



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Oregon Task Force on Land Use Planning

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

FAX (503) 378-5518

Web Address: <http://www.oregon.gov/LCD>

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

OREGON TASK FORCE ON LAND USE PLANNING

May 10, 2006

State Capitol Building

900 Court St. NE

Hearing Room 50

Salem, OR 97301

(track 1)

Chair Thorne calls the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. on May 10, 2006

Members present:

Chair Mike Thorne

Vice-Chair Nikki Whitty

Director Lane Shetterly

Ken Bailey

David Bragdon

Steve Clark

Jill Gelineau

Judie Hammerstad

Wes Hare

Cameron Krauss

Gretchen Palmer

(track 2)

Agenda Item 1 – Review and Approval of April 18, 2006, Task Force Minutes

Chair Thorne – Asks the task force if there are any comments or suggestions for changes to the April 18, 2006, minutes.

Motion – Task Force Member Hare moves to adopt the minutes as submitted.

Hammerstad seconds.

Vote – 10-0, no objection.

(track 3)

Agenda Item 2 – Overview of public comments, outreach activities, and non-Task Force

directed research activities

Task force discussion of staff's attendance to outside conferences and the participation level at those conferences. Task Force members request that staff inform them of invitations received and those conferences that are actually attended.

Director Shetterly – States that his directive to staff has been to respond to invitation to attend non-task force programs, pass along the invitations to task force members as appropriate, attend in an observer capacity, and not to discriminator or show a preference to any particular group.

Chair Thorne – States that after the work plan has been submitted, he would like to use the expertise of the task force members to seek out specific interests groups and ask for their input on task force issues to assimilate information.

(track 4)

Agenda Item 3 – Public Comment

Peggy Lynch, League of Women Voters of Oregon – Testifies and discusses a letter that was submitted and included in the public comments regarding the draft work plan (**Exhibits A & B**). Requests that task 2.2 and 2.3 of the draft work plan be changed so that the public is educated on the current program per SB 82 before people are asked their opinion of the program.

Sarah Deumling, citizen – Testifies regarding Oregon's natural resources and how to maintain them.

John Shafer, citizen – Testifies and submits testimony regarding his concern about issues that he heard at the last task force meeting and that they didn't seem to be any new or fresh ideas regarding Oregon's land use system (**Exhibit C**).

Richard Van Pelt, citizen – Testifies regarding Oregon's land use system, and states a value, fear and recommendation to the task force.

Lois Kenagy, citizen – Testifies and states her gratefulness that the Task Force on Land Use Planning exists and discusses her involvement when SB 100 was created.

Cliff Kenagy, citizen – Testifies and states his recommendation to the task force for making it easier for people to own their own home or parcel of land and his concerns about land speculation purchase.

John Englebrecht, citizen – States concerns about the task force's work plan and asks that the people of Oregon get the same voice as lobbyists and the industries of Oregon.

Rob Zako, 1000 Friends of Oregon – Discusses the Envision Oregon event that was held on April 29, 2006, and that the six organizations that sponsored the conference are interested in feedback from the task force whether or not the issues discussed and information provided from the event was helpful.

John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute – Discusses the task force’s work plan and that Phase 2 and 3 of the work plan might be out of order for the task force to assimilate the information received.

(track 5)

Agenda Item 4 – Presentation of draft work program and discussion

Steckler – Submits draft work program to the task force (**Exhibits D & E**).

Commission discussion on who creates the work program, how it is to be submitted to the Governor and Legislative leadership by the June 2, 2006 deadline, and that the work program that is adopted at the May 24, 2006 meeting will be the work program that the task force moves forward and works on.

Steckler – Continues with presentation of work program and discusses the five Phases that are included in it: I) Scoping and organization, II) What do Oregonians want? III) What do Oregonians think? IV) Recommendations, and V) Validation.

Chair Thorne – Recesses the meeting at 11:13 a.m.

(track 6)

Chair Thorne – Reconvenes the meeting at 11:23 a.m.

Agenda Item 5 – Survey presentation

Tom Eiland, Conklin Fiskum & McCormick, Inc. – Testifies and presents PowerPoint presentation to the task force regarding Oregonians’ Values and Beliefs about Land Use (**Exhibit F**).

Bailey – Did the survey address the issue of whether or not people were here in 1973 when SB 100 was adopted?

Eiland – We didn’t see a substantial difference between those people who have lived in Oregon for a long time, and those that are new.

Clark – Asks about “Market-based or Planning-based decisions” slide and what the purpose of asking the question “Which set of words do you personally value most when it comes to land use – Planning-based decisions for land use vs. Market-based decisions for land use” was.

Eiland – Explains that it is to compare between planning and market-based decisions, based on the values that are held by Oregonians.

Clark – Do you have any evaluation on whether or not Oregonians would support periodic review of land use planning to allow for flexibility?

Eiland – States that regarding this survey, there was strong support of a periodic review of land use planning as well as a stated concern for the harsh line between policy and what people would like to do with their land.

Hare – How do you best use the survey research to inform the public?

Eiland – Survey research is really a bad way to inform and educate the public. Discusses several ways that he thinks are better alternatives to inform and educate the public.

Whitty – Asks about pg. 8 regarding “Property Rights or Reasonable Planning” – and pg. 10, “Fair Treatment” and how knowledgeable the people who were asked these questions are on land use issues.

Eiland – We didn’t ask them about their knowledge of land use issues.

Gelineau – Regarding the “Fair Treatment” slide, for those people who didn’t feel like they had been treated fairly, do you know why?

Eiland – States that the result was a combination of knowledge gathered by the survey, and speculation due to having done other research and hearing from people about their experiences with local governments.

Chair Thorne – Asks about the slide on how “Values differ among Oregonians” and fair treatment.

