

City of Scappoose
Ad-Hoc Economic Opportunity Analysis Advisory Committee Meeting
City Hall: May 18, 2010 / 6:00 p.m.

Call Meeting to Order

Chair Donna Gedlich called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Chair Donna Gedlich introduced Debbie Jacobs from Columbia County Planning; she is representing Glen Higgins this evening.

Committee Present:

Chair Donna Gedlich ~ Scappoose City Council, Brian Varricchione ~ Scappoose City Planner, Jerry Johnson ~ Johnson-Reid, Terry Luttrell ~ Port of St. Helens, Debbie Jacobs ~ Columbia County, Dennie Houle ~ Business Oregon, Gary Fish ~ DLCDD, Seth Brumley ~ ODOT, Marie Gadotti ~ citizen and land owner, Brian Rosenthal ~ property owner, Greg Winterowd ~ Winterbrook Planning, Jesse Winterowd ~ Winterbrook Planning, Bill Blank ~ Planning Commission.

Paula Miranda ~ Port of St. Helens & Rita Bernhard ~ County Commissioner (arrived later)

Anticipated Outcomes for this meeting

Jesse Winterowd explained the meeting today was called to finalize the Scappoose Economic Opportunities Analysis Committee process. He explained the expected resolution today is a recommendation from the Committee as to how to proceed with this. He explained as he talked to Brian Varricchione a couple of weeks ago, trying to get to the bottom of exactly this question “What do we expect from the ad-hoc committee here” and they went back and looked at the founding ordinance to determine that what we are trying to accomplish here and it was formed to look at the economic opportunity analysis and determine whether that was reflecting the City’s goals and objectives and to advise that and approve that document. He explained what we have ended up doing here with this committee is a little bit of a “scope creep” where we are looking at directional alternatives and a little bit more than just looking at the Economic Opportunities Analysis and trying to gauge the impacts and effect for the City of that document. He stated what we are hoping for is approval of documents that we have already looked at and talked about and at least somewhat approved so far in previous meetings. He explained he went through this in his May 7, 2010 memo Scappoose UGB Alternatives Recommendation. He explained one of those documents was the Economic Opportunities Analysis that ended up being approved somewhat or mostly or at least as far as we know, approved through this committee a couple meetings ago. He explained then we have a few other documents that deal with transportation impacts, infrastructure, existing UGB infrastructure, vacant and redevelopable land supply, that we also approved last year in this committee, need and supply summary and series of maps. He stated so all of these things we have looked at in committee so far, talked about and in some cases we said that we provisionally approved them. He explained he would like to get confirmation on that and there is also the directional inserts which are the larger issues for a lot of people here. He

explained the end result of what was originally envisioned of being a separate process looking at what direction to grow by how much but we have gotten into that here. He stated the objective of this particular meeting is to get a recommendation from the committee to approve the EOA and possibly have some directions to go with the need identified in the EOA.

Chair Gedlich thanked Jesse Winterowd.

Approval of April 6, 2010 EOA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 6, 2010 EOA Advisory Committee meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Review Open House (City Staff, Winterbrook)

City Planner Brian Varricchione explained the open house was held on May 5 and it was a two hour open house and there was fairly good attendance by Committee members, Councilors, Planning Commissioners and members of the public. He explained it gave the chance for people to look at some of the graphics of various alternative analysis, some of the target industries and the economic opportunity analysis and the facts and figures behind it and basically just a chance for people to get a glimpse of what the Committee has been up to. There were a couple of comments that were submitted and copies of those were presented to the committee this evening.

Citizen comments from the Open House

City Planner Brian Varricchione read the comments:

Submitted by: James Dias ~ Need to develop land on the South side of town, not just the North side/airport.

Submitted by: Kristie Flanagan ~ Jon Hanken stated that the SE portion can be added (UGB) if the criteria of the state is met ~ why is this not proposed? We need more commercial ~ take some of Class II soil classification from the NE area and put the SE portion of Johnsons Landing. ~ see if you can meet the criteria ~ some people are concerned that since this consultant firm is paid by those who want to take in so much of the NE area, that everyone is not looking at the needs of this community for more commercial NOW, not 20 years from now.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he thinks that both of these comments reflect a lot of what the committee has been struggling with all along is the desire to go the southeast area and for a number of reasons that has proven challenging to actually satisfy the Statutory improvement criteria.

City Planner Brian Varricchione explained he does think it would be valuable if for those who were able to attend that they also comment on any conversation they had with members of the public.

Marie Gadotti stated she attended the open house and she thinks what Brian said there were a lot of people present that want the development to go southeast and they have very strong feelings

about that because it has been in the works for a long time, as Rita has told us and Donna has told us and she thinks that is a big concern and she thinks that is a concern that she doesn't think we can ignore.

Jesse Winterowd stated something he heard at the open house had to do with the southeast expansion but we also had some other things that people brought up like the southwestern map boundary. He stated that is something that Brian Rosenthal noticed and we have corrected that in our mapping based on that comment. He explained there was interest in how the conceptual plan for the northeastern airport expansion area that we had put up from Otak earlier and talked about in this Committee. There was concern that that was taking in the Class II soils in the northeast and that is reflected in some of the comments that we received here: Why not take some of that Class II soil and move it to the southeast but that is not exactly the way that it works but we did notice that we were taking in Class II soils up in the northeast there so we revised the concept plan to shrink that Class II impact substantially by about 75% and cut it way back so that we were taking in less of the Class II soils in the northeast in response to that, so that was a good catch. He explained he thinks we had a concern about how the open house relates to the citizen involvement process, whether people had the opportunity to comment and be known here and he thinks he explained it this was the first part of the much larger process with many opportunities to comment publicly and that it is good that people are commenting now and interested now and they will have a continued opportunity to comment on the process.

Chair Gedlich replied she was also there. She explained they probably had at least 25 people throughout the time frame. She was able to talk to quite a few of the individuals that were there, some were citizens, some were developers and some were business owners. She explained it was very interesting. She stated some of the comments were positive, some of the exhibits were very informative, some of them were a little confusing and were explained, however 98% of the comments she got were basically worried about the northeast quadrant versus the southeast quadrant because of the number of areas that we are talking about versus development in the southeast quadrant decades away and everyone is really very concerned about that and it has been in the works with the City for years and she is hoping that maybe something can be done.

Chair Gedlich stated early this afternoon she received an email from Kristie Flanagan and the committee has a copy of that. She stated it basically reiterates what she said at the open house. Paula Miranda, Port of St. Helens, explained she also sent an email this afternoon from the Port.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied there is a copy of that email on the back table for the committee to read.

Marie Gadotti stated she thinks the comments she has heard throughout this last couple weeks has just been the same thing basically that was said that night of how a lot of people are worried about everything going to the airport, it not getting developed and 20 years we are still waiting over on the southeast side and she thinks that is just a real issue that needs to be addressed.

Chair Gedlich replied she has to agree. She has received lots of comments in the last two to three weeks about the same thing.

Changes to documents and mapping based on comments

Review Packet Materials (Winterbrook, Otak) Committee Approved Documents

Revised Maps

Recommendations memorandum

Greg Winterowd stated it is clear that we have one substantial disagreement and that is on the direction of growth but what we should commend ourselves on for the last eight months or so since we have been doing this is that we do have agreement, he thinks, on the content of the economic opportunities analysis that has the support of at least two State agencies and the third is scratching their head, because they have some good questions, that would be Transportation. He explained we have agreement with the Port, which is not a small thing in this community and we also have, he believes, the support of the County for the economic opportunities analysis portion of this, as well as the suitable lands inventory that was completed. He stated so we have got the need and the supply and the coordination aspects down, those are three of the most difficult things that are always faced in any urban growth boundary amendment and that is not a small thing. He stated so in that sense, as Jesse was suggesting, this committee has done its work. He stated we do have disagreement on the direction of growth. He stated one thing he will say is that it is not a question of “Oh we had 20 acres of extra Class II soil in the northeast lets move that some place else”, he explained it is a matter of “Can any Class II soils be justified for inclusion within the UGB giving the large amount of Class III soils that abut the UGB.” He stated it is a very different question, it wasn’t like this little bank if you go in to and pull the Class II soils and move them. He also wants to make this very clear that it is his sincere belief that if we do what was suggested at the open house we will run into a brick wall with DLCD, we will be unsuccessful upon appeal to LCDC if there is an objection. He stated so he would ask you all to consider is it worth jeopardizing the work that has been done to pursue something that by our reading, by WinterBrook Planning’s reading and by DLCD’s reading of State Statutes cannot be pulled off at this point and his view, it is not a minor view, it is a strong view, is that would be a foolish move. He stated having said that it seems to him at a minimum today we could move forward in this process and take to the Planning Commissions we will have plenty of opportunities, both Planning Commissions, both sets of Elected officials to hear public testimony and to get letters from DLCD and ODOT and Business Oregon on this subject, there will be plenty of opportunities for that but he guesses he would employ you to make a recommendation on the direction, whatever that is, but to move the other items forward so that we can get this aired through the public hearing process because it seems to him that we have distinct difference of opinion on the committee and that they may not be resolvable in this forum.

