



**Multnomah County
Urban and Rural Reserves**

**Public Comment Summary
January 2009 to August 2009**

For Planning Commission Hearing August 10, 2009

CAC Meetings# 1-6

No public comment

CAC Meeting# 7

January 22, 2009

Sandy Barker of Barker Properties explained that Barker Properties owns 62 acres of land in Keiser and Germantown, and is surrounded by city limits and the UGB. This land has been under their ownership for 50 years, and should be considered as a candidate for rural reserves.

Greg Malinowski distributed copies of an Oregonian article “Refugees grow vegetables, hopes and futures on farm”. He explained that Malinowski is a certified organic farm in a conflicted area, because people but don’t want to invest in infrastructure to continue farming. He suggested that the area be considered a possible permanent rural area. Soils are designated class 3 and 4, and in the past, Grinning Goat who worked in the area made good profits off of the quality soil. Malinowski Farms is also working with Mercy Corps to help refugees open farming businesses in the area (read Oregonian article), and built infrastructure including barns and water improvements. The area contains vineyards and orchards, is a wildlife area for elk, and is used by bicyclists. Washington County wants to urbanize a big chunk above north Bethany, so if there is to be any natural reserve, Multnomah County would likely be the only willing lead. There are also mud slides in the area where building and development should be avoided for safety reasons. Greg expressed praise for Multnomah County, and agreed that the County should not automatically let people build on slide areas.

CAC Meeting# 8

February 26, 2009

Joe Angel: Joe noted that he served for 8 years on the Portland Planning Commission, and owns property in Skyline. He told CAC members that the documents packet includes a map and chronology of his property. He purchased the property 40 years ago, under the promise that it would be in urban area. Through an error, it has been divided partially inside of and outside of the UGB. He would like this property to be a designated urban reserve area.

Matt Wellner: Matt explained that he works for Tricounty Investments and has a Planning background. He owns property in the Northwest Hills areas, which is proximate to services. He told CAC members that more information is available in the documents packet, including soil data. He stated that there is conflict over how soil type is described in the area. Metro mapping that was submitted by DOA shows it as conflicted for farming. Much of Northwest Hills area is ranked difficult for sewer infrastructure, but in actuality this designation is not set. Information should be looked at in more detail before such a ranking can be given. Matt claimed that East Bethany contains areas that can actually be easily serviced by sewer, but these are not reflected well in the map.

Kathy Blumenkron: Kathy stated that she owns 40 acres of property in East Bethany, and would like the area to be considered for urbanization. She noted that Friends of Forest Park does not speak for all of East Bethany. Her acreage is flat, faces the mountains, and is a home to herds of elk, which people can get permits to hunt. If the area were included in urban growth, it would be protected. The area is a 20-minute commute from downtown Portland, and presents an ideal opportunity for creative planning, which could include wildlife corridors, mountain-facing neighborhoods, wildlife protection protocols, and new trails.

Bob Zahler: Bob lives on Springfield Road, where his family purchased a farm in the 1800s, and where he grew up in 1930s. The area was generally quasi-farming, and major farms always existing in Washington County. The area has been isolated for so long, and it is difficult to live with the current density without proper services. The area was zoned suburban residential in 1954, but later rezoned to farm-use with no justification.

Joe Ashton: Joe is involved with the Multnomah Yacht Harbor, and owns a harbor East of Sauvie Island Bridge. His harbor has development permits, and he noted that reports are in error, stating that the area is not served by water. The area does have water service, and sewer was recently extended as well. The area has a density of 15 residences on 10 acres, is outside of the 100 year flood plain, and would like to be included in urban growth.

Jim Irvine: Jim lives in Damascas, and informed the group that a number of people are looking at the area around Forest Park in a different way. He is teaching a class on the property as it relates to a different vision which would add 700 acres to Forest Park. This vision would deal with the elk issues, would turn some land into urban areas, and would offer good public use. There is a group of people working towards this goal of addressing true stewardship of the park

John Burnham: John lives at the juncture of East Bethany and North Bethany, and owns 115 acres of land. He said that he and his family have tried to farm the land for last 53 years, and only in 8 of the last 37 years have they made a profit. He claims that the land is clearly not suitable for farming, and has the added problem of roaming elk which tear down the fences and allow livestock to run free. He would like the area to be included in the urban reserve area.

