



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.lcd.state.or.us



MEETING MINUTES

February 1-3, 2006

LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Agriculture Building

635 Capitol St. NE, Basement Hearing Room

Salem, OR 97301

(track 1)

Chair VanLandingham calls meeting to order at 1:41 p.m., Feb. 1, 2006.

Commission Members present:

John VanLandingham

Ron Henri

Dennis Derby

Hanley Jenkins

Tim Josi

Commissioners Marilyn Worrix, Margaret Kirkpatrick are excused.

(track 2)

Agenda Item 1 – Informational Briefing on the Department’s Natural Hazards Program

Ann Beier, Planning Services Manager – Introduces Christine Valentine and gives background of the Natural Hazards program.

Christine Valentine, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report and PowerPoint presentation regarding the department’s Natural Hazards Program (**Exhibits A and B**).

Commissioners ask who is involved on the interagency hazard mitigation team, and what kind of information would trigger the process of providing technical assistance to a local government.

Valentine – Continues with staff report and discusses how and why the department was picked to be the state coordinator for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Commissioner Tim Josi – Discusses how Tillamook County has dealt with their flood issues and how their insurance premium is based.

Valentine – Explains what the department’s role is in promoting the NFIP and continues with presentation.

Josi – Asks if the local communities continue to adopt the local ordinances, would this program not be needed after awhile?

Valentine – Explains that local jurisdictions continually have questions regarding their programs and that the need may eventually lessen, but not anytime in the foreseeable future.

Commissioner Hanley Jenkins – Explains a situation in Union County where the department was needed in updating their ordinances.

Chair John VanLandingham – Asks if this program is for technical support or for helping jurisdictions identifying their floodplain zone.

Valentine – Explains that the assistance that the department provides changes daily and depending on the jurisdiction that needs the help. Continues with presentation regarding floodplain events. The department will help local governments update their floodplain information into digital format in order to provide updated information to FEMA to update localized maps. Discusses the department’s map modernization role.

Chair VanLandingham recesses meeting at 2:51 p.m.

(track 3)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 2:59 p.m.

Agenda Item 2 – Informational Briefing on the Draft Oregon Transportation Plan by the Oregon Department of Transportation

Bob Cortright, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report and introduces Gail Curtis and Carolyn Gassaway from the Oregon Department of Transportation and the work they have done on the draft Oregon Transportation Plan (**Exhibit C**).

Gail Curtis, Oregon Department of Transportation – Presents Commission with PowerPoint presentation regarding the draft Oregon Transportation Plan (**Exhibit D**).

Josi – Asks about the vehicles miles traveled chart regarding the funding gap.

Curtis – Discusses that the funding gap is a looming problem that the state is currently in the midst of. Continues with PowerPoint presentation regarding the draft Oregon Transportation Plan.

Carolyn Gassaway, Oregon Department of Transportation – Continues with presentation on the draft Oregon Transportation Plan PowerPoint presentation.

Jenkins – Asks if ODOT anticipates that local jurisdictions might need to reevaluate their local transportation plans to comply with this draft Oregon Transportation Plan.

Gassaway – Explains that local jurisdictions might need to further refine their plans to comply with the statewide plan.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks if ODOT is receiving much public input regarding the plan.

Curtis – Explains that they are expecting a comment letter from every group that they present the plan to. After March 1, 2006, the sixty-member group will come back together and the steering committee will advise the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Commission discussion regarding investment plan opportunities and that there is a need to show Oregonians the need for additional revenue for transportation needs.

Chair VanLandingham – Discusses that LCDC might play a role in commenting on the next draft plan, specifically having Bob Cortright watch and make comments.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 3:52 p.m.

(track 4)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 4:01 p.m.

Agenda Item 3 – Informational Briefing on Periodic Review

Rob Hallyburton, Community Services Division Manager – Submits staff report and PowerPoint presentation regarding the periodic review process (**Exhibits E and F**).

Commission discussion regarding how cities and counties coordinate new periodic review.

Hallyburton – Continues with the periodic review briefing. Discusses several issues that the department is facing regarding periodic review as outlined in the staff report (**Exhibit E**).

