

DRAFT
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 7, 2011 AT 7:00 P.M.
SCAPPOOSE HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM
SCAPPOOSE, OREGON

Mayor Burge called the City Council Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Attendance:

City Council Members:

Scott Burge	Mayor
Jeff Bernhard	Council President
Donna Gedlich	Councilor
Judie Ingham	Councilor
Larry P. Meres	Councilor
Jeff Erickson	Councilor
Mark Reed	Councilor

Jeff Bennett	Legal Counsel
--------------	---------------

Staff:

Jon Hanken	City Manager
Brian Varricchione	City Planner
Doug Greisen	Police Chief
Susan Reeves	City Recorder

Press:

Josey Bartlett	The Chronicle
Stover Harger	The Spotlight

Approval of the Agenda

Councilor Ingham moved and Council President Bernhard seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Bernhard, aye; Councilor Gedlich, aye; Councilor Ingham, aye; Councilor Meres, aye; Councilor Erickson, aye and Councilor Reed, aye.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on items that were not on the agenda.

Consent Agenda

January 3, 2011 City Council Meeting Minutes and January 18, 2011 City Council Meeting Minutes

Councilor Ingham moved and Council President Bernhard seconded the motion to approve the January 3, 2011 City Council Meeting Minutes and January 18, 2011 City Council Meeting Minutes. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Bernhard, aye; Councilor Gedlich, aye; Councilor Ingham, aye; Councilor Meres, aye; Councilor Erickson, aye and Councilor Reed, aye.

Old Business

**Continuation from January 3, 2011 hearing on Docket # CPA1-10/CPTA1-10/DCTA3-10
Public Hearing to solicit comments on the following proposed actions:**

DRAFT

- **Amend the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate 2010 Scappoose Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and 2010-2030 Columbia County population forecast;**
- **Remove outdated information from the Comprehensive Plan and add key findings and policies from the EOA;**
- **Add new airport employment Plan designation and overlay zones to implement the EOA;**
- **Amend Scappoose Urban Growth Boundary to meet industrial and commercial needs identified in the EOA and to include a regional park area.**

Format: Legislative Land Use

Mayor Burge read the opening statement: I am calling this public hearing to order to consider an application for a Legislative Land Use Decision. Testimony and evidence must address the criteria that apply to the decision as described in the staff report or to the criteria the person testifying believes to apply to the decision. Persons may speak only after being recognized by the chair and must come forward to the microphone and state their name and address for the record. Only testimony that is relevant to the application will be considered. Immaterial or repetitious testimony will not be allowed and time limits will be imposed if testimony is irrelevant or repetitious. There shall be no audience demonstration or other conduct which would disrupt the hearing.

The order of the hearing is the staff report and Planning Commission report, then proponents, then opponents, then neutral participants, then a staff response, and we are at the staff response portion of this evening, then any questions the City Council may have. Thereafter, the hearing is closed for consideration of the matter by the Council.

The staff and Planning Commission reports and public testimony was provided at a prior meeting so tonight's hearing will begin with staff response.

City Planner Brian Varricchione stated thank you Mr. Mayor and Council. He explained as requested at the last Council hearing on this application staff has prepared written responses to the public testimony that was submitted during the hearings processes. Since these responses are available in written format we won't read them out loud in their entirety but we'll answer any questions that Council may have about the responses. Referring to the application itself, there is a set of policy issues for Councils determination that's touched on in the written staff responses and in order to proceed with these issues in an orderly fashion staff recommends the review sequence on page 2 of his staff report dated January 28. He will touch briefly on those items and outline the policy choices from a planning perspective. After that Jeff Bennett will provide the legal perspective and will have some procedural comments. Referring to the recommended sequence staff is proposing for discussion, the first item is reviewing the 2010 – 2030 Columbia County population forecast to adopt the forecast as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The population forecast was a coordinated effort; it was prepared by Portland State University. It has been adopted by Columbia County. It has not been adopted by the City at this time. Staff proposes that this population forecast be adopted and incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan so that the City may rely on the figures that are found in that forecast. For this item there really is no policy choice other than a Council decision on whether to adopt the forecast or not. The second item is to review the Scappoose Economic Opportunity Analysis or EOA. It should be noted that Johnson-Reid has submitted an updated EOA

DRAFT

dated January 10, 2011 and the EOA was updated in response to public testimony that was submitted in December and January. The main policy choice for Council's discussion in regards to the EOA is how they wish for the community to grow. The EOA as proposed would change the jobs- to-housing ratio. This is really a fancy way of saying that if development occurs at the rate that's projected in the EOA, Scappoose would be less of a bedroom community and have a more robust employment base. There's been a lot of discussion of the annual average growth rate of 7.6% for job growth but really he wants to caution against paying too much attention to that figure because that mischaracterizes the policy choice. That 7.6% is actually derived from the growth projection for the year 2030 in various employer categories. So if Council wishes to change the growth numbers really it should refer to figure 1 in the EOA which lists by various categories of employment, what the anticipated job numbers would be. The EOA includes target industries that are found in that table and then for each industry a level of employment is projected. It is only after that total has been computed that the growth rate is then back calculated. The third item is reviewing the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments that will remove outdated information from the Comprehensive Plan and add key findings and policies from the EOA. From a housekeeping standpoint the narrative and tables in this Comprehensive Plan update would need to make sure they match the final form of the EOA, however Council wishes that to look. The current draft of this is dated October 21, 2010 and as the EOA gets revised, then for final adoption staff would update the Comprehensive Plan Amendments to match. With regards to the policy choices for this item staff has proposed replacing the Economic Goals and Policies as well as adding additional policies for Public Facilities and Services to the Comprehensive Plan. So we would request that Council review those and comment on them. The fourth item is reviewing the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary for industrial and commercial needs identified in the EOA and a regional park area. The proposed UGB amendments are based on the projected 20 year land need identified in the EOA and consistent with State Wide Planning Goals 9 and 14 and related Statutes and Administrative Rules. Map A is the proposed UGB expansion area and that illustrates the acreage and the locations of the proposed expansion of the UGB. One policy choice for Council is whether to include three additional parcels or rather portions of parcels as Keith Settle testified at one of the prior hearings. Mr. Settle and two other property owners currently have their parcels split by the UGB and so Council could determine whether they wish to include the entirety of those parcels in the UGB. Another policy choice is how much Highway Commercial Exception area to include. The Planning Commission recommended that only the land between Old Portland Road and Highway 30 down by Fairview Cemetery be included. Then another policy choice is how the Council wants to address property owners who may not be interested in being in the UGB. The fifth item would be reviewing the proposed Airport Employment Comprehensive Plan designation. We are proposing to amend the Comprehensive Plan to create a new chapter and designation for land near the airport. Currently that area is planned for industrial. This proposal would create a new airport employment designation that would go hand in hand with the City's Public Use Airport Zone. The major policy choice for Council's consideration on this is whether to add non-aviation related uses. The proposed Comprehensive Plan chapter would allow for multiple types of uses, it would still result in an employment center near the airport but the composition of this would be more mixed use and not strictly aviation related. The sixth item is to review the proposed development code amendments which includes the proposed Airport Employment Overlay zones as well as Planning Commissions recommended changes to the annexation chapter. The overlay zones are proposed in conjunction with the Airport Employment Comprehensive Plan designation to protect sites for the uses for which the UGB is being amended. The Planning Commission did amend the proposed list of allowable uses and remove several objectionable types of development but there still remains the policy choice of whether Council wishes to amend that list or even

DRAFT

whether they wish to use overlays or some other tool in order to implement the land protection policies. That concludes his response and at this point he will turn it over to Jeff Bennett.

