Robert Bailey
7455 NW Helvetia Road
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124

April 26, 2011

Board of County Commissioners
Multnomah County
Portland, Oregon

Supplemental Information for the Urban and Rural Reserves Record

I start with **praise** for those decision makers among you who have kept an open mind and shown respect for citizen involvement and input. I **praise** those who have managed to keep the protection of prime farmland a functional goal during this Reserves process.

The Legislative Assembly granted **historic authority** to Metro and the three counties to undertake the Reserves process. It is said that this legislation grew out of the farmers' aspirations for certainty. The process appears to have delivered that more in Multnomah and Clackamas Counties.

In Washington County, cities' and county aspirations (other than Cornelius) appear to be getting the **land use certainty**. Consensus with citizens and the agricultural sector has gone wanting. Communication from LCDC has been less than transparent and in particular they have failed to communicate their lack of a written remand order. This thwarts the due process of objectors.

Save Helvetia made a request for some public records from Washington County Administration. We have posting these on our website for public review: www.SaveHelvetia.org. We submitted into the record a CD of documents but I will reflect on a few at this time. They offer a glimpse into a largely invisible process, the stage curtains parted for a moment in time.

- The current changes in Ordinance 740 were the initial product of Tom Brian and Andy Duyck, and then broadened to include Tom Hughes and Metro councilors Hostika, Harrington, and later Colette.

- Washington County has had three votes for Ordinance 740 throughout the process and long before any hearings took place. See Tom Brian's e-mail dated 11-14-10.

- There are hints that LCDC could not write a written remand order dating from early November: Mulvihill email of 11/1/10 and Brian email of 11/2/10. LCDC has yet to communicate with the public whether they could, would, couldn't and if so, why or when. This has been detrimental to the standing and due process of the parties who opposed parts of Ordinance 733. This gap has been used by Metro and Washington County to move rapidly forward with an amended plan. Those with standing now are realizing that that they are standing in the dust of their Goal One rights.

- The e-mails show Metro Chairman Hughes, and Councilors Harrington and Hostika as mutual architects of Ordinance 740 beginning in early December on. Hughes was involved before he came on to the Metro chairmanship: see Tom Brian e-mail dated 11/14/10.

- Metro attorney Benner advocated to LCDC's Richard Whitman not to finish a written order of remand, to limit "litigation" from those in opposition. See Benner e-mail dated 1/5/11.

- Washington County's attorney Dan Olsen communicated with LCDC's Director Richard Whitman about the timing or lack of written remand order: see Olsen e-mail dated 11/23/10.

- There is growing concern in the community that Director Whitman is actively advocating for adoption and acceptance of the regional reserves proposal instead of acting in a neutral way. The lack of a written order and the lack of clear and timely communication with the public about the status of the order are disappointing. It is also rumored that the Director set aside his staff's assessments of the original reserves decision and related Objections and replaced them with his own.

While this is far from a full picture, it does offer a glimpse into the **very exclusive** and **internal** planning. It strongly suggests that the hearings have

been a **roll-out** of the pre-ordained plan. What few changes occurred appear more as attempts at charades of compromise and/or choreographed empathy for the taking of prime farmland.

I also oppose Washington County's use of undesignated land. It has been used alternatively in an attempt to mollify the City of Cornelius, and conversely to add urban reserves (lite) in Helvetia, while appearing to compromise.

Washington County released its Reserves "Reasons for Designations for Urban and Rural Reserves" on April 21st, the day of the final Metro hearing, and after the close of three of its four hearings:(3/15/11, 3/29/11, and 4/19/11). This is a **bare minimum** of facilitating citizen access to key documentation. When I look at Tom Brian's e-mail memo dated 11/14/10, I think that it is reflective of the **current culture of citizen involvement.**

Washington County and Hillsboro came to the dance, hand in hand with agriculture. Washington County and Hillsboro now leaves the dance with the development sector. The development-government complex has arrived in Washington County and Hillsboro. One does not have far to look for examples of those circulating between government and development. The mantra of jobs has been effectively used to re-define Oregon's history of land use values. Farmers here are now treated as a second class sector. Washington County wants to grow us to 1,000,000 in a radically short period of time, benefit from an increased tax and fee base, and have us all pay for a one billion dollar dam project necessary for this rapid expansion. They proclaim it prudent planning. It is a choice that they make and that they benefit from.

Measured growth is available without taking prime farmland.
Robert Bailey
Save Helvetia

Attachments of public documents from Washington County

Brent Curtis

From: Andy Duyck[redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 10:28 AM
To: Tom Brian; 'Dennis Mulvihill'
Cc: Brent Curtis; Andrew Singelakis; Dan Olsen; Robert Davis; Dennis Mulvihill; Rob Massar
Subject: RE: Urban and Rural Reserves

Tom,
There probably isn't much that I can say until we talk. I intend to be at the public services building this afternoon to discuss this with Staff. I will give you a heads up that my inclination is not to roll over on this one. We developed the reserves in good faith. I would expect LCDC to respect that. Is there anything we can do to accommodate your health situation?

Andy

From: Tom Brian[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2010 7:52 AM
To: 'Dennis Mulvihill'; Andy Duyck
Cc: 'Brent Curtis'; 'Andrew Singelakis'; 'Dan Olsen'; 'Bob Davis'; 'Dennis G Mulvihill'; 'Rob Massar'
Subject: RE: Urban and Rural Reserves

All

Interesting if LCDC can not adopt an order implementing their decision of last Friday...I thought it would be their order that would require us to review our plan and without the order, there would not be that directive? Of course, we would be smart to recognize it is pending and start our review.

Frankly, and I have not talked to staff or Andy, but I think there are a LOT of options to consider, and we should be very little comment to ANYONE until we have a chance to discuss some of them, even preliminarily. I have been contacted by KH and CH who are anxious to start talking. I think there is some thought out there regarding the election tomorrow night and an inkling that Metro and others would much more like to work with the current, "known" BCC: if a certain two are elected, there could be a roll back of virtually everything north, and Cooper Mtn. and parts around Sherwood...then, there would have to be a "rebalance" regionally for employment and residential land and a huge nightmare. If another two are elected, there is the thought that the BCC could decide not to participate further (you will recall in the final month or two of negotiations, we said "this is it, if we do not get this, then we will not support participating.")..so folks can easily worry that would be the case of the more conservative two win.

At the same time, they really do not know what mood Andy and I are in, and how willing we are to work the map some more. I told KH and CH that Andy and I had not talked, that I would absolutely want him at the table because of his past participation and future role as Chair. I also said I saw a lot of options but I would not comment on them until Andy and I and staff had at least a preliminary meeting.

I think I could come to the Thursday meeting, not sure about lunch after, etc., but I would try the meeting and see. I think it would be worth having for the prelim.
tb

Brent Curtis

From: Tom Brian [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2010 7:52 AM
To: 'Dennis Mulvihill'; 'Andy Duyck'
Cc: Brent Curtis; Andrew Singelakis; Dan Olsen; Robert Davis; Dennis Mulvihill; Rob Massar
Subject: RE: Urban and Rural Reserves

All

Interesting if LCDC can not adopt an order implementing their decision of last Friday...I thought it would be their order that would require us to review our plan and without the order, there would not be that directive? Of course, we would be smart to recognize it is pending and start our review.

