see, can we even meet our 20-year need in that configuration? So, that was sort of the origin of the 20-acre need question. Because I think if you can't meet your 20-year need, it may be more likely to advocate for changes than not, right? So, that was the genesis of the 20-acre need. It's really the County's goal, can we do that?

The reserves themselves, as I said, are designed to meet a 50-year need. Now, one thing to say about that though is there is no legal requirement, there was a legal requirement that the urban reserves independently meet a land need for each county, right? That wasn't part of the urban reserves calculation, really at all in a formal way. Obviously, the Counties advocated for what was in their backyards or not. But there is no requirement that the 50-acre need be balanced across the region. Multnomah County, for example, has very, very little urban reserves. There's no way, if you looked at Multnomah County independently that they would have a 50-year supply.

Chair Ludlow: So getting back to that. Shall we approach the first one there, Borland Road, Oregon City, northwest Wilsonville; now, when you speak of Oregon City, you're talking about the Beavercreek area. We have not solicited, now have we received, feedback from our citizen participation organization and/or the villages. So, I would emphasize that this is a bit tentative in a sense because we want to hear from partners, etc. Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: So, what we're asking for – what we're talking about right now is what is currently in the reserves, the urban reserves.

Chair Ludlow: Or the map.

Jim Bernard: Yeah. We're asking – so, right now what we're talking about is not a change to the map?

Ms. Greene: [57:38] That is correct.

Chair Ludlow: Left-hand column, correct.

Ms. Greene: [57:38] Everything to the [inaudible 57:40] and serving employment land inside that area looking for affirmation that that land is available. The County should [inaudible 57:59] in the short term. So, thinking a little bit in terms of short-term, if you will, in the 20 years [inaudible 58:05] as opposed to looking out [inaudible 58:10]

Chair Ludlow: Well, Jim had asked about the inside the urban [inaudible 58:18]. You waved your hand there east of Canby included in that, but that cannot because it's not, you know, I think the line should be –

Ms. Greene: [58:26] Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

Ms. Fritzie: [58:28] There's a line there.

Commissioner Smith: Well, I favor Borland. I don't know how we're going to serve Oregon City if that makes any difference to anybody. And, does northwest Wilsonville want to be included? One, does it matter? And Mr. Chair, are you looking for a motion?

Chair Ludlow: Yeah, I think –

Commissioner Smith: Okay, *I'll make a motion that we include Borland Road, Oregon City, northwest Wilsonville into the 455 acres.*

Chair Ludlow: Alright, is there a second?

Commissioner: [58:57] *I'll second it.*

Commissioner Savas: [58:58] I'd like to clarify – well, actually, maybe amend the motion.

Chair Ludlow: Well, we can try that. We've got a motion and second for Borland Road, Oregon City, northwest Wilsonville to confirm that that is something we would like to see developed. So, Paul?

Commissioner Savas: I don't know how I would word it, but basically what I'm trying to say is I think the motion should just – should we leave the Borland/Stafford 4 A, B, C, and D as is – and that's what I'd like to vote on. Basically the map, the urban reserves that are currently urban reserves within – that are on the map, adjacent to the UGB, we're leaving as is. That's really what the motion is, right?

Commissioner Smith: Well, Paul, yes; really what the motion is when you throw in 4 A, B, C, and D, we don't have reference to that on our maps today, nor are they up there so, I think that's a little bit confusing.

Commissioner Savas: Well, I think people are already confused. I know that some constituents out there want to know where we stand on those. I think if we got **Borland** on there and yet, the Staff presentation says "Other than negotiations on the Stafford area" so I'm assuming when we say that, on Bullet #2, "Other than the Stafford area", that's going to be **S 4 A, B, C, and D**, right? [1:00:20] So, your motion now includes that, where the Staff presentation excludes that. So which is it?

Commissioner Smith: Well, if I can clarify my motion, I can restate it if you want to be clear on it. ***I move that we include Borland, which is 260, Oregon City, which is 70, and northwest Wilsonville, which is 125.*** Now, if you want to throw other land designations in there that somebody else has said "I don't have clarification in front of me"; my motion is very clear and I believe it's been seconded.

Chair Ludlow: So a clarification, then I'll get to Martha. The 260 acres, is that just from the Tualatin River to I-205, or does it include the Tualatin River up to Rosemont?

Mr. Chandler: It would be Tualatin south of 205, and that would be the amount of developable land. The whole area there is around 400 acres, but with the constraints, it's generally deemed to be around 260 developable –

Commissioner Smith: Because it's steep and it really can't be developed.

Mr. Chandler: Yeah. If it might be helpful, I think in that first column, the reason we sort of put it there independently was to really ask the question: Is the Board okay with just counting that, those three

things as part of our supply? In other words, are there any problems or questions as sort of counting those as our – part of the calculus of our employment lands?

Commissioner Schrader: So, what I'm trying to clarify is, it is that one section of Stafford, and then we're moving forward with a conversation with our three cities, and also with presentations of all the other folks who are involved, who have been involved with presentations, to talk about how the rest of that triangle will move forward. So, what we're really specifically – which is I think is what you were saying, Commissioner – you're saying are we talking about the whole Stafford triangle, or just acknowledging today that Borland is going to be part of the inventory.

Commissioner Savas: Right, you are correct.

Commissioner Schrader: and that's all we're saying. Borland's going to be part of the inventory. We still have significant conversations to have to get us through a "remand" with all the parties involved with that.

Commissioner Savas: [1:02:38] Yep.

Commissioner Bernard: So we're talking only employment land in this specific column?

Mr. Chandler: [1:02:45] Correct.

Commissioner Bernard: Because I think, Paul that you're asking, you know, in the urban/rural reserves, the Stafford triangle included both employment and housing, which I support with continued discussions. But I mean, I could agree that, you know, this column for industrial lands – or employment lands is a much better term – we could agree to that. But I just think it's kind of crazy to start picking this stuff off a map when, you know, the truth is once we get to this certain area, we're going to have to decide, "Are we going to open this up and start all over?" Or are we going to ask to affirm the urban reserve? So, I'm not going to vote to support this because the bigger discussion is "Are we going to ask Metro to address the Stafford transportation problems?" Or are we going to open up the whole process, and I am not interested in doing that. It doesn't make sense to piece it out.

Commissioner Savas: Well, I kind of agree with Jim on this. But, I just want to make it perfectly clear: the way this is put together is confusing to me because it says right up there "Potential Land Supply with No Changes to Reserves." Okay, and I think it's hard for me to say, "Borland Road, okay is that, you know, 4 A, B, or C, or D, or how does that affect 4 A, B, C, or D? So, it's simpler for me because I understand that to say, you know –

Commissioner Bernard: [1:04:18] Stafford.

