







RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #15 ANNOTATED AGENDA

Date:June 10, 2009Time:9:00 a.m. to noonPlace:Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

- I. Welcome and Introductions (9:00 9:15) Debra Nudelman, facilitator
 - Agenda review
 - Adoption of May 13, 2009 meeting minutes
 - Updates since last meeting

Packet materials: May 13, 2009 meeting minutes.

- II. Public Comment (9:15 9:25)
- III. Rural and Urban Reserve Candidate Area Evaluation Process (9:25 10:25) Core 4 staff
 - Next steps in Rural and Urban Reserve candidate area evaluation process
 - Anticipated work products and timing

Desired Outcomes: Steering Committee understanding of candidate area evaluation process, anticipated work products and timing. Packet materials: None.

- IV. Break (10:25 10:40)
- V. Making The Greatest Place Update (10:40 11:30) *Metro Staff*
 - Overview of preliminary Employment Urban Growth Report
 - Clarifying questions from Steering Committee

Desired Outcomes: Steering Committee overview and understanding of preliminary Employment Urban Growth Report and status of policy discussions about employment. Packet Materials: Executive summary of preliminary Employment Urban Growth Report.

- VI. Next Steps and Wrap-up (11:30 noon) Debra Nudelman
 - Upcoming meetings & topics
 - Confirm agreed-upon next steps
 - Meeting summary

VII. Adjourn

Reserves Steering Committee Upcoming Agenda Items Draft – subject to change

July 8 – MEETING CANCELLED

August 12

- Discussion of urban and rural reserve evaluation information
- Making The Greatest Place update: status of policy and investment decision discussions

September 9 (*please hold extended meeting time – 9 am to 4 pm*)

• Presentation of rural and urban reserve recommendations

NEW MEETING PROPOSED: September 23 (please hold extended meeting time – 9 am to 4 pm)

- Discussion of rural and urban reserve recommendations
- Making The Greatest Place update: Draft Urban Growth Report, draft Regional Transportation Plan

October 14 (please hold extended meeting time – 9 am to 4 pm)

- Complete discussion of proposed urban and rural reserve areas
- Recommend preliminary urban and rural reserve areas to Core 4 [Phase 3 completion]

The committee will receive regular updates on Making The Greatest Place activities

Phase 4 milestone: Reserve areas recommended via intergovernmental agreements - Dec. 2009

Phase 5 milestone: Metro designates urban reserves; counties designate rural reserves – May 2010

RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

May 13, 2009; 9:00 am – 12:00 noon Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Core 4 Members Present: Washington County Chair Tom Brian, Multnomah County Commissioner Jeff Cogen, Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Clackamas County Commissioner Charlotte Lehan.

Reserves Steering Committee Members Present: Susan Anderson, Chris Barhyte, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Kathy Figley, Jack Hoffman, Mike Houck, Kirk Jarvie, Keith Johnson, Tim Knapp, Greg Manning, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Dick Strathern.

Alternates Present: Susan Barnes, Doug Decker, Meg Fernekees, Mara Gross, Jim Johnson, Richard Kidd, Jim Labbe, Marc San Soucie, Michael Williams.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Peter Harkema.

I. <u>Welcome and Introductions</u>

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:13 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials.

Deb noted that the word "error" had been changed to "err" on page 10 of the April meeting summary and that Jim Labbe had provided revisions to his comments on page 9. She then asked for any additional comments or amendments to the April meeting summary.

Greg Specht requested that his comment on page 7 be revised to read "...existing jobs will be harder to maintain and new jobs more difficult to attract...."

There being no other modifications, the summary was adopted as final pending the agreed to revisions. Deb then asked for updates since the last Steering Committee meetings.

Greg Manning reported that the business coalition met with Clackamas County regarding the coalition's written recommendations. During this meeting the coalition expressed its continued support for Urban Reserve candidate area designation for the following three areas: I-5 South of the Willamette River, the Highway 26 area, and Pete's Mountain. The parties will continue to discuss these specific areas of Clackamas County in more detail.

Alice Norris requested that Washington County provide a brief explanation of the May 13 Oregonian article. Brent Curtis explained that on Monday, May 11 the WCRCC had been provided with a need analysis to assist the committee in addressing the question of how much land to study in the reserves process. Using the need analysis and Urban Reserves factors the committee determined that it was more appropriate to consider 47,000 acres, rather than the 150,000 acres originally being considered. Brent noted that the county's aspirations are 47,000, that the committee's recommendation was a preliminary evaluation and that additional "screens of evaluations" would be applied at the local and regional level. He then explained that subsequent to the committee's decision a number of errors were identified in the report. The errors were evident and were corrected within 24 hours and, he explained, the new numbers supported the same conclusion. Washington County will be reviewing the report and bringing it back to the WCRCC in early June to confirm that they still affirm their original decision. An update will also be provided to this Reserves Committee following that meeting.

II. <u>Public Comment for Non-Agenda Items</u>

Carol Chesarek, a resident of Forest Park Neighborhood and a member of Multnomah County Reserves CAC, submitted written testimony in the form of a letter regarding Metro's Natural Hazards Tech Memo. Carol explained that she was addressing the committee neither as a representative of either Forest Park Neighborhood nor as a Multnomah County Reserves CAC member. She suggested that applying Oregon Department of Forestry's state hazard map might not be an accurate tool given the fact that it is based on the current rural lands. She noted that there are additional sources of information that could be used to improve the analysis of the Natural Hazard Tech Memo produced by Metro. For example, she suggested that it would be appropriate for Metro to use Washington and Clackamas County's Community Wildfire Protection Plans and Portland's Wildfire Hazard assessment. Similarly, she noted that there are county specific earthquake hazard maps. It will be important to consider the different types of seismic hazards and the access people have to emergency services. Carol believes that the methodology used in the Natural Hazards Tech Memo minimizes the importance of individual hazards.

Art Fiala, resident of the Stafford Triangle, thanked the Reserves Steering Committee for the opportunity to speak and explained that his grandparents had purchased property in the Stafford Triangle area in 1903. His aunt and uncle are still living on the farm and his cousins are farming the land but, unlike in the past, farmers now have a hard time making a profit from the area. Art urges for the area to be designated as an Urban Reserve as it would be a great asset to Clackamas County.

Chris Raujol, a resident of Stafford, explained that in 1901 his grandfather began logging the Stafford Triangle area, in fact many of the roads in the area were started from the original skid roads. Their family has lived in the area since the 1930's and since then have never seen the area be a productive agricultural area. Chris wants the area to be considered an Urban Reserve and believes that the natural beauty can still be protected. He noted that he will submit written comments.

Alan Rosenfeld, citizen of West Linn, has spoken in the past in favor of a Rural Reserve designation for Stafford Triangle because of the unique character of the area and the high costs of infrastructure. He noted that there is currently successful agricultural production in the area including a commercial operation winery, a community supported agriculture farm, a number of produce operations, and equestrian. These operations are different than the historical agriculture of the area. Alan noted that Jim Labbe's update last month may not have sufficiently addressed all the five natural features in Clackamas County. In addition, Alan noted that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) report mentioned at the last Reserves Steering Committee meeting would be worth additional discussion as it identifies I-205 near OR 212/225 and others as highways that are the least likely to accommodate growth and the expense to improve them would be considerable according to ODOT.

Tony Holt, Wilsonville citizen, noted that at the recent public meeting nearly 60% of the attendees came from Wilsonville and that there had been much support to encourage growth within the Urban

Growth Boundary (UGB), protection of foundation agricultural lands, and natural landscape features. He also said that there had been overwhelming support for the protection of the area south of the Willamette River along I-5.

Mike Houck noted that it is important to have opportunity to comment on the natural hazard study and preliminary urban growth report. He noted that page five of the governor's climate change task force report predicts that there will be more severe flood events due to climate change. The 100 year flood plain is likely to look very different in 20 or 30 years and therefore it warrants additional consideration in the Reserves process. He noted that the Natural Hazards Tech Memo may not sufficiently address the individual hazards. For example, areas in a flood plain are likely to be flooded during a flood event regardless of whether it is adjacent to another hazard. Mike will submit written comments.

III. ECONOMIC AND MARKET-BASED HOUSING CHOICE CONSIDERATIONS

Craig Brown introduced Jerry Johnson of Johnson Reid, LLC and noted that the housing industry is in favor of efficient, sustainable growth, and is interested in relying as little as possible on public support. He said that the group disagrees with how the information from Metroscope is being used. He noted that the study does not focus on specific areas and that housing needs to be flexible and should be located close to commercial. Craig said that the report assumes that there will be little or no UGB expansion for 20 years and that the resultant concentration in the center would drive up costs and limit choice. He also noted that the report largely ignores the high costs of infrastructure investment in these areas and the potential impact of future investment and technology changes.

Jerry Johnson made a presentation titled "The U.G.R. and Housing Choice: Economic and Market-based Considerations," in which he explained that Johnson Reid had been hired by a coalition of groups to review the methodologies used by Metro to establish the residential Urban Growth Report (UGR), review the housing needs analysis, and assist in framing the implications of potential policy choices. He explained that the UGR uses a variety of assumptions to outlines a range of potential conclusions and that the assumptions used have significant implications for policy. Jerry went on to discuss five particular assumptions: economics of density, impact on affordability, infrastructure costs, "livability," and economic development. He explained that, for a variety of reasons described in his presentation, it costs more to develop high density areas. In addition, density is driven by achievable price and rent levels, which tend to be high in the center and fall off away from the center, this difference in price points make high density development possible in Portland but not West Linn. Jerry went on to explain that affordability is likely the most important factor in housing choice that higher density development require higher prices to be feasible and higher prices may displace growth outside the UGB. Constrained housing and land supply will also drive up home prices. He questions Metro's assumption in the Housing Needs Study that housing prices are expected to rise by 80% and also whether Metro is giving sufficient consideration to housing choice, including affordability, as is required by state law.

Jerry then explained that the Portland metro area is not a "spoke" model city, but more of a "satellite" model, in which a majority of the employment is located on the margin and not in the city center. In recent history the central and inner ring areas have lost jobs at 0.2% to 0.5% annually whereas the outer ring areas have added jobs at over 3% annually. He suggested that this trend is likely to continue as employers seek cheaper land on the outer ring and that it will be important to have housing available to close to these jobs. Jerry went on to question the assumption that it is

always cheaper to develop in the center. He explained that the degrees of differentials in the Metro studies are not as conclusive as they are assumed to be and the benefit of refill may not be as high as many think, particularly because they assume a high level of public subsidy. In addition, he believes that the urban reserves process must consider transportation efficiently, variety, and cost. He noted that there is no conclusive evidence of the "Centers effect" on transportation, as many work outside the city center. For example, the Forest Grove has a lower average commute time than Portland. Jerry went on to discuss the UGR's estimate of a 27% - 40% refill rate. He questioned whether this level of refill would be possible or desirable and noted that it would likely limit choice, make sites for public services difficult to find and expensive, and the resultant higher density may not be attractive for much of the population. Jerry went on to explain that the economic development of the metro area was an important consideration for the Reserves process. He noted that the Metro area is competing nationally and internationally for jobs and population and that part of our advantage is the available housing stock.

Jerry concluded with a summary of the main points from his presentation and then invited questions.

Greg Manning noted that he had read the residential UGR and Housing Needs Report and felt that a couple of the assumptions were troubling. He asked whether Jerry felt that the areas growth management strategy has helped to buffer against recent market fluctuation.

Jerry responded that he does not believe that we have been buffered and that there are areas that have been over built (e.g. urban condos). He explained Metroscope does not sufficiently reflect that supply and price are economically connected at all levels.

Dick Strathern noted that there are many people involved in evaluation of the long term plan who affirm the assertion that the public is generally not in favor of refill and high density. There are areas, like east Multnomah County, that have great infrastructure and transportation options (e.g. located on a Max line) but are located between the inner circle and the center and are experiencing decay. People living in these places are not in support of additional density and refill.

Councilor Harrington thanked Jerry for his presentation and analysis and noted that later in today's agenda there would be time to discuss the UGR, and that soon Metro will be releasing the Employment Report. She explained that this is the first time that Metro has released a preliminary report to allow for this additional dialogue and input. She noted that there is currently not enough money for the infrastructure to meet the needs of the area and citizens and that Metro has and will continue to take this into consideration. She went on to explain that what is happening in the UGR is informational to the Reserves process; however, the Reserves process is focused on suitability and ultimately we will be designating areas that are adequate. She looks forward to additional discussion about this topic at future MPAC meetings.

Tim Knapp said that he questioned the assertion that there will be continued growth of jobs outside the center and the need for people to live near this employment. He explained that as a fringe resident he knows that the cost of developing infrastructure from scratch is huge, especially if you consider the total costs (i.e. sewer, parks, roads, etc.) as required by Making the Greatest Place. He suggested that without urban renewal it seem unlikely that they will be able to accommodate growth. Jerry responded that he recognizes that urban renewal is a very important tool and that there is variability in infrastructure costs. Some places, Damascus, for example, have very high costs, while other places have much lower cost. He clarified that the presentation was not trying to assert that infrastructure costs were equal for all locations and suggested that infrastructure costs should be evaluated on a case by case basis.

Chair Brian asked Jerry whether there is an optimum growth rate that is typically considered during planning efforts.

Jerry explained that he is not aware of any optimum growth rate number. However, like economists, it is helpful for communities to look at several business cycles to determine if they have achieved a sustainable growth rate and livability.

Craig Brown noted that the reports don't support Tim Knapp's comment that it is cheaper to develop in urban centers and through urban renewal. It is possible that urban centers provide some unique ways of raising funding; however, it is important that people are able to choose their preferred housing option.

IV. <u>RURAL AND URBAN RESERVE CANDIDATE AREAS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION</u>

Marcia Sinclair provided an overview of the Phase Three public outreach since the April 8 Reserves Steering Committee meeting. Between April 15 and April 30, eight meetings were held and a total of 606 people attended the meetings. The team is still processing the information, however an initial summary titled *Public Comment Report to the Regional Reserves Steering Committee, May 13, 2009* has been included in the meeting packet. During the public meetings, the team provided a PowerPoint presentation that included maps of the Urban Reserves candidate areas, Rural Reserves candidate areas, a combined map, and the rationale for the candidate area selection. Following the presentation, many attendees stayed to discuss project details and provided a lot of valuable information. Attendees and online users also filled out a Survey Monkey survey, responses for questions three and nine were provided to the Reserves Steering Committee as a handout. She explained that a lot of great information had been provided through Phase Three public meetings and that there seems to be a high level of knowledge about the Reserves process.

Deb Nudelman invited comments and feedback on the Phase Three public comments. There were no additional comments.