Sandy Baker: Sandy noted that she and the public should be notified when the CAC holds a special meeting or study group.

Matt Welner: Matt would like the Northwest Hills area to be included in the urban reserves area because it would make the Bethany area more efficient, and would also improve the local economy by adding a greater population and access to the Bethany Center in that area. He believes that since the CAC is considering a topic that will impact people 50 years from now, they should not be too constrictive in their recommendations.

Jim Emerson: Jim wondered whether, now that the CAC had selected candidate urban and rural reserves, their job was complete. Chuck responded that the CAC is still receiving new information for consideration in their recommendations. Currently, they are only in the first screening for urban and rural reserves, and have yet to make formal designations. By May, a clearer decision will need to be made.

CAC Meeting# 9
March 26, 2009

Joseph Rayhawk (Germantown horse farm owner)

My wife and I operate a horse stable in Germantown. We recommend that this area remain as a rural reserve. We have operated the farm for 5 years, and it has been profitable. There is another nearby facility, Cornerstone, on Kaiser Road, that provides high end equestrian facilities. Cornerstone has been profitable since it opened. Agriculture is good in this area. We provide training for students beyond our borders as well. We attended a Title 13 meeting, and were surprised to learn about the very wide existing riparian corridors and the proposed extensions. *Joe Rayhawk provided a letter for the CAC's consideration.*

Steve Barker and Sandy Baker

We have three main issues. We conducted a vacant lot analysis, and came up with a minimum of 55 vacant tax lots that could be built on in the area between Springdale and City of Portland. Secondly, people are opposed to Measure 37; there is a significant concern about the state of the aquifer in this area, as springs are drying up, and wells are going out. People are concerned that drilling additional wells will overdraw the existing reservoir, and ground water is limited. The third issue is transportation. The County has stated that Germantown Rd is at or exceeding peak capacity. There is a problem at the lower part of Germantown, and up to the East. Potential East Bethany development will also likely use Germantown and Springville Roads as a shortcut to travel to Portland, which will cause a problem. We think this area should be designated as an urban reserve. *Steve and Sandy provided three maps on vacant lot analysis, sewer issues, and transportation issues in the area.*

Donna Smith Arnold

Adding another 1000 acres to Forest Park is not a decision that the CAC should be considering. Forest Park cannot manage the land it currently has, and could not take on more land. Elk don't pay taxes. This is supposed to be a citizen's advisory group, and allowing just a few minutes for public comment is not fair. This group's deliberations can effectively stop property owners from doing what they want to do, and urbanizing their own land. The County needs to discuss this information with everybody that is affected by urban and rural reserves designations; property owners need to know exactly what is going on.

Susan Goldfield, (East Bethany Resident)

I live in the yellow zone on the map that is supposedly a "wonderful developable property". In reality, that area is not all flat open space; it is wooded, with wetlands, ponds streams and wildlife. If you just preserve some of it but not all of it, you lose the buffer zones that the wildlife and natural areas need. UGB expanding up here would mean a lost buffer or wildlife corridor.

Jim Emerson (President of Forest Park Neighborhood Association)

I would ask the CAC, as you go through factors for designation, do not simply focus on factors 1 through 4. We are also trying to create great communities, and in Board's opinion, urbanizing the last shreds of rural fringe areas of Multnomah County is not really serving the 40 to 50 year future. People and wildlife have needs for open space and recreation, and we may also be living

Oral Testimony Collected at CAC Meetings# 1-15

in a potentially very different situation in 50 years, with new ways of thinking about transportation and food security. It will likely be valuable to have farmlands located close-in and streams available. Leave these areas as rural reserves. *Jim provided a letter from the Forest Park Neighborhood Association.*

Joe Angel

I was on the Planning Commission for 7.5 years. I have 48 acres that have been in the city for 40 years. The City of Portland claimed early on that it would bring water service to my property, and in every study this land has been designated as a future urban area. I ask the CAC to please consider that. My property is adjoining a City water tower and one in Germantown. My property was split onto either side of the UGB by a technical error by a topographer who did not follow the edge of the hill as he was supposed to. My land includes three pancake-shaped plateaus that could be developed. In every city, there should exist various kinds of housing styles.

