

**Urban and Rural Reserves**  
**Phase 2 Open House – Gresham, July 7, 2008**  
**Summary of Public Input**

Summary prepared by Maggie Dickerson, Clackamas County staff

*Date of draft: July 18, 2008*

**General**

The Gresham open house was designed to provide an opportunity for input for anyone in the region, but especially for people in east Multnomah and east Clackamas counties. The open house drew 23 attendees.

Approximately 33 responses were received. Responses were written on large table maps, small map-questionnaires, and on flip charts. Clackamas County posed a question about a potential boundary amendment being considered by the county Policy Advisory Committee. Some attendees took questionnaires home with them and may mail in responses. All responses from Phase 2 open houses will be compiled at the completion of the open house series. The final document will contain appendices of verbatim comments.

The following summary reflects general themes and is not considered a thorough analysis of responses.

**Suggestions regarding study area boundary**

- Consider expanding the study area boundary to follow Highway 211 from Sandy to I-5 to protect more farmland.
- Expanding the study area boundary to Highway 211 would infringe on the outlying cities.
- Expand the study area boundary in the region SW of I-5 near Aurora/Dundee/Newberg to protect farmland.

**Suggestions regarding urban/rural reserve designations**

- The Hamlet of Mulino wants to be designated a “rural reserve”.
- The Tualatin National Wildlife refuge is a regional asset and should be considered for rural reserves.
- Protect Abernathy Creek.

**Questions or suggestions about the data underlying the project**

- The underlying population assumptions were questioned.
- There were questions about the “Shape of the Region” studies.

**Suggestions, comments and questions about how the study will be carried out**

- Consider wine growing conditions; also smaller niche farms.
- How is the transportation plan influencing designation of reserves?

- Regarding population forecasts: look at demographic/future development studies used by high tech interests; also check project forecasts against other Metro forecasts.
- Can the study prioritize preserving or re-creating corridors for animals & plants to travel – important for populations that will be challenged by global warming?

#### **Process questions**

- What is the role of Planning Commissions, public hearing processes/ex parte contact?
- What is the interaction between reserves and the urban growth boundary amendment process?

#### **Other**

- Farmers don't want to be locked out from being able to urbanize.
- What guarantees rural reserves will really be off-limits?
- Who speaks for the trees?
- We want to preserve our rural lifestyle.

#### **Regarding the Clackamas County's PAC's idea to move the boundary to Highway 211:**

- Three people responded. Two thought it was a good idea, one was opposed.

## VERBATIM RESPONSES FROM THE JULY 7 OPEN HOUSE

### RESPONSES TO THE HIGHWAY 211 QUESTION

At the “question” station, Clackamas County asked about the concept of moving the study area boundary to Highway 211. The question was posed as follows:

The Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) would like your opinions on this idea: *Have the study area follow Highway 211, from Sandy to I-5.*

Good idea! Why; Bad idea: Why, Other suggestions, What and Why.

There were three responses to this, noted below.

Good idea! 2

Why:

- Considering that this land that would be included in the study area is listed as “important” farmland, expanding the study area boundary to follow Highway 211 from Sandy to I-5 would potentially protect more farmland – which I think is a good thing.
- Seems like hgw 211 is an important rural transportation corridor and if brought into the study area maybe it could be improved for the preserved farmland along it.

Bad idea! 1

Why: What purpose would it serve to infringe on the outlying areas? Where the local cities should have control!

Other suggestions 2

- What: If this expansion of the study area means the potential to designate more rural reserves for important farm and forestland I think it could be beneficial to at least study the area since it is designated as important farmland but I think there is already a lot of area under consideration.
- What: Expand the study area boundary in the region SW of I5, near Aurora/Dundee/Newberg.  
Why: This draft area looks a little thin and narrow compared to other areas. More farmland could be protected if the boundary here were expanded.

### RESPONSES ON LARGE TABLE MAPS

The one large table map with input had two comments, both referring to the importance of the Tualatin National Wildlife refuge and its importance as a regional asset, and that it should be considered for rural reserves.

## FLIP CHAT NOTES

Below are the verbatim flip chart notes, except that italics are provided by project staff.

### From Station 3: "Reserves Study Area"

- What is Foundation Land?
- Protect Abernathy Creek.
- Consideration (*should be given*) for ideal wine growing conditions, not just soils but aspect. (*I think "aspect" means climate/orientation in this context?*)
- Have we looked at demographic/future development studies used by high tech interests, Google etc?
- What consideration is given to smaller niche farms?
- How is transportation plan influencing designation of reserves?

### From Station 4: "What's Next"

- When did Metro start the studies, the background work and why?
- What guarantees rural reserves will really be off-limits?
- What is the interaction between reserves and boundary amendment process? Can rural reserves be adjusted via amendments at all? Are both undesignated urban reserves eligible for existing amendment process?
- Metro web site reference to "urban reserves" only and map, should say "urban and rural."
- Like building blocks phrasing on web site.
- Look for differential between TAZ population on Metro website (RTP pop forecasts).
- Role of Planning Commissions? Public hearing process/ex parte contact?
- Farmers don't want to be locked out from being able to urbanize.

## RESPONSES TO "HELP SHAPE THE NEXT HALF-CENTURY" SURVEY

Three surveys were turned in at the meeting. Others may be mailed in later; in which case they will be summarized with all surveys as a group. Questions asked and the responses to the questions are listed verbatim below:

### Are these the areas that the Reserves Steering Committee should study and analyze further?

- The Hamlet of Mulino wants to be designated as a "rural reserve".
- (*The following entries appear to be notes for another purpose*)
  - PMAR - Portland Metro Assoc. Realtors
  - Yelp - Peer review site free
  - Recommendations like angus (argus?) list
  - PDX - search

tribe.net -- all bunnymen (?) people  
Alumni associations of universities

**What additional information should be considered in defining these study areas?**

- Metro final TAZ shows a population increase from 2005 to 2030 of 608, 700. OEA is 564,560. Why is the 1,000,000 number used in this program?
- My concern is specifically with preserving/(re)creating corridors for animals & plants to travel – essentially with establishing a web of transit opportunities for populations that will be challenged by global warming. Can the STUDY piece of this process prioritize land uses of that sort? I hope big issues like this will continue to be considered @ all stages.

**Why are you interested in the Urban and Rural Reserves process?**

- To preserve our rural lifestyle.
- I co-chair the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI).

**Do you have additional comments or suggestions?**

- Who speaks for the trees? (Thanks, Dr. Seuss, for that). The question is serious, though – is there land that can't/won't be "urban" or "rural", but will provide opportunities to wildlife of different sorts to travel the region? Keep this in mind, please.