



MULTNOMAH COUNTY AGENDA PLACEMENT REQUEST

(revised 12/31/09)

APPROVED: MULTNOMAH COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
AGENDA # R-9 DATE 6/17/2010
LYNDA GROW, BOARD CLERK

*Approved with substituted
Documents*

Board Clerk Use Only

Meeting Date: 6/17/2010
Agenda Item #: R9
Est. Start Time: 11:05 am

PUBLIC HEARING and Amending Exhibits 2 (Findings) and 3 (Record Index) to Ordinance No. 1161 that Amended Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan; and the Multnomah County Plan and Sectional Zoning Maps Relating to Urban and Rural Reserves, and Declaring an Emergency. Presenter: Chuck Beasley (15 min).

Note: If Ordinance, Resolution, Order or Proclamation, provide exact title. For all other submissions, provide a clearly written title sufficient to describe the action requested.

Requested Meeting Date:	<u>June 3, 2010</u>	Amount of Time Needed:	<u>15 min.</u>
Department:	<u>DCS</u>	Division:	<u>LUP</u>
Contact(s):	<u>Chuck Beasley</u>		
Phone:	<u>503-988-3043</u>	Ext.	<u>22610</u>
Presenter(s):	<u>Chuck Beasley</u>	I/O Address:	<u>455/116</u>

General Information

1. What action are you requesting from the Board?

Adopt an amendment to the Urban and Rural Reserves Ordinance No. 2010-1161 to conform the Multnomah County findings in part II of Exhibit 2 to the findings adopted by Clackamas County, Washington County, and Metro.

2. Please provide sufficient background information for the Board and the public to understand this issue. Please note which Program Offer this action affects and how it impacts the results.

Multnomah County adopted an ordinance amending the County Framework Plan policies and zoning maps designating rural reserves in Ordinance No. 2010-1161 on May 13, 2010. In addition to the plan policies and map, the ordinance included Exhibit 2, a Statement of Reasons for the plan designations, and Exhibit 3, an index of the Multnomah County record supporting designation of reserves. Exhibit 2 contains findings that support the county's decision in part I, and findings that support the regional decision in part II. The regional or "overall" findings in part II describe the extent of both urban and rural reserves in all three counties, and explain why the amount of urban and rural land designated meets the legal requirements in the OAR. Since the findings in Exhibit 2 part II have changed, and since these findings must be identical in all of the ordinances, Multnomah County must re-adopt these findings as a conforming amendment to the ordinance.

The Urban and Rural Reserves process is a new regional approach to managing the Metro region urban form while protecting important farm, forest, and landscape features from urbanization. Adoption of the proposed policies and map is the final phase in the reserves designation process that began after the state legislature adopted enabling legislation in SB 1011(2007) followed by LCDC adoption of Oregon Administrative Rule Division 27 (OAR) in January of 2008. The plan and zoning map in Exhibit 1 identify reserve areas in Multnomah County as part of a process that included collaboration with Washington and Clackamas Counties, Metro, cities, and others. The Reserves process provides greater flexibility to decide what areas around the Portland Metro region are best suited for future urbanization, and the 50 year time horizon will result in greater predictability for where growth is and is not expected to occur. Land outside of the UGB has been studied to inform decisions about how to balance land needed to create great urban communities, to protect lands important to the viability of the agricultural and forest economies of the region, and protection of natural features that define the region.

This amendment is necessary because each county and Metro must adopt the same findings in part II of Exhibit 2 pursuant to the Urban and Rural Reserves Administrative Rule (OAR) provisions in 660-027-008. One or more amendments to the areas designated as urban or rural reserve has been made, and this change must be included in the Exhibit 2 that Multnomah County adopts.

Completion of this amendment is needed to enable the Multnomah County portion of the joint Urban and Rural Reserves decision to be submitted concurrently with the ordinances of Clackamas and Washington Counties, and Metro to LCDC in a timely way. Due to the timeline for submitting to LCDC, this amendment needs to be adopted by emergency.

3. Explain the fiscal impact (current year and ongoing).

Staff resources and project support for adoption of an ordinance to implement urban and rural reserves is accommodated within existing budget. This IGA with Metro anticipates future county participation in concept planning for areas considered for addition to the UGB, and to participate in a review of the reserves program within 20 years. Resources for these efforts will come from future budgets.

4. Explain any legal and/or policy issues involved.

No legal or policy issues associated with this ordinance amendment are noted. The Board considered these elements in prior proceedings on this matter.

5. Explain any citizen and/or other government participation that has or will take place.

This amendment follows an extensive public involvement program that led to adoption of Ordinance No. 2010-1161. That outreach program followed a regional Coordinated Public Involvement program and a County Public Involvement program. Coordination with affected local governments was been an important element in support of reserves evaluation and decisions. Outreach to the public occurred in a number of ways including newspaper notifications, use of the internet, individual property owner mailings, open house events, public meetings, and public hearings.

Required Signature

**Elected Official or
Department/
Agency Director:**



Date: 6/3/2010

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

ORDINANCE NO. 1165

Amending Exhibits 2 (Findings) and 3 (Record Index) to Ordinance No. 1161 that Amended Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan; and the Multnomah County Plan and Sectional Zoning Maps Relating to Urban and Rural Reserves, and Declaring an Emergency

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners Finds:

- a. The Multnomah County Planning Commission recommended that the Board adopt an Ordinance adding new policies and strategies to the County's Comprehensive Plan and amending the plan and zoning map with respect to urban and rural reserves.
- b. On May 13, 2010, the Board adopted Ordinance No. 1161 relating to urban and rural reserves as recommended by the Planning Commission.
- c. Detailed findings in support of Ordinance 1161 entitled: Reasons for Designating Areas in Multnomah County as Urban Reserves or Rural Reserves; were attached as Exhibit 2 and incorporated by reference. A Record Index listing all the evidence in the County's Record related to Urban and Rural Reserves designations was attached as Exhibit 3.
- d. The legislative changes made by Ordinance 1161 implement an IGA with Metro and complete the reserves designation process that relied on the coordinated efforts of Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties and Metro (Jurisdictions).
- e. Exhibit 2 contains findings that support the county's decision in part I, and findings that support the regional decision in part II. The regional or "overall" findings in part II describe the extent of both urban and rural reserves in all three counties, and explain why the amount of urban and rural land designated meets the legal requirements in Oregon Administrative Rule Division 27.
- f. As the findings in Exhibit 2 part II have been changed by other parties and these findings must be identical in all of the ordinances adopted by the Jurisdictions, it is necessary to adopt the amended findings. The Record Index, Exhibit 3, to Ordinance 1161, is updated to include new evidence submitted to the Board in the hearing leading to adoption of Ordinance 1161.

Multnomah County Ordains as follows:

Section 1. The amended attached Exhibit 2 entitled: Reasons for Designating Areas in Multnomah County as Urban Reserves or Rural Reserves and Exhibit 3, Record Index listing all the evidence in the County's Record related to Urban and Rural Reserves designations to Ordinance No. 1161, are adopted and incorporated by reference.

Section 2. This ordinance, being necessary for the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of Multnomah County, an emergency is declared and the ordinance takes effect upon its signature by the County Chair.

FIRST READING AND ADOPTION:

June 17, 2010

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

Jeff Cogen, Chair

REVIEWED:

AGNES SOWLE, COUNTY ATTORNEY
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By Sandra N. Duffy, Assistant County Attorney

SUBMITTED BY:

M. Cecilia Johnson, Director, Department of Community Services

Part I
Reasons for Designating Areas in Multnomah County as
Urban Reserves or Rural Reserves

I. Introduction

Reserves designations proposed for Multnomah County were developed through analysis of the urban and rural reserves factors by the County's Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), consideration of the analysis in briefings and hearings before the Multnomah County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners, discussion in regional forums including the Reserves Steering Committee, Core 4, and public and government input derived through the county Public Involvement Plan for Urban and Rural Reserves and the regional Coordinated Public Involvement Plan. Record Index #APR Reserves IGA 2/25/10.

The Multnomah County Board appointed a CAC to consider technical analysis of the statutory and administrative rule factors, to make recommendations to County decision makers, and to involve Multnomah County citizens and stakeholders in development of the proposed County reserves plan. The make-up of the 15 member committee was structured to include a balance of citizens with both rural and urban values. The rural members were nominated by County recognized neighborhood organizations from the four affected rural plan areas to the extent possible. The CAC developed a suitability assessment and reserves recommendations in sixteen meetings between May, 2008, and August, 2009.

The approach to developing the proposed reserves plan began with analysis of the study area by the CAC. The county study area was divided into areas corresponding to the four affected county Rural Area Plans, and further segmented using the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) mapping and CAC discussion for a total of nine county subareas. Record Index #Candidate Areas Assessment Methodology and Results 3/16/09. The phases of the CAC work included 1) setting the study area boundary; 2) identification of candidate urban and rural reserve areas; and 3) suitability recommendations based on how the subareas met the urban factors in OAR 660-027-0050 and the rural factors in -0060. The results of the suitability assessment are included in the report provided to the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners in August and September of 2009. Record Index #Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09.

The Multnomah County Planning Commission considered the CAC results and public testimony in a public hearing in August, 2009, and the Board of County Commissioners conducted a public hearing to forward recommendations to Core 4 for regional consideration in September, 2009. Additional Board hearings, public outreach, and regional discussion resulted in the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Multnomah County and Metro approved February 25, 2010. The IGA is a preliminary reserves decision that is the prerequisite to this proposed plan amendment as provided in the administrative rule. Record Index # Reserves IGA 3/17/10.

II. CAC Analysis, Candidate Areas and Suitability Rankings

The initial phase of analysis by the CAC considered the location of the regional study area boundary in Multnomah County. This, together with an overview of the various studies and the factors was the content of CAC meetings 1 through 3. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled. The first major phase of the analysis, identifying Candidate areas for urban and rural reserve focused on the first rural factor, the potential for urbanization to narrow the amount of land for further study as rural reserve. This occurred in CAC meetings 3 through 9, and resulted in agreement that all of the study area in Multnomah County should continue to be studied for rural reserve. Data sources studied included the Oregon Departments of Agriculture and Forestry (ODA) and (ODF) studies, Landscape Features study, aerial photos, existing land use, and information from committee members, and the public. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled.

The urban candidate areas assessment focused on urban factors (OAR 660-027-0050(1) and (3) to consider the relative efficiency of providing key urban services. This work relied on the technical memos and maps provided by the regional water, sewer, and transportation work groups comprised of technical staff from each of the participating jurisdictions. This information resulted in rankings on the efficiency of providing services to the study area. The CAC also considered information related to urban suitability including the Great Communities study, a report on industrial lands constraints, infrastructure rating criteria, and physical constraint (floodplain, slope, and distance from UGB) maps in their analysis. In addition, input from Multnomah County "edge" cities and other local governments, and testimony by property owners informed the assessment and recommendations. Rankings were low, medium, or high for suitability based on efficiency. Throughout this process effort was made to provide both urban and rural information at meetings to help balance the work. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled.

The suitability recommendations phase studied information relevant to ranking each of the urban and rural factors for all study areas of the county and took place in CAC meetings 10 through 16. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled. The approach entailed application of all of the urban and rural factors and suitability rankings of high, medium, or low for their suitability as urban or rural reserve based on those factors. Technical information included data from the prior phases and hazard and buildable lands maps, Metro 2040 design type maps, extent of the use of exception lands for farming, zoning and partitioning. During this period, the CAC continued to receive information from citizen participants at meetings, from local governments, and from CAC members. Record Index # CAC Meeting Summaries. The group was further informed of information present in the Reserves Steering Committee forum, and of regional public outreach results. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled. The product of the CAC suitability assessment is a report dated August 26, 2009, that contains rankings and rationale for urban and rural reserve for each area. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09.

III. Urban Reserves in Multnomah County

Urban Reserve 1C: East of Gresham

General Description:

This 855-acre area lies east of and adjacent to the Springwater employment area that was added to the UGB in 2002 as a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA). Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 52, 54 and Gresham City Council President Richard Strathern letter 10/21/09. It is bounded by Lusted Rd on the north, SE 302nd Ave. and Bluff Rd. on the east, and properties on the north side of Johnson Creek along the south edge. The entire area is identified as Foundation Agricultural Land.

However, the urban reserve area contains three public schools within the Gresham Barlow School District that were built prior to adoption of the statewide planning goals. It also includes the unincorporated rural community of Orient. The area is the most suitable area proximate to Troutdale and Gresham to accommodate additional growth of the Springwater employment area and is the only area adjacent to the UGB on the northeast side of the region with characteristics that make it attractive for industrial use.

How Urban Reserve 1C Fares Under the Factors:

The urban factors suitability analysis produced by the CAC and staff ranked this area as medium on most factors. The analysis notes that there are few topographic constraints for urban uses, including employment, that the existing rural road grid integrates with Gresham, and that it is near employment land within Springwater that has planned access to US Highway 26. Concern about minimizing adverse effects to farming was noted, although this factor was ranked medium also.

The rural reserve suitability assessment generally considers the larger Foundation Agricultural Land area between Gresham/Troutdale and the Sandy River Canyon as a whole. The analysis notes the existence of scattered groups of small parcels zoned as exception land in the southwest part of the area, including the Orient rural community. The lack of effective topographic buffering along the Gresham UGB, and the groups of small parcels in the rural community contributed to a "medium" ranking on the land use pattern/buffering factor (2)(d)(B). The CAC found the area as highly suitable for rural reserve, and indicated that the north half of the area was most suitable for urban reserve if needed.

Why This Area was Designated Urban Reserve:

This area was ranked as the most suitable for urbanization in Multnomah County in the suitability assessment. Gresham indicated its ability and desire to provide services to this area primarily for employment. The area is also suitable for continued agricultural use. However, as noted above, the presence of the Orient community, areas of small parcels, and lack of topography that buffers the area from adjacent urban development make this the most appropriate area for urbanization.

Additional support for urban/industrial designation in this general area was received from several sources including Metro in the Chief Operating Officer's report, the State of Oregon agency letter, and Port of Portland. Record Index # Metro COO Recommendation 9/15/09

Appendix 3E Clackanomah pgs 2, 3, State Agency Letter 10/14/09 pg 15, Port of Portland Imeson ltr 9/4/09. Concern for protection of Johnson Creek was expressed by environmental stakeholders, and is addressed by holding the southern urban reserve edge to the north of the creek. Record Index # JCWC 4/14/09 ltr. The position of the area on the east edge of the region adds balance to the regional distribution of urban reserve, and employment land in particular. All of the rural land in this area is Foundation Agricultural Land, however, the proposed urban reserve is the best choice to address employment land needs in this part of the region.

IV Rural Reserve in Multnomah County

Area 1B West of Sandy River (Clackanomah in Multnomah County)

General Description:

This map area includes the northeast portion of the regional study area. Record Index # Study Area Map 6/16/08. Subareas studied by the CAC in the suitability assessment include Government, McGuire and Lemon Islands (Area 1), East of Sandy River (Area 2), Sandy River Canyon (Area 3), and West of Sandy River (Area 4). Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 30 through 54. The Troutdale/Gresham UGB forms the west edge, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area is the north boundary, and the Study Area edge and county line are the east and south boundaries. With the exception of the Government Islands group, all of this area is either Foundation or Important Agricultural Land. In addition, all except the southeast quadrant is within 3 miles of the UGB. Record Index # PC Exhibit 1, Hearing 4/10/10.

How Rural Reserve 1B Fares Under the Factors:

The Foundation and Important Agricultural Land areas between the Gresham/Troutdale UGB and the east edge of the Sandy River canyon qualify as rural reserve because they are within 3 miles of the UGB. The Sandy River Canyon is a high value landscape feature and is made up of either Foundation or Important Agricultural Land. The canyon and associated uplands are not suitable for urbanization due to steep slopes associated with the river and its tributaries. The canyon forms a landscape-scale edge between urban areas on the west and rural lands to the east and ranked high in the suitability analysis on additional key rural factors of: sense of place, wildlife habitat, and access to recreation. The Government Islands area is not classified as either Foundation, Important, or Conflicted Agricultural Land, but is classified as "mixed forest" in the Oregon Department of Forestry study. The area ranked low under the farm/forest factors, and high on the landscape features factors related to natural hazards, important habitat, and sense of place.

Why This Area was Designated Rural Reserve:

Rural reserve is proposed from the eastside of the UGB eastward to the eastern edge of the Sandy River Canyon except for the urban reserve area 1C (see Section III above). The east rural reserve edge corresponds approximately to the county Wild and Scenic River overlay zone, and maintains continuity of the canyon feature by continuing the reserve designation further than 3 miles from the UGB to the county line. An area adjacent to the city of Troutdale in the northwest corner of the area is proposed to remain undesignated in order to

provide potential expansion for future land needs identified by the city. The Government Islands group remains rural land since it already has long term protection from urbanization in the form of a long-term lease between the Port of Portland and Oregon Parks and Recreation, and the Jewell Lake mitigation site. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 30 through 34 and 42 through 54.

Areas 9A through 9F West Multnomah County

This map area includes the north portion of the regional study area. Subareas studied by the CAC in the suitability assessment include NW Hills North (Area 5), West Hills South (Area 6), Powerline/Germantown Road-South (Area 7), Sauvie Island (Area 8), and Multnomah Channel (Area 9). Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 55 through 96.

Area 9A – 9C Powerlines/Germantown Road-South

General Description:

This area lies south of Germantown Road and the power line corridor where it rises from the toe of the west slope of the Tualatin Mountains up to the ridge at Skyline Blvd. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 73 - 84. The north edge of the area is the start of the Conflicted Agricultural Land section that extends south along the Multnomah/Washington county line to the area around Thompson Road and the Forest Heights subdivision in the city of Portland. The area is adjacent to unincorporated urban land in Washington County on the west, and abuts the City of Portland on the east. Most of the area is mapped as Important Landscape Features that begin adjacent to Forest Park and continue west down the slope to the County line. Record Index # map NFLI 4 7/29/09. The area is a mix of headwaters streams, upland forest and open field wildlife habitat.

How Rural Reserve 9A - 9C Fares Under the Factors:

The CAC ranked the area “medium-high suitability” for rural reserve after considering important landscape features mapping, Metro’s designation as a target area for public acquisition through the parks and greenspaces bond program, the extensive County Goal 5 protected areas, Metro Title 13 habitat areas, proximity to Forest Park, and local observations of wildlife use of the area. Record Index# Metro Greenspaces Acquisition Refinement Plan and Maps, Zoning Map SEC NW Hills South, map Metro Regionally Significant Fish and Wildlife Habitat, USGS Map with Wildlife Sightings FPNA. The CAC further ranked factors for sense of place, ability to buffer urban/rural interface, and access to recreation as high. While there was conflicting evidence regarding capability of the area for long-term forestry and agriculture, the CAC ranked the area as medium under this factor. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 73 - 83. The county agrees that the west edge of area 9B defines a boundary between urbanizing Washington County and the landscape features to the east in Multnomah County. Elements that contribute to this edge or buffer include the power line right-of-way, Multnomah County wildlife habitat protection, planned Metro West Side Trail and Bond Measure Acquisition Areas, and the urban-rural policy choices represented by the county line. Record Index # J.Emerson email 4/16/09, map West Side Trails, and City of Portland 1/11/09 letter pg 4.

The CAC ranked the area “low suitability” for urban reserve generally, with the exception of areas 9A and 9B. Areas 9A and 9B resulted in a split of the CAC between “low” and “medium” rankings. Most of the area 9A – 9C contains topography that limits efficient provision of urban services, and, should urban development occur, would result in unacceptable impacts to important landscape features. Limiting topographic features include slopes that range from 10% in the majority of area 9B to above 25% in portions of 9C, and stream corridors and ravines interspersed throughout the area. Record Index# CAC 9 map Reserves South, constraints 3/26/09. Due to these features, the area was ranked low for an RTP level transportation “grid” system, for a walkable, transit oriented community, and for employment land. The CAC also recognized that should urban development occur, it would be difficult to avoid impacts to area streams and the visual quality of this part of Landscape Feature #22 Rock Creek Headwaters.