Milly Skach

I live in the yellow NW South area on the map and have three concerns. There are working farms in this area, and existing wildlife. If the area becomes urbanized, there will be an issue with providing education for new families. Lincoln High School, and the East and West Sylvan areas are at capacity; we don't have room for more people here, who would saturate schools.

CAC Meeting# 10 **April 23, 2009**

Sandy Baker

If you refer to the vacant lot report, note that some of these lots are buildable. My brother did a study of a small finger-shaped area in the West Hills area, and came up with 83 buildable lots here. The area should be brought into the UGB or otherwise brought into access of water and sewer services. The Hillhurst area appears on the map as a collection of individual lots, but it is really just several homes.

Sandy asked Carol whether her property was located in the upper or lower 400' elevation. Carol replied that it is located outside of the urban reserve candidate area, in the upper part of the west hills.

Joe Rayhawk

According to the HCT map, it looks as though there is a plan to bring HCT up on 185th around PCC into North Bethany. This is no longer an option, so there will likely not be a corridor there. If a person owns land classified as an exemption farmland, they receive an automatic tax deferral. If the land is outside of the EFU, the landowner needs to be making \$3000 or more per year to receive this tax deferral. The point is that if you move this land area into the UGB, within a short time, many of the small farms will come out of EFU, and their tax numbers will double.

CAC Meeting# 11 **May 28, 2009**

No public comment provided.

CAC Meeting# 12
June 18, 2009

Cory Bacher

Cory lives in Area 7, and stated that she has been hearing two conflicting points of view. One is that the area is inappropriate for agriculture, but Cory does not think this is true. She owns a 93 acre tree farm on the west side of Tualatin Mountain, and things grow well. She noted that her soils are clearly adequate for agriculture. The other point of view is that there needs to be a better effort to prevent logging. Cory pointed out that harvest is a vital part of agriculture. She said that she is managed by the Oregon Department of Forests and is required to replant, with ongoing replanting on her property. Cory believes agriculture is an appropriate use in Area 7, and that agriculture will involve harvest.

Fred Bacher

Fred stated that he believes Mr. Vanderzanden was disingenuous, misrepresented what happened at the Beaverton meeting, and misstated information about a portion of Multnomah County's land as an aspiration for Beaverton. Beaverton does have two areas for aspiration, but not the area Mr. Vanderzanden pointed out. Fred argued that Area 7 is exactly the kind of area that the state law is trying to make a rural/urban decision about and that currently there is a disincentive to do agriculture and forestry there.

Susan Goldfield

Susan lives in Area 7 and submitted a letter which was signed by 27 neighbors living along Springville Rd. Susan noted that there have been comments made that Springville neighbors are in support of an urban reserve, but the letter shows that the group of 27 residents wish to be part of a rural reserve. She was frustrated that in a public process she and her neighbors only have one minute to voice their concerns, while a developer such as Tom Vanderzanden received 15 minutes of presentation time. (*Jeanne responded that CAC rules dictate that the comment period at each meeting is 10 minutes, and that there are many other avenues for public comment.*)

Greg Malinowski

(*Submitted a letter from the Beovich Family*) Greg stated that Malinowski farm is not the only agricultural land out in his area. Louie Beovich and his family own 93 acres of land, which they are using to do agriculture, grow vegetables, and build green houses. Greg asked the group to consider the area for rural reserve.

Julia DiLeone, EMSWCD

Julia clarified that, regarding the Sandy River Canyon protection designations, this may not signify that adjacent land is protected. The area is not part of Columbia Gorge national scenic area.