Jeff Bennett explained there are a number of legal issues that are implicated by the policy choices that you are about to consider tonight and one of the things that we thought we would do is kind of take you briefly through the process that Statute and Administrative Rules, which apply to this case, how those work in the policy choices that you are about to make. As you are aware, both State Statute and Administrative Rules require you to project your employment needs over a 20 year time period so you are by definition looking forward for an extended period of time. Keep that in mind as you take into consideration your decisions about how to look at growth, how to look at the types of employment opportunities that may present themselves within the City of Scappoose and how you want to accommodate those needs. When you look at that employment need you are not looking at making a precise calculation of exactly how many jobs will need to be accommodated in Scappoose during that 20 year time period. What you're doing is estimating that job growth as the term is used in the Administrative Rule and that estimate is circumscribed by the term reasonable. The estimates that you use need to be reasonable given the circumstances that you are presented with and by definition you are looking at things like: past employment trends, future employment trends, future types of employment opportunities that may be available to the City of Scappoose given what is projected to happen in our world over a 20 year time period. So in some measure looking back is instructive but in some measure limiting yourself to historical trends is in a sense a false limitation. What you are really trying to do is look at what kind of economic development future you see for the City of Scappoose and then identifying what kind of lands you need to include within the UGB to accommodate those needs. Now what is important by use of the word reasonable in the Rule and the challenge that some other cities have encountered when their decisions regarding UGB amendments have been challenged is that they have not done a very good job, or at least in either LUBA's mind or in the Court of Appeals mind have not done a good job of explaining how you get from the projections and the data that you are given to the projection that you choose. In other words you really can't just choose a number out of thin air and say that's the number we choose. You have to look at data, you need to look at trends, you need to look at specific opportunities that are presented in the City of Scappoose and you need to connect all those things together to lead you to a reasonable estimate of job growth for this community over that 20 year time period. That kind of goes back to a comment that Brian made and that's that it's important not to solely focus on the, for example the job growth number 7.6% per year. What is important is to look at how that 7.6% number was reached and what kind of factors were considered in reaching the 7.6% number and then evaluating those various factors which really are uses and saying well does that use projection make sense for what we want to see in Scappoose. You are going to see in the EOA a list of uses that are projected to occur here based upon those unique things that Scappoose has to provide and it's looking at those uses that you really need to focus on in determining whether the 7.6% number is one that you think is reasonable under the circumstances or whether a higher number or lower number is reasonable under the circumstances. But the bottom line is focus less on the numbers than on the uses and that gets to kind of a policy question of what employment uses can reasonably be expected to locate here. At the beginning of the day, and at the end of the day is a common euphemism that you hear everywhere these days, what we are looking at is at the beginning of the day what is it about Scappoose that you've learned through the performance of the EOA and through this hearing process, what is it about Scappoose that you have learned can reasonably expect certain types of employment related uses to locate here. You have heard a number of factors, and they're reflected in the EOA that were used to say these are the types of unique things that exist within this community that can generate interest in a specific list of uses and you have to decide

DRAFT

whether that is reasonable. At the beginning of the day you are looking at what kind of uses can reasonably be expected to be located here and in order to answer that question you need to look at what kind of unique economic development opportunities does the City of Scappoose present. So you need to look at those economic development opportunities that are listed in the EOA and say to yourself do we agree with that concept, do we agree that we don't want to be a bedroom community that we want to be a more self-sufficient economy, do we want to head ourselves in that 20 year time period to a more self-sufficient economy then we presently have and those are the kinds of decisions we need to make. Do we want to have more commercial land here so that people in this community and the surrounding area can shop more here then going to Portland. So that's the second thing you need to look at and all of that under the Rule basically is saying that what you are doing is analyzing the economic development potential of this community. That's what generates the whole need concept of expanding an Urban Growth Boundary because when you are looking at Urban Growth Boundary expansions you are looking at two things under Goal 14 and Goal 9. You are looking at how much land do we need to accommodate our anticipated job growth on one hand and once you determine how much that land is the question then becomes where is it located. Those are the locational factors. That is where you get to point to where once you may have made those policy decisions about what do we want to look like, what are our economic development policies, then you start to say what kind of sites do we need to provide for within the City of Scappoose in order to accommodate those needs. Do we need 50 acre sites, do we need 20 acre sites, do we need 10 acre sites? If we need 50 acre sites how many do we need, if we need 20 acre sites how many do we need and that is all driven by the schedule of uses that you choose to attract here consistent with your economic development policies. The bottom line there is that once you have decided what the need is you must designate "An adequate number of sites of suitable sizes and types and locations to accommodate the identified need". So the Rule itself requires once you have determined how much need you have to look at sites of suitable sizes and types and locations to accommodate it and those sites need to be vacant and suitable for that use. Once you get to the point where you are looking at sites you go through, what he refers to sometimes as the work down process. You are looking for available suitable sites for employment uses and as part of doing that you are required by law, by State Statute and LCDC's Administrative Rules to identify land of certain priorities outside the UGB. But before we talk about lands outside the UGB let's talk about what you have to do to look at lands inside the UGB because you do have an obligation to see what uses can be reasonably accommodated inside the existing Urban Growth Boundary on lands that are designated for industrial uses or other types of employment uses. So your first inquiry once you decide how much land do we need, and that doesn't mean just an acreage calculation, the Rules allow you to look at identifying the sites needed and the number of sites that are needed in order to implement your economic development policies. You look at can those sites be accommodated with lands inside the UGB and there are circumstances in Oregon where there are cities that have enough land already so they can't justify expanding the Urban Growth Boundary on that basis at least with regard to employment lands. One of the things the EOA does is it goes through and analyzes the existing sites you have inside your UGB and concludes that you don't have adequate acreage here. There can be questions about whether the analysis of the inside the UGB sites has been adequate. There hasn't been a lot of question about that here. At least the question hasn't been you didn't look at this site, you didn't look at that site, there have been general allegations made that you haven't done a good enough job, but no analysis that anyone has done that has said the EOA analysis has site A, site C and Site M is inadequate, you haven't heard that. You need to look at sites inside the UGB first as to whether the need can be accommodated and if it can't be accommodated inside the UGB then you go outside the UGB. As he said there is a Statute that says how that analysis is conducted. There's a set of priorities that are set forth and there is one exception to those priorities but basically

