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

Aug. 9-11, 2006

LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Florence Events Center
715 Quince St.
Florence, Oregon 97439

(track 1)
Chair VanLandingham calls meeting to order at 8:35 a.m., Aug. 10, 2006.

Commission Members present:

John VanLandingham
Ron Henri
Hanley Jenkins
Marilyn Worrix

Commissioners Margaret Kirkpatrick, Dennis Derby and Tim Josi are excused.

Agenda Item 2 – Public Comment

Wilhelm Hagen, Citizen – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding the Land Use Board of Appeal (LUBA) process **(Exhibit A)**.

VanLandingham – Asks if the Task Force on Land Use Planning is looking at the LUBA process.

Shetterly – Discusses that the Task Force is looking at the issue of public process which will include the LUBA process.

VanLandingham – Clarifies that neither the Commission or the department have control over LUBA.

Shetterly – States that he will share Mr. Hagen's testimony to the Task Force on Land Use Planning.

(track 2)

Agenda Item 3 – Requests to Appeal

Jon Jinings, DLCD Staff – Submits staff report to the Commission regarding a Umatilla County appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) **(Exhibit B)**.

VanLandingham – Discusses that this is a quasi judicial proceeding and not a legislative hearing. If any of the Commissioners have had ex-parte contact they need to disclose that now.

Jenkins – States that he had a telephone conversation with the Umatilla County Planning Director, Tamra Mabbott, regarding how the Commission would process this appeal.

Shetterly – Explains that the normal time frame on an appeal of this nature would have put this matter on the October LCDC agenda, but since both parties were ready, the department decided to proceed.

Shipsey – Covers the guidelines for how the Commission should proceed with the appeal.

Dennis Doherty, Umatilla County Commissioner – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding the CIFF Enterprises application and the County's land use decision **(Exhibit C)**.

Tamra Mabbott, Umatilla County Planning Director – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding the CIFF Enterprises application and the County's land use decision **(Exhibit D)**.

VanLandingham – Is the county working on a long range plan for the corridor?

Mabbott – States that the county has been doing the leg-work on the plan but haven't hired a consultant yet.

VanLandingham – Why doesn't the county wait to make this decision until a comprehensive plan has been done?

Mabbott – We think that we have the opportunity now to create family wage jobs and if we do a comprehensive plan it could take up to a year and we may lose this opportunity.

Doherty – States that Milton-Freewater is a divided community. Discusses that it is important to not delay this decision because it would take a long time to get community consensus on a long-range plan for this corridor.

VanLandingham – Asks if the benefit will be to bring jobs to the people who used to work in the agriculture community.

Doherty – The main benefit will be to bring momentum to improving the economy.

VanLandingham – Does that create a risk of an economic node in that corridor?

Doherty – Yes, but Milton-Freewater doesn't have the room for this business.

Mabbott – Discusses the zoning along the corridor in question and that it will remain rural in nature except for the commercial property in question.

VanLandingham – Umatilla County was a strong proponent of HB 2458 (2005) to allow industrial land uses in rural areas. Now you are proposing taking some industrial land and making it commercial?

Doherty – Umatilla County was a proponent of the original HB 2458 which applied to both commercial and industrial zoning, but that didn't get adopted. The commercial needs of Umatilla County can still be addressed through the exceptions process.

Mabbott – States that she spoke with the current land owners who wanted to rezone their rural residential property into light industrial but were not able to find a buyer for that property. They now feel it would be better for commercial use.

Worrix – Asks how the shape and composition of the property make it unique and strategic.

Doherty – Discusses the property in question and that there wasn't property available in Milton-Freewater without parceling together pieces of land that may or may not be for sale.

Mabbott – The parcels that were available were too small to accommodate a "big box" retailer.

Worrix – Is Milton-Freewater unable to support a business of this size because of a lack of property or lack of a market?

Doherty – Explains that it is both.

Jenkins – The exceptions requirement states that you look at existing sites within UGBs to accommodate the proposal. The Commission doesn't have the whole record in front of us, and it doesn't seem that there has been an exhaustive process to find an existing piece of property that would work. This property seems to be about equal distance from Milton-Freewater and Walla Walla. It doesn't seem that there hasn't been an examination of alternative sites that could be in a UGB expansion for Milton-Freewater.