Why This Area was Designated Rural Reserve:

Among the urban factors in the Reserves rules are efficient use of infrastructure and efficient and cost-effective provision of services. These are also among the most important factors in the Great Communities study. Record Index # Great Communities Final Report, pgs 7, 8. Multnomah County does not provide urban services and has not since adoption of Resolution A in 1983. Record Index# Mult.Co.Aspirations 2/19/09. The County no longer has urban plan or zone designations; it contracts with the cities in the county for these services. This means urban services to Areas 9A - 9C would have to come from a city in a position to plan and serve new urban communities. As was the case when Metro considered addition of lands in Multnomah County on the west slope of Tualatin to the UGB in 2002, there is not a city in a position to provide urban services to Areas 9A to C. Beaverton is over two miles to the south. Metro assigned urban planning to Beaverton when Metro added the North Bethany area to the UGB in 2002. Given the obstacles to annexation of the unincorporated territory over that two miles, Washington County took on responsibility for the planning instead of Beaverton. Unlike Multnomah County, Washington County continues to provide planning services and maintains urban plan and zoning designations for unincorporated urban areas.

The only other city that could provide services is Portland. Portland has said, however, it will not provide services to the area for the same reasons it would not provide services to nearby “Area 94” when it was considered for UGB expansion in 2002. (Metro added Area 94 to the UGB. The Oregon Court of Appeals remanded to LCDC and Metro because Metro had failed to explain why it included Area 94 despite its findings that the area was relatively unsuitable for urbanization. Metro subsequently removed the area from the UGB.) Portland points to the long-standing, unresolved issues of urban governance and urban planning services, noting the difficulties encountered in nearby Area 93. The City emphasizes lack of urban transportation services and the high cost of improvements to rural facilities and later maintenance of the facilities. The City further points to capital and maintenance cost for rural roads in Multnomah County that would have to carry trips coming from development on both sides of the county line and potential impacts to Forest Park. Record Index # BOCC 2/23/10 Portland letters 10/16/09, 12/10/09, 1/11/10, 2/23/10.

For these reasons, areas 9A – 9C rate poorly against the urban reserve factors.

The proposed rural reserve designation for all of area 9A – 9C recognizes and preserves the landscape features values that are of great value to the county. Record Index # BOCC 2/25/10 Hearing. The small scale agriculture and woodlots should be able to continue and provide local amenities for the area. Rural reserve for this area is supported not only by the weight of responses from the public, but by the Planning Commission and the regional deliberative body MPAC as well. Record Index # Area 9B Survey Responses, PC 8/10/09 meeting minutes and MPAC 2/1/10 meeting record.

9D and 9F – West Hills North and South, Multnomah Channel

General Description:

This area extends from the Powerlines/Germantown Rd. area northward to the county line, with Sauvie Island and the west county line as the east/west boundaries. All of the area is proposed as rural reserve. Agricultural designations are Important Agricultural Land in 9D, and Foundation Agricultural Land in area 9F. All of area 9D is within three miles of the UGB, and the three mile line from Scappoose extends south to approximately Rocky Point Road in area 9F.

How Rural Reserve 9D and 9F Fare Under the Factors:

All of the Multnomah Channel area is an important landscape feature, and the interior area from approximately Rocky Point Rd. south to Skyline Blvd. is a large contiguous block on the landscape features map. Record Index # map Natural Landscape Features Inventory 4 7/29/09. This interior area is steeply sloped and heavily forested, and is known for high value wildlife habitat and as a wildlife corridor between the coast range and Forest Park. It is also recognized as having high scenic value as viewed from both east Portland and Sauvie Island, and from the US Highway 26 corridor on the west. Landscape features mapping south of Skyline includes both Rock Creek and Abbey Creek headwaters areas that abut the city of Portland on the east and follow the county line on the west.

The potential for urbanization north of the Cornelius Pass Rd. and Skyline intersection in area 9D, and all of 9F, was ranked by the CAC as low. Limitations to development in the Tualatin Mountains include steep slope hazards, difficulty to provide urban transportation systems, and other key services of sewer and water. Areas along Multnomah Channel were generally ranked low due to physical constraints including the low lying land that is unprotected from flooding. Additional limitations are due to the narrow configuration of the land between US Highway 30 and the river coupled with extensive public ownership, and low efficiency for providing key urban services. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 91 - 96. Subsequent information suggested some potential for urban development given the close proximity of US Highway 30 to the area.

Why This Area was Designated Rural Reserve:

This area is proposed for rural reserve even though urbanization potential is low. Of greater importance is the high sense of place value of the area. The significant public response in favor of rural reserve affirms the CAC rankings on this factor. In addition, the high value wildlife habitat connections to Forest Park and along Multnomah Channel, the position of this

part of the Tualatin Mountains as forming edges to the urban areas of both Scappoose and the Portland Metro region, further support the rural reserve designation.

9E - Sauvie Island

General Description:

Sauvie Island is a large, low lying agricultural area at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia Rivers. The interior of the island is protected by a perimeter dike that also serves as access to the extensive agricultural and recreational areas on the island. It is located adjacent to the City of Portland with access via Highway 30 along a narrow strip of land defined by the toe of the Tualatin Mountains and Multnomah Channel. This area was assessed as Area 8 by the County CAC. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 85 through 89. The island is entirely Foundation Agricultural Land, and is mapped as an important landscape feature. Large areas at the north and south extents of the island are within 3 miles of the Scappoose and Portland UGBs.

How Rural Reserve 9E Fares Under the Factors:

The island ranked high on the majority of the agricultural factors, indicating suitability for long-term agriculture. It ranked high on landscape features factors for sense of place, important wildlife habitat, and access to recreation. The low lying land presents difficulties for efficient urbanization including the need for improved infrastructure to protect it from flooding, and additional costly river crossings that would be needed for urban development. The CAC ranked the island low on all urban factors indicating low suitability for urbanization.

Why This Area was Designated Rural Reserve:

The island is a key landscape feature in the region, ranking high for sense of place, wildlife habitat, and recreation access. The island defines the northern extent of the Portland-Metropolitan region at a broad landscape scale. These characteristics justify a rural reserve designation of the entire Multnomah County portion of the island even though potential for urbanization is low.

V. Statewide Planning Goals Compliance

MCC Chapter 11.05.180 Standards for Plan and Revisions requires legislative plan amendments comply with the applicable Statewide Planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.175(2)(a). These findings show that the reserves plan amendments are consistent with the goals, and they therefore comply with them.

GOAL 1: CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

The process of studying, identifying, and designating reserves began in January of 2008, with formation of the regional Reserves Steering Committee, adoption of a Coordinated Public Involvement Plan to coordinate the work flow, and formation of county committees to assess

reserve areas and engage the public. Record Index # RSC Post Meeting Packet 3/14/08, and BOCC Resolution to form CAC and Appointment of CAC 5/1/08.

Multnomah County incorporated the Coordinated Public Involvement Plan into the plan followed for the county process, and this plan was reviewed by the Multnomah County Office of Citizen Involvement Board. Record Index # CAC 2 Mult Co PI Plan 3/5/08. In addition to providing opportunity for public involvement listed below, the county plan incorporated a number of tools including internet pages with current and prior meeting agendas and content, web surveys, mailed notices to property owners, email meeting notifications, news releases and meeting and hearing notices, neighborhood association meetings, and an internet comment link.

Key phases of the project in Multnomah County included:

- The Multnomah County Reserves Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) developed their suitability assessments and recommendations in 16 public meetings between May 2008 and July 30, 2009. Record Index # CAC Agendas Compiled. The Planning Commission conducted a hearing on Aug 10, 2009 to consider the CAC suitability recommendations and recommendations for reserve designations in the county. Record Index # PC 8/10/10 hearing staff report, and minutes. Consensus of the Planning Commission endorsed the CAC recommendations.
- The Board adopted Resolution No. 09-112 at their September 10, 2009 public hearing, forwarding to Core 4 and the Reserves Steering Committee, urban and rural reserves suitability recommendations developed by the Multnomah County (CAC). Record Index # BOCC Hearing 9/10/09. The Board focused on suitability of areas for reserves rather than on designations of urban and rural reserves pending information about how much growth can occur within the existing UGB and how much new land will be sufficient to accommodate long term growth needs.
- The Board adopted Resolution No. 09-153 at their December 10, 2009 public hearing, forwarding to Core 4, recommendations for urban or rural reserve for use in the regional public outreach events in January 2010. Record Index # BOCC Hearing 12/10/09. These recommendations were developed considering public testimony and information from the Regional Steering Committee stakeholder comment, discussion with Multnomah County cities, and information and perspectives shared in Core 4 meetings. Record Index # Testimony BOCC R5 12/10/09, APR Form 11/25/09 and Core 4 Packet 12/4/09.
- The Board approved the IGA with Metro at a public hearing on February 25, 2010. Record Index# BOCC Hearing 2/25/10 Exhibit A [recordings and documents]. Additional public and agency input was considered in deliberations including results of the January public outreach, results of deliberations by the regional Metropolitan Planning Advisory Committee, and interested cities.

Public outreach included three region wide open house events and on-line surveys. The first was conducted in July of 2008 to gather input on the Reserves Study Area Map. Record Index

Study Area Boundary Open House Comments 7/31/08. The second occurred in April of 2009, for public input on Urban and Rural Reserve Candidate Areas - lands that will continue to be studied for urban and rural reserves. Record Index # Phase 3 Initial Results Summary 5/13/09. The third regional outreach effort to gather input on the regional reserves map prior to refinement of the final map for Intergovernmental Agreements occurred in January of 2010. Record Index # Public Comment Report Phase 4 draft 2/8/10.

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners heard briefings on the reserves project on 2/14/08, 4/16/09, and 8/20/09, and conducted public hearings indicated above. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on 8/10/09 and received regular briefings during the reserves project. Record Index # PC 8/10/09.

Public testimony has been an important element in the process and has been submitted to Multnomah County in addition to public hearings in several ways including open house events that took place in July of 2008, April of 2009, and January of 2010, and in testimony provided at CAC meetings. Record Index # CAC Meeting Summaries.

GOAL 2: LAND USE PLANNING

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

The County's Plan policies and map amendments put in place the framework needed to carry out the objectives of the reserves plan by identifying areas where rural resources will be protected from urbanization. The County rural plan has been coordinated with Metro's urban plan to identify where urbanization should occur during the 50 year plan. The County's policies and map ensure that rural reserve areas will remain rural and not be included within urban areas. The amendments further contain policies and strategies to support the on-going planning processes to facilitate availability of urban reserve areas for urban use as appropriate.

Coordination with Multnomah County Cities

Understanding the land needs and service potential of cities is of critical importance because the County would look to a city to provide urban governance and services should areas designated urban reserve come into the UGB in the future. Input from cities with an interest in reserves within Multnomah County during CAC development of the suitability assessments and these reserve designations is briefly summarized below.

- Beaverton – The City has indicated that it may be able to provide urban governance for areas on the west edge of the county, however whether that city would eventually provide these services is uncertain, and timing for resolution of all outstanding issues that would set the stage for extending Beaverton governance to this area is likely many years away.
- Gresham – The City indicated in their 2/25/09 letter that areas east of the city should continue to be studied for urban reserve, recognizing that the recommendation is made without a complete picture of urban land needs. Record Index # Gresham Councilor

Strathern letter 2/25/09. There should be some rural reserve east of the city, the region should minimize UGB expansions, and the City wants to focus on areas within the current UGB. The City provided a follow up letter dated 10/24/09 requesting urban reserve between SE 302nd and the Gresham UGB. Record Index # BOCC 12/10/09 Hearing. That area is shown as urban reserve on the proposed reserves plan map.

- Portland – City coordination efforts have occurred regarding potential reserve designations, particularly along the west edge of Multnomah County. Focus has been on the efficiency of providing urban services, and how governance services could be provided by the City. The City has indicated that the county line is an appropriate urban/rural edge, has identified service difficulties, the importance of landscape features in the area, and stated their interest in focusing limited resources on existing centers, and corridors and employment areas rather than along the west edge of the County. Therefore Portland recommended rural reserve for this area.
- Troutdale – Troutdale requested approximately 775 acres of land for expansion, including the area north of Division and east out to 302nd Ave., indicating a need for housing land and ability to provide services to the area. Record Index # PC Hearing 8/10/09 R.Faith memo 8/10/09. The proposed plan map leaves an approximately 187 acre area adjacent to the city without reserves designation. Proposed Policy 5 provides for a review of the reserves plan that can consider this and other areas in the region 20 years after the plan is adopted.

Additional agency coordination efforts related to Multnomah County reserves that occurred in addition to the regional process included Port of Portland, City of Scappoose, Sauvie Island Drainage District, and East and West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Record Index # CAC 8 T.Boullion 2/26/09, CAC 12 B.Varricchione 5/7/09, CAC 9 J.Townsley 3/25/09, and CAC 6 Farm/Forest TAC 12/9/08.

GOAL 3: AGRICULTURAL LANDS

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.

Agricultural lands in the county are protected for farm use by existing zoning and plan policies, and these are unchanged by the proposed amendments. The proposed policies and map add a new element, rural reserve, that ensures protection from urbanization of farmland important to the long-term viability of agriculture in the County. This protection is consistent with the goal of maintaining agricultural lands for farm use.

GOAL 4: FOREST LANDS

To conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state's forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture.

Forest lands in the county are protected for forest use by existing zoning and plan policies that are unchanged by the proposed amendments. The proposed policies and map add long-term protection from urbanization of Goal 4 resources consistent with this goal by designating these areas as rural reserve.

GOAL 5: NATURAL RESOURCES, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, AND OPEN SPACES

To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

The Goal 5 resources in the county are protected by existing zoning and plan policies that are unchanged by the proposed amendments. The reserves factors require consideration of the importance of resources of the type that are protected by Goal 5 plans though the Landscape Features factors. The factors also require consideration of how these resource areas could be protected when included within urban reserve and subsequently urbanized. Goal 5 protection will apply to land included within the UGB in the future. The reserves suitability assessment considered natural and scenic resources as it was developed, and existing county protections are maintained consistent with Goal 5. Record Index # CAC 10 D.Tokos memo 4/23/09.

GOAL 6: AIR, WATER AND LAND RESOURCES QUALITY

To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

The proposed plan policies and map have no bearing on existing waste management plans and are therefore consistent with this goal.

GOAL 7: AREAS SUBJECT TO NATURAL HAZARDS

To protect people and property from natural hazards.

Existing zoning contains safeguards intended to protect rural development from identified hazards. The factors required consideration of areas of potential hazard including flood, landslide, and fire in forming reserves designations. Record Index # CAC 10 D.Tokos memo 4/23/09, Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pg 76. Consideration of hazard areas in the reserves plan and continuation of existing protections is consistent with this goal.

GOAL 8: RECREATIONAL NEEDS

To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

The factors that applied to consideration of rural reserve to protect landscape features from urbanization include access to recreation areas including trails and parks. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pg 77 -78. Urban factors consider how parks can be provided in urban reserve areas. Existing plan and zoning provisions for parks are unchanged by the proposed reserves plan. The proposed reserves designations are consistent with Goal 8.

GOAL 9: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

The proposed urban reserve east of Gresham includes land that has potential to support additional economic development. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pg 52. This puts in place the potential for greater diversity of economic development in this area while minimizing loss of economically important farm land consistent with this goal.

GOAL 10: HOUSING

To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.

The proposed reserves plan increases potential for additional housing opportunity by designating additional land as urban reserve consistent with this goal. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 51 - 54.

GOAL 11: PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

The reserves factors analysis used in consideration of urban reserve included assessment of how efficiently the key public facilities could be provided to potential reserve areas. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 51 - 54. Further, the 50 year urban reserve plan allows service planning to occur over a longer time frame. These elements support timely orderly and efficient provision of services consistent with this goal.

GOAL 12: TRANSPORTATION

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

The proposed reserves plan policies and map do not cause any change to the County rural transportation system. Transportation planning to support urban uses within the proposed urban reserve east of Gresham will occur at the concept planning stage prior to including areas within the UGB. The relative efficiency of providing adequate transportation services in potential reserve areas was considered in the factors analysis. The proposed plan policies and map are consistent with Goal 12.

GOAL 13: ENERGY CONSERVATION

To conserve energy.

The evaluation of the suitability of land for urban reserve took into account the potential for efficient transportation and other infrastructure, and sites that can support walkable, well-connected communities. These are energy conserving approaches to urban development, and the proposed urban reserve ranks moderately well on these factors and is consistent with this goal. Record Index # Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12/10/09 pgs 51 - 54.

GOAL 14: URBANIZATION

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

The reserves plan and policies implement an approach to the transition from rural to urban land that increases understanding of the future location of new urban areas and the time to plan for the transition. Urban reserves are expected to thereby improve this process consistent with this goal.

GOAL 15: WILLAMETTE RIVER GREENWAY

To protect, conserve, enhance and maintain the natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, economic and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River as the Willamette River Greenway.

Land planned under this goal in Multnomah County is located along Multnomah Channel and is zoned with the county Willamette River Greenway overlay zone. The reserves plan does not change that zoning. The proposed rural reserve along the channel protects the Greenway from urban development during the 50 year plan period, and this protection is consistent with the goal.

The findings in Part II below describe the process by which the Reserves partners, Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties, and Metro, designated urban and rural reserves. The findings, together with the findings in Part I, demonstrate compliance with the provisions for completing Intergovernmental Agreements between Multnomah County and Metro in OAR 660-027-0030. These findings are adopted by Multnomah County to fulfill the requirement for submittal of joint findings to LCDC in OAR 660-027-0080(4).”

Part II Reasons for Designations of Urban and Rural Reserves

I. Background

The 2007 Oregon Legislature authorized Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties (“partner governments”) to designate urban reserves and rural reserves following the process set forth in ORS 195.137 – 195.145 (Senate Bill 1011) and implementing rules adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) (OAR 660 Division 27). The Legislature enacted the new authority in response to a call by local governments in the region to improve the methods available to them for managing growth. After the experience of adding over 20,000 acres to the regional urban growth boundary (UGB) following the soil-capability-based priority of lands in ORS 197.298, cities and the partner governments wanted to place more emphasis on the suitability of lands for sustainable urban development, longer-term security for agriculture and forestry outside the UGB, and respect for the natural landscape features that define the region.

The new statute and rules make agreements among the partner governments a prerequisite for designation of urban and rural reserves. The remarkable cooperation among the local governments of the region that led to passage of Senate Bill 1011 and adoption of LCDC rules continued through the process of designation of urban reserves by Metro and rural reserves by Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties. The partners’ four ordinances are based upon the formal intergovernmental agreements between Metro and each county that are part of our record, developed simultaneously following long study of potential reserves and thorough involvement by the public.

II. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Metro Ordinance No. 10-1238 designates **28,615** gross acres as urban reserves, including urban reserves in each county. These lands are now first priority for addition to the region’s UGB when the region needs housing or employment capacity. As indicated in new policy in Metro’s Regional Framework Plan in Exhibit A to the ordinance, the urban reserves are intended to accommodate population and employment growth for 50 years, to year 2060.

Clackamas County Ordinance No. ZDO-233 designates **68,713** acres as rural reserves in Clackamas County. Multnomah County Ordinance No. 2010-1161 designates **46,706** acres as rural reserves in Multnomah County. Washington County Ordinance No. 733 designates **151,536** acres as rural reserves in that county. As indicated in new policies in the Regional Framework Plan and the counties’ Comprehensive Plans, these rural reserves – **266,954** acres in total - are now protected from urbanization for 50 years. Staff Report, June 30, 2010, **Metro Rec.____**. The governments of the region have struggled with the urban-farm/forest interface, always searching for a “hard edge” to give farmers and foresters some certainty to encourage investment in their businesses. No road, stream or floodplain under the old way of expanding the UGB offers the long-term certainty of the edge of a rural reserves with at least a 50-year lifespan. This certainty is among the reasons the four governments chose the longer, 50-year, reserves period.