Commissioner Savas: Borland/Stafford: 4 A, B, C, and D, leave it alone and then the cities at that point, can determine whether or not they want to bring it in. All we're doing is reserves, because that's our responsibility. So, if they say "No, we're averse to bringing that in," then that's their call in the UGB. The map and the reserves are our responsibility. And this Staff presentation is not clear as to really what we're doing here.

Mr. Krupp: So the way I understand these charts, if our goal is to identify what would be 1100 acres of employment land to help meet our 20-year need, the way I would understand that first column, that would include Borland, Oregon City, and North Wilsonville, that we can identify up to 455 acres towards that 1100-acre goal. That's the way to understand it, as you move across the chart, you can

identify additional acreage we could achieve to be able to reach that 1100 acre goal for that 20-year supply. That's the idea here. This doesn't answer the question about the details related to the negotiations that need to be conducted regarding Stafford, but what we can say is when we look at that first column, we've identified 260 acres in the Borland area, 70 acres in Oregon City, and 125 acres in northwest Wilsonville that will provide to us 455 acres towards our 1100 acre goal.

Commissioner Smith: So if we're not going to vote on this chart, why are we – ?

Chair Ludlow: What are we doing here?

Commissioner Smith: Yeah, what are we doing here, today? I mean, a terrible thought just came through my mind: this whole exercise is bound for failure. If we can't even take the low hanging fruit of Borland, for crying out loud people, and fight over it – we all saw the oblong shaped circle that Staff presented to us and that's what the 260 acres means. We all saw in Oregon City the 70 acres on the map. We all know what that mean as well as Wilsonville. For any of us to say “Oh I'm not going to vote on this because blah, blah, blah, blah,” or, you know, “I want to include A, B, C, D, E, F, G” I think we should do this and move forward, because folks, we cannot fail today. That is so not an option. We need to vote on this and move forward. If can't get this first column into the affirmative, Mr. Chair, I'm going to move that we adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Savas: So getting back to Mr. Krupp, as he kind of clarified what we're doing, I appreciate that. So, with his rationale for what we're doing here today, I would say that the 260 acres, respective of the Executive Summary, our 2020 Goal, and everything else going on, that 260 acres, though we want to see that happen, politically might be highly unlikely. I'm concerned about actually adding that and making that the sum total of the 1100-acre requirement, knowing that's politically challenged. It's unlikely, I mean, maybe it will, but I'm concerned with history being what it is, yes, let's keep it that way. I would support that we keep it under that same designation. But, I am not comfortable with calculating that and subtracting it from the 1100 acres. I mean really if you take a look at these numbers, what is there on here that you feel comfortable about? You got North Wilsonville; we're probably good with that. And you've got North Milwaukie. Other than that, there's nothing.

Commissioner Savas: Okay. You're asking me?

Commissioner Savas: Well, I mean I'm looking at this and – no, I'm not asking you. If you look at this chart and you actually make that decision based on that, there's 500, well, there's 425 acres. We're pretty comfortable we could be – but we can't – you know, it's just like I'm not going to build a road because it's going to fill up. I'm not going to not decide on this because we're not going to do it. We got to work towards that. So I just think, you know, the greater question here isn't about this. I'm good with those numbers should the community accept it. The bigger question is here: are we going to open up the process or are we going to ask Metro to address the concerns in the remand and move forward and go on to the industrial land later.

Ms. Greene: [1:09:01] We will get to that.

Mr. Krupp: So one other way to describe this is this really is aspirational, but it's also true that, particularly with regard to Borland that it's already current County policy with respect to the actions that the Clackamas County Board of County Commissioners had already taken with respect to the Stafford area. So, you're working from what has been adopted policy on the part of our existing

policy framework, and the issue that prevents us from moving forward to that is the appeal, which requires negotiation with our cities to resolve.

Now, one of the things this body has got to be able to do is to articulate what our position is going to be with respect to negotiating a solution for the remand. And absent direction from the Board, we can't even begin to sit down face-to-face with Metro in talking with them about our intergovernmental agreement about how we're going to be able to move forward. So, the idea here is if you believe that we may be able to achieve our employment land goals, or a portion thereof, by affirming and relying on the 455 acres identified in existing urban reserves as they have been adopted by the County, then we would move forward and move down the chart to look at the next categories.

Commissioner: [1:10:47] I think what we're really talking about, if we're including this acreage, is whether or not the whole of the triangle, with the conversation with the remand remains in urban reserve. And I think that's where we're headed; however, with the caveat that there are multiple stake holders in that triangle. And what urban development means, actually depending on the topography and the negotiations that are worked out could be quite different and actually could be a transformative process, in my opinion. Borland Road, I think, in the whole conversation no matter whom you talk to, that it's like the one area of agreement where people are all on board with that. And working with the Stafford folk, knowing the angst that they're having, they would love to have it undesignated or rural. What I've kind of tried to say is: just because it's designated that way doesn't mean that we have to do "development" as usual. There are lots of methods out there; there's lots of outside of the box thinking. So, I feel comfortable moving forward with this, but I do think that it's going to be likely then that the whole area is "designated urban". But what that means in terms of what the cities want, and what the Hamlet wants, and what the SLOA wants, is going to be a continued negotiation.

Ms. Greene: Borland [inaudible 1:12:12]

Commissioner: [1:12:15] That's right and so, that's what I'm saying. I see that a future opportunity and I'm not willing to keep anybody out of the conversation. I just want to make sure that that's clear. When people say "urban" it provides a lot of angst and I'm saying "no, nobody's going to be excluded and what we mean by "urban" to me is quite a different thing in Oregon than what we might be talking about in other areas of the United States.

Chair Ludlow: So let's have a vote on this, shall we? Thank you. Caroline.

Caroline Hill: Commissioner Schrader.

Commissioner Schrader: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Savas.

Commissioner Savas: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Bernard

Commissioner Bernard: I'm going to vote "no" because I don't think it makes any difference –it's a waste of time to pull things off.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Smith:

Commissioner Smith: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Chair Ludlow.

Chair Ludlow: Aye. Passes 4 to 1. Next column. Paul.

Commissioner Savas: Just for clarification, I going to make my statement here. I probably won't get a second, but I'm going to do it any how. ***I move that we don't include the 260 acres in the calculation because it might be unlikely to reach a solution within the framework of the Staff presentation and the 20-year supply.***

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second? [Silence.] Okay then, Kirstin. Oh, yes, Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: So, there's actually just one motion we need today, which would resolve all these questions. And so, I doubt that I'm going to get a response on this either, but I'm going to look to Tom McCall, Senate Bill 100, Tom McCall, a great republican. And ***I move we ask Metro to address the Stafford transportation issues and request the LCDC to affirm the urban/rural reserves.*** I want to add to that is that that would include all of Stafford and all these figures and numbers within that agreement are already in the rural reserves and the urban reserves. So, that's my motion to ask Metro to address the Stafford transportation issues, and request LCDC to affirm the urban/rural reserve process.

