

DRAFT

Meeting Notes  
Rules Committee  
January 13, 2009  
3:00 p.m.

Hood River County Administration Building  
Hood River, Oregon

**Committee Members Present:** Judy Davis, Joyce Reinig, Jeff Condit, Walt Loehrke, Sara Grigsby.  
**Others present:** Jill Arens, Jennifer Kaden, Brian Litt  
**Public present:** Rick Till, Nathan Baker, Mary Repar, Dan Durow, Steven Andersen, Anne Debbaut, Phyllis Thiemann, Tomi Owens, Rodger Nichols

Committee Chair Judy Davis called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

Commissioner Davis recapped the previous Rules Committee meeting and asked Committee members and the audience to brainstorm ideas about how to prioritize lands that might be considered for urbanization.

Prioritization of Lands brainstorming:

First, demonstrate the need cannot be met elsewhere (outside NSA).

Tier I (generally referring to lands to look at first for urbanization)

- Developed settings
- Low/no SNCR resources
- Existing urban services, infrastructure
- Existing urban development
- Land that is path to outside NSA
- Lands consistent with Oregon Urban Growth Boundary laws
- Lands consistent with Washington Growth Management Act laws
- Contiguity with Urban Area boundary
- Land that better protects/enhances NSA resources – gravel pit, cultural resources
- Lands surrounded by developed settings
- Lands east of Crates Point

Tier II (generally referring to lands to look at after Tier I lands)

- Path to outside NSA
- Lower value farm, forest land
- Large lot rural residential, martini farms

Tier III (generally referring to lands to look at after Tier I & II lands)

- Identified wildlife corridors
- Prime farm, forest, open space lands
- SMA lands
- Lands where there would be adverse affects to SNCRs
- Lands with most sensitive resources
- Highly scenic areas
- Natural areas/Ag-Special lands

The Committee and audience then brainstormed ideas for a regional approach to making a case to expand an urban area boundary:

## **Regional Analysis**

- Metro's model for regional population forecast and land need
- Define Region - Is it NSA or beyond? Authority outside NSA
- How to define "regional"? How broad?
  - 3 subregions – 1. Hood River, White Salmon, Bingen, 2. The Dalles/Dallesport, 3. Stevenson/Cascade Locks (e.g. that function as one (or potential to))
  - Live/work breakouts
  - May vary by use needed
- How much of anticipated need will be absorbed elsewhere – different for housing, employment, schools, etc.
- Population forecast consistent with Oregon requirements
- Population forecast consistent with Washington requirements
- Encouraging growth to occur in existing urban areas
- Cumulative effect or cumulative significant impact
- Link to maximum efficiency (Criterion C)
- Define maximum efficiency
- Recognize limitations across state lines, across political boundaries
- Bridge capacity, transportation infrastructure
- Public transportation (availability)
- Commute patterns (encourage shorter)
- Ability of urban area to provide urban infrastructure – water, sewer, storm, streets
- Analysis of growth patterns
- Sequential process – population study, traffic, vacant & buildable lands, etc.

## **Minor Revision** (continued from 1/7/09 meeting)

- Effect on lands near expansion area (outside urban area)
- Minor would not be a substantial impact on surrounding farm/forest uses
- Significant impact on surrounding wildlife habitat, etc.
- Minor would not encroach on adjacent uses – sensitive resources
- Compatibility of adjacent uses or mitigation of effects
- No net adverse effect on sensitive resources

## **Other**

- Reconcile NSA resources and resources outside NSA (e.g. EFU land in Oregon vs. non-farm NSA lands)
- How do we trade off valuable ag land – in or out of UA; establish basis for evaluation
- SNCRs values outside NSA
- Authority to consider resources outside NSA

## **What's Next**

- Minor separate from 4(f) criteria or take those into consideration?
- Varying processes in Oregon and Washington
  - Create equivalent standards on both sides
  - Where does NSA process fit?
- Options for the entire package (3 topics)
- Should committee examine process?
- Characteristics of a good rule
- Q: Can we use IGAs for resource protection in perpetuity?

The Committee set two future meeting dates: Wednesday, January 28, 10 a.m. to Noon and Wednesday, February 11, 3-5 p.m. Both meetings will be at the Commission office.