Rita Bernhard stated she is just kind of wondering is there a possibility of doing a secondary suggestion or an alterative plan. She stated we could maybe go forward with what we think may be doable but if there is some way that we could do an alternate plan basically saying we very much want to pursue the development in that area.

Chair Gedlich stated why don't we talk about that at the next agenda item for options and lets finish the overall review of the packet that we received last week.

Gary Fish stated he had one point and Tom Hogue and he reviewed the EOA document several times and when he got it this time he made another pass through it and he talked about this with Tom Hogue and he shared Gary's concerns but we are not sure what if anything can be done about it and it is something that Jerry put in, he believes, at the bottom of page 38 about environmental constraints for commercial land. He stated is says "In order to be suitable the site must be flat or nearly flat having a slope of less than 10%, site must be free of wetlands, floodplains, riparian constraints or other known environmental constraints which will significantly protruded delay or significantly increase the cost of development of the development on all or a portion of the property." He is wondering if it is wise to put something that broad in there, in that wetlands and riparian areas can often be an amenity to certain types of development and incorporated into the design.

Jerry Johnson replied he thinks the point of that, and it is not that they aren't an amenity, in fact a lot of the time they have had to go through applications on commercial projects for developers to have an appeal to have them relocated. He stated it is more of a configuration issue to the extent if it runs diagonal across your site and it doesn't give you a developable parcel it is a big issue. If it runs adjacent to one edge and actually is attractive or can be made to be attractive then it is not a constraint. He stated we can maybe clarify that in that paragraph. He stated intent, particularly with commercial which has relatively highly value it allows you the ability to play around with the very long process it can take to actually move, relocate or reconfigure riparian area or wetland area, where industrial land doesn't have enough value to make that worth while typically. For commercial lands you do get that, it is just that so we can clarify some of those issues. We are not trying to say that it can't be done, because they do it actually quite regularly.

Gary Fish stated and he understood that and he read this document several times.

Chair Gedlich replied she looked at this report, also, three times, line by line and her only concern about this statement has to do with the southeast quadrant and the northeast airport area because it is basically flat land, it is in the floodplain, it is riparian area, it is basically the same land it is just located north and south of each other. She stated it is not on the west side of the highway, it is all on the northeast, southeast side. She asked is there a difference. She thinks the statement is contradicting the two areas, it is not matching.

Jesse Winterowd replied the constraints this is referencing are mapped on these documents so you can see where there is a mapped floodplain and riparian areas are generally inside the floodplains. So the difference there isn't intended to be differences between north and south or east and west it is simply how you look at it on the map.

Chair Gedlich stated the wordage is a little confusing. If it referred to a certain map or a certain area because Mr. Fish commented that this sentence basically is regarding the southeast quadrant. She asked is that true.

Gary Fish replied no, in general because it is in the EOA it applies to all commercial land, anywhere.

Chair Gedlich replied we haven't designated any area in the EOA that is commercial proposed.

Gary Fish replied that is why he is concerned about having such a broad blanket statement unexplained in the document.

Jerry Johnson replied he is worried it eventually becomes policy so sequentially we are laying out here that is what you would like to see in a commercial site but if we are this specific then it takes away flexibility later. If we say we actually look at one that is maybe a riparian but we think we can address some of those issues.

Chair Gedlich asked how can you word it so this isn't so.

Jerry Johnson replied instead of the must it could probably be these things, you would prefer to have a site with these characteristics or that you would be able to economically address the configuration issues associated with these impacts.

Paula Miranda stated she thinks from her understanding what it is saying here is more directly related to actual usable areas in order to count as commercial because if you take 100 acres and 70% of that is wetland you don't want to count and take away your 100 acres that you would have incorporated.

Jerry Johnson replied that is one of the reasons we do that because we want to take it off your inventory so we are not counting a wetland that you don't get to actually use. He thinks we can do that with language that is less absolute which gives us more flexibility.

Greg Winterowd replied but it has to be written in such a way that it, as Paula was suggesting, that we can actual map it. So words like preference would also be problematic at DLCD so he thinks what we want to do is make clear that we have large buildable areas of land after accounting for, as Paula suggested, the wetlands. So that a true concept, it is not that a site has to be completely free of them, which this applies, but that we account for them in the process and that the stream of the wetland isn't smack dab in the middle of the site which would preclude development.

Jerry Johnson replied right, so we are really just counting net buildable land.

Greg Winterowd replied so I think that we have to make that change, good catch. He can assure you, Chair Gedlich, we were not even remotely thinking of applying this in one area versus the other, it was a City wide thing, it wasn't intentional.

Chair Gedlich stated so that language will be changed.

Jerry Johnson replied yes, he can make the clarification. He thinks it is more of a clarification. He explained the issue is that we have large developable parcels that we are not counting areas that are wetland riparian against our, we are making our gross to net reductions on what is mapable.

Marie Gadotti stated she, with all due respect to the consultants here, doesn't agree that they have addressed the concerns that we have brought up through this plan and it is interesting all of a sudden now the Class II soils are gone, they have been there for months, we have talked about them for months, but they didn't get taken out until the very end and that makes her worry of what kind of a document we have here. When you start talking classes of soil that the experts in the beginning said it was fine to put in them in and now they are saying take them out.

Greg Winterowd replied what you had was a concept plan that was prepared by Otak that had never gone thorough review that was an idea for a plan. He replied in response to your comments and others we went back and looked at exactly how much Class II soil was affected and then they adjusted the plan. This is not a last minute thing, this is something that we are responsive to and to suggest that we are trying to sneak something through he doesn't think is appropriate in this case.

Marie Gadotti replied she doesn't mean to have said it quite like that. She stated she would like to finish her comment on that because we have maps that you have given us throughout the proposal and she doesn't think from her relocation nobody has come to the table or open house and said you can't take Class II soils. She doesn't think that was any comment from anyone.

Jesse Winterowd replied he heard that comment directly and Scott as well. He stated a comment related to can you take Class II soils or does it matter, can you take mostly a Class III or should you be going by soil priorities and the answer to that is priorities is you are supposed to go to Class III before you go to Class II and so when you have a conceptual plan as he thinks we tried to make this for this, this was not a plan of UGB expansion, this is how it could look if you took that certain number of acreages and sites in that area, how could it work. He explained we revised that based on looking at that versus the soils and saying you know we are taking in about 30, 40 acres up here Class II but we are supposed to be going to Class III first, you know the road system it should be doing a smooth arc and doing that nice arc was taking in the Class II so we shrunk that in a lot just to avoid, specifically to avoid the Class II. He stated that was a concern that he thinks we talked to a consultant at the Open House.

Marie Gadotti replied anyway when we looked at these things and we have had this map it is dated February 22 but she can't remember when it was actually given to us and that is the information you guys handed us and that is what she started to say, maybe she needs to clarify that to the people in this room and in this group. Members of the public didn't come in and say "Oh my gosh you can't take Class II soils." She stated the comments were as she recollects at the meeting, hey if you guys want to do it over there you should be able to do it over here and she thinks there is some confusion out there is to how you guys got going down that road and then switched and now we are back out of it. Those kind of issues, there is another issue we talked about that is addressed in this but we took out in the last meeting and it is still in here and that talked about Callahan Road. There is another road that we really didn't address and she doesn't think people realize was in the map because we didn't have any information except for two days before the meeting so she thinks there are some problems with your document and the question has been asked several times, what criteria could we get that would allow us to go some other place and our answer today has been there is no other criteria that would allow us to go some where else.

Chair Gedlich would like to expound on that Jesse too in the April 6 minutes we talked about deleting the Callahan signal and it is still there, it is still on the map. Page 5 and also the street extension from Southeast Havlik we received a new map. She doesn't know if everyone has seen the map but 2nd Street extends from Havlik Drive going east then north, all the way to the north clear up to Moore Road and Honeyman Road and then all the way up to Highway 30 and she really wants to know why this happened and why we got it in the last packet. Did somebody suggest this because basically what it does it just winds around the UGB line. She asked someone to explain the map to her because she doesn't ever remember seeing it before.

Marie Gadotti stated we certainly didn't discuss it.

Jesse Winterowd replied this map was included in the last meeting he thinks.

Chair Gedlich replied no, it was with the...

Paula Miranda replied she doesn't remember seeing that in the packet.