The region's governments have also debated how best to protect important natural landscape features at the edges of the urban area. The partners' agreements and these ordinances now identify the features that will define the extent of outward urban expansion.

The region's urban and rural reserves are fully integrated into Metro's Regional Framework Plan and the Comprehensive Plans of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. Metro's plan includes a map that shows urban and rural reserves in all three counties. Each of the county plans includes a map that shows urban and rural reserves in the county. The reserves shown on each county map are identical to the reserves shown in that county on the Metro map. Each of the four plans contains new policies that ensure accomplishment of the goals for the reserves set by the four local governments and by state law. These new policies are consistent with, and carry out, the intergovernmental agreements between Metro and the three counties signed in February, 2010.

Together, these reserves signal the region's long-term limits of urbanization, its commitment to stewardship of farmland and forests, and its respect for the features of the natural landscape that give the people of the region their sense of place. Urban reserves, if and when added to the UGB, will take some land from the farm and forest land base. But the partners understood from the beginning that some of the very same characteristics that make an area suitable for agriculture also make it suitable for industrial uses and compact, mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-supportive urban development. The most difficult decisions made by the four governments involved Foundation Agricultural Land¹ near the existing UGB and the circumstances in which this land should be designated as urban reserve to accommodate growth in a compact form and provide opportunities for industrial development difficult or impossible on steep slopes.

Some important numbers help explain why the partners came to agree that the adopted system, in its entirety, achieves this balance. Of the total **28,615** acres designated urban reserves, approximately **13,981** acres are Foundation or Important Agricultural Land. This represents only four percent of the Foundation and Important Agricultural Land studied for possible urban or rural reserve designation. If all of this land is added to the UGB over the next 50 years, the region will have lost ~~3.5~~ five percent of the farmland base in the three-county area. Staff Report, June 30, 2010, **Metro Rec. ___**.

There is a second vantage point from which to assess the significance for agriculture of the designation of urban reserves in the three-county region: the percentage of land zoned for exclusive farm use in the three counties that is designated urban reserve. Land zoned EFU has emerged over 35 years of planning as the principal land base for agriculture in the counties, and is protected for that purpose by county zoning. The inventory of Foundation and Important Agricultural Lands includes land that is "exception land" no longer protected for agriculture for farming. Of the **28,615** acres designated urban reserves, some **10,767** acres

¹ Those lands mapped as Foundation Agricultural Land in the January, 2007, Oregon Department of Agriculture report to Metro entitled "Identification and Assessment of the Long-Term Commercial Viability of Metro Region Agricultural Lands.

are zoned EFU. Even including the **2,774** acres of these EFU lands that are classified by ODA as “conflicted”, these **10,767** acres represent four percent of all land zoned EFU in the three counties. If the “conflicted” acres are removed from consideration, the percentage drops to ~~less than three~~four percent. Staff Report, June 3rd, 2010, **Metro Rec. ___**.

If the region’s effort to contain urban development within the existing UGB and these urban reserves for the next 50 years is successful, the UGB will have accommodated an estimated 74 percent increase in population on an 11-percent increase in the area within the UGB. No other region in the nation can demonstrate this growth management success. Most of the borders of urban reserves are defined by a 50-year “hard edge” of **266,954** acres designated rural reserves, nearly all of which lies within five miles of the existing UGB. Of these rural reserves, approximately **249,116** acres are Foundation or Important Agricultural Land. Staff Report, June 3rd, 2010, **Metro Rec. ___**.

Why did the region designate *any* Foundation Agricultural Land as urban reserve? The explanation lies in the geography and topography of the region, the growing cost of urban services and the declining sources of revenues to pay for them, and the fundamental relationships among geography, topography and the cost of services. The region aspires to build “great communities.” Great communities are those that offer residents a range of housing types and transportation modes from which to choose. Experience shows that compact, mixed-use communities with fully integrated street, pedestrian, bicycle and transit systems offer the best range of housing and transportation choices. *State of the Centers: Investing in Our Communities*, January, 2009. **Metro Rec. ___**. The urban reserves factors in the reserves rules derive from work done by the region to identify the characteristics of great communities. Urban reserve factors (1), (3), (4), and (6)² especially aim at lands that can be developed in a compact, mixed-use, walkable and transit-supportive pattern, support by efficient and cost-effective services. Cost of services studies tell us that the best geography, both natural and political, for compact, mixed-use communities is relatively flat, undeveloped land. *Core 4 Technical Team Preliminary Analysis Reports for Water, Sewer and Transportation*, **Metro Rec. 1163-1187**; *Regional Infrastructure Analysis*, **Metro Rec. 440-481**.

The region also aspires to provide family-wage jobs to its residents. Urban reserve factor (2) directs attention to capacity for a healthy economy.³ Certain industries the region wants to attract prefer large parcels of flat land. Staff Report, June 3rd, 2010, **Metro Rec. ___**. Water, sewer and transportation costs rise as slope increases. *Core 4 Technical Team Preliminary*

² (1) Can be developed at urban densities in a way that makes efficient use of existing and future public and private infrastructure investments;

(3) Can be efficiently and cost-effectively service with public schools and other urban-level public facilities and services by appropriate and financially capable providers;

(4) Can be designed to be walkable and service with a well-connected system of streets, bikeways, recreation trails and public transit by appropriate services providers;

(6) Includes sufficient land suitable for a range of needed housing types.

³ (2) Includes sufficient development capacity to support a healthy economy.

Analysis Reports for Water, Sewer and Transportation, Metro Rec. 1163-1187; Regional Infrastructure Analysis, Metro Rec. 440-481. Converting existing low-density rural residential development into compact, mixed-use communities through infill and re-development is not only very expensive, it is politically difficult. There is no better support for these findings than the experience of the city of Damascus, trying since its addition to the UGB in 2002 to gain the acceptance of its citizens for a plan to urbanize a landscape characterized by a few flat areas interspersed among steeply sloping buttes and incised stream courses and natural resources. Staff Report, June 30, 2010, Metro Rec. ____.

Mapping of slopes, parcel sizes, and Foundation Agricultural Land revealed that most flat land in large parcels without a rural settlement pattern at the perimeter of the UGB lies outside Hillsboro, Cornelius, Forest Grove, Beaverton, and Sherwood. These same lands provide the most readily available supply of large lots for industrial development. *Business Coalition Constrained Land for Development and Employment Map, Metro Rec. 1105-1110.* Almost all of it is Foundation Agricultural Land. Metro Rec. _____. Had the region been looking only for the best land to build great communities, nearly all the urban reserves would have been around these cities. It is no coincidence that these cities told the reserves partners that they want significant urban reserves available to them, while most other cities told the partners they want little or no urban reserves. *Washington County Cities' Pre-Qualified Concept Plans, MetroWashCo Rec. ____.*

Despite these geopolitical and cost-of-services realities, the reserves partners designated extensive urban reserves that are *not* Foundation Agricultural Lands in order to meet the farm and forest land objectives of reserves, knowing they will be more difficult and expensive to urbanize:

Urban Reserve 1D east of Damascus and south of Gresham (2,716 acres);
 Urban Reserve 2A south of Damascus (1,239 acres);
 Urban Reserves 3B, C, D, F and G around Oregon City (2,232 acres);
 Urban reserves 4A, B and C in the Stafford area (4,699 acres);
 Urban reserves 4D, E, F, G and H southeast of Tualatin and east of Wilsonville (3,589 acres);
 Urban Reserve 5F between Tualatin and Sherwood (572 acres);
 Urban Reserve 5G west of Wilsonville (203 acres); and
 Urban Reserve 5D south of Sherwood (447 acres).

This totals approximately 15,697 acres, 55 percent of the lands designated urban reserve. Staff Report, June 3, 2010, Metro Rec. ____.

Our reasons for not selecting more non-Foundation Agricultural Land as urban reserves from the 400,000 acres studied can be found in our analysis of these lands using the urban reserve factors. First, we began our analysis by examining lands within five miles of the UGB. Most of these lands initially studied are beyond the affordable reach of urban services. With one exception (Urban Reserve 1D), designated urban reserves lie within two miles of the UGB.

Second, much of the Important and some Conflicted Agricultural Lands are separated from the UGB by, or include, important natural landscape features:

- East of Sandy: the Sandy River Canyon and the county's scenic river overlay zone
- Eagle Creek and Springwater Ridge: the bluffs above the Clackamas River
- Clackamas Heights (portion closest to UGB): Abernethy Creek
- South of Oregon City: steep slopes drop to Beaver Creek
- West Wilsonville: Tonquin Scablands
- Bethany/West Multnomah: Forest Park and stream headwaters and courses.

Urban reserve factors (5), (7) and (8)⁴ seek to direct urban development away from important natural landscape features and other natural resources.

Third, much of the Important and Conflicted Agricultural Lands rate lower against the urban reserves factors in comparison to areas designated urban reserve, or remain undesignated for possible designation as urban reserve if the region's population forecast proves too low.⁵

- Clackamas Heights
- East Wilsonville
- West Wilsonville
- Southeast of Oregon City
- Southwest of Borland Road
- Between Wilsonville and Sherwood

Lastly, some of the Important and Conflicted Agricultural Lands lies adjacent to cities in the region that have their own UGBs and want their own opportunities to expand over time:

- Estacada
- Sandy

These reasons are more fully set forth in the explanations for specific urban and rural reserves in sections VI-VIII.

The record of this two and one-half-year effort shows that not every partner agreed with all urban reserves in each county. But each partner agrees that this adopted system of urban and rural reserves, in its entirety, achieves the region's long-range goals and a balance among the objectives of reserves: to accommodate growth in population and employment in sustainable

⁴ (5) Can be designed to preserve and enhance natural ecological systems;

(7) Can be developed in a way that preserves important natural landscape features included in urban reserves;

(8) Can be designed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on farm and forest practices, and adverse effects on important natural landscape features, on nearby land including land designated as rural reserves.

⁵ "Retaining the existing planning and zoning for rural lands (and not applying a rural or an urban reserves designation) is appropriate for lands that are unlikely to be needed over the next 40 years, or (conversely) that are not subject to a threat of urbanization." Letter from nine state agencies to the Metro Regional Reserves Steering Committee, October 14, 2009, page 15.

and prosperous communities and neighborhoods, to preserve the vitality of the farms and forests of the region, and to protect defining natural landscape features. The partners are confident that this system of reserves will allow the continuation of vibrant and mutually-reinforcing farm, forest and urban economies for the next 50 years. And the partners agree this system is the best system the region can adopt by mutual agreement.

III. OVERALL PROCESS OF ANALYSIS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

A. Analysis and Decision-Making

The three counties and Metro began reserves work as soon as LCDC adopted the new rules on reserves (OAR Division 27). The four governments formed committees and began public involvement to raise awareness about reserves and help people learn how to engage in the process. Each of the four governments selected one of its elected officials to serve on the "Core 4", established to guide the designation process and formulate recommendations to the county boards and the Metro Council. The four governments also established a "Reserves Steering Committee" (RSC) to advise the Core 4 on reserves designation. The RSC represented interests across the region - from business, agriculture, social conservation advocacy, cities, service districts and state agencies (52 members and alternates).

The four governments established an overall Project Management Team (PMT) composed of planners and other professions from their planning departments. Each county established an advisory committee to provide guidance and advice to its county board, staffed by the county's planning department.

As part of technical analysis, staff gathered providers of water, sewer, transportation, education and other urban services to consider viability of future service provision to lands within the study area. The parks and open space staff at Metro provided guidance on how best to consider natural features using data that had been deeply researched, broadly vetted and tested for social and political acceptance among Willamette Valley stakeholders (Oregon Wildlife Conservation Strategy, Pacific Northwest Research Consortium, Willamette Valley Futures, The Nature Conservancy's Ecoregional Assessment). Business leaders, farm bureaus and other representative groups were consulted on an ongoing basis.

The first major task of the Core 4 was to recommend a reserves study area to the county boards and the Metro Council. With advice from the RSC, the county advisory committees and public comment gathered open houses across the region, the Core 4 recommended for further analysis some 400,000 acres around the existing urban area, extending generally five miles from the UGB. The four governments endorsed the study area in the fall of 2008. Then the task of applying the urban and rural reserve factors to specific areas began in earnest.

The county advisory committees reviewed information presented by the staff and advised the staff and county boards on how each "candidate area" rated under each reserves factor. The county staffs brought this work to the RSC for discussion. After a year's worth of work at regular meetings, the RSC made its recommendations to the Core 4 in October, 2009.

Later in the fall, each elected body held hearings to hear directly from their constituents on proposed urban and rural reserves. Public involvement included six open houses, three Metro

Council hearings around the region and a virtual open house on the Metro web site, all providing the same maps, materials and survey questions.

Following this public involvement, the Core 4 submitted its final recommendations to the four governments on February 8, 2010. The recommendation included a map of proposed urban and rural reserves, showing reserves upon which there was full agreement (the large majority of proposed reserves) and reserves upon which disagreements were not resolved. The Core 4 proposed that these differences be settled principally in bilateral discussions between each county and Metro, the parties to the intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) required by ORS 195.141. Over the next two weeks, the Metro Council reached agreement on reserves with each county. By February 25, 2010, Metro had signed an IGA with Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. **Metro Rec.____.**

The IGAs required each government to amend its plan to designate urban (Metro) or rural (counties) reserves and protect them for their intended purposes with plan policies. The IGAs also set times for final public hearings on the IGA recommendations and adoption of ordinances with these plan policies in May and June. The four governments understood that the IGAs and map of urban and rural reserves were not final decisions and, therefore, provided for final adjustments to the map to respond to public comment at the hearings. By June 31⁵, 2010, the four governments had adopted their reserves ordinances, including minor revisions to the reserves map.

B. Public Involvement

From its inception, the reserves designation process was designed to provide stakeholders and the public with a variety of ways to help shape the process and the final outcome. Most significantly, the decision process required 22 elected officials representing two levels of government and 400,000 acres of territory to craft maps and agreements that a majority of them could support. These commissioners and councilors represent constituents who hold a broad range of philosophical perspectives and physical ties to the land. Thus, the structure of the reserves decision process provided motivation for officials to seek a final compromise that met a wide array of public interests.

In the last phase of the reserve process – adoption of ordinances that designate urban and rural reserves - each government followed its established procedure for adoption of ordinances: notice to citizens; public hearings before its planning commission (in Metro's case, recommendations from the Metro Planning Advisory Committee) and public hearings before its governing body. But in the more-than-two years leading to this final phase, there were additional advisory bodies established.

The RSC began its work in early 2008. RSC members were expected to represent social and economic interests to the committee and officials and to serve as conduits of communication back to their respective communities. In addition, RSC meetings were open to the public and provided an additional avenue for citizens to voice their concerns—either by asking that a steering committee member represent their concern to the committee or by making use of the public testimony period at the beginning of each meeting.

Once the three county advisory committees got underway, they, like the RSC, invited citizens were to bring concerns to committee members or make statements at the beginning of each meeting.

Fulfilling the requirements of DLCD's administrative rules on reserves and the reserves work program, the three counties and Metro developed a Coordinated Public Involvement Plan in early 2008 that provided guidance on the types of public involvement activities, messages and communications methods that would be used for each phase of the reserves program. The plan incorporated the requirements of Oregon law and administrative rules governing citizen involvement and reflects comments and feedback received from the Metro Council, Core 4 members, each jurisdiction's citizen involvement committee, other county-level advisory committees and the RSC. The Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) reviewed and endorsed the Public Involvement Plan.

The four governments formed a public involvement team, composed of public involvement staff from each county and Metro, to implement the Public Involvement Plan. The team cooperated in all regional efforts: 20 open houses, two "virtual open houses" on the Metro web site, additional online surveys, presentations, printed materials and analysis and summaries of comments. The team members also undertook separate county and Metro-specific public engagement activities and shared methodologies, materials and results.

Elected officials made presentations to community planning organizations, hamlets, villages, city councils, advocacy organizations, civic groups, chambers of commerce, conferences, watershed councils, public affairs forums, art and architecture forums, and many other venues. Staff and elected officials appeared on television, on radio news broadcasts and talk shows, cable video broadcasts and was covered in countless news articles in metro outlets, gaining publicity that encouraged public engagement. Booths at farmers' markets and other public events, counter displays at retail outlets in rural areas, library displays and articles in organization newsletters further publicized the opportunities for comment. Materials were translated into Spanish and distributed throughout all three counties. Advocacy organizations rallied supporters to engage in letter email campaigns and to attend public meetings. Throughout the reserves planning process the web sites of each county and Metro provided information and avenues for feedback. While there have been formal public comment periods at key points in the decision process, the reserves project team invited the public to provide comment freely throughout the process.

In all, the four governments made extraordinary efforts to engage citizens of the region in the process of designating urban and rural reserves. The public involvement plan provided the public with more than 180 discrete opportunities to inform decision makers of their views urban and rural reserves. A fuller account of the public involvement process the activities associated with each stage may be found at Staff Report, June 30, 2010, **Metro Rec.**_____.

IV. AMOUNT OF URBAN RESERVES

A. Forecast

Metro developed a 50-year “range” forecast for population and employment that was coordinated with the 20-year forecast done for Metro’s UGB capacity analysis, completed in December, 2009. The forecast is based on national economic and demographic information and is adjusted to account for regional growth factors. The partner governments used the upper and lower ends of the 50-year range forecast as one parameter for the amount of land needed to accommodate households and employment. Instead of aiming to accommodate a particular number of households or jobs within that range, the partners selected urban reserves from approximately 400,000 acres studied that best achieve the purposes established by the Land Conservation and Development Commission [set forth in OAR 660-027-0005(2)] and the objectives of the partner governments.

B. Demand and Capacity

Estimating land demand over the next 50 years is difficult as a practical matter and involves much uncertainty. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) recognizes the challenge of estimating long-term need even for the 20-year UGB planning period. In the section of OAR Division 24 (Urban Growth Boundaries) on “Land Need”, the Commission says:

“The 20-year need determinations are estimates which, although based on the best available information and methodologies, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision.”

OAR 660-024-0040(1). The uncertainties loom much larger for a 40 to 50-year estimate. Nonetheless, Metro’s estimate of need for a supply of urban reserves sufficient to accommodate housing and employment to the year 2060 is soundly based in fact, experience and reasonable assumptions about long-range trends.

The urban reserves estimate begins with Metro’s UGB estimate of need for the next 20 years in its *Urban Growth Report 2009-2030*, January, 2010 (adopted December 17, 2009). **Metro Rec. 646; 715** (~~UGR, 33-34; 101~~). Metro relied upon the assumptions and trends underlying the 20-year estimate and modified them where appropriate for the longer-term reserves estimate, and reached the determinations described below.

The 50-year forecast makes the same assumption on the number of households and jobs needed to accommodate the population and employment coming to the UGB from the seven-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) as in the *Urban Growth Report*: approximately 62 percent of the MSA residential growth and 70 percent of the MSA employment growth will come to the metro area UGB. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, p. 11, Appendix 3E-C, Metro Rec. 599; Appendix 3E-D, Metro Rec. 606-607; 20 and 50 Year Regional Population and Employment Range Forecast, Metro Rec. — (p.6).*

Metro estimates the demand for new dwelling units within the UGB over the next 50 years to be between 485,000 and 532,000 units. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves,*

Appendix 3E-C, Metro Rec. 599. Metro estimates between 624,300 and 834,100 jobs will locate within the UGB by 2060. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-D, Table D-3, Metro Rec. 607.* Staff Report, June 3rd, 2010, **Metro Rec. ___**.

The region will focus its public investments over the next 50 years in communities inside the existing UGB and, as a result, land within the UGB would develop close to the maximum levels allowed by existing local comprehensive plan and zone designations. This investment strategy is expected to accommodate 70 to 85 percent of growth forecasted over that period. No increase in zoned capacity within the UGB was assumed because, at the time of adoption of reserves ordinances by the four governments, the Metro Council will not have completed its decision-making about actions to increase the capacity of the existing UGB as part of Metro's 2009 capacity analysis. For those areas added to the UGB between 2002 and 2005 for which comprehensive planning and zoning is not yet complete, Metro assumed the areas would accommodate all the housing and employment anticipated in the ordinances that added the areas to the UGB over the reserves planning period. Fifty years of enhanced and focused investment to accommodate growth will influence the market to use zoned capacity more fully.