Commission discussion regarding overdue work tasks and what the local jurisdictions expect on their periodic review tasks.

Josi – States potential conflict of interest regarding Tillamook County's overdue work tasks and that he won't actively participate in discussion regarding those overdue tasks.

Commission discussion of how Goal 5 is in potential conflict with the periodic review process.

Chair VanLandingham – States that it would behoove the department to figure out the overdue work task issue before July 1, 2007, as soon as there is some direction based on the Measure 37 decision.

Hallyburton – Continues with the periodic review briefing and cites Attachment B of the briefing regarding eligible jurisdictions for periodic review as of July 1, 2007 (**Exhibit E**).

Chair VanLandingham – Suggests that fiscally it might not be possible to start twenty new periodic reviews all at the same time and that a legislative fix might be appropriate. The July 1, 2007, start date could be extended, or the SB 82 Task Force might chose to look at this issue.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 4:53 p.m.

(track 5)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 8:39 a.m., Feb. 2, 2006.

Commission Members present are:

John VanLandingham

Ron Henri

Dennis Derby

Hanley Jenkins

Tim Josi

Commissioners Marilyn Worrix, Margaret Kirkpatrick are excused

Agenda Item 4 – Public Comment

Chair VanLandingham – No one signed up for public comment.

Agenda Item 13 – Director’s Report

Lane Shetterly, Director – Provides Commission with Director’s Report (**Exhibit G**).

Eric Jacobson, DLCD Staff – Updates the Commission on the Bend periodic review per a decision that the City made last night, February 1, 2006.

Director Shetterly – Continues with Director’s Report update (**Exhibit G**). Updates the Commission on testimony he gave to the House Interim Land Use Committee last week and the work plan that that Committee has.

(track 6)

Agenda Item 6 – Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed Administrative Rule Amendments – OAR 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule)

Lane Shetterly, Director – Submits staff report and explains that Bob Cortright, the department’s staff person on the Transportation Planning Rule, won’t be able to attend the meeting this morning because of a bicycle accident (**Exhibits H and I**).

Chair VanLandingham – Explains that this item will be carried over to the March Commission meeting, but that public testimony will still be taken.

Craig Greenleaf, Oregon Dept. of Transportation – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012. The joint ODOT/LCDC Transportation subcommittee has not had time to review this and make a joint recommendation.

Bonnie Heitsch, Dept. of Justice, Asst. Atty. General for Oregon Dept. of Transportation – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012.

Mark Greenfield, consultant to the Oregon Dept. of Transportation – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012.

Mark Becktel, City of Salem – Testifies regarding the City of Salem’s opposition to the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012. Cites letter (**Exhibit H, attachment D**) from Salem Mayor Taylor regarding street width. States that this issue is better decided at the local level than for the entire state.

Jenkins – Asks about what the design would entail to encompass a 30 foot street.

Becktel – Cites Salem city street standards and reaffirms that the decision to have a specific width street should be a local decision.

Jeanne Harrison, City of Portland – Testifies and submits written comments regarding the City of Portland’s support for the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012 (**Exhibit J**).

Rob Zako, 1000 Friends of Oregon – Testifies in opposition to the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012.

Commissioner Margaret Kirkpatrick – Asks if there are situations that can be looked at where the proposed rule amendments would have made a difference.

Zako – States that the court case regarding the Newberg/Dundee bypass might have had a different outcome.

Linda Ludwig, League of Oregon Cities – Testifies and submits written comment regarding opposition to the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012 (**Exhibit K**).

Art Schlack, Association of Oregon Counties – Testifies in opposition to the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012.

Kelly Hossaini, Miller Nash – Testifies and submits written comment in support of the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012, regarding alternative threshold standards (**Exhibit L**).

Jenkins – Asks if there should be some standards for thresholds.

Hossaini – The thresholds have specific standards that should be met, otherwise it is very hard to specify what requirements need to be met.

John Dorst, City of Gresham – Testifies and submits testimony (**Exhibit M**) regarding the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012. Discusses the safe harbor issue on street widths and that setting a specific standard for the State is difficult.