Chair Gedlich stated she is sure it was in this packet because she has not separated any of the other information and she knows if it was in a previous packet she would have seen red and she doesn't ever remember seeing that map. She doesn't ever remember anybody talking about that map.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied just a point of clarification that figure one that you are holding up was part of that March 23 memo from DKS Associates, it is the same one that had the signals that Marie Gadotti was referring to.

Marie Gadotti stated and that is why when she brought it up tonight her comment was we talked about the Callahan Road light but we didn't get this document until two days before the meeting so for us to have caught all of these things in two days we missed this which she thinks is a big thing for us to be looking at because she doesn't think this is in the transportation plan, is it?

Chair Gedlich replied no, it isn't.

Marie Gadotti replied she thinks it is an alternative to the Johnson Landing Road Road and with all due respect to the people sitting here she thinks it was an alternative not necessarily supportive for what we are trying to do here.

Seth Brumley stated he thinks kind of what we are getting caught up in is what the consultant suggested in the beginning is that we have economic opportunities analysis that we are trying to sign off on but we also have the "scope creep" into some other areas that are more concept planning for more specific areas and to some extent we have to kind of take a step back and say okay there are some details here that aren't set in stone at all they are more just blank spots on the map that will be filled in later once more decisions will be made. So it is confusing a little bit because we have all these things on paper here but he thinks we just have to try to roll it back a little bit and realize a lot of this is the very early stages.

Chair Gedlich stated the only thing is the written documentation here does not match the Land Use Concept Plan. She stated we don't even have a map and we are not going to get that map, it will go to the Planning Commission. So there is information and material that her understanding is that is out there that we aren't going to get.

Marie Gadotti stated also she thinks what the point is of bringing some of these things up is these things are in this analysis and we are saying hey wait a minute there are some things in here that we don't necessarily like or we would like them changed or whatever we would want to say. To her there is this concept the analysis has to open question marks in her mind as to whether they have been answered and it sounds like a little thing, well we are here for a reason and we are here for what is best for the City of Scappoose and we have an obligation to fulfill that.

Chair Gedlich stated she thinks from the EOA analysis like when you talked about the 7.6% employment rate she is not sure if that is really being realistic but if that is the case what would happen if we raised it to 10% and asked for more land, would that work, could we do that.

Greg Winterowd replied the answer is no. What we had in preparing the EOA is we used data that was available and we can't rig the data to come up with a specific outcome.

Jerry Johnson replied we can push, you can be aspirational, we have to be passable as well, so there is a back push, we can't go over the edge. He stated we probably pushed DLCD about as far as we can on this without getting significant push back. He stated he would actually like to clarify some of the document pieces, we are talking about the concept plan but the concept plan is not in the EOA. He stated it is interesting and it is much easier to talk about because it something you look at it and say well that seems like something I can relate to. EOA's are something kind of hard to relate to and so they are sort of, he thinks, distinct issues because the transportation thing, all of that stuff is useful and is a good discussion piece. He thinks the fact that you guys are doing it is probably because this committee had a lot of interest of how it is going to look and he understands that but he does think there is sort of a separate, like Seth was talking about. If we get rid of the EOA piece and then talk about what do we do about it that is sort of the next steps. Usually the EOA just says here you have got these growth and these different pieces here are some generalize need pieces the real discussion comes after the fact, now what do I do about it and that is where we can start talking northeast or southeast and we can start talking road network.

Brian Rosenthal explained he had a question; is the concept plan technically part of the EOA because every time he sees that he sees the other attached to it.

Chair Gedlich replied no it is two separate documents.

Brian Rosenthal replied that is what he thought.

Jerry Johnson replied it is just coming in the same packet so it is confusing.

Greg Winterowd replied the reason we do a concept plan is to give an idea of what one large property owner had in mind, it is not a binding plan, it wasn't the only possible plan, but is was to give a sense of what could happen with a rather large area in the City. It is not part of the

EOA, it is something that this Committee doesn't have the authority to adopt, even the City Council would not adopt probably as a binding document, it is meant to be illustrative. We did make a mistake on Callahan signal, we should have removed that. We agreed to the intent was to do it down the road, so I guess you got us on that. The other map has been around since March and that transportation plan is not intended for adoption it is intended to show people we have thought about how the transportation system might work in the future. So it would be really wrong to suggest that the Council is about to adopt a new transportation plan, we couldn't do legally because we haven't gone through the whole transportation planning ruling process, that is a whole different process and so to focus on those details as if there is some underlined reason for some things we are doing is just not accurate. The one thing that the concept plan does show is the outer limits of the urban growth boundary and the key thing that Jesse mentioned that needs to be remembered is we have to go to the Class III soils first. The only Class III soils that are included now in the UGB are those which must be included to have a road system. We talked to Ed Freeman, we talked to Otak and we told them there is an inconsistency here. Their comment was this is a much less efficient plan, we said we know but that's the law. That has been the constant position WinterBrook has had from the beginning. We are trying to get a plan adopted that can actually be approved by the State and sometimes that means saying to some people you can't get what you want right now under the Statewide system. We are trying to be realistic and practical and he is very concerned with the direction of this Committee, which could end up holding this up to look at every concept plan, every drawing on the transportation system plan, simply delays the process and doesn't get the City where it wants to go and if you look at the original charge of this committee it was to adopt an EOA with the land needs analysis that focused on the advantages of the airport so that is what we have been trying to do.

Chair Gedlich replied she doesn't think anybody is trying to hold back on what we are doing. She thinks we are all so concerned about the future of the community that we want to make sure we are doing the right thing and everybody understands the documents and what we have to agree and or disagree on and she is not saying that we think you are doing anything behind closed doors, because we know, she doesn't believe that would happen. She has a couple of questions from Jesse's memorandum of January 14 and it is on page 6, she thinks, it is the last page and it is the airport related uses. She stated her question is there is 144 acres is that in addition to the 315 acres.

Jesse Winterowd replied the EOA provides the needs and so you see the airport related uses is summarizing the need identified in the EOA for those uses.

Chair Gedlich replied the 144 acres is part of this.

Jesse Winterowd replied yes, it is part of that.

Chair Gedlich stated her next question has to do with probably the same document. She asked Jesse to explained to her the Public Use Airport zoning, are you trying to make part of it something else. She needs Jesse to explain the map to her because maybe she is not understanding it. She asked could part of this be issued for commercial or is this whole area, 315, is that all total airport related industry or is it dividable.

Jesse Winterowd replied you are talking about the concept plan relating to that document to the document of January 14, he thinks that is what she is asking, how do those numbers relate to the conceptual plan shown by Otak in the Scappoose Airport Land Use Concept.

Chair Gedlich replied right.

Jesse Winterowd replied okay. So what we did in this process was we looked at the employment need identified in the EOA that has sites office, commercial, retail, industrial, lodging related included based on comments from the committee, as well as things like the runway extension that he believes we worked with the Port to figure out and so we looked at the existing supply of land inside the UGB, how does that supply meet, we put all of the need that we could inside the UGB because we are required to do that before we look outside so once we had all the uses we could get inside, according to our suitable lands analysis, the maps that we looked at before, then we looked at what goes outside the UGB and that has a number. That number includes sites of different sizes, it includes location of characteristics, like the highway related commercial and those are things that we couldn't find inside the UGB a spot for so we put those outside and those are reflected in the concept plan outside the UGB where you can see the airport expansion, the runway extension. That's in the EOA, that's on the map, the large sites in the EOA also on the maps. So that is what is showing up in the concept plan. The concept plan isn't intended to show all of the needs that are identified in the EOA because it is only looking at a certain area. There's land inside the UGB already that meets some of the needs identified in the EOA. So those numbers identified in the EOA are not all in the concept plan. He asked does that clarify.

Brian Rosenthal stated he had a question. He stated you have thrown around the term "Highway Commercial", what does that exactly mean. He stated you have never defined it as far as he knows.

Jerry Johnson replied the Highway Commercial is (Brian Rosenthal finished the sentence).

Brian Rosenthal stated near proximity to the highway.

Jerry Johnson proximity to the highway clearly but it is actually in this particular context not only serving some of your locals needs but we are actually anticipated it will serve some broader needs from the surrounding the communities which all the way up to St. Helens, maybe some of St. Helens.

Brian Rosenthal replied he guesses part of his question is from a geographic point is it highway frontage, is it within three blocks of the highway kind of.

Jerry Johnson replied no, it is a type of commercial. The actual location and this is your northeast, southeast thing, within the land use system we don't always get to put it where we would, if he had full control and there was no soil types and classifications.

Brian Rosenthal replied no, this isn't about the southeast point, this is just something that he keeps on seeing and he is trying...