Consistent with residential capacity analysis in the *Urban Growth Report*, vacant land in the existing UGB can accommodate 166,600 dwelling units under current zoning over the next 50 years. Infill and re-development over this period, with enhanced levels of investment, will accommodate another 212,600 units. This would leave approximately 152,400 dwelling units to be accommodated on urban reserves through 2060. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-C, pp. 5-6, Metro Rec. 602-603.*

Based upon the employment capacity analysis in the *Urban Growth Report*, the existing UGB has sufficient capacity – on vacant land and through re-development over the 50-year reserves period - for overall employment growth in the reserves period. However, this supply of land does not account for the preference of some industrial employers for larger parcels. To accommodate this preference, the analysis of the supply of larger parcels was extrapolated from the *Urban Growth Report*. This leads to the conclusion that urban reserves should include approximately 3,000 acres of net buildable land that is suitable for larger-parcel industrial users. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-D, pp. 6-7 Metro Rec. 609-610; Staff Report, June 3rd, 2010, Metro Rec. ___*.

Metro assumed residential development in urban reserves, when they are added to the UGB over time, would develop at higher densities than has been the experience in the past, for several reasons. First, the region is committed to ensuring new development at the edges of the region contributes to the emergence of "great communities", either new communities or as additions to existing communities inside the UGB. Second, because many urban reserves are "greenfields", they can be developed more efficiently than re-developing areas already inside the UGB. Third, demographic trends, noted in the *Urban Growth Report* that is the starting point for Metro's 2010 capacity analysis, indicate increasing demand for smaller housing units. This reasoning leads to the assumption that residential development will occur in reserves, when added to the UGB, at 15 units per net buildable acre overall, recognizing that some areas (centers, for example) would settle at densities higher than 15 units/acre and

others (with steep slopes, for example) would settle at densities lower than 15 units/acre. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-C, pp. 6-7; Staff Report, June 30, 2010, Metro Rec. ___.*

Metro also assumed greater efficiencies in use of employment lands over the next 50 years. The emerging shift of industrial activity from production to research and development will continue, meaning more industrial jobs will be accommodated in high- floor-to-area-ratio (FAR) offices rather than low-FAR general industrial space. This will reduce the need for general industrial and warehouse building types by 10 percent, and increase the need for office space. Office space, however, will be used more efficiently between 2030 and 2060, reducing that need by five percent. Finally, the analysis assumes a 20-percent increase in FARs for new development in centers and corridors, but no such increase in FARs in industrial areas. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-C, Metro Rec. 603-604; Staff Report, June 30, 2010, Metro Rec. ___.*

These assumptions lead to the conclusion that **28,615** acres of urban reserves are needed to accommodate 371,860 people and employment land targets over the 50-year reserves planning period to 2060. *COO Recommendation, Urban Rural Reserves, Appendix 3E-C, pp. 5-7 Metro Rec. 601-603; Staff Report, June 3, 2010, Metro Rec. ___; Appendix 3E-D, pp. 4-7 Metro Rec. 607-610; Staff Report, June 30, 2010, Metro Rec. ___.* The nine state agencies that served on the Reserves Steering Committee said the following about the amount of urban land the region will need over the long-term:

“The state agencies support the amount of urban reserves recommended by the Metro COO. That recommendation is for a range of between 15,000 and 29,000 acres. We believe that Metro and the counties can develop findings that, with this amount of land, the region can accommodate estimated urban population and employment growth for at least 40 years, and that the amount includes sufficient development capacity to support a healthy economy and to provide a range of needed housing types.” *Letter to Metro Regional Steering Committee, October 14, 2009, Metro Rec. 1373.*

Based upon the assumptions described above about efficient use of land, the four governments believe the region can accommodate 50 years’ worth of growth, not just 40 years’ of growth.

V. IMPLMENTING URBAN RESERVES

To ensure that urban reserves ultimately urbanize in a manner consistent with the Regional Framework Plan, Ordinance No. 10-1238 amended Title 11 (Planning for New Urban Areas) (Exhibit D) of Metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to require planning of areas of urban reserve prior to inclusion into the UGB. Title 11 now requires a “concept plan” for an urban reserve area prior to UGB expansion. A concept plan must show how development would achieve specified outcomes. The outcomes derive from the urban reserve factors in OAR 660-027-0050, themselves based in part on the characteristics of “great communities” identified by local governments of the region as part of Metro’s “Making the Greatest Place” initiative. Title 11 sets forth the elements of a concept plan, including:

- the general locations of types of uses
- the general locations of the urban services (including transportation systems) needed to support the uses
- estimates of the cost of the services to determine the feasibility of urbanization and to allow comparisons of urban reserves
- the locations of natural resources that will be subject to Title 3 and 13 of the UGMFP
- agreement among local governments and other service providers on provision of services to the area
- agreement among the local governments on annexation of the area to a city or cities and responsibility for planning and zoning.

Title 11 continues to limit development in areas added to the UGB to protect the opportunity for efficient urbanization during the time needed to adopt new local government plan provisions and land use regulations. Title 11, together with the comprehensive plans of the receiving local governments and Metro's Regional Framework Plan (including the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan), will ensure land use and transportation policies and designations will allow mixed-use and pedestrian, bicycle and transit-supportive development once urban reserve areas are added to the UGB. Staff Report, June 30, 2010, **Metro Rec.**___.

Document Index for Multnomah County Rural and Urban Reserve Project

Page Number	Meeting / Hearing Date	Document Date	Description
1 - 13		2/1/2007	Final Natural Landscape Features Inventory "New Look"
14 - 56		2/1/2007	Final state "Identification & Assessment of Long-Term Commercial Viability of Metro Region Ag Lands" submitted to Metro
56 - 80		1/29/2008	"Criteria for Consideration of Forestlands within Future Rural Reserves" version 1.4
81 - 82	5/1/2008	5/1/2008	Agenda
83 - 84		5/1/2008	Purpose and charge
85 - 87		5/1/2008	Discussion draft Protocols
88 - 91		5/1/2008	Sign in sheet
92			CAC Members and staff contact sheet
93		3/26/2008	Main Path Work Program
94		3/12/2008	Work Program Overview
95 - 109		4/29/2008	.ppt Intro to Urban and Rural Reserves
110 - 112			RSC members and schedule
113			Key Milestones Chart
114			Road Map for Making the Greatest Place
115 - 141			Great Communities Final Report
142 - 157			OAR Division 27 and SB 1011
158			Natural Landscape Features Inventory - map and text
159 - 160	6/12/2008	6/12/2008	Agenda, charge/protocols, OAR factors, Broad study area, issues to consider, public involvement
161 - 166			5/1/08 Meeting summary
167 - 168		5/1/2008	CAC Charge
169 - 171		6/12/2008	CAC Protocols draft
172 - 177		3/20/2008	Mult Co Reserves Public Involvement Plan
178 - 188		3/5/2008	Coordinated Public Involvement Plan
189		6/13/2008	Open House table
190		5/23/2008	Proposed Study Area Attachment B map
191 - 192		undated	Rules Fundamentals undated from RSC packet
193		4/7/2008	Urban Factors table incl Broad Study Area and other "filters" associated with the factors
194		6/12/2008	Sign in Sheet
195 - 196	7/31/2008	7/31/2008	Agenda, CAC Recommendation re Broad Study Area, review inventories and studies, study area evaluation, meeting schedule
197 - 199		6/12/2008	CAC Protocols final
200 - 201		undated	CAC Charge final
202 - 204		undated	Issues to Consider
205 - 212		7/31/2008	CAC meeting 2 summary
213 - 215		7/31/2008	Open house Study Area Boundary comments
217		4/30/2008	ODF Land Use map
216		6/16/2008	Study Area Map
218 - 235		7/31/2008	Shape Summary .ppt re Inventories and studies - Great Communities, Ag, Natural Features, Landscape Inventories
236 - 237	10/23/2008	10/23/2008	Agenda, Development Constraints - Group Mackenzie, ODA ag study, land not subject to urbanization
238 - 245		6/31/2008	CAC meeting 3 summary

246 - 248		8/13/2008	CAC Issues to Consider table
249 - 259		1/29/2009	Grp Mackenzie .ppt (.pdf) delete 1.29.09 memo
260		10/23/2008	Notes for Agenda item 4, Lands not subject to urbanization
261 - 263		10/31/2008	e-mail correspondence bet. Carol & Richard Brenner of Metro re: questions about Reserves
264		10/23/2008	Sign in sheet
265 - 266		11/20/2008	Agenda
267 - 271		10/23/2008	CAC 4 meeting summary
272 - 274		11/4/2008	memo, Reserves Phase 3 suitability and analysis work program
275 - 276		10/23/2008	No Urban Potential memo, summary of break out sessions at 10/23/meeting.
277 - 278		10/30/2008	Infrastructure Cost Criteria, FCS memo to Metro re: cost criteria for extending services to new urban areas.
279 - 280		11/20/2008	Initial farm/forest screening questions for break out exercise
281		11/20/2008	map NW Potential Blocks, from CAC break out session
282		11/20/2008	map Sandy Blocks, from CAC break out session
283		11/20/2008	map Sandy Potential, from CAC break out session
284		11/20/2008	map Nov_Forest_contours, tax lots, contours, public ownership of Forest Park section of NW
285		11/20/2008	map Nov_NNW_contours, tax lots, contours, public ownership of northern county
286		11/20/2008	map Nov_SNW_contours, tax lots, contours, public ownership of south portion of NW hills.
287		11/20/2008	map Nov_Sandy_contours, tax lots, contours, public ownership of west of sandy area
288		11/20/2008	map Nov_Sauvie_contours, tax lots, contours, public ownership of Sauvie Island
289		11/20/2008	map photo_nov_Forest, aerial photo with tax lots of Forest Park section of NW
290		11/20/2008	map photo_nov_NNW, aerial photo with tax lots of northern county
291		11/20/2008	map photo_nov_Sandy, aerial photo with tax lots of west of sandy area
292		11/20/2008	map photo_nov_Sauvie, aerial photo w tax lots of Sauvie Island
293		11/20/2008	map photo_nov_SNW, aerial photo w tax lots of south portion of NW hills.
294		11/20/2008	map zone_nw_nov, tax lot map with exception and resource zoning for west county
295		11/20/2008	map zone_nw_sandy_nov, tax lot map w exception and resource zoning for east county
296-323		11/12/2008	RSC 09 meetings - Steering Committee schedule packet
324-327		1/1/2007	Great Communities Executive Summary
328		11/20/2008	map History of UGB Expansions
329-330		2/1/2007	map Natural Landscape Features summary 2.0
331-334		1/1/2007	ODA Ag Lands summary & Full Report
335		1/22/2008	Steering Committee members
336-337	1/8/2009	1/8/2009	Agenda to develop map of candidate areas
338-341	1/8/2009	11/20/2008	Minutes of 11/20/08 meeting
342-343	1/8/2009	12/11/2008	Farm and Forest TAC 12/09/08 meeting results
344-345		1/8/2009	Candidate Rural Reserve Areas draft, CAC comments re landscape features factors (a), (e), (f).

346-350		1/8/2009	Initial Landscape Features Screening, CAC #5 results & w/CCheserak comments
351	1/8/2009	1/2/2009	Soils Map - NW North, Multnomah County
352	1/8/2009	1/2/2009	Soils Map - NW South, Multnomah County
353	1/8/2009	1/2/2009	Soils Map - Sandy River, Multnomah County
354	1/8/2009	12/11/2008	Zoning Map East
355	1/8/2009	12/12/2008	Zoning Map Government Island
356	1/8/2009	12/3/2008	Zoning Map SEC NW Hills North
357	1/8/2009	12/3/2008	Zoning Map SEC NW Hills South
358	1/8/2009	11/20/2008	OAR 660-027-0060 Factors for designation of lands as Rural Reserves - Ag & Forest
359	1/8/2009	11/20/2008	OAR 660-027-0040 Factors for designation of lands as Rural Reserves - Landscape Features
360-361	1/8/2009	11/20/2008	Landscape Features Charrette 2007, Regionally Significant Natural Landscape Features within the Urban & Rural Reserves Study Area
362	1/8/2009	10/22/2008	Natural Landscape Features Inventory Feb 2007, text description of Mult Co. areas
363	1/8/2009	10/23/2008	Natural Landscape Features Map1 Subset Government Island
364	1/8/2009	10/23/2008	Natural Landscape Features Map2 Subset Orient
365	1/8/2009	10/23/2008	Natural Landscape Features Map 9Subset West Hills
366	1/8/2009	1/7/2009	map Resource Layers NW north & Sauvie Island
367	1/8/2009	1/7/2009	map Resource Layers NW south
368	1/8/2009	1/7/2009	map Resource Layers Sandy & Govt Island
369-391	1/8/2009	1/8/2009	Metro Res 07-3834 Acquisition Refinement Plan w/ exhibits including 3 maps (9/2007) of target acquisition areas in west hills
392		2/1/2006	Map Metro Regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat areas west of Forest Park
392a		9/1/2006	map USGS w Elk, cougar, bear sightings FPNA
393-394	1/8/2009	11/4/2008	map Metro HCT Lines for initial screening
395-396		10/30/2008	FCS Group memo to Metro - Infrastructure Cost Criteria
397-398		1/14/2009	letter and map re: loss of use of property as rural reserve
399-400			Sign in sheets
401-402	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	Agenda to develop CAC Consensus Map of Candidate Rural Reserve Areas
403-406			1/08/09 Meeting Summary
407-409	1/22/2009	1/12/2009	Coalition for a Livable Future ltr to Council & Committee re: equity considerations in planning process
410-411	1/22/2009	01/00/09	News article about start of Area 93/Bonny Slope West planning process
412	1/22/2009	2/22/2008	Draft of South Hillsboro Community Plan infrastructure cost & revenue comparison table
413	1/22/2009	10/11/2007	Prelim development cost estimates for N. Bethany
414	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	mmo "Reasons" summarize RR sub group assessment for the CAC
415-421	1/22/2009	1/8/2009	Rural Reserves -CAC Initial Farm/Forest lands screening assessment from 11/20/08 & 1/08/09 mtgs
422	1/22/2009	1/8/2009	e-mail re: Government Islands & Reserves
423-425	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	mmo to CAC re: procedure for UR assessment
426	1/22/2009		Urban factors list - 0050

427-428	1/22/2009	10/30/2008	FCS Group memo to Metro - Infrastructure Cost Criteria
429	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	Draft Slope & Floodplain Summary, acreages of constrained areas
430	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	map Slope, floodplain, distance constraints
431	1/22/2009		map Slope, floodplain, distance constraints
432	1/22/2009		map Slope, floodplain, distance constraints
433	1/22/2009		Efficiency ratings for sewer map
434	1/22/2009	1/21/2009	Prelim Water Service Suitability map
435-437	1/22/2009	undated	Letter & maps of Barker Family properties
438-439	1/22/2009	8/21/2006	Oregonian article about Hayat Farm
440-457	1/22/2009	1/21/2009	Results of CAC west side sub-group screening on 1/17/09 (18 pgs)
458-461	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	Break out sessions & flip chart notes for RR candidate areas - 1/8/09 & 1/22/09 meetings
462-463	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Agenda - Develop CAC Urban Candidate areas map, consider interests of Mult Co UGB edge cities for urban reserve
464-471	2/26/2009	1/22/2009	1/22/09 Meeting summary
472-475	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Committee and public sign-in sheets
476	2/26/2009	2/19/2009	Study group meeting notes
477	2/26/2009	2/17/2009	Letter from Mayor Jim Knight of Troutdale
	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Questions for 2/26/09 topic Candidate Urban Reserves - memo w/questions for break out sessions (see 2/28 post mtg packet)
478-483	2/26/2009	2/23/2009	Opposition letter from landowners & maps
484-486	2/26/2009	2/11/2009	Angel property chronology & zoning map
487-497	2/26/2009	2/17/2009	Letter re: Request for Urban Reserve Candidate Designation & attachments
498-501	2/26/2009	2/23/2009	Soils map and NRCS tables
502-513	2/26/2009	2/4/2009	Letter - include unconstrained lands in Group McKenzie study for urban reserve consideration. Attached is 1/29/09 Group McKenzie Constrained Lands study including map series, narrative, methodology, relative amount of land in county study areas
514-521	2/26/2009	2/20/2009	Urban Reserve initial screening summary, water, sewer, transportation - rankings for Mult Co areas from regional studies
522-523	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	memo from McFarland re: Transportation Suitability of Mult Co Study Areas - describes regional work group process & results for areas. (See 2/28 post mtg packet)
524-525	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Letter re: Government Island reserves designation Port of Portland
526	2/26/2009		Clark County to Metro Regional corridors map
527	2/26/2009	4/8/2008	Port map Strategy 1 Clark county HCT corridors
528-529	2/26/2009	2/25/2009	City of Gresham letter re: study area boundaries comments & suggestions
530-534	2/26/2009	2/25/2009	Ltr from Malinowski Farms re: request for rural reserve candidate designation, incl 2008 field acreage map, soils map & NRCS tables
535-536	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Memo from Todd Mobley PC, Lancaster Engineering re: East Bethany Transportation Assessment
537	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Ltr from Multnomah Yacht Harbor re: sewer & water service suitability studies

538-542	2/26/2009	2/23/2009	Ltr from East Bethany Owners Collaborative - support UR, addresses urban factors, includes map, signed by Blum, Burnham, Gaerisch, Burger, Zahler, Partlow, Crandall
543	2/26/2009		CAC Comments - messages to staff from CAC members inadvertently left out of 2/26/09 meeting materials
544-547	2/26/2009	2/5/2009	Tech Team Initial Screening of regional service providers for sewer, water, transportation mmo to RSC
548-560	2/26/2009	2/9/2009	Tech Team Sewer Preliminary Analysis memo to RSC and map
561-567	2/26/2009	2/11/2009	Tech Team Transportation Preliminary Analysis memo to RSC and map
568-572	2/26/2009	2/9/2009	Tech Team Water Preliminary Analysis memo to RSC and map
573-574	2/26/2009	2/1/2009	memo Clack Co re: regional technical team meetings for storm, schools, parks. Result is that these services don't contribute much to urban reserve decisions at broad landscape level.
575-585		11/29/2009	Group Mackenzie - land constrained for employment, includes maps, table shows 18% of study area is in Mult Co.
586-589	2/26/2009	2/6/2009	memo, staff report Urban Rural First Screen - results of CAC initial assessment and methodology
590	2/26/2009	2/25/2009	map CAC Preliminary water and sewer
591-592	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Questions re: services suitability & draft initial screening summary
593-596	2/26/2009	2/26/2009	Service Suitability - UR initial screening results of water, sewer, transportation rankings for Mult Co areas, high-low incl conversion chart
597-598	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Agenda & agenda topics re: Urban Reserve factors evaluation
599-607	3/26/2009	2/26/2009	Summary of 2/26/09 CAC meeting
608-611	3/26/2009	2/26/2009	Sign in sheets
612	3/26/2009	3/20/2009	Memo re: 3/26/09 Agenda Topics, project timelines, additional information incl to refine urban candidate areas
613	3/26/2009	3/16/2009	PI Phase 3 Open Houses - schedule
614	3/26/2009	3/13/2009	RSC 09 meetings - Steering Committee schedule
615-616	3/26/2009	3/5/2009	CAC Urban Reserves Recommendation Table draft (candidate areas in Mult Co)
617	3/26/2009	2/25/2009	map Candidate Rural Areas in Mult Co
618		2/27/2009	map Candidate Urban Areas in Mult Co
619-635	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Great Communities "Test Area Evaluation Methodology" dated Dec '06, Consolidated List of Driving Characteristics (Nov 17, 2006), NW Hills Test Area Evaluation (Nov 17, 2006), NW Hills Test Area sketch diagram (map)
636-637	3/26/2009	1/22/2004	map Mult Co Functional Classification of Traffic ways, east & west county
638-643		3/16/2009	Candidate areas - Initial Assessment Methodology and Results mmo - in reports from Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington Counties to RSC March 2009, Internet post
644-645	3/26/2009	3/16/2009	map Regional Urban & Rural Candidate Areas
646-647	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Urban Reserves Questions 2 - Candidate Areas
648		2/26/2009	map Preliminary Water & Sewer - rankings
649	3/26/2009	2/26/2009	map Preliminary Trans Added Lane cost
650-650a	3/26/2009	2/26/2009	maps Preliminary Trans Connectivity and Lane Cost Suitability
651	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	map Reserves Mar09_26 North - slope, flood constraints
652	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	map Reserves Mar09_26 South - slope, flood constraints