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second? [Silence] Let's not forget that we've applied for a Construction Excise Tax (CET) grant for the studying of traffic in the Stafford area. Certainly there are participants; the three cities would love to have us study everything known to man, every infrastructure need in that area, but we will be at the table with Metro, let's not forget, talking about that very thing, so it'll be addressed soon enough.

Ms. Greene: [1:14:57] Great. Thank you and well done; making progress, so North Milwaukie. Mr. Chair you were addressing the CET grant that the County [inaudible 1:15:06] ***intensification of land use in the Milwaukie area.*** That north Milwaukie area is intended to be used as just an affirmation [1:15:10] of your ***attention*** really. So in the 20 years, we can agree to include or endorse the western portions of Damascus adjacent to Happy Valley and the North Milwaukie area, which would add an additional 700 acres, and as you know, that's [inaudible 1:15:36] infrastructure a willingness [inaudible 1:15:40].

Commissioner Savas: My earlier point about my concern about adding the acreage, because if you add 455 plus 700, we have 1145 acreage. Someone could say "Geez, our work's done; let's just go home."

Ms. Greene: Well, in 20-years, but not in 50.

Commissioner Savas: Well, this is all in the 20-year premise, but the Johnson Study was a 20-year need. So, my problem with that is, what's really likely, number one by our 2020 Goal and by the 20-year goal, what's likely to take place? And so, I'm okay with that, but I'm not okay with adding them together and say our work's done or it's 1100 acres because too much of that is unlikely in that timeframe. That's what's wrong.

Commissioner Schrader: Okay, so here's what this is enabling us to do. And Commissioner, I do understand your angst, and you've been a champion of making sure that this County has really

acreage for employment land. If we can get through this, this will give some clarity of where the infrastructure investments need to happen. And so, for me when I look at it, it's kind of like first things first. Okay, if – if the triangle with Borland, for instance, needs traffic infrastructure, we'll know that. Damascus – we call it Damascus, it's likely Happy Valley. Since I've been here we've done tremendous infrastructure investment with the roads out there and you can see that. And I remember when that was still relatively rural in that whole Sunnyside Expansion, and the work we did up to, I want to say 217 has, I think, helped make some of that likely.

And then the whole North Milwaukie piece is really going to be driven by land aggregation with a willing partner with the City of Milwaukie and willing land owners, as well as opportunities that we've looked at, dare I say because of light rail with a connection to OHSU, OMSI, the connection to [OTRADI](#), which is kind of all along that line and moving people back and forth. And maybe having an opportunity in that area as entities need to expand, such as OHSU, maybe OSU, we don't really know that we're ready for that. And so that kind of has an infrastructure already in place as well and so to me this is infrastructure investment and water and sewer and it helps us focus on first things first. So, that's how I'm looking at this exercise.

I truly believe the Stafford area is going to take additional conversations because it really is all going to come down to what the design is and what “urban” really means, what “rural” really means, and what urban/rural interfaces really mean. But that area, and what we're doing here, will really enable us to see where those investments start to be made because that's the key hurdle we have. It's not only the land, but the infrastructure to serve it.

Commissioner Smith: Well, my opinion of this is we're not limited to 1100 acres. We can certainly go beyond that, and so I don't think we should say that “Oh, we decided on 1100 acres and we're done; our work is done.” It's just not. I mean I fully intend to continue out to the full chart on the paper today. And, Mr. Chair, *I move that we include Damascus of 400 acres, North Milwaukie of 300 acres inside the UGB, or whatever it is we need to do.*

Chair Ludlow: Again, I'll second for at least the purpose of discussion here. Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: Well, actually I was interested in a motion that Clackamas County did meet its aspirational needs in the first two categories because that actually was our aspirational desire, and we did. I mean, if these, whether they're challenged or not, they're still aspirational and you can move on to the next one and say, “Yeah, that's aspirational.” But none of these require opening up the whole process again. So, Clackamas County has met its aspirational needs in the first two columns. If we want to change our aspiration, let's do it. Our aspiration is 2000 acres, let's make that our aspiration.

[Commissioner Savas](#): [1:20:17] Again, I'm struggling with what we're doing here, just not – things just aren't gelling together; they don't make a lot of sense. Bullet #1: Can Clackamas County meet its 20-Year need for non-retail employment land within the current configuration of the urban/rural reserves, right? And then the Johnson study is something completely different than that. So, what's our target? Is our target meeting the 1100 acres the Johnson Study says or is our target here today establishing what's urban reserve or what's undesignated or what's rural? I'm trying to make some logical conclusions. So, Tootie, if you didn't put the math in your motion, I'd probably say I'd be supportive of, or I would have seconded the motion. But we're going back the math, and how does the math relate to the first bullet or our Year 2020 Goal?

Chair Ludlow: Let's not forget that Staff met with each Commissioner separately before this meeting about what would be contained in here. Let's not forget that Washington County lost 2000 acres. We were told we're going to get a piece of that. Damascus is disintegrating, 4200 acres there. The Stafford area is 4700 acres, the Norwood area is 2600 acres. And I talked with the regional chairs and

mayors' group here this last week in a closed-door session, and reminded them that they've only designated 27,000 future urban reserves and that total there – almost half of that is gone. So, I have no problem at all with saying, "To heck with the 1100 acres, we should go on with that" because there are some of those acres that are [challenged \[1:21:51\]](#) and some of it will never be developed. And let's not forget that Boring is foundation farmland, and they say that that will develop some day – when pigs fly. Besides that, without Damascus in between, it might develop, but it'll be part of the City of Gresham, unfortunately. So, I have no problem going with more acreage. Now, if somebody wants to make a motion to amend and put better math in there, that's fine. But again, we went over these numbers with Staff, each one of us did. If we have any problem with the math, we probably should spell it out now.

[Ms. Greene: \[1:22:32\]](#) We have a motion on the table [regarding](#) the Damascus and North Milwaukie areas. [Are you \[1:22:39\]](#) concentrating the town center [\[inaudible\]](#) finding employment [land to meet demand in the](#) short-term. Does that make sense to you? [\[1:22:45\]](#)

Chair Ludlow: Yeah. That's what it is.