Doherty – It was the Board of Commissioners decision that there wasn't another available site. They felt that if the people of Milton-Freewater wanted to go to a commercial business of this type by placing it on the proposed site, they wouldn't have to go all the way to Walla Walla.

Mabbott – States that department staff, Jon Jinings, worked with the Governor's office, and the county to look at existing pieces of property that might work for a business of this type and that they could not find one that would work.

Doherty – States that he is satisfied with the level of work that was done by the department over the last year on this project. Discusses that they feel their jobs as County Commissioners is to give their community a new way to thrive.

Henri – Asks if it is "relatively common" to have a parcel large enough to accommodate this type of project and if much effort was put in to trying to consolidating and parceling together developable sites to equal a property of this size.

Mabbott – The county has not put effort into consolidating smaller sites to see if we could make that happen. It is my understanding from the work that the department did in conjunction with the Governor's office that the types of properties available for consolidation are not available in Milton-Freewater.

Doherty – States that because of the era of Measure 37, the county doesn't feel like they can press the people of Milton-Freewater into a change like this.

Shetterly – From the department's prospective, we are trying to protect the best interest of the community as well and keep a business opportunity within a UGB.

Doherty – I would rather see this located inside the UGB as well, but at least having it located outside of the UGB would add to the school tax base.

Mabbott – Thanks the department for their work on this project. States that ODOT was in support of this project as well.

Worrix – States that the department's perspective starts with a land use approach and incorporate economic development, but the county's perspective is to look at economic development first.

Mike Robinson, Attorney for Applicant – Testifies and submits written testimony regarding the CIFF Enterprises application and the County's land use decision **(Exhibit E)**. Discusses the testimony that was presented at the local hearing in opposition to this proposal. Discusses the "relatively common" language as it relates to property available. Discusses how the proximity of this development is important to potential Washington based customers.

VanLandingham – This site and this use is that you can draw customers from Walla Walla and the theory is that they will drive 4 miles to this site but not 8 miles to Milton-Freewater?

Robinson – Correct. We have been told that they can draw people from Washington but if it is much further, they wouldn't. As far as this being a concern for other parts of the state, I don't think there is another site around the state that would be similar to this situation.

VanLandingham – The difference of this site is that people would come here so that they don't have to pay sales tax.

Robinson – That is not the reason that we proposed this site. The difference is that we are competing for economic development with Washington.

Jenkins – There is already big box development in Walla Walla, so I don't see the competitive advantage except if it is the sales tax issue.

Robinson – We never talked about the sales tax issue. The people that own this property have not been able to sell this property as light industrial and now have someone interested in making this a commercial property.

VanLandingham – States that the Commission was in Ontario several years ago and they draw commercial development because people from Idaho come over so that they don't have to pay sales tax. That is not what is driving this issue?

Robinson – No, that issue was not brought up. There is a tax advantage for construction materials in Oregon that is not found in the state of Washington.

VanLandingham – The "uniqueness" is that we would have an Oregon based business taking advantage of Washington based customers?

Robinson – Yes.

Jenkins – How are we going to find that this site is unique to this circumstance and not have it apply all over the state?

Robinson – Availability is not the only factor when trying to site a facility. It has to do with locational factors and not necessarily price factors. Discusses how the property in question is unique. States that if the Commission feels additional findings are needed, you could ask the county to remand this so that additional findings can be addressed.

VanLandingham – States that the issue of having to drive eight miles instead of four to this location wouldn't be a problem for people who are used to having to drive.

Robinson – People won't have the opportunity to drive eight miles, because the business won't locate it there.

VanLandingham – Did the company in question want to locate in Walla Walla first?

Robinson – States that he believe that this business' first choice was the proposed site and not in Walla Walla.

VanLandingham – Recesses the meeting at 10:03 a.m.

VanLandingham – Reconvenes the meeting at 10:16 a.m.

VanLandingham – States that there is a significant state interest in this issue because of the precedence it could set as well as locating a facility of this type on rural lands outside of a UGB. Lists issues that the proponents believe makes the site unique: 1) not resource land; 2) land on major corridor; 3) close to a population base; 4) population base from state of Washington – would be importing dollars.

Robinson – I believe that is accurate.

VanLandingham – Why should we not worry about this happening somewhere else in Oregon?

Robinson – Because we don't believe that there is another situation like this in the rest of the state. Those four factors are a good faith distinction between other sites that may be proposed.