653	3/26/2009	7/9/2008	Draft of Metro's comparative infrastructure costs to gauge relative costs of transportation, sewer, water in new urban areas
654	3/26/2009	3/16/2009	Tri Met transit system map
655-656	3/26/2009	3/17/2009	Rural reserves opposition letter
657-660	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Letter from Perkins Coie lawyer representing Joseph Angel advocating Urban Reserves designation
661-663	3/26/2009	no date	Letter from Mr. Sowder requesting more consideration of data before final decisions made
664-666	3/26/2009	3/25/2009	Letter from Johnson Creek Watershed Council re: concerns & issues relating to potential designation of subject area as urban reserve
667-668	3/26/2009	3/25/2009	Letter from former District Manager of Sauvie Island Drainage Improvement Co. re: flood control & drainage on the Island
669	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	e-mail from SI Drainage stating Sauvie Island not suitable for urban development
670	3/26/2009	3/23/2009	E-mail opposing designation of "private reserve" of their property in Hillsboro
671	3/26/2009	3/23/2009	E-mails opposing rural reserve designation
672-673	3/26/2009	3/21/2009	Letter & map opposing rural reserve designation
674-675	3/26/2009	undated	Ltr supports FPNA & RR, habitat, RPNA survey, Metro acquisition areas, Great Communities found NW Hills not good for urban, difficult transportation network
676	3/26/2009	3/20/2009	Letter advocating urban reserve
677	3/26/2009	3/19/2009	Letter opposing rural reserve
678-679	3/26/2009	3/20/2009	Letter from North Cascades District Foresters re: Candidates map dated 2/9/09 and impacts on fringe areas between rural & urban reserve areas
680-685	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Memo re: Port of Portland's perspective on the reserves designation for Govt Island & attachments
686	3/26/2009	undated	Handout, Local Transit Toolbox, Zoning Code
687-690	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	e-mail from City of Portland re: preliminary comments & recommendations on service suitability for three urban candidate areas
691-695	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Concept area plan & maps
696	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Letter re: rural reserve classification
697-699	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Three maps re: Vacant Buildable Lot analysis, aquifer & sewage issues, transportation issues
700-703	3/26/2009	3/25/2009	Documents from citizens & Forest Park Neighborhood Assoc supporting rural reserve designation
704-705	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Letter in support of Forest Park Neighborhood recommendations re: rural reserves designation
706	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	Angel Properties current zoning map
707-709	3/26/2009	undated	Letter advocating Urban Growth Reserve designation
710-711	4/23/2009	4/23/2009	CAC meeting agenda re: information needs to form rural and urban recommendations
712-723	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	Meeting summary of CAC 3/26/09 meeting
724-725	4/23/2009	4/23/2009	Sign in sheets
726	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	Updates, Phase 3 Open House schedule 3/19/09; RSC Upcoming Agenda Items 4/8/9
727	4/23/2009	4/1/2009	map Regional Candidate Areas for Evaluation

728	4/23/2009	2/12/2009	HCT Corridors for Evaluation adopted by Metro
729-736	4/23/2009	4/6/2009	Letter to RSC & attachment from State of Oregon depts w/preliminary comments on counties' initial identification of candidate urban & rural reserve areas
737-745	4/23/2009	3/30/2009	Staff Report on Initial Assessment Methodology & Results incl candidate urban & rural maps
746-750	4/23/2009	4/16/2009	Memo & table to Chuck Beasley from Staff Planner re: 10-Year Land Division Study w/maps
751	4/23/2009	4/16/2009	E-mail from FPNA re: Court of Appeals finding re Urban-Rural Buffer along County line adjacent to N.Bethany. (CA#A122169) Case supports -0060(2)(d)(B) and (3)(d,e,f,g) provides buffers, boundaries, sense of place, separation.
752	4/23/2009	4/14/2009	Letter from Johnson Creek Watershed Council re: designate creek watershed RR, lack of consistency among Counties about proposed designations & map
753-757	4/23/2009	4/13/2009	Ltr rural reserves designation for South West Hills area, incl map 94 from West Hills Plan w/SECh,s. Notes service issues
758-759	4/23/2009	4/1/2009	Ltr to Core 4 from Home Builders Association (HBA) re: Service Availability analysis (CWS) is flawed, must be refined in NW Hills and other areas, suitability for service should not be based on policy choices of providers
760-761	4/23/2009	3/20/2009	E-mailed duplicate of ltr submitted at CAC 9 meeting advocating Urban Reserve.
762	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	re: Mult Co Urban/Rural study areas vs. Existing West Hills Rural Area Plan - area around Skyline/Cornelius Pass sb UR because the West Hills plan indicates it should be studied for rural community
763	4/23/2009	3/27/2009	Ltr w/maps to Chuck reiterating key points presented at CAC mtg #9 on 3/26/09 advocating Urban designation
764	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	map Vacant Buildable Lot Analysis
765	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	map Transportation issues - Germantown overburdened, expensive to improve, subject to hazards from bad weather slope, curves, bring area into UGB to fund much needed improvements
766	4/23/2009	3/26/2009	map Aquifer & Sewage Issues - cites well difficulties, additional development from vacant lots & advocates for urban reserve to facilitate water service to area
767	4/23/2009	4/1/2009	E-mail clarifying/correcting elements of Barker testimony
768-769	4/23/2009	3/29/2009	Area should be Urban Reserve due to existing development & proximity to Portland
770-823	4/23/2009	4/22/2009	Explains reference docs submitted for CAC, ODFW Conservation Opportunity Areas, Area 93 Existing Conditions Report, ODFW Elk Management Plan, NW Hills Scenic Overlays (County SEC maps)
824-825	4/23/2009	4/22/2009	Ltr from FPNA re: preliminary vote affirming rural reserve and not in favor of Irvine/Thayer plan w/ Forest Park Conservancy 8/12/08 letter to Bragdon, Wheeler, Potter attached & CPO 7 11/13/06 ltr attached
826-836	4/23/2009	4/22/2009	attached 1/5/07 FPNA ltr and attachments, Neighborhood survey results, Goal 5 inventory showing Forest Park area

837-842	4/23/2009	4/17/2009	E-mail from CAC member outlining concerns about process, details Jim Irvine development proposal
843-845	39926	4/13/2009	To CAC re: D. Burger statements re: Hillsboro proposed UR areas, includes map
846-852	post 4/23/2009	4/23/2009	Letter & attachments re: Land Use analysis of Exception Lands in Mult Co
853-856		2/19/2009	memo to Metro, Mult Co Aspirations
856a-f		4/23/2009	Relationship between LU Regulatory Program and Factors for Designating lands as rural reserves
857-860	post 4/23/2009	4/21/2009	Memo & maps re: NW Hills buildable lot analysis
861-871		3/1/2009	Preliminary UGR Summary March 09 draft
872-887		4/1/2009	Summary 20-50 Range Forecast
888-889	5/28/2009	5/28/2009	Agenda re: rural reserve factors evaluation
890-900	5/28/2009	4/23/2009	Meeting summary of CAC 4/23/09 meeting
901-902	5/28/2009	5/28/2009	Sign in sheets
903-908	5/28/2009	5/13/2009	Phase 3 Public Involvement Initial Summary & survey responses
909-910		3/31/2009	Factors & Reserves Candidate Areas - memo to RSC about application of factors incl OAR div 27
911		9/18/2008	map Groundwater Restricted Areas - State of Oregon
912-913		5/27/2009	memo re: CAC Information Request - Rural Irrigation in West of Sandy, West of Forest Park & Springville Rd areas
914-921		5/2/2009	Compilation of Map - Chart Pak Comments 5-2-09 mdr-update
922-929	5/28/2009	5/6/2009	Memo re: Identification of Natural Hazards w/in Reserves Study Area - incl maps Floodplain, Landslide, Wildfire, Seismic Hazards & Hazards Composite Map, Natural Hazards Model, Earthquake Hazards in Clackamas Co
930-931		5/21/2009	map County West Hills & West of Sandy Slope Hazards Overlay Zones
932		5/21/2009	map Beaver, Kelly, Johnson Creeks (incl Sandy River) contours
933-935		5/20/2009	map West Hills and West of Sandyu River School District Boundaries
936-945		5/20/2009	Natural Hazards Model
946		5/28/2009	map West of Sandy prime soils
947		5/20/2009	map West of Sandy River School District Boundaries
948		5/28/2009	memo from PMT to RSC, C4 re timeline revision.
949-951		5/14/2009	CAC Information Request list and status
952-953		5/25/2009	Memo re CAC Information Request - Rural Irrigation
954			map Water/Sewer suitability and Conceptual Transportation Grid
955-963	05/28/09	5/25/2009	Memo & map re: Rural Reserves Suitability Recommendations
964-973			Rural Communities Rule Division 22
974-975	5/28/2009	5/6/2009	Email opposing urban reserve North of Hwy 26
976			ODOT UR study area capacity analysis version 3
977-1004		3/1/2009	Preliminary UGR Summary & Summary 20-50 year range forecast. Metro docs
1005-1006	5/28/2009	4/28/2009	E-mail re: agriculture in Springville Road area & opposition to Urban Reserve designation
1007	5/28/2009	4/28/2009	E-mail from Mercy Corps NW supporting rural reserve designation
1008-1011	5/28/2009	2/19/2009	Letter to Chris Deffebach re: Mult Co aspirations for growth w/Resolution A & BOCC Planning Values

1012-1013	5/28/2009	5/7/2009	Gov't Island Reserves designation recap
1014-1021	5/28/2009	5/22/2009	Article about Wildlife Crossing - rethinking road design to improve safety & accompanying map
1022		1/1/2009	map Metro Acquisition Areas - submitted in 7/14/09 email to staff
1023-1036	5/28/2009	5/27/2009	West Forest Park Concept Planning Area w/ maps
1037-1049		6/14/2009	Comments Q6 (Is there area you believe should be excluded from further study as an urban reserve?) summary
1050-1052			MultCo summary 0509 Public Involvement April 2009
1053-1054	6/18/2009	6/18/2009	Agenda re: continuing rural reserve factors evaluation of rural candidate areas, rural reserves suitability recommendations & East Bethany Urbanization concept
1055-1065	6/18/2009	5/28/2009	CAC 11 Meeting summary
1066-1068		6/18/2009	Meeting sign in sheet
1069	6/18/2009	6/9/2009	Reserves CAC Meeting Forecast - May/Sept 2009
1070	6/18/2009	06/00/09	Steering Committee Revised Meeting Schedule
1071-1101	6/18/2009	6/10/2009	Staff Rural Reserves Factors Analysis & Rural Reserves Suitability recommendations Areas 1-9
1102-1107	6/18/2009	6/17/2009	Study area maps 1-9
1108-1109		6/15/2009	e-mail to CAC re: meeting packet and on line resources for upcoming meetings
1110-1113			Metro Hazard Maps - Flood, landslide, wildfire, composite
1114-1124			Metro Regional Trails and Greenways and map
1125			map Metro West Side Trails
1126			map Metro Bond Acquisition Areas
1127		10/1/2008	Landscape Features Subset 08 Map
1128-1130			ODF Forest A, B, C, X, Y, Z
1131			map ODA Ag Study
1132-1133	6/18/2009	5/7/2009	Scappoose staff e-mail re: potential for City of Scappoose to expand into Multnomah County.
1134		none	map Development Constraints in Scappoose Vicinity
1135-1136	6/18/2009	undated	Audubon Society (Urban Greenspaces Institute) letter re: suitability of natural features for urban & rural reserves 6/12/09
1137-1139	6/18/2009	5/25/2009	Ltr to CAC re: Input for next meeting - mostly related to decisions West Hills Area
1140-1141	6/18/2009	6/8/2008	Favor of Rural Reserve in candidate area northeast of CPO 7 in Multnomah County to protect Rock, Abbey creeks, local food. Poor Transit & connections east
1142-1143	6/18/2009	6/8/2009	Concern about Area 93 becoming part of Rural Reserve
1144-1148	6/18/2009	10/9/2002	Joint resolution w/Multnomah County re: UGB expansion & creation of rural/urban edge (#2577 & 02-135)
1149-1156	6/18/2009	5/22/2009	Duplicate from CAC 11 - Article about Wildlife Crossing - rethinking road design to improve safety & reconnect habitat
1157		6/18/2009	Farmed 94 acres for 50 yrs, successful farm, favors rural reserve along Springville Rd
1158-1159k	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	Agenda re: Complete review of rural reserve factors evaluation of rural candidate areas and Meeting #12 Summary
1160-1190		6/17/2009	Staff Rural Factors Analysis - memo, rural factors staff analysis & maps for all areas 1-9
1191-1203			Study area maps 1-9
1204-1206			Forest Maps A, B, C & X, Y, Z

1207			ODA Ag Lands map
1208			Landscape Features Subset 08 Map
1209-1212			Metro Hazard Maps - Flood, landslide, wildfire, composite
1213			Metro Bond Acquisition Areas Map
1214-1225			Metro Regional Trails & Westside Trails Map
1226-1229			Scanned sign in sheets
1230-1231	6/25/2009	4/13/2009	Draft of UR Development Constraint from SI bridge to PDX, 45 acre strip bet Hwy 30 & Mult Channel
1232-1233	6/25/2009	5/11/2009	email re: New Transportation Corridors Consideration meeting recap & edits
1234-1235	6/25/2009	5/11/2009	email re: Urban Reserves Analysis along Mult. Channel - Hwy 30 and Rail Crossing Issues
1236-1239	6/25/2009	5/12/2009	email re: chain of ODOT emails re: potential Urban Reserve area along Multnomah Channel - Expressway designation
1240-1241	6/25/2009	5/14/2009	email to ODOT rail division re: Multnomah Channel Rail Crossing request for summary
1242-1279	6/25/2009	6/10/2009	Staff Rural Factors Analysis
1280-1281	6/25/2009	6/10/2009	Mult Channel Rail Crossing - re 45 acre strip bet SI Bridge & PDX, next 40-50 yr rail use
1282-1295	6/25/2009	6/17/2009	14 letters to RSC & Council urging CAC to keep areas north of Hwy 26 rural reserves
1296-1297	6/25/2009	8/12/2008	Forest Park Conservancy wants RR east of Cornelius Pass Rd and north of US 26
1298-1300		6/22/2009	Question re staff interpretation of factor 3d, response from R. Benner, e-mail
1301-1304	6/25/2009	6/22/2009	Area 5 NW Hills North comments
1305-1311	6/25/2009	6/22/2009	Area 6 NW Hills South forest/landscape factors comments
1312-1319	6/25/2009	6/22/2009	Area 7 Power line/Germantown Rd South farm/forest/landscape factors comments
1320-1321	6/25/2009	6/24/2009	Comments re: staff ratings on remaining areas from CAC 12 meeting
1322	6/25/2009	6/20/2009	Comments re: land value and his 6/22/09 email comments on Factors 2A & 3A
1323	6/25/2009	6/23/2009	Summary of testimony from 6-18 CAC meeting re: minimizing Urban Reserve designations
1324		6/13/2009	RSC group email request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserve
1325		6/14/2009	RSC group email request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserve
1326		6/14/2009	RSC group email request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserve
1327-1328	6/25/2009	6/11/2009	email to Metro opposing rural recommendation for CPO 7 area
1329-1332		6/18/2009	Live on Springville Rd, Lane & Cherrio Ln, favor RR, support FPNA (8/12/08 letter), habitat, small farms, over capacity rural roads expensive to upgrade are not viable links to PDX, recreation eg. Bikes, hikes, birds. 26 signatures
1333		6/18/2009	Letter family farm on 94 acres is profitable, ag land along Springville Rd. sb RR
1334-1337		6/18/2009	WMSWCD recognition of G. Malinowski for NRCS conservation plan, participation.
1338-1340	6/25/2009	6/23/2009	Comments on rural reserve factors for sub areas 6 & 7

1341	6/25/2009	6/24/2009	email re: division of most recent urban study for Areas 6 & 7
1342-1343	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	Letter & property map. Family owned 65 acres, EFU but not good for farm, slope, creek, soil, no water right, busy Germantown Rd. Near N. Bethany.
1344-1345	6/25/2009	6/23/2009	Comments on factors for designation of lands as urban reserves
1346-1349	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	Remarks on important elements of the ag study for area 7, small farms, capability, suitability
1350	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	She is trained biologist/ecologist, small timer land producer close to Forest Park. Cites biodiversity & ability for private resource managers to maintain this near Forest Park - keep Area 7 RR to allow this.
1351-1353	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	Parcel size analysis - 50% are 40+ acres in farm/forest mgmt, smaller parcels committed to RR, not suitable for urban per CA decision re services
1354-1355	6/25/2009	6/25/2009	Family owns 115 acres at county line adj to power lines, support E. Bethany plan. Has prof. timber/farm background - landowners need return on investment. Supports VanderZanden approach.
1356-1368	6/25/2009	6/25/2010	Article "Effect of Urban Proximity on Ag Land Values" P. Guiling et.al.
1369-1372		6/25/2010	CAC emails from K. Lacher, J. Thayer, C. Chesarek re: small farms, reserves factors.
1373-1374	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Agenda re: completing urban reserve factors evaluation for candidate areas in the West Hills, West of Sandy River & Multnomah Channel
1375-1383	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Meeting summary of CAC 13 6/25/09 meeting
1384-1386		7/16/2009	Meeting 14 sign in sheets
1387		7/13/2009	Area 9 Multnomah Channel Urban Factors eval-ODOT consult memo w/attachments - Internet post
1388-1389	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Urban Reserves Factors Analysis 7.16.09
1390-1392	7/16/2009	6/1/2009	Mult Channel Rail Crossing - re 45 acre strip bet SI Bridge & PDX, next 40-50 yr rail use
1393-1394	7/16/2009	5/11/2009	email re: chain of ODOT emails re: potential Urban Reserve area along Multnomah Channel - Hwy 30 and Rail Crossing Issue
1395-1396	7/16/2009	5/11/2009	email re: New Transportation Corridors Consideration meeting recap & edits
1397-1430	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Urban Factors Analysis memo rev. 07.16.09
1431-1433			maps for Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 - Internet post
1434	7/16/2009	7/9/2009	map Buildable Lands Map A_East Side Analysis - Metro
1435		7/9/2009	map Buildable Lands Map H_West Side Analysis - Metro
1436		7/14/2009	map Reserves_base2040_workshop1_A East - design types for east side Metro
1437		7/14/2009	map Reserves_base2040_workshop1_H west
1438		7/14/2009	map Westside Elevation Map - Metro
1439-1447		6/18/2009	Clackamas_Multnomah Urban Factors Eval draft 6.18.09 - tech team evaluation table w/rankings against urban factors
1448			Reserves Design Workshop - General Design Concepts used in the regional UR assessment
1449-1451	7/16/2009	6/25/2009	CAC 13 Meeting DOT results
1452-1453		4/13/2009	Development constraints south of Sauvie Island Bridge memo