Jerry Johnson replied there are some commercials that orient towards convenience or proximity to neighborhoods and other issues then the highway commercial will primarily be auto dependent commercial uses any expectation that access, ingress, egress is going to be really important, those types of uses.

Paula Miranda stated as you mentioned the process, she just kind of wants to expand a little bit more on that because it obviously seems like there are a lot of questions here regarding where we are now as this group is moving forward and she thought maybe it would be helpful if he kind of could describe the process moving forward so the group understands and especially have concerns that they feel that they can continue making some input in the future, that they would be able to so maybe it would be an easier way to move this part of the process forward in knowing that they still have some ways in making comments and input in regards to the concerns that they have especially as far as transportation. She stated timewise what it would take and what are the steps she thinks would be very helpful.

Chair Gedlich stated she thinks that is a great idea; in fact she has it in her notes at the very end. She stated why don't we talk about that at the end of our options, if you don't mind and finish the packet. She asked if there were any more questions.

Bill Blank stated the fact that itself, his comment would be will this be a proposal as presented, its going to help the community the businesses and developers develop or it is going to hinder it's growth by the design at the expense of some and others might feel like they are getting cut out because of where they are located; northeast sector, southeast sector, that kind of thing. He stated will we be able to use this and actually do what we intended to do and our intended purpose of this is 20 years down the road we have actually been able to expand and we have been able to do it in a way that will work, not something that is going to get patched, like a quilt design. So that is kind of where he is at right now, kind of seeing where we are going with this and where should we go with this. He realizes this was just one map here on what would happen if a road went around there and that kind of stuff.

Chair Gedlich stated she thinks we have been given so much stuff to digest in basically a short amount of time and of course the gentlemen and ladies that work for these agencies do it all day long, five days a week. For us people it has really been confusing trying to make sense of all of it and she has to commend all of you. The questions, the concerns, the comments have really been outstanding so that everybody is trying to work together, whether you are aye or nay or whatever it happens to be. She thinks we have done a good job. She hopes everybody thinks that.

Lisa Smith, resident, stated she has a question with regards to that memorandum you all were talking about the total unmet employment need that you were discussing. She doesn't see any place in here, in any of these documents where we talked about the 315 acres that is already zoned Public Use Airport that allows all of these things like hotels, motels, car rental agencies and all of that stuff that we already have in Scappoose between West Lane and the airport, is this the 50 acres that we talked about redesignating the 54 acre for airport related, that is obviously in addition to the 315 acres that we already have zoned Public Use Airport or is the Port giving back some of that land because we already have 315 of Public Use Airport zoned land and she was just curious how that worked.

Paula Miranda replied the Port barely owns any property that can actually be expanded into it and that is one of the reasons there is more needs for additional aviation.

Lisa Smith replied she isn't talking about the land the Port owns she is talking about the City's zoning for Public Use Airport, no matter who owns it, there is a whole batch of it 315 acres. Some of the Port does own, in fact the Port owns 197 acres according to the FAA web site, which might be a mistake she doesn't know but that is what the FAA is showing. She stated she really does understand the need for the airport extension she also understands the need for 900 feet from the center line to the east side of the airport and that is a lot more than 40 acres that show in here for hangar so she is really thinking that maybe the airports needs aren't exactly addressed in this and those are significantly locational, you can't move those somewhere down in the southeast quadrant. Those have to be met within that 900 feet on the other side of the runway. So that is why she is trying to understand how the numbers add up with regards to the airport.

Jesse Winterowd replied the airport related uses the need for these is identified in the EOA specifically exhibit 1.17, it is at the end of his document as the last page. So we have the exhibit which shows the land demand by site size. This is fairly unchanged since last August but what we did add here is the lodging related based on feedback from the committee that added about 7 acres. So what we are talking about here is 144 acres of airport related need, that comes out of this document that includes hangar reserve, runway extension and the airport employment identified in this table. Those are all intended to be included in that concept plan and he believes they are shown in that concept plan. The airport employment is intended to be use inside the exiting UGB in land that is west of the airport.

Paula Miranda stated just on the Port point of view here in a perfect world they would love to have all of this property that you can see around the airport for aviation related business but unfortunately sometimes general aviation airports like that it takes a long time for it to be developed and that is not just here it is everywhere. General aviation business went down about 30% in the past year. She was just at a FAA conference a month ago and they are saying whoever thinks the general aviation is not hurting right now anywhere in the country is fooling themselves. So in other words we know that in order for the Port to implement and make everything aviation like we want we have to buy it and make it that way. Unfortunately in order for the Port to buy it they need FAA to come aboard with them and work with them in buying those. FAA is just not going to jump in and let them buy stuff unless they can prove it without a doubt that they have the related uses they want and they have a master plan and that master plan has certain needs and certain uses and unfortunately they have not been able to implement like they intended to. With that said the intent here is to work with the local developer that is trying to work this out and trying to generate as much of that of aviation if we can but we understand sometimes it doesn't work. Profitwise they may have to have a mix and there has also been the wish of doing hotels and other things to accommodate some of those other uses. So they are trying to work with that as far as the Port is concerned but their wish would be they would love to have all of that area in purple as part of the airport, but is just doesn't work that way.

Lisa Smith replied she is going to ask the question again because it still hasn't been answered. Do you understand that everything in light purple on this map is currently zoned Public Use

Airport? It doesn't matter when you guys own it or not, it is zoned Public Use Airport and that permits a whole list of activities including hotels, motels, restaurants and other uses customarily associated with a Public Use Airport. Are you giving up some of that 315 acres redesignating it to something else. Is that the Port's intent?

Paula Miranda replied no. The Port's intent is to keep as much, everything we have zone wise aviation and possibly add more. We have no intent to shrink the aviation uses.

Lisa Smith replied then we have a problem because you have property redesignated inside the Urban Growth Boundary and that is causing a little concern and she is trying to figure out where that is going to come from.

Greg Winterowd replied he respectfully disagrees with what she said. He stated we have not designated anything on a comp plan map yet. The proposal, we have a diagram that shows how we might preserve some large industrial sites as required by Goal 9 consistent with the EOA, that is all we have. There is no proposal to take away airport related uses from the Port or from the City, in fact the proposal is to expand them. If you look at this diagram it shows runways going everywhere. As you noted the existing airport zone is not a pure airport zone it allows other uses under certain circumstances. We are proposing a similar approach but keeping large parcels because we have identified that need. We have worked very closely with the Port. That was a challenge that present to us by DLCDD, by Economic Development from the very beginning, it is a challenge we took really seriously. We want to maximize the use of this airport for the City's benefit, for the property owner's benefit, for the Port's benefit and to suggest otherwise is just dead wrong.

Lisa Smith stated so where does the 100 acres that needs to be redesignated come from because it clearly states in this memorandum and she very much could be misunderstanding the memorandum but it does say that we have 153 vacant suitable industrial acres, some 104 acres were proposed for MUE and A. The A part wouldn't count because it is PUA now but are we redesignated from inside current Urban Growth Boundary land that is currently zoned PUA, Public Use Airport, to something else. That is what she is trying to understand. Since that was the only piece of the property that was large enough she automatically assumed that.

Jesse Winterowd replied we are not proposing a rezoning. He thinks is what she is talking about. He stated they are not proposing changing the comprehensive plan inside the UGB at this time so he thinks you would still have the comprehensive plan designation there. There may be potential zone changes in the future.

Paula Miranda stated she has a comment here. Just so you know one of the things, the Port actually had been sitting down with the developer here quite some time probably for a couple of years going over some of these concepts and we also have the understanding that they had the intent for the new area to be brought into the UGB that they would have some aviation uses and that is the reason that there are some taxiways on the concept plan uses and we also understand that they would want additional industrial, commercial, unrelated necessarily but may be even some folks that may want to use the airport but that is the whole thing that you have to be approved by FAA anyway for through the fence but with that said we sat down with them, we

went through this map before it even made it in to this meeting and she doesn't think we necessarily have a problem. Some of those areas will be designated something else, something mixed but her understanding is that is all we are dealing with it is the new concept of the new area to be sort of a mixed aviation and non-aviation. So that is their understanding. She thinks from all the meetings that she attended we have never agreed that we would be redesignating the current aviation.

Jesse Winterowd replied yes, there is nothing that says you can't use airport related uses inside the UGB in that area, that is not part of this. So if it can be used for lots of different sizes inside the UGB that is one thing. The existing comprehensive plan designation and zoning out there is very inclusive. A lot of uses that aren't airport related so we are not proposing to limit it away from the airport pieces.

Chair Gedlich asked with the MUE's is that going to be right here on this 54 acres, where is that going to be.

Jesse Winterowd replied are you talking about the airpark employment?

Chair Gedlich replied yes.