Frankly, and I have not talked to staff or Andy, but I think there are a LOT of options to consider, and we should be very little comment to ANYONE until we have a chance to discuss some of them, even preliminarily. I have been contacted by KH and CH who are anxious to start talking. I think there is some thought out there regarding the election tomorrow night and an inkling that Metro and others would much more like to work with the current, "known" BCC: if a certain two are elected, there could be a roll back of virtually everything north, and Cooper Mtn. and parts around Sherwood...then, there would have to be a "rebalance" regionally for employment and residential land and a huge nightmare. If another two are elected, there is the thought that the BCC could decide not to participate further (you will recall in the final month or two of negotiations, we said "this is it, if we do not get this, then we will not support participating.")..so folks can easily worry that would be the case of the more conservative two win.

At the same time, they really do not know what mood Andy and I are in, and how willing we are to work the map some more. I told KH and CH that Andy and I had not talked, that I would absolutely want him at the table because of his past participation and future role as Chair. I also said I saw a lot of options but I would not comment on them until Andy and I and staff had at least a preliminary meeting.

I think I could come to the Thursday meeting, not sure about lunch after, etc., but I would try the meeting and see. I think it would be worth having for the prelim.
tb

From: Dennis Mulvihill [mailto:dgmulvihill@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 11:20 AM
To: Tom Brian; Andy Duyck
Cc: Brent Curtis; Andrew Singelakis; Dan Olsen; Bob Davis; Dennis G Mulvihill; Rob Massar
Subject: Urban and Rural Reserves

It is my understanding that Metro's legal counsel is advising that LCDC may be prevented from adopting an order until Metro/Region resubmits changes to what was proposed in Washington County, and LCDC approves a new and complete Reserves list after local and LCDC hearings. Is there legal room for advancing an argument to work simultaneously on changes to Reserves and expanding the UGB for areas not in question? This approach could solidify quickly. Is this Thursday's Policy Meeting timely enough to talk through the options? I have not engaged with anyone at Metro.
DGM

Brent Curtis

From: Andrew Singelakis
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 1:02 PM
To: Brent Curtis
Subject: FW: URRs...
Importance: High

Brent,

I'd like to sit down with you and go over this to determine what other options we might have.

Thanks,
Andrew

From: Tom Brian [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2010 1:32 PM
To: Brent Curtis
Cc: Andrew Singelakis; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck
Subject: URRs...
Importance: High

Brent:
I am not sure of your vacation schedule, but I want to get these requests for information to you ASAP. Andy and I have a meeting with Kathryn and Carl early on Monday, 11/22 and would like this information if at all possible.

1) With regard to 7B (508 acres, Forest Grove), the LCDC discussion clearly expressed an interest that we consider NOT going north of the "Council Creek" extension, or whatever the main creek is that runs diagonally through 7 B. Whatever we wish to retain north of this feature will have to meet a "high standard" or "high bar" as their members said.
   - Request #1: how many acres are north of the natural feature they are concerned about?...If we were to "give up" UR land in 7 B, Andy and I would most certainly want to add it to the 624 acres of UR lost north of Cornelius.

2) As to area 7i (624 acres, Cornelius), one of the options is to have the entire lost UR acreage become "undesignated." Other options include subareas of that acreage. Earlier this year, we discussed a few options in the 7i area where the UR could have stopped as we moved north.
   - Request # 2: please inform us of one or two options short of the whole 7i, that could be made "undesignated" and how many acres are involved in these subareas?

3) So, whether it is the 624 acres from 7i, or additional acres coming out of a northerly portion of 7 B (FG) ...Andy and I feel strongly that the lost URs should be replaced acre for acre somewhere in Washington County.

4) In reviewing possible areas to which to add URs, we concluded the most logical and possibly defensible would be the "rectangular" area north of Hwy 26, south of West Union and between Jackson School Road on the West and XXXX on the east. Currently, there is a 150 acre area designated UR, then as we move to the west it is undesignated, then as it approaches Jackson School Rd., it becomes Rural. Our thought is the possibility of adding URs around the 150 acre of current URs, then move westerly until all

624 acres (plus any from the FG piece) are added back. Where the new westerly line of UR is as a result of this re-designation, any lost undesignated would be claimed our of the RRs adjacent (and to the west towards North Plains). We should be able to retain the buffer between North Plains and the City of Hillsboro as was negotiated last year.

- Request #3: please create maps that depict the addition of URs as I have described, and the related changes to undesignated and RRs, all within the rectangle I mentioned. I would like these maps in two scales; one close up enough to see any natural features in the rectangular and the acres in each portion, and secondly, a map of the same scale that shows all of Washington County (URRs In Washington County: Exhibit A to the IGA dated 2/18/20...pink, blue, green) This would show our proposed response on a familiar map and scale.

SPECIAL NOTES: A) We are open to any additional thoughts and suggestions you have regarding this or another approach

B) We are attempting to keep these ideas CONFIDENTIAL and do not want to give potential opponents any more lead time than legally provided. So, I am concerned about WHO makes these revised, draft maps. Usually we have had John Williams at Metro do these maps, haven't we? You should do whatever you have to do, but please keep these discussions and options as confidential as possible for the time being.

Finally, Andy and I will be at the AOC conference and will have time for informal discussion about this, and available by email and phone.
Thanks,
Tom

Brent Curtis

From: Tom Brian[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2010 9:20 AM
To: Brent Curtis
Subject: RE: URRs...

Thanks, Brent. Hope you had a good vacation!

If possible, Andy and I would like to review and discuss this material in Eugene. It would really be helpful for he and I and you particularly to go over some options. Friday morning, Andy and I are meeting with Tom Hughes in Eugene to give him a preview of our position on URR adjustments, then we have the meeting Monday morning with Carl and Kathryn...and Tom will be joining us then, too.

Seems there is strong interest in moving to an IGA before the end of the year. If we can, that is fine...but I want to make sure we have three solid votes on the current AND future Boards.

Thanks again.
Tom

From: Brent Curtis [mailto:Brent_Curtis@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 8:47 PM
To: Tom Brian
Cc: Andrew Singelakis; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck
Subject: RE: URRs...

Tom - Sorry for the delay in response. I have not had email service from approximately Tuesday. Apparently the county's email system had some type of major problem. I returned from Arizona Wednesday evening. Due to the holiday Thursday, I wasn't able to get my email service back up to speed until late this afternoon. I understand the information you want me to prepare and the confidential nature of the request. I will get started on the request and associated analysis first thing Monday. We should be able to prepare the work and review it with both you and Andy before your meeting on 11/22. Brent

---

From: Tom Brian[redacted]
Sent: Wed 11/10/2010 1:31 PM
To: Brent Curtis
Cc: Andrew Singelakis; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck
Subject: URRs...

Brent:
I am not sure of your vacation schedule, but I want to get these requests for information to you ASAP. Andy and I have a meeting with Kathryn and Carl early on Monday, 11/22 and would like this information if at all possible.

1) With regard to 7B (508 acres, Forest Grove), the LCDC discussion clearly expressed an interest that we consider NOT going north of the "Council Creek" extension, or whatever the main creek is that runs diagonally through 7 B. Whatever we wish to retain north of this feature will have to meet a "high standard" or "high bar" as their members said.
   - Request #1: how many acres are north of the natural feature they are concerned about?...If we were to "give up" UR land in 7 B, Andy and I would most certainly want to add it to the 624 acres of UR lost north of Cornelius.