Commissioner Savas: I just want to clarify that when you referenced us meeting with Staff on those one-on-ones, of the hour dedicated, I spent an hour and 20 minutes or an hour and a half with that. And I had some of these same questions, so I didn't get to the same closure. I didn't have the Staff presentation in front of me when we had that, nor did I see how this was going to be framed. So, I didn't have an opportunity to say, "Hey, this makes sense. Let's assemble the Staff presentation this way." It was really about what Martha presented, which I think she did a fine job, and Dan presented. So I don't have a quarrel with that, but as it relates to process here today and understanding what we're really doing, that wasn't part of that one-hour session.

[Commissioner Schrader: \[1:23:26\]](#) Well, how else do we get to a resolution on any of this if we don't do it this way?

Commissioner Savas: Well, this is a starting point. I just don't see this as an ending –

[Commissioner Schrader:](#) Well, I don't see that it's an ending point either. Hence, I go back to my statement "We are not limited to 1100 acres." You know what, we can include everything for the kitchen sink as far as I'm concerned; I've always been a proponent of that. I've not liked land-use planning in the State of Oregon. It's just fraught with problems every time you turn around, but there is a motion on the table and, Mr. Chair, could we vote?

Chair Ludlow: Yeah. Unless there's specific discussion about the motion itself, I'd say it's time to vote. Caroline.

[Ms. Hill:](#) Commissioner Bernard?

Commissioner Bernard: I'm not interested in pulling out pieces –

[Commissioner Schrader:](#) Yes or No?

Commissioner Bernard: I – you know, you make comments all the time.

[Commissioner Schrader:](#) Well, it's Yes or No, Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: And so, the answer's "No". I was going to tell why I voted no. I'm not interested in pulling out pieces of this for discussion when actually the whole question is the last part, and it's just like smoke and mirrors.

Chair Ludlow: Okay, there's a "No".

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Schrader?

Commissioner Schrader: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Savas.

Commissioner Savas: I've got my reservations, Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Smith?

Commissioner Smith: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Chair Ludlow?

Chair Ludlow: Aye. Passes 4 to 1.

Commissioner Savas: [1:24:45] So, I'm going to try one more time. *I move that we not use the math of the acreage for this exercise in this format.* I think we have to at some point, I mean, we have to use that as a calculation, but if we're going to use that as math to make a decision, and with all that, again unlikeliness of a lot of that property that's on there, the unlikeliness to do it within that timeframe is high that we can't use that from the math.

Chair Ludlow: So would you like the word "approximate" in front of it?

Commissioner Savas: Well, no; no, not at all. But we know that the acreage relates to the area that was considered; I think that's accurate. But to use it as a computation, knowing that it can't, you know – it's not all going to add up. That's not going to relate to the Johnson Study. I mean, if we relate that to the Johnson Study and say, "okay, what is achievable by 2020" just read the goal there, it's by 2020, which just five years away, four and a half years away – we can't get there. So, that's what we have to talk about at some point. It's the here and now, or it's the reserves, it's what the potential is – I agree, that's a potential of acreage; that's a valid number for the potential that it could be.

Ms. Greene: [1:26:06] That's right. Any time you are planning [inaudible] netted out, as far as infrastructure – these are net estimates. But you should never [inaudible] specific parcels. That's what makes [inaudible]. In terms of the Canby area, Canby is split, as you know, east of Canby is currently undesignated with no Metro region. This is asking the Commissioners to direct Staff to work with cities [inaudible] additional land [inaudible] for County supply. [1:26:06 – 1:26:45]

Commissioner Schrader: In terms of the Canby piece that makes sense to me, and largely because they've done a phenomenal job with what they already have there. In terms of the transportation infrastructure, I had an interesting conversation with Pioneer Pump that actually liked locating there because there isn't – as much as people might perceive that there's a traffic constraint there, actually they're saying that they get in and out so quickly, it's a secret I probably shouldn't be mentioning this, they don't want anybody to know about it. And it's already an area where I think that they've

shown some success and it would make sense to me, if there is a willing city, to move ahead with that.

Ms. Greene: [Inaudible 1:27:38]

Mr. Chandler: [1:27:42] That land is already undesignated.

Commissioner Schrader: Yeah, so, do we want to make it urban reserve?

Mr. Chandler: It might be helpful to go back to – I mean the questions that we asked at the start, the big questions about where we’re trying to end up, and I apologize that the framing hasn’t seamlessly lead us there, but I’m not sure whether we could have had a framing that would have seamlessly lead us there.

So, the three questions at the start: One was “Can Clackamas County meet its 20-Year need within the current configuration of urban/rural reserves?” Some of this discussion is sort of aimed at that question, but that question leads to the next question, and it’s probably the big question, “Other than negotiations regarding the Stafford area – we all recognize that’s in play – should Clackamas County advocate for changes in the current configuration of urban and rural reserves? So question one is should we advocate for changes, and if so, what changes? So, when we started this four-step process, those were the questions that we intended to answer so we’re 90 minutes in, I want to make sure that we get the big question back in your minds as we go forward.

Commissioner Schrader: [1:28:57] So, if we were going to advocate for changes, that would be one I would suggest.

Chair Ludlow: That would be one of them.

Ms. Greene: [Inaudible 1:29:02 – 1:29:10] the data for the area east of Canby, there’s also –

Commissioner Schrader: Yeah, they have an area that’s undesignated that should remain undesignated, and that’s the area by the river, I know that. It’s by the dahlia farm. It’s undesignated now, and they asked us to leave that undesignated, and I stepped out of that conversation. I don’t own a farm there any more, but my family owns a farm there, and so that’s fine, but that’s a piece of it. But this is on the other side where they have flat land within an industrial area that’s already been robust. So that’s kind of where I am. With that, if you have a willing city, I think they’re on the cusp of having some real opportunities there. That’s just my feeling, so.

Commissioner Smith: Well, yeah. I can go either way on this Canby piece. Like you say the industrial area is already there. This is my issue: we haven’t even begun the conversation in our reserves areas where it’s prime farmland. Now, I want to have a discussion today about the protection of prime farmland. This area, the 400 acres east, is the most prime farmland in the entire State of Oregon; the top soil is rich, and areas of Canby are the only areas in Oregon that have 10-foot deep top soil. Now, if we want to pave over this 10-foot deep top soil, go ahead and vote “yes” on this. We also have not addressed the bigger issue that I see, not so much this chart, and that’s the Boring/Damascus area where there’s 2000 acres out there that is prime farmland. Is it 4200? Okay.