Jesse Winterowd replied he believes that is inside on the west side because that is not an expansion of the UGB concept that we are trying to get here. He doesn't really understand the concern about implementing an airpark employment zone he thinks that is a good thing for the airport.

Marie Gadotti stated she thinks this discussion kind of brings back some points of the EOA. There is a lot of people in this community that have thought and been told in several different ways that what goes on at the airport is going to be airport related. Now we are hearing "Oh wait a minute, it may not all be airport related, it might be some of these other things", which is what these folks would like to see at the south end of town not northeast of town. She has concerns with the ways some of these are put together and she is not saying anybody did whatever. You have a big land owner who would like to do a big development and everybody has their wishes but she thinks this document doesn't, in her opinion it doesn't reflect where we need to be going.

Jesse Winterowd replied that document does not reflect a direction of choice.

Seth Brumley replied he thinks we need to go back to the Port's suggestion, if possible, of clarifying what, if this committee accepts this EOA, which is only this part, correct.

Jerry Johnson replied it does not include that map.

Seth Brumley stated if this committee accepts this does that say anything about where the UGB will expand. So all it is saying is that the City is meeting these needs if it expands in some direction it can meet more needs, is that correct.

Jesse Winterowd replied to clarify, there are specific airport related needs and you can say those airport related needs are going to go by the airport, but other than that there is not a directional component to large industrial sites or other pieces of the EOA.

Chair Gedlich stated when you look at the EOA numbers, she doesn't have a problem with all of the diagrams, what she has a problem with is there is something in the document that says that there's 7.6% employment for the next 20-25 years, that is not even realistic in this community. She means right now we have a 20% unemployment rate. People look at these figures and they are laughing at us. It isn't like we are in downtown Portland.

Jerry Johnson replied downtown Portland has lost employment for the last decade so they are not going to lead the way as far as growth.

Chair Gedlich stated what she wants to see is a document with realistic numbers that she can give to our community before we pass it on to the next group.

Bill Blank replied it is a concern on the statistics on numbers and whatever. He asked what were they determined on and how did they reach those figures because he thinks a lot of people here in the community do not see that that is growth, they see stages of it. Are we going to be a bedroom community of Portland, is that what they are saying and we are going to be swamped by growth or is it the fact that what if we remain pretty much the way we have been in the past. You are not going to see that huge jump in the figures and if that is the case then how should we prepare for that too.

Jerry Johnson replied when we take a look at a Goal 9 what they typically look for is the aspirations of the community. You have got an overall region with a 1.2% average annual growth rate expected from the State. What we were doing in these forecast is targeting industries and trying to change the your nominal share of employment over time so that you become less of a bedroom community and you start to capture more of your commercial needs, you start creating more employment locally a little bit less of a commute and basically you are aspiring to grow your commercial industrial base at a rate faster than your population base. That is what this reflects, and if you make those findings and say this is what we would like to see, then you confirm if your land supply is supportive of that. He explained that you decide multiple phases in a Goal 9, here is where I would like to be, here is what I would like to see happen in the future, I need to make sure that I basically set the table, I have established a land supply consistent with where I am trying to go so that I have the ability to get there or at least my land supply is not precluding me. It doesn't mean that you are going to realize it. Some people have urban growth boundaries, we work all over the State, that they are nowhere near, they are smaller than they were 20 years ago when they did their first Urban Growth Boundary, they are not getting tighter. He did one in La Grande recently and this is actually when he got a comment from the State, not Gary but this was from the State and they said this is La Grande has lost employment for the last 5 years, how come you are looking for more employment land. They said because they don't aspire to lose employment for the next 20 years and so our forecast isn't going to be that we are going to decline in perpetuity so we are just going to close up the doors and shut it down we would like to see some redevelopment, we would like to see some other things happening. It doesn't guarantee you are going to get it and it is not a hard forecast to get it but what it means is

this reflects the community's expectations that it is plausible to get this. When you take a look at your growth rates keep in mind that your industrial base is not that high in Scappoose so your growth rate can be quite strong if you just get a higher share of the growth in Columbia County as a whole, much less some of the overflow growth from the Portland Metro area, which may be fairly significant. There are things that over time companies can move around you can meet these things potentially. He doesn't think they are laughable, he does think they are pushing and that they are definitely aggressive, but he doesn't think it is wrong for a community in its economic effort to be aggressive. Portland has lost employment for the last 10 years. He just went through their forecast for one of their pieces and they are expecting to grow at 5% a year for the next 20 years. There is no historical indication that is going to be happening but they are pretty bullish about it.

Councilor Gedlich replied she thinks Portland is a little different than our community because we are looking at 7.6 to develop 315 acres out at the airport, whether it is airport related or not but we have other areas in the community that we won't grow until there is a lot of activity done in that area.

Jerry Johnson replied he doesn't think the airport is going to be your first area to develop anyways. You have a lot of infill redevelopment and other activity close to the highway and other things you are going to see happening before that airport property. For the talk about reserving the airport for airport related use, he thinks you can put restrictions when you get to the zoning code again we are way ahead when we get to code which has the zone you can put things that say we really think this is important. That is one of the reasons you call out and say we think airport related industry is important for us. That gives you a policy call out to them put an overlay and say look we want some airport dependent restrictions or something in this code that basically calls up that we recognize or identify that we want to do this. The new land that gets brought into the Urban Growth Boundary won't be the first step to develop necessarily. It is sort of the marginal step on the edge. He still thinks you will see sort of similar patterns with the stuff toward the highway still being more desirable particularly to commercial users.

Chair Gedlich asked the committee does everyone approve of this economic opportunity analysis and they go along with all of the language, all of the numbers that is going to move on. She asked if there are any other concerns other than the one clarification statement that is on page 38.

Paula Miranda asked if she is looking for a motion or a consensus.

Chair Gedlich replied she wants a motion.

Marie Gadotti moved that this committee does not support this or oppose it, we move it out of this committee with no recommendation.

Marie Gadotti stated there are too many unanswered questions where she does feel we have done the best for our City and business people and the residents of this town going through all this document. So her compromise at this point would be that we will not make a recommendation and it goes to the Planning Commission.

Brian Rosenthal asked does this motion mean we are neither approving or denying we are just sending it on.

Marie Gadotti replied correct.

Chair Gedlich replied right, that is exactly correct. She stated whether you approve it or disapprove it, it stops here with no recommendation as per the motion and it just moves on to the Planning Commission level. Do I have a second?

Paula Miranda stated she will second it just because she thinks we should move on.

Rita Bernhard stated she guesses she is just a little concerned if we go without any recommendation one way or the other. What is the next move.

Chair Gedlich replied it just goes to the Planning Commission. All the information that we have gathered, that they have gathered, our minutes and whatever information that we don't have in front of us the Planning Commission will get. It just ends here now.

Marie Gadotti replied it is a way to move this things forward. It looks like there are a lot of vehicle that want to move this forward. She stated the committee does not have to make a recommendation. She thinks there are a lot of folks that we are a committee to represent and this point she thinks her best way to represent those folks is to go with this motion.

Jesse Winterowd stated he thinks we have to look at what the point of what we are going here is.

Chair Gedlich stated you mean the resolution for the committee.

Jesse Winterowd replied right, the point of having the committee in the first place.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he doesn't have the exact language but when he, in the memo on the last page date May 7, the first two paragraphs he was sort of paraphrasing the resolution that created the committee and some was more than paraphrasing and some cut and paste, so basically what City Council was looking for this committee to do is to figure out how much additional land should be brought in to the Urban Growth Boundary for commercial and industrial development. So the main thing that the Council chartered the committee for was to help review and advise the EOA development and then to settle on a number or numbers for growth and unfortunately we should have pulled that Charter out a little bit earlier to help guide the discussion of the committee because it has kind of strayed in to additional things, which he thinks was valuable to pull everyone to growth but that was frankly beyond the scope of the Council had asked for.

The committee took a recess at 7:28 p.m. and resumed at 7:43 p.m.

City Planner Brian Varricchione distributed the 5/7/10 memo from WinterBrook that for some reason had been left out of the meeting materials.

Chair Gedlich stated we do have a motion on the table.

Paula Miranda withdrew her second. She explained she feels the committee needs some sort of recommendation here, she believes we really should move forward with this. She stated obviously we do not at this point authorize or approve any rezoning of any kind especially around the airport. She doesn't think that the intent and the Port is certainly not going for that at this point in time but she thinks just go through with that analysis and move forward as far as the study that has been put together at this point.

Brian Rosenthal asked you just said the Port doesn't want to do rezoning around the airport but he thought the analysis talks about rezoning.

Jerry Johnson replied the EOA doesn't talk about that.

Chair Gedlich stated the motion dies for lack of a second.

