

January 15, 2008

The Springwater Gresham Plan Progress To Date:

1. There has been minimal interest shown by new employers to consider Springwater.
2. One parcel sold to a speculator for \$50,000 per acre near Danner Nursery. This parcel was the best zoned property in Springwater. (i.e. allowed the most commercial)
3. Some parcels have been offered in the \$100,000 per acre range (Telford Rd) One seller on Jeanette Road (Ray Carver) has 5 acres for \$650,000 with a home with future industrial zoning and for a year has been very disappointed in activity.
4. Nursery farm land, near Springwater but outside of it has been appraising generally at \$15,000 per acre with a high of \$20,000 per acre.
5. A seller with nursery land zoned future industrial which is one of few industrial zoned properties actually suitable for industrial. (e.g. not too steeply sloping). It is priced at \$75,000 per acre. Usually suitable industrial runs about \$200,000/ac.
6. Residential builders are finding Gresham imposing comparatively costly environmental standards (e.g. green streets to be provided by the developer) on residential lands in Springwater. This will effectively steer housing demand normal for Gresham to development in other communities.

Opportunity for Change: Probably as a result of at least some of my lobbying efforts, many Gresham Officials, most Metro officials, and a number of state officials are at least secretly aware the Springwater plan is seriously flawed. If such efforts were to stop, the likely course of action is to keep everything on ice until Metro does a new study of the Urban Growth boundaries to be completed five years from now. If this prognosis becomes reality, I foresee extremely limited non-residential development until then, and limited progress on extending sewer and water. There is no guarantee METRO will adequately fix the plan at the 5 year reviews about year 2012.

1. Metro. No sign of change. The newly appointed Metro councilor declined to meet
2. Department of Land Conservation and Development. Former Director Mr. Lane Shetterly retired Jan 2, 2008. He should have never been appointed to the state position. His replacement, Mr. Whitman, was recently appointed the Department of Land Conservation & Development Commission. Presumably this same commission appointed Shetterly. Mr. Whitman, also an attorney, is credited as one of the authors of M-49. Private practice attorneys say that the misleading ballot statement that it classified M-37 concerns say that the requirements to file a M-49 to cover you M-37 issue are so onerous that it effectively kills nearly all of the M-37 applications. As practical matter none of the concerns the voters had with measure 37 legislation will see the light of day the way M-49 deals with them.

3. The Big Look Committee appointed and funded by the Legislature two sessions ago was axed by M-37 leaders in last summers legislature (e.g. US Senate Candidate Jeff Merkley, President of the House). They were originally appointed to take a fresh look of Oregon Land use Laws probably in an attempt to dissuade interest in M-37 concerns. Thus this may have been merely a 'head fake'. In any event it was poorly administrated by then DLCD Director Shetterly, under funded, and comprised almost entirely of private citizens member who were asked to volunteer. Many of these 'do gooders' were not particularly qualified. The significant exception to private side appointments was the appointment of the political positioned Dave Bragdon, chairman of METRO. Presumably he has the most to cover up in the state, making this appointment curious. This special session in February may restart the Big look Committee but may well not as although truth from that committee can no longer stop the ambitions of M-49, the committee could still blow the 'whistle' on Metro's mistakes which DLCD has dutifully closed its eyes to and officially 'acknowledged' (approved of) with its blessings.

Robert Butler

Parenthetically, the political promise for the South Water Front Project (OHSU) has yet to create one job of the 16,000 jobs promised. Springwater is at about the same progress with even a larger promise of 17,000 jobs to be created. Many of their jobs were to be high tech. This in the face of the trend in the other direction. Nearby Merix in Fairview just announced it is closing its doors. LSI liquidated at ten cents on the dollar. Fujitsu vanished.

Measure 49 Arguments

farmers and ranchers and traditional agriculture.

Those that support Measure 49 may think that we can be replaced with mega-corporate farms, but we believe that small-scale, family-based agriculture is best for our state, our natural resources, and our environment.

Please reject the misleading campaign and help us protect Oregon agriculture for future generations. Vote No on Measure 49.

www.orcattle.com

(This information furnished by Kay Teisl, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.)