VanLandingham – Is the fact that we are drawing Washington customers, both unique and a important to Oregon?

Robinson – The commercial use will serve and have a benefit to Oregonians, but will also be attracting dollars from Washington.

VanLandingham – The one factor that couldn't be replicated all over the state is having customers from Washington.

Robinson – I agree.

VanLandingham – The distinguishing factor is that the market base is to attract those from out of state. States concerns with markets being driven outside of Walla Walla and that it may create a commercial node along this corridor.

Robinson – Discusses the possibilities of this area becoming a commercial node and both the positively and negatively impacts that may have.

Doherty – Explains how siting this company in this area happened and that it is and always has been the interested party's first choice. States that one of the biggest reasons that the company wants to locate in Umatilla County is because there isn't a sales tax on construction materials.

VanLandingham – How do we avoid that corridor becoming a commercial node?

Jenkins – Asks about the "Rural Service Commercial" properties and how if this corridor becomes a commercial node for additional urban development, that it doesn't become an urban commercial corridor.

Mabbott – States that those are the issues that the County and the department talked about. The properties that are currently in the corridor don't have the characteristics that would draw urban scale development.

Robinson – Discusses that there are properties along the corridor that are currently commercially zoned and how the Board of Commissioners made their decision on this property as cited in the record.

Jenkins – Asks about the findings and that they state "future opportunities."

Robinson – "Future economic opportunities," not urban uses. We think this would give a jump-start to the rural service commercial properties that are there now.

Doherty – Discusses that there has been talk within the county of bringing the economic development director for Umatilla County into the Planning office so that they can better

coordinate. Discusses the potential development and impacts of those developments along this corridor.

VanLandingham – One risk of is this is "strip" development. Doesn't that argue that you should do a comprehensive plan before you create this development?

Doherty – Yes, that would be preferable but we would lose this opportunity if we don't act now.

Robinson – Discusses the staff report and cites pgs. 3 and 4 regarding the factors. States that if there are additional findings that the department needs, his client would be willing to do that.

VanLandingham – Would a commercial use in this area, create more traffic than an industrial use?

Robinson – Yes, but in the Transportation Impact Analysis we were able to mitigate that with the proximity of the state line.

Mabbott – ODOT asked that the County give them the assurance that they would have some say in the format of on-site improvements of the property either through site development or through a conditional use process.

Jenkins – Asks if the *Kittleson* report consulted with the state of Washington.

Mabbott – The Region 5 planner for ODOT, spoke with her counterpart in Washington regarding that issue. Explains that the maintenance of the intersection at the state line is maintained by the state of Washington.

Henri – Asks about pg. 10 of the findings and what "specific commercial activities" would be.

Mabbott – That would allow for the urban level of commercial development on this specific site, when no other properties along the corridor have that urban designation.

Robinson – Cites pg. 11 of the findings and how they have explained the limited use overlay will limit it to the use requested.

Worrix – Normally, in focusing on economic development the main issue is family-wage jobs. Would more of the employees, if this business is sited in Umatilla County, come from Walla Walla, Washington, or Oregon?

Robinson – We would like to bring in Washington customers, but create jobs for Oregonians.

Mabbott – It is the County's expectation that it bringing in a large format retailer, that would far exceed the number of family-wage jobs than needed.

Jinings – Discusses the six appeal factors and that the staff hasn't heard anything new in the testimony that would change the department's decision.

VanLandingham – Is there a difference between the “use” and the “site” when considering the justification of exceptions?

Jinings – There is a difference, but there also is a relationship between the two as well. We need to understand what a particular proposed activity is so that it can be determined if the site has unique characteristics or the locational advantage to be able to deviate from the state wide planning laws that normally apply. We feel we have done that assessment and that they aren’t significant enough to deviate from the laws that would regularly apply.

VanLandingham – Recesses the meeting at 11:06 a.m.

VanLandingham – Reconvenes the meeting at 11:19 a.m.

Jenkins – Discusses the Commission’s responsibility on whether the department should proceed with an appeal, and states why he agrees with the three factors that were discussed by staff as to appeal this decision. States that long range planning is important and should proceed before a decision to bring in a business of this type is done. Discusses the exceptions process and that urban development has not been demonstrated by the possibility of expanding Milton-Freewater’s UGB. States that it is unfortunate that the urban vs. rural commercial issue has not been addressed statewide.