Commissioner Lehan provided a brief overview of the Core 4 decision on rural and urban reserve candidate areas. She explained that the Core 4 had reviewed the candidate areas for all three counties and, though there is a difference in the scale between the counties and how the factors are being applied, this is largely a matter of timing. She noted that there had been some minor changes (i.e. Clackamas County added a small amount of urban candidate areas). She explained that, after thorough discussion and review, the Core 4 agreed unanimously to move forward with both urban and rural reserve candidate areas for further evaluation. It is important to note that if compelling information is presented the candidate areas may move into or out of a particular category (e.g. urban reserve candidate to rural reserve candidate – and vice versa). She clarified that for this reason the notion of the Reserves process as a "sieve" does not work well for her.

Councilor Harrington explained to the committee that there is a high degree of dialogue between and with the Core 4 member's boards, commissions, and councils. She then thanked the other Core 4 members for participating in the April 23 Metro Council meeting and for helping the Council remain informed.

Chris Barhyte requested clarification on the implications of undesignated areas.

Commissioner Lehan explained that, with the exception of the furthest edges of Clackamas and Washington Counties, nearly everything is being studied as a candidate area as either an urban or rural reserve. However, at the conclusion of this process there are likely to be significant areas that are undesignated, as they do not fit either the rural or urban criteria. She noted that the Reserves process is different than UGB expansion, noting that zoning in the reserves would be "frozen" until land was added to the UGB.

Councilor Harrington noted that there are some particular areas that are not potentially subject to urbanization and may remain undesignated through this process.

Chris Barhyte asked whether there was a legal process available for changing undesignated areas close to urban centers into urban reserves.

Dick Benner explained that the rule and statute suggest that additional urban reserves can be designated but may not be taken from the rural reserve within the reserves timeline. The law would allow for UGB expansion into undesignated areas but this would difficult because you would first have to demonstrate that the urban reserves areas were not sufficient.

Chair Brian noted that the situation was a bit of a "catch 22" because areas cannot be designated as a rural reserve unless they threatened but can be considered for an urban reserve if they have proximity and availability of service.

Dick Benner explained that the initial analysis had focused on a couple of factors to the exclusion of others. The "subject to urbanization" factor is just one factor but does not mean that an area should be or needs to be designated as rural. The area could remain undesignated.

Craig Brown asked what the process would be if expansion into undesignated areas were opened up.

Dick Benner explained that the same reserves process could be used as was used this time. He noted that LCDC has two rules that apply and that the other rule might also be used but might be less desirable.

Metro Commissioner Hosticka noted that current legislation (i.e. House Bill 3298) suggest that no new urban reserves could be designated until 50% of the current reserves have been used.

V. <u>Reserves Milestones Timeline</u>

Commissioner Cogan explained that at the April 8 Reserves Steering Committee meeting, concerns were raised about the timeline and sequencing of the Reserves process and that following the Reserves Steering Committee meeting he received similar feedback from Multnomah County. He noted that there is an interest from the Core 4 to be as well informed as possible when making their decisions. The revised timeline allows more time for creation and review of technical product and will still allow for an agreement on reserves by the end of 2009. He explained that while there is not a statutory requirement to adhere to the current timeline, there is also an interest not "losing the moment." He then asked John Williams to review the details of the revised timeline.

John referenced the two page memo titled "Reserves Milestone Timeline Revisions and Next Steps" included in the meeting packet and provided an overview of important dates and next steps. He noted that in addition to technical products, the revised timeline will provide additional time for public outreach, coordination with the Reserves Steering Committee, the county processes, and the Making the Greatest Place process.

Meg Fernekees asked if Metro will still need to identify 50% of the UGB capacity by 2010 and, if so, whether Metro felt they could meet this timeline.

John responded that by the end of 2010, Metro must identify at least half of the capacity, which will include any measures that will be taken to increase the efficiency of the UGB. He explained that, if the Reserves process is done by May, then Metro will still have seven months to make those decisions and staff is confident that the revised Reserves timeline will not cause a shift in this goal.

Deb noted that, at the April 8 Reserves Steering Committee meeting there were many perspectives expressed about the timeline. The Core 4 took all of these viewpoints into consideration when making its decision to revise the timeline.

John provided a formal reminder to the group that with the revised timeline there will be additional Reserves Steering Committee meetings and encouraged people to monitor their email for additional meeting dates.

VI. <u>MAKING THE GREATEST PLACES UPDATES</u>

Councilor Harrington explained that the Metro Council is working with its jurisdictional partners to discuss how to manage growth in the future. They are assessing research learning from local knowledge and experiences from around the world. She expressed appreciation for the efforts of everyone reviewing the information and explained that she is looking forward to policy discussions and decision.

John explained that since the last meeting two additional documents have been developed: the *Preliminary Urban Growth Report* and the *Preliminary Housing Needs Analysis*. John noted that the full Urban Growth Report is available; however, the full housing needs report is not available but will be provided to the group as soon as it is available.

John noted that the Residential Urban Growth Report is required to provide an inventory that links with population and employment forecasts. The UGR begins from these forecasts, which are informed by regional and national information. Using this information, how much of the population growth is likely to happen within the UGB (historically between 60-63%), and an assumed vacancy rate Metro derived an estimated number of households. All of this information was then used to figure a dwelling unit range for the next 20 years. The capacity analysis is then conducted which contains a buildable land summary and a summary of zoning in the region. John noted that there is already a lot of zoned capacity and Metroscope is used to help determine how

much of the capacity will be used by the market. He went on to explain that the UGR lays out a range of capacities for the existing UGB varying from a baseline of 184,500 dwelling units to a high supply scenario of 358,300 dwelling units. John noted that the higher capacity scenario assumes that certain additional steps will be taken (e.g. policy changes) but the Metroscope analysis does support the numbers. In addition, the report identifies a number of questions that will need to be addressed in the next two years of the process. He noted that the UGR considers various influences (transportation, energy costs, etc.) but assumes no zoning changes.

The housing needs analysis addresses transportation and future affordability, which will be an important issue for ongoing discussion. He explained that "cost burdened households" are defined as renters spending 50% of income or more on rent and this group is expected to double. The housing needs analysis also includes documentation of trends of decreasing lot sizing and context of affordability relative to other western cities and illustrates distributions based on the same set of baseline assumptions documented in the UGR. He noted that the assumptions are particularly important because they control the model output. John then explained that the overall finding was that centers and corridors are likely to be affordable for some but not affordable for all. It is possible that transportation investment, mixed use incentives, among others can also increase affordability. John also noted that it would be important to consider the linkage with employment since good jobs make housing more affordable.

John stated that the employment analysis is being released soon and all of the reports will then form the foundation of discussion at MPAC and the development of an integrated report, including transportation and reserves.

Greg Manning noted that there had been ongoing conversations with the Commercial Real Estate and Economic Development Coalition regarding Figure 1 on page 8 of the UGR titled "*Household Demand Forecast and Sources of Residential Capacity.*" He said that the graph assumes there will be aggressive policy and infrastructure investment choices, which may or may not be accurate.

John explained that the graph is intended to point to the fact that investment (either inside or outside the UGB) would be required.

Councilor Harrington noted that Metro recognizes that residential capacity will depend on future decisions and in placing the information in the report is stating this clearly and upfront.

Craig Brown asked whether the 2000-2002 economic assessment included the same refill rate and whether Metro should figure future needs be considered the same even though there has been refill.

John responded that the baseline uses the observed refill rate. He noted that there was capacity added (e.g. Damascus) but the question is how to utilize this capacity and Metroscope is advising that infrastructure investment would be required.

Chair Brian noted that the UGR makes assumptions about absorption of capacity assumes policy changes, including infrastructure investment. He asked if there is an estimate of the investment that would be required and how much would come from urban renewal districts and other public sources.

John explained that the baseline capacity assumes no additional infrastructure investment above current direction. The capacity shown in the chart as dotted would require additional infrastructure investment. He noted that in some cases there are tools, like local financing mechanisms and urban renewal districts, to help areas develop but these were not specifically discussed in the report, because that will be a part of this discussion.

Mara Gross noted Table 5 in the residential UGR and asked how much evaluation was being conducted on how many affordable units might be expected in the newly developed areas and if there will be an expanded discussion of affordability.

John said that he was not sure how much evaluation was being conducted on affordability and noted the full report had not been completed. He said he would look into it. [Action Item]

Greg Specht noted that figure one of the residential UGR implies that 40,000 additional units will be created by the end of 2010 and he wondered if that was reasonable, given the fact that infrastructure often takes a while to build.

John said that he understood Greg's point that you cannot expect today's investments to have immediate effects; however, where it really hits the road is in the out years, when there is there is increased tension between demand and supply. He said he would check with others to confirm. [Action Item]

Craig Brown asked whether affordable housing was assumed to be the same height, size, and function in the center as in outlying areas. He also wondered whether the cost of urban renewal was included in affordability.

John explained that affordable housing is generally different in the center. He then explained that urban renewal is included in the cost that the homeowner has to pay. Metro does try to understand what impact urban renewal will have but also understands that it is not a magic tool.

Craig noted that urban renewal is a cost that is born by the public and it is disingenuous to suggest otherwise.

John explained that urban renewal is one tool being used but is not the only one, and that a discussion of the positive and negative affects is important.

Mary Kyle McCurdy noted that many local governments have already committed to infrastructure investment and that urban renewal districts are not likely to be any more expensive. She also noted that the existing portion of the Figure 1 graph is at least as great as new areas.

John clarified that all of the colored area in the charts assumes current zoning and that no new zoning ("upzoning") is included in the current analysis.

Jack Hoffman said that it was important to remember that it is not the "fringe" versus the "core" because every city has a center. He noted that an important question will be how much development the surrounding cities will accept. The cities will continue to have to have this discussion during this process.

VII. <u>Summary</u>

Deb thanked everyone for their attentiveness and efforts during the meeting.

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:59 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR MAY 13, 2009

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
2.	Letter	5/13/09	To: Core 4 and members of RSC From: Carol Chesarek RE: Natural Hazards Tech Memo	051309rsc-01
4.	Table	April 2009	Preliminary Public Involvement Results, Urban and Rural Reserves Phase 3	051309rsc-02

UGR-Employment Executive summary



PRELIMINARY URBAN GROWTH REPORT



Employment – Executive Summary

May 2009



INTRODUCTION

A strong regional economy that provides job choices and prosperity is an important part of quality of life. The economic health of the Portland metropolitan region is partially dependent upon global factors as the world shifts towards new market realities. However, local and regional choices can shape this region's place in the global economy. In addition to capacity to support job growth, factors that contribute to a strong regional economy include an educated workforce, high value-added businesses and above average wage levels, a diverse mix of jobs, successful economic development efforts by private- and public-sector leaders, a balanced transportation system, infrastructure investments and a vibrant quality of life.

Oregon's land use laws were crafted to protect and maintain a high quality of life for our residents. In the Portland metropolitan area, Metro is the agency legally responsible for anticipating changes in population and employment and monitoring our region's ability to support jobs and a strong economy. Oregon land use law requires that Metro maintain sufficient capacity for the number of people anticipated to work in the region over the next 20 years. Every five years, Metro conducts an inventory of the current capacity to support employment growth within the urban growth boundary, forecasts employment growth over a 20-year period, calculates the anticipated need, and documents the results of these analyses in an urban growth report. This preliminary urban growth report provides the analysis of the region's employment demand and the capacity of the existing urban growth boundary (UGB) to meet that demand. A separate report, issued on March 31, provides an analysis of the region's residential capacity and demand.

This preliminary employment urban growth report indicates that there is sufficient capacity within the current urban growth boundary to meet the low end of the regional forecasted employment demand in the 5- and 20-year time frames. The analysis shows that there is sufficient capacity to meet the high end of industrial demand, but policy or investment changes must be made to meet the high end of the non-industrial demand. The analysis also calls out a potential gap in the capacity of the existing UGB to meet unique industry needs. The report illustrates a potential disparity between the location of certain types of land supply and current employment location trends. These topics should be considered for local and regional discussion, specifically through Metro's Making the Greatest Place initiative that connects land use and transportation policies and investments to support vibrant communities across the region.

Metro has developed a new approach to analyzing employment demand and supply in this preliminary urban growth report, considering changing times and learning from past experiences. This demand and supply analysis describes Metro's best estimates of what is likely to happen over the next 20 years, given the policies in place today, which may or may not be adequate for adaptation to a changing world. The initial assumptions made in this preliminary urban growth report are likely to be amended as a result of local and regional discussions and policy changes made in the spring and summer of 2009. This preliminary analysis provides a vehicle for seeking feedback on assumptions. The analysis will be revised and released as a draft in September for the Metro Council to consider for adoption.

OUTCOMES-BASED APPROACH TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Planning for the future is not just an exercise in analyzing numbers and issuing forecasts. Planning creates opportunities for people and communities to define and articulate their collective desires and aspirations for enhancing the quality of life in our region and their communities. It allows citizens and their elected leaders to take stock of the successes that have been achieved in their communities through years of hard work. It also requires us to think carefully about and to be accountable for the costs of our choices, ensuring we get the greatest possible return on public investments.

Aside from fulfilling statutory requirements, this preliminary urban growth report provides the region with an opportunity to assess how it has been performing and determine which policy actions could be taken to improve future outcomes and ensure that our communities are sustainable. Shorter-term circumstances such as the current economic recession and longer-term concerns such as climate change demand that we do things differently and make a new approach to our growth management responsibilities all the more timely.

The determination of employment demand and capacity is necessarily part art and part science. State statutes and statewide planning goals direct the region to determine what share of growth can "reasonably" be accommodated inside the existing boundary before expanding it. Ultimately, how the region defines "reasonable" will be a reflection of regional and community values and commitments. At the opposite ends of the spectrum, the Metro urban growth boundary could be held tight or expanded significantly. There are tradeoffs that accompany such choices. This preliminary urban growth report is intended not just to determine whether there is a need to increase employment capacity over the next 20 years, but also to place growth management decisions in the context of the region's desired outcomes.

Characteristics of a successful region

In 1995, the region endorsed the 2040 Growth Concept, an innovative blueprint that seeks to direct future population and employment growth into urban centers, transportation corridors and employment areas in a manner that uses land more efficiently and enhances the character and economic vitality of urban communities. In making growth management decisions, the Metro Council and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) have indicated their desire to weigh policy and investment tradeoffs to produce outcomes that citizens have expressed support for. To that end, in the summer of 2008, the Metro Council, following MPAC's recommendation, adopted six desired outcomes that provide guidance for growth management decisions to support the 2040 Growth Concept:

- 1. People live and work in vibrant communities where they can choose to walk for pleasure and to meet their everyday needs.
- 2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
- 3. People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
- 4. The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
- 5. Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
- 6. The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

Why do things differently?

In the current economic climate, consumers are being cautious, companies are laying off employees, and businesses are keeping inventories lean. At the same time, baby boomers are nearing retirement age, distinctions between traditional land uses are blurring, and technological advancements for everything from telecommunications systems, inventory management, and on-line shopping are increasing. A sampling of existing and emerging trends informs this analysis of the capacity of the Metro region to meet employment needs and support a strong regional economy.