Commissioner Dennis Derby – Asks to what extent residential fire sprinklers mitigate the design widths that might be required.

Dorst – Explains that 88-92% of our calls are health related on the fire trucks, so the ability to get in quickly is more often related to a health concern rather than fire. The sprinkler issue wouldn't necessarily solve the transportation aspect.

Derby – Should local jurisdictions be looking at alternative vehicles to fire trucks for safety issues?

Scott Bricker, Bicycle Transportation Alliance – Testifies and submits testimony regarding his concerns of the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012 (**Exhibit N**).

Mark Whitlow, Retail Task Force – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding the possible adoption of proposed administrative rule amendments to OAR 660-012 (**Exhibit O**).

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

(track 7)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 10:57 a.m.

Chair VanLandingham – States that between now and the March 22-24, 2006, LCDC Commission meeting, that staff will look at the issues that were raised by testimony today and report back to the Commission.

Ann Beier, Planning Services Division Manager – States that the skinny street issue that was included in the proposed amendments was supposed to be options, not standards for state enforcement.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks staff to rewrite the safe harbor issue in a way so that the skinny street issue is clear.

Jenkins – There needs to be a way to provide some clarification on a way to evaluate something other than the safe harbor.

Kirkpatrick – States that she would like more discussion about the goal exception issues and the thresholds.

Greenleaf – Restates that a meeting date for the joint ODOT/LDCD subcommittee is being scheduled so that some of these issues can be discussed. We will submit a cleaner version of the threshold issue to the Commission.

Chair VanLandingham – States appreciation for the Oregon Department of Transportation staff for their hard work on this issue.

(track 8)

Agenda Item 7 – Possible Reconsideration of Commission Decision Denying Request for Approval of Resource Zone Minimum Lot Size in Yamhill County

Rob Hallyburton, Community Services Division Manager – States that Yamhill County has submitted testimony asking that this item be withdrawn from the Commission’s work today (**Exhibits P and Q**).

(track 9)

Agenda Item 8 – Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Amendments to Administrative Rules Regarding Periodic Review and Unincorporated Communities

Rob Hallyburton, Community Services Division Manager – Submits staff report regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rules regarding periodic review and unincorporated communities (**Exhibits R and S**).

Jenkins – Asks about the oral argument issue and whether a timeline can be coordinated so that when there are exceptions submitted to the department, they can be given to the Commission in time for consideration.

Lane Shetterly, Director – Explains that if that is the case, some of the decisions may have to be put off to the next Commission meeting in order to receive the exceptions and be able to report on them and provide it to the Commission with enough time for review.

Steve Shipsey, Asst. Attorney General for the Commission – States that a process could be established to change how rule exceptions are submitted in order for there to be enough time for Commission review.

Chair VanLandingham – Discusses how the proposed amendments might change the process or the need to change the process to allow for people who participated in a hearing, but did not object, the ability to continue to be involved in the process.

Sid Friedman, 1000 Friends of Oregon – Testifies and submits testimony regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rule regarding periodic review and unincorporated communities (**Exhibit T**).

Jenkins – Asks if a specific issue has to be raised in a written comment in order to be able to discuss it later in the process.

Chair VanLandingham – States that is an issue that needs to be clarified.

Art Schlack, Association of Oregon Counties – Testifies and submits testimony regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rule regarding periodic review and unincorporated communities (**Exhibit U**).

Chair VanLandingham – Explains how small cities are not required to do periodic review and that part of Mr. Schlack’s testimony is regarding targeted issues; where there could be a county that might want to do periodic review “lite”, and the issues might be other than the big five.

Hallyburton – States that for a county that wants to opt in to periodic review, it is not a full periodic review process that they are allowed to do.

Chair VanLandingham – Discusses that in HB 3310 (2005), the language refers to a full, but limited, periodic review.

Schlack – States that in Section 2 of HB 3310, counties are allowed to volunteer into periodic review, but that the Economic Revitalization Team could work with a city to talk about vision, and encourage them to do the voluntary periodic review.

Kirkpatrick – Asks if the five issues that are specific to periodic review are the only items that can be considered.