Worrix – Discusses that frequently cities run out of land inside of their UGB’s before they can expand, which isn’t the case in this situation. States that there are reasons to site a use outside of a UGB, but it is the Commission’s job to balance that decision. Discusses concern with allowing a project to happen outside of a UGB and then to follow up with the planning at a later date, as well as starting an economic development node without really knowing might happen there. States that she agrees with the department’s recommendation.

Henri – Discusses reasons why he believes the Commission should agree with the department’s analysis and proceed with an appeal. States concern that while the motivation by the County is right, the immediate economic benefits may not actually be met by this project. Discusses that looking at expanding the UGB needs to happen before siting a use such as this. States concern with the precedence that this could make for statewide siting of commercial uses outside of UGBs.

VanLandingham – Discusses reasons why he believes the Commission should agree with the department’s analysis and proceed with an appeal. States that he believes that there could be statewide implications by allowing urban development outside of urban boundaries. Discusses reasons why he believes this site is not unique and that an exception should not occur.

Shetterly – Thanks the Commission for the time they took on deliberating this matter. Discusses HB 2458 and the decision the legislature made taking commercial development outside of UGBs.

VanLandingham – Discusses the four-mile issue and that he believes that especially people that live in urban communities are willing to drive further.

Motion – Commissioner Jenkins moves that the Commission approve a department appeal of the subject decision from Umatilla County to the Land use Board of Appeals because the information included in this report demonstrate that OAR 660-001-023 (3)(a)(b) and (e) apply.

Commissioner Worrix seconds.

Vote – 4-0, Commissioners Kirkpatrick, Derby and Josi are excused.

(track 3)

Agenda Item 4 – Periodic Review of City of Salem Tasks 3 & 5

Shetterly – Asks the Commission to continue this to the October LCDC meeting in order to continue with the possibility of mediation.

Motion – Commissioner Jenkins move that the Periodic Review of City of Salem Tasks 3 & 5 be continued to the Commission's October meeting.

Commissioner Henri seconds.

Worrix – Requests that the Commission receive a briefing on how mediation is used in land use issues.

Vote – 4-0, Commissioners Kirkpatrick, Derby and Josi are excused.

(track 4)

Agenda Item 7 – Task Force on Land Use Planning Update

Shetterly – Provides Commission with a status report of the work of the Task Force has been doing since the Commission last met.

VanLandingham – Asks how the staffing will work to support the six work groups.

Shetterly – Explains that the work groups will not be meeting as "public meetings" and as a result will not require as much staffing. States that the department is interviewing and will be hiring a RARE (resource assistance for rural environments) person to help with staffing needs.

Commission discussion as to how the Task Force work groups will gather information and report back to the full Task Force.

Jenkins – States that he spoke to an Oregonians in Actions forum and that Frank Nims stated that citizen involvement wasn't taken into consideration in the decision making process in the land use program.

Commission discussion regarding citizen involvement as it relates to the Task Force on Land use Planning.

(track 5)

Agenda Item 9 – Director's Report

Shetterly – Provides the Commission with the Director's Report regarding recent activities of the department since the Commission last met **(Exhibit F)**.

Commission discussion regarding Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) facilities being sited in Oregon.

Shetterly – Continues with the Director's report regarding recent activities of the department.

VanLandingham – Recesses the meeting at 12:18 p.m.

VanLandingham – Reconvenes the meeting at 1:11 p.m.

Shetterly – Continues with the Director's report.

VanLandingham – Discusses that mobile home park closures might be an issue that comes before the legislature and that the department might receive calls regarding this issue because people think it is a land use issue.

(track 6)

Agenda Item 5 – Informational Briefing on City of Damascus

Stacy Hopkins, DLCD Staff – Provides Commission with background on the City of Damascus recently becoming a city.

John Hartsock, Damascus City Council – Submits written comments regarding the City of Damascus becoming a city in November 2004 **(Exhibit G)**.

Mary Webber, Interim Community Development Director with the City of Damascus – Discusses the process the City of Damascus has done to become a city.

VanLandingham – Asks about the Metro excise tax and the effect of that on Damascus.

Hartsock – Discusses that the tax is already in place. Discusses the written comments that were submitted regarding the City of Damascus' Annual Report, the Davis Hibbits report and the newspaper that is delivered to every home **(Exhibit G)**.