Financial market instability The current economic slowdown became undeniable when, after nearly 20 consecutive quarters of rising employment, the State of Oregon posted its first job losses in the second quarter of 2008. More recently (March 2009), Oregon's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate reached 12.1 percent, now second highest among 50 U.S. states.

Housing market While not directly an economic development factor, housing values and credit availability affect household wealth and resulting decisions ranging from consumer purchases to job choices. Perceptions of housing availability and pricing also can affect business location decisions and subsequent employment creation.

Fiscal environment The current fiscal environment is forcing governments to find more costeffective ways to deliver services and, in many cases, to cut services. Declining employment and personal income will result in declining tax revenues, and state and local governments will need to cut services and infrastructure investment which will affect business and consumer location decisions.

Global positioning Key manufacturing sectors of the Pacific Northwest economy are increasingly dependent on international markets as exemplified by high tech, aerospace and machinery. This dependence presents risks as well as opportunities.

Going green Higher energy costs may encourage development of smaller and more dispersed distribution centers and increased driving costs may lead to people seeking a shorter commutes. The Portland Metro region may be well positioned for this trend. The region also has an opportunity to focus on the development of alternative energy sources such as wind and solar power.

Development costs Construction material costs are likely to influence future development patterns. In the short-term, construction materials are likely to become more affordable as commodity prices ease, but they may rise again as the global economy rebounds. This combination of factors places more pressure on finding cost-effective ways of delivering urban development while also supporting redevelopment and renovation of existing buildings.

Demographics Aging baby boomers, smaller household sizes, and flat levels of labor force participation have short-, medium-, and long-term implications to the labor market and levels of consumer spending, which will likely outlast the immediate financial situation.

New methods in this employment analysis

The last time Metro produced an analysis of employment demand and capacity was in 2002. The world has changed significantly since then with shifting global economic conditions, technological innovations, increased understanding of resource limitations, awareness of individual and collective actions on the global climate and creative approaches to workplace environments, to name just a few. To support a more sophisticated approach for analyzing employment demand and capacity, Metro contracted with a consultant team led by E.D. Hovee & Company, LLC.¹ The Hovee team reviewed global, national, and local trends, conducted focus groups with employers, analyzed recent job location data, updated and categorized the region's employment and industrial land inventory, and developed a new employment demand paradigm.

The consultant work informed the methodology in this preliminary employment urban growth report, as described in Table 1. The analysis also makes use of MetroScope, an integrated land use and transportation simulation model that operates on economic principles to predict where the region's employment and housing will locate in the future. The intent of this approach is to allow policy makers to focus on outcomes and the types of places that support a strong regional economy.

¹ The E.D. Hovee team included FCS Group, Bonnie Gee Yosick, LLC, and Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall.

Demand ranges	Rationale			
5- and 20-year range forecast	 Acknowledges risk and uncertainty Consistent with five-year periodic review schedule Applicable to city and county Goal 9 requirements Recognition that five- and 20-year markets are different, in the short-term markets are likely to be similar to today, but in the longer-term changes and innovations are more likely 			
Variable redevelopment rates	• Recognition that redevelopment rates are not the same across the region, higher in some market subareas than others			
Capacity ranges	Rationale			
5- and 20-year range capacity forecast	• Recognition of uncertainty in supply and that policies and investments can influence capacity			
Analysis by 2040 design types	 Region's strategy is to support development consistent with 2040 growth concept focused on centers, corridors and employment/industrial areas Recognition that 2040 design types have special market affinities that policies and investments can impact Acknowledges that centers, corridors and other design types are not alike and attract different types of development 			
Floor-to-area ratios (FARs) (measurement of building intensity)	 FAR densities vary across the region, market subarea and design types FAR densities vary over time, as the market matures Proxy for variations in achievable rents between market subareas 			
Building space as unit of capacity measurement	• Allows discussion regarding the form of future workforce space needs, rather than a primary focus on needs for added land acreages			
Market subareas	 Recognition that labor markets are not the same across the region Rents and FAR intensity differ by market subarea Allows decision makers to consider more effective policies and investments tailored to local markets Acknowledges that different industries may be attracted to different locations across the region 			

Table 1 New methods in 2009 employment urban growth report

RANGE 20-YEAR EMPLOYMENT FORECAST

A primary factor that influences future employment need is population growth. The findings of Metro's current 5- and 20-year employment forecasts are summarized in this preliminary urban growth report. In recognition of the uncertainty surrounding future conditions, the forecast is expressed as a range.

How much and what type of employment growth are we planning for?

The employment forecast begins with the seven-county statistical area² and then must be narrowed to the area within the Metro urban growth boundary. In 2030, the total jobs for the 7-county area ranges from 1.3 million at the low end to 1.7 million at the high end.

The first step in the new demand paradigm is to recognize that there are market subareas within the Portland metropolitan region. These market subareas attract different components of the forecasted employment growth. The market subareas are shown in **Map 1**.



Map 1: 2009 market subareas, employment and industrial analysis

Forecast by sector: Employment growth rates are forecasted for a number of sectors, which are grouped here for simplicity. The growth rates vary by sector, rather than consistently across all employment. Sector level details are important for this preliminary urban growth report analysis since square footage requirements for industrial, commercial and institutional users vary widely. Population serving employment sectors, such as healthcare, education, and professional services, grow at a rate commensurate with population growth.

² The Portland-Beaverton-Vancouver OR-WA Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) now comprises a total of seven counties (Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, Clark, Columbia, Skamania, and Yamhill), as defined by the federal Office of Management and Budget.

Manufacturing job growth is anticipated to be slower than job growth in the service and government sectors, consistent with expected U.S. macroeconomic trends. (See Figure 1 employment distribution for three employment sectors in 1975, 2007, and 2030) Despite this shift in job concentrations, even in recent years, industrial land consumption has held steady at about 300-500 net acres per year. One reason for this is that technological changes allowing for more automation permit companies to use fewer employees in the same amount of space, a finding that was confirmed in the Portland metropolitan region by employer focus group participants. Industrial demand is presented separately in this analysis because site usage has historically been very different than other employment sectors, and industrial employment supports the traded sector that brings wealth into the region.



Figure 1: Employment distribution 1975, 2007, 2030

Capture rate An employment capture rate is applied to the 7-county range forecast in order to estimate what share of projected job growth is anticipated to locate within the Metro urban growth boundary between 2010 and 2030. This rate may be expected to change somewhat depending upon regional (and macroeconomic) economic growth assumptions, land supply assumptions, and regulatory assumptions. Capture rates tend to rise and fall relative to regional business cycles.

In analyzing the high growth economic scenario, the employment capture rate for 2010 to 2030 is projected to be 73 percent for the Metro urban growth boundary (relative to the 7-county PMSA job growth) and a 75 percent capture rate is projected in the low growth scenario. Figure 2 shows capture rates by industry sector. Based on this methodology, the region must plan for between 975,000 and 1.2 million total jobs by 2030.



Figure 2: Projected industry sector UGB capture rates: 2010-2030 Source: MetroScope UGR scenarios

The construction sector exceeds 100 percent because of projected region-wide job losses in construction employment in the low growth scenario and retrenchment of remaining construction jobs into the Metro UGB.

Forecast by building type One of the innovations of this analysis is to consider employment demand and supply in terms of the buildings that accommodate jobs, rather than only on the land. This allows policy makers to discuss both the employment demand and the building form that shapes the way communities look and feel.

Forecasted jobs are assigned to six building types, based on recent trends and professional expertise. The six building types used for purposes of the design paradigm are: office, institution, flex, general industrial, warehouse and retail. Assumptions as to the building type in which jobs are located could change over time as the real estate market matures, land prices increase, and technologies shift. Once jobs have been assigned to building types, they are converted to building square foot demand using estimates of the amount of building square feet needed for an employee in each of the six building types.

Building square foot demand varies by market subarea, accounting for market realities in the location decisions made by the region's employers.

Based on analysis of the trends just described, there will be a need to accommodate up to 82 million square feet of industrial space and between 99 million and 188 million square feet of non-industrial space within the UGB by 2030.

Figures 3 and 4 show the 20-year building square foot demand (net of redevelopment demand) by market subarea. At the low end of the population and employment forecast there is a projected reduction in demand for industrial jobs, commensurate with national trends showing a decline in manufacturing. Demand shifts from some locations, such as industrial employment in the central city, to locations in outer areas with lower land costs. This analysis carries forward recent job location trends; local and regional policy and investment actions could shift this demand to different locations. The demand by market subarea is aggregated to identify the regional demand range for industrial and non-industrial building square feet.



Figure 3: 2010-30 Industrial square foot demand



Figure 4: 2010-30 Non-industrial square foot demand

Market subarea

What is the capacity range?

Determining the total employment capacity of the current urban growth boundary is not as simple as adding up the maximum-zoned capacity of all parcels. Unlike residential zoning, some of the land zoned for employment uses does not have legal limits to height and other restrictions. However, this does not mean that this analysis assumes infinite capacity in those locations, since the urban real estate market does not intensively use land where achievable rents will not cover the cost.

Capacity changes over time as real estate market conditions change. A primary purpose of this preliminary urban growth report is to begin a discussion of how the region might make more of its existing capacity market-feasible, both on vacant land and through redevelopment and infill (refill). This purpose is in keeping with Statewide Planning Goal 14's guidance to determine that growth cannot be "reasonably" accommodated inside the existing urban growth boundary before expanding it.

Vacant land capacity A thorough understanding of the region's vacant land supply zoned for employment uses is a crucial first step in analyzing the capacity of the region to meet future employment demand. Metro's vacant buildable land inventory was supplemented by local review and analysis of development readiness by the E.D. Hovee consultant team. The region's vacant employment and industrial land supply is categorized by generalized land use classification, parcel size, and market subareas. This approach allows an analysis of both the amount of land supply as well as its ability to accommodate both the short- and long-term employment demand in the region. **Map 2** shows the results of the buildable land inventory.³

³ Metro will continue to review and potentially update the inventory with the help of city and county staff until the draft urban growth report is released in September 2009.



Map 2: 2009 buildable land inventory: employment and industrial land

Refill capacity Like the Metro UGB employment capture rates, the refill rate may also rise and fall with fluctuations in regional business cycle activity. The refill rate is impacted by the pace of regional economic growth, macro-economic cycles (such as interest rates, home price valuations, inflation, credit availability to name a few), regional land supply assumptions, and regulatory factors. Refill rates are expected to vary during the 2010-30 forecast period by market subareas. The market subareas represent uniquely different labor markets. Refill rates also vary substantially between industrial uses and non-industrial uses. For this preliminary analysis, the aggregated refill rates are 24 percent for industrial and 45 percent for non-industrial.

Redevelopment and infill on employment and industrial land predominately occurs by:

- Industrial uses redeveloping into other industrial uses
- Vintage industrial uses redeveloping into non-industrial uses
- Non-industrial uses redeveloping into other non-industrial uses
- Vintage non-industrial redeveloping into industrial uses (theoretically possible, but data analysis has not found detectable amounts of this activity)





Translating land supply to a capacity estimate To be consistent with the employment demand assessment, which translated the employment forecast to a building square footage demand, this analysis translates the vacant land supply into building square feet. While it is difficult to translate local zoning into the number of jobs that might be provided on a parcel, it is easier to assess the building type and form likely to be built based on the zoning. Floor area ratios (FARs) allow a translation between local zoning and capacity expressed through building square feet. FAR is the ratio of a building's floor area to the total parcel area. FARs are not consistent across the region.

Higher intensity of development (or FAR) can occur as land becomes more valuable, requiring more efficient use of space including multi-level development, lower parking ratios with greater use of transit, and more structured parking. Higher intensity of employment is also expected to the extent that an increasing share of regional employment takes place with service and office-related functions compared with traditional manufacturing or distribution space. Any transition in intensity of employment is expected to occur over time and to the extent supported by global and regional market trends. This capacity analysis recognizes variations by market subarea, 2040 design type, and zoning, as well as varying the expected achievable FAR over time.

The region's employment and industrial capacity is calculated by multiplying acres by FAR value for each market subarea, accounting for building mix and differences in FAR in the short- and long-term. The building square foot capacity on buildable land by market subarea is shown in **Figures 6 and 7** for industrial and non-industrial land. The charts do not show redevelopment and infill ("refill") capacity by market subarea, which comprises a significant portion of the supply in the central and inner market subareas.



Figure 6: Industrial capacity on vacant land in building square feet, by market subarea

Market subarea





Market subarea

Comparing market subarea demand and supply This analysis shows that the region's capacity on vacant land is not always located where demand is projected to be. It highlights the importance of redevelopment and infill to support the region's economy as well as creating vibrant communities.

For industrial, the outer I-5/205, outer westside, inner north and northeast, and east Multnomah County market subareas show sufficient capacity to meet forecasted demand. The vacant capacity in outer Clackamas is almost entirely in new urban areas, requiring infrastructure and other investments to become developable (one reason that projected demand is low). Inner I-5, inner westside, and the central city do not have sufficient vacant capacity to meet projected demand, and must rely on redevelopment and infill.

Non-industrial demand and supply by market subarea shows sufficient capacity to meet demand in outer I-5/205, east Multnomah county, outer westside and outer Clackamas. Demand is projected to be much higher than vacant capacity in the inner north and northeast, inner westside, and the central city. Local and regional policies and investments can help to address the disparity between capacity and demand.

What is the potential gap between employment demand and capacity and what are some policy choices?

The current employment demand forecast and the analysis of employment capacity within the UGB do not indicate a need to add land to the boundary for industrial purposes at the regional level to meet statutory requirements to maintain a 20-year land supply. However, the analysis does show a need for additional capacity through investments, policy changes, or expansions to meet the high end of the demand range for non-industrial employment. Further analysis of certain categories of employment land uses (such as large lot employer/industrial uses) and the ability to address economic development opportunities to support the regional economy may be needed.

Figures 8 and 9 depict the five- and 20-year building square foot demand range (from the 20-year forecast) for industrial and non-industrial development along with the capacity range. The demand range is illustrated with two lines that show the upper and lower end of the building square foot demand forecast. Two primary types of capacity are shown. The capacity depicted in solid colors can be relied upon with a continuation of current policy and investment trends. The capacity shown in dotted colors is deemed to be zoned capacity that requires additional policy or investment actions to render it market feasible by the year 2030. As with the residential UGR, this chart is all based on current zoning; no "upzoning" is assumed.

Expected employment and industrial capacity based on current policies

The first type of capacity shown in **Figures 8 and 9** is zoned capacity inside the current urban growth boundary that is market feasible (in the short- and long-term) with no change in policy or investment trends. Land that is classified as development-ready is included in this category in both the short-term (five-year) and long-term (20-year). Most of the small lot vacant land is included in this category for the long-term, with a small portion assumed to be available in the short term. Refill rates (the amount of redevelopment and infill), which are different for industrial and non-industrial development, are based on historic rates and MetroScope scenario analysis (24 percent for industrial and 45 percent for non-industrial). Finally, half of the new urban areas (land brought into the urban growth boundary since 1997) are deemed to be market feasible by the year 2030.