DRAFT

the priorities say that you first look at exception land that is adjacent to the UGB and exception land is short hand way of saying it's land that has already been committed to a nonagricultural or nonforest or other type of non resource use because the sites have been developed into lots that are fairly small or because there actually are uses that have been built there that preclude efficient use of those site for resource uses, those kinds of things. But those are exceptions land, exceptions are already incorporated in the County's Comprehensive Plan so we know what exception lands are and what exception lands are not. That's the first thing you do. The second thing you do is that if the need you have identified cannot be accommodated on an adjacent exception lands then you go to resource lands that are surrounded by exception lands and then if that land isn't enough to accommodate it then you go to resource lands and identify those resource lands to accommodate the urban uses. Now it's important for him to point out, and he did it in the staff report, you go through those priorities one at a time, in other words you look at exception lands, adjacent exception lands and if there is enough adjacent exception land to accommodate the need you must use adjacent exception land. You don't have the discretion then to go to the second tier. If there's enough first tier land you must stay within the first tier and use that first tier land and it is the same for the second tier. Now there is one exception to that and that's if you remember he said that one thing you will do is when you're looking at your projected need you will identify the types of characteristics lands need to have in order to accommodate or carry out that need and if for example Priority 1 lands the exception lands are not of such a character that they meet the physical characteristics that are required to attract the types of uses you want then you can go to the next tier without exhausting all of the first tier or you can go to the third tier without exhausting all of the second tier. That's the process you need to go through in deciding what to do here and the one thing that you need to do once you finish that process is that you are then required to not only expand the Urban Growth Boundary but to implement Comprehensive Plan designations that adequately identify and protect those lands for the uses that you have identified and that's why you have some comprehensive plan amendments and some code amendments before you tonight because those are necessary in order to implement the uses that have been identified through the EOA to date. Having said all that you can probably understand from what City Planner Brian Varricchione has said and what he has said that this is in some measure a step-by-step process. There are decisions that you make that drive the next decision, that drive the next decision, that drive the next decision. So you need in your discussions to make your decisions in sequence because that is the way the process works. There are a few follow on detail points that he wants to make that are listed in his staff report but he thinks it is important that he says them out loud. First is there has been some discussion or some urging that you not only look at employment land but that you also look at housing land at the same time you are doing this with the assertion that you really can't decide one without the other. LCDC's Administrative Rules empower you to look at employment land needs separate from housing land needs if you wish to. Now you can look at them all at once but the Rules allow you to separate them out. You are legally allowed to separate them out from one another. So you are not required to look at housing needs at the same time you look at employment land needs. He has already said that the Goal 14 Rule gives you some latitude in determining what your employment net need is and you do have some latitude again. The important thing is that there is some logic in getting to the number you choose and it's important that if you decide to choose the 7.6% number or if you choose to change the 7.6% number that the logic for doing that is apparent in your discussions. There was an argument that job growth needs to mirror population growth and again the Goal 14 Rule says that that is not necessary. They can be different from one another. He thinks it is important to say that there were some arguments that it's important to make sure that you don't have inconsistent or choose uses that are allowed in zones that run counter to the purpose for which the plan designation or zone was chosen. In other words if you are choosing to add land because

DRAFT

you have an airport and you want to attract airport related uses you better make sure that the areas that your Comprehensive Plan designates for those airport related uses allow those airport related uses and not other uses that could chip away at the plan's efficacy in achieving your ability to draw those airport related uses and there was a lot of testimony about that and he thinks that the rules that apply here give credence to that. The rule says assign appropriate plan designations to the added land consistent with the need determination. The local government must also apply appropriate zone to the added land consistent with the plan designation. So you need to be careful to make sure that if you make a policy decision to say we have an airport, over the past 15 years we have been able to attract a lot of airport related uses to that airport and we have based upon that growth and based upon airport capacities at other nearby airports and other growth policies that we are going to adopt we are going to try to attract a much higher rate of that kind of use. If you use that as justification for amending the Urban Growth Boundary you need to make sure that the plan designations you apply don't allow such broad uses in that area that your ability to achieve those airport uses would be frustrated. So be careful about uses that you choose. There is a nice little provision in the Administrative Rules, this is in the Goal 9 Rule, that he thinks you need to know that the City of Scappoose should take advantage of and what it basically says is there is a sliding scale against which the precision of your employment land planning will be measured. We're not going to measure the efforts of the City of Scappoose with the same exacting standard that we would measure the City of Portland which has immense resources to do this kind of work. The City of Portland, Metro, what have you. So it does say that the effort necessary will vary depending on the size of the jurisdiction and the detail of economic development planning efforts and the extent of new information on various scales and trends. So you have some flexibility as a smaller community and he thinks we need to all keep in mind that we shouldn't be compared with what Metro does here. There were some objections that questioned whether we can adopt policies that tend to capture economic activity presently occurring in both Portland and Hillsboro and this really arose related to evidence that has been presented saying that a couple of things; number one that the Portland Metro Region has a scarcity of large lot industrial parcels. So that is evidence in that area. There is other evidence that had to do with the capacity of PDX and in particular the Hillsboro Airport to accommodate the types of uses that might be well suited to come to Scappoose. The arguments basically were to say well if Portland is already planned for those uses and Hillsboro has already planned for those uses you can't take those away unless you coordinate with Metro and Hillsboro to do that and that's really not quite what the law says. Probably more important, that is not what our EOA says. What our EOA says is we don't want to compete. What our EOA says is there is a lack of capacity for industrial uses in the Portland UGB. There is a lack of capacity to accommodate airport related uses both at PDX and Hillsboro and the EOA is saying we have the capacity to accommodate those uses here in Scappoose. So we aren't saying we are going to compete with them for those uses, what we are saying is there is a lack of supply at those airports and in that marketplace that we can serve here in Scappoose. So it is really a different issue. He thinks the last thing he will say is this and he alluded to it earlier. There may be a temptation to say instead of using 7.6% lets just use 7% or lets use 6.5%, be really careful doing that because instead of picking the number first and trying to justify it look at the charts, look at the tables and see whether you agree with what's in the EOA and if you think some of the uses that are projected there are too aggressive in numbers say that. If you think they are too conservative say that and let those decisions drive the number. For an example if you take a look at Table 1 in the EOA there is a laundry list of uses there, there is probably a dozen uses there. Natural resource, construction, manufacturing, there is a laundry list of uses there and the important column if you look at 2010-2030, if you look at the next to far right hand column, we are talking about 2010-2030 growth, and under the next to last column it's jobs and they are projecting the number of jobs for that time

