

Urban and Rural Reserves
Phase II Open House – Forest Grove, June 26
DRAFT Summary of Public Input
Summary prepared by Mike Dahlstrom, Washington County staff

General

The Forest Grove open house drew 49 attendees.

Approximately 24 responses were received during the Forest Grove open house.

Responses were submitted via large table maps, small map-questionnaires, postcards and chart packed input. The following summary reflects general themes and is not considered a thorough analysis of responses. All responses from Phase II open houses will be compiled at the completion of the open house series and contain appendices of verbatim comments.

Intent of designation process appears to be unclear:

- Some responses indicate clarity is needed for third option for undesignated lands in study area. Make it clear not all lands in study area will be or need designation.
- A couple of responses indicate need to address outcome of lands within study area not designated; for instance, are un-designated lands available for UGB expansion within the 40 – 50 years if they are not identified as urban or rural reserves?
- A couple responses suggest including Yamhill County lands adjacent to study area.
- A couple responses indicate confusion of reserves process and existing cities' UGB overlaps (specifically Banks and Forest Grove)

Intent of designation process is understood:

- Several responses indicate desire to move forward and designate specific areas for urban and rural reserves consideration within study area.
- One response questioned peculiarity of northern study area inclusion of all of Multnomah County and a mis-alignment of Washington County.

Other:

- A couple of responses desire clarity on next steps, what happens to lands designated regarding; concept plans, UGB expansion (or not), governances, zoning (re-zoning), development
- Address protections of property owner rights