2) As to area 7i (624 acres, Cornelius), one of the options is to have the entire lost UR acreage become "undesignated." Other options include subareas of that acreage. Earlier this year, we discussed a few options in the 7i area where the UR could have stopped as we moved north.
   - Request # 2: please inform us of one or two options short of the whole 7i, that could be made "undesignated" and how many acres are involved in these subareas?

3) So, whether it is the 624 acres from 7i, or additional acres coming out of a northerly portion of 7 B (FG) ...Andy and I feel strongly that the lost URs should be replaced acre for acre somewhere in Washington County.

4) In reviewing possible areas to which to add URs, we concluded the most logical and possibly defensible would be the "rectangular" area north of Hwy 26, south of West Union and between Jackson School Road on the West and XXXX on the east. Currently, there is a 150 acre area designated UR, then as we move to the west it is undesignated, then as it approaches Jackson School Rd., it becomes Rural. Our thought is the possibility of adding URs around the 150 acre of current URs, then move westerly until all 624 acres (plus any from the FG piece) are added back. Where the new westerly line of UR is as a result of this re-designation, any lost undesignated would be claimed our of the RRs adjacent (and to the west towards North Plains). We should be able to retain the buffer between North Plains and the City of Hillsboro as was negotiated last year.

   - Request #3: please create maps that depict the addition of URs as I have described, and the related changes to undesignated and RRs, all within the rectangle I mentioned. I would like these maps in two scales; one close up enough to see any natural features in the rectangular and the acres in each portion, and secondly, a map of the same scale that shows all of Washington County (URRs In Washington County: Exhibit A to the IGA dated 2/18/20...pink, blue, green) This would show our proposed response on a familiar map and scale.

SPECIAL NOTES: A) We are open to any additional thoughts and suggestions you have regarding this or another approach

B) We are attempting to keep these ideas CONFIDENTIAL and do not want to give potential opponents any more lead time than legally provided. So, I am concerned about WHO makes these revised, draft maps. Usually we have had John Williams at Metro do these maps, haven't we? You should do whatever you have to do, but please keep these discussions and options as confidential as possible for the time being.

Finally, Andy and I will be at the AOC conference and will have time for informal discussion about this, and available by email and phone.
Thanks,
Tom

Brent Curtis

From: Patrick Ribellia [patrickr@ci.hillsboro.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 1:37 PM
To: Brent Curtis
Subject: FW: Cornelius Response to LCDC Decision
Attachments: CorneliusMemoLCDC.pdf

FYI as you prepare for the 2:30PM meeting. Thanks, Pat. R.

From: Kathryn Harrington [mailto:Kathryn.Harrington@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 1:34 PM
To: Patrick Ribellia
Subject: FW: Cornelius Response to LCDC Decision

See attached.

Kathryn

Kathryn Harrington
Metro Councilor, District 4
503-797-1553
Kathryn.Harrington@oregonmetro.gov

www.oregonmetro.gov
Metro | People places. Open spaces.

From: Nikolai Ursin
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 12:09 PM
To: Robin McArthur; John Williams; Richard Benner; All Council-COO
Subject: Cornelius Response to LCDC Decision

All,

Attached is a memo received this morning from Cornelius concerning LCDC's decision on the reserves process.

Nikolai Ursin
Council Policy Coordinator
Metro
503-797-1939

www.oregonmetro.gov
Metro | People places. Open spaces.

Dan Olsen

From: Dan Olsen
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2010 8:44 AM
To: 'Whitman, Richard'
Subject: RE: Reserves Order

Sounds fair. Thanks.

From: Whitman, Richard [mailto:richard.whitman@state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 3:25 PM
To: Dan Olsen; Richard Whitman
Subject: RE: Reserves Order

The order is not close (yet). We haven't decided whether to circulate a draft yet, but I think that is likely. We would circulate to all (46+) parties if we do so.

Richard Whitman | Director
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150 | Salem, OR 97301-2540
Office: (503) 373-0050 ext. 280 | Cell: (503) 881-7093 | Fax: (503) 378-5518
richard.whitman@state.or.us | www.oregon.gov/LCD

From: Dan Olsen [mailto:Dan_Olsen@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 9:25 AM
To: Richard Whitman
Subject: Reserves Order

Among the many rumors floating around AOC was that you have the order almost ready. I have no idea if that is true, but am wondering whether Dick and I will get a chance to review and comment before you final? I'd very much like to do so if possible. Thanks.

Dan Olsen

From: Richard Benner [Richard.Benner@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 3:06 PM
To: Dan Olsen
Cc: Dan Cooper
Subject: RE: IGA

OK

From: Dan Olsen [mailto:Dan_Olsen@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 3:03 PM
To: Richard Benner
Subject: RE: IGA

I think that makes sense.

From: Richard Benner [mailto:Richard.Benner@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 2:53 PM
To: Dan Olsen
Cc: Dan Cooper
Subject: IGA

2/6/10
Dan,
A conversation with Dan Cooper and a little more contemplation leads me to suggest a revision to this section:

D. Metro and Washington County acknowledge that the LCDC remand order has not been issued. Further, Washington County reserves the right to appeal all or any part of the LCDC remand order. Other parties to the LCDC reserves decision may appeal. Accordingly, Metro or Washington County shall be entitled to initiate good faith negotiations with the other party hereto regarding any amendments to, or termination of, this Agreement as may be prudent in light of the LCDC remand order or any appeal. After 30 days, either Metro or Washington County may provide 10 days written notice of termination of this Agreement and the Reserves IGA to the other.

How's this (*italics*):

D. Metro and Washington County acknowledge that the LCDC remand order has not been issued. Further, Washington County reserves the right to appeal all or any part of the LCDC remand order. Other parties to the LCDC reserves decision may appeal. Accordingly, *up to the date of adoption of the ordinances described in sections D and E of this agreement*, Metro or Washington County shall be entitled to initiate good faith negotiations with the other party hereto regarding any amendments to, or termination of, this Agreement as may be prudent in light of the LCDC remand order or any appeal. After 30 days, either Metro or Washington County may provide 10 days written notice of termination of this Agreement and the Reserves IGA to the other.

This resolves any misunderstanding over the effect of adoption of ordinances on the effectiveness of the IGA.

Dick

Brent Curtis

From: Richard Benner [Richard.Benner@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 1:56 PM
To: John Williams; Mike Dahlstrom
Cc: Brent Curtis
Subject: RE: Courtesy Memo to Reserves Interested Parties

Good point, John! We've been warned by the department NOT to say these areas are for any particular use or classes of use.

From: John Williams
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 1:52 PM
To: Richard Benner; Mike Dahlstrom
Cc: Brent Curtis
Subject: RE: Courtesy Memo to Reserves Interested Parties

Thanks Mike – as we just discussed on the phone, I will talk to some folks here to make sure we are good on Councilors knowing about this before your press release hits the street. And, to check on the phrase "consensus recommendations" in favor perhaps of another term. I'll be in touch this afternoon.

I'd suggest instead of "intended for employment" in paragraph 3 we might say "suitable for employment" – we've been pretty careful to represent things that way.