Potential employment and industrial capacity based on future policy choices

The second type of capacity that is depicted in Figures 8 and 9 is zoned capacity inside the urban growth boundary that is likely to require changes to policies and investments to make it market feasible by the year 2030. Policy and investment actions (such as targeted infrastructure investments) can increase FARs, increase the refill rate, and increase the market feasibility of vacant land. The potential result of these actions (based on MetroScope scenario analysis) taken at the local or regional level is shown in the dotted colors in the figures.

Table 2 describes the key assumptions that establish the range of capacity for industrial and non-industrial employment land.

INDU	STRIAL	NON-INDUSTRIAL		
Low supply	High supply	Low supply	High supply	
 Infrastructure limits development in new urban areas Refill at 24% FAR reflects current development 	 No infrastructure limits Refill at 50% (potential) FAR increased by 10% 	 Infrastructure limits development in new urban areas Refill at 45% FAR reflects current development 	 No infrastructure limits Refill at 90% (potential) FAR increased by 10% 	
88.6 million building square feet	140.9 million building square feet	118.6 million building square feet	223.2 million building square feet	

Table 2: Assumptions that establish the range of capacity





Source: Metro, E.D. Hovee & Company, LLC, FCS Group

NOTE: This analysis does not specifically address unique needs such as large lot industrial/employment demand.

Figure 9: Non-industrial building square foot demand forecast and sources of capacity Source: Metro, E.D. Hovee & Company, LLC, FCS Group



Potential employment and industrial capacity based on future policy choices

The second type of capacity that is depicted in Figures 8 and 9 is zoned capacity inside the urban growth boundary that is likely to require changes to policies and investments to make it market feasible by the year 2030. Policy and investment actions (such as targeted infrastructure investments) can increase FARs, increase the refill rate, and increase the market feasibility of vacant land. The potential result of these actions (based on MetroScope scenario analysis) taken at the local or regional level is shown in the dotted colors in the figures.

Table 2 describes the key assumptions that establish the range of capacity for industrial and nonindustrial employment land.

POLICY CHOICES

As the region's leaders review this analysis of forecasted employment demand and the current boundary's capacity to meet that demand, there are a number of questions to keep in mind:

Supporting the region's place in a shifting global economy

- 1. The world is changing rapidly what are our region's unique strengths in a global economy and how do we capitalize on those strengths in ways that are consistent with the region's vision? Should the region be positioned as a leader in the green economy to address greenhouse gas emissions and reduce dependence on imported sources of energy?
- 2. How important is land supply in the mix of elements that make up a strong regional economy (along with educated workforce, quality jobs, and other factors)?
- 3. Global economic conditions change quickly. Is twenty years an appropriate time horizon for planning how to accommodate job growth? How might we be prepared to act upon new opportunities in a timely fashion? How can we design a rapid response system to support a strong regional economy both in the near term and sustainably over the next 40-50 years?

Maintaining capacity for land-extensive industry

- 4. Given the impossibility of predicting with confidence the need for large-scale manufacturing capacity over the 20-year planning period and the difficulties experienced trying to preserve large private parcels for industrial use in the face of pressures from landowners who do not want to "bank" their land for 10-15 years of waiting for a large company and from cities and counties that want flexibility to respond to more immediate opportunities, are there better ways than used in the past to address the call for large parcels?
- 5. Is employment land interchangeable or are there specialized needs for certain locations or industries? (For example, is a car manufacturer more likely to locate on Swan Island or in the Columbia Corridor while high tech companies may tend to cluster together?)
- 6. What strategies can be put in place to ensure that industrial land is used for job generating industrial purposes in order to protect public investments made to support industrial uses (such as transportation investments and planning efforts) and enhance regional competitiveness?

Investing and infrastructure

- 7. What strategies and investments would support more non-industrial employment in the region's centers and corridors?
- 8. What is the right balance of strategies and investments to support redevelopment of existing employment areas and development on greenfield industrial sites when there are limited local and regional resources?
- 9. How should the region prioritize public investments, such as transportation, infrastructure, and technical resources? What does a city or county need to have in place to take advantage of regional investments?

Balancing local and regional perspectives and managing risk

- 10. How do we balance local desires or aversions with a regional perspective? (For example, what if all jurisdictions plan on being home to solar industries, but no jurisdictions plan on being home to warehousing and distribution)?
- 11. What are the risks of planning for the high or low end of the employment forecast? Are there different risks when planning for employment (versus housing)?
- 12. What are the risks of assuming that future employment trends will be the same or different, compared with today? Can the region minimize these risks by targeting high growth industries or business clusters? Or should there be less attention to identifying potential winners and losers, with more emphasis on assuring competitive capacity to serve the increasingly diverse needs of as yet unknown employers who will grow the jobs of the next 20-50 years?
- 13.In addition to the creation of employment capacity, are there reasons (based on the six desired outcomes) to expand the UGB?
- 14. How might our region's policies and investments interact with actions taken in the broader economic region, from Longview to Salem?

Employment capacity is a product of zoning, public investments, market dynamics and regional growth management policy. It is up to all of the cities and counties in the region to work with Metro to make a determination of where growth should occur and to take policy and investment actions as needed to direct growth in a way that supports local aspirations and the regional vision. How growth is accommodated will play a large part in determining whether or not the region achieves its desired outcomes and creates great communities.

A strong regional economy into the future will depend on a variety of decisions that are not related to land use. Greenlight Greater Portland, a regional group organized to market the Portland – Vancouver region to attract businesses, focuses on the people and places that make up the region.

"What people find here is vitality and livability: great neighborhoods, schools and efficient means of getting around; a creative work environment; a backyard of mountains, rivers and forests. This isn't lost on business leaders, well aware that where there's urban vitality there's talent. The region's skilled workforce is drawing companies to Portland-Vancouver, where they're adding new expertise and innovation to a diverse economic base."

Source: 2008 Greater Portland Prosperity Index

Local and regional policy choices can foster communities that are attractive to the people that make up the regional economy. Some of those choices are described below.

Zoning In most cases, the maximum zoned capacity in centers, corridors, employment and industrial areas is adequate to meet demand. The challenge is to attract the market to more closely approach zoned capacity. Removing barriers to more efficient use of land in industrial areas is a strategy that can be pursued (such as innovative approaches to landscaping requirements such as green walls and green roofs, etc.).

Investments in centers and corridors Past experience and recent scenario modeling indicate that investments in centers and corridors are effective means of attracting growth to these areas. Employment in these locations creates great places by generating daytime activity. Residential development, as a companion to employment uses, supports retail and entertainment and creates nighttime activity. Investments can take the form of:

- Urban renewal
- Urban design improvements (such as street trees, sidewalks, traffic calming design improvements)
- Land assembly
- Investments in structured parking
- Incentives that reduce the costs of construction (such as System Development Charge credits, vertical housing tax abatement, or the other tools explored in Metro's Community Investment Toolkit: Financial Incentives (2007))
- Design and technical assistance, including incentives for prototype developments illustrating profitable concepts in a mixed use, sustainable setting

Investments in brownfields A portion of the region's land supply is currently environmentally contaminated. Public investment in cleaning up brownfield sites is good from an environmental perspective, supports redevelopment and reuse of land in existing urban locations that are typically well-served by infrastructure, and allows new private investment to occur without the risk of uncertain costs.

Targeted infrastructure investments Infrastructure investments determine where population growth will occur. Transportation investments are a key component. Participants in recent employer focus groups emphasized the importance of transit to support employment and industrial areas. These strategies will also be necessary for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

TIMELINE

This preliminary employment urban growth report is being released well before decisions must be made in order to allow substantial discussion among policymakers and local planning professionals. Refinements to the data and assumptions as well as local and regional actions that affect employment capacity that are put in place in 2009 will be considered for inclusion in the final urban growth report to be accepted by Metro Council by the end of the year.

Technical review Metro staff will meet with city and county staff and members of the business community in May and June to review the methodologies and outstanding issues identified in the preliminary analysis. Groups include the Employment Coordination and Advisory Committee, business associations, and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee.

Spring-Summer 2009 Regional leaders will engage in a more specific discussion of the long-term aspirations of local communities and the capacity assumptions in the preliminary analyses, culminating in a draft urban growth report to be issued in September 2009.

December 2009 Metro Council will accept a 2030 population and employment range forecast and complete a final urban growth report that describes any capacity gap to be addressed in 2010.

December 2010 Local and regional governments will continue to implement policies and investments to create and enhance great communities while accommodating anticipated growth. Metro Council will submit plans to accommodate at least 50 percent of any 20-year capacity need (through local and regional actions inside the boundary or through expansions) to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Metro | People places. Open spaces.

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy and good transportation choices for people and businesses in our region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges that cross those lines and affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to protecting open space, caring for parks, planning for the best use of land, managing garbage disposal and increasing recycling. Metro oversees world-class facilities such as the Oregon Zoo, which contributes to conservation and education, and the Oregon Convention Center, which benefits the region's economy.

Metro representatives

Metro Council President – David Bragdon

Metro Councilors

Rod Park, District 1 Carlotta Collette, District 2 Carl Hosticka, District 3 Kathryn Harrington, District 4 Rex Burkholder, District 5 Robert Liberty, District 6

Metro Auditor – Suzanne Flynn

www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro 600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736

503-797-1700










Reserves Steering Committee 2009 Meeting Schedule (REVISED)

Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

Meetings are *usually* held on the second Wednesday of the month from 9:00 a.m. to noon. All meetings are open to the public.

Wednesday, January 14 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, February 11 9:00 a.m. to noon

Monday, March 16 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, April 8 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, May 13 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, June 10 9:00 a.m. to noon Wednesday, July 8 <u>Canceled</u> 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, August 12 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, September 9 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Wednesday, September 23 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Wednesday, October 14 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Wednesday, November 4 9:00 a.m. to noon

Wednesday, December 9 9:00 a.m. to noon

For more information about this schedule, please contact John Williams at 503-797-1635 or John.Williams@oregonmetro.gov.

Hello Catherine, I will include your letter in the Reserves Steering Committee meeting packet, which will go out within the next two days. Thank you, Laura Dawson Bodner

Laura Dawson Bodner Program Assistant Urban and Rural Reserves Metro 600 NE Grand Portland OR 97232 (503) 813-7577

From: Valley Vista Farm [mailto:valleyvistafarm@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 12:34 PM
To: Reserves
Subject: Urban Reserves NOT good for the Dairy/McKay Creek subregion

Marcia,

Attached is a copy of comments I made at the April 6th Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee meeting. They are equally applicable to the Metro Reserves Steering Committee. Can you please forward my comments to the members of the Metro committee and perhaps include them in an upcoming meeting packet?

Many thanks!

Catherine Keith 503-647-0444

To: Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee

From: Catherine Keith Owner, Valley Vista Farm Resident, CPO8

Date: April 6, 2009

Re: Critical Mass of rural area for farming, comments made at April 6 WCRCC meeting

I would like to remind the WCRCC members about the conclusions presented in the Katy Coba report from the Oregon Department of Agriculture regarding the viability of agriculture in the Dairy/McKay Creek subregion¹:

"This subregion has all the elements, including excellent soils, available water for irrigation, parcel size, local market and overall ability to conduct farming practices. The excellent integrity of area agricultural lands is due in no small part to the existence of good edges, compatible land uses within the UGB (Buffers) and the opportunities that exist to better develop good edges. With the exception of the David Hill area, the department considers agricultural lands located within this subregion to be signifecant and recommends strong consideration for designation as an agricultural preserve".

"It is the department's opinion that the critical mass needed to support the agricultural service industry in Washington County is currently present but under threat".

The report mentions that raffic is already starting to be a problem for farmers in the area and is "an issue to watch and give serious consideration in future planning decisions. The department is concerned about the impacts of urban commuter traffic on roads cutting through metro core agricultural areas".

It is clear that any urban growth in the Dairy/McKay Creek area will jeopordize the viability of the agricultural economy of the entire sub-region. Please do not establish any Urban Reserves in this area. Ideally, preserve the area by designating it as a Rural Reserve.

¹ This region includes the farmland "bound on the south by the metro area UGB, including the cities of Beaverton, Hillsboro, Cornelius and Forest Grove, and Highway 8. It is bordered on the east by 185th Street and Cornelius Pass Road. The subregion extends west and north into private and state timberlands in the Coast Range and Columbia County".

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.



June 8th, 200

Reserves Steering Committee Metro, 600 NE Grand Portland, OR 97323

Dear Commissioners & Reserve Steering Committee Members:

Slow Food Portland is a non-profit organization with over 500 members in the Portland metro area. Slow Food Portland is part of the global and national Slow Food movement that works toward a food system that is based on the principles of high quality and taste, environmental sustainability, and social justice – in essence, a food system that is good, clean and fair. Such a food system depends first and foremost on the availability of local farmland.

Slow Food Portland was the first chapter of its kind in the United States, founded in 1991 by local small business owners. Slow Food Portland, like its umbrella organization Slow Food USA, is a non-profit educational organization dedicated to supporting and celebrating our regional food traditions through programs and activities dedicated to defending biodiversity and building food communities. From the salmon in our local rivers to the produce at our farmers' markets and restaurants; from animal breeds and heirloom varieties of fruits and vegetables to handcrafted wine and beer, and farmhouse cheeses; these foods are a part of our cultural and geographical identity. They reflect generations of commitment to the land and devotion to the processes that yield the greatest achievements in taste.

These foods, and the communities that produce and depend on them, are constantly at risk from competing interests in and degradation of our farmland. Slow Food Portland therefore advocates for the central role and importance of agriculture in future land use decisions involving urban growth in the metro region. It is for this reason that we have been following the Urban & Rural Reserves Process closely.

Several of our members participated in the recent Reserves Open Houses or completed the online survey. We were pleased to see that the results of this public outreach broadly supported protecting working farms.¹ With this in mind, we

would strongly encourage you to reduce the number of acres being considered for urban reserves in your meetings over the next few months. We are especially concerned about the large tracts of "Foundation"² farmland that are still being considered for urban reserve in Washington County. This concern was also clearly raised on page 5 of the Open House summary.

In response to these concerns, we'd like to draw your attention to the Washington County Farm Bureau Foundation Lands Base Protection Map. This map was submitted to the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee on May 11^{th,} 2009. We would encourage the Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee to seriously consider this proposal.

The Urban & Rural Reserves process is our generations chance to leave the kind of legacy for the region that Senate Bill 100 was for the previous generation! We encourage you to support an end product that creates vibrant urban centers and preserves the working farms that we as Oregonians cherish.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Katherine Deumling Slow Food Regional Governor, Oregon Slow Food USA, Board of Directors Katherine@slowfoodportland.com; 503.239.1664

¹ Urban & Rural Reserves, Phase 3 Public Involvement Summary, pg 2

² as defined in the Oregon Dept. of Agriculture Report to Metro, Jan '07





Portland Area Community Supported Agriculture Coalition www.pacsac.org

June 8th, 2009

Reserves Steering Committee Metro, 600 NE Grand Portland, OR 97323

Dear Commissioners & Reserve Steering Committee Members:

The Portland Area Community Supported Agriculture Coalition (PACSAC) is a group of farmers growing fresh sustainable local food and selling it directly to families in the north Willamette Valley. The Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) model is a way for family farmers to produce a wide variety of high quality food in a sustainable way. CSAs foster responsible relationships between the grower, the consumer, the crops, and the land on which the food is grown.