VanLandingham – States that the City has done an incredible job with the amount of time and effort they are putting into this.

Hartsock – States that he enjoys being able to give back to the community as well as plan for the future.

VanLandingham – Asks how they are going to handle some of the challenges regarding multi-family housing.

Hartsock – States that those are concerns, but that if people can identify and get the vision of affordable housing, they will be able to do something about it.

Webber – States that being able to build affordable housing in Damascus is a huge concern.

Shetterly – Thanks both Ms. Webber and Mr. Hartsock for their presentation today as well as their effort to work with the department regarding their City.

(track 7)

Agenda Item 6 – Informational Briefing on Goals 5 and 6

Stacy Hopkins and Amanda Punton, DLCD Staff – Provide Commission with PowerPoint presentation regarding Goals 5 and 6, Riparian Areas, Habitat and Water Quality **(Exhibit H)**.

VanLandingham – States that the Commission is receiving the briefing because Metro's submittal that includes Goal 5 work and which the Commission will hear in October, may likely be appealed.

Hopkins – Last June, Metro came before the Commission and asked that when they provide their submittal to you for your review, it be done in the manner of periodic review. Under the new periodic review rule, the director must refer this to the Commission for hearing.

VanLandingham – Are there lessons to be learned from Metro's work on Goal 5?

Punton – Metro's work on the integration of different environments has been interesting.

Commission discussion regarding "cultural resources" and what that statement means regarding land use planning.

Amanda Punton, DLCD Staff – Continues with presentation regarding Goals 5 and 6, Riparian Areas, Habitat and Water Quality **(Exhibit H)**.

Hopkins – At the October LCDC meeting, Metro's submittal will be before the Commission looking specifically at riparian and wildlife corridors.

(track 8)

Agenda Item 8 – Measure 37 Update

Shetterly – Updates the Commission on the latest Measure 37 numbers and how that is affecting department staff. Discusses several lawsuits that have been filed with the state regarding transferability, date of acquisition, reduction of value determination and review of a state agency decision.

Worrix – Asks what types of claims go to other state agencies.

Shetterly – There are farm and forest, as well as water rights and resource issues that go to other agencies. Discusses the possibility of the number of claims winding down after the December 2, 2006 deadline. States that the department now has staff tracking the county waivers that have been and are being granted without the state's acknowledgement or waiver. Discusses that the department would like the Commission's approval to look toward doing some rulemaking regarding Measure 37 issues.

Jenkins – Discusses that because the decisions on waivers are written by the Department of Justice, the people that receive those waivers have a hard time deciphering what those decisions mean and that they are frustrated with the counties instead of the state.

Worrix – Asks about state versus local control and if that issue might be exacerbated by doing rulemaking.

Shetterly – Most local governments have already been waiting to approve a claim until the state has made its decision, but the rulemaking would hopefully make sure that there was uniform application around the state and consistency of how jurisdictions are processing claims.

Jenkins – From the county's perspective, the sooner the better.

Henri – I agree that the department should proceed.

VanLandingham – If the cities and the counties don't want to do this, then what happens?

Shetterly – We aren't sure, but are hoping that discussing this with them ahead of time will keep them in the loop.

VanLandingham – I agree that this should move forward. States concern that this could become a bigger issue at the October meeting than anticipated.

Shetterly – Continues with discussion of what the Measure 37 rulemaking might include.

(track 9)

Agenda Item 10 – Commission Business and Reports

VanLandingham – Provides Commission with report from the Budget and Management Subcommittee **(Exhibit I)**. Discusses a report that he received from Robert Liberty regarding a windfall tax concept and that they would like time on a future LCDC agenda to discuss their proposal. Asks if there is a way for the department and the Commission to monitor, overtime, the approval of go-belows or other issues that the Commission approves. States that he has asked the Governor's office to be reappointed to the Commission as he did not actually serve a full two-terms.

(track 10)

Agenda Item 12 – Review of Future Agendas

VanLandingham – Discusses the upcoming Sept. 12, meeting regarding McMinnville in Salem.

(track 11)

Agenda Item 13 – Other

Pat Zimmerman, Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee – Submits document regarding a decision that the Coos County Planning Commission recently made on who has standing in a case before the county and CIAC's concerns regarding that decision **(Exhibit J)**.

Shipsey – Discusses that Coos County probably can establish these rules but that he has some concerns about several issues.