John

From: Richard Benner
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 1:23 PM
To: Mike Dahlstrom; John Williams
Cc: Brent Curtis
Subject: RE: Courtesy Memo to Reserves Interested Parties

Mike,
Thanks for the chance to review. To be more accurate, I would substitute "Regional Framework Plan" for "Urban Growth Functional Management Plan" in the one place you mention it.
Dick

From: Mike Dahlstrom [mailto:Mike_Dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 1:17 PM
To: John Williams; Richard Benner
Cc: Brent Curtis
Subject: Courtesy Memo to Reserves Interested Parties

Good afternoon.

Attached is a courtesy memo to be sent tomorrow morning to reserves interested parties. The memo refers to upcoming County Board of Commissioners consideration next tuesday regarding adjustments to reserves.

Please review the sixth paragraph to ensure that the message is appropriate and valid.

Thanks,
M

Mike Dahlstrom
Program Educator
Washington County - DLUT
Planning Division #350-14
155 North First Avenue
Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072
503-846-8101
mike_dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us

Brent Curtis

From: Andy Duyck
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 10:03 AM
To: Dick Schouten
Cc: Tom Brian; Andy Duyck; Roy Rogers (E-mail); [redacted]; Robert Davis; Andrew Singelakis; Brent Curtis; Dan Olsen; Dennis Mulvihill
Subject: Re: Draft Urban and Rural Reserves Map, Responding to LCDC...draft email to our BCC colleagues...

Thanks Dick
The map is getting out there but won't be officially released till later this afternoon or early tomorrow. It is our hope that Brent would complete an official narrative to be released with it. However, because the timeline is short, we can disseminate the information any way that gets it out there.

Andy D

On Dec 6, 2010, at 12:49 PM, "Dick Schouten" <Dick_Schouten@co.washington.or.us> wrote:

> Tom and Andy:
>
> Thanks for the excellent and clear graphics and maps. I can readily see and appreciate that a lot of work and time went into the attacheds. The attacheds and below narrative squares up with Andy's Friday phone briefing. Thanks Andy and Tom and all concerned staff. At this point, now being Monday I am assuming the maps and charts are publishable to the world or have been so published already.
>
> Dick
>
>
> _____
>
> From: Tom Brian [mailto:tom.brian@frontier.com]
> Sent: Saturday, December 04, 2010 11:23 AM
> To: Roy Rogers; Dick Schouten; [redacted]
> Cc: Andy Duyck; Brent Curtis; Dan Olsen; Robert Davis; Andrew Singelakis; Dennis Mulvihill
> Subject: FW: Draft Urban and Rural Reserves Map, Responding to LCDC...draft email to our BCC colleagues...
>
>
>
> To: Roy, Dick and Desari
>
> From: Tom and Andy
>
> Colleagues:
>
> Andy and I have been working with staff, legal counsel, Metro Counselors, and the LCDC director to develop this proposed response to LCDC's decisions (and likely official order). We have reviewed substantial LCDC meeting notes and our staff and counsel have been working with their counterparts at Metro and LCDC to avoid misunderstandings and to hopefully, arrive at a response that is acceptable to our Board, the Metro Council and the LCDC. We apologize in advance for the length of this discussion, but as you know, it is complex and there have been a lot of discussions and meetings in the past month.
>
> There is general agreement and understanding that we are operating under the following principles:
>
> 1) Per the authority included in LCDC's action, it is our goal to replace Urban Reserves by Cornelius (624 acres) and Forest Grove (28 acres) "acre for acre" and near as practicable.
>

> 2) Replacement acreage would be "type for type," in other words, employment land for employment land, residential land for residential land.
>
> 3) Replacement acreage will be contiguous to current Urban Reserves, and shall not exceed the gross acreage "lost" as a result of the LCDC decision. Significant natural features, roads, or property lines shall be used as boundaries whenever possible.
>
> 4) Current Rural Reserves and Undesignated acres may be modified in order to comply with LCDC's decision.
>
> 5) Some members of LCDC expressed concern regarding the small amount of undesignated lands and suggested the County should "look at that" although the addition of undesignated land was not directed. Some also offered that we may have protected too much farm and forest land with Rural Reserves designations that were not necessary.
>
> 6) There is general agreement that sufficient analysis and public comment is in the record from which the amendment can be fairly considered; neither Metro nor the County feels it is necessary to re-open the analysis process or conduct an extensive outreach and public information effort.
>
> Metro has asked that an amendment to our current IGA with them be amended before the end of the calendar year if agreement can be reached, for the following reasons:
>
> a) This action is likely to receive better consideration by the Metro Councilors, our Board members, and staff who have been working on URRs for the past three years (meaning, take advantage of the knowledge, history of the work, negotiating relationships).
>
> b) It may be some time before LCDC's order is 'actionable' due to possible appeals, and it would be helpful to the region to have an amended agreement to look to while appeals run their course.
>
> c) Property owners would be benefitted to know the direction the region is headed in its response to the LCDC decision. Several owners have offered to have their [illegible] included in the modified Urban Reserves and are once again becoming active for that purpose; it would be constructive to inform them whether or not their properties are to be included.
>
> d) To achieve an URRs IGA modification as requested, our Board would have to take action on December 14th and Metro Council December 16th. Both agencies are taking steps to preserve that opportunity for their governing bodies.
>
> e) Due to the short timeframe, Andy and I suggest the attached draft maps (and explanation that will be available Monday, December 6) be immediately distributed (Monday) to the public (including but not limited to the media, the cities, Metro and interested parties such as the Farm Bureau, TRK, 1000 Friends of Oregon, NAIOP, WEA, our notification list, and other parties).
>
>
>
> Other Comments:
>
> Following our understanding of LCDC's directive, and after discussion with Metro, LCDC and staff, Andy and I set out to determine a draft response to LCDC. LCDC's primary directives were to 1) eliminate all Urban Reserves in area 7 (i), the land north of Council Creek, north of Cornelius, 2) strengthen the findings for area 7 (b), in Forest Grove and north of the Council Creek tributary, or, eliminate some or all of this area if we chose not to strengthen the findings.
>
> As to Forest Grove, we recommend eliminating all Urban Reserves east or north of Council Creek, and making the area Undesignated. This is marked as "A" on the revised draft maps and involves 28 gross acres and 16 net buildable acres; it is adjacent to State Highway 47 and Purdin Road. The remainder of the Forest Grove 7 B area would be retained as URs residential land and its findings strengthened per LCDC's suggestion.
>
> As to Cornelius 7 (i), the area North of Council Creek. We recommend eliminating all Urban Reserves in this area in compliance with LCDC's directive. This is a reduction of