Joe Rayhawk

Joe advocated his area being kept in rural reserves, and provided input in the meeting packets. He noted that none of his land could be annexed into Portland unless the neighbors take a vote, and Joe believes they would never vote in favor of this. Approximately 15% of all the lands in

this area, at most, can be developed. The area will not meet the density requirements for urban reserves. Joe believes that Area 93 should never have been moved into the UGB, and that his land will never be annexed by Portland or by Beaverton. Joe expressed that people in the East Bethany project misrepresented who they are, and that Jim Thayer and Tom Vanderzanden should not be trusted about anything about the East Bethany area.

Jim Emerson

Jim asked the CAC to step back as they apply the factors to Area 7, and really interpret them, because the whole reserves process is not just about land, but about time. Recommendations will not expire until 2060. Jim noted that America has had the same development patterns for the past 60 years, so not many options jump into peoples' minds about other types of development. He asked the CAC to think deeply about new development changes in the future. There will be a great increase in population, higher energy costs, an increase in lower income populations, and climate reduction goals. Thus, development will likely be different. Jim expressed that converting land to big subdivisions at the fringe is not what this community needs, and that instead efforts should be made to restrict the boundary. He urged the CAC to be limiting in their urban reserve designations.

CAC Meeting# 13
June 25, 2009

Steve Baker

Steve Baker referred to a letter he submitted, including a map. The letter represents personal thoughts by Sandy Baker, to counteract the abstract matrices and maps that the CAC has been given. Steve stressed that this letter represents concerns of real people living in the area. He encouraged the committee to consider the area for urban reserves, adding that designating an area as an urban reserve does not bar one from growing vegetables or timber on the land.

Greg Malinowski

Greg referred to a statement he submitted about the agricultural capacity of the area he lives in. He noted that studies show agriculture is difficult in the area because farm equipment cannot travel easily on roads, but this is not true for small farms which do not require this large equipment. The agricultural studies focus on large scale farming; Greg stressed that he is not suggesting this type of agriculture for the area.

Kirk Andrews

Kirk explained that there is a wildlife overlay for the whole area which restricts building and questioned how this overlay factors into the urban/rural assessment. Jeanne replied that somebody would follow up.

Bob Burnham

Bob submitted a letter stating that he owns 112 acres in Area 7, but unlike Greg Malinowski, he cannot farm it all. He does not believe that farming in Area 7 would make a sustainable income for anyone, as the land is conflicted and surrounded by urban development. He asked the CAC to keep an open mind, and to consider protecting the wildlife and rural areas.

Fred Bacher

Fred thanked the CAC for their thoughtfulness in considering the urbanization pressure in Area 7. He asked them to step back from the technical studies of the area and focus on whether they would personally like to see an urban or rural future there. He thanked the group for demonstrating that Area 7 is a viable agricultural and forestry land.

CAC Meeting# 14
July 16, 2009

Greg Malinowski

Greg explained that school children visited his farm on a field trip in a short 30 minute drive. The kids drew pictures and wrote about their experiences on the farm (he passed around their drawings). If the nearest rural area had been on the other side of North Plains, they may never have been able to visit during a fieldtrip. Greg also brought a map of elk sightings in his area, and explained that there are many elk west of Forest Park. Washington County would like to see part of this area developed, but that would cut the elk range out. Greg expressed concern that more development on the Portland side would cut this range even more.

Laura Foster (Co-president of Skyline Bridge Neighborhood Association)

Laura spoke about the elk population around Tualatin Mountains, explaining that no other part of the metro area has such an uninterrupted natural landscape; to further urbanize this area, even in pockets, would drive elk out of the hills. She noted that the elk leave a big footprint, and residents enjoy knowing they share their land with the elk. During other parts of the year, the elk are often in the Germantown and Keizer Road region. Laura explained that elk require large swaths of nature areas in which to forage, and narrow corridors would drive elk to other areas. The Tualatin mountains are unique as one of the few areas in the lower 48 states where elk and humans inhabit and coexist in the same county.