Our coalition includes more than 40 local farms and hundreds of families who are CSA members. We share a desire to promote, support and strengthen a healthy regional food system. As you have heard from Oregon Department of Agriculture and the many diverse producers they represent, protection of valuable and productive agricultural land is necessary for the continued success of our vibrant agricultural economy. In addition, by growing food now - and maintaining the land base necessary to grow food in the future - agriculture makes an invaluable contribution to the safety, security and livability of the region that no other industry does.

We are writing to you today in support of the Washington County Farm Bureau Foundation Lands Base Protection Map. This map was submitted to the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee on May 11^{th,} 2009 and you'll find a copy at the end of this letter. We would encourage the Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee to seriously consider this proposal.

Foundation Farmland, as defined by the Oregon Department of Agriculture, forms the heart of the Metro region's agriculture. We are extremely concerned to see large tracts of Foundation Farmland are still being considered for Urban Reserve in Washington Co. The Foundation Lands Base Protection Map would offer the kind of protection to

Foundation Agriculture Lands - especially those currently under threat of urbanization - that we believe is necessary if the region's agricultural economy is to continue to thrive.

The Urban & Rural Reserves conversation is a regional one because decisions made in each county will impact the others. The loss of significant farmland in Washington County could have very negative implications for farmers in Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. In addition to the irreplaceable loss of some of the nation's best agricultural soils, the conversion of significant tracts of Washington County farmland to Urban Reserve would also jeopardize the region's agricultural infrastructure.

"Elements such as transportation, irrigation delivery, labor availability, processing and other service needs, agricultural special districts, drainage facilities, etc., can be important factors in the long-term viability of an area. It is important to note that, unlike the infrastructure needs for new urban development, the agricultural infrastructure is in most cases already in place and has been and is being maintained and updated on an ongoing basis."¹

The CSA farms in our group depend on this infrastructure just as much as the larger grass seed, nursery & berry growers do. Individually, farms in each county may not be able to support all the pieces needed for a vibrant and healthy agricultural infrastructure, but together they have shown a remarkable ability to do so.

In the interest of supporting the long-term viability of our region's diverse agricultural economy, we would encourage you to seriously consider the Foundation Lands Base Protection Map for Washington County.

Sincerely,

Amy Benson Portland Area CSA Coalition Member 6370 NW Evers Road, Forest Grove, OR 97116 squarepegfarm@yahoo.com 503.357.1214

¹ Identification and Assessment of the Long-Term Commercial Viability of Metro Region Agricultural Lands, January 2007, Oregon Department of Agriculture Report to Metro



Suburted on Celiolog

ROSEMONT TRACTOR SERVICE PO BOX XXXX /72_ MARYLHURST, OR 97036

Metro Councilors,

Please let this correspondence serve as my recommendation that the Stafford Triangle be designated Urban Reserve. I feel that I have a unique vantage point in coming to this conclusion.

As a resident of the Stafford Triangle for 33 years I have lived on a small (under 5 acre) hobby farm which transformed from beef to vegetables and fruit during that time. I spend very little time on my own farm. For the past 16 years my full time business has been "custom tractor work". I undertake agricultural work on specific, short term projects, and on recurring maintenance or annual production activities. In addition, I manage an 80 acre farm for a resident client. The Stafford Triangle delivers 35 to 40% of my normal annual revenue. I do similar work in other parts of Clackamas, Yamhill, Washington and Marion counties. Also, I act as the "ag consultant" and do much of the ground work at two other Clackamas County operations (outside the Triangle), one a world class equine facility and the other a hay and timber operation, together comprising over 550 acres. I have worked on well over 60 small farms specifically in the Triangle and, currently, conduct annual work at 23 of them. This work has given me the opportunity to observe past and current farming, vineyard and grazing practices, test soils and become intimately knowledgeable of the economics at the farms I work or manage. I know my resident clients quite well.

Here are some general and a few specific observations of Stafford Triangle agriculture from the past 16 years of work:

1) All of my clients enjoy the lifestyle of being able to have privacy in a pastoral setting, close to the amenities of Portland.

2) Only one client relies on the revenue from their property as their primary source of income. (They sell semen from a single valuable horse.) This is one of only three clients who actually works on their farm.

3) All other clients must subsidize their ag operations, and hire the work, in order to maintain the lifestyle they have chosen.

4) The primary motivating factor at the vast majority of my client's farms is the continuation of their ag tax deferral.

5) Soils are poor for annual crops (with the exception of numerous small garden spots enriched by composting) but can support some trees and grapes. Formal soil inventories and designations confirm this.

6) More land has been taken out of production than has been added during the last 16 years.

7) Two of the last three beef cattle operators in the Triangle have gone out of business in the past two years.

8) My two equine facility clients are trying to reduce the size of their herds due to growing operating expenses. A third left the business entirely 5 years ago, and was able to sub-divide

their property and sell a parcel.

, ⁽³

At a recent Hamlet Town Hall meeting, while on the topic of agricultural operations, two residents offered that there was no expectation of profit from their operations. The largest vineyard owner said the operation was highly subsidized simply because his family enjoys the lifestyle and it was never expected to make a profit.

^

I chaired one of the Neighborhood meetings in the "Wisteria Neighborhood", (known as Area 37 in recent UGB decisions) and attended the second such meeting. There was almost unanimous consensus that development would occur in the not too distant future and that they preferred one acre zoning (down from the current 5 acre zoning) as the most appropriate for our area. That would allow many to leave parcels for children's inheritance, eventual income from their long term investments in the land, provide for new housing appropriate for, and compatible with, what is already in the area, and preserve the majority of the trees.

Last year I was approached by two new large land owners for an estimate to put their unused land into some sort of limited production in order to qualify for the ag tax deferral. Neither had an ag background, equipment or knowhow to undertake the envisioned project. They were horrified at the cost of the initial ground work and could not justify the expense. Their land remains a blackberry and thistle patch.

If anyone should encourage adding agricultural acres or simply maintain what is already in production, it would be me. Working small farms is my only source of income. However, I am in favor of the state's land use regulations and feel strongly about urban sprawl into <u>valuable</u> farm land. I can't have it both ways in the Triangle. The real farm lands (large, profitable, professional producers) are miles away and <u>should</u> be protected. The Stafford Triangle is clearly more suitable as future residential and employment land than it would ever be as rural ag land.

Thank you for reading my observations and recommendation. I'm happy to answer any questions on this subject if you care to contact me.

Best regards, Mike Miller Rosemont Tractor Service 503-913-8185

Value of Oregon agriculture: Crop production 2008

diop piouu	CLIVII	<u>, 2000</u>	
Crop	Acres	Production	Value
Field crops			
Barley (bu)	45,000	2,250,000	\$10,463,000
Corn, grain (bu)	33,000	6,600,000	\$25,740,000
Corn, silage (tons)	27,000	729,000	\$26,937,000
Hay, alfalfa (tons)	420,000	1,680,000	\$357,840,000
Hay, all other (tons)	605,000	1,271,000	\$255,471,000
Hops (Ibs)	6,370	9,997,600	\$37,991,000
Oats (bu)	18,000	1,800,000	\$4,500,000
Peppermint (lbs)	19,000	1,672,000	\$21,736,000
Potatoes (cwt)	35,300	18,676,000	\$211,039,000
Sugarbeets (tons)	5,900	195,000	\$7,371,000
Wheat (bu)	945,000	52,600,000	\$340,178,000
Seed crops			
Alfalfa seed (lbs)	2,950	2,578,000	\$5,074,000
Bentgrass seed (lbs)	8,460	4,964,000	\$13,360,000
Bluegrass seed (lbs)	22,700	28,618,000	\$31,911,000
Fescue seed (lbs)	194,830	284,238,000	\$196,863,000
Ryegrass seed			
Annual (Ibs)	123,800	215,973,000	\$64,808,000
Perennial (lbs)	122,860	174,861,000	\$132,230,000
Fruits and nuts			
Apples (tons)	4,800	85,000	\$37,752,000
Blackberries, all	6,300	37,900,000	\$22,941,000
Blueberries (lbs)	5,200	43,100,000	\$49,266,000
Cherries, sweet (tons)	12,500	26,400	\$55,184,000
Cranberries (bbls)	2,700	400,000	\$36,600,000
Grapes for wine (tons)	14,900	34,700	\$71,135,000
Hazelnuts (tons)	28,400	32,000	\$52,160,000
Peaches (tons)	650	1,500	\$1,504,000
Pears, Bartlett (tons)	4,200	57,000	\$22,341,000
Pears, other (tons)	12,000	140,000	\$70,241,000
Prunes & plums (tons)	1,500	7,500	\$2,083,000
Raspberries, red (lbs)	1,500	4,910,000	\$7,822,000
Strawberries (lbs)	1,800	23,800,000	\$16,768,000
Vegetables			·
Beans, snap (tons)	18,600	112,140	\$26,418,000
Corn, sweet (tons)	22,700	204,060	\$34,864,000
Onions, storage (cwt)	21,800	11,492,000	\$97,524,000
Peas, green (tons)	18,000	33,320	\$8,768.000

County	gross	farm	and	ranch
sales, 2	.008			

Rank

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

5, 2008	
County	Dollars
Marion	\$604,058,000
Umatilla	\$378,961,000
Morrow	\$371,078,000
Clackamas	\$364,243,000
Washington	\$302,057,000
Klamath	\$300,932,000
Linn	\$296,447,000
Yamhill	\$283,900,000
Malheur	\$276,443,000
Polk	\$164,920,000
Lane	\$139,822,000
Tillamook	\$118,594,000
Benton	\$112,574,000
Wasco	\$83,294,000
Harney	\$82,344,000
Union	\$80,259,000
Multnomah	\$79,147,000
Jackson	\$77,429,000
Lake	\$77,054,000
Hood River	\$73,459,000
Jefferson	\$69,777,000
Baker	\$66,496,000
Douglas	\$63,794,000
Coos	\$61,377,000
Wallowa	\$47,469,000
Grant	\$45,998,000
Sherman	\$43,205,000
Crook	\$39,899,000
Curry	\$37,469,000
Deschutes	\$25,991,000
Gilliam	\$24,877,000
Columbia	\$22,869,000
Clatsop	\$22,575,000
Josephine	\$21,833,000
Wheeler	\$11,827,000
Lincoln	\$10,843,000

Contains

Recycled Materials

Value of Oregon agricultural exports, 2007

Commodity	Value
Wheat and products	\$239,065,000
Seeds	\$174,300,000
Fruits and preparations	\$170,600,000
Vegetables and preparations	\$145,300,000
Tree nuts	\$52,200,000
Nursery products	\$49,400,000
Hides and skins	\$23,600,000
Live animals and red meat	\$17,600,000
Feed and fodders	\$16,600,000
Christmas trees	\$15,300,000
Poultry and products	\$3,000,000
Fats, oils, and grease	\$700,000
Dairy products	\$500,000

Oregon commercial fish landings, 2008

Type of fishery	Pounds	Value
Groundfish	66,594,464	\$43,587,000
Crab	13,887,594	\$29,175,000
Shrimp	38,980,654	\$21,384,000
Tuna	8,864,222	\$10,651,000
Whiting	74,637,604	\$8,365,000
Salmon	1,924,378	\$4,385,000
Other	55,425,312	\$8,992,000
Total	260,314,228	\$126,539,000

Oregon's record high production for years 1980-2008

Year

Crop	Amount	Ye	ar
Apples ¹ (tons)	102,500	198	37
Barley (bu)	20,805,000	198	36
Bartlett pears (tons)	85,000	198	31
Hay, all (tons)	3,624,000	200)4
Hazelnuts (tons)	49,500	200)1
Onions, storage (cwt)	15,359,000	200)7
Potatoes (cwt)	30,683,000	200	0
Prunes & plums (tons) 33,000	198	30
Ryegrass, ann. (lbs)	266,460,000	199	99
Snap beans (tons)	173,900	198	9
Strawberries (cwt)	1,014,000	198	8
Sweet cherries (tons)	60,000	198	8
Sweet corn, proc. (tor	ns) 452,330	199	5
Wheat, all (bu)	77,400,000	198	0
¹ Utilized production			



Preliminary figures show 2008 agricultural production valued at \$4.9 billion dollars, the same as last year's preliminary estimate, which was a record high.

Information furnished by

National Agricultural Statistics Service Oregon Field Office, Chris Mertz, Director. Oregon State University Extension Service.

June 2009

This publication is provided at no charge by Oregon Department of Agriculture 635 Capitol Street NE Salem, Oregon 97301-2532

Phone: 503-986-4550 ODA Web site: <oregon.gov/ODA>

In compliance with the Americans with disabilities act, this publication will be made available in alternative formats upon request.