DRAFT

period for those various uses and the jobs, the number of jobs there at the bottom is what really drives the percentage number you see in the last column. What really drives the percentage number is the list of employment opportunities, the number of jobs that are forecast and that's what drives the number. So if you are uncomfortable with the 7.6% number start looking at those uses and see if you are convinced that the uses there are the right uses, whether the number of jobs projected are the right numbers based upon the trends and data that you see and if you think those uses are wrong, if you think the number of jobs is too high or too low let those kinds of decisions drive the number of jobs and the number of jobs is what will drive your percentage number. Just be cautious how that is done because that is how that number was derived. The notices that have gone out for what you have before you have gone out for what you have before you and not something else. So if you vary too far from the path and we will keep our ear to the road as you go through your discussions and make your policy decisions, if you vary too far from the path we may have to re-notify and start new hearings so that people can have an opportunity to further weigh in on the path that you might choose to take. You have some discretion here and in some areas you have pretty broad discretion but when it comes to starting to talk about different zone classifications or significant modification of where the boundary might be that would include lands that weren't in the existing recommended boundary then we start having notice issues. So one of the things we will do is we will try to keep track of where you are going and if you get to a point where you would go to a place where additional notice and hearings would be required we will let you know that. It doesn't mean you can't do that, you can do that. If this process takes you to a point where you want to look at something materially different than has been given to you for consideration then at that point and time we would need to kind of regroup and you would need to give your staff some direction as to wanting to look at different things, we would then re-notify and give folks an opportunity to speak. That ends his comments unless Council has any questions.

Mayor Burge asked Council if they have any questions.

Mayor Burge asked as far as process.

City Manager Hanken replied as far process we go back to City Planner Brian Varricchione's list to start talking about and one of the things he thinks we start talking about is the coordinated population forecast and have some discussions about that to see if that is what Council wishes to adopt. Then go down to the next item to the EOA. That is where you start having those discussions in terms of policy questions or policy directions that you may want to have some answers to some consideration given to, that is what staff is looking for you at this particular time, is again let's say there is some discussion related to what Mr. Bennett has said in terms of the Figure 1 in terms of the jobs. If there are some things that Council says that you are not sure about or you want to look at this we can come back, he won't say the next meeting because he wants to be careful about giving staff time to reply to your directives, but come back maybe the first meeting in March to say okay you have asked us to look at this and what does this mean for the potential UGB expansion and that way we can come back to you.

Councilor Gedlich stated she would like to make a motion that we direct staff to get information from these six items so that we have all the material in front of us and we are all on the same table on what we are talking about. She thinks it would be kind of a disadvantage to staff to tell us when we don't have anything to review or some of the information is in the material that we have but it would take time to muddle through everything.

DRAFT

City Manager Hanken replied he guesses that is one of the things in terms of conversation that the Council needs to have is to help us identify what those concerns and issues are from the Council. That is kind of what we are looking for in terms of like the EOA with the list of the employment forecasts and jobs. Are there any ones in particular that Council has concerns with? That is the input that staff is looking for from Council in terms of helping us provide information to you. We need, what he would say, is your list of concerns, is probably the best way to phrase that in order for us to move forward. We are kind of looking at Council to say okay you have heard the testimony for those who are for the UGB as it was presented, you have heard testimony from those in opposition so help us to help you in terms of what are your issues that we can identify and then come back to you with information.

Council President Bernhard stated he suggest that we move forward with the sequence that has been recommended and even starting off at number one. That one is a fairly easy one to get passed but really the discussion is going to be around number two which he could see taking up the majority of the evening and he thinks we have enough information in front of us to possibly start those discussions and then give staff the opportunity to come back to us at the next meeting based off of that discussion and those questions. He asked City Manager Hanken if Council needs to have a motion or just a consensus of the population forecast, what are you looking for on that?

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied his recommendation would be not so much a formal motion as discussion amongst the various Council members and then when it appears that some consensus has been reached Council would move on to the next or if it becomes clear that there are specific questions that require further research by staff that could be done prior to future hearings.

Mayor Burge replied okay, population forecast, does everyone agree on the population forecast. This is the population forecast from Portland State.

Councilor Gedlich replied right, she just wants to make sure that this is the latest information that we have right? There are no other figures?

Mayor Burge replied correct.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied correct.

Mayor Burge replied this is what the County has adopted.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied yes.

Councilor Gedlich replied thank you.

Mayor Burge asked if there are any objections to that one?

Council replied no.

Lisa Smith spoke from the audience.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied the recommendation from what the County adopted would be the middle growth scenario, midrange scenario.

DRAFT

Mayor Burge stated thank you, Okay moving to the EOA.

Council President Bernhard explained he is not really sure where to start off on this one but he is going to give it a shot. It is very clear that we obviously don't want to start off with a particular percentage of growth as we see on page three, the top figure. When he looks at the different types of businesses or trades within this model the questions that come up for him is obviously retail trade is fairly self explanatory but when he starts looking at other ones, for example Education and Health, perhaps maybe he is looking for a little bit more detail on what that actually means. Is it a possible PCC type site, is it a health club we are taking about, same thing with Leisure and Hospitality. If he could get a little more detail on that and the reason why he is going down this road is the methodology and past decisions and the past history of the airport itself has always been surrounded by airport related industrial type facilities. That was always the type of draw that we have been trying to do. So perhaps maybe he can get some additional information when it comes to that and then Council can start to discuss what those numbers really are as in jobs and percentages. He is also fearful to put out an actual number or he guesses we could also say the methodology that was used to obtain the 7.6% is already justified and we move forward with it that way. That is obviously a discussion for Council.

Councilor Gedlich asked Council President Bernhard so you are saying you think the 7.6% is an adequate number so we are talking about going from 6,000 jobs in about 20 years.

Council President Bernhard replied are you asking for my professional opinion?

Councilor Gedlich replied well you were on the one that just said do you think the 7.6% is realistic. She thinks it is way too high.

Council President Bernhard replied that is the discussion he was hoping to have. He doesn't know. He gave kind of a plan A and a plan B. We can either start going through these and saying hey I think this is off or that is and then come up with some kind of justification or two say 7.6% is justified.

Councilor Gedlich replied when you look at a typical example is the retail trade. We are going from 519 clear up to almost 1,700 and then when you look at professional 101 versus 1,126. To her it is just a huge jump in 20 years. The City has only grown about 1% a year since 1996. So we have only doubled our population in 30 years or 40 years. Where are we going to accommodate all of these positions and at what location, not only business, whether it is commercial, industrial, retail, professional, versus houses, infrastructure. We would have to update all of our master plans and we don't even have the money to do that. She is trying to figure out how they justified the 7.6% and when she chaired the committee last year they talked about this over and over and over and there was no way, they never justified it, they just made excuses or they talked around things. We never could get any specific information out of them. One of the things that was so frustrating to her was we were being compared to other communities larger than Scappoose, we were being compared to the Metro area, Wilsonville, Hillsboro, Tigard. We have not grown like some of those other communities. She would just like to have some truthful justification on where these numbers came from so that we can base our communities growth on these projections, how do we change it?

Council President Bernhard replied he didn't chair the committee so he couldn't tell her.

DRAFT

Councilor Gedlich replied right, she wanted to and she couldn't. When you look at these numbers they are outrageous. Three or four of the industries is our population.