1454-1458	7/16/2009	7/13/2009	Area 9 Multnomah Channel Urban Factors eval-ODOT consult
1459		6/1/2009	Multnomah Channel Rail Crossing C Kettenring email
1460-1461		5/11/2009	New transportation corridors considerations meeting recap L.Rahman email
1462-1471		5/12/2009	UR Analysis Mult Channel Rail Crossing issues email Lrahman
1472-1473		4/15/2009	UR Analysis Multnomah Channel Hwy 30 & Rail Crossing Issues email Rmelbo
1474	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Draft Urban Reserves Map of Areas 2, 3 & 4
1475	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Draft Urban Reserves Map of Area 6
1476	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Draft Urban Reserves Map of Area 7
1477-1478	7/16/2009	7/7/2009	Rural Reserve 2a/3a factors letter
1479	7/16/2009	9/13/2009	In support of Forest Park Neighborhood Assoc (FNPA) & Forest Park Conservancy rural reserve recommendation
1480-1482	7/16/2009	7/7/2009	e-mail from Jim Thayer to Chuck Beasley re: Carol Chesarek's correspondence to neighbors in NW Multnomah County advocating Rural Reserves
1483-1484	7/16/2009	7/14/2009	e-mail to Chuck Beasley requesting Carol Chesarek recuse herself from Area 7 discussions or decisions.
1485	7/16/2009	7/9/2009	e-mail to Chuck Beasley re: CAC communications protocol
1486-1488	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	Ltr to Chuck Beasley re: Committee Actions vs. future planning processes & Water Quality
1489-1490	7/16/2009	7/9/2009	e-mail requesting information about decision making process re: reserves designations & in support of rural reserves for her area
1491	7/16/2009	7/16/2009	quote from Nature Conservancy, Summer 2003
1492-1493	7/16/2009	6/23/2009	RSC group e-mail - recap of public comments at June 18 mtg re: development patterns, climate changes, energy costs, etc.
1494-1532	7/16/2009	6/15/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1533-1534	7/16/2009	7/13/2009	e-mail urging CAC to not leave any areas undesignated
1535-1547	7/16/2009	7/2/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1548-1549	7/16/2009	7/5/2009	RSC group e-mail describing a little farm called La Finquita del Buho that may be affected by Urban Reserves designation - also requests all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves.
1550-1551	7/16/2009	7/5/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 and Forest Park area as rural reserves
1552-1553	7/16/2009	7/5/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 and Forest Park area as rural reserves
1554-1578	7/16/2009	7/6/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1579-1580	7/23/2009	7/23/2009	CAC Meeting Agenda - at David Evans & Assoc
1581-1593	7/23/2009	7/16/2009	Draft summary of 7/16/09 CAC meeting (#14)
1594-1595	7/23/2009	7/16/2009	June 25 CAC meeting outcomes & key information
1596-1600		7/23/2009	CAC Responses to Area 7.1 - list of CAC responses to questions emailed after 7/23/09 meeting
1601-1604		7/23/2009	Urban and Rural Suitability Recommendations & Alternatives - table draft
1605-1610	7/23/2009	7/7/2009	ODFW Prioritization of Metro Natural Landscape Features and email ODFW Habitat Rankings
1611	7/23/2009	7/21/2009	e-mail re Abbey Creek "swale"

1612-1618	7/23/2009	7/20/2009	Letter & maps requesting Urban Reserve candidate designation
1619-1620	7/23/2009	7/16/2009	"Fun facts about Urban Infrastructure"
1621-1622	7/23/2009	6/11/2009	e-mail request to Chuck asking for Metro to provide guidance & response from John Williams, Metro
1623	7/23/2009	7/23/2009	e-mail requesting succinct written summary about implications of each designation as they relate to Sauvie Island & surrounding areas
1624	7/23/2009	5/5/2009	Letter w/comments about urban rural reserves & suitable farming areas
1625	7/23/2009	7/23/2009	e-mail to Chuck re: natural features protections
1626-1628	7/23/2009	7/23/2009	Testimony advocating Rural Reserves status for Area 7
1629	7/23/2009	7/22/2009	Letter favoring Urban Reserve designation for subject areas
1630-1631	7/23/2009	7/22/2009	e-mail to Jim Johnson, of ODA requesting clarification on Springville Rd area conflict
1632-1639	7/23/2009	7/22/2009	e-mail to Chuck re: Input for CAC Meeting July 23, 2009
1640-1641	7/23/2009	7/22/2009	e-mail to Chuck requesting Rural Reserve designation for areas north of Hwy 26
1642-1643	7/23/2009	8/6/2008	Forest Park Conservancy re: Costal Corridor
1644-1646	7/23/2009	7/22/2009	e-mails to Chuck & Kathy requesting maps & notes be sent to CAC members prior to July 23 meeting
1647-1658		7/22/2009	3 maps incl zoning & N. Bethany natural features overview
1649-1651	7/23/2009	7/16/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1652	7/23/2009	7/13/2009	e-mail to Multnomah County Chair requesting Rural Reserve protection for this area
1653-1656	7/23/2009	7/8/2009	e-mail supporting Rural Reserve designation NW of Portland surrounding Forest Park & area past Cornelius Pass Road to WA County line
1657		7/14/2009	Letter re: Carol Chesarek advocacy of Rural Reserve indicates she is not impartial nor following CAC rules
1658-1659		7/16/2010	e-mail supporting Rural Reserve designation north of US 26, Forest Park & Helvetia
1660-1661		7/13/2009	This area needs certainty of being designated either urban or rural - do not leave undesignated
1662		7/8/2009	Rural Reserve around Forest Park & Cornelius Pass Rd. Wildlife corridor, raptors, headwater streams close to Portland
1663-1665		7/21/2009	Discussion of urban factors in West of Sandy area
1666-1667	7/30/2009	7/30/2009	Agenda & meeting packet w/maps re: review & complete urban & rural reserve suitability recommendations
1668-1681			Meeting 15 summary - includes Meeting Outcomes and Key Information from June 25 CAC meeting
1682-1684		7/28/2009	email re: Baker Property
1685-1686		7/28/2009	email: Urban and Rural Reserves duration/timeline
1687-1688		7/24/2009	email: Rural Reserves for going a little further than the 3 mile line in Area 5
1689-1691		7/23/2009	Beaverton Schools near East Bethany capacity vs. enrollment data & FAQ's
1692-1694		7/23/2009	Metro Habitat Conservation Area Map for Title 13; Fish and Wildlife Habitat Inventory Map; Natural Area Bond 2006
1695		7/23/2009	Sauvie Island and Rural Reserves

1696		7/23/2009	Requested Urban Reserve Map
1697-1698		7/23/2009	Forest Park Conservancy re: Candidate Areas
1699-1705		7/23/2009	Metropolitan Land Group comments on Candidate Designation
1706-1708		7/16/2009	Property on Germantown and Kaiser Rd
1709-1710		7/30/2009	CAC Sign in sheets
1711-1724			Meeting 15 summary - includes Meeting Outcomes and Key Information from June 25 CAC meeting
1725-1727			CAC Meeting 15 voting - overall recommendations and voting results from 7/23/09 CAC meeting
1728-1733		7/30/2009	Meeting 16 summary
1734-1737		7/23/2009	Urban & Rural Suitability Recommendations and Alternatives - table draft
1738-1751	7/30/2009	7/23/2009	Draft Summary of CAC meeting #15 (7/23/09) w/Rural & Urban Suitability recommendations & alternatives
1752-1765		7/30/2009	Draft Report Summary CAC - document incl summary section of the full report - carried to mtg, emailed to CAC 7/30/09 10:35pm
1766			Sauvie Island aerial photograph
1767		7/29/2009	map Natural Landscape Features - NFLI 4 - new map
1768			Area 4 & 5 potential rural reserve lines - marked up map
1769			map Buildable Lands map - H
1770-1773	7/30/2009	7/28/2009	Property does not fit the low (urban) factor ranking for area 6.1. Includes Bethany Development Plan Map
1774-1775	7/30/2009	7/28/2009	e-mail to CAC re: how quickly the urban reserve land supply could be brought into the UGB
1776-1777	7/30/2009	7/24/2009	e-mail to CAC re: extending Rural reserves beyond than 3 mile line in Area 5
1778-1780		7/23/2009	Metro habitat maps in Areas 6, 7
1781-1783	7/30/2009	7/23/2009	Beaverton Schools near East Bethany capacity vs. enrollment data & FAQ's
1784-1786	7/30/2009	7/23/2009	Metro Habitat Conservation Area Map for Title 13; Fish and Wildlife Habitat Inventory Map; Natural Area Bond 2006
1787	7/30/2009	7/23/2009	letter from Sauvie Island Conservancy requesting Sauvie Island be given Rural Reserves designation
1788		7/23/2009	map showing Troutdale Urban Reserve request area
1789-1790		7/23/2009	Forest Park Conservancy letter advocating long term landscape features protection for areas near Forest Park
1791-1797		7/20/2009	Request for urban reserve, includes urban factors responses. 0
1798-1799	7/30/2009	7/16/2009	Letter w/maps in support of Urban Reserve designation
1800		7/15/2009	map of lots - Portland Maps
1801	7/30/2009	7/30/2009	e-mail to Jeanne Lawson objecting to public comment being sacrificed at CAC meeting
1802		7/29/2009	e-mail requesting information for the CAC re: what areas in Area 4 are most suitable for urban, and where to draw the line in Area 5
1803-1804	7/30/2009	7/29/2009	e-mail re: Rural Reserves boundaries
1805	7/30/2009	7/29/2009	e-mail urging Chair Wheeler, Commissioners Cogen & Kafoury to consider this rural area as a treasure

1806-1819	7/30/2009	7/27/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1820-1917j	8/10/2009	8/3/2009	Staff Report w/ Urban & Rural Reserves recommendations from CAC & County Staff, meeting minutes.
1918-1923	8/10/2009	8/5/2009	PC Reserves Hearing Memo & County Counsel CAC memo dated 7/23/09
1924-1970	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	PC Reserves public comment summary Jan 09 - Aug 09
1971-1988	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	CAC Suitability Assessment Reference Maps
1989-1996	8/10/2009	8/6/2009	Letter & maps from Metropolitan Land Group in favor of Urban reserves designation for East Bethany/West Forest Park area
1997-1998	8/10/2009	8/8/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
1999-2000	8/10/2009	8/8/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
2001-2002	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	CAC member ltr to PC re: perceived flaws in CAC process
2003	8/10/2009	8/9/2009	e-mail requesting Sauvie Island be designated Rural Reserve
2004	8/10/2009	8/9/2009	e-mail requesting Sauvie Island be designated Rural Reserve
2005-2041	8/10/2009	8/9/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
2042	8/10/2009	8/6/2009	e-mail asking Areas 5, 6 & 7 be designated rural reserves
2043-2044	8/10/2009	8/2/2009	Area 7 Designation support
2045	8/10/2009	8/2/2009	Area 5,6 & 7 Designation support
2046	8/10/2009	7/31/2009	Request SE Carpenter Lane in Gresham stay rural
2047	8/10/2009	7/28/2009	e-mail requesting Abbey Creek area remain rural
2048	8/10/2009	7/27/2009	Designate West Hills as Rural Reserve
2049-2053	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Letter in favor of Urban Reserves designation for Area 7
2054	8/10/2009	6/18/2009	Ltr to CAC recommending Rural Reserve designation
2055-2064	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	CAC Member ltr to PC recommending Rural Reserves designation to Areas 5, 6 & 7
2065-2077	8/10/2009	8/12/2009	Ltr w/ attachments from Forest Park Conservancy recommending Rural Reserve designation; Metro CPO 7 support
2078	8/10/2009	undated	Ltr To PC requesting Urban Reserve designation
2079	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Ltr to PC requesting Rural Reserve designation
2080-2081	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Ltr to PC requesting Rural Reserve designation
2082-2083	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Ltrs to PC from Troutdale community Development Director & Mayor requesting Urban Reserve designation
2084-2086	8/10/2009	2/17/2009	Ltrs to PC from Troutdale community Development Director & Mayor requesting Urban Reserve designation
2087-2102	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Pkt to Staff w/input on Urban & Rural reserves designations
2103	8/10/2009	undated	Ltr urging Commissioners to follow CAC recommendations
2104-2105	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Ltr requesting Rural Reserves designation
2106-2111	8/10/2009	undated	Handwritten & typed ltrs w/maps to PC requesting Urban Reserve designation
2112	8/10/2009	8/6/2009	Ltr to PC requesting Rural Reserve designation
2113-2115	8/10/2009	7/21/2009	Memo to CAC re: Urban Reserves Factors Evaluation
2116-2139	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Ltr w/attachments recommending Urban Reserves designation
2140-2144	8/10/2009	undated	Letter & maps advocating Urban Reserve designation
2145-2150	8/10/2009	undated	Letter w/signatures advocating Rural Reserve designation
2151	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Letter urging Commission to keep Area 7 fully intact
2152-2153	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Letter advocating Urban Reserve designation

2154-2163	8/10/2009	7/24/2009	Comparison chart, Concept Planning area w/maps
2164-2167	8/10/2009	2/26/2009	East Bethany Transportation Assessment
2168	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Letter urging Rural Reserve designation
2169-2344	8/10/2009	7/12/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
2345-2347	8/10/2009	8/20/2009	NAIOP Support
2348-2349	8/10/2009	8/27/2009	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community Testimony
2350-2351	8/10/2009	8/29/2009	testimony
2352-2355	8/10/2009	8/31/2009	City of Cornelious Development and Operations Director testimony
2356-2357	8/10/2009	9/1/2009	OSU Extension Service Washington County
2358-2569	8/10/2009	8/27/2009	RSC group e-mail - request all study areas north of Hwy 26 as rural reserves
2570-2588	4/16/2009	4/16/2009	Urban & Rural Reserves Mult Co Board Briefing PowerPoint presentation
2589-2688	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Final Report with maps - Recommendations from CAC and Staff
2689-2690	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Resolution No 09-112
2691	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Urges urban reserve designation for Springville Rd Area
2692-2699	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	In favor of portions of Area 7 being adopted as Urban Reserve
2700	9/10/2009	undated	Request for Urban Reserve designation
2701-2705	9/10/2009	undated	West Forest Park Concept Planning Area
2706-2716	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Recommends approval of CAC recommendations
2717	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Recommends approval of CAC recommendations
2718-2719	9/10/2009	undated	Request rural reserves designation
2720-2721	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Request for Urban Reserve designation
2722-2723	9/10/2009	9/9/2009	Urban Reserves-Provision of Public Infrastructure Svcs
2724	9/10/2009	undated	Urging Council to follow CAC recommendations
2725	9/10/2009	9/10/2008	Request rural reserves designation
2726	9/10/2009	8/10/2009	Request rural reserves designation
2727-2728	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Request rural reserves designation
2729-2730	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Request rural reserves designation
2731-2736	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Request rural reserves designation
2737-2738	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Letter supporting CAC recommendation to make all of rural west Mult Co Rural Reserve
2739-2744	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Ltr disagreeing with CAC designation of area
2745-2762	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Comments about Urban and Rural Reserves incl CAC's final reserves recommendations, suitability ratings, key points @ urban & rural reserves, key differences bet staff & CAC recommendations & background information
2763-2764	9/10/2009	9/8/2009	Letter reiterating position that entire Johnson Creek Watershed outside the UGB be designated rural reserve, w/map of proposed candidate rural reserve area
2765-2767	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Request 5-acre parcel be brought into urban reserves
2768-2769	9/10/2009	9/4/2009	Letter informing Mult Co that City of Beaverton willing to provide governance & urban services to East Bethany area if it is recommended as an urban reserve where City of Beaverton's corporate limits are contiguous to East Bethany area

2770-2774	9/10/2009	9/9/2009	Letter to BOCC dated 9/9/09 w/attachment to Steering Committee/Core 4 dated 9/4/09 urging support to add 775 acres to urban reserves adjoining city limits of Troutdale directly SE of city.
2775-2776	9/10/2009	8/17/2009	property
2777-2778	9/10/2009	8/18/2009	Letter to BOCC that City of Troutdale urging support to add 775 acres to urban reserves adjoining city limits of Troutdale directly SE of city.
2779	9/10/2009	8/13/2009	Support inclusion of 775 acres of land south and east of City of Troutdale into urban reserves
2780-2781	9/10/2009	9/9/2009	Letter supporting recommendations of CAC to establish rural reserves in these areas.
2782-2798	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Letter & maps supporting suitability for urban reserve of Lower Springville Rd area. Incl stats, objectives, West Forest Park & North Bethany concept plans, water, sewer, transportation corridors maps etc
2799-2813	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Troutdale Urban Reserves presentation seeking support urban reserves designation for land directly SE of city
2814-2816	9/10/2009	9/2/2009	Letter to BOCC agreeing w/CAC recommendation for rural reserves for area, w/background information
2817-2818	9/10/2009	9/2/2009	Letter agreeing with CAC recommendation that areas 6 & 7 be rural reserves; however, feels that should include all of the area, including Springville Rd
2819-2820	9/10/2009	9/4/2009	Would like to see this area designated Urban Reserve to preserve opportunity for job growth over 40-50 years, and leave Govt Island undesignated to preclude possibility of new transportation corridor
2821-2854	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	APR Reserves Resolution Exec Summary Hearing 9.10.09
2855-2856	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	Reserves BCC Resolution re Suitability 9.10.09
2857-2862	9/10/2009	8/3/2009	Reserves Area 1; 2 3 4; 5; 6; 7; 8 9 maps dated 080309
2863-2865	9/10/2009	8/3/2009	CAC Recommendations Reserves Area Map 080309; Reserves Suitability Areas 1,2,3,4 090209 combined & Reserves Suitability Areas 5,6,7,8,9 090209 combined; Staff Recommendations Reserves Area Map 030309
2866-2883	9/10/2009	9/10/2009	CAC Suitability Assessment Reference Maps
2884-2893	10/14/2009	10/16/2009	Urban Greenspaces Institute Recommendations and Maps
2894-2898	12/10/2009	11/25/2009	APR Form signed, RES 09-153
2899-2903	12/10/2009	Undated	Attachment A Reserve Designations Rationale and Maps pdf
2904-2931	12/10/2009	12/10/2009	Attachment B BOCC Reserves Hearing 12.10.09
2932-3031	12/10/2009	12/10/2009	Attachment C BOCC Reserves Hearing 12.10.09
3032-3193	12/10/2009	12/10/2009	Binder Testimony Sign Up Back Up - 162 pgs
3914-3198	12/10/2009	12/3/2009	Core 4 Reserves Status and map 12.03.09
3199-3200	12/10/2009	11/24/2009	In support of Urban Reserves
3201-3204	12/10/2009	10/16/2009	Ltr to Core 4 advocating City's position on reserves (previously submitted)
3205-3212	12/10/2009	11/9/2009	Ltr to Core 4 advocating Urban reserves
3213-3215	12/10/2009	11/16/2009	Ltr to Metro Council advocating Urban reserves
3216-3217	12/10/2009	11/16/2009	Letter in support of CAC recommendations that all rural land in West Hills be designated rural reserves
3218	12/10/2009	9/16/2009	Attachment B BOCC page 9 West Suitability

3219-3222	12/10/2009	12/3/2009	Core 4 Reserves Discussion Status - Proposed Areas of Preliminary Agreement-URBAN
3223	12/10/2009	Undated	Balch Creek Dist 3 Info
3224-3225	12/10/2009	10/26/2009	Letter to Chair Wheeler re: City of Beaverton's position on potential Urban Reserves
3226-3227	12/10/2009	10/21/2009	Letter to Core 4 from City of Gresham
3228-3229	12/10/2009	9/9/2009	Ltr to Ted Wheeler & Reserves Steering Committee submitting comments
3230-3231	12/10/2009	10.13.09	email to Metro Reserves Steering Committee advocating Rural Reserve designation
3232-3235	12/10/2009	10.23.09	Hand delivered ltr from Caroline MacLaren, attorney at law representing "The Haugens"
3236-3238	12/10/2009	9/8/2009	Ltr to Core 4 re: urban & rural reserve draft recommendation for East Mult County requesting urban reserve for 5 acre parcel.
3239-3240	12/10/2009	9/10/2009	email requesting that views of volcanoes be protected
3241-3242	12/10/2009	11/2/2009	email requesting Urban Reserve designation
3243	12/10/2009	9/9/2009	In support of Urban Reserves
3244-3249	12/10/2009	10/23/2009	Hand delivered ltr from Caroline MacLaren, attorney at law, representing "Meisel Rock Products" aka Town Quarry advocating adjustment of UR-L boundary
3250-3288	11/6/2009	11/4/2009	Letter to Metro Council and Mult. Co. BOCC and exhibits, City of Beaverton ltr, NW PDX neighborhood assn ltrs, etc. 39 pgs
3289-3291	1/11/2010	undated	Area 1 Open House pamphlet (region's Eastern edge from Troutdale to Sandy)
3293-3296	1/11/2010	undated	Area 9 Open House pamphlet (West Multnomah County)
3297	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Wants to discuss the loss in property values of small parcel property owners between the cities and the farms.
3298	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Purpose of reserves, Inconsistent Multnomah Co. Reserves recommendations. Multnomah Co. Reserves CAC recommendations reflected in Ag/Nat Resources group Reserves
3299-3310	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Lists 3 properties in Boring, 30401 SE Hwy 212, 30357 SE Hwy 212, and 30365 SE Hwy 212, and land left of Boring back do not fit the legal description of Rural Reserves. Feels that these properties fit within the Urban Reserve. (Includes Attachments)
3311-3313	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	His property at 26950 NW Meek Rd. in Hillsboro has been designated as UR-C on some of the recent planning maps of our region. He owns 15 acres on the south side of Meek Rd. and is in favor in designating this area as an Urban Reserve.
3314-3315	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Supports overall recommendations made by CAC for Urban & Rural Reserves. Wants to preserve rural areas in Troutdale and have more restraint for urban reserves in Gresham and bet. Sandy
3316	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Bring Property into UGB that can be developed with existing infrastructure. No repeat of Damascus type annexation No ability to develop in a timely manner or economic manner.
3317-3318	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Supports the Agriculture & Natural Resource Coalition Map. Encourages us to invest in the Metro Region's existing urban areas through infill & redevelopment, instead of building irreversible new development on some of Oregon's richest soil.