Oregon farms 2008

Hogs ^a All goats 10ŠU ² July , 2008 ³December 1, 2008

Viegon larms, 200	0
Number of farms	38,600
Land in farms (acres)	16,400,000
Average farm size (acres)	425
Value per crop land acre (dollars	s) 2,260
Operations	
Size of operation (acres)	% of total farms
1-9	24.8%
10-49	36.7%
50-179	19.3%
180-499	8.6%
500-999	4.0%
1,000-1,999	2.6%
2,000 or more	4.0%
By type	Percent
Individual	85.1%
Partnership	7.5%
Incorporated	6.5%
Other (cooperative, estate/trust,	institutional) 0.9%
By tenure	Percent
Full owners	78.2%
Part owners	16.0%
Tenants	5.8%
Age of principal operator	Percent
Under 25	0.3%
25-34	3.9%
35-44	10.6%

operations		3	Glass se
Size of operation (acres)	% of total farms	4	Cattle &
1-9	24.8%	5	Milk
10-49	36.7%	6	Wheat
50-179	19.3%	7	Potatoes
180-499	8.6%	8	Christma
500-999	4.0%	9	Onions, s
1,000-1,999	2.6%	10	Pears
2,000 or more	4.0%	11	Wine gra
By type	Percent	12	Faas
Individual	85.1%	13	Cherries
Partnership	7.5%	15	Hazelnut
Incorporated	6.5%	14	Corp. ors
Other (cooperative, estate/trust, instit	tutional) 0.9%	16	Blueberri
By tenure	Percent	17	Groundfi
Full owners	78.2%	10	Hone
Part owners	16.0%	10 © 10	Apples
Tenants	5.8%	19	Apples
Age of principal operator	Percent	20	Cranberr
Under 25	0.3%	21	Sweet co
25-34	3.9%	22	Grass an
35-44	10.6%	23	Crab land
45-49	11.2%	24	Snap bea
50-54	15.1%	. 25	Horses*
55-59	15.9%	26	Vegetabl
60-64	14.3%	27	Mint for c
65-69	11.2%	28	Blackber
70 and over	17.5%	29	Shrimp la
Average age of operator	57.5	30	Hay silag
Livestock Inventory, 1	L/1/2009	31	Mink
Commodity	Head	32	Strawber
Cattle and calves	1.240.000	33	Raspberi
Beef cows	535,000	34	Tomatoes
Milk cows	115,000	35	Sheep &
Cattle on feed	75,000	36	Tuna, alb
Sheep and lambs	220,000	37	Barley
Ewes	121,000	38	Squash 8
Market lambs	67,000	30	Waterme
Horses and mules 1	122,800	40	Green no
Mink, females bred ²	57,210	ΨU	arean pe
Hogs ³	20,000	* 001	ontimet -
All goats	38,000	030	esumate
1OSU			
A second s Second second se Second second se Second second sec	and the second second second and the second seco	THE REPORT OF A DESCRIPTION OF A	All the second state of

Oregon's top 40 commodities

Rank	Commodity	Value
	A 1 A 1 A 1	
1	Greenhouse & nursery products*	\$880,061,000
2	Hay	\$613,311,000
3	Grass seed, all*	\$510,298,000
4	Cattle & calves	\$426,794,000
5	Milk	\$412,482,000
6	Wheat	\$340,178,000
7	Potatoes	\$211,039,000
8	Christmas trees*	\$122,765,000
9	Onions, storage	\$97,524,000
10	Pears	\$92,582,000
11	Wine grapes	\$71,135,000
12	Eggs	\$64,974,000
13	Cherries, all	\$56,356,000
15	Hazelnuts	\$52,160,000
14	Corn, grain & silage field	\$52,137,000
16	Blueberries	\$49,266,000
17	Groundfish landings	\$43,587,000
18	Hops	\$37,991,000
19	Apples	\$37,752,000
20	Cranberries	\$36,600,000
21	Sweet corn, all	\$34,864,000
22	Grass and grain straw*	\$34,004,000
23	Crab landings	\$29,175,000
24	Snap beans, processing	\$26,418,000
25	Horses*	\$25,500,000
26	Vegetable & flowers seed*	\$25,072,000
27	Mint for oil	\$24,544,000
28	Blackberries, all	\$22,941,000
- 29	Shrimp landings	\$21,384,000
30	Hay silage*	\$20,068,000
31	Mink	\$20,033,000
32	Strawberries	\$16,768,000
33	Haspberries, all	\$13,082,000
34	Iomatoes'	\$12,995,000
35	Sheep & lambs	\$11,369,000
36	i una, albacore landings	\$10,651,000
37	Barley	\$10,463,000
38	Squasn & pumpkins*	\$9,956,000
39	watermeions"	\$8,865,000
40	Green peas, processing	\$8,768,000

2008	National	rankings	of
Orego	on agricu	ltural pro	duction

Commodity	Rank	Percent of US
Blackberries, all	1	100%
Hazelnuts	1	100%
Loganberries	1	100%
Raspberries, black	1	100%
Ryegrass seed	1	97%
Orchardgrass seed	1	96%
Crimson clover	1	95%
Fescue seed	1	87%
Boysen and youngberries	1	80%
Sugarbeets for seed	1	78%
Red clover seed	1	70%
Potted florist azaleas	1	47%
Christmas trees	<u>_</u> 1	38%
Dungeness crab	1	38%
Peppermint	2	30%
Kentucky bluegrass seed	3	28%
Onions, storage	1	25%
Pears	3	24%
Austrian winter peas	3	18%
Snap beans, processing	2	14%
Blueberries	3	12%
Hops	2	12%
Nursery stock	3	12%
Sweet cherries	3	11%
Mink pelts produced	3	10%
Spearmint	2	10%
Green peas, processing	4	8%
Raspberries, red	2	8%
Sweet corn, processing	4	6%
Cranberries	4	5%
Herbs dried	3	1%
Strawberries	3	1%
Wine grapes	5	1%
그는 소문에 다 전에 가지 않는 것이 없는 것이 없 않는 것이 없는 것이 않는 것이 않는 것이 않는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 않는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 않는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 않는 것 않 것이 않는 것이 않는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 않는 것이 않이 않이 않이 않이 않는 것이 않는 것이 않는 것이 않는 것이 않이	よっ する ちゃくたろく ちゃう ちゅうろ	く やりか アンドル ふうちん たけがちゃうち 行びにした

Oregon's top producing counties 2008

counties, 2008	
Greenhouse and nursery	Gross sales
Clackamas	\$195,775,000
Marion	\$192,811,000
Washington	\$168,295,000
Yamhill	\$123,920,000
Multnomah	\$56,680,000
Cattle & calves	Number
Malheur	181,300
Morrow	119.700
Harney	109.800
Klamath	83,600
Lake	74,500
Hav	Tons
Klamath	356 700
Lake	344 700
Malheur	336,700
Harney	295.700
Umatilla	184,600
Canabarrias	Gross salas
Marion	\$15,918,000
Clackamas	\$13,968,000
Washington	\$8 955 000
Multhomah	\$3,650,000
Yamhill	\$2,794,000
Detetee	\$2,701,000
Morrow	<u>GW</u>
Imatilla	7,670,000
Klamath	2,573,000
Baker	1 900 000
Malheur	1,200,000
National States	1,102,000
	Busnels
Marrow	17,023,800 E 42E 100
Sherman	5,425,100
Malbour	4,779,000
Wasco	3,810,200
	<u> </u>
Pears	lons
	159,616
Magaa	5,050
Marion	5,400
lecephine	900
	900.
<u>wine grapes</u>	Tons
Yamhili	9,992
POIK	4,086
washington	3,395
wallon	3,367
Jackson	2,763

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CLACKAMAS COUNTY Candidate Rural Reserve Areas: DRAFT Staff Review of Factors, Issues, Suggestions & Options

May 18, 2009

The Reserves project applies a new process for identifying urban reserves in the Portland Metro area as provided by the Oregon legislature in 2007 (SB 1011). The law enables, for the first time, the creation of rural reserves to help shape the region and protect agriculture, forestry and natural features from future urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-027-0060 sets out factors for designation of rural reserves for the purpose of long-term protection of agriculture and forestry, long-term protection of important natural landscape features, or both (a summary of rural reserve factors is attached).

This *Executive Summary* provides an overview of the results of a staff review of rural reserves candidate areas selected by the Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). Staff have prepared a technical memo with the details of the review to be used by the PAC in its discussions and recommendations regarding rural reserves. The technical memo includes an area-by-area discussion addressing each of the rural reserve factors for Areas A through S as shown on Map 1. The *Executive Summary* includes a table with the staff's suggested designations, rationale and other options for rural reserve designation for each area.

Staff suggestions are based on a technical analysis of the state's factors for rural reserves, and also take into consideration priorities expressed by the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners. The analysis in the technical memo, which underlies the suggestions and options shown here, relies on a number of studies, including:

- The Oregon Department of Agriculture study, *Identification and Assessment of the Long-Term Commercial Viability of Metro Region Agricultural Lands, January, 2007*
- The Natural Landscape Features map created at Metro in 2007, updated in 2008
- Mapping done by the Oregon Department of Forestry in 2008 (*Forestland Development Zone Map*)
- Other maps and reports produced by Reserves project partners Metro, Clackamas County, Multnomah County and Washington County.

Note: The table on the following pages and the technical memo refer frequently to three types of farmland: foundation, important and conflicted. These terms are used in state land use laws and were defined in the Oregon Department of Agriculture study referenced above. They can be generalized as basically lands that are most productive, somewhat productive and not productive (respectively) for industrial agriculture.

> Prepared by: **Clackamas County Department of Transportation and Development Division of Planning** -- Doug McClain, Planning Director Maggie Dickerson, Principal Planner; Martha Nix, Planner II Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist; Randall Gray, Programmer/Analyst

OVERVIEW OF STAFF SUGGESTIONS, RATIONALE AND OPTIONS

	Suggest Rural		
Area	Reserve	Rationale	Options
A – North of	Designation?	Not under much threat of	Option1: Designate
Estacada to Eagle Creek	No	 urbanization – too far from urban growth boundary (UGB). Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	inventoried natural features – Clackamas River. Option 2: Designate all or part of area – because it is "important" farmland.
B – East of Canby	Yes	 Under threat of urbanization. Qualifies under agricultural protection – "foundation" farmland. Qualifies under safe harbor. 	Option 1: Leave a portion undesignated to allow city to try to expand its UGB. Option 2: Designate inventoried natural features rural reserve -Molalla River.
C – Clackamas Prairies	Yes	 Under threat of urbanization. Qualifies under agricultural protection – "foundation" farmland. Qualifies under natural features protection. Qualifies under safe harbor. 	Option 1: Designate only area within 3 miles of UGB– areas beyond are not under much threat of urbanization. Option 2: Designate inventoried natural features – Pudding and Molalla rivers. Option 3: Do not designate the northwest corner shown as undesignated by Canby.
D – Canemah/ Willamette Narrows	Yes – identified natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization. Qualifies under natural features protection – Willamette Narrows and Bluffs. 	Option 1: Do not designate the small upland area – area of interest for Oregon City. Option 2: Do not designate any of the area – natural features can be protected with acquisition and development restrictions.

Area	Suggest Rural Reserve Designation?	Rationale	Options
E – Southeast Clackamas West	No	 Area buffered from UGB by steep slopes. Generally protected for agricultural and timber uses by zoning. 	Option 1: Designate portions of area within 3 miles of UGB – except special use areas like rural communities and airport. Option 2: Designate inventoried natural features – Beaver Creek.
F - Beavercreek	No	• Contains "conflicted" farmland – rates low on many agricultural protection factors.	Option 1: Designate all or part of area – protect emerging local foods movement on small farms.
G – Clackamas Heights	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under natural features protection – Clackamas River Bluffs and Greenway, and Newell and Abernethy creeks. 	None suggested.
H – Redland Rd/Southeast Clackamas	No	 Approximately 2 miles from UGB, but separated by significant topography. Protected for agricultural and timber uses by zoning. 	Option 1: Designate area within 3 miles of UGB – "important' farmland.
I – Springwater Ridge South	No	 Not under much threat of urbanization – too far from UGB. Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	Option 1: Designate inventoried natural features – Clackamas River. Option 2: Designate all or part – "important" farmland.

Area	Suggest Rural Reserve Designation?	Rationale	Options
J – Springwater Ridge North	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under natural features protection – Clackamas River, Clackamas River Bluffs and Greenway, Clear Creek Canyons. Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	Option 1: Designate entire area – "important" farmland.
K – Eagle Creek North	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under natural features protection Clackamas River, Deep Creek Canyons. Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	Option 1: Designate entire area – "important" farmland.
L – South of Damascus	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under natural features protection Clackamas River, Clackamas River Bluffs and Greenway, Deep Creek Canyons. Contains "conflicted" farmland – rates low on many agricultural protection factors. 	Option 1: Do not designate Damascus areas of interest – natural features can be protected by acquisition and regulation, and could create a natural edge for urban area.
M – Clacka- nomah	Yes	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under agricultural protection – "foundation" farmland. Qualifies under natural features protection – East Buttes. Qualifies under safe harbor. 	Option 1: Do not designate part of area adjacent to UGB at Highway 26 to allow for some urban expansion.

Area	Suggest Rural Reserve Designation?	Rationale	Options	
N – Stafford	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization. Qualifies under natural features protection– Tualatin River and Wilson Creek. Contains "conflicted" farmland – rates low on many agricultural protection factors. 	Option 1: Do not designate any of this area – floodplains and riparian areas can be protected by acquisition and/or development restrictions.	
O – East Wilsonville	No	 Contains "important" and "conflicted" farmland – rates low on many agricultural protection factors. Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	Option 1: Designate part of area – "important" farmland.	
P – West Wilsonville	No	 Contains "important" and "conflicted" farmland – rates low on many agricultural protection factors. Protected for agricultural and forestry uses by agricultural and forestry zoning. 	Option 1: Designate part of area – "important" farmland.	
Q – French Prairie	Yes	 Under threat of urbanization. Qualifies under agricultural protection – "foundation" farmland. Qualifies under safe harbor. 	Option 1: Do not designate part of area.	
R – Parrett Mountain	No	 Not under much threat of urbanization. Natural feature not included on revised natural features maps; most of Parrett Mtn. not in Clackamas County. 	Option 1: Designate part of area – "important" farmland.	
S – Pete's Mountain/ Peach Cove	Yes – inventoried natural features only	 Under threat of urbanization Qualifies under natural features protection – Tualatin River and Peach Cove. Peach Cove area protected for agricultural use by zoning, and physical buffer provided by Pete's Mountain and river. 	Option 1: Designate part of area – "important" farmland.	

Summary of

Factors for Designation of Lands as Rural Reserves

(1) A county shall indicate:

- which land was considered and designated in order to provide long-term protection to the *agriculture and forest industries* and
- which land was considered and designated to provide long-term protection of *important natural landscape features,* or
- both.

Based on this choice, the county shall apply appropriate factors in section (2) or (3), or both.

- (2) Agricultural or Forest Industry: To provide long-term protection to the agricultural or forest industry, or both: a county shall decide based on whether the lands proposed for designation are:
 - a) Urbanization -- In an area that is otherwise potentially subject to urbanization during the applicable period described in OAR 660-027-0040(2) or (3) as indicated by
 - a. proximity to a UGB or
 - b. proximity to properties with fair market values that significantly exceed agricultural values for farmland, or
 - c. forestry values for forest land;
 - b) Long-term Operations -- Capable of sustaining long-term agricultural operations for agricultural land, or capable of sustaining long-term forestry operations for forest land;
 - c) Suitable soils/Available water -- Have suitable soils where needed to sustain long-term agricultural or forestry operations and, for agricultural land, have available water where needed to sustain long-term agricultural operations; and
 - d) Sustained Operations -- Suitable to sustain long-term agricultural or forestry operations, taking into account:
 - i. For farm land, the existence of a **large block of agricultural or other resource land** with a concentration or cluster of farm operations; for forest land, the existence of a **large block of forested land** with a concentration or cluster of managed woodlots;
 - ii. Adjacent land use pattern, including its location in relation to adjacent non-farm uses or non-forest uses, and the existence of buffers between agricultural or forest operations and nonfarm or non-forest uses;
 - iii. **Agricultural or forest land use pattern**, including parcelization, tenure and ownership patterns; and
 - iv. Sufficiency of agricultural or forestry infrastructure, whichever is applicable.

