

MINUTES OF LAND USE, RECREATIONAL & CULTURAL ACTIVITIES MEETING, COMMITTEE III

Held: May 25, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gisvold, Chairperson; Blunt, Herrell, Jaegger, Moshofsky, Sprecher and Stenenson.

EXCUSED: Brickley, Bullier, M. Johnson and Kirkpatrick.

Staff: Rich, Lamb and Martin.

Invited Guests: Steve Schell, member, Land Conservation and Development Commission

Andy Jordan, counsel, CRAG

Martin Crampton, Planning Director, Multnomah County

Gus Riviera, Planning Director, Clackamas County

John Rosenberger, Planner, Washington County

Ernie Bonner, Planning Director, City of Portland

Richard Bolen, Planning Director, City of Tigard

Mr. Gisvold explained that this was the first of a series of meetings the committee will hold on land use and that the topic for today would be state-local relationships. He then called upon Mr. Schell.

Mr. Schell said that LCDC had adopted statewide goals and guidelines as of January 1, 1975, with which cities and counties were supposed to have complied by January 1, 1976. Time for compliance has been extended. In the metropolitan area, the extension is on the basis of three-month reviews to identify problems.

Problems which have been indentified include: (1) Citizen involvement. There has been resistance from elected officials who fear they are being by-passed. (2) The detailed evaluations each juresdiction must make. LCDC is modifying these requirements for smaller jurisdictions.

Of \$3.3 million available for allocation to local governments, more than \$1 million has been allocated to date. Nearly all of the \$1.1 million for allocation to coordinating bodies, such as CRAG, has been allocated.

Mr. Moshofsky asked if LCDC had power to review all aspects of local planning. Mr. Schell replied no, that it had no power over areas of purely local interest. The commission feels that planning is basically a local function.

Mr. Gisvold asked Mr. Schell what changes from the present system he would recommend. He replied that CRAG needed to assume responsibility for matters of regional significance. It has the statutory authority but has been understandably reluctant to use it.

Also, the legislature should review the appeals procedure and elvaluate whether the commission is best fitted to handle it. Its role should be better defined, or there could be an independent appeals agency.

Minutes of Land Use, Recreational & Cultural Activities Meeting, Committee III, cont.

Mr. Moshofsky asked about restricting LCDC's appeal role to only matters of statewide concern. Mr. Schell replied that the statute gives standing to appeal to any substantially affected person. The commission has taken the position that no one who has not participated in the proceedings below has standing to appeal to the commission.

Mr. Herrell asked what jurisdictional conflicts there were in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Bonner stated that the basic question must be as to what planning is for. The planner must protect the interests of future generations in the decision-making process. He also adds a systematic process, for which an objective is required.

Mr. Herrell asked is planning needed to be done on an areawide basis. Mr. Bonner replied that some decisions need to be made at the neighborhood level.

Mr. Crampton displayed two charts on the planning process (at the committee's request, these are being duplicated for distribution to the committee). He said that the LCDC goals and guidelines are the planning base; specific application is made by the cities and counties. At the same time, local government responds by formulating its own general rules. There is a regional responsibility for things of less than statewide concern and more than local concern.

Mr. Bolen commented that by the time things get down to the neighborhood level, the decisions have been pretty well made. How do they get to participate in the choices sooner. Mr. Crampton said there needs to be a metropolitan forum for neighborhood input so the neighborhoods can understand the impact of their choices on the region.

Mr. Moshofsky asked if CRAG's present role was one of metropolitan screening. Mr. Crampton replied that it was supposed to be. We have a good structure, but we haven't addressed ourselves to substance.

Mr. Schell said the system was too new to tell how it's going to fit together. Don't shuffle the boxes now. What is needed is better communication.

Ms. Jaegger asked how a regional agency like the Port fitted in. Mr. Crampton said there would be no problem if CRAG formed a coordinating function, since the Port participates in CRAG.

Mr. Herrell asked what the problem is with CRAG. Mr. Crampton said it was an inability to bridge the gap between technical processes and decision making.

Mr. Moshofsky asked, if CRAG members don't think regionally, what about an elected body? Mr. Schell said that people are more apt to identify with and hold accountable their present elected officials.

Mr. Joreau said CRAG had three problems: (1) The board reacts defensively; the members tend to wear their local, rather than their regional, hats. (2) Staff moral - - they don't feel they have anyone, a governing body, they are committed to. (3) With growing pressures to get the job done, board members just don't have the time because of the press of problems of their own jurisdictions.



Minutes of Land Use, Recreational & Cultural Activities Meeting, Committee III, cont.

Mr. Moshofsky commented that it seemed that a better defined metropolitan function would solve some problems. Mr. Jordan said that you don't want CRAG to be just one more appellate hoop to jump through. Mr. Moshofsky suggested it would be better to have appeals at the regional level than at the state level.

Mr. Riviera commented that the more levels of government, the more the pressure on the citizen at the bottom. The county staff also feels frustrated, he said, because they feel all of the decisions have been made for them. Mr. Bonner replied that there has been feedback from the communities to CRAG which has changed some decisions. Mr. Crampton pointed out that it was possible, and the importance to make exceptions, if justified, to the LCDC goals and guidelines at the local level.

Ms. Jaegger observed that neighborhood groups now have to go to a variety of agencies and wondered if a regional planning agency could furnish a single place to go.

Mr. Jordan questioned whether there was such a thing as a matter of regional significance as opposed to state significance and local significance.

Mr. Gisvold asked if it would be better to have a board of both representative officials and directly elected members. Mr. Schell replied that he thought the present study might be premature, since things are still in a state flux from the 1973 legislation.

Mr. Bonner said the important thing was to have purpose at each level of planning; the present structure permits this. Mr. Riviera commented that each level tends to justify itself at someone else's expense.

Mr. Moshofsky and Mr. Gisvold asked the guests to make further comments to the staff.