Councilor Reed replied he has to admit that some of these numbers, double digit numbers are glaring at him too. 11.7% in manufacturing, 12.8% in professional and business and the one that really sticks out is 10.7% in other services. He would like to know what other services are. The one that he saw first was the 11.7% in manufacturing. He will pick on that right now because that is probably what is going to go out at the airport. His question is that percentage based upon what we are planning to do here with the Urban Growth Boundary?

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied the figures that are in this Table 1, this Figure 1 are identical to those in Figure 26. So perhaps we should have mentioned it in that sequence previously. What this is all meant to say is that these figures weren't derived in the beginning of the process but at the end. There is an extensive discussion of how they were arrived at looking at trends and then projecting forward growth, growth trends and then aspirational trends from there. The specific line that you are looking at, the manufacturing, what the EOA does is project a job growth of 1,755 employees and because of that projected growth that then gets translated to a specific demand for land and that is part of the reason that the UGB is being proposed to expand. The first figure is the job number rather than the UGB acreage.

Jeff Bennett stated if one of the things that you want to do between now and your next hearing, because he is getting some sense that there is going to be a next one, City Planner Brian Varricchione just referred to Table 26, Figure 26, that's in the center of a portion of the EOA that actually explains how they came to the 7.6% based upon industry, based upon traded sectors or industry sectors. So there is about a 3 or 4 page analysis there that will help you understand how the EOA went through that process, the process that the EOA went through to develop that number. So one of the things that you can do is look at that explanation to see, as you go through it to see how you agree with it and how you may not.

Council President Bernhard stated maybe another possible way to look at this is obviously the numbers are what's on some of the Councilmembers' minds right now and as we consider at one point decreasing the amount of acreage that is actually placed into the proposed UGB that also would lower that net number of the 7.6% that is currently on there at this time. So if we consider, this again this is just discussion, is retail and commercial/lodging is slated for 35 acres at this particular time under that scale. As we continue to look at these numbers and ask ourselves the question, because he thinks there was some good discussion during the open discussion about retail space out there. He's also in agreement that he believes that retail is not the proper fit for an industrial area out next to the airport. Perhaps we can look at it this way, again what really is our airport supposed to be, what are we supposed to be looking at here, go back to history and what the past Council has gone through, the gravel wars and what came out of that. Perhaps we should look at those numbers instead of saying if we actually lowered the number of an acreage that we are looking to put into the UGB justification of the net number may all the sudden just kind of fall into our lap. He asked if that is another way to possibly look at it.

Jeff Bennett replied you probably could but the better way, and you articulated it, the better way is to question for example the retail space projections adjacent to the airport by saying that's a "need" that we think is too high and because that employment projection for that type of use it too high the number of acres that we need to accommodate therefore is reduced. So in other words instead of

DRAFT

saying well lets go see if we can take some acreage out of the UGB and back into it. What you are really saying, at least what I heard you saying was we don't agree with the policy that says that there should be a significant amount of retail near the airport and because of that policy decision the number of projected jobs near the airport is too high and because that number is too high the overall job projection goes down, the amount of land needs goes down, the types of land that you need to accommodate that need goes down therefore we have to reduce the size of the UGB amendment to meet with that.

Council President Bernhard replied he thinks that could be a starting point at least for this Council. He would agree with that methodology that retail space is not our key component out there at the airport.

Mayor Burge replied as far as retail jobs out by the airport he is going to agree with Council President Bernhard that there were some really good strong arguments that commercial property should be along the highway and he tends to agree. As far as our commercial plans they should be focused along the highway. So he doesn't know how that would affect any of the numbers here but he thinks that is one of the directions we are going.

Councilor Gedlich stated Council President Bernhard made a comment a few minutes ago about some of the history about what's been going on and she has to say for the last 30 years City Council and City staff has had a policy of protecting the airport land for airport related development only. She really is opposed to these overlay zones. All of the proposals that they have been initiated in the recommendation for the new UGB out at the airport they can already do what they want to do without the overlays. We already have overlays for the downtown area so that we can encourage people to use that area. She would really like to see us just eliminate the overlay zones and really consider just having what the policy has been all along, is that we protect the airport related development only and have commercial along the highway. I know all of you have been familiar with the articles that we have seen in the Spotlight regarding Old Town and there's this mythology that if you go about a half a block or a block off Highway 30 your business is in jeopardy, it is not a myth. She has had business people call her, approach her and ask her about why we would want to have the Scappoose Airport like maybe Portland's airport or Hillsboro's, we don't want that. We want as many any airport related businesses to come here for that purpose only. We don't want to make the land out at the airport so constrictive that we are losing a major opportunity. There was discussion about maybe a PCC facility out there. If PCC has a facility out there what are they going to do, what are they going to build, what is it for. PCC has three or four classes a year here and they can use the high school. She thinks there are just so many things that we need to consider right now. These numbers are really not realistic and she thinks what we have to remember is getting people that want to come here to shop here. People are not going to go 3 miles outside the city if they don't have to. We have a hard time getting them off Highway 30 just to get them to the Ixtapa Restaurant. If they don't see it they don't stop.

Mayor Burge thanked Councilor Gedlich. He asked if there is any other discussion. He is going to say on the overlays he agrees with Councilor Gedlich. He actually went back and read the Public Use Airport Zone and realized the overlays didn't make any sense because the PUA Zone would as a conditional use allow a hotel or restaurant or some of those supplementary services that would be seen by an airport and you wouldn't need to use commercial land. You could use the PUA Zone. He knows he has had this conversation with City Manager Hanken and as well as Council President Bernhard about the idea that he doesn't like the overlays. He thinks that would be one of the areas

DRAFT

that we would have to look at the net effect of removing the overlay and of course it would also lead to a new set of hearings before our Planning Commission about other changes, not associated with this, about commercial lands and focusing them along the highway. Obviously separate since based on what our attorney Jeff Bennett said Council can't make that decision within this meeting so we would have to re-notice. So we want to do that separately, which is fine and he will discuss that later.

Council President Bernhard replied he also agrees with him and Councilor Gedlich on this particular one right here too. He thinks the overlays need to go away on this one. He thinks it is a good idea Donna and he knows it is something they have discussed in the past. He would like to hear from other Councilmembers regarding decreasing the size of the potential UGB and in turn working backwards to come up to a different net number as per the employment forecast. The reason for that again he feels strongly enough about, he thinks we have an opportunity to still obviously bring industrial and commercial to a point out to our airport. But by decreasing that size he thinks we are going to he thinks finally come to a conclusion on these numbers, getting past step two is going to be paramount here. So he would like to hear from other Councilmembers, please chime in on possibly going that direction.

Councilor Gedlich stated she has a question also, in the last meeting or the meeting before residents that were in the Ring-A-Ring Road area expressed a desire not to be included in this proposal and she thinks we really need to take something like that into consideration. Right off hand she doesn't remember how many areas that involved however she thinks we should respect their requests just like we did for the people that were on the westside of Old Portland Road. Also what she thinks we have to remember is Settle property, where half of it is in and half is out.