Marie Gadotti asked if everyone in the room see this before tonight.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied there was supposed to be a memo that was supposed to be in the packet and he didn't find it in his and apparently no one else has it either.

Rita Bernhard asked are we supposed to make a decision tonight or will we be meeting again to make a final decision.

Chair Gedlich stated if nobody minds she would like to ask if we can have one more meeting and have everyone please be here, we need everyone's comments, everyone's questions. If you hear from anyone please write their comments down. If you get an email from anyone, please bring it. Let's schedule another meeting soon.

Jesse Winterowd replied the 5/7 memo is a summary document of the packet, it doesn't provide new information, it summarizes all of the information that you have received over the past year so that is what is going on here. The new information, the things that we talked about; the information we received from the open house. For example, that we have talked about here but he doesn't think that there is a great deal of difference in what you know now versus what you will know in a week or two.

Chair Gedlich asked on the next agenda items it stated the committee options, how would everybody feel if we met for another ½ hour or 45 minutes and explained this document so we can move on and then we don't have to have another meeting or would you like to come back.

Debbie Jacob asked why don't we have Jesse summarize and then we can have Brian also summarize his memo.

Paula Miranda stated she thinks it is important that they know the steps once this moves on. She thinks knowing those steps she thinks it is easier for them to make a discussion in knowing

where this is going and what exactly are they approving, she thinks that would clarify a few things for us.

Chair Gedlich asked if everybody is in agreement to finish this evening.

Marie Gadotti stated part of what she thinks seems to be part of the problem is she guesses when we read all this stuff which she has read it, when we read it all and we take a look at what responsibility we have and we don't come up with the same things as what is presented and then we have a memo from somebody, and she is not picking names, she wants to read the whole thing. To get a memo from the people who put it together to give you an oversight, our job is to actually look at the whole thing and not just that kind of a thing and that is what you are going to be doing if you just do this oversight we still have a document here that we are suppose to be looking at every page of it.

Jesse Winterowd replied the EOA you have had for 3 months, just pointing that out.

Rita Bernhard stated she is looking at this memo from Brian and there is a suggested motion and what she was asking earlier is there some way to say we have reviewed this document and have received information, and received public input and so on, however we don't totally agree with everything that is in this document and therefore this third motion talks about the committee recommends this land be included within the UGB, and this is the area we are looking at in the southeast quadrant. We continue to say that is what we want at some point and time and she is thinking we should have some kind of language at the end of all this saying that we still are interested, even though this document has been presented and we understand the difficulties of getting that possibility to have or make it happen, we still would like at some point to pursue that. She thinks we need to have that in the final recommendation as a fallback, we absolutely want to pursue it at some point and time when the time is right and when it is a possibility that we can do this we want to do it and she thinks we don't want to get that lost.

Chair Gedlich replied she thinks she asked that at the last meeting, if she remembers correctly, it is in the minutes, explicitly stating that we wanted language in here about that.

Bill Blank replied he is looking at the 5/7 memo and the last thing it says is Class II farm land, currently limits expansion along Highway 30 to the southeast. The committee can recommend future urban studies continued to peruse opportunities to provide a north south connection to Johnson Landing Road. It is kind of in that same vein that you are talking. If you have language like that then he thinks that addresses your concerns, maybe.

Marie Gadotti replied she understands it is there, she understands it here but we have been told several times that if this expansion goes that direction, the direction being proposed it could be 20 years before anything is going to happen at the other end. That has to be developed somewhat before you can move your UGB and she doesn't want that to get lost in this discussion either because if we are looking 20 years from now we are not doing the City the justice that we need to be doing. So the words in here don't really say much, it makes it sound good, makes us feel good, but it really doesn't tell us anything.

Chair Gedlich stated most of the concerns have been in the actual minutes, like this, it is not really in any document and that is what she asked from the last meeting are all the concerns this is part of the options from the agenda. She thinks it is kind of like we have lost something and she is going to ask that we have one more meeting, please. She is sorry and the reason she is asking this is because she thinks everybody needs to go back and read the minutes, from clear back and list the concerns that is in everyone's minds; the southeast quadrant, the northeast quadrant, the northwest and make sure that everybody brings to the table at the next meeting a list of what we want to pass on to the next group. She doesn't care if it is the Planning Commission, she doesn't care if it is an open house at this point because we want the best document and so do they. She has no problem with this analysis except personally she just feels it is not realistic. However she is not a planner so she doesn't know. She thinks for the citizens of the community, she thinks we would be doing them a disservice if we just stopped it right now and just pass it on when there is still concerns on the table.

Dennie Houle explained he has been at most of the meetings and participated and listened to a lot of the discussion and he recognizes there are some issues that remain for the community and he doesn't live here but he personally thinks the work that has been done on the Economic Opportunity Analysis and he thinks the proposed motion or recommendation from staff is good. He also thinks that maybe another motion could be made to strengthen our feelings about how the property that was not able to be included for consideration caused consternation with this group and that we strongly recommend that it would go to the Planning Commission and then eventually the Council for them to take more testimony from citizens that can talk to them directly and make a decision about what they do at that level but he seems to think that this work for this committee is complete and he feels comfortable with the staff recommendation with the caveat that we come in strong signal to the Planning Commission and they will know our consternation they will hear from citizens and that probably is the right forum.

Bill Blank stated since it will be coming in front of us (Planning Commission) if we do go forward with this at some point and time whether it be tonight or some other time he would like to ask that Brian include any of the minutes to the Planning Commission of this group so that we have the full sense of what is going on, not just this particular piece.

Paula Miranda would second what Dennie said. She thinks that is more in tune with what she thinks we believe. She thinks the work as far as the general information it has been done enough to figure out that we need some UGB expansion, there are some needs obviously industrial, aviation, commercial, you name it they are all there.

Dennie Houle replied he actually thinks having a proposed motion on the table and to see how the committee feels and how it gets voted on would be a reasonable thing to do tonight before we make the decision to have another meeting.

Chair Gedlich stated she has a question, when you look at, you just talked about the southeast quadrant and what the community is really looking at, when you look at motion two when it says including the airport and southeast and exceptions along Old Portland Road, could we include the southeast quadrant area. She said tell me why Gary, tell me why.

Gary Fish replied he thinks Brian's attempts here to capture this goes as far as he would be willing to go. He stated he called him earlier today and made a couple of suggestion, a couple of minor word edits. He believes and he suggested this at the last meeting that going to the southeast is sending the City on a path that others have tried and he is not going to repeat his words and he just doesn't view it as feasible. He believes what Brian has here captured the essence of what he said.

Chair Gedlich replied she thinks all this, her understanding is that all this committee does is kind of pass our concerns along and everybody knows that for months we have talked about the southeast quadrant and like Commissioner Bernhard made mention, she brought up the southeast quadrant and said is there a motion that we can do something to direct people in that direction, even if it is 10 years, 15, 20 down the road, is there a problem with putting that wordage in the second motion. She is just asking a clarification question.

Gary Fish stated he believes the way that Brian separated it out made clear recommendations on clear cut parts of this and he tried to separate them out to kind of ranking as to what is the recommendation, what is coming is a recommendation and the third one is this community would like to continue looking at the southeast quadrant, it is not going to be a part of this but that in the future, it might not be 20 years. Everybody is blocked in on 20 years. EOA's change, he has seen EOA's change in 2 or 3 years depending on what happens around here.

Jerry Johnson explained they just did one in Hillsboro after three years because things changed.

Gary Fish stated he believes the wording that he has there captures, it says when it can be justified according to State priorities. That doesn't set a time frame on it.

Chair Gedlich replied so if there is no time frame then it shouldn't matter whether the southeast quadrant is in that sentence because that is our third option when we talked about it two meetings ago. So she is just asking why we can't add the southeast quadrant.

Brian Rosenthal replied he doesn't think it matters if we put the southeast in there because it is not part of the plan. It is more of an aspiration than it is anything else at this point. He doesn't feel it would get to the nuts and bolts of what he thinks the southeast is trying to get to. He doesn't know if it changes any thing. He asked is that fair?

Rita Bernhard replied she just thinks that we need to have some kind of wording in whatever recommendation we pass on. She thinks it needs to state very clearly that we spent a lot of time talking about the southeast quadrant, it is the strong desire of this committee, that means a strong desire of this group of members as well as the citizens who have appeared already. We have received emails, we have received word from the public that that is what they want. So she thinks what we need to say is we are passing this along, the three motions as stated probably would do the trick but she thinks at some point we need to stress how we felt that the EOA was a good job the way it was done, there is nothing wrong with the items we received, it has been very helpful, however that doesn't change the fact that people in this community want to develop that area. She stated she knows it is a want, but it has been want for probably 20 years that she is aware of, or maybe 30 since she has been here. She thinks at some point we have to address that

and say this is something that we strongly recommend in the future, at some point somebody needs to start looking at this to see if there is some way that we can do something with that. Chair Gedlich stated she doesn't know why there isn't something that we can put in words, that we pass along Gary. She doesn't understand what the big deal.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he wrote this memo and he is not particularly attached to the exact wording. Just a suggestion, he knows for him he does better when he can look at something. He explained this is like five drafts and if someone has a sixth or seventh draft beautiful.