Ms. Greene: Oh yeah, you are right [inaudible 1:30:46]

Commissioner Smith: You know, you got numbers all over the place, so whether it’s either 2000, 3000, or 4000, whatever it is –

Ms. Greene: [Inaudible 1:30:53]

Commissioner Smith: Okay. My issue with that is those are farms; they're nurseries, and that is a huge business cluster in Clackamas County that should even be in its designation, and we're wasting a lot of time by nitpicking on this chart. If it was up to me, I would have never ever done this chart. I would have started at the higher issue, and then worked our way down through some of these areas, like French Prairie, like Beaver Creek, like Springwater Road that has 1500 acres. I think, you know, within even 50 years, it would be a big hope to even see that developed. So –

Ms. Greene: Should we take some things off? Do you want to work from this side and start to take [inaudible 1:31:38] Springwater, or do you want to take –

Commissioner Smith: Well, this is what I want to do, and you know, we only have 25 minutes left. I want to ***make a motion that we take the current land that's designated in the Boring/Damascus area of approximately 4200 acres, or whatever it is, and make that undesignated for the reason that is saving our prime farmland.*** Those people over there don't want to develop it. They have no infrastructure. Boring does not want to be a part of Metro; they're trying to get out of it. That's my motion.

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second? [Silence.] Now, let me remind everybody, as Tootie said there's 25 minutes left. Each of the Commissioners that put their hand up, they want to talk some more about this, we probably should work through this list today if we have an opportunity to do so. Jim, you're next.

Commissioner Bernard: So that would require opening up the process, right?

Commissioner Smith: It goes Undesignated, it doesn't open up the process.

Commissioner Bernard: It's a change in the [map](#); that's the problem. And that's the question we need to get to. Simply this: Do we want to open it up or not? We can ask to affirm the urban reserves or we can say "let's throw out the baby and start all over." That's the truth.

Commissioner Savas: That's a can of worms.

Commissioner Bernard: Yes, it is.

Commissioner Savas: But I think we should talk about that, so I'm going to get back to what – I agreed a lot with what Tootie said. And, I don't want to be – and you said earlier, you mentioned Tom McCall okay? I don't want to take productive farmland out of use and pave over it. I'm not sure any of us would want to do that. So I agree, I think that's what Tootie's comments were along those lines, so I have reservations about the Canby piece. And, I would have seconded the motion, because I believe in the motion that Tootie made up to a point, and that – yeah, Jim, we need – it is [map \[1:33:43\]](#) change. Okay, but to me, I'm okay with taking it out as long as we backfill it with something else, but if we don't backfill it –

Commissioner Smith: Okay I can change my motion, but I think it's a two-step process. First, we take it out, but then we look at what we put back in, so how would you like me to change the motion?

Chair Ludlow: We have other Commissioners lined up here. Nobody seconded the motion.

Commissioner Smith: That's what I'm working on is a second.

Chair Ludlow: Let's be cognizant of the fact there's still one more Commissioner that wants to say something before I give the floor to somebody to make a motion. We've had that round as we go. Paul, are you done?

Commissioner Savas: No, I wasn't done. So, I'll reframe the motion then because my comment really, I'm concerned about how we're doing this. I said that already enough times today. I just don't think this is really comprehensive enough, so ***my motion would be to take the urban reserves in the Boring area, which I believe is about 4000 acres, and consider that part of the consideration for a change.***

Commissioner Smith: Consideration of what? I don't understand, Paul. Can you be more specific?

Commissioner Savas: Consideration of a change of the designations to undesignated or rural reserve, really, because I don't know exactly if all 4200 of that acres is actually prime farmland, so without that information – Let's say that 1000 acres of that is prime urban reserve land, or it's prime for that and it's not foundation farmland or high-quality soil. So if it's not high-quality soil, I don't want to take something out of that equation.

Commissioner Smith: Well, then make the motion to make it –

Commissioner Savas: Well, my motion was to consider it.

Commissioner Smith: Well, consider – that doesn't make sense to me, I don't think. It doesn't get us anywhere. It just says we're delaying it, so we can think about it. The word "consider" doesn't mean anything. I would be willing to go with you on this but –

Commissioner Savas: How about if I change the word to "study"?

Chair Ludlow: How about if we let Martha talk? As we are sliding through this, you guys can debate whatever motion might fly, but let's get to Martha's comments so we can get on with this process. Martha?

Commissioner Schrader: Okay. So just one comment, I do have a 12:30 meeting that I have to go to because it's renegotiating or looking at our workforce. I can be here until 12:15, but I am going to have to go; this is an important piece of what we do in the [counties](#), [\[inaudible 1:36:07\]](#) let people know that.

The reason I looked at the Canby piece is that really when you look at their situation at this point in time, they are surrounded by prime farmland no matter which side that you look from. And as I said, from their urban growth boundary now out to the river, actually is also 10 feet of soil, which is prime farmland that's currently being managed by the [Monocucos](#) and the dahlia farm and hops on the Three Rivers Farm areas, so it is prime, but it's been left undesignated. So, that means that if it's undesignated, it is the last piece that's brought in. Other pieces that are designated as rural reserve – there's a lot of hurtles to leaving – to getting something undesignated into that. The reason why I looked at the other side of Canby is because they have already – even though it's on prime farmland, which I believe is really hard to – I feel the pain there, but they have already established an opportunity there that additional land would still maintain what they have further out, but it would give them an opportunity to build on what's already there. I really feel very sad about the fact that it's

farmland. Unfortunately, in some of these areas, that's the kind of decision we have to make and I talk as someone who actually farmed for 30 years, too, and it doesn't make me feel good, but they're pretty much hemmed in. If you look at what's happened, they have one area that's undesignated towards the river, then the rest of it is all rural reserves. So, the issue is where do they grow a job space? Where do they grow their housing? More than likely the area that's undesignated towards the river would end up housing, I think, longer term. But I think if we're looking for a city that is poised to have that opportunity; it's there, so I just wanted to explain why I said what I said.

Chair Ludlow: You going to make a motion on that portion?

Commissioner Schrader: No, I'm not going to make any motions today. I'm going to leave it up to you guys.

Mr. Krupp: One of the things I want to make sure we're thinking about here, and of course, a little later on today, Dan and I and [Nate Boderman](#) are going to be traveling up to Metro to begin talking through the logistics of the discussion to take place with the three cities and Metro and the County over the Stafford remand; we're working on the details of that. And, you know, part of that will be what we mean by defining a scope of the remand, which will need to be reconciled and agreed to in the very first item that Mr. Chandler has identified on Page 3 of his memorandum to you, which talks about what happens when we make changes to the reserves. And so, as we're thinking through the different options and opportunities – we started this conversation thinking about what it is, what we would do to meet a particular goal in the way of adding areas that would be available for employment lands. The moment we begin talking about trading off areas, suggesting that there are areas currently designated in a particular way, one of the very first things we're going to encounter is the very first item that's on that list, and then take that issue down every one of those seven particular steps. The larger the scope and scale, the tradeoffs and changes, the larger the scope and scale will be for the work effort that needs to be done that's identified here on Page 3. I want to make sure we're really clear about that because the first step is going to be having an agreement on the intergovernmental agreement with Metro about what the scope of the remand is actually going to be.

