

From: Anne Sigrun
To: [Donnelly, Jennifer](#); [Hoge, Tabatha L](#); [DLCD PR-UGB](#)
Cc: [Abbott, Amie](#)
Subject: Exception to Referral of MURR Submittal to LCDC
Date: Friday, November 03, 2017 8:20:43 AM

Urban and Rural Reserve Specialist
Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150
Salem, Oregon 97301

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Carl N. Keseric.

I have resided at 13720 NW Springville Lane, on my family's 10-acre woodlot in Unincorporated West Multnomah County, since 1963.

I am writing today to urge the LCDC to reject Multnomah County Ordinance No. 1246.

Of the seven written objections recently received by the DLCD regarding the urban and rural reserve re-submissions from Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, five of them concerned Multnomah County Study Area '9B' (also referred to as East Bethany or the 'L' shaped area) and one concerned Multnomah County area '9D', the study area immediately to the northwest of Area 9B.

In 2010, after two years of highly contentious public hearings, the Multnomah County Land Use Planning staff recommended that Reserves Study Area 9B should receive a reserve status of 'undesignated'.

Why did the Multnomah County commissioners vote to overrule the carefully considered final recommendation of their own professional planners?

The shortest answer is one that has seemingly gotten buried during the course of this ten-year-long process - connectivity.

An early plan to connect NW Saltzman Road with either NW Springville Road or a road that was designated 'Road A' in the original North Bethany Plan has apparently been completely forgotten. This connection would open a direct, four-lane access route to NW Cornell Road, NW Barnes Road, Highway 217, and Highway 26.

Failing to implement this extension will leave NW Germantown Road as the only direct route east towards Highway 30 and downtown Portland from the Bethany area.

NW Germantown Road is a narrow, steep, and winding road that snakes through Forest Park. It is a two-lane road that was developed from an old trail that connected the southern tip of Sauvies Island to the north plains of the Tualatin Valley. It was not designed for urban traffic flow.

In the development of urban infrastructure in the Bethany area, Washington County has made provisions for a NW Saltzman Road extension within its current road system. However, there

remains a gap of two or three miles in that road system. That gap lies wholly within Multnomah County Study Area 9B.

The Multnomah County Rural Area Plan for the West Hills Rural Area (2007) states:

POLICY 8: Oppose placement of regional roadways in the West Hills Rural Area, should such roadways be under consideration by any regional transportation authority in the future.

https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/5616/Multnomah_West_Hills_Rural_Plan.pdf

The same document classifies NW Germantown Road as a ‘Rural Collector’, with a “traffic volume of less than 3,000 vehicles per day”.

Multnomah County Transportation System Plan (2016) states:

Although rural County residents recognize the need for improving the local road system, they also cherish the rural character of the areas they live in and prefer not to have more roads built or existing roads widened to a significant degree in order to accommodate increased traffic and to provide greater traffic safety. Many of the comments from the public recognize the traffic problems caused by growing population and commute patterns, but seek solutions that will not result in more road construction. Although traffic continues to grow, rural County roads are not meant to handle regional through traffic. Residents value the trees, wildlife, and the pastoral countryside characteristic of Multnomah County’s rural areas and do not want to see the landscape and habitat diminished by construction of new and expanded roads...

<https://multco.us/file/56309/download>

As someone who has used that road to get to work for over 20 years, my wife could tell you that the rush-hour traffic on NW Germantown Road is currently bumper-to-bumper. The idea that NW Germantown Road can adequately support traffic-flow growth for the next 50 years is ludicrous.

The following news articles from that time may serve to illustrate the events behind the Multnomah County Commission’s actions:

Multnomah County’s vote came after Commissioner Judy Shipwreck added an amendment shifting undesignated land along the Washington County border near Bethany (Area 9B) into the rural reserve. The amendment passed 3-2, with Commissioners Diane McKeel and Deborah Kafoury joining Shipwreck in support.

Kafoury testified that she received close to 1,000 e-mails and phone calls in favor of putting the land into rural reserve, county spokeswoman Karol Collymore said.

DJC Oregon February 25, 2010

<http://djcoregon.com/news/2010/02/25/47696-urbp/>

And:

Then-Metro Council President David Bragdon warned the Multnomah County

commissioners that they were making a mistake by designating East Bethany (Area 9B) rural.

The Oregonian, October 18, 2010

http://www.oregonlive.com/environment/index.ssf/2010/10/with_critics_on_all_sides_port.html

In 2014 David Bragdon stated in an interview that land use planing in Oregon produced “sentiment-based conclusions”.

NYC to PDX: An Interview with David Bragdon

<http://orlo.org/nyc-to-pdx-an-interview-with-david-bragdon/>

I have lived in Area 9B for over 50 years. Then, as now, the total number of residential houses within that area numbers less than fifty.

Who exactly sent Commissioner Kafoury those “1,000 emails and phone calls”? Are they in the public record? Could we look at them? How many of those people actually live in rural Multnomah County?

Those emails resulted from a series of ‘Action Alerts’ by 1000 Friends of Oregon, in which they deliberately and systematically mis-identified Area 9B as being in the Willamette Valley and an area of “prime farm land”.

Area 9B lies entirely within the Tualatin Valley in what is know as ‘exception’ land, in that it is an “exception to either Goal 3, Agricultural Lands, or Goal 4, Forest Lands, has been approved by Multnomah County and acknowledged by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission.” [Amended 1999, Ord. 924]

Some county residents may “cherish the rural character of the areas they live in” and “prefer not to have more roads built”, but isn’t it rather short-sighted to deliberately block viable solutions to projected traffic woes by basing any potential solutions on such sentiments?

Long-term regional infrastructure needs should not be determined by a ‘popularity contest’. Recognizing that fact, the Multnomah County Planning Staff recommended an ‘undesignated’ status for Area 9B.

By remaining outside of the Reserves system, Area 9B will be open to a purely political solution by the Oregon State Legislature, in much the same way as Area 93 has been.

Again, I would like to urge that the LCDC reject Multnomah County Ordinance No. 1246 and remand the issue back to Multnomah County with instructions to restore the ‘undesignated’ Reserve status to Area 9B.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Sandy Barker, Chuck Beasley, David Bragdon and Jed Tomkins for their assistance, patience, and advice.

Carl N. Keseric
13720 NW Springville Lane
Portland OR 97229