624 gross acres of URs and 470 acres of net buildable. The area west of Susbauer Road, marked as "B" on the revised draft maps would be designated Rural Reserves. The area east of Susbauer Road, marked as "C" on the revised draft maps would be identified as "Undesignated."
>
> Combined, these recommendations would result in a reduction of Urban Reserves of 652 gross acres and 486 net buildable. Virtually all of this land is considered 'employment land.'
>
> As to where to locate the replacement acreage, we examined all areas in Washington County that were contiguous to current Urban Reserve designations, and suitable for employment land. Without going into rather exhaustive detail at this time, we eliminated the option of adding the replacement acreage in Sherwood, Tigard, Cooper Mountain, South Hillsboro or South Cornelius. This left the area north of Hwy. 26 and south of West Union Road, and bounded on the west and east by Jackson School Road and Shute Road (now the northerly extension of Brookwood Parkway) respectively. This "rectangle" current includes 88 acres of URs, 585 acres of Undesignated and 632 acres of RRs. Andy and I recommend the following:
>
> 1) Moving from east to west, starting with the UR corner piece of 88 acres, change the 585 acres of undesignated and 40 acres of Rural Reserves to Urban Reserves (total replacement acres: 625 as compared to the reduction of 652). These replacement areas are marked as "E" and "F" on the draft revised maps.
>
> 2) To recoup the reduction of Undesignated land, continue west and change 592 acres from Rural Reserves to Undesignated. This area is marked as "D" on the draft revised maps.
>
> 3) The northwest corner of the "rectangle," adjacent to Jackson School Road and West Union Road, will remain Rural Reserves to serve as a buffer between the communities of North Plains and Hillsboro. This designation was agreed to and considered sufficient by the two cities, Metro and our Board previously.
>
> Finally, there is the matter of whether we should add undesignated lands or reduce Rural Reserves designations as referenced by some of the LCDC members. We are suggesting a conservative approach to this. First, we recommend we leave our Rural Reserves designations intact and as currently depicted, other than as modified by item #2, immediately above. We also recommend that we not pursue extensive new Undesignated areas simply to add a few thousand acres of potentially buildable land. We do, however, recommend three additional Undesignated areas:
>
> a) The area marked "G" on the draft revised map includes 832 gross acres (515 net buildable acres). This designation could be the location of residential development to support the substantial employment land in the longer term future. It would help provide jobs/housing balance and housing in close proximity to the jobs to reduce commuting miles. It is bounded by three major transportation corridors: 185th, West Union Road and Cornelius Pass Road. The Undesignated status would also assist the County in achieving the ability to improve the intersection of Cornelius Pass Rd., Germantown Road and 185th in the future. This recommendation has NOT been vetted to the extent of the Urban and Rural Reserve considerations and will require further discussion.
>
> b) The area marked "H" on the draft revised map includes 67 gross acres (41 net buildable). Undesignated is recommended solely for the purpose of facilitating a future transportation connection from TV Highway (also South Hillsboro/Cornelius Pass Rd.) to Farmington Road. This will enhance connectivity of all modes. This recommendation has NOT been vetted to the extent of the Urban and Rural Reserve considerations and will require further discussion.
>
> c) The area marked "I" on the draft revised map includes 9 gross acres (zero buildable). Undesignated is recommended solely for the purpose of facilitating future transportation improvements along State Highway 99 W. This recommendation has NOT been vetted to the extent of the Urban and Rural Reserve considerations and will require further discussion.
>
> Unfortunately, Andy and I will be in Washington DC from tomorrow morning (12/5) until late Thursday evening (12/9) and thus not available for meetings. However, we will both have access to email for your comments, questions or suggestions and we will do our best

to respond. Brent is, of course, an excellent source of information.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Tom and Andy
>
>
>
>
>
> <AreaE.PDF>
> <DraftIGAmap.pdf>
> <Dec03_mapB.PDF>
> <Dec03_Acres.pdf>

From: Mike Dahlstrom
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 7:38 AM
To: 'Nick Christensen'
Cc: Philip Bransford
Subject: RE: Reserves

Good morning Nick.
Sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

The original proposal began with discussions from Chair Brian and Chair-Elect Duyck. The other three commissioners were then given information to review late last week. The worksession yesterday was the first opportunity for Commissioners to discuss this publicly.

Regards,
Mike

Mike Dahlstrom
Program Educator
Washington County - DLUT
Planning Division #350-14
155 North First Avenue
Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072
503-846-8101
mike_dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us

From: Nick Christensen [mailto:Nick.Christensen@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2010 3:37 PM
To: Mike Dahlstrom
Subject: Reserves

Mike –

There was some question at the council today as to whether the Duyck/Brian memo reflected a proposal from Washington County or just the opinion of two commissioners. Are you able to clarify?

Thanks,

Nick Christensen
News Reporter
Metro
nick.christensen@oregonmetro.gov
503-813-7583 (desk)
503-952-6757 (cell)

http://oregonmetro.gov/news

Brent Curtis

From: Angie Aguilar
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 2:26 PM
To: Tom Brian; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck
Cc: Mike Dahlstrom; Rob Massar; Robert Davis; Brent Curtis; Andrew Singelakis
Subject: RE: Mtg request from Metro -this Friday 12/10

I'm on it. I'll let you know once I've confirmed.
Thanks.

From: Tom Brian [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 2:23 PM
To: Angie Aguilar; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck
Cc: Mike Dahlstrom; Rob Massar; Robert Davis; Brent Curtis
Subject: RE: Mtg request from Metro -this Friday 12/10

Angie:
I have spoken with Andy and Carlotta. Please confirm our availability for 12:00p.m. noon on Friday. This would be lunch...let's try Stanford's/Kruse Way (off I-5)? An alternate to that would be the Oswego Grill, also on Kruse Way just off I-5.

Attending: Brian/Duyck/Collette/Hosticka/Harrington...

Thank you.
Tom

From: Angie Aguilar [mailto:Angie_Aguilar@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 12:12 PM
To: Dennis Mulvihill; Tom Brian; Andy Duyck
Cc: Mike Dahlstrom; Rob Massar; Robert Davis
Subject: Mtg request from Metro -this Friday 12/10

Ina Zucker called this morning on behalf of Council President Carlota Collette asking for a meeting with Andy and Tom this Friday with the three Metro Councilors regarding the Urban-Rural Reserves. She said Carlota spoke with Tom earlier this week.

Is this possible? If so she mentioned times that work for them are 12-1:30 or 4:30 for 1 hour. Meeting place suggestion - some place on Kruse Way

Ina's contact info:
503 797-1543
ina.zucker.oregonmetro.gov

Brent Curtis

From: Angie Aguilar
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 4:21 PM
To: Andy Duyck; Tom Brian
Cc: Dennis Mulvihill; Rob Massar; Andrew Singelakis; Brent Curtis; Mike Dahlstrom
Subject: FW: Mtg w/ Tom and Andy Re: Rural- Reserves this Friday

The meeting is confirmed for Friday 12/10 at noon at Stanford's. I've put it on your calendar.

From: Ina Zucker [mailto:Ina.Zucker@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 2:57 PM
To: Angie Aguilar
Subject: RE: Mtg w/ Tom and Andy Re: Rural- Reserves this Friday

Hi Angie—

Yes, noon at Friday at Stanford's will work for our councilors. Thanks for your help with this.

--Ina

Ina Zucker, Council Policy Coordinator
Metro Council
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232
503/797-1543
ina.zucker@oregonmetro.gov

www.oregonmetro.gov
Metro | People places. Open Spaces.

From: Angie Aguilar [mailto:Angie_Aguilar@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 2:39 PM
To: Ina Zucker
Subject: Mtg w/ Tom and Andy Re: Rural- Reserves this Friday

Hi Ina,
I just left you a voicemail. Andy and Tom are available to meet at noon this Friday for a lunch meeting. They would like to meet at Stanford's/Kruse Way (off I-5). Does that work?