Chair Ludlow: Paul. Well, go ahead – we're going to let you get a word of input here.

[Ms. Greene: \[Inaudible 1:40:22\]](#) If you did want to vote on [\[inaudible\]](#) Canby, that would probably be a smaller scale opening [and a parallel Damascus/Boring out and then further down the road](#). So I don't know if Commissioners want to take them off in chunks [or do a full open up to \[inaudible\] the reserves \[inaudible\]. 1:40:42](#)

Chair Ludlow: Good point. Paul, then Tootie.

Commissioner Savas: So, Don, responding to your statement, I thought really though this last year, which I agree has been a really crazy year because we have just been all over the map and I haven't figured out why and I'm not referring to that map. But I thought this was a foregone conclusion that we'd been making changes to the reserves because we asked for – we went to LCDC and we asked for a remand and it wasn't broad enough because we know we wanted to make changes, and then we got our remand, so it was a foregone conclusion we'd make changes, otherwise why did we ask?

Mr. Krupp: So the question is how broad and how large a scale is our ask with respect to a remand? And keeping in mind that whatever we do, we will have to find cause for agreement with Metro in the intergovernmental agreement. So, it's a bilateral conversation that takes place there, and, in fact, when you look at regional factors, Multnomah County may also have an opportunity or a

responsibility of weighing in on that particular question, as well. I'm just wanting to make sure we know the scope and scale of the challenges we will face as we make the conversation larger. If we're talking about removing large areas out of what are now classified as urban reserves, and then finding large areas to trade in, we're going to have to walk that conversation through all seven steps here, that's identified on page 3so –

Commissioner Smith: [1:42:28] No.

Commissioner Savas: So just a quick follow up, so then we should be voting on the first bullet. The first bullet says "Can Clackamas County meet its 20-Year need for non-retail employment land within the current configuration of urban reserves." If the answer is "No, we cannot", then you have your answer, that opens the door. That's what you go to Metro with.

Commissioner Smith: Don, I take exception. I think we have a different point of view on this, and I appreciate what you're trying to do here today, I really do. We seem to be at an impasse. If we take out the Boring/Damascus piece, I don't think it's up to us to immediately substitute for another thing. I think we need to make the statement that that is prime farmland, which should be protected as such, not developable. So, we take it out, then we go to Metro, we sit down with them and say "well, together, can we get to some place?" We haven't even identified the other things. And then on Page 3, where you referred to those 5 bullet points and then 4 and 5 is repeated, we have to do that anyway. This is nothing new, whether we vote on anything, we're going to be at the table, revising the IGA. We're going to have a joint public process. And to assume that we're going to open everything up, it's already opened up because we haven't voted to approve the map. I think there's a lot of assumption that have been set today that aren't true in this process, but I think this step can help us get to where we can tell Metro something. We can tell Metro, "You know, that ruse of an urban reserve added in Damascus and Boring, we know what that is. In fact, it was Clackamas County that put that part in urban reserves. It is this Board in Clackamas County that can take it out, and we do not need a replacement for that." I'm going to make another motion. I'm going to ***move that Clackamas County remove Damascus/Boring piece out of its current designation and make it undesignated without a substitution, and then we go to Metro and sit down at the table, where can we go?***

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second? [Silence.] All right, the next one to speak is Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: Well, I still think you have to apply the factors. You can't just pull it out. And any of those changes will require opening up the process, and that is not an assumption, that is a fact. We could simply move on, make our determination that we do need industrial land **assets**, we affirm the urban/rural reserve process. We got three years to play with this, fool around and get the information we need and then try to sell it at the legislature. That's really the only way we're going to get it. So, get this behind us, move on to the legislature to get what we need. But I can tell you Metro's not going to say "All right, let's just change this; let's not apply the factors." You know ever time we do that, not apply the factors, we hear from people "You didn't apply the factors. Let's open it up and start all over. See you in court."

Commissioner Smith: Can we address my motion? There's a motion on the floor. I would like somebody –

Chair Ludlow: I asked for a second and there wasn't one. Unless there's a second, I'd like to give myself the floor. You know what? We have three years right now. Why is that? Because Metro has decided not to expand the urban growth boundary. I appreciate the fear and loathing behind changes to the reserve, but we got three years and Metro has said it didn't matter a lick whether the maps were approved anyway,

they would not have expanded the urban growth boundary. So, we got at least three years from right now. The only city in Clackamas County that asked for an expansion was Wilsonville. And you know for a long time Wilsonville was blaming us for that. Well, again, it's Metro that makes that decision, and again they've said whether the maps were confirmed or not, they weren't likely to expand the urban growth boundary. So, we got three years and more from right now; it's a 6-year process, as Mr. Chandler has explained. They've agreed to shorten that and there are some disappointed cities in other counties because of that decision. So, Paul.

Commissioner Savas: So I'm going to make a motion, but I'm going to try to explain the motion. The motion will be basically what you're trying to get to, but I think we need to study and consider it and then negotiate, not just take it out, so that it's backfilled. So here's my motion: ***I motion to direct Staff to study and consider the Damascus/Boring area urban reserves for removal or a change of its designation.***

Commissioner Smith: Second.

Chair Ludlow: All right. Motion made by Commissioner Savas, seconded by Commissioner Smith. So, the clarification I need is that removal or change, but if there was a removal or a change, there would be no replacement area in Clackamas County nor would there be a demand to do so?

Commissioner Savas: My intention was that it would; that it would be something we would negotiate, because right now, the motion is to study and consider, and then we would, as a group, figure out how we negotiate that or barter for that or backfill that land. That would be the intention.

Chair Ludlow: Caroline? You got that?

Ms. Hill: [\[Inaudible 1:48:20\]](#) Is that part of your motion, simply that studies consider Damascus as part of the [removal or change](#)? With the intention [\[inaudible 1:48:33\]](#).

Commissioner Savas: Correct.

Chair Ludlow: Let's see what Caroline has because we're going to vote on that and that would be part of the record.

[Ms. Hill](#): Okay. What I have is Commissioner Savas moved to direct Staff to study and consider Damascus/Boring urban reserves for removal or change of designation.

Chair Ludlow: And again that doesn't – I appreciate the word "negotiation" there – but I don't want to lose any more than we're already losing here. And, you know, that means if we're talking something away I'd like to have a replacement. Jim.

Commissioner Bernard: So my issue is when are they going to do that, between marijuana studies? And what about the five-year plan to look at the ZDO stuff? The other thing is that I disagree, John, about we've got all the time in the world. I don't think we do. We have people have been waiting decades for things to happen and the problem is we're continuing that long, tortuous discussion when we should be down in the legislature putting this behind us and moving down the legislature and if we can get help from them, great.