Council President Bernhard replied he also agrees with Councilor Gedlich on that particular area and if we consider again of decreasing the size of the acres into the UGB. When he looks at a map in the northeast quadrant next to that particular area that would be a potential area that we could hold from the UGB expansion at this time. For a couple different reasons, one is it gives us an opportunity if other lands become available in the future to place into the UGB. A good example would be property along Highway 30 for commercial use, retail use, whatever that might be. We are not putting all of our eggs in one basket. We are kind of killing two birds with one stone. That particular property, next to Ring-A-Ring property, have that not go into the UGB. Make it a little bit smaller, come into a different net number from what we keep talking about here. That could be a possibility. He thinks that is a good idea Councilor Gedlich.

Councilor Gedlich also has another suggestion. She doesn't have the map but there is 50-70 acres below the airport runway, you can't place development on that. She looked in the Port of St. Helens Master Plan and she didn't see any language in there at all, nor has she heard anything other than what Paula Miranda discussed with lengthening the runway. She is not sure if they can do, it is already 5,000 feet long and we could eliminate that 50 acres and move that down to Highway 30.

Council President Bernhard replied he is not opposed to the idea the only thing he is looking at from a map standpoint the natural transition that from the Crown Zellerbach Road to the Crown Zellerbach Trail, which is obviously on the Transportation Master Plan as a collector road kind of wraps around the backside of the airport which opens up the property on the southeast quadrant.

Councilor Gedlich replied he is looking at a different map.

DRAFT

Council President Bernhard replied from what he is understanding Councilor Gedlich is suggesting that the southeast quadrant also would not be part of it. His recommendation is to actually keep the southeast quadrant still in play all around the west quadrant, going from south to north and deleting the northeast quadrant near Ring-A-Ring Road. That is somewhat of a suggestion there. Again he is trying to stay on task as in going back to number 2.

Councilor Gedlich replied the only thing too is 50 acres is a lot if they can't develop south of the runway why include that 50 acres, that is a lot of land.

Mayor Burge asked City Planner Brian Varricchione how does that 50 acres or that acres of that airport except land or that flyover land, how does that work with this whole thing.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied that land could not be used anywhere else. It was put in specifically for special uses. There are three special uses that are called out. One is potential runway expansion south of the existing runway, one is lands reserved for new hangers out at the airport and the other is for a potential campus of PCC or other educational institution. So those uses total 110 and if they are not used for any of those listed uses then they could not be used elsewhere.

Mayor Burge replied other uses, those aren't industrial uses.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied no, those are specifically called out separate from those other job figures.

Councilor Gedlich asked if this is in the overlay zone?

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied the overlay zones are currently proposed just to be created as a new chapter in the development code but not actually applied to any specific land at this time. Councilor Gedlich you are correct that the land south of the runway could not be developed due to restrictions related to runway protection zone and other requirements of FAA and the State of Oregon. Staff does recommend including that in the UGB if for no other reason than the City would have land use authority over it rather than the County. Right know it could not be annexed into the City but if it were put into the UGB then it could.

Council President Bernhard asked the other four councilmembers to please speak up and address the issue. He would like to seriously consider the retail lodging acreage of approximately 35 acres to not be placed in the UGB and how that will affect that net number that he keeps on talking about. Do we have any kind of consensus on this, does anybody else agree or disagree.

Mayor Burge asked if the 35 acres is all coming out of the commercial area up in....

Someone asked Council President Bernhard where he is referring to.

Council President Bernhard replied he is going off of page 31 of the Economic Analysis retail/commercial/lodging, average jobs, net acres of 35 and please correct me if I am wrong of going off of that particular number. He is again looking at the area in the northeast quadrant next to Ring-A-Ring Road if you are looking at a map and again maybe his acreage is wrong here.

DRAFT

Mayor Burge replied as far as the retail/commercial/lodging he asked Council President Bernhard if he is just saying not allocate it currently.

Council President Bernhard replied approximately that size because his methodology is we can agree and some of us agreed so far that retail isn't necessarily the best fit by the airport. That is why he came up with that particular number.

Councilor Gedlich replied she agrees.

Councilor Ingham stated she thinks we are all agreed upon the retail trade. She thinks that is an obvious exclusion from this. She is looking at the other categories under employment forecast to see where else we might have a sticking point. The education and health is a major component. The PCC campus is crucial in the fact that with her discussions their focus would be on airport and aviation focused curriculums. Leisure and hospitably is probably the second question she has for needed lands.

Mayor Burge asked Councilor Ingham if she is wondering if that number is too high.

Councilor Ingham replied yes, she is questioning that number. She asked Mayor Burge if that is what he wanted to do was go through each of these different categories and see where.....

Mayor Burge where we agree and disagree.

Councilor Ingham replied exactly. Obviously construction, manufacturing and wholesale trade is important. The information is low and she doesn't know exactly what is involved in that particular category.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied frankly he doesn't have the detail on that. These are classifications schemes that are for all of North America and the Department of Labor and other Governmental Agencies that set these so he doesn't know all the particulars within those various categories.

Councilor Gedlich asked if City Planner Brian Varricchione or City Manager Hanken can explain what the other services are. She means it is 225 then it jumps up to almost 1,500. Could you give her an example and also the public administration, is that city employees, school administrators, what is that?

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied for all the uses that are listed in the table as he said the classifications are set up by the Federal Government and other agencies so he is not up to speed enough to know specifically what other services might entail.

Councilor Ingham replied this is obviously one category then, it's the first one on the list, that we need more specific information. She doesn't want to delete something out of public administration if in fact there is something there that is important to the livability and to the progress out at the airport. So she needs more information on these different categories. She understands some of them, they are obvious but some of them are a little vague.

DRAFT

Jeff Bennett stated the direction, at least of the dialog he hears is you are focusing on the airport related uses and that is absolutely an appropriate focus but he thinks Council needs to remember that we are looking at a 20 year job forecast here for the entire city not just at the airport but how many retail jobs there going to be, how many construction jobs there going to be. He suspects that the public administration is city employees, potential county employees, school employees, social services employees, any kind of public job that is administrative in nature. Don't limit your discussion to just what is going to be located at the airport. The real inquiry here is how many jobs you anticipate will need to be accommodated in the City of Scappoose in these job categories, not necessarily that are just airport related because there will be non-airport related jobs in Scappoose over that time period.

Councilor Erickson stated he has to agree with Councilor Ingham that leisure and hospitality are way too high, he doesn't see it.

Councilor Gedlich stated she agrees with Councilor Ingham. She would like a little bit more information regarding the categories that are listed because she thinks there are some that might not really apply to our community and something else that we wouldn't want to reduce or eliminate because when you look at the way the City's flexibility is with the various small family businesses we have we want to be as flexible as possible.