Eiland – Explains how they determined the different values of Oregonians.

Whitty – Asks who in Southwestern Oregon was interviewed.

Eiland – Explains how they determined their sample base for the survey.

Chair Thorne – Regarding “Fundamental Values,” there is a high value on protecting the rights of property owners, but how do those values cross-reference with Oregonians’ other values of protecting farm and forest lands?

Eiland – We did not go into that detail in this survey because Oregonians have strong but inconsistent values.

Chair Thorne – Regarding the slide “What we Learned,” asks about the protection of farmland and if that protection is because of the desire to protect open-space or actual farmland?

Eiland – We didn’t go into that kind of detail with this survey, but in other surveys we have done, it seems to be more of a protection of open-space issue rather than an economic issue.

Bailey – When asking the public for their input, do you generally ask what people think, or do

you need to ask them specific questions for them to respond to?

Eiland – It depends on what kind of information that task force is hoping to receive, but both kinds of comments can be helpful. Discusses other survey options that might be helpful to the task force when gathering information from the public.

Clark – States that the task force has to have agreement on their scope of work before they survey the public in order to discern what the recommendations to the Governor and Legislative leadership should be.

Hare – Discusses that along with the survey, there has to be a way to validate the information to produce a work program or end product that will be suitable for the public, Governor, and Legislature.

Palmer – Asks about the Measure 37 questions in the survey and whether or not for those people who stated they should receive compensation, if they were asked how that should happen.

Eiland – Explains that they didn't get into the policy side of the questions in the survey.

Chair Thorne – Recesses the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

(track 7)

Chair Thorne – Reconvenes the meeting at 12:46 p.m.

Agenda Item 6 – Survey presentation

Adam Davis, Davis Hibbitts and Midgall – Provides PowerPoint presentation to the task force members regarding “Public Attitudes about Land Use Issues” (**Exhibit G**).

Whitty – Regarding farm and forest lands, did you ask the question differently regarding whether or not it was productive farm or forest land?

Davis – No, we did not.

Chair Thorne – Asks about water quality and why that was such a big issue.

Davis – Explains that because there are so many different aspects to water quality, it is an important issue to a variety of Oregonians.

Clark – Regarding the unwillingness to convert forestland to housing or commercial development, do we know if there are certain motivations behind those responses?

Davis – Explains that the public is aware that converting farm or forest land would contribute to urban sprawl, and most people don't want that.

Hare – What techniques do you see are most effective to reach Oregonians to find out where they are at and give them information at the same time?

Davis – That is a challenge. It has become more difficult to connect with Oregonians. You have to go to the people, where they work, places of worship, or schools to meet with them and discuss their issues. There is a difference between the “public” and those people who actually vote. Finding out how to reach the “public” is not easy.

Hammerstad – Asks about the definition of “forest land” and if that definition also includes land that is resource land within an urban growth boundary.

Davis – States that what planners and policy makers need to discuss more is open space when considering the design functions of their local area.

Krauss – Was there a definition given to “urban development?”

Davis – When doing a survey, we don’t view our job as to educate people, but to ask people questions based on their current knowledge of an issue.

Commission discussion of the next meeting dates and possible task force retreat in July.

Shipsey – States that even if the meeting is a retreat, it will still be open to the public meeting law requirements.

(track 8)

Agenda Item 7 – Work program discussion continued

Commission discussion on the most effective ways and opportunities to gather information from the public regarding Oregon’s land use needs. Discussion of what kinds of questions should be included in a statewide survey.

Chair Thorne – Asks Director Shetterly what the department’s activities are regarding some of the same issues that the task force is considering.

Shetterly – The Commission has adopted a much narrower agenda for policy and rulemaking for this biennium, in deference to this task force.

Gelineau – States that task force member Wes Hare’s questions and ideas that were submitted as part of public comment had more of the essence of a work plan that she’d like to see.

Commission discussion regarding having David Bragdon and Jill Gelineau work with staff to create a revised work program.

Bragdon and Gelineau – State that they will have something for the task force’s review regarding

the task force work program by May 19, 2006.

Palmer – States each member of the task force will be talking to different interest group, that to ensure consistency they should be asking the same questions to those groups.

Clark – Discusses that it would be helpful to ask local jurisdictions what their current land use plans are, as well as what their plans are for the future, such as review of local plans, and how the work of the task force can help accommodate them.

Shetterly – States that staff can help facilitate bringing in local jurisdictions work plans for the task force's review.

Bailey – States that he wants to make sure that what remains from the current draft work program is the part regarding public outreach as it relates to other meetings and conferences.

(track 9)

Agenda Item 8 – Next Steps

Task force discussion on what the agenda should be for the May 24, 2006 meeting, and interest in assuring that the invited witnesses address substantive issues of interest regarding the land use program, and that their testimony not be limited to the draft work plan. Ms. Steckler will ensure that the invited witnesses are so advised.

Chair Thorne – Adjourns the meeting at 2:32 p.m.

Submitted By:

Jody Haury,
Department of Land Conservation and Development

Exhibit List:

- A. Agenda Item 2, Overview of Public Comments – DLCD Staff, 31 pgs.**
- B. Agenda Item 2, Addendum to Public Comments – DLCD Staff, 10 pgs.**
- C. Agenda Item 3, Written Testimony – John Shafer, 1 pg.**
- D. Agenda Item 4, Draft Work Program - DLCD Staff, 11 pgs.**
- E. Agenda Item 4, Flowchart of Work Program – DLCD Staff, 1 pg.**
- F. Agenda Item 5, PowerPoint Presentation – Tom Eiland, 13 pgs.**
- G. Agenda Item 6, PowerPoint Presentation – Adam Davis, 5 pgs.**