Worrix – States that they might want to educate the Coos County Realtors involved with this issue because Realtors are frequently involved in planning commission's decisions.

VanLandingham – Would it be appropriate for the department to write a letter to Coos County?

Shetterly – I believe so.

VanLandingham – States that he feels it would be helpful for CIAC to write a letter to Coos County raising their concerns.

VanLandingham – Recess the meeting at 3:46 p.m.

(track 12)

VanLandingham – Reconvenes the meeting at 9:05 a.m., Aug. 11, 2006.

Agenda Item 12 – Continuation of Public Comment

Wilbur Terynik, Oregon Coastal Conservation Commission – Provides Commission with background of the Oregon Coastal Conservation Commission. Discusses federal consistency and the moving beach and dunes issue in Florence.

Shetterly – Is the BLM land inside the Florence city limits?

Terynik – Yes it is, but the City is thinking about leasing it.

VanLandingham – Thanks Mr. Terynik for coming and speaking to the Commission.

(track 13)

Agenda Item 14 – Roundtable Discussion with Local Governments, Confederated Tribes of the Coos Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, Coquille Indian Tribe and other invited guests

Those in attendance include: Onno Husing, Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association; Wendy Farley, Florence Planning Department; Paul Holman, City of Florence; Tom Kartrude, Port of Siuslaw; Larry Henson, Newport City Council; Vicki Sieber-Benson, Confederated Tribes of the Coos Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians; Peggy Lynch, League of Women Voters; Lane Shetterly, Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development; John VanLandingham, Chair of the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC); Ron Henri, LCDC Commissioner; Marilyn Worrix, LCDC Commissioner; Hanley Jenkins, LCDC Commissioner; Rob Hallyburton, DLCD Staff; Cliff Voliva, DLCD Staff; Sarah Watson, DLCD Staff; Steve Shipsey, Department of Justice.

Issues discussed include: Goal 5 and maintaining tribal historical and cultural issues; sewer extension in Florence to allow access for the Confederated Tribes of the Coos Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians to use it because it is on sovereign land and that the case is currently before the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA); second and third homes and how that inflates the price of land on the coast and the impacts that has on homelessness as well as the issue of handling census data; urban growth boundary expansion to include a community college and how that may impact the Newport airport; that Oregon Coast housing costs don't seem to be wavering or going down which is having a huge cultural impact change as retirees are moving to the coast; that sixty to seventy-percent of children in coastal towns are on assisted school lunches; that coastal towns now comprise of low income people or retirees; coastal cities might have to consider developing a master plan to incorporate affordable housing; Goal 17 and water dependant development and commercial uses; the commercial fishing industry is not dead and that the state needs to be aware of how to keep that industry while attracting tourism to the coast; that small city and county staff can not take on more responsibilities of looking at issues such as affordable housing.

VanLandingham – Adjourns the meeting at 11:19 a.m.

Submitted By:

Sarah Watson,
Department of Land Conservation and Development

Exhibit Summary:

A. Agenda Item 2, Public Comment, Written Testimony – Wilhelm Hagen, 1 pg.
B. Agenda Item 3, Staff Report on Umatilla County's Request to Appeal – DLCD Staff, 26 pgs.
C. Agenda Item 3, Written Testimony on Umatilla County's Request to Appeal – Dennis Doherty, 6 pgs.

D. Agenda Item 3, Written Testimony on Umatilla County's Request to Appeal – Tamra Mabbott, 2 pgs.
E. Agenda Item 3, Written Testimony on Umatilla County's Request to Appeal – Mike Robinson, 4 pgs.
F. Agenda Item 6, Director's Report – DLCD Staff, 68 pgs.
G. Agenda Item 5, Written Testimony on City of Damascus– John Hartsock, 14 pgs. and newspaper article
H. Agenda Item 5, PowerPoint Presentation Regarding Goals 5 & 6 – DLCD Staff, 22 pgs.
I. Agenda Item 10, Budget and Management Subcommittee Report – DLCD Staff, 5 pgs.
J. Agenda Item 13, Coos County Planning Ordinance – Pat Zimmerman, 2 pgs.
K. Agenda Item 14, Written Testimony by the Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association – Onno Husing, 30 pgs.
L. Agenda Item 14, Roundtable Sign-up Sheet – 1 pg.
M. Agenda Item 1, Field Trip Information – DLCD Staff, 3 pgs.