Councilor Ingham stated you were talking about making the decision on how much land we need and first if we can accommodate those needs inside the UGB. There are definitely categories here that her feeling is that those jobs like public administration could be accommodated inside the UGB. Leisure and hospitality, that would need more space than she thinks we have at this point. Same with the education, we are looking down the road and building a new high school and we obviously have to go outside the city limits to do that. But there are some categories here that partial percentage of these numbers could probably be accommodated inside the UGB as it is now and that is another question she has because she needs a breakdown. These categories are a little too general and inclusive of a lot of different types of jobs and for her to make a decision on what we can accommodate inside the UGB and what we can't she thinks it needs to be a little more specific please.

Councilor Gedlich replied she is really concerned about the overlay zones and she is glad that most of them agree that they need to eliminate them however she realizes that we have to have the 20 year employment forecast so we have proposed UGB land, we already have land in the city that hasn't been developed yet, that could be for some of these categories. There are public lands, where the school was that could possibly be a future school. She thinks that maybe what we need to do is concentrate on the 20 year forecast and get more information and then we can kind of come forward. She thinks we are just kind of spinning our wheels now. She thinks the thing we have to remember is the last 30 years the City Council has been very emphatic about keeping the airport related development its top priority and not commercial and not anything else otherwise it is going to end up like Hillsboro.

Councilor Ingham stated it says right here as our recommended sequence that decisions on each item may effect subsequent items and the sequence she agrees with is the appropriate plan of action. So we are kind of stymie now because of this. We are in the fog about definitions of these different categories of employment.

DRAFT

Council President Bernhard replied he agrees. He is looking at the rest of the recommended sequence here and obviously number two effects three through six. He would like to see a staff report also going into a little bit more detail on the different areas that we have already talked about on Figure 26 and then from there hopefully we can come to our EOA number which will obviously reflect the amount of acreage that we are going to place within the UGB. He asked City Manager Hanken if this is something that is obtainable, are we asking something that is unattainable.

City Manager Hanken replied no, it is very attainable. What we need to do is understand what businesses or what type of industries fit into each category so we have that definition laid out to you and then again going back through all the other issues you have identified putting that together. He will throw out probably we will not get to that point in two weeks. His recommendation would be the first meeting in March to be able to come back with that. That is kind of for a couple of reasons, one is that it does take us sometime to put things together, the second reason is we do have other City business to take care of between meetings and so he would like to be able to address those issues at our next Council meeting and again give City Planner Brian Varricchione some time to put things together.

Council President Bernhard stated he guesses before we conclude for the night he would like to add a couple more items to that question list that don't pertain to the EOA but is that recommended or not recommended.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied his recommendation would be that you have at least preliminary discussions on each of these items such that if you have questions we can answer them otherwise we are looking at a 12 month hearing process.

Mayor Burge stated as far as the EOA, it sounds like we want more information before we move forward on that job growth number. So he thinks we want to move to number three and have some discussion on the comp plan amendments.

City Planner Brian Varricchione explained as he stated in the beginning some of the information in the proposed comp plan amendment flows straight out of the EOA and so the actual final text would be dependent upon when you approve the EOA. However having said that, there are policies which he thinks, economic goals and policies, that are ripe for discussion by the Council and he could point Council to some of them if they want to look at them.

Mayor Burge replied please do.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied in Binder A, Tab 5, Exhibit 2 that is the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Once you get to that point, pages 9-11 of that document are specific economic goals and policies. Just to explain how we arrived at those, many of these are both already in the Comprehensive Plan and then some others are updated. For instances on page 9 significant findings number 3, we say the population in Scappoose is expected to reach 10,022 by 2030. That number was pulled out of the coordinated population forecast. But as he said the actual goals and policies he thinks Council will find very familiar. There may be some of these that they deem no longer relevant or there may be some additional policies that you wish to see in there.

DRAFT

Council President Bernhard stated it took us about four hours to six hours to go through these policies for economic development that we are looking at here. If he remembers correctly it was facilitated by Ms. Smith, who used to be a Councilmember with us. He doesn't know if we are in a position tonight to go through these again unless she feels up to facilitating at this particular time.

Ms. Smith must have replied no.

Council President Bernhard replied he didn't think so. At this particular time he doesn't see anything that needs to be adjusted.

Mayor Burge replied nor does he. He stated those goals look fine.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied this is not a strikeout redline version. This is proposed to be your new goals for economic development and as he said the majority of these are lifted straight from today's comprehensive plan. If Council wishes to see a redline strikeout version we can certainly present that. We started on that basis and the document got quite unwieldy and we proposed a clean copy instead.

Councilor Gedlich stated if you turned to page 3 of 17 in Tab 5 it has got the Figure 1 again of the 20 year forecast that we have been discussing. So if everyone is in agreement with the summary of the EOA findings then we will no longer be discussing the 7.6% employment forecast.

Mayor Burge replied he does believe that that page is part of the EOA presented in that area, not the goal section but the comp plan.

Councilor Gedlich replied it is the summary of the findings, isn't that what we are talking about is the findings.

Mayor Burge replied no we were talking about the goals, the economic development goals of the Council that would be put into the comp plan.

Councilor Gedlich asked doesn't that mean that we would be including that 7.6%.

Mayor Burge replied no, that is not included in those specific goals.

Council President Bernhard asked City Manager Hanken if there is anything in this particular draft that really stands out that was a major change from the workshop that they had about a year ago.

City Manager Hanken replied no there is not what he will call any significant changes that are different than our workshop.

Council President Bernhard replied he is not seeing anything that stands out to him. He has read every single one and he is not seeing anything that really stands out that needs to be adjusted at this time.

Councilor Gedlich replied look at number 18, page 11 number 18.

DRAFT

Mayor Burge replied whatever we amend the EOA to be it is just directing you to the EOA, whatever that is.

Council President Bernhard replied we are not saying that that particular EOA is what we agree upon.

Mayor Burge replied yeah, because we haven't adopted the EOA.

Councilor Gedlich replied right. She just wants to make sure that everybody understands that. She knows that, but she wants everybody in the audience to understand that.

City Planner Brian Varricchione stated also on page 17 of that same tab we are proposing two new policies for public facility and services.

Council President Bernhard replied he doesn't see an issue with that at all.

Councilor Ingham stated she agrees.

Mayor Burge replied, yeah it looks good. He asked City Planner Brian Varricchione if they can move to number 4.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied yes.

Mayor Burge stated okay number 4 would be proposed amendments to the UGB 20 year land need. He asked is that really going to be something working all with the EOA.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied those will be very close, yes.

Mayor Burge replied so unless we can know what our forecast employment numbers are going to be it is really difficult for them to say the 20 year land need is this or that.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied correct.

Mayor Burge replied okay. So that one should probably be passed over for now.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he thinks that you could revisit that when you have more information on the employment figures.

Mayor Burge replied okay, moving on to number 5 comp plan. He asked for questions from Council.

Council President Bernhard asked City Planner Brian Varricchione if he has anything to state on this one.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied yes I do. The proposed Airport Employment Comprehensive Plan Designation would do something that he recommends that the Council seriously consider. The current plan designation is industrial and what he would recommend is Council create a special category if you really want to protect that land for airport related uses that

DRAFT

you create a special classification for airport related uses and that is what is proposed primarily in the Airport Employment Chapter that is being proposed here. Now having said that he will note that what's proposed does discuss and allow for the overlay zones that would allow some subset of non-airport related uses. So if as a policy choice Council decides not to pursue that then this chapter would need to be amended accordingly. But he still thinks it would be a good tool for the City to have. The content may need some adjustment based on your discussions later.