- (3) Natural Landscape Features: To designate land as rural reserves to protect important natural landscape features, a county must consider those areas identified in Metro's February 2007 "*Natural Landscape Features Inventory*" and other pertinent information, and shall decide on whether the lands proposed for designation are:
 - a) In an area that is otherwise **potentially subject to urbanization** during the applicable period described in OAR 660-027-0040(2) or (3);
 - b) Subject to **natural disasters or hazards**, e.g. floodplains, steep slopes, areas subject to landslides;
 - c) Important fish, plant or wildlife habitat;
 - d) Necessary to protect water quality or quantity, such as streams, wetlands, riparian areas;
 - e) Provide a sense of place for the region, such as buttes, bluffs, islands, extensive wetlands;
 - f) Can serve as a **boundary or buffer**, such as rivers, cliffs and floodplains, to reduce conflicts between urban and rural uses, or between urban and natural resource uses;
 - g) Provide for separation between cities; and
 - h) Provide **easy access to recreational opportunities in rural areas**, such as trails and parks.
- (4) Agricultural Lands Within 3 Miles of a UGB: Notwithstanding requirements for applying factors in OAR 660-027-0040(9) and section (2) of this rule, a county may deem that Foundation or Important Agricultural Lands within 3 miles of a UGB qualify for designation as rural reserves under section (2) without further explanation under OAR 660-027-0040(10).



•	7
	2
	1



WASHINGTON COUNTY

June 4, 2009

To: Washington County Planning Directors

From: Brent Curtis, Planning Manager

Subject: Memo: Phase 3 Rural Reserves Analysis – Update

Phase 3 of the Urban and Rural Reserves designation process focuses on analyzing candidate areas in preparation for specific reserves recommendations. For potential Rural Reserves, Washington County must consider designating farmland, forest land and important landscape features for long-term protection.

These resources were initially identified in three inventories: the Oregon Department of Forestry's (ODF) Wildland Forest, Oregon Department of Agriculture's (ODA) Agricultural Land and Metro's Natural Landscape Features. The inventories provide a broad basis for analysis and the first "screen" for considering rural areas for protection from urbanization. As the analysis moves forward Washington County staff are refining the tools required for more specific determinations to be used when potential urban and rural areas overlap.

Staff decided to identify the three elements; farmland, forest land and natural landscape features with individual Rural Reserves designations to facilitate discussion. Those individual descriptions are:

- RF indicating Rural Farmland Reserves
- RFL indicating Rural Forest Land Reserves
- RNF indicating Rural Natural Landscape Features Reserves

Farmland Analysis

The following describes the current considerations and application of factors for farmland analysis in Washington County.

Farmland - The ODA Agricultural Lands Inventory divides land into three categories; Foundation, Important and Conflicted. The inventory map shows that virtually all of the 5 mile study area is designated Foundation or Important Agricultural Land. Since the majority of the existing UGB abuts Foundation Agricultural Land, it is much more likely to be impacted by potential Urban Reserves than forest land. Staff believes that there will be serious consideration of adoption of Urban Reserves on the valley floor near existing cities and therefore it is necessary to provide additional specific details about farmland that the ODA Agricultural Lands Inventory does not provide.

Rural Reserve Factors - 660-027-0060 Section 2

Factor 2a - Are situated in an area that is otherwise <u>potentially subject to urbanization</u> during the applicable period described in OAR 660-027-0040(2) or (3) as indicated by proximity to a

Department of Land Use & Transportation • Planning Division 155 N. First Avenue, Suite 350-14, Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072 phone: (503) 846-3519 • fax: (503) 846-4412

UGB or proximity to properties with fair market values that significantly exceed agricultural values for farmland, or forestry values for forest land

This factor requires consideration of proximity to a UGB or proximity to land with fair market values that significantly exceed agricultural values.

Proximity to a UGB

To apply this factor, we initially proposed to score "proximity to a UGB" on a scale of 1 to 9, which reflects areas least subject to urbanization to those most subject to urbanization. Based on additional review, we are proposing to define three classes of land - land that is rated as high subject to urbanization (HU), medium subject to urbanization (MU), and low subject to urbanization (LU). The city areas of interest are rated HU. The area previously identified as potential urban candidate areas (approximately 106, 000 acres) is rated MU. The remainder of the 5 mile reserve study area is rated LU.

This assumes that if land is being studied for Potential Candidate Urban Reserve Areas then that land is subject to urbanization and should also be considered for Rural Reserves designation. The land nearest the UGB is rated as high for subject to urbanization. Land that is rated as medium is generally further away from the UGB. Land that is rated as low is usually furthest from the UGB. Application of this factor will continue to be refined throughout the analysis process. New information such as population and employment forecasts will add to the refinements.

Fair Market Value

Staff has compiled more than a dozen variations to address the fair market value aspect of Factor (2) (a). Based on available information staff determined that "Fair Market Value" (independent of other indicators) does not provide a reasonable indication of land areas that may be "subject to urbanization."

Factor 2b - Are capable of sustaining long-term agricultural operations for agricultural land, or are capable of sustaining long-term forestry operations for forest land

After examining various methods for analyzing farmland, water availability appears to be a significant factor in preservation of farmland for the long-term. With water already in short supply and projected growth for the region water availability is going to become more important in the future. When considering between two areas for designation as an Urban Reserve, preference should be give to irrigated over non-irrigated farmland.

Give the long planning horizon for the reserves, Staff believes that water availability will be a significant limiting factor for agriculture. The Willamette Valley typically gets most of its rain in the winter (50% of the annual total from December through February) with less in the spring and fall, and dry summers (*The Climate of Oregon*, George H. Taylor and Chris Hannan, 1999). Irrigated soils are more productive than non-irrigated soils (see discussion under "Agricultural Productivity Ratings for Soils") and can grow more diverse crops. Staff believes availability of water is the key to sustaining long-term agricultural operations.

Approximately 82,100 acres of farmland are in the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District (TVID). The water is allocated by Bureau of Reclamation as part of the Tualatin Project. The principal features of the Tualatin Project include Scoggins Dam, Henry Hagg Lake, Patton Valley

Pumping Plant, Spring Hill Pumping Plant, and more than 120 miles of a piped distribution system. The area of land that can be irrigated varies year to year. For example, in 2001 (a drought year), the Bureau of Reclamation allocated only 12,832 acre feet to TVID.

Staff mapped the boundaries of TVID as well as existing water rights based on "place of use" using Oregon Water Resources Department data. Rural Reserves should protect irrigated farmland where possible.

Factor 2c - Have suitable soils where needed to <u>sustain long-term agricultural</u> or forestry operations and, for agricultural land, <u>have available water where needed to sustain</u> long-term agricultural operations

Staff considered four approaches for agricultural lands analysis:

- ODA Agricultural Lands Inventory
- Soil-capability classifications
- Agricultural productivity ratings for soils
- High-value farmland

ODA Agricultural Lands Inventory – This rating system is described above under "Farmland."

After examining various methods for analyzing farmland, water availability appears to be a significant feature. With water already in short supply and projected growth for the region water availability is going to become more important in the future. If there are Urban Reserves, irrigated farmland should be considered for protection where possible. (No data is currently available for several attributes that could assist farmland analysis such as leased or rented farmland that could be used to determine farm sizes and types. Therefore in addition to Factor 2a, staff is currently focusing on Factor 2c.)

Soil-Capability Classification - This system, developed in the 1930s, has been used by the Oregon land use system to define agricultural land since 1973 when Goal 3 was adopted. The *Soil Survey of Washington County, Oregon* was published in 1982 by SCS (now NRCS). The digital copy of the soil maps was produced in 1991. There are 8 classifications (Class I-VIII) - Washington County only has seven. This system continues to be widely used. There are several challenges inherent in this system:

- Agriculture Handbook No. 210 explains new technology applies unevenly to soils and the grouping of soils can change over time (some soils that were once considered poor for crop production are now some of the best.)
- The originators of the system realized that classes of land were not permanent and any number of changes in the land such as accelerated erosion or supplies of irrigation water would call for reclassification of the area. Staff is unaware of any systematic examination or update to the soil classifications in Washington County to reflect the original soil mapping.
- Another problem is that there is a lot of subjectivity because often the classes overlap. For example the range of slope, which often divides classes, for a Class II soil can be 7 to 12% and the range for Class III can be 12 to 20% and the edge of class distinctions are difficult to assess. (LiDAR mapping could be used to reexamine slopes but is currently not available for all areas - 95% of the study area is covered in Washington County.)
- Classes I IV within the valley are intermingled making it difficult to distinguish areas that are being better or worse for agriculture. Mapping agricultural land in Washington

County based on NRCS Soil Capability Classes results in the valley floor all looking the same.

High-Value Farmland - This system for defining agricultural land was adopted by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in 1993. It too is based on the SCS classification system, but it provides only two types agricultural land High-Value and Other. For Washington County, High-Value Farmland is mainly Class I - IV. With only two categories of agricultural land, the system is not a useful analysis tool for refining the reserve work - the valley floor is primarily High-Value Farmland.

Agricultural Productivity Ratings for Soils - This rating system was developed by J. Herbert Huddleston, an OSU Extension Service Soil Specialist (*Agricultural Productivity ratings for Soils of the Willamette Valley*, 1982). This system divides soils into three categories: Native Productivity, Maximum Productivity for Dryland and Irrigated. This rating system: is based on actual yields for indicator crops; provides ratings-based dryland and irrigated maximum productivity. One of the intended uses of the report is to help planners "make difficult decisions when choosing among competing uses for agricultural land." It also highlights the importance of water.

Staff considers this rating system useful because:

- It highlights the importance of irrigation. The maximum Native Productivity is 75, the maximum Dryland Productivity is 80 and the maximum Irrigated Productivity is 100 there is only 5% difference between Native Productivity and Dryland but there is a 20% difference between Dryland Productivity and Irrigated Productivity.
- This system provides a classification system with 100 levels of distinction. It provides one additional method for analysis refinement.

Staff believes that in the future water availability will be a significant limiting factor. Land inside TVID and land with agricultural water rights based on "place of use" (OWRD data), were mapped and give Irrigated Productivity values, all other farmland were given Dryland Productivity values. These maps were used to identify the most productive farmland.

Factor 2d - *Are suitable to sustain long-term agricultural or forestry operations, taking into account:*

(A) for farm land, the existence of a large block of agricultural or other resource land with a concentration or cluster of farm operations, or, for forest land, the existence of a large block of forested land with a concentration or cluster of managed woodlots;
(B) The adjacent land use pattern, including its location in relation to adjacent non-farm uses or non-forest uses, and the existence of buffers between agricultural or forest operations and non-farm or non-forest uses;

(*C*) *The agricultural or forest land use pattern, including parcelization, tenure and ownership patterns; and*

(D) The sufficiency of agricultural or forestry infrastructure in the area, whichever is applicable.

No data is currently available for several attributes that could assist farmland analysis such as leased or rented farmland that could be used to determine farm sizes and types. The only information that can be easily analyzed is ownership and parcel sizes. Staff initially studied

approximately 44,000 acres north of the Cities of Cornelius, Forest Grove and Hillsboro for parcelization and ownership patterns.

Tax lots were ranked by size into seven ranges and color coded to determine parcelization patterns. A similar process was used to rank ownership. However, the ownership analysis was time consuming since the data had to be cleaned up - slight differences in data entry of names resulted in tax lots being labeled as different owners (e.g. one include middle initial and another tax lot only includes first and last name).

The ownership ranking map looked similar to the parcel ranking map - large ownership patterns seemed similar to large parcel patterns. Since the County has no information about leased or rented farmland that can be used to determine actual farm sizes , location of farms and ownerships change over time, staff determined that tax lot sizes are the best available data for mapping parcelization blocking patterns. With the current minimum lot size restrictions in the exclusive farm use zones (EFU & AF-20) of 80-acres, staff believes that parcel sizes are less subject to change than ownership data and thus more useful for predicting future agricultural land-use patterns. Staff is aware that crops and agricultural practices vary over time, but parcel sizes and shapes are more static.

The initial parcelization study area was expanded to include approximately 95,000 acres of the reserves study area (56 percent). Due to the labor intensive nature of this analysis, only the areas nearest the UGB were studied. The parcelization data covers most of the valley floor though some areas, such as southwest of the Tualatin River, were not studied. The study area is essentially a ring around the existing UGB. An overall map was made that ranked by tax lots in the area into seven ranges to determine patterns.

Also as discussed above, TVID boundaries and water right data were mapped to help define agricultural infrastructure. Staff continues to analyze other infrastructure such as agricultural product processors and access to farm markets.

Potential candidate Rural Reserve Areas for Farmland and Sub-Area Types

For the farmland analysis, the entire reserve study area was divided into sub-areas. The boundaries of the areas were defined based on a combination of data.

Urbanization - areas were broadly defined as high subject to urbanization (HU), medium subject to urbanization (MU), and low subject to urbanization (LU). The city areas of interest are rated HU. The area previously identified as potential urban candidate areas (approximately 106, 000 acres) is rated MU. The remainder of the 5 mile reserve study area is rated LU.

Productivity Rating - As discussed previously, all of the soils were give a productivity value. Areas were divided into higher productivity (HP) and lower productivity (LP). Higher productivity areas are composed of soils that have water rights to irrigate or are in the TVID and lower productivity areas are composed of soils that do not have water rights to irrigate or are not in the TVID.

Parcelization - The overall pattern was evaluated to help define the boundaries of sub-areas. Areas where parcel sizes were a factor were simply labeled bigger parcels (BP) or smaller parcels (SP).

Physical Features - Both natural and man-made physical features were used to form boundaries for sub-areas. Sub-areas that have physical features that help define areas are labeled PF. The most common physical features are flood plains, roads and golf courses (there are eight in the study area). Flood plains form natural buffers between areas. Golf courses, depending on size and location, can isolate one area from another. Roads were also used and were judged to be better boundaries than property lines.

Potential Candidate Rural Reserve Areas for Farmland - The Potential Candidate Rural Reserve areas are divided into four tiers based on the combination of factors. The tier ranking reflects a cumulative value based on all subset values (productivity, parcel sizes etc.). Some values are positive (e.g. high productivity) while others are considered negative (e.g. areas that are highly parcelized). Each sub-area is labeled with a tier ranking (1, 2, 3 or 4). Tier 1 is for areas that rate the highest of designation as a rural reserve - Tier 4 are rated as lowest. Each sub-area is also numbered. The table provides a brief discussion of each area.