3319	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	URR Metro Council Hearing #1: Testimony #16; Important to allow expansion in areas next to current UGB edges so as not to promote sprawl.
3320	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	URR Metro Council Hearing #1: Testimony #17; In support of allowing property north of Canby to remain undesignated.
3321	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	URR Metro Council Hearing #1: Testimony #18 and 19; Please save prime farmland.
3322	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	URR Metro Council Hearing #1: Testimony #20 and 21; Wants to live on a farm when they are done traveling and then wants to pass it on to their children.
3323	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Adopt small or zero urban reserves. There hasn't apparently been sufficient demonstrable evidence of need for urban reserves in East County. High value farmland and natural resources are not worth the sacrifice.
3324	1/11/2010	1/11/2010	Concerned about county's decision to create urban reserves-not showing dedication to livable cities in Gresham & Troutdale. Commitment to climate change legislation when putting efforts into sprawl cost to develop on edges vs. within urban areas.
3325-3326	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Supports map prepared by Natural Resource coalition. Adequate rural reserves are crucial to future of farming in Metro region.
3327-3329	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Coalition for a Prosperous Region, urges Core 4 and Metro Council to designate the 34,340 gross acres initially proposed for urban reserves by WA County, including 20,000-25,000 gross acres in urban reserves & remainder in undesignated.
3330	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Portland is unique NW city in terms of urban/rural planning.
3331-3333	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Feels Tualatin Riverkeepers came up with better plan than Core 4 or Counties that has urban reserve acreage consistent w/population, employment.
3334-3337	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Area 9
3338-3340	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Letter discussing important differences in Core 4, Bragdon/Hosticka and other maps in Mult. Co.
3341-3342	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	In support of rural reserves for East Bethany
3343	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Comments urging Council to accept Agriculture & Natural Resources Coalition proposed reserve areas.
3344	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Supports retaining rural nature of these areas.
3345-3347	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Presented ltr from Chris Schreiner of Oregon Tilth, Inc in support of the Agriculture & Natural Resources Coalition Map
3348-3350	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges urban reserve designation for Area 1.
3351	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges urban reserve designation for Area 1.
3352-3357	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Supports urban reserves designation for Greater Bethany
3358-3365	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Malinowski Farms requests rural reserve designation
3366	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Malinowski Farms requests rural reserve designation
3367	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Concern for this area, would like development
3368-3370	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Favors rural reserves in NW sector north of Hwy 26
3371-3377	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges rejection of leaving areas adjacent to UGB undesignated
3378-3413	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Submitted packet in support of all of Area 9 be rural reserves
3414	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Please keep as rural reserve
3415-3418	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Community Supported Agriculture farmer who urges preservation of foundation agricultural land
3419	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Supports Ag & Natural Resource Coalition map; has concerns about Troutdale .

3420-3421	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges Rural Reserve designation for all of Area 9
3422	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges Rural Reserve designation for all of Area 9
3423-3424	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges Rural Reserve designation for Area 9B
3425	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Wants clarification of Urban & Rural Reserves in Portland Metro area administrative rule 660-027.
3426	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges Rural Reserve designation for Area 9
3427	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	In support of the Agriculture & Natural Resources Coalition
3428-3429	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges farm reserves in Area 9
3430	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Minimize urban and maximize rural reserves
3431	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges placing area north of Hwy 26 in rural reserves
3432-3433	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Feels 50 years is too long a time to restrain land use change.
3434-3435	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges urban reserves designation for UR-1 to balance regional process.
3436-3437	1/14/2010	1/14/2010	Urges rural reserves designation
3438-3440	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Reserves: Area 9 B (Multnomah County) Inclusion in Urban Reserve letter
3441-3443	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter urging a credible supply of Urban Reserves for 40-50 year timeline.
3444-3446	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter re: urban density & gross domestic productivity
3447-3457	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter asking for Urban designation
3458	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Urges expansion of Urban Reserves
3459-3460	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter in support of not leaving any areas undesignated, and endorses Metro COO, Mult. Co. CAC recommendations
3461-3466	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	In support of revised Core 4 map; represents appropriate balance of values.
3467-3473	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter urging common sense, balance & compromise in Urban & Rural Reserves choices
3474-3476	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Urges rural designation
3477-3478	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Urges Rural Reserves designation
3479-3482	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Encourages Core 4 to ask Metro GIS specialists to continue analysis for urban reserves selection process, or develop methodology that explicitly and clearly outlines how high value environmental resources will be protected.
3483-3496	1/20/2010	1/20/2010	Letter & maps urging Area 9D be considered Urban Reserve or undesignated.
3497-3498	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Supports Agriculture & Natural Resources Coalition map
3499-3501	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Letter encouraging support of Agriculture & Natural Resources Coalition's proposed reserves area map
3502-3514	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Letter supporting rural designation for Multnomah Channel moorages and marinas
3515-3538	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Nine Agencies
3539-3540	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Advocating jobs, and opportunities for future growth
3541	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	advocates Area 9b, Area 53 & adjacent rural area for Urban
3542-3543	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	Letter stressing that no farmland or natural resources should be in Urban Reserves.
3544	1/21/2010	1/19/2010	Research & Source documentation in support of recommendations of the Coalition for a Prosperous Region (CPR)
3545-3663	1/21/2010	1/21/2010	CPR's Summary of Technical & Legal Concerns related to Metro's Reserve Process
3664		2/10/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves

3665-3666		2/2/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3667		2/3/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3668		2/10/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3669		2/11/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3670-3673		2/2/2010	Supports Ag & Natural Resources Coalition reserves map
3674		2/10/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3675		2/9/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3676-3677		2/2/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3678		2/4/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3679		2/3/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3680		2/9/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3681		2/17/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3682		2/6/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3683		2/10/2010	Advocates Rural Reserves
3684-3685			Urban & Rural Reserves Meeting Sign In List Gresham open house only
3686-3692			Urban & Rural Reserves Meeting Sign In List Oregon City, Gresham, Wilsonville
3693-3722			Area 1 Survey Summary_01262010
3723-3808			Area 9 Survey Summary_01262010
3809-3864			Regionwide Survey Summary_01262010
3865-3874	2/25/2010	2/25/2010	APR, IGA Exhibit A Adopted 2_25_10
3875-3894	2/25/2010		Exhibit B - Reserves IGA Clackamas/Multnomah/principles/principles Mult
3895	2/25/2010	2/23/2010	Letter from City of Portland Mayor & Commissioners to Wheeler & Cogen reiterating recent recommendations on reserves by MPAC at Jan 27, Feb 1 & Feb 10 meetings. Urge Area 9 remain undesignated rather than rural reserve as MPAC recommends.
3896	2/25/2010	1/14/2010	Letter to County Commissioners urging urban reserves
3897-3900	2/25/2010	12/10/2009	Letter to BOCC re: difference of opinion on reserves designation recommendations for East Bethany & Bonny Slope
3901-3907	2/25/2010	1/11/2010	Letter to Metro Councilors re: Specific Reserve Designations for South NW Hills area in Mult Co/Power line/Germantown Rd/Lower Springville Rd
3908-3915	2/25/2010	1/20/2010	email from Jim Emerson forwarding letter dated 1/11/10 from Mayor Sam Adams & Commissioner Fritz (above)
3916-3917	2/25/2010	2/22/2010	Letter to Chair Wheeler to be entered as testimony, strongly urging rural reserves designation
3918-3921	2/25/2010	10/16/2009	Letter to Core 4 from City of Portland
3922	2/25/2010	2/17/2010	Letter to Core 4 from WA County re: ability of WA County to provide services to areas west of Mult Co/WA Co line
3923		2.26.10	Mult Co BOCC Map Change mark up 2.26.10
3924-3932	11/13/2009	11/13/2009	Reserves Core 4 Meeting Annotated Agenda/Oct 22 & 26 meeting minutes/Intergovernmental agreements/proposed prelim areas of agreement & further discussion
3933	11/13/2009	11/9/2009	Revised Core 4 meeting schedule
3934-3954	12/4/2009	12/4/2009	Reserves Core 4 Meeting Annotated Agenda/Nov 9 & 13 meeting minutes/Intergovernmental agreements/refined proposed prelim areas of agreement & further discussion

3955		2/18/2010	Core4_RegionalReserves_021610
3956-4009		2/18/2010	Public comment report Phase 4-January 2010
4010		2/24/2010	Reserves_022410_mult
4011		2/24/2010	Reserves_022410_mult2
4012			Reserves Area 1 0617
4013			Reserves Area 2,3,4 0617
4014			Reserves Area 5 0617
4015			Reserves Area 6 0617
4016			Reserves Area 7 0617
4017			Reserves Areas 8,9 0617
4018		6/9/2009	Mult Co Reserves Recommendation Development timeline meeting forecast
4019-4049		6/10/2009	Staff Rural Factors Analysis & draft Rural Reserves Suitability Recommendations memo
4050-4087		6/10/2009	Staff Rural Factors mmo 6.19.09
4088		3/16/2009	Urban & Rural Combined Candidate Areas Map 3.16.09
4089-4154		3/16/2009	Reserves Steering Committee Meeting #12 Annotated Agenda, Rural & Urban Reserve Candidate Areas, Steering Committee feedback on prelim tech analysis of infrastructure suitability
4155-4160		9/16/2009	Reserves Area Maps combined 091609
4161		9/15/2009	Reserves Suitability Areas 1 2 3 4 091509 combined
4162		9/15/2009	Reserves Suitability Areas 5 6 7 8 9 091509 combined
4163		9/15/2009	Memo to Steering Committee re: Mult Co Suitability Assessments for Urban & Rural Reserve
4164		9/16/2009	Suitability assessments table_rural
4165		9/16/2009	Suitability assessments table_urban
4166-4260		9/15/2009	Factors Analysis Report w/maps
4261-4355		10/14/2009	Full committee meeting records re: state agency comments on urban & rural reserves Packet & Packet Part2
4356-4359		10/15/2009	Letter from City of Forest Grove re: Strategies for a Sustainable & Prosperous Region - Urban Reserve Recommendations
4360-4362		10/14/2009	Letter from NAIOP/Oregon Chapter outlining Reserves Business Coalition's contributions to Urban & Rural Reserves process
4363-4365		10/13/2009	Letter to Michael Jordan re HBAMP's observations & concerns re: Metro's "Making the Greatest Place" report & accompanying recommendations
4366-4373	3/1/2010		Comprehensive Framework Plan Vol2: Policies 4/98
4374-4378	3/1/2010	2/10/2010	Metro Reserves Plan Amendments draft 2.10.10
4379-4387	3/1/2010		OAR Division 27 adopted 1.24.08
4388-4392	3/1/2010		PC-08-010 Work Session staff report1
4393-4394	3/1/2010		staff report supplement 3/1/10 re: Urban and Rural Reserve Plan Amendments
4395		2/25/2010	Exhibit B Agreement between Metro & Mult Co re: principles for concept planning of urban reserves
4396-4400			Reserves IGA Multnomah1
4401-4405	4/5/2010	3/26/2010	PC 08-010 Hearing Staff Report 3.26.10
4406	4/5/2010	4/1/2010	Reserves Recommendation Areas Orient RC 040110
4407	4/5/2010	3/29/2010	Plan and Zone Map Exhibit 1 PC 08-010_3.29.10

4408-4419	4/5/2010	3/26/2010	Reasons for Designating Reserves 3.26.10 - Exhibit 2
4420-4423	4/5/2010	9/16/2009	Exhibit3 - incl CAC Rural & Urban Suitability Summary Tables 9.16.09 & maps of Reserves Suitability Areas 1,2,3,4 and 6,5,7,8,9
4424-4429	4/5/2010		Exhibit4 - IGA bet Metro & Mult Co to Adopt Urban & Rural Reserves
4430-4438	4/5/2010		OAR Division 27 Reserves Rule
4439-4448	4/5/2010	4/5/2010	Letter, maps & CD submitted w/suggested changes in wording & definitions of proposed Framework Plan policy for clarity
4449	4/5/2010	4/5/2010	Letter endorsing Urban & Rural Reserves map and associated agreements
4450	4/5/2010	3/26/2010	Orient Rural Center
4451-4453	4/5/2010	4/5/2010	Letter in opposition to endorsing IGAs with Section A Paragraph 8 and Section B Paragraph 6, etc
4454-4479			Area maps/TC Aerials/Work maps/A Farm, Forest; B_C Farm, Forest; Buildable land maps; East Co zoning; GI zoning; NaturalsFeaturesSUBSET maps; NW Hills Zoning SEC north & south; Sandy Exception Zone; W_X_Y Farm & Forest; West Hills Exception Zone
4480-4481		6/12/2009	Memo to Steering Committee re: Suitability of Natural Features for Urban & Rural Reserve
4482-4485		6/8/2009	State Factors Evaluation draft ver Mult Co - tech team urban factors analysis of Multnomah and Clackamas County.
4486-4497		7/8/2009	email to Chuck w/attachment - Rural Reserves discussion items for 070609 - reference materials 11 pgs. Mult Co, Metro & state sources about Natural Features
4498-4501		7/10/2009	email to CAC members citing the law and rules to help clarify rural reserve & natural landscape features
4502-4505		12/10/2009	Letter to BOCC reiterating City of Portland's position re: Reserve Designations
4506-4507			Design workshop scope
4508			map of East of Sandy River New SEC-s
4509-4510		11/24/2009	Letter to Metro Council, Core 4, Mult & WA BOCC summarizing reasons why East Bethany should be designated Urban Reserve
4511-4512		7/17/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - recommends high mark for lower portion of Springville Rd., medium for area above 800 ft level and high for area next to Area 93.
4513		7/17/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - agrees with overall recommendation by Staff
4514-4515		7/19/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - believes Area 7.1 is unsuitable for Urban Reserves
4515a-d		7/28/2009	Reserves recommendation with letter to CAC from Forest Park Neighborhood Association.

4516-4517		7/20/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - agrees with assertions, with reservations about area east of Area 93 being designated Urban Reserve. Concerned about characterization of challenges affecting urbanization of portions of this area
4518		7/20/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - agrees with findings
4519-4520		7/20/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - states pocket along Springville Rd area be considered urban reserve, but not Springville Rd sub area in Area 7.1
4521		7/22/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - agrees with three recommendations for 7.1
4522-4524		7/19/2009	email response to Chuck's inquiry @ staff's overall recommendation for Area 7.1 - agrees with Carol Chesarek
4525-4556		7/30/2009	CAC agendas for 16 meetings
4557-4562	5/1/2008	5/1/2008	APR Appointment of CAC and Resolution to Form CAC
4563-4604	3/14/2008	3/14/2008	RSC Post Meeting Packet - contains PI plan
4605-4746		9/15/2009	Metro UGR - COO overview, table of contents, 3E Urban and Rural Reserves
4747-4750		4/1/2009	Analysis of farm/forest use of exception lands, 4 Excel data files, 2 tables, parcel map/aerials for 100 parcels in County and WSR areas. Source data for C.Klock exception lands memo to CAC 4/23/09
4751-4758	5/6/2010	5/2/2010	Letter w/maps requesting area south of McDaniel, west of NW Mill Pond & north of Forest Heights be included in UGB
4759-4760	5/6/2010	4/6/2010	Agrees with Rural Reserves designation
4761-4762	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Letter of appreciation for process & Rural Reserve designation for area
4763-4765	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Letter recommending adoption of Amended plans & sectional zoning map as published & monitor LCDC process to change rules that apply to RR
4766-4767	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Letter urging confirmation of RR designation for area
4768-4769	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	In favor of confirmation of rural reserves
4770-4771	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	For Rural Reserves
4772-4810	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Disagrees with pending rural reserves designation, includes documentation from Environmental Science & Assessment, Cardno WRG, Tualatin Valley Water District, Lancaster Engineering
4811-4815	5/6/2010	3/6/2010	Letter w/maps - In favor of rural reserve designation, requests addition of additional text
4816	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Agrees with Rural Reserves designation
4817-4878	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Letter affirming February decisions about Reserves with new information for possible inclusion in draft Findings & attachments (NLF1, Willamette Valley synthesis map, Mult Co functional classification of trafficways, Master Planning Westside Trail Segment 10, Photos, OR White Oak Survey, Northern Red-legged Frog Survey, aerial photos & Helen Kimmelfield email)
4879-4880	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Offers support and compliments in favor of Rural Reserve designation

4881-4882	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Same submission as Richard Malinowski, above
4883-4886	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Letter w/maps - Disagrees with suitability factors, opposes Rural Reserves designation
4887-6157		2009-2010	891 e-mail regarding Reserves Designation
6158-7044		2009-2010	707 e-mail regarding Reserves Designation
7045-8055		2009-2010	944 e-mail regarding Reserves Designation
8056-8273		2009-2010	164 e-mail regarding Reserves Designation
8274-9020		2009-2010	401 e-mail regarding Reserves Designation
9021		6/1/2009	Portland Urban Service Boundary Maps
9022-9025		6/1/2009	Map 1, 2, 3, 4
9026-9028		4/21/2009	Prime Farmland west of Sandy, current land use west of Sandy, clackanomah boundary north
9029-9031		9/8/2009	Director of Community Development Department Communication relaying the Council's desires
9032-9034		3/20/2009	NW Hills area map clarification
9035-9036		7/6/2009	Sewers Efficiency ratings refinement NW Hills
9037-9038		4/13/2009	Sewers Expert Group mtg
9039-9042		3/12/2009	New urban reserves considered for Johnson Creek Watershed
9043-9044		2/23/2009	Mult Co CAC Meeting draft Agenda
9045-9048		6/3/2009	Urban Candidate Areas Design Workshop results
9049		9/11/2009	Councilor Strathern Concerns
9050-9062		11/12/2009	Gresham Urban Reserve request ltr
9053		2/12/2009	Sewer Water Transportation preliminary suitability
9054		6/11/2009	Urban Factors evaluation matrix
9055-9059		1/5/2009	Reserves Coordination
9060-9061		2/14/2009	Reserves Coordination Mult Co Cities mtg
9062-9064		2/25/2009	Reserves ltr
9065-9066		11/2/2009	Gresham testimony to Reserves Steering Committee 11.12.09
9067-9074		3/11/2009	Reserves Assist re: Water Sewer Transportation
9075-9085		8/10/2009	Draft Urban evaluation in NW Hills - Clay 81009 doc
9086-9095		6/12/2009	Beaverton Portland Urban Service Map
9096-9105		3/5/2009	CAC#8 Meeting Summary draft_PC(3) doc
9106-9114		11/16/2009	Cedar Creek Community 10.15 Comments to PDX 11.16.09
9115-9118		8/17/2009	Lower Springville edges documentation
9119-9141		5/20/2009	Request for Urban Service Staff Contact P&D follow-up, Unified city position on West Forest Park Development Concept Plan Proposal
9142-9143		3/19/2009	Reserves - Forest Heights
9144		6/1/2009	map 2
9145		6/1/2009	map 3
9146-9156		8/18/2009	NW Hills Candidate Areas Evaluation Memo CB
9157-9167		8/18/2009	NW Hills Candidate Areas Evaluation Memo CB repl 8.18.09
9168-9170		3/6/2009	PDX Reserves Request ltr
9171-9181		11/5/2009	Portland Multnomah Capacity and Track Record on Growth & Change per UGR
9182-9183		3/12/2009	ORS Suitability Criteria
9184-9185		3/2/2009	Reserves - Request for City Assistance
9186-9188		3/12/2009	ORS Suitability Criteria