Mayor Burge stated on the PUA as it is currently written it fits in the comp plan without the overlays.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied yes. It is currently written, it is a subset of the industrial plan designation.

Mayor Burge stated it just has some very specific conditional uses that are favorable to airport related retail restaurant or even a hotel under the current PUA.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied and car rental.

Councilor Gedlich stated are you saying City Planner Brian Varricchione that we need a special classification or just keep it as public airport uses.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied he is talking about the comprehensive plan which as he said is currently industrial. So he would recommend creating a new Airport Employment plan designation.

Councilor Gedlich replied she would like to do that.

Mayor Burge replied, okay. He thinks if we keep that one where it is obviously there's going to be changes if the Council decides tonight to scrap the overlay zones and of course he thinks that also would have an impact on employment numbers.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied it would have an effect on locations of UGB expansions and potentially the size. That would be an analysis that would have to be looked at a little further. One of the tools that's proposed in the overlay is master planning requirements for sites by the airport so that you make sure that sites are subdivided in a logical manner to provide for taxiways and proper utility services. Whether you do the overlay or not, that's an important tool that could be for instance insert in the PUA Zone if you decided not to do the overlays. The other thing that would have to be looked at is if the overlays are not used are there other tools that instead the City would need to employ to make sure that the lands are protected for their intended uses. Jeff Bennett and he could talk about that before the next meeting.

Mayor Burge stated comp plan, you've got direction then. It sounds like it's good. Development Code he thinks the biggest one is the overlay zones. He asked what does Council want to do with the overlay zones.

Councilor Gedlich replied she would like to eliminate them.

DRAFT

Councilor Ingham stated she is moving towards having a negative view of the overlay zones but being as we just directed City Planner Brian Varricchione to look at our options if we don't use overlay zones she thinks we should wait and make that decision when we have all the information.

Mayor Burge replied he thinks what we want him to be able to do is come back to us and say without the overlay zones here's what you have.

Councilor Ingham replied and what if what we have without the overlay zones isn't as good as what we have with them.

Mayor Burge replied that's why we have to look at them.

Councilor Ingham stated she doesn't just want to do away with the overlay zones at this meeting she wants to make sure that the decision is made correctly.

Mayor Burge replied yeah, we want to get the information as to what is the impact of removing the overlay zones. He is not a big fan of overlay zones.

Councilor Ingham replied no but you have to look at the options.

Councilor Gedlich asked if they could see a plan without the overlay zones.

Mayor Burge replied yeah, that is what he said. City Planner Brian Varricchione will bring the impact of removing the overlay zones.

Councilor Gedlich stated she thinks they will just have to remember that she could reiterate her statement again but she thinks the airport land needs to be for airport related industrial development only. We could be losing a lot of industry.

Mayor Burge asked if there are any other points. He stated to City Planner Brian Varricchione not trying to tread too heavily on the legal issues, he has noted those down. Some of the discussion they were having is keeping commercial where commercial belongs along the highway and obviously not as a part of this plan but does it make sense for the Council to direct staff, at the next meeting, to direct staff to move in that direction to look at converting commercial land, or some of the industrial land along the highway to commercial?

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied we could certainly prepare some commentary on what that might look like.

Mayor Burge stated you would have to go back through the whole process of zone change.

City Planner Brian Varricchione replied exactly. As he said we could provide some general information but if you did want to pursue the zone change you could direct staff to, as part of some separate action, to provide the notice and develop the findings and all that separate from this and there may be some merit in separating some actions from this application to allow the bulk of it to move forward. Because as you probably recall the next step is to go to the County Planning Commission and the County Board of Commissioners and then it goes to the State so there is a lot to be done yet.

DRAFT

Mayor Burge replied he clearly understood that to separate that action and it sounded like our attorney suggested that we would have to anyways. So that's one of the things that he would like to have brought back as a separate action for the Council to direct staff to do.

Council President Bernhard stated he also agrees. He thinks that it validates the possible expansion of the UGB by placing the properties in the right zones that we are looking at highway frontage as in commercial pieces. As Councilor Gedlich specified a couple times as in keep industrial where industrial needs to be and he thinks it brings validation to those points.

Councilor Gedlich stated in Binder A Tab 3 its page 1 of 1 and it is the Multnomah County Annual Average Nonfarm Employment and it shows some of the categories that we had questions about and we can maybe talk about it at the next meeting.

Mayor Burge replied yeah, we will have clarification on what those different categories are and it will give us time to really look at it and come to some conclusion on where we want to go with those numbers.

Jeff Bennett suggested in terms of how to structure what the staff gives to you for the first issue. What maybe we could do to best help you given the volume of information that's available on those use issues is either gather up excerpts from the record that help walk you through those issues and put them all in one place whether they are part of the EOA, whether they are part of subsequent submittals, whether they are from opponents, proponents and try to put all that together in one place for you or give you references to in the record where you can find it. His guess is the first would be more helpful than the second and he thinks that is something we can do. It would be a good task for them to do just to help organize their thinking and he thinks it would help Council muddle through lots and lots of documentation.

Mayor Burge replied sounds good.

Council President Bernhard stated he thinks it would be very helpful.

Mayor Burge asked City Planner Brian Varricchione and City Manager Hanken if they know what to bring back to Council now.

Announcements

Mayor Burge went over the Calendar.

The UGB hearing will be continued until March 7, 2011 at the Scappoose High School Auditorium.

On February 22, 2011 there will be a City Council workshop starting at 6:30 p.m. and then the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m. at Scappoose City Hall.

Councilors

Councilor Gedlich thanked everyone for attending tonight and listening to Council.

DRAFT

Councilor Ingham stated she thinks we all know this is a learning process for all of us. She thanked everyone for their attendance and learning with Council, it is important.

Councilor Erickson stated it will be interesting to see what develops out at the airport considering that is where he grew up as a kid.

Councilor Reed explained he would like to echo Councilor Ingham's sentiments. He talked about the empty buildings by Ixtapa which are only a half of block from Highway 30 and that some businesses can't seem to make it. He would like to thank Mr. Bennett for explaining things clearly.

Mayor

Mayor Burge explained he has had multiple conversations with business owners current and past who have rented by Ixtapa and the issue that businesses have is the cost of renting the spaces there.

He explained last month when the City of Rainier lost Chief Painter the City Council made a donation to help with the cost of the memorial service. He explained he received a call from Rainier Mayor Jerry Cole and he played that message that he received. Mayor Jerry Cole expressed his gratitude for the donation and all that the City of Scappoose has done during this tragedy.

Adjournment

Mayor Burge adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

Scott Burge, Mayor

Attest: _____
Susan M Reeves, CMC, City Recorder