Sandy Baker

Sandy passed out a letter and explained that she lives on Germantown Road, where neighbors don't know about Forest Park and the urban reserves issue. Sandy owns 600 acres of land and is not represented by Forest Park at all. She stated that there are many neighbors there who do want to be in an urban area. She also explained that Carol has been working on this with Jim Emerson for about 3 years. She expressed distress that in continuing to hear about putting elk before people.

Matt Eler

Matt urged CAC members concerned about farmland preservation to look at this area as an urban reserve. The area is conflicted for farming. He explained that Foundation farm ground is going to be targeted for urban reserve, and that the North Bethany investments will make services easier to bring in.

Jim Emerson

Oral Testimony Collected at CAC Meetings# 1-15

Jim read from a letter he submitted, concluding that construction of urban spaces leads to destruction of rural uses.

CAC Meeting# 15 July 23, 2009

Rich Faith, City of Troutdale

Rich request that CAC members consider some area adjacent to Troutdale city limits as an urban reserve. It looks as though the committee is going to put Area 4 into a rural reserve category. It would be unfair to lock Troutdale out of future expansion opportunities. The Mayor has written a letter included in the CAC packet with reasons for the City's request, mostly that the city has no other place to grow. Rich requested that the committee consider some portion North of Lusted as an urban reserve.

Matt Wellner, Tri-County Investments

Matt referred to two items in the meeting packet, including a letter from the Metropolitan Land Group and North Bethany Concept Plan Map. He asked that the group consider the Lower Springville Rd area in Area 7 for urban reserve at minimum for the entire NW Hills area. He noted that at the last meeting, he heard comments that North Bethany would definitely be built, but that is not the case. Matt is very involved in that process, and the concept plan is only in its planning process. CWS is planning for sewer lines into the area. Matt expressed that it would be important to build around the huge investment that will be made in the area.

Donna Metrasa

Donna stated that Sauvie Island (Area 8) should be given rural reserves designation due to its high landscape and resource value and good farmland. She expressed that Sauvie Island needs long term stability, not to have continual zone change proposals in the future.

Stephen Hatfield, Forest Park Conservancy

Stephen asked the group to consider long term protection for natural resources features in Areas 5, 6 and 7. The Forest Park Conservancy believes these areas are very suitable for rural reserve designation. The law requires that Metro's 2007 natural landscape features is used in the reserves process, and these areas fall within domain of this map.

Jay Rayhawk

Jay noted that on page 27 of main packet, there is a map of Bethany Plan, and that Area 7.1 is rated medium for various factors. He stated that Washington County does not overbuild schools, and that North Bethany cannot let students from other counties into its schools. He also stated that road congestion on Bethany Blvd and Saltzman is horrible. North Bethany is also struggling to get sufficiently large capacity for transit development. East Bethany will be located more than a mile from areas along Sunset Blvd. Jay does not believe it is possible to enhance ecology in this area. He asked the committee to reconsider its recommendation.

Anonymous

Oral Testimony Collected at CAC Meetings# 1-15

This Biology major at Willamette University noted that she live in Area 7, and asked that it be designated rural reserve due to extremely high habitat value and biodiversity. Her property alone includes endangered habitat land, with elk that moves from Springville to Cornelius Pass. Many birds nest in this area and migrate through it. Her property adjoins other habitats, and they move through the property with no understanding of property lines.

B Bawker

B Bawker noted that he lives on Skyline in Area 7, and asked that it be designated rural reserve because of its ability to absorb CO₂ from cars. The property has both old and young trees. This is valuable to keep Portland air clean. The area should continue to function as a carbon sink.

Susan Goldfield

Susan reminded the group that the North Bethany development has not been planned in a fashion that is supportive of a wildlife overlay. They are having trouble getting funding. Though they are moving ahead with plan, that does not mean it is a perfect plan.