9189-9192		2/19/2009	Mult Co CAC Meeting - Aspirations
9193-9197		3/2/2009	Reserves - Request for City Assistance
9198-9205		3/10/2009	Assistance re Water Sewer Transportation Services
9206-9213		7/14/2009	Area 93 - Portland Connection
9214-9217		6/15/2009	Beaverton Portland Urban Service Map
9218-9223		8/12/2009	Draft Urban evaluation in NW Hills - Clay 81009 doc
9224-9232		6/1/2009	Map & Metro Ordinance 97-665C
9233-9239		4/17/2009	Mult Co Reserves concerns about process
9240-9241		8/21/2009	Candidate Areas Evaluation Memo CB repl 8.21.09
9242-9243		4/7/2009	Assistance re Sewer Suitability for Sauvie Island
9244-9245		1/26/2009	Growth Allocation Scenarios
9246-9247		3/26/2009	Mult Co CAC Meeting Check In
9248		1/9/2009	Mult Co Portland Coordination
9249-9250		8/5/2009	Recommendations for August 10 PC Hearing
9251-9321		11/4/2009	Subregional Population & Employment Capacity
9322		3/11/2009	Reserves Assistance Follow Up
9323		10/27/2009	Reserves City of Beaverton
9324-9327		2/4/2009	Reserves Coordination - Mult Co Cities Meeting Monday Feb 23
9328-9331		3/19/2009	Water Sewer Transportation First Screen Assessment
9332-9334		5/14/2009	Rural Reserves (North of HWY 26)
9335-9336		2/12/2009	Transportation Suitability Mapping in NW Hills
9337-9340		9/9/2009	Urgent Letter from Beaverton - indicates Beaverton's interest in area east of Bethany
9341		1/9/2009	Mult Co Portland Coordination
9342-9344		3/2/2009	Request for City Assistance - PDX Reserves req draft 2
9345		6/1/2009	Urban Candidate Areas Design Workshop results
9346-9349		10/27/2009	City of Beaverton Doyle ltr to PDX 10.27.09 - Design Workshop Scope
9350-9353		11/17/2009	Matt Wellner Letter to PDX 11.16.09
9354-9371		7/2/2009	NW Hills Meeting Agenda & Attachments - Reminder - Monday July 6
9372		3/6/2009	Reserves Request for Assistance
9373-9375		7/17/2009	Reserves NW Hills Areas 6 and 6.1_7.17.09
9376		2/25/2009	Troutdale letter
9377-9378		11/10/2009	Troutdale Urban Reserve Area
9379-9383		4/23/2009	Additional Govt Is Reserves Info
9384-9385		3/10/2009	Mult Co NW Hills area map clarification
9386		5/4/2009	Sewers Efficiency ratings refinement NW Hills
9387-9391		5/19/2009	Rural & Urban Reserves in Forest Park area
9392-9393		5/27/2009	Urban Reserves Aspirational Map
9394-9395		4/21/2009	New Regional Roads in CFU (Goal 4) Areas
9396-9405		1/20/2009	Reserves CAC Mtg 7
9406		2/24/2009	Govt Island Reserves Designation
9407-9408		4/20/2009	Sewers expert group mtgs
9409-9413		11/15/2009	PMT mtg w/Richard Whitman - comparison of Metro & WA Co reserves need methodologies
9414-9415		5/19/2009	Govt Island Reserves Designation mtg recap
9416-9418		1/16/2009	Govt Islands and Reserves
9419-9424		4/22/2009	Govt Island Reserves Designation
9425-9433		6/1/2009	Map & Metro Ord 97-665C

9434-9436		6/15/2009	Mapping info for Mult Co area
9437-9439		2/11/2009	Metro Reserves
9440-9441		3/20/2009	Ag Forest TAC Assistance
9442-9462		7/17/2009	CAC Mtg & Urban Factors Evaluation - UR Area 6 West Hills South, UR Area 7 Powerline_ Germantown South, UR Areas 2, 3, 4 West of Sandy, Urban Factors analysis memo correction
9463-9466		5/20/2009	Contact Info request for Mult Co Schools
9467		6/9/2009	Info re: Farming in WSR
9468		6/9/2009	Info re: Farming in WSR Fedje
9469		6/15/2009	Infor re: Farming in WSR Klock
9470		6/25/2009	Mult Co Staff Rural Factors Evaluation
9471-9472		5/26/2009	Mult Co CAC re: Area that roughly extends the North Bethany area east (north and south of Springville road) to Skyline Dr
9473		6/11/2009	Mult Co Edge Cities mtg Clackanomah
9474-9475		5/11/2009	New Transportation Corridors Considerations Mtg recap
9776-9478		5/20/2009	Potential for Irrigation Permits in areas West of Forest Park
9479-9482		4/28/2009	E Bethany Conflicted Ag Area Klock
9483-9484		7/6/2009	Sewers Efficiency ratings refinement NW Hills
9485		8/27/2009	Update re Assumptions for Reserves
9486-9487		7/29/2009	Urban & Rural Edges Aerials 1 thru 3
9488-9490		6/24/2009	Urban Factors Assessment & Urban Diagrams
9491-9581		5/11/2009	PSU-PRC_Columbia_Co_Forcsts_2010-2030
9582-9585		3/9/2009	Tri Met Contact / reserves_Mar09_WestUrban & reserves_Mar09_EastUrban
9586-9588		3/23/2009	Reserves designations - North Cascades response
9589		3/9/2009	County Group Info Sharing
9590-9591		5/8/2009	New Transportation Corridors Considerations Meet Recap
9592		4/30/2009	Rural & Urban Reserves in Forest Park area
9593		3/26/2009	Sauvie Island
9594-9600		3/26/2009	PDX Reserves Request ltr
9601		3/24/2009	Rural Reserves & Mult Co CAC - Sauvie Island recommendation
9602		7/30/2009	west of Sandy line
9603-9663c	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	BOCC Packet; APR_Reserves final, BOCC Record Index Rev. 5.6.10, Mult Co_Metro Findings Rev_05 06 10, PC Resolution 4.5.10, Plan and Zone Map_ Exhibit 1 to Ord____, Reserves IGA with Metro3.17.10, ORD 1161
9664-9758	6/17/2010	6/3/2010	BOCC Packet; APR, Proposed Reserves Ordinance final 6.3.10, Reserves IGA with Metro3.17.10, Mult Co. Adopted Reserves Map Ord 1161, Mult Co_Metro incl DB 6.10.10, PC Resolution 4.5.10, Reserves Record Index
OVERSIZED EXHIBITS			
	1/27/2010	1/27/2010	Audio Recording of Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting on Urban & Rural Reserves & Discussion of Draft IGA's to advise Metro Council and Core 4 on IGA pkg Core 4 will consider 2.8.10, plus public testimony
	2/1/2010	2/1/2010	Audio Recording of MPAC meeting to finish discussion of reserve areas: Core 4 urban reserve areas (5A, 6B, 7C, 8A, 8B) & areas Core 4 has not addressed (3A, 5E, 8D, 9A, 9B, 9C, 9F)

	2/10/2010	2/10/2010	Audio Recording of MPAC meeting to discuss recommended IGA proposed by Core 4 & provide formal recommendation to Metro Council on proposed IGA
	3/1/2010	3/1/2010	Audio Recording of Planning Commission Hearing
	4/5/2010	4/5/2010	Audio Recording of Planning Commission Hearing
	8/10/2009	8/10/2009	Audio Recording of Planning Commission Hearing
	2/25/2010	2/25/2010	Audio Recording of Board of County Commissioners Hearing
	5/6/2010	5/6/2010	Audio Recording of Board of County Commissioners Hearing
	6/17/2010	6/17/2010	Audio Recording of Board of County Commissioners Hearing

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
for MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

RESOLUTION NO. PC-08-010

In the matter of recommending that the Board of Commissioners amend the Multnomah County Framework Plan and the County Plan and Zoning Map to adopt the Proposed Urban and Rural Reserves Plan for Multnomah County.

The Planning Commission of Multnomah County Finds:

- a. The Planning Commission is authorized by Multnomah County Code Chapters 11.05, and 33 through 36, to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners the adoption, revision, or repeal of regulations intended to carry out all or part of a plan adopted by the Board.
- b. Multnomah County agreed to work together with Clackamas and Washington Counties and Metro in a process for designating Urban and Rural Reserves (Reserves). This represents a new approach to growth management in the Portland Metro region by identifying urban reserves where urban growth will be directed over the next 50 years, as well as rural reserves that will be off limits to growth in the same period. This long-term approach involved coordination among Metro and the counties, and coordinated public involvement to reach the consensus provided for in ORS 195.137 through 195.145 and in Oregon Administrative Rule OAR 660-027-0005 through -0080.
- c. Planning for urban and rural land uses over the long-term 50 years is in the interest of Multnomah County (the County) because this work has the potential to provide a balance that best provides for livable communities, viability and vitality of the farm and forest industries, and protection of landscape features that define the region for its residents.
- d. The policies and strategies in proposed Policy 6A incorporate the County requirements agreed to in the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Metro dated March 17, 2010. The IGA served as the preliminary decision and a prerequisite to these plan amendments as provided for in the state rules.
- e. The reserves plan was developed according to the Multnomah County Public Involvement plan that incorporated the provisions of the regional Coordinated Public Involvement Plan. These plans resulted in a broad public and stakeholder involvement effort that included a regional Reserves Steering Committee, formation of county committees to assess reserve areas and engage the public, region-wide public outreach events, and use of a number of tools including the internet, mailed notices to property owners, email meeting notifications, news releases and meeting and hearing notices, and neighborhood association meetings.

- f. The Multnomah County Reserves Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) developed suitability assessments and recommendations in public meetings between May 2008 and July 30, 2009. The CAC produced a thoughtful, well informed assessment that provided guidance to the County in arriving at conclusions about what lands should be designated as urban or rural reserve. The proposed reserves designations have been further informed by the Regional Steering Committee, and by additional public and agency input received through adoption of the IGA by the Board and Metro in February, 2010.
- g. No regulations are being proposed that further restrict the use of property and no mailed notice to individual property owners is required ("Ballot Measure 56 notice").
- h. Notice of the Planning Commission hearing was published in the Oregonian newspaper and on the Land Use Planning Program internet pages. Notification was also provided by electronic mail to individuals and stakeholders who had requested notification of proceedings and information about reserves.

The Planning Commission of Multnomah County Resolves:

- 1. The Multnomah County Framework Plan amendment to add proposed Policy 6A and the proposed Rural Reserve designation areas on the Plan and Zoning Map in Exhibit 1, are hereby recommended for adoption by the Board of County Commissioners.

ADOPTED this 5th day of April, 2010.

PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON


John Ingle, Chair

**Intergovernmental Agreement
Between Metro and Multnomah County
To
Adopt Urban and Rural Reserves**

This Agreement is entered into by and between Metro and Multnomah County pursuant to ORS 195.141 and 190.003 to 190.110 for the purpose of agreeing on the elements of an ordinance to be adopted by Metro designating Urban Reserves and of an ordinance to be adopted by Multnomah County designating Rural Reserves, all in Multnomah County.

PREFACE

This agreement will lead to the designation of Urban Reserves and Rural Reserves. Designation of the Urban and Rural Reserves by this agreement will help accomplish the purpose of the 2007 Oregon Legislature in enacting Senate Bill 1011, now codified in ORS 195.137 to 195.145 ("the statute"):

Facilitate long-term planning for urbanization in the region that best achieves

- Livable communities;
- Viability and vitality of the agricultural and forest industries; and
- Protection of the important natural landscape features that define the region.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Metro and Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties ("the four governments") have declared their mutual interest in long-term planning for the three-county area in which they exercise land use planning authority to achieve the purpose set forth in the statute; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Legislature enacted the statute in 2007, at the request of the four governments and many other local governments and organizations in the region and state agencies, to establish a new method to accomplish the goals of the four governments through long-term planning; and

WHEREAS, the statute authorizes the four local governments to designate Urban Reserves and Rural Reserves to accomplish the purposes of the statute, which are consistent with the goals of the four governments; and

WHEREAS, the Land Conservation and Development Commission ("LCDC") adopted rules to implement the statute on January 25, 2008, as directed by the statute; and

WHEREAS, the statute and rules require the four governments to work together in their joint effort to designate reserves and to enter into formal agreements among them to designate reserves in a coordinated and concurrent process prior to adoption of ordinances adopting reserves; and

WHEREAS, the statute and the rules set forth certain factors to be considered in the designation of reserves, and elements to be included in ordinances adopting reserves; and

WHEREAS, the four governments have followed the procedures and considered the factors set forth in the statute and the rule; and

WHEREAS, the four governments have completed an extensive and coordinated public involvement effort; and

WHEREAS, the four governments have coordinated their efforts with cities, special districts, school districts and state agencies in the identification of appropriate Urban and Rural Reserves;

NOW, THEREFORE, Metro and Multnomah County agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

- A. **Metro agrees** to consider the following policies and Urban Reserve designations at a public hearing and to incorporate them in the Regional Framework Plan, or to incorporate them as revised pursuant to subsections 3 and 4 of section C of this agreement:
1. A policy that designates as Urban Reserves those areas shown as proposed Urban Reserves on Exhibit A, attached to this agreement, or on any amendment to Exhibit A pursuant to section C of this agreement.
 2. A policy that determines that the Urban Reserves designated by the Regional Framework Plan pursuant to this agreement are intended to provide capacity for population and employment between 2010 and 2060, a total of 50 years from the date of adoption of the ordinance designating the reserves.
 3. A policy that gives highest priority to Urban Reserves for future addition to the urban growth boundary (UGB).
 4. A map depicting the Urban Reserves adopted by Metro and the Rural Reserves adopted by Multnomah County following this agreement.
 5. A policy that Metro will not add Rural Reserves designated by ordinance following this agreement to the regional UGB for 50 years.
 6. A policy that Metro will not designate Rural Reserves as Urban Reserves for 50 years.
 7. A policy that Metro will require a "concept plan", the required elements of which will be specified in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan in consultation with the county, for an area of Urban Reserves under consideration for addition to the UGB to be completed prior to the addition. Concept plans shall include elements on finance, provision of infrastructure, natural resource protection, governance, the planning principles set forth in Exhibit B and other subjects critical to the creation of great

communities. Concept plans will provide that areas added to the UGB will be governed and planned by cities prior to urbanization.

8. A policy that Metro will review the designations of Urban and Rural Reserves, in coordination with Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, 20 years after the adoption of reserves by the local governments pursuant to this agreement, unless the four governments agree to review the reserves sooner.

B. Multnomah County agrees to consider the following policies and Rural Reserve designations at a public hearing and to incorporate them in its Comprehensive Plan, or to incorporate them as revised pursuant to subsections 3 and 4 of section C of this agreement:

1. A policy that designates as Rural Reserves the areas shown as proposed Rural Reserves on Exhibit A, attached to this agreement, or on any amendment to Exhibit A pursuant to section C of this agreement.
2. A map depicting the Rural Reserves designated by the Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Reserves adopted by Metro following this agreement.
3. A policy that Multnomah County will not include Rural Reserves designated pursuant to this agreement in the UGB of any city in the county for 50 years from the date of adoption of the ordinance designating the reserves.
4. A policy that Multnomah County will not re-designate Rural Reserves as Urban Reserves in the county for 50 years from the date of adoption of the ordinance designating the reserves.
5. A policy that commits Multnomah County, together with an appropriate city, to participation in development of a concept plan for an area of Urban Reserves under consideration for addition to the UGB.
6. A policy that the county will review the designations of Urban and Rural Reserves, in coordination with Metro and Clackamas and Washington Counties, 20 years after the adoption of reserves by the four governments pursuant to this agreement, unless the four governments agree to review the reserves sooner.

C. Multnomah County and Metro agree to follow this process for adoption of the ordinances that will carry out this agreement:

1. Each government will hold at least one public hearing on its draft ordinance prior to its adoption.
2. Metro and the county will hold their final hearings and adopt their ordinances no later than June 8, 2010.
3. If testimony at a hearing persuades Metro or Multnomah County that it should revise its ordinance in a way that would make it inconsistent with this agreement, then it shall

continue the hearing and propose an amendment to the agreement to the other party and to Clackamas and Washington Counties.

4. If Multnomah County or Metro proposes an amendment to the agreement, the party proposing the agreement will convene the four governments to consider the amendment. Any objections or concerns raised by a government that is not party to this IGA shall be considered carefully and the four governments shall take reasonable, good faith steps to reach consensus on the amendment. After this consultation, Multnomah County and Metro may agree to an amendment.
5. Metro and Multnomah County will adopt a common set of findings, conclusions and reasons that explain their designations of Urban Reserves and Rural Reserves as part of their ordinances adopting the reserves. Metro and the county will incorporate maps into their respective plans that show both the Urban and Rural Reserves in Exhibit A to this agreement, with the county showing only the reserves in the county.
6. Metro and Multnomah County will establish, in coordination with Clackamas and Washington Counties, a process for making minor revisions to boundaries between Urban Reserves and undesignated land that can be made at the time of concept planning, and a process for making minor additions to Rural Reserves, with notice to, but without convoking all four reserves partners.
7. Within 45 days after adoption of the last ordinance adopting reserves of the four governments, Multnomah County and Metro will submit their ordinances and supporting documents to LCDC in the manner of periodic review.

D. This agreement terminates on December 31, 2060.


MULTNOMAH COUNTY




Ted Wheeler
Chair, Multnomah County
Board of Commissioners

Dated: _____

Reviewed:




METRO



David Bragdon,
Metro Council President

Dated: 17 March 2010

Approved as to form:




Urban and Rural Reserves In Multnomah County

Exhibit A to Intergovernmental Agreement between Metro and Multnomah County

02/25/10



EXHIBIT A



	Rural reserve areas
	Urban centers
	Undesignated areas
	Reserve study area
	County boundaries
	Urban growth boundaries

0 1 2 Miles




**Multnomah County Urban and Rural Reserves
Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map**

The following Sectional Zoning Maps are amended by this map: 1-86, 88-92, 94-112, 115-118, 121, 122, 124, 125, 131-134, 586, 592, 597, 598, 603-604, 610, 634, 649, 651, 667-674, 679, 680, 682-686, 688-701, 703-716.

Adopted as Exhibit 1 of Ordinance no. 1161 on the 13th day of May, 2010.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON**

Jeff Cogen, Chair



- Rural Reserve
- Urban Reserve
- Existing Urban Areas
- Undesignated
- Study Area Boundary