Sub-area Number	Tier	Sub-area Factors	Comments	
1	4	LU, LP, PF	Chehalem Mtn., Low Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating,	
			Physical Features help define the area	
2	1	MU, HP, BP, PF	Medium Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
3	2	MU, LP, BP, PF	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
4	4	LU, LP, PF	Henry Hagg Lake area, Low Urbanization, Lower Productivity	
			Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
6	2	HU, LP, SP, PF	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
7	3	HU, HP, SP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
8	3	MU, LP, SP	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels	
9	4	С	Conflicted	
10	3	HU, LP,SP, PF	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
11	2	HU, HP, SP, PF	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
12	1	HU, HP, BP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels,	
			Physical Features help define the area	
13	2	MU, LP, BP	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels	
14	1	HU, HP, BP, PF	Higher Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
15	3	HU, LP, SP	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels	
16	4	C	Conflicted	
17	1	HU, HP, BP	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels	
18	1	HU, HP, BP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels,	
			Physical Features help define the area	
19	2	HU, HP, SP	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels	
20	4	С	Conflicted	
21	2	HU, HP, SP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Smaller	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
22	2	MU, LP, BP, PF	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
23	1	MU, HP, BP	Medium Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger	
			Parcels	

24	1	HU, HP, BP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
25	2	HU, LP, PF	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
26	3	HU, HP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
27	1	HU, HP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
28	4	С	Conflicted	
29	1	HU, HP, PF	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
30	1	HU, HP, BP		
31	4	С	Conflicted	
32	1	HU, HP, BP	High Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels	
33	2	MU, LP, SP, PF	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
34	2	HU, HP, SP, PF	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	
35	2	HU, LP, BP	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels	
36	1	HU, HP, PF	Higher Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Physical Features help define the area	
37	2	HU, HP, SP	Higher Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels	
38	3	HU, LP, SP	Higher Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels	
39	3	MU, LP, SP	Medium Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels	
40	4	HU, LP, SP	High Urbanization, Lower Productivity Rating, Smaller Parcels	
41	4	С	Conflicted	
42	4	С	Conflicted	
43	1	MU, HP, BP, PF	Medium Urbanization, Higher Productivity Rating, Bigger Parcels, Physical Features help define the area	

BP- Bigger Parcels C - Conflicted HP - Higher Productivity HU - High Urbanization LP - Lower Productivity LU - Low Urbanization

MU - Medium Urbanization

PF - Physical Features

SP - Smaller Parcels

Forest Land Analysis

The following describes the current considerations and application of factors for forest land analysis in Washington County.

Forest Land: The ODF forest land inventory divides land into seven categories - Factor 2a will be applied to each of the seven categories.

Factor 2a (**subject to urbanization**) - This factor requires consideration of proximity to a UGB or proximity to land with fair market values that significantly exceed forestry values.

Proximity to a UGB

To apply this factor, we initially proposed to score "proximity to a UGB" on a scale of 1 to 9, which reflects areas least subject to urbanization to those most subject to urbanization. Based on additional review, we are proposing to define three classes of land - land that is rated as high subject to urbanization (HU), medium subject to urbanization (MU), and low subject to urbanization (LU). The city areas of interest are rated HU. The area previously identified as potential urban candidate areas (approximately 106, 000 acres) is rated MU. The remainder of the 5 mile reserve study area is rated LU.

This assumes that if land is being studied for Potential Candidate Urban Reserve Areas then that land is subject to urbanization and should also be considered for Rural Reserves designation. The land nearest the UGB is rated as high for subject to urbanization. Land that is rated as medium is generally further away from the UGB. Land that is rated as low is usually furthest from the UGB. Application of this factor will continue to be refined throughout the analysis process. New information such as population and employment forecasts will add to the refinements.

Fair Market Value

Staff has compiled more than a dozen variations to address the fair market value aspect of Factor (2) (a). Based on available information staff determined that "Fair Market Value" (independent of other indicators) does not provide a reasonable indication of land areas that may be "subject to urbanization."

Potential candidate Rural Reserve Areas for Forest Land

- **RFL1** The best forest land that should be considered for protection due to the highest wildland forest rating and the highest subject-to-urbanization value.
- **RFL2** Forest land that has a lower wildland forest rating or have a lower subject-tourbanization value.
- **RFL3** Forest land that has the lowest subject-to-urbanization values.

Important Landscape Features Analysis

Staff continues to develop an appropriate method to map important landscape features. Mapping will be based on the Metro Natural Landscape Features Inventory and will potentially include floodplains and other attributes.



C:\Urban_and_RuralReserves\Maps\Jim\New_Parcel_Size\Sections_All\Sections_All__5_7_09_w_Tiers_AOI.mxd 5/27/2009



Pre-qualifying Urban Reserve Concept Planning

DRAFT – Working Copy for Discussion Only

Introduction

Pre-qualifying Concept Planning is a vital component of Washington County's approach to identifying urban reserve areas. The approach to Pre-qualifying Concept Planning connects directly with three important planning concepts/considerations:

- o The Urban Reserve Factors of OAR 660-027-0050
- The Metro Region 2040 plan typology and their plan approach (focusing on aspirations)
- The Washington County Urbanization Forum being conducted by the cities of Washington County, the service districts of Washington County and the County itself

The overall approach of Pre-qualifying Concept Planning is to prepare a plan map and plan text (depicting the planning intentions) for each Urban Reserve Candidate Area. The overall intent is to test and apply the OAR 660-027-0050Urban Reserve planning factors. The level of plan detail is akin to the detail of the Metro 2040 Plan and of Concept Plans called for by Metro Title 11. It is proposed that the Metro Plan typology be employed with several enhancements.

Proposed Typology

The application of the typology should be in the form of a plan map and plan text setting the planning concepts firmly in the context of the planning work to prepare Pre-qualifying Concept Plans. The planning work should be led by the appropriate city, with assistance, if required, from Washington County.

This approach is consistent with the Urbanization Forum's exploration of a policy which would provide governance and urbanizing land use authority by a city for all future UGB additions. The Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee (RCC), along with assistance from the Planning Directors of Washington County will coordinate the planning to ensure consistency within Washington County. The RCC will, in turn, coordinate with the Regional Steering Committee and Core Four.

It is not the intention of Pre-qualifying Concept Planning to be an official, binding land use plan. Rather it is a depiction of a city's ideas of how Urban Reserve Candidate Areas fit with existing city aspirations and how it would be used to create a new great community. As each Urban Reserve Candidate Area qualifies for Urban Reserve Area subsequent, more deliberate planning, with extensive citizen involvement will be required.

Designating Land Uses

The foundation for the land designations used is the regional 2040 design types. The reason for applying these is that they are a familiar and common nomenclature. Not all of the design types are being recommended for candidate urban reserves and not every reserve would use every of the suggested types. There are seven design types being recommended. Definitions for the first six are from Section 3.07.130 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. The seventh, Neighborhood Center, is being proposed as a means to capture a type that is not adequately addressed in the current 2040 plan.

Station Community – Nodes of development centered approximately one-half mile around a light rail or high capacity transit station that feature a high-quality pedestrian environment.

Town Center – Local retail and services will be provided in town centers with compact development and transit service.

Corridor – Along good quality transit lines, corridors feature a high-quality pedestrian environment, convenient access to transit, and somewhat higher than current densities.

Employment Area – Various types of employment and some residential development are encouraged in employment areas with limited commercial uses.

Industrial Area – Industrial areas are set aside primarily for industrial activities with limited supporting uses.

Inner Neighborhood – Residential areas accessible to jobs and neighborhood businesses with smaller lot sizes are inner neighborhoods.

Neigborhood Center – Add definition here.

Associated with these design types are targets for dwelling units and employment. Because future urban growth boundary expansions will look to areas designated as urban reserves and would involve the conversion of land from rural to urban it is not unreasonable to expect higher densities from urban reserves than existing urban areas. The recommended densities for these design types are in Table 1.

Design Type	Dwelling Units per Acre	Jobs per Acre	Notes	
Station Community Area	20	20	Some areas may be more employment based and others more residential based which may justify different splits between units & jobs.	
Town Center	20	20	Some areas may be more employment based and others more residential based which may justify different splits between units & jobs.	
Corridor	10			
Employment Area	0	40		
Industrial Area	0	19		
Neighborhood Center				
Inner Neighborhood 10		0	50% Single-Family Detached 25% Single-Family Attached 25% Multi-Family	
Residential densities are fo	r net residenti	al acres		
The housing type splits for inner neighborhoods may change for an area to reflect local				
aspirations. The splits used	d need to be d	ocumented,	particularly for the calculation of	
students to determine scho	ol needs.			

Table 1

Determining Capacity

After applying the design types the next step is to determine the capacity for dwelling units and employment that would be generated from the pre-qualifying concept plan. Natural areas requiring protection or would not be

available for development should be identified and have their designation changed to "Open Space" on the plan. These areas are comprised of;

- 100-year Floodplain
- Steep Slopes (over 20%)
- Power Line easements
- Classes I, II, III, A & B of Metro's Goal 5 Inventory where it exists
- 50' buffers of known streams and wetlands
- Areas on Metro's Natural Landscape Features map

After designating open space the developable portion of the plan area needs to be further reduced for public infrastructure, principally streets, schools and parks. From the planning of recent urban growth boundary additions, a 20% deduction for rights-of-way is recommended. An additional 5% should be removed for small-scale neighborhood commercial and non-park and school institutional uses. Using the acreages for design types (less the 25% for streets and other uses) and the estimated yields for residential units and jobs in Table 1 the initial number of units and jobs is achieved. The number of dwelling units by housing type will be used to determine school needs. Presuming an average of 2.5 people per dwelling unit, and estimated population for the area can be determined. This number will be used to determine park needs.

It is recommended that existing school standards should be used to estimate the number of students by school type that would result from development and how many of each school type would be needed along with the number of acres to build those schools. The information in Table 2 is from the Beaverton School District, but the standards of the applicable school district should be used.

Туре	Students per Household Type	Students per School	Students per Dwelling Unit*
Elementary School	0.31 Single-Family Detached	600	0.205
	0.10 Multi-Family	000	0.205
Middle School	0.13 Single-Family Detached		
	0.05 Single-Family Attached	1,000	0.0875
	0.04 Multi-Family		
High School	0.13 Single-Family Detached		
	0.08 Single-Family Attached	2,000	0.0975
	0.05 Multi-Family		

Table 2

* Housing type split of 50% Detached, 25% Attached & 25% Multi-Family

In order to build complete communities they will also need adequate park space. Existing park requirements vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. A starting point would be the targets being used for the West Bull Mountain planning area that are a hybrid of the standards from the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District, City of Tigard and the National Recreation Parks Association, which are shown in Table 3. As with the school standards the applicable local district standards should be used.

Table 3	Tał	ole	3
---------	-----	-----	---

Park Type	Size	Acres per 1,000 People
Community Park	15 acres & larger	3
Neighborhood Park	1-3 acres	2
Open Space / Linear Parks / Trails	Na	5

Overall park standard is 10 acres per 1,000 people. If open space doesn't reach 5 acres per 1,000 additional acres would need to be assigned to community and neighborhood parks to reach 10 acres.

The needed acres for parks and schools leads to an iterative process of taking out the acres from development capacity and recalculating the park and school needs until a balance is reached between students and schools, population and parks.

Transportation

Transportation infrastructure is an important and expensive element for preparing an area for urban-level development. Consideration should be given to not only to circulation within the new urban areas, but how people get to and from these new urban areas. Additionally it is important to consider the transportation impacts new urban areas will have on the existing urban transportation facilities. Some urban reserve areas may be suitable for expansion of the region's high capacity transit system and such opportunities should be identified as part of pre-qualifying concept planning. The spacing of facilities should try to meet the goals identified in the regional road concept, arterials spaced approximately one-mile apart with collectors midway in-between.

Testing for transportation system needs and off-site impacts is important to assist with understanding the nature of transportation needs the new urban areas may eventually have. The testing and resulting costs should not be seen as a constraint to urban growth area expansion. Rather this type of testing informs the planning by reviewing the size and scope of necessary off-site facilities.

To enable transportation system evaluation the general land use patterns, including generalized dwelling unit and employment assumptions will be needed. Staff will then allocate the generalized dwelling unit and employment assumptions to sub-area transportation area zones (TAZs) so that it can be entered into a transportation model. The travel model will be developed using assumptions consistent with the Metro regional travel model. The results of the model will allow a review of the opportunities and constraints that developing a transportation system for the new urban areas may present.


I. Introduction (placeholder: information to be provided by WaCo)

Section should provide an overview and efforts to date; including state and regional directives.

II. City Name

City introduction and background information. Include total City area, acres devoted to residential, industrial, commercial etc, existing population and employment numbers, general characteristics (for example, transportation linkages to region, significant features/history). Description of City needs and aspirations. Include description of what can be achieved inside existing UGB and what cannot, including any comprehensive plan and local plan relevance, transportation limitations and projected needs.

III. Potential Candidate Reserve Area

Staff should give a general description and overview of the potential candidate urban reserve area, including location map that shows existing infrastructure and development. City UGB should be shown, as should Goal 5 areas. Reserve factors should provide context as to why particular geographies are preferred.

IV. Pre-Qualified Concept Plan

Describe how factors were analyzed in preparing the pre-qualified concept plan. Show concept plan area map and include all design types. Information should also be included in tabular form that indicates dwelling units and number of jobs per acre by design type (e.g. town center: 20 dwelling units; 20 jobs per acre). Areas not included in buildable land inventory should be quantified (e.g. Goal 5 areas, flood plains, steep slopes. Basis of park size calculation should be noted. Note existing infrastructure and projected extensions/expansions.

V. Urban Reserve Factor (OAR 660-27-0050) Findings

Use the factors to describe outcomes and identify how the factors were met in the prequalified concept plan. Highlighted areas are suggestions or starting points for Staff discussion and are not meant to be exclusive.

A local government must show how each of the factors in the above rule were considered and balanced in analyzing potential reserve areas. Findings shall be submitted in the following section that documents how Staff weighed their analysis and the methodology used in determining concept plan areas. Minimum considerations follow each factor.

(1) Urban Reserve Factors: When identifying and selecting land for designation as urban reserves under this division, Metro shall base its decision on consideration of whether land proposed for designation as urban reserves, alone or in conjunction with the land inside the UGB:

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

Staff Comment: show density calculations by design type (corridors, employment & town centers, etc). Include map and/or narrative illustrating how projected infrastructure needs can be coordinated

(b) Includes sufficient development capacity to support a healthy economy;

Staff Comment: Note existing and projected jobs capacity for employment areas, industrial, and commercial areas.

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

Staff Comment: present school calculations based on school district formula for number of students per dwelling unit. Note expected service provider agreements.

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

Staff Comment: Note potential walkability components on plan map and trail corridors, transit centers and stop locations; preliminary street grid pattern.

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

Staff Comment: discussion of criteria used to protect natural features in accounting for future development.

(f)Includes sufficient land suitable for a range of housing types;

Staff Comment: discussion of different residential types by density and location

(g) can be developed in a way that preserves important natural landscape features included in urban reserves, and;

Staff Comment: Note Goal 5, non-buildable areas, and other areas precluded from development. Denote buffer areas on map of at least 50 feet in riparian corridors

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

Staff Comment: discussion of potential buffer locations and/or density-limited development pattern. Perspective on existing and potential impacts from development on farm/forest areas.

VI. Summary

Describe how the addition of new urban lands will complete the existing city as a whole and how the new urban land relates to the existing city. Be sure to tie back to city needs and aspirations discussed in Section II. Possible discussion could relate to infrastructure improvements and extensions, increased open space/parks acreage, housing and jobs capacity increases,