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

Date	Name	Agency or Group	Comment Summary	Format
02/17/09	Matt Wellner	Metro Land Group	Letter addresses urban reserve factors specific to subject property in Greater Bethany area. Concludes that the subject site and much East Bethany should be considered as candidates for an urban reserve. Provides maps.	Letter
02/23/09	Margaret Barker, Steven Barker, Sandy Baker, Nancy Miller & Greg Barker	Interested individual(s)	Opposes any consideration of a rural reserve for their property due to close proximity to UGB, poor soil and lack of water for farming, gentle slopes, access to existing road network, ability for Clean Water Services to provide environmental protections, and close proximity to planned sewer line.	Letter
02/23/09	Joe Angel	Interested individual(s)	Provided 40-year chronology of his 48-acre properties, and corresponding maps.	Letter
02/23/09	Mark Crandall	East Bethany Owners Collaborative	Letter submitted on behalf of 17 property owners in East Bethany advocates for inclusion of their properties into an urban reserve area. Correspondence addresses urban reserves factors.	Letter
02/25/09	Greg Malinowski	Malinowski Farms	Malinowski Farms requests Springville Road area be designated as a rural reserve due to productive soils and farm operations in the area, governance concerns, proximity of a fault line, and governance concerns. Provided maps and soil data.	Letter
02/26/09	Todd Mobley	Lancaster Engineering	Provided transportation considerations in the Bethany area on behalf of Metro Land group. Concludes that urban development of the East Bethany area appears to be feasible and could facilitate significant transportation improvements and connectivity.	Letter
02/26/09	Joseph Ashton	Multnomah Yacht	Requesting that his Marina Way property be included in the UGB due to availability of water and sewer services. Property is above the 100-year floodplain.	Letter
03/02/09	Andy Huserik	Interested individual(s)	Does not feel his property is appropriately zoned for exclusive farm use, and would like to see his 22 acres developed with high density development. Cites close proximity to UGB and gentle slopes.	Letter
03/16/09	Tom Hamann	Interested individual(s)	States that Western Multnomah County needs to be a Rural Reserve due to presence of regionally important natural features, community opposition to future urbanization, the Great Communities study, and transportation concerns.	Letter
03/17/09	Floreen & Arnold Hammack	Interested individual(s)	Opposes a Rural Reserve designation on 25+ acre property . Would like children to subdivide and build.	Letter
03/19/09	Ken & Pam Denfeld	Interested individual(s)	Opposes designation of their property as a Rural Reserve. Expressed concern that CAC members were not familiar with the Bonny Slope area.	Letter
03/20/09	Scott & Lynne Gaerisch	Interested individual(s)	Believes their Springville Road Property, and the East Bethany area, should be designated an urban reserve.	Letter

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

03/20/09	Greg Cline, District Forester; Ken Cushman, Unit Forester; Jeff Hepler, Stewardship Forester	ODF North Cascade District	In reference to the map labeled: Draft "Potential Candidate Urban Reserve Areas" dated February 9, 2009, the North Cascades District does not have concerns about specific candidate rural reserve or urban reserve areas. Acknowledged pressure placed on those fringe areas between candidate rural reserve and urban reserve areas, and concerns over soils and operability, zoning, parcelization and ownership, fragmentation, existing land use conflicts and sensitive resource sites.	Letter
03/23/09	Eric & Kim Evans	Interested individual(s)	Opposes any proposal to desingate their 2.37 acres of land in Washington County located at 11534 NW Rockton Dr in Hillsboro as a "private reserve."	Email
03/23/09	Kevin Bender	Interested individual(s)	Opposes designation of his 29 acres of land located at 14226 NW Skyline Blvd as a Rural Reserve. Expressed concern over the lack of property owner notification on Reserves process.	Email
03/25/09	Josh Townsley	Former District Manager of the Sauvie Island Drainage Improvement Co	Provided summary of Sauvie Island, and the Drainage Improvement Company. Expressed opinion that the island is not suitable for urban development because of flooding and seepage issues.	Letter
03/26/09	Steven Pfeiffer	Perkins Coie	Provided information relating to the suitability of his client's property (Joseph Angel) for designation as an Urban Reserve, including its location within the City of Portland and urban services boundary, and availability of sewer service.	Letter
03/26/09	Bob Clay	City of Portland	Provided staff comments on service suitability issues in the Northwest Hills South (from Cornelius Pass/Skyline intersection south and west 400' elevation), Sauvie Island, and South Multnomah Channel east of Hwy 30 areas.	Email
03/26/09	Joseph & Shelley Rayhawk	Interested individual(s)	Provided background on horse boarding operations on their Germantown Rd property, and surrounding properties. Noted existing and proposed environmental overlays which encumber properties in this area.	Letter
03/26/09	Barker	Interested individual(s)	Provided maps of Springville Rd area with estimated number of buildable lots in vicinity, and summary of transportation issues.	Maps
03/26/09	Susan Goldfield	Interested individual(s)	Strongly supports Forest Park Neighborhood recommendations and a rural reserve designation for Multnomah County properties outside the UGB based on environmental considerations and the lack of infrastructure in the area.	Letter
03/26/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Urges CAC to not designate any urban reserves in NW Multnomah County. Cites concerns over impacts to forest, wildlife, water and agricultural resources. Addresses urban reserves factors.	Letter
03/26/09	J. Angel	Interested individual(s)	Provided current zoning map of properties he owns.	Misc.
03/26/09	Tim Couch	Sauvie Island Drainage District	Conveyed opinion that Sauvie Island is not suitable for urban development.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