This space purchased for \$500 in accordance with ORS 251.255.
The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Opposition

The Hood River Agriculture, Forestry, and Landowner's Association Asks You to Vote NO on Measure 49

We are all long time agricultural and forest property owners. Together we represent the vast majority of EFU land in Hood River County. We own orchards, vineyards, hay fields, and forest acreage. We raise kids and pears and apples and grapes and cherries and fir trees and cows. We are all farmers with "family farms." The next time you read in the newspaper about agriculture in the Hood River Valley, they are talking about us.

We are also unanimously opposed to Measure 49. Why? Because Measure 49 strips us of our most valuable commodity - the right to control how we operate our farms and use our land.

Today, foreign competition along with state and federal laws are slowly combining to put us out of business. In order for us to compete, we must be able to make changes to the way we use our land based on economics, not how pretty the view is or the soil type.

But Oregon's statewide, centralized land use laws, the only ones of their kind in the nation, prevent us from making changes based on economics.

To them, it is all about protecting "farmland." But no one cares about protecting the "farmer."

Measure 49 strips us of our property rights. It is a cruel blow to an industry that is already struggling to stay alive. If Measure 49 passes, we will be unable to diversify our operations, and to use our unproductive areas for higher economic uses, which allow us to keep farming on the productive parts of our farms.

We are proud to be Americans working in the natural resource industry. It is our hope that our children and grandchildren will continue our heritage. But Measure 49 and Oregon's ridiculous land use laws make that unlikely.

Please vote NO on Measure 49.

(This information furnished by John M. Benton, Sr., Hood River Agriculture, Forestry and Landowner's Association.)

This space purchased for \$500 in accordance with ORS 251.255.
The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Opposition

Legislators ignored Oregon Voters too long and Measure 37 passed. A hidden agenda begins. First a "head fake" saying its finally past time to rework our land use laws and SB 82 in the 2005 session authorizes a volunteer task force of 10, "The Big Look Task Force". With questionable support by the state, the hard working task force appears wandering. In the process Department of Land Use Conservation, (DLCD) Governor's Office, Metro, and the Task Force are receiving facts indicating that the planning function is far more suspect than ever imagined. Extreme errors were cited in Metro Government Planning. Metro which governs 40% of Oregon's Population had apparently frivolously extended the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) especially along Mt. Hood Highway east of Gresham also Damascus to be important sources of tens of thousand of industrial and high technology jobs. (Metro's Title 4 map of Significant Industrial Lands). Then Oregon's DLCD "acknowledges" their plans to officially meet state goals. ODOT even jumps in and starts spending Federal Funding to pursue transportation studies for Metro's exuberance. This sets the stage for damage control. Promptly at the legislature Metro gets the legislature to delay its 5 year cycle requirement to review the urban growth boundary by adding another 2 years. I say no wonder they are clueless on how to fix their last mistakes let alone update the UGB. Then curiously the potential 'whistle blowing' Big Look Committee gets the axe. The weak excuse is that Oregon voters are not "sophisticated enough" to think about more than just M-37 (i.e. Task Force puts our intelligence on overload). Lastly, damage control makes sure that the land use committees in the House and Senate avoid even the routine land use problems normally addressed. Then, finally, in the late hours with problems swept under the rug, and under false pretenses of "clarifying", M-37 gets a 'hatchet' job renamed M-49.

Robert Butler, President, Butler Brokers Inc., Commercial Realtors

(This information furnished by Robert Butler, Butler Brokers Inc., Commercial Realtors.)

This space purchased for \$500 in accordance with ORS 251.255.
The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Opposition

Measure 49 has never had a public hearing.

Measure 49 is so bad, legislatures would only vote for it if it was referred back to the voters.

Measure 49 is 24 pages of tricks and errors, including:

-If you are inside the UGB, you are guaranteed **0** lots (Section 9(2) "... may not exceed the lessor of..." (Section 9(6) "The reduction in fair market value..." (see financial formula!)

-If you are outside the UGB, you are guaranteed **1** lot (per application, not lots owned!) Section 6(2)(c)

-If your "highest and best use" is not residential, you will get **0** lots; for residential or otherwise. Section 7(8)

-If you try to use the financial formula, you will fail- it was designed that way! A CPA firm was hired to run many examples; highest value was **1** lot, usually **0** lots. Section 7(6) Out UGB Section 9(6) In UGB

-You can't use the financial formula if you are in "high value" farm or forest (90% of buildable Clackamas, Washington, Yamhill, etc) - OR if you are:

Section 2(c)(A) "...water irrigation"