Chair Ludlow: That's a big "if".

Commissioner Bernard: Yes.

Chair Ludlow: Jim. The point there is this: we do have three years, period; at minimum, three years. So I appreciate the other workload we put on our Staff, that's certainly understandable, but we do have three years, no matter what anybody says. And I don't see anybody but Wilsonville knocking on our door saying "You know, we need this property annexed. We need this property to go urban in the urban growth boundary." I don't see anybody knocking on the door on that. There's only one city as I point out and you know, again I have not heard from anybody else, any other study that said, "Hey we need this badly right now," so –

Ms. Hill: [Inaudible 1:50:14]

Unknown: Yeah, we have a motion.

Chair Ludlow: Eventually, we still like to talk things to death here. All right, Caroline, repeat the motion one more time so I can understand it.

Ms. Hill: To direct Staff to study and consider Damascus/Boring urban reserves for removal or change of designation.

Chair Ludlow: All right. Everybody understand the motion? Everybody ready to vote? Caroline?

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Schrader?

Commissioner Schrader: No

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Bernard?

Commissioner Bernard: No.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Smith?

Commissioner Smith: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Savas?

Commissioner Savas: Aye

Ms. Hill: Chair Ludlow?

Chair Ludlow: Oh, this is rare. For right now, I'm going to say "No", so, it fails 3 to 2

Commissioner Smith: Mr. Chair, I would like to move the discussion ahead because we only have I don't know how many minutes to talk about one area that we have not talked about and that's 1800 acres in the French Prairie area. When I looked at that map presented by Staff, I says, "You know, that isn't even in the realm of my thinking, 1800 acres in French Prairie, and again I make the argument of prime farmland. You go down Airport Road and to the east of that is hundreds and hundreds of acres of prime farmland including our – what do you call it? ENRAC, an experimental station for agriculture – you wouldn't want to include that. And then you cross and you go to the west, where we are bordering on Yamhill County on Boones Ferry Rd. You go out there, there's huge prime farmland I not want to see, [1:51:59] but you know what? There is some developable acreage there. There have

been bills in the legislature to do it. There is interest of property owners to have that developed. And I want to make some statements about that, and then I'm going to make a motion. And [this is a statement 630 acres, \[1:52:20\]](#) and you've seen it on the presentation on your materials here today. I think there have been a lot of misstatements made about that property. For instance, water. I think it can be supplied with water. Wilsonville is going to currently expand their water system by the way, south of the river to Charbonneau. I don't see how that is an issue. Aurora Airport currently gets their water from the City of Aurora; that could be expanded just not very far up the road. And employment land: you don't need additional, huge sewer operations. It could have self-contained systems. Irrigation: The [sewer](#) that you have from industrial land can be applied to the irrigation of green lands around the property. And the transportation, to me the biggest selling point of that 630 acres is the transportation. Yeah, we know there's I-5 there, but did you know there's an additional – and I drove that this weekend – there's an additional seven roads in the area that can support that: Airport Road, Elan Road, Miley Road, Butteville Road, Orange Road, 99E, and Oregon 551. Also, it's supported by a railroad. I was kind of surprised in a recent analysis that we got by the Union Pacific Railroad, which runs north and south. It has a short line and a main line. And when you talk about how we're going to get there, the people that would probably work at those locations would probably come from the south, as housing is cheaper in St. Paul, Hubbard, Woodburn, Aurora, and Canby compared to what is currently going on with the industrial workers in Wilsonville and Tualatin. So, they wouldn't even be using the Boones Bridge; traffic would be coming in the reverse direction. To say that the Boones Bridge, which is already seven lanes, needed to be expanded further – if we did expand it further, it would be the only bridge in the state of Oregon that is seven lanes. I move that we add 630 acres into the undesignated category with the borders of Airport Road to the east, Boones Ferry Road to the west, Marion County line to the south, and Miley Road to the north; it's approximately 630 acres.

Chair Ludlow: All right, there's a specific motion, is there a second?

[Commissioner Savas: \[1:55:10\]](#) Clarifying question. You said east of Airport Road.

Commissioner Smith: To the Airport Road to the east. Airport Road is the eastern boundary, so it's really encapsulated.

Chair Ludlow: Airport Road to the east, Boones Ferry to the west, south of the river, and north to Arndt Road, is that what you said?

Commissioner Smith: North to Miley Road because the river takes in Charbonneau; and it takes out Charbonneau, and then obviously, the Marion County boundary to the south.

Commissioner Savas: I thought it was Airport Road to the west, not the east.

Commissioner Smith: No, Paul. We don't cross Airport Road to the east because that is prime farmland. Airport Road is the boundary line.

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second?

Commissioner Savas: I'll second it.

Chair Ludlow: Okay, motion made by [Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Savas. And again, east/west, east/west. Airport Road is the eastern boundary; Boones Ferry Road is the western](#)

boundary; the southern boundary is Arndt Road, and down to Charbonneau, which is Miley Road. That is the specific motion, further discussion?

Commissioner Schrader: Yeah. Here's the difficulty I have, and I just want to state all the elephants in the room. We have Wilsonville here, and the City has been really more interested in the other areas that they want to develop. This has been a bone of contention with – I see the owners of the property here as well – and the difficulty I have is, and I've said this to the Charbonneau folks – I honestly think that that area, being left undesignated, would be the better compromise and choice, largely because, as I said, the acreage surrounding property that my children own is kind of in the same thing, where there is going to be a significant number of hurdles to actually bring that in. The political difficulty we have is we have a city that has been absolutely – it is not one of their priorities, and we also have folks in the Charbonneau area who have lobbied considerably hard down in Salem to prevent this from happening. I truly believe that there is a good compromise to be had. I am not particularly against anything happening there. I think that if, long term, even if we vote yes for this today, and I'm inclined to, which is going to put me on the hot seat, let's be perfectly honest. There are folks in Charbonneau that will just absolutely be so upset, but I have been consistent that if I had been part of the urban rural reserves, I would have seriously looked at that as being an undesignated parcel. I need to be consistent; however, I'm going to caution everybody that there are considerable hurdles, and unless there is peace made between the folks who live in Charbonneau, who have a concern about their quality of life and what anything happening there would mean, and unless, frankly, there is a willing city – because we should not be, and I'll say this right now, as a County, doing anything at all to urbanize areas. That really is a city function. So essentially, you'd have to have the City of Wilsonville be willing to move forward with the infrastructure there. So, I'm going to vote yes on this, but with the caveat that this can be a poison pill. There's going to be considerable resistance to this. I'm willing to go to the Charbonneau folks and take the heat for what I will receive for this, but I think that it is important to be consistent. And, I will make a point of chatting with those folks sooner than later, but they will definitely be up in arms. And I would strongly suggest, if we move forward with this as an opportunity to ask, that we make sure everybody is at the table. I think this is a similar situation as Stafford. We don't know what it means; we don't know what it is going to be turned into; all the controversy – “Oh, it's going to be a distribution center.” “Oh, we are going to work with the tribes and get –” that all needs to be put behind, people. And, I will caution the folks if we make it undesignated, I do not see this as happening immediately at all. It is simply, actually, adding it to the lowest tier of a long term potential and it may very well take, not 20 years, but 50 years to bring it in. So, there you go. Mark, I love you guys. I'll come and have you guys yell at me, and the land owners here. I have been consistent with my message. I would prefer not to see the whole area brought in, but I think that one section could make sense if it is developed with input and appropriately with the folks that live there so their quality of life is not absolutely destroyed. It would be a beautiful opportunity. So, there you go. I have fallen on my sword today. And with that, can we get to the vote, because I have to go to another meeting.