Angie Aguilar
Executive Assistant
Washington County
Administrative Office &
Board of Commissioners
503.846.8302

Brent Curtis

From: Tom Brian [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, December 12, 2010 12:01 PM
To: Roy Rogers; Dick Schouten; [redacted]
Cc: Dan Olsen; Brent Curtis; Mike Dahlstrom; dgmulvihill@gmail.com
Subject: DRAFT # 2...REVISED URBAN AND RURAL RESERVES MAPS AND ACREAGE CALCULATIONS
Attachments: Dec11_Dsize.pdf; Dec11_IGAmap.pdf; Dec11_SRmap.pdf; Dec11_Acres.pdf

Colleagues:
Andy and I have continued to meet and talk with others during the week. Clearly there were plenty of misunderstandings and erroneous communications zipping around but we have made progress on increasing understanding of our intent and proposals. Most importantly, Andy and I have discussed with others the principles upon which the maps were constructed, and heard more about the concerns others had regarding our proposal. With these discussions and good faith efforts, we believe the attached maps bring us closer together and increase the possibilities that a positive result can still occur. We accept the fact that "positive result" is in the eye of the beholder.

Attached are maps that illustrate revisions occurring as a result of meetings with Metro Councilors and others. Metro Councilors have NOT promised or committed to support these maps, but we believe we are within reach of obtaining necessary support on the Metro Council. We also believe the proposals reflected in these maps fully comply with the direction given by LCDC in their approved motions and discussion.

To summarize the effect of the maps:

- Area A: Forest Grove...Changes Urban Reserves to Undesignated east and north of Council Creek (reduction of UR by 28 gross acres/16 buildable). This is the same as last week's map.
- Area B: Cornelius...Changes Urban Reserves to Rural Reserves north of Council Creek and west of Sussbauer Road (reduction of UR by 430 gross acres/324 buildable). This is the same as last week's map.
- Area C: Cornelius...Changes Urban Reserves to Undesignated north of Council Creek and east of Sussbauer Road (reduction of UR by 194 gross acres/146 buildable). This is the same as last week's map. B & C total 624 gross acres/470 buildable).
- Area D: North of Hwy 26...Changes Undesignated to Urban Reserves west of 8 B (addition of 585 gross acres/392 buildable). This is the same as last week's map and is the entire replacement for reduced UR in Cornelius and FG (652gross/408 buildable).
- Area E: North of Hwy 26...eliminates 40 acres of UR proposed in last week's map; creates area of 290 acres of undesignated rather than 592 acres as proposed in last week's map.
- Area F: North of Hwy 26...remains Rural Reserve rather than change to Undesignated as proposed in last week's map.
- Area G: North of Rock Creek (between Cornelius Pass Road and 185th)...832 acres remains Rural Reserve rather than change to Undesignated as proposed in last week's map.
- Areas H and I: transportation corridor between South Hillsboro and Farmington Road, and along 99W by Sherwood; both remain Rural Reserves rather than change to Undesignated as proposed in last week's map (76 gross acres combined).

By the numbers, compared to the Regionally approved map sent to LCDC...

- Urban Reserves reductions: 652 gross acres (624 acres at Cornelius, Areas B & C and 28 acres at FG, Area A)...replaced by 585 gross acres (north of Hwy 26, Area D); net reduction of 67 acres Urban Reserves.
- Undesignated reductions (utilized for replacement): 585 gross acres (Area D)...ADDED: 28 acres (FG Area A), 194 acres (Cornelius Area C) and 290 acres North of Hwy 26 (Area E); net reduction of 73 acres of Undesignated.
- Rural Reserves additions: 430 acres gained (Cornelius Area B) and 290 acres reduced (to undesignated, north of Hwy 26, Area E); net addition of 140 acres Rural Reserves

This map reflects net reductions of Urban Reserves, net reductions of Undesignated and net additions of Rural Reserves. Furthermore, Andy and I believe, based upon testimony as well as research, the land recommended for replacement land is 1) less productive farmland than north of Cornelius and 2) more productive employment land with transportation access and other infrastructure adjacent.

Please let us know your comments ASAP. We would like to get the revised maps to the Metro Council and the public as soon as possible (no later than Monday morning).

Thank you,
Tom and Andy)

Brent Curtis

From: Richard Benner [Richard.Benner@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 10:01 AM
To: Brent Curtis; BEASLEY Charles; dan chandler (dchandler@co.clackamas.or.us)
Cc: Tim O'Brien; John Williams; Dan Cooper
Subject: Draft Remand Findings
Attachments: Reserves new findings.doc

1/4/11
Brent, Chuck and Dan:
Here is a draft of revisions to the "overall" findings (pp. 1-16) in redline so you can see what's new.

You will recall that the principal *legal* basis for LCDC's remand of several urban reserves in Washington County was that the findings did not adequately respond to the requirement in 0040(11) of the rules. First, the findings did not expressly explain why we designated Foundation Ag Land as urban reserve with reference to the *rural* factors in the rules. Second, there was concern that the explanation with reference to the urban factors was not sufficiently clear and precise.

With these weaknesses in mind, I added paragraphs that explain why we designated Foundation Agricultural Land as urban reserve in relation to the rural factors. I also beefed up the discussion of urban factors (more precision; more references to facts in the record).

As I started this, I thought Multnomah and Clackamas counties – where Metro also designated Foundation Land as urban reserve – would have to strengthen their findings. However, having completed this draft, I now think we can cover the weaknesses in the overall findings. Let me know if you agree with this assessment.

Some of the redlining is simply moving old text to new places. The acreage numbers sprinkled throughout the overall findings will need adjustments to reflect a yet-to-be-reached agreement between Metro and Washington County. Significantly, the new numbers will almost certainly *not* require a change in the current 50-year reserves period.

I intend to add materials to the record in the process leading to adoption by the Council of an ordinance revising the map of reserves in Washington County. You can see what I would add by finding my citations to "Metro Supp. Rec. __."

NOTE: I will need some help with citations to your records for the findings on pp. 7 and 8 (suitabilities).

NOTE: Metro and Washington County have tentatively scheduled meetings to adopt ordinances to re-designate reserves in the county in the second half of March. Multnomah and Clackamas counties will, at least, have to re-adopt the overall findings (as with the first designations, no county has to adopt another county's findings) as revised. In order to submit the remand package to LCDC as quickly as possible (to have a chance to gain full approval LCDC's June 16-17 or August 4-5 meeting), Dan and Chuck should try to get adoption of revised overall findings on the counties' schedules for the end of March.

Last point: Chuck and Dan, I do not know what Richard Whitman has decided about entry of a remand order (I hear only rumors). He told me weeks ago that he was mulling the question and would not issue an order without checking with us. (I've urged him NOT to enter an order but, rather, to cut down on litigation, wait til

we re-submit and enter a final order after approval.) If the department decides not to issue a remand order, that means your two counties have an opportunity to "fix" anything that you think makes the designations vulnerable to the inevitable appeals of the LCDC approval order to the Court of Appeals.

Dick

Brent Curtis

From: Dan Olsen
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 5:19 PM
To: Brent Curtis
Subject: FW: Reserves

FYI. Did not see you cc'd on this.

From: Dennis Mulvihill [mailto:dgmulvihill@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 12:12 PM
To: Robert Davis; Dan Olsen
Subject: Fwd: Reserves

FYI

From: Dennis Mulvihill <dgmulvihill@gmail.com>
Date: January 12, 2011 12:09:52 PM PST
To: Andy Duyck [redacted], Roy Roge [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Reserves

We need to meet with them. They are aware of our principles and may be able to offer options that are in keeping with them, in other words, satisfy our interests.

I think it good for all involved to see we are resolute (adhering to our goals and purposes) but not stubborn (determined not to change our attitude or position in spite of good arguments or reasons). Given the ramifications of failure the cities as well as citizens need to see we are doing all we can to find a way to yes.