03/26/09	Travis McFeron	PS Engineers	Notes potential conflict between possible rural reserve area near intersection of NW Cornelius Pass and NW Skyline and the West Hills Rural Area Plan. The Plan indicates potential for Rural Centers in the planning area, which would be precluded by a rural reserves designation.	Email
03/27/09	Steve Barker	Interested individual(s)	Barker family believes that area in vicinity of Germantown, Kaiser and Springville Roads, and Skyline blvd, should be brought into the UGB. Notes an existing aquifer problem, significant inventory of buildable lots, and existing volumes of traffic which exceed capacity of area roads. Provided maps reiterating these points.	Letter
03/29/09	Cherie Sprando	Fred's Marina	Indicates that area along NW Marina Way has potential for urbanization. Cites availability of water and sewer services, and presence of flat land.	Email
04/01/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Rebuts testimony and maps provided by Mr. Barker at March 26th meeting.	Email
04/13/09	Joseph & Shelley Rayhawk	Interested individual(s)	Supports Rural Reserve designation for their farm, and surrounding area. Cites environmental constraints, inability to develop at the necessary density, infrastructure constraints, and annexation issues. Provides background on County SEC zoning overlay restrictions.	Letter
04/16/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	References Oregon Court of Appeals Case #A122169 which decided that the "Bethany expansion area will have clear boundaries that serve to both visibility highlight the line separating urban and rural uses...." Requests that Multnomah County lands in "NW South" area be considered a potential Rural Reserve Area.	Email
04/22/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Indicated opposition of Forest Park Neighborhood Association to "West Forest Park Vision" presented at April CAC meeting. Iterated support for a rural reserve designation around Forest Park, and no urban reserve designations north of Hwy 26.	Letter
04/22/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Please support the designation of the areas north of Highway 26 as a Rural Reserve. In particular, the physical constraints on Cornell Road and the lack of a comprehensive traffic management plan for these areas have resulted in major traffic congestion and concomitant affects on the natural environment and the quality of life in our neighborhood.	Letter
04/28/09	Gregory Malinowski	Malinowski Farms	Provided background on the Malinowski Farm and surrounding agricultural activities. Expressed concern over governance, and long-term agriculture investment without certainty on land use issues. Supports Rural Reserve designation for Springville Road area.	Email
04/28/09	David Beller	Mercy Corps Northwest	Expressed support for preservation of open space and agricultural production in the Springville Lane area as part of the review of rural reserves.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