Chair Ludlow: I've got two more Commissioners – they swear they will be short, right? Paul.

Commissioner Savas: I will be brief. I was going to say, I'm not familiar with all the 630 acres, so my caveat in supporting this will be based on, none of that land, I'm presuming is productive farmland; because if it is, I don't support it. So that's caveat #1. I just want to point out, Title 11 Section 3.07.1110, that really, any kind of urban planning in that area, if it ever happens, is the responsibility of the city, not the county. So the keys are in the hands of the cities in that regard. And, again, this is undesignated; it hits a 75 percent rule [2:01:22] so, it's not first to come in. And, I want to make sure, the other caveat is, that 630 acres is not computed into the 1100 some odd acres we need because that is not going to happen anytime soon, unfortunately.

Commissioner Bernard: I guess I have the benefit of having done a lot of this urban/rural discussion, and actually applying factors. I guess the positive thing about what you are talking about is that you have thrown out the factors, just exactly what Washington County did, so the legislature or the court will figure it out, but you can't just throw out the factors; they were applied. This is not only a poison pill, and thanks, John, it's a nuclear pill. Again, Tom McCall Senate Bill 100, great governor, he tried to prevent urban sprawl and protected some of the best farmland in the world. And so, whether it is being farmed or a golf course, this is what it is about. I like that golf course. It's a great golf course, but it will also make a great farm, so, I'm going to vote no on this.

Chair Ludlow: Real quickly, I read the report from the Port of Portland that said this is the best developable property in the region. Right now, what prevents it – let's all understand if it's undesignated, it would still need the City of Wilsonville to provide services and annex that property. So this great fear about it being undesignated, you know, undesignated still means it's a heck of a process to go through. What is the big fear of that? Let's also remember, and I was mayor there 25 years ago, and you know, we all had a different idea about that area at that time. This is temporary. This existing Wilsonville Council will not be around should this property ever be developed. Period. They won't be there. And Charbonneau will still be there, but let's not forget, Charbonneau opposed the safety tower at the airport. You know, these things change and attitudes change as they will. But it is extremely short sighted to not say this has great potential in the future, maybe beyond our lifetimes. I'm sorry, Martha, go ahead.

Commissioner Schrader: With that being said, I do think that the folks of Charbonneau need to be in intimate conversation with anything that happens there, and, I want to get that on record now. And I don't think anything is going to happen for quite a while. The other piece of this is that from my perspective, as I said, it's a really tough decision and my notion is, even if we go to Metro with this and we articulate, "Well, these are two areas we would like to take a look at and change", there is no guarantee that Metro will say yes, in which case, the way I see this, and we have our other positions where no change will happen, but I will tell you it will be very difficult to approach Metro and have this conversation and get it changed. So even though we want to say, "This is what our thoughts are" the caveat is that there is a city that I think will be very unhappy with us. I'm not convinced that Metro will be very happy with this as well, so I'm going to strongly suggest that the fallback position be those first three areas where there is no change. I'm more than willing to actually present some changes, but I think that there is going to be significant pushback, and you know what, that's public process in Oregon and people have a right to pushback, and I think it will happen.

Chair Ludlow: Time for the vote.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Smith?

Commissioner Smith: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Bernard?

Commissioner Bernard: No.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Savas?

Commissioner Savas: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Commissioner Schrader?

Commissioner Schrader: Aye.

Ms. Hill: Chair Ludlow?

Chair Ludlow: Aye. Passes 4 to 1. Now, some people would think we kind of rushed through this, and we kind of did. Is there any buy in – we've actually skipped some areas in here to get to that important one in a timely manner so Martha could leave and everybody has other plans, probably.

Commissioner Savas: I can if we can make it quick. I move we consider the Springwater Road area and the Beaver creek area for consideration to urban or undesignated reserves.

Commissioner Smith: I could go with Beaver creek on that, but I don't think I can do Springwater.

Chair Ludlow: Is there a second. [*Silence.*] Yeah, Martha, I understand. I'll just say it. The number one problem I have with Springwater Road is its infrastructure: water, sewer, and that really crummy little bridge at Carver, and that really bad intersection up to Highway 224. I don't have any problem with Beaver creek, I guess. Would you shorten your motion to that, right now?

Commissioner Savas: I was going to say that if you actually look at that, the infrastructure is not that far away, and there's not very much land. I'm not suggesting there's 1500 acres to serve, I'm suggesting there's much less than that, that it's feasible, so if you look at what is closest to – just passed Barton Park – if you look at what's close to that; some of that area already has some industrial uses right now. There's probably a couple hundred acres right there that's feasible; 50-acre large lots, that's what this is all about, and we don't have it anywhere. We need it. So, I think that we consider it. We are not actually moving it to change that, we are looking to have Staff consider that, is that correct?

Chair Ludlow: I would ask that we consider another session on this for the purposes of more information on Beaver creek, Springwater, and Boring, specifically. So, in the interest of time, rather than trying to take a quick vote on this, is that okay with the Commission that we bring this portion back at a later time?

The Commission consented to discuss this at another time.

Chair Ludlow: Don did you have something to wrap it up?

Mr. Krupp: No, actually; I just wanted to thank you for this. We do have coming out of this particular session, direction involving two full columns and a specific proposal for the French Prairie Area, and then we will schedule some time to complete the discussion regarding the other areas that we have not had an adequate opportunity to go through.

Chair Ludlow: Kirstin, I think you've done as best you can in herding cats, and normally – this is probably the most controversial issue we deal with, other than marijuana, thanks a bunch. I really appreciate your patience in this, and actually, doing as good as you probably could at getting us to some decision making, so thank you for participating today. Any other business before us? Otherwise, I am adjourning this meeting. Thank you very much.