The legislation providing the authority for the Urban and Rural Reserves process was crafted by many stakeholders, all of whom have a legitimate right to argue for their point of view through to the end. In our favor is that all stakeholders agreed status quo was unacceptable.
DGM

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dennis Mulvihill" <Dennis_Mulvihill@co.washington.or.us>
Date: January 12, 2011 11:39:30 AM PST
To: "Dennis G. Mulvihill" <dgmulvihill@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Reserves

DGM

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Roy Rogers" [redacted]

Date: January 12, 2011 11:30:29 AM PST
To: "Andy Duyck" <Andy_Duyck@co.washington.or.us>, "Dennis Mulvihill" <Dennis_Mulvihill@co.washington.or.us>
Subject: RE: Reserves

It looks like our meeting with them has been moved from the original Tuesday date to a Monday at Metro. I will try and be available. I agree with Andy's comments but would like to hear what they propose. It could be very embarrassing in the future if we do not give them the courtesy of at least hearing their proposal. They could contend that we were unwilling to discuss options (some of which maybe of great benefit to our citizens).

Roy

-----Original Message-----
From: Andy Duyck [mailto:Andy_Duyck@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 11:18 AM
To: Roy Rogers; Dennis Mulvihill
Subject: Reserves

Gentlemen,
In my discussions with Tom Hughes this morning, it was clear that Metro is still open to crafting a deal that is different from that which we proposed in the latest IGA revision. This would involve 1000 friends as well as Jim Irvine. I leave it to you to figure out what kind of a deal this is. Tom did not give specifics. I suspect that this is the reason that they want to meet with Roy and I, not, as was said, to choreograph the hearings.
I did my best to reaffirm that this is not an option. I explained that as a matter of protocol, any "deal" should begin with the County. I made all of the usual arguments, but Tom kept telling me to keep an open mind about it.
I left it with this.... The County has taken it in the shorts at every step. We have negotiated in good faith, and been pushed back every time. The only deal that would bring us back to the table is one in which we have something to gain. I told Tom that if Metro would offer us an alternative that they were willing to publicly endorse, which included enough to " make it worth our while" and that we believed was an increase in reserves flexibility, then I would circle back to our Board in order to consider it. Tom knows this is a high bar, but I felt it prudent to let him know that we have no interest in being pushed once again. I would suggest that this be discussed at a policy meeting prior to the 31st. If Roy is available, I'd like to have him in on the discussion.

Andy D

Brent Curtis

From: Kelly Ross [kelly@westernadvocates.com]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 8:42 AM
To: Brent Curtis
Cc: dgmulvihill@gmail.com
Subject: Mtng. w/Councilor Collette

Brent, I have a 10:00 meeting with Carlotta Collette this morning to talk about several issues. . .anything new on the reserves discussion that I should talk to her about?

Kelly Ross
Western Advocates, Inc.
12725 SW 66th Ave., Suite 107
Portland, OR 97223
(503) 924-1181
(503) 380-1316 Cell
(503) 597-3668 FAX

Angie Aguilar

From: Alexandra Roberts-Bullock [Alexandra.Roberts-Bullock@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 9:15 AM
To: Robin McArthur; John Williams; Carl Hosticka; Kathryn Harrington; Tom Hughes; Andy Shaw; Roy Rogers; Dennis Mulvihill; Andy Duyck; Andrew Singelakis; Brent Curtis; Richard Benner
Cc: Ina Zucker; Nikolai Ursin; Suzannah Hamlin; Juli Mills; Angie Aguilar
Subject: Meeting Confirmation: 2/17/11 Reserves Meeting

MEETING CONFIRMATION

Meeting: Metro/Washington County Reserves Meeting
Date: Thursday, February 17th, 2011
Time: 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Location: Metro Regional Center, Room 301 (Council Department)

Please feel free to contact me with any questions/concerns.

Thank you!
~ Alex

Alexandra Roberts
Director's Assistant
Planning and Development

Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1839
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | Making a great place

Brent Curtis

From: Richard Benner [Richard.Benner@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 1:53 PM
To: Brent Curtis; John Williams; Robin McArthur
Subject: RE: PossibleOrdinanceTimelines.doc
Attachments: Reserves Remand IGA.docx

Brent,
I send Richard W an email Friday with the general outlines of the schedule you, Robin, John and I discussed that afternoon. As I mentioned, Richard had told us we should expect to be on LCDC's August agenda if we submit our new reserves to the department by the end of April. He responded tersely to my email, with no further elaboration about the agency's review schedule.

I intend to send RW another email late Thursday or Friday, telling him what happened at the two governments meeting at 3:30 (assuming something of note happens). Then I'll press him about schedule.

Here is a slightly revised version of the draft IGA Dan Olsen and I had been developing before the county board adopted its IGA. I sent this version to Dan several days ago. Let me know what you would like to add on the schedule.
Dick

From: Brent Curtis [mailto:Brent_Curtis@co.washington.or.us]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 1:43 PM
To: John Williams; Richard Benner; Robin McArthur
Subject: FW: PossibleOrdinanceTimelines.doc

Ordinance 740 is the ordinance which will conform our plan to the IGA. Option B is the current preferred. I assume we will together amend Washco existing IGA to explicitly include a schedule. Based on past practice we should list a date for completion of the joint record and transmittal to DLCD.

I am sure the BCC will ask me questions tomorrow re schedule, a joint meeting on 3/15 and whether Richard Whitman has committed to a June or Augest, 2011 LCDC meeting. To the extent you know any more about these issues today, please give me a quick update. Thanks

Angie Aguilar

From: Andy Duyck
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 2:53 PM
To: Dennis Mulvihill
Cc: Andy Duyck; Dan Olsen; Brent Curtis
Subject: Re: Reserves Agreement Draft

Well, you might want to have my name spelled correctly at the end, but otherwise this is a great piece of work and sets the tone I was hoping for!

Andy D

On Feb 16, 2011, at 2:00 PM, "Dennis Mulvihill" <dgmulvihill@gmail.com> wrote:

> Jim Middaugh drafted this. I think it works as is. Comments? I need to get back to Jim asap with any corrections etc..
> DGM
>
> <DRAFT reserves announcement.doc>

Ken Ray
Metro
503-797-1508
ken.ray@oregonmetro.gov

From: Dennis Mulvihill
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 1:28 PM
To: Ken Ray; Jim Middaugh; Mike Dahlstrom; Philip Bransford
Subject: Fwd: Andy signature

Chairman really likes the letter. Please delete signature once used. CC me when letter is sent. Does Washington County need to send letter to it's own list?

DGM

<Joint Duyck-Hughes reserves announcement - 2-22-11.doc>

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken Ray [mailto:Ken.Ray@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 5:10 PM
To: Dennis Mulvihill
Cc: Philip Bransford; Mike Dahlstrom; Jim Middaugh
Subject: Talking points on Metro/Washington County reserves proposal

Thanks Dennis. Attached is the version I am sending to the Metro Council today. Please feel free to share this with your commissioners, and please let me know if they have any questions or concerns about this. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: Dennis Mulvihill
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Ken Ray
Subject: Re: For review: talking points on updated reserves proposal

It's ok for now. We will likely need additional versions.