Shirley Sable, resident, complimented the ladies that are addressing the citizens concerns. She is hearing a lot of feedback from some of the other folks here at the table and she is not familiar with their position but it sounds like they are not necessarily citizens of Scappoose or the surrounding area and they are not taking that into consideration. She agrees that something needs to be put into the document to be passed along because if it is not what are you going to tell your citizens. You are here to support those people, that is our job, right.

Chair Gedlich thanked her for her input.

Don Hansen stated he thinks your comments are very well taken. He is on the other side of this issue, he is a northeast guy around the airport, that is his client that is where he is engaged the most. He explained he has listened to several of your meetings and he has done a lot of work in Scappoose, he has had his tailed kicked at the Planning Commission a few times. One thing he will observe about the geography here is that parallel routes to the highway are critical and they are a great shortage to the City. For that reason alone he would mention this access to road linkage at the south end, it should be front and center in what you put forward and it sounds like the motions head that way. He stated we are dealing with a mathematical study this evening to decided if that is valid, and it is, but making mention of this circulation and access concern that the City has is a good thing and he thinks you would want the Planning Commission to hear that loud and clear.

Chair Gedlich replied that has been her concern over the last several meetings is that we make sure all of our concerns have been addressed adequately. Whether something happens five years from now or 50 years from now.

Don Hansen replied none of us know the timing Donna of anything. He thinks having it stated as part of your deliberations is the way to go.

Chair Gedlich thanked Don Hansen for his comment. She stated she thinks that is what she was trying to get out of Mr. Fish was just because somebody has an idea doesn't mean it is good or bad or in different. For 30 some years we have been trying to figure out how you do a parallel system off Highway 30 because we have know for years that we aren't going to get any more traffic lights, we aren't going to get any more railroad crossings so we have to be realistic somewhere and she thinks it would be a disservice to us on this body not to put some kind of language, even if it is just by motion that the information is passed along to the next group so they are aware of the concerns and then let them deal with it.

Rita Bernard replied ultimately the Council will be making the final decision anyway and this body was supposed to be gathered in order to get information and to make a recommendation based on the information we received. It will go on now to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission will do another process where they gather information and then they will pass it ultimately on to the Council and at that point the Council can make up their mind do they want to try to pursue something else. She stated it is difficult sometimes and DLCD is not going to be too thrilled about this idea, we heard that loud and clear but there maybe something that someone can come up with that might be able to do something and that needs to be perused at the Council level.

Chair Gedlich replied she doesn't think anything is going to happen until they change the States Land Use Laws but that won't be happening.

Chair Gedlich stated why don't we do some motions or is everyone satisfied with what Jesse presented.

Rita Bernhard asked if everyone saw the motions that Brian proposed, does everybody have that.

Dennie Houle replied he realizes he is not a citizen of Scappoose, while a member of the Committee and to see if we can test whether or not Brian's suggested motion reflect the committees desire.

Dennie Houle made a motion to use Brian's language in the three motions and vote on it with the two edits suggested by Gary and Brian; Statutory in place of land use we have employment advantages as amended.

Rita Bernhard seconded for the purpose of discussion.

Seth Brumley stated it states that we recommend that the City Council recognize that the transportation and land use advantages and employment advantages. The transportation advantages may be perceived advantages at this time which is fine for the recommendation but just so everyone knows ODOT in the future may say there is no advantage to this. He just wanted to put that on the table.

Rita Bernhard replied there is an advantage to the community for transportation. ODOT may not be too thrilled about it but this is something the community feels will be a benefit.

Marie Gadotti explained at least the people they talked to a year ago that where some here in the top part of ODOT about a frontage road and a light at Johnsons Landing Road. So unless you guys just don't know what each other is saying that is the meeting she was at and that is what the folks were telling us then. So whatever happened in between she has no idea.

Rita Bernhard stated well maybe we want to put the wording in there that recognizes the transportation and employment advantages to the community, maybe we need to have something in there, may be add that.

Bill Blank asked did we address the environmental constraints, on page 38, is that included in that.

Rita Bernhard asked Bill Blank if he wanted to look at the proposed motion that she has.

Lisa Smith stated she needs to understand exactly what is the economic opportunity analysis. Will someone please hold up precisely what it includes; it doesn't include the transportation memorandums, needs and land use, MUE Zoning and all that stuff, it is simply the Johnson-Reid document.

Jerry Johnson replied yes this is it.

Lisa Smith replied okay, then this is very misleading because then it goes on to say excluding the March 23 memo regarding a possible inclusion of commercial and warehouse, which was never in the Johnson-Reid analysis that you just held up so there is not reason to exclude it, it is very misleading.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he did not intend to mislead anyone in this room. He was trying to clarify. He didn't want to just say the memo by Johnson-Reid because they wrote a March 23 memo about the possible inclusion of commercial warehouse distribution uses, that has never been voted on by the committee, either accept it or reject it. He chose to put it in there so that it could be specifically rejected.

Lisa Smith stated she just wants to make sure that everybody knows that we are only talking about that and not anything else.

Rita Bernhard asked if she has a date on that memo.

Jerry Johnson stated it say Feb 2010.

Rita Bernhard stated maybe you might want to put that.

Chair Gedlich replied what she would suggest for clarification Dennie is lets do one motion at a time because if there is word language change then it would be easier to clarify it.

Paula Miranda stated maybe just add the date of Feb 2010 in the motion.

Lisa Smith stated the first motion could read:

I move that the Advisory Committee accepts the Feb 2010 Economic Opportunity Analysis.

Dennie Houle and Rita Bernhard accept that motion.

Bill Blank stated again he just wants to know Gary brought up a point of the environmental constraints on page 38, did that get addressed here.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied it has not been included in any motion at this point.

Bill Blank replied so right now that language would stay as is.

Chair Gedlich replied that is right.

Bill Blank replied we need to adjust it.

Chair Gedlich stated somebody said as amended.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied taking a cue from Lisa he thinks Paula's friendly amendment to add February 2010 means we can strike the part about March 23 and not confuse anyone and then somebody can say the part about the environmental needing a little tweaking.

Chair Gedlich stated lets try this: I move that the advisory committee accept the February 2010 Economic Opportunity Analysis prepared by Johnson-Reid and amend page 38 environmental constraints regarding flood plain riparian constraints.

Lisa Smith stated just have one thing done first.

Chair Gedlich stated the first motion is going to read, if it is okay with Dennie: I move that the advisory committee accept the February 2010 Economic Opportunity Analysis prepared by Johnson-Reid.

Dennie and Rita are fine with that motion.

Chair Gedlich stated there is going to be language change in all three of them and if all three of them aren't clarified when it gets to the Planning Commission level we are sunk. So let's do one at a time, please. She has been doing this since 1984 and that is what her attorney has taught her for decades so we are going one motion at a time, I am sorry.

Rita Bernhard confirmed she and Dennie are fine with the first item as stated.

Dennie Houle moved and Rita Bernhard seconded the motion that the advisory committee accepts the February 2010 Economic Opportunity Analysis prepared by Johnson-Reid. Motion passed. Marie Gadotti abstained.

Chair Gedlich stated the second motion is about amending page 38 on the EOA. Do you have language that you want?

Jerry Johnson replied let me write language. Why don't you go to one of your other motions and he will write language, he needs to rewrite this.

Rita Bernhard moved and Debbie Jacobs seconded the motion that the Committee recommends that the City Council recognize the transportation and employment advantages to the community of future expansion in the southeast quadrant south of Havlik Drive and the committee

recommends that this land be included within the UGB when this area can be justified under Goal 14 and Statutory Priority.

Marie Gadotti stated that really doesn't, that certainly makes us all feel good, but it doesn't go anywhere and so if it makes you feel good. She just doesn't want anyone to walk out of this room thinking it really doesn't go anywhere.

Chair Gedlich replied she thinks we all know that.

Motion passed unanimously.

Jerry Johnson asked if the committee likes this wording for the next motion:

Change the wording on page 38 under environmental constraints to say: In order to be suitable the site should be flat or nearly flat, having a slope of less than 10%, the site must be able to provide appropriately sized and configured developable areas free of wetlands, floodplains, riparian constraints or other known environmental constraints which would significantly preclude, delay or significantly increase the cost of development of all or a portion of this site.