Hallyburton – Discusses that in the last several legislative sessions, the direction has been to limit what periodic review includes.

Director Shetterly – Explains that the five factors are the items that are limited as to what the department can financially help with.

Schlack – States that this could be a real issue if there is a county that would like to participate and might be told that they can’t.

Director Shetterly – States that regarding this policy, the department isn’t in opposition to it, but trying to stay within the current rules of HB 3310 might be difficult.

Linda Ludwig, League of Oregon Cities – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rule regarding periodic review and unincorporated communities.

Gabrielle Schiffer, Governor’s Economic Revitalization Team (ERT) – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rule regarding periodic review and unincorporated communities and ERTs role in periodic review.

Shipsey – Clarifies the oral argument issue and how another state agency might be included and allowed to speak on an issue.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 12:28 p.m.

(track 10)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 1:16 p.m.

Agenda Item 9 – Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Amendments to Goal 8 in Response to Amended State Laws Regarding Destination Resorts

Bob Rindy, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report regarding the possible adoption of amendments to Goal 8 in response to amended state laws regarding destination resorts (**Exhibit V**).

Chair VanLandingham – Clarifies that none of the changes were policy changes, just changes to comply with current statute.

Rindy – Discusses that there are several destination resort issues being processed for approval by counties, but that none of the counties with proposed destination resorts submitted any comment on this goal.

Motion – Commissioner Kirkpatrick move adoption of the Jan. 10, 2006, draft with revisions.

Josi – Seconds motion.

Vote – 6-0, Commissioner Worrix excused.

(track 11)

Agenda Item 10 – Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Amendments to Administrative Rules Regarding Farm Land, Forest Land, and Goal Exceptions

Ron Eber, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rules regarding farm land, forest land, and goal exceptions (**Exhibits W, X and Y**).

Commissioner Ron Henri – Clarifies on pg. 3 that prepared foods would mean “ready to eat.”

Eber – Explains that it is hard to define “prepared foods” and it will be up to each county to define that term.

Derby – Asks if there were any issues that came up regarding restraint of trade by those counties on the edge of the State. The staff report makes it clear and allows those farm stands to have other products included in their stand.

Harlan Levy, Oregon Association of Realtors – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rules regarding farm land, forest land, and goal exceptions and states support for those amendments.

Don Schellenberg, Oregon Farm Bureau – Testifies regarding the possible adoption of amendments to administrative rules regarding farm land, forest land, and goal exceptions and states support for those amendments.

Kirkpatrick – Asks about the sunset clause.

Eber – The department prefers not to do a sunset clause. It is not something we normally do with our rules. We will look at it in the context of our farm and forest reporting. The benefits from this rule outweigh the potential for abuse.

Motion – Commissioner Henri moves to adopt the amendments to the OAR Chapter 660, Divisions 004, 006 and 033, with two changes: 1. in Division 004, pg. 1, line 15, 2. to adopt the February 2, 2006 farm stand language.

Kirkpatrick – Seconds motion.

Vote – 6-0, Commissioner Worrix excused.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 1:58 p.m.

(track 12)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 2:04 p.m.

Agenda Item 11 – Periodic Review – Appeal of Dallas Task 6 – Urban Growth Boundary Expansion

Geoff Crook, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report regarding City of Dallas periodic review of Task 6 and urban growth boundary expansion (**Exhibits Z and AA**).

Mark Irick, City of Dallas – Testifies regarding City of Dallas periodic review of Task 6 and urban growth boundary expansion.

Jerry Wyatt, City of Dallas – Testifies regarding City of Dallas periodic review of Task 6 and urban growth boundary expansion. Discusses how the City came up with their employees per acre number.

Chair VanLandingham – You anticipate some of the new industrial land will be used for commercial land. There is a concern that that is not appropriate and could lead to a Wal-Mart. Could a Wal-Mart meet the conditional use process?

Irick – Explains how a Wal-Mart could not meet the requirements for a conditional use permit to build in the proposed industrial zone.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks how the four parcels of twenty-acres were determined.

Commission discussion with the City of Dallas staff on how the number and size of lots were chosen to be included in the industrial lands.