DGM

On Feb 22, 2011, at 3:38 PM, "Ken Ray" <Ken.Ray@oregonmetro.gov> wrote:

> Dennis --
>
> I left you a message on your cell phone about some talking points we've developed here at Metro that hopefully Metro Councilors and the County Commissioners can use in discussing the revised reserves proposal.
>
> Before I circulate this to my elected officials, and ask you to do the same to yours, I wanted to send you a draft to review quickly and provide comment on. Included in the talking points is a short FAQ section in which I tried to address likely questions about features on the map, notably the areas north of Cornelius and Forest Grove.
>
> Please review this document at your earliest opportunity and send me any concerns and suggested changes you may have. I am aiming to get this in the hands of Councilors before 5:00 p.m. Feel free to call if you have any questions.
>
> Thanks.
>
>
> Ken Ray
> Metro
> 503-797-1508
> ken.ray@oregonmetro.gov

From: Metro Council President Tom Hughes [mailto:MetroCouncil=oregonmetro.gov@mcsv72.net] **On Behalf Of** Metro Council President Tom Hughes
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 3:24 PM
To: Philip Bransford
Subject: An important message from Tom Hughes and Andy Duyck

Metro | *Making a great place*

Feb. 22, 2011

On behalf of the staff and elected officials of Washington County and Metro we are pleased to report there is a new urban and rural reserves proposal that responds to the direction provided by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in October.

As you may know, the Commission voted unanimously last fall to approve urban and rural reserve designations in Clackamas and Multnomah counties, and most of the urban reserve designations in Washington County.

Two urban reserve areas were sent back to Metro and Washington County by the Commission. One was just north of Cornelius and the other was just north of Forest Grove. The Commission provided oral direction to Washington County and Metro to remove the urban reserve designation near Cornelius, and to strengthen the findings of the area near Forest Grove.

Our entire region benefits when elected and community leaders reach for and support compromise even when their strongest supporters urge a different path. When we put the region's needs ahead of any individual interest, we build on Oregon's great legacy of land use innovation and leadership created by our parents and grandparents.

To this end we are proposing targeted changes to address the Commission's direction. Our first commitment is always to the people of our region and their desire to provide long-term protection for valuable farm and forestlands, while also providing land for good jobs and homes now and in the future. Equally important, we believe this proposal thoroughly addresses all of the concerns raised by the Commission while providing certainty to farmers, businesses and working families.

If approved the proposal will result in 50 years of protection for 266,992 acres of valuable farmland, forest land and natural areas for current and future generations. The proposal also provides 28,548 acres of developable land across the region to ensure we can provide good jobs and homes for everyone now and in the future, in a way the makes the most of our

existing cities and neighborhoods.

This proposal is the result of unprecedented partnerships and participation from local governments, advocacy organizations and thousands of citizens. It's a one-of-a-kind, collaborative roadmap for the effective utilization of land that no other region in the United States has achieved. But let's be clear: our work will not be done until the public has a chance to thoroughly review and comment on this important decision.

So take a look at the proposal, map and other information on Metro's web site. The Metro Council and Washington County Board of Commissioners will hold a joint hearing in Hillsboro on Tuesday, March 15, to consider your comments on this proposal and to vote on a revised reserves agreement.

If a final agreement is approved by both bodies on March 15, each would proceed to formal adoption of ordinances, findings of fact, and maps in April. At each step Metro and Washington County will provide opportunities for public testimony.

Finally, Clackamas County and Multnomah County will also need to take formal action on the overall findings for the reserves program because of the revisions required by LCDC. After formal adoption, the revised urban and rural reserves will be presented to LCDC for review.

We are proud of our work and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Andy Duyck
Chair,
Washington County Board of Commissioners

Tom Hughes
Metro Council President

Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1700
503-797-1804 TDD
503-797-1797 fax

TALKING POINTS

Date: February 22, 2011

For: Metro Councilors and Washington County Commissioners

Subject: Revised urban and rural reserves proposal for Washington County

Audience: General public

Messaging goal: Develop an appreciation by the public that the revised reserves proposal responds to LCDC's concerns, protects valuable farm and forestland, and provides land for strategic job creation now and in the future.

Prepared by: Ken Ray

KEY MESSAGES:

- **This proposal ensures we can provide good jobs and homes** for everyone now and in the future, **makes the most of our existing cities and neighborhoods**, and **protects farmland, forest land and natural areas for current and future generations**.
- **This completes a four-year collaborative effort to shape our region's future for the next 50 years**.
- **We believe this proposal thoroughly addresses all of the concerns raised by LCDC** while providing certainty to farmers, businesses and working families.
- **We welcome feedback from the public on this proposal.**

Frequently Asked Questions

Q: What parts of the reserves map have changed since last fall?
A: (See attached sheet that lists adjustments to the reserves map.)

Q: Why is the only public hearing on this proposal being held at 10 a.m. on a weekday when most citizens who work cannot attend?
A: There are plenty of opportunities to comment on the revised reserves proposal, and testifying at a public meeting is only one of them. Metro and Washington County are accepting public comments via e-mail at reserves@oregonmetro.gov, and there is more information on Metro's reserves web page (www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves) on how to contact Metro Councilors and Washington County Commissioners directly. All comments submitted will be considered and included in the public record.

Q: How many total acres of urban and rural reserve will there be if this proposal is accepted by LCDC?

A: This proposal provides 151,574 acres of rural reserve in Washington County (an increase of 38 acres from the previous proposal) and 13,817 acres of urban reserve (a decrease of 67 acres from last October). If accepted by LCDC, the total acreage, across all three counties, would be 266,992 for rural reserves and 28,548 for urban reserves.

Q: The urban reserve north of Forest Grove (7B) didn't change much. Did you fully address LCDC's concerns about this area?

A: LCDC asked us to look carefully at the area east of Council Creek. This proposal addresses that direction by removing that area from urban reserve designation.

Q: Why is some of the old urban reserve north of Cornelius (7I) being converted to undesignated, rather than rural reserve?

A: The majority of the former urban reserve (430 of 624 acres) will become rural reserve and off-limits to development for the next 50 years. The remaining 194 acres would become undesignated because they feature many small parcels of exception land and have a strong natural boundary. Under state law, this would be among the lowest priority land for urban expansion during the next 50 years.

Q: Where can I find more information about this topic?

A: More information on this revised proposal can be found on Metro's urban and rural reserves web site at www.oregonmetro.gov/reserves.

Changes to Washington County reserves map

Adjustment Area	Total Acres
Area A – East Portion of Urban Reserve 7B Change from Urban Reserve to Undesignated These 28 acres are located between Council Creek and Highway 47 in the vicinity of the intersection of NW Purdin Road/NW Verboort Road and Highway 47	28
Area B – West Portion of Former Urban Reserve 7I Change from Urban Reserve to Rural Reserve This portion of former urban reserve 7I is south of NW Long Road between NW Susbauer Road and NW Cornelius-Schefflin Road	430
Area C – East Portion of Former Urban Reserve 7I Change from Urban Reserve to Undesignated This portion of former urban reserve 7I is east of NW Susbauer Road and includes the area around NW Hobbs Road	194
Area D – Adjacent to Urban Reserve 8B Change from Undesignated to Urban Reserve This area is north of Highway 26, south of NW West Union Road and includes land on both sides of NW Groveland Road	585
Area E – South of SW Rosedale Road Change from Rural Reserve to Undesignated This area is south of SW Rosedale Road, west of SW Farmington Road and includes the parcels along SW Riggs Road	383