Chair Gedlich stated we didn't change that many words, did you.

Jerry Johnson read the proposed motion again: In order to be suitable the site should be flat or nearly flat, having a slope of less than 10%, the site must be able to provide appropriately sized and configured developable areas free of wetlands, floodplains, riparian constraints or other known environmental constraints which would significantly preclude, delay or significantly increase the cost of development of all or a portion of this site.

Brian Rosenthal moved and Terry Luttrell seconded the motion that the committee approve the following language from the EOA on page 38 under "Environmental Constraints" to read: In order to be suitable, the site should be flat or nearly flat, having a slope of less than 10%, the site must be able to provide appropriately sized and configured developable areas free of wetlands, floodplains, riparian constraints or other known environmental constraints which would significantly preclude, delay or significantly increase the cost of development of all or a portion of this site.

Lisa Smith asked if that changes the suitable land map

Jesse Winterowd stated no, the original language would have remove the entire parcel from consideration if any part of it had a wetland or minor constraints to that was the original language in the EOA. We didn't approach our mapping that way because we understood the intent was not to be that way so that is why it doesn't change the map.

Chair Gedlich asked if there are any other comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

Rita Bernhard moved and Terry Luttrell seconded the motion that the committee recommend expansion of the UGB in to the northeast to include predominantly Class III soils by the airport and southwest to include the exception areas along Old Portland Road, any unmet employment needs should be held in reserve and considered when the City performs a residential land needs analysis.

Debbie Jacobs stated she has concern when you are saying Class III soils by the airport, would that be, if we exclude by the airport, would that predominantly significantly change this recommendation so the Class III soils are surrounded around the airport then, in the northeast quadrant. She stated it seems like we're targeting that specific area so we could be deemed as favorable to the airport only.

Rita Bernhard replied but it also says to include the exception areas along Old Portland Road so that is far away from the airport.

Jesse Winterowd thinks it is fine to exclude by the airport because the soils aren't changing. He stated if you say predominantly Class III soils that has a similar meaning effectively but you are not saying by the airport. He thinks it is fine.

Chair Gedlich stated she likes that language, it simplified it.

Debbie Jacobs replied she thinks it would be less favorable toward a specific area.

Rita Bernhard asked are you saying, what about the southwest to include the exception areas on Old Portland Road, do you want to take that out too?

Debbie Jacobs replied no, just for the airport because the airport is one particular, it could be, we could be viewed as being inappropriately favoring that area.

Greg Winterowd replied he completely agrees with what Jesse says because if there were land that were adjacent to the UGB that were Class III soils it would have been included in the recommendation but there wasn't any so it doesn't change the meaning. He thinks it is an important point to make because it was soils based, it wasn't airport based.

Debbie Jacobs replied that is what she wanted to bring up; this is based on the soils not the location of them.

Rita Bernhard replied if you say southwest to include the exception areas along Old Portland Road that is a location too.

Debbie Jacobs replied yes, but Old Portland Road has more than one property owner, it is various different property owners.

Chair Gedlich asked Rita if she likes that language now.

Rita Bernhard replied that is fine.

Chair Gedlich asked if everyone is in agreement.

Marie Gadotti replied she wants clarification. She doesn't know that she can clarify this. Lisa Smith might be able to ask the question better than I can. In the EOA don't they talk about the reason we have to expand near the airport is because we have airport related industry.

Greg Winterowd replied well in part yes and that is one of the key economic advantages of the community. So you are right, it does say that you want to have airport related uses near the airport.

Marie Gadotti replied that is the purpose of this group right? Okay, let me restate that right, the purpose of the EOA.

Greg Winterowd replied he won't answer that question.

Jesse Johnson replied the airport related uses were one of the called out target industries and it represents about a third of your overall employment need over the next 20 years of the forecasted need so it is an element and it is clearly an element that is location specific.

Rita Bernhard replied just a comment, keeping in mind that the airport has been targeted for economic development with airport related industries for at least 20 to 25 years that she knows of. She explained back when we went through this process to expand the urban growth boundary before we actually eliminated property north and south as being proposed in the urban growth boundary so that we could take in the property at the airport for that very purpose and that has been years and years ago.

Chair Gedlich replied that's right, that was in the 80's.

Marie Gadotti replied and we have 144 acres undeveloped at this time.

Chair Gedlich replied hopefully that will change. She asked if there were any other comments about the motion.

Chair Gedlich asked Rita Bernhard to read the motion:

Rita Bernhard moved and Terry Luttrell seconded the motion that the committee recommend expansion of the UGB in to the northeast to include predominantly Class III soils and southwest to include the exception areas along Old Portland Road. Any unmet employment needs should be held in reserve and considered when the City performs a residential land needs analysis.

Terry Luttrell is fine with the amendments.

Marie Gadotti stated when we started this meeting tonight we started talking about the only thing this group was going to do is look at the EOA and approve size of UGB expansion well now we are recommending where it is going to go.

Chair Gedlich replied the only thing is that everybody on this committee decided that were not going to meet again and they wanted to pass it on to the Planning Commission and that is exactly what we are doing.

Marie Gadotti replied she just wanted to make a clarification what we are doing.

Motion passed. Marie Gadotti abstained.

Chair Gedlich asked if there are any more questions or concerns.

Rita Bernhard stated so this recommendation goes on to the Planning Commission and then the Planning Commission will review and go through their public process and then it will ultimately go to the City Council.

Chair Gedlich stated the next thing we are going to talk about since we got through all of this and go through all of our motions is we need to have an explanation on the process and she doesn't know whether Greg does that or Brian.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he will start it. He explained a little about process. So the committee has recommended the economic opportunities analysis which is mostly numbers. You have recommended some discussion of areas. What would need to happen next before any of this actually turns into anything tangible is much more detailed analysis of what are the exact parcels that constitute how many acres adding up to these numbers. There will be amendments proposed to the comprehensive plan map. Very likely also amendments to the comprehensive policies for instance with regards to the expression of going in the southeast, that seems like something that should be captured as a policy in the comprehensive plan so that you know it is not just buried in the memo in the archives somewhere it is in the comp plan, it is something that can be referred to. So there will have to be a number of steps like that. Those will be developed by a consultant team and by staff in conjunction with each other. At that point once there is sort of an adoptable document we send formal notice to the State, we schedule hearings in front of the City Planning Commission and in front of the County Planning Commission. Each of those bodies will review it and make recommendations. Ultimately if this passes it will be adopted by City Council as well as the County Board of Commissioners. Then it goes to the State to the Director of Department Land Conservation and Development for him to review it and basically determine whether we are consistent with State Law or not, if we are then we would get some sort of acknowledgement from the Director. If we are not then it gets a little more complicated and it goes to LCDC and all that. His basic point is there is a minimum of four public hearings, most likely more that would still happen and there will have to be specific maps and specific proposed amendments to the comp plan and all of the information in the EOA would also need to get folded in to our comp plan because that will serve as the foundation for any map amendments and policy amendments so there's still a fair amount of work to be done.

Bill Blank asked City Planner Brian Varricchione if he can give a rough ball park figure, 18 months or so for the whole process. He asked if he has any idea.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he would think it would be less than that but frankly a lot of this is going to depend on work load, staff work load and scheduling things in front of hearing bodies. He is not real certain but the goal would be to get this done in a quick manner rather than a knock down drag out slow manner. No one likes to see these take forever so we will try to move things as fast as possible.

Rita Bernhard stated she wants to clarify that there will be plenty of opportunities for further public input so if citizens in this community agree, disagree, whatever they will have adequate opportunities to have their views known.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied correct. For any property owners for which they may be proposing changes, adding to the UGB, those people get notice by mail and then everyone else there will be newspaper notice and hopefully we can get some articles and stuff like that so we can build awareness.

Rita Bernhard stated it is a big deal, regarding the changes to the Urban Growth Boundary and everything that we are talking about here so it is something that the public really needs buy in to and be part of.

Chair Gedlich asked are we going to have minutes of this meeting sent to us.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he thinks that would be advisable.

Chair Gedlich replied she would like to see the final minutes and she does want them approved so she will probably email all of you to make sure that it is on the record that we approved those minutes. Thank you for your cooperation.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied not to drag anyone to another meeting but one concept that Donna and he sort of floated was we could have sort of one final meeting to adopt the minutes.

Some one from the audience asked how it would be noticed and she wanted to make sure people are aware of this.

There was discussion on having a press release.

Chair Gedlich stated we could send a notice on the water statements.

Chair Gedlich adjourned the meeting 8:50 p.m.

Chair Donna Gedlich, Councilor

Minutes typed by:

Susan M Reeves, CMC, City Recorder