Wyatt – Discusses the maps that were created to identify parcels based on soil classifications.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks when the last time Dallas expanded the UGB.

Wyatt – The last time was around 1985.

Jane Henderson, citizen – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding City of Dallas periodic review of Task 6 and urban growth boundary expansion (**Exhibit BB**).

Kelly Gordon, citizen – Testifies regarding City of Dallas periodic review of Task 6 and urban growth boundary expansion.

Crook – Clarifies that the department has already acknowledged the numbers that the city used to justify their needs. Discusses how the City of Dallas projected their employee per acre need.

Kirkpatrick – Asks about how the city’s Economic Opportunity Analysis explains the number of employees per acre and the number of sites they are saying that they need.

Crook – Continues with department recommendations regarding commercial land in industrial zones. Discusses adequate sites in the current UGB. Discusses the city’s twenty-year planning horizon.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks about the mixed-use areas and if those areas could be used for industrial sites.

Crook – Explains why it isn’t optimal to use mixed-use areas for an industrial site. Regarding economic opportunities analysis, the city, when they created their plan in 1998, did not specify an economic opportunities analysis.

Jenkins – Asks for clarification on what was adopted by the Commission in 2003 regarding the City of Dallas.

Crook – My understanding is that all of the economic opportunities analysis was adopted in 2003; it made up the work task 2 economic development and buildable lands inventory.

Derby – Asks about the planning horizon.

Crook – Explains that based on what was in the comprehensive plan, when it was adopted, it was a 23-year plan.

Kirkpatrick – Discusses the importance of having industrial lands available for potential economic opportunities.

Motion – Commissioner Kirkpatrick moves to affirm the director’s approval of the City of Dallas Task 6 submittal in Order 001674 based on the findings in the department’s staff report and information provided at the hearing.

Jenkins – Seconds motion.

Vote 6-0, Commissioner Worrix is excused.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 3:09 p.m.

(track 13)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 3:18 p.m.

Agenda Item 12 – Discussion and Possible Amendments of the Commission’s 2005-07 Policy Agenda

Bob Rindy, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report on the Commission’s 2005-07 Policy Agenda (Exhibit CC).

Chair VanLandingham – Asks if there are items on the policy list that might be taken care of by the SB 82 Task Force.

Rindy – States that the task force may look at the urban reserves issues.

Lane Shetterly, Director – States that the task force may make bigger policy issues that may drive some changes to items on this policy list.

Rindy – Discusses the safe harbor issue.

Brent Curtis, Washington County – Testifies regarding the Commission’s 2005-07 Policy agenda. Urges the Commission to look at the issue of subregional rules.

Ron Campbell, Oregon Dept. of Parks – Testifies regarding the Commission’s 2005-07 Policy agenda. Urges the Commission to review the Division 34 rules regarding exception uses allowed in park lands.

Chair VanLandingham – Reads note from Harlan Levy regarding the Commission’s 2005-07 Policy agenda (Exhibit DD).

Rindy – States that the department continues to hear from local jurisdictions on small adjustments to the department’s rules.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks about the subregional decision, and states the decision itself creates problems for future rulemaking. Is that something we need to address?

Steve Shipsey, Asst. Attorney General for the Commission – Explains that the sub-regional rule may conflict with Goal 14.

Director Shetterly – Suggests that department staff could become more engaged in the Metro effort on sub-regional rules to keep the Commission informed.

Jenkins – Discusses the work of the commercial industrial work group and that the work would not be able to get done if Measure 37 is reinstated. Suggests breaking the policy agenda into two groups – a group of items that can get done quickly, and those that can't.

Art Schlack, Association of Oregon Counties – Testifies regarding the Commission's 2005-07 Policy agenda and the amount of work that the department is trying to do regarding rulemaking.

Derby – States concern with pausing work on Goal 14 when it isn't clear how long the SB 82 Task Force look will take.

Schlack – Discusses the Goal 14 issue and how it relates to Urban Reserves.

Director Shetterly – Discusses that apart from the policy agenda there will be some forums that the Commission will be holding on specific land use issues.

Rindy – States that department staff could do more research on how to make urban reserves work better.

Chair VanLandingham – Suggests that the Commission look at the RLUIPA, State Parks, and Goal 14 issues in the short-term. The long-term issues to be looked at would be population forecasts, rural commercial, subregional, and urban reserves.

George Naughton, Deputy Director – We have been told to get our E-Board requests in early because of the huge issues the Dept. of Human Services is facing.

Kirkpatrick – States that it does make sense to take on small portions of the work plan.

Ron Eber, DLCD Staff – Explains the issues that encompass the RLUIPA issue and that it might not be an easy fix. Staff work may not be that complicated, it will just be the issue.

Henri – States that the Goal 14 issue may be too large to do in the short-term.

Kirkpatrick – Asks if the Commission can direct the department on the top priorities and then leave it up to the department to look at other resources and decide which issues to take on.

Director Shetterly – States that staff can potentially start the process on some of these issues and then leave them again if work has to begin on Measure 37 again.

Commission discusses the categories of policy works and what issues will be started and worked on at the department's discretion.

Chair VanLandingham recesses the meeting at 4:37 a.m.

(track 14)

Chair VanLandingham reconvenes the meeting at 9:06 a.m., Feb. 3, 2006.

Members present:

Marilyn Worrix

Hanley Jenkins

Tim Josi

Dennis Derby

Ron Henri

Chair VanLandingham

Commissioner Kirkpatrick is excused

Agenda Item 14 – Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee

Pat Wheeler, Vice-Chair of the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) – Provides report to the Commission of current CIAC activities. Asks that the Commission not make a decision today on the vacant at-large position on CIAC to allow the rest of the committee more time to review the applicants' information (**Exhibit EE**).

Carl Judy, Citizen – Provides Commission with his professional background history and why he is interested in serving on the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (**Exhibit EE**).

Beth Bridges, Citizen – Provides Commission with her professional background history and why she is interested in serving on the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (**Exhibit EE**).

Commissioner Marilyn Worrix – Asks if Mr. Judy will be able to do the travel as may be needed by being on the position.

Judy – Answers that he will be able to do the travel.

Derby – Asks Mr. Judy of his work history not including his citizen involvement experience.

Judy – Gives brief work history background.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks Mr. Judy if he will be willing, as a CIAC member, to mostly look at the Goal 1 issue.

Judy – States that he understands the role of a CIAC member is to work with citizen involvement.

Henri – Asks both the applicants what their computer and electronic experiences are to be able to serve those needs of the committee.

Bridges – Explains that at her position with the City of Eugene, part of her role is to work with outreach systems and to post and gather information on the web.

Judy – Discusses his experience in working with computer systems. States that he feels working in committees with computer systems can be more effective than using it as an outreach tool.

Chair VanLandingham – Asks Mr. Judy how he enjoyed his experience working with the aggregate work group.

Judy – Discusses his participation in the aggregate work group.

Derby – Asks both applicants how they feel the public should be connected to educate them on the land use program.

Bridges – Discusses that there are so many new people that have moved into Oregon in the last decade, that the lack of information and the immediacy of needs are specific and immediate issues. Providing information to people is important.

Judy – Discusses that there is a disconnect in the way that people want to have a say, but do not want to participate. He feels that talking with people in a less formal setting is a way to hear people's needs and get information to them.

Henri – Discusses that an important part of the Big Look effort will to involve the younger generations. Asks the applicants how they would engaged the younger population.

Bridges – Suggests that there should be a curriculum developed and presented to high school students to encourage them to participate. Getting younger people to look to the future and determine what they want that future to look like is important.

Judy – States that not having the younger people involved has been an issue that he has been concerned with for a long time. Discusses that in his region of the state, the students involved in Future Farmers of American (FFA) and others have discussed these issues, but no one has engaged them to ask them what they think.

Worrix – Asks the applicants how you take the information that is gathered from citizen outreach and compile it into a format that is useful and explainable to others.

Judy – Discusses that the information should be compiled and put in a format to be reviewed by LCDC.

Bridges – States that good decision making is done by the decision makers deciding what they are going to do with information before it is received. Then, once the information is received, be able to share that information with others who can help in the decision making process.

Wheeler – Continues with update to the Commission of CIAC activities including: educational projects, CIAC county web page survey, liaison, and citizen feedback.

(track 15)

Agenda Item 15 – Commission Business and Reports

Derby – Provides the Commission with the Budget and Management report (**Exhibit FF**).

Chair VanLandingham – Discusses that the department is developing its legislative concepts and will present them to the Commission at its March meeting.

Chair VanLandingham adjourns the meeting at 10:14 a.m., Feb. 3, 2006.

Submitted By:

Jenny Hill,
Department of Land Conservation and Development

Exhibit Summary:

- A. Agenda Item 1, Informational Briefing on the Department’s Natural Hazards Program Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 23 pgs. plus guidebook**
- B. Agenda Item 1, Informational Briefing on the Department’s Natural Hazards Program PowerPoint Presentation – DLCD Staff, 10 pgs.**
- C. Agenda Item 2, Informational Briefing on the Draft Oregon Transportation Plan Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 3 pgs. plus two booklets by ODOT**
- D. Agenda Item 2, Informational Briefing on the Draft Oregon Transportation Plan PowerPoint Presentation – Gail Curtis, ODOT, 11 pgs.**
- E. Agenda Item 3, Informational Briefing on Periodic Review Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 14 pgs.**
- F. Agenda Item 3, Informational Briefing on Periodic Review PowerPoint Presentation – DLCD Staff, 6 pgs.**
- G. Agenda Item 13, Director’s Report – DLCD Staff, 12 pgs.**
- H. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 138 pgs.**
- I. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Attachment D to Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 7 pgs.**
- J. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – Jeanne Harrison, City of Portland, 1 pg.**
- K. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – Linda Ludwig, League of Oregon Cities, 3 pgs.**

- L. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – Kelly Hossaini, Miller Nash, 3 pgs.**
- M. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – John Dorst, City of Gresham, 1 pg.**
- N. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – Scott Bricker, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 2 pgs.**
- O. Agenda Item 6, Proposed Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Amendments Testimony – Mark Whitlow, Retail Task Force, 6 pgs.**
- P. Agenda Item 7, Yamhill County Zone Change Testimony – Yamhill County, 13 pgs.**
- Q. Agenda Item 7, Yamhill County Zone Change Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 8 pgs.**
- R. Agenda Item 8, Periodic Review and Unincorporated Communities Amendments Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 70 pgs.**
- S. Agenda Item 8, Periodic Review and Unincorporated Communities Amendments – DLCD Staff, 22 pgs.**
- T. Agenda Item 8, Periodic Review and Unincorporated Communities Amendments Testimony – DLCD Staff, 7 pgs.**
- U. Agenda Item 8, Periodic Review and Unincorporated Communities Amendments Testimony – Art Schlack, Association of Oregon Counties, 1 pg.**
- V. Agenda Item 9, Goal 8 Amendments Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 68 pgs.**
- W. Agenda Item 10, Farm Lane, Forest Land and Goal Exceptions Amendments Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 85 pgs.**
- X. Agenda Item 10, Farm Lane, Forest Land and Goal Exceptions Amendments Additional Comments – DLCD Staff, 4 pgs.**
- Y. Agenda Item 10, Farm Lane, Forest Land and Goal Exceptions Amendments Testimony – DLCD Staff, 1 pg.**
- Z. Agenda Item 11, Dallas Task 6 Periodic Review Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 252 pgs.**
- AA. Agenda Item 11, Dallas Task 6 Periodic Review Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 9 pgs.**
- BB. Agenda Item 11, Dallas Task 6 Periodic Review Testimony – Jane Henderson, 1 pg.**
- CC. Agenda Item 12, Commission 2005-07 Policy Agenda Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 24 pgs.**
- DD. Agenda Item 12, Commission 2005-07 Policy Agenda Testimony – Harlan E. Levy, Oregon Association of Realtors, 1 pg.**
- EE. Agenda Item 14, Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee Staff Report – DLCD Staff, 20 pgs.**
- FF. Agenda Item 15, LCDC Budget and Management Subcommittee Report – DLCD Staff, 8 pgs.**