05/06/09	Kim Carlson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Group of neighbors in NW Portland expressed concurrence with the issues itemized in the joint letter sent by Forest Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA) and Forest Park Conservancy dated August 12, 2008. Has specific concerns about increased in traffic, and lack of pedestrian facilities or bike lanes. Undeveloped areas north of highway 26 are more appropriate for rural reserves.	Email
05/19/09	Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland	Indicated that the Port of Portland would not object to either no designation or a rural reserve designation for Government Island.	Email
05/25/09	Joseph & Shelley Rayhawk	Interested individual(s)	Provided correction to CAC regarding farm deferral status with and without EFU zoning; summary numbers of EFU, CFU and RR land within the West Hills; information on County Significant Environmental Concern (SEC) overlays	Letter
05/27/09	Matt Wellner	Interested individual(s)	Provided a copy of a "West Forest Park Concept Plan" and supporting documents.	Misc.
06/08/09	Ralph Henkaus	Interested individual(s)	Expressed concern about Area 93 becoming part of the Rural Reserve.	Email
06/08/09	Mary Manseu	Citizen Participation Organization #7	CPO 7 recommends that the candidate reserve area within CPO7 and the candidate area northeast of CPO 7 in Multnomah County be designated as a Rural Reserve due to the lack of an adequate transportation system, the need to protect farmland, the need to protect watersheds, and the presence of a fault line.	Letter
06/11/09	Amy Sim	Interested individual(s)	NW North Road resident, opposed to recommendation of designated area as a Rural Reserve.	Email
06/13/09	Mary Danner	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Rob Danner	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Sheila Weaver	Interested individual(s)	Expressed need to preserve farmlands for future generations.	Email
06/13/09	Kevin Rutherford	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Jennifer Eddy	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Patricia Miller	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Jonathon Krane	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/13/09	Rachel Ford	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/14/09	Karen A Semprevivo	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/14/09	Melissa Stangeland	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/14/09	Laura M Sanders	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/14/09	Alissa McMaken Roberts	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

06/14/09	Aaron Eddy	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/14/09	David W Schroeder	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
06/23/09	Greg Malinowski	Malinowski Farms	Addresses Urban Reserves factors. Recommends not creating Urban Reserve for Area 6 and 7.	Letter
06/23/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Urges decision makers to minimize the amount of land recommended as Urban Reserves. Cites need to develop within existing UFB to minimize carbon emissions and to accommodate aging population.	Letter
06/24/09	Sandra Baker	Interested individual(s)	Inquired about the division of Areas 6 and 7, and how and why the line was determined. Also inquired about areas, based on proximity, that staff felt had a relatively higher potential for urbanization during the next 50 years. Expressed disagreement with the staff recommendation for the area which encompasses her property.	Email
06/25/09	Fred Bacher	Interested individual(s)	Recommends that Area 7 be designated a Rural Reserve	Letter
07/01/09	B. Wayne Luscombe	Interested individual(s)	Expressed support for Rural Reserves in Outer Northwest--west of Forest Park	Email
07/01/09	Pen Barnes	Interested individual(s)	Expressed support for a Rural Reserve designation to protect habitat around Forest Park, down to the Washington County line and beyond Cornelius Pass Road.	Email
07/03/09	John and Mary Telford	Interested individual(s)	Expressed support for a Rural Reserve designation to protect habitat around Forest Park, down to the Washington County line and beyond Cornelius Pass Road.	Email
07/07/09	Chris Foster	Interested individual(s)	Staff appears to be treating reserves factors 2a and 3a identically and in ways that are sometimes in conflict with the OAR. Perhaps they need revisiting?	Letter
07/08/09	Keith Hansen	Interested individual(s)	Conveys strong support for establishing rural reserves northwest of Portland surrounding Forest Park and the area past Cornelius Pass Road to the Washington County line. Lives on the west side of the Tualatin Mountains, close to Firelane 15. Cites abundance of wildlife, water resources, and steep slopes.	Email
07/08/09	Mollie Nelson	Interested individual(s)	Indicated support for our area receiving a "rural reserve" designation in Springville Rd area so that we can preserve the wildlife habitat, natural and recreational resources, and to support the preservation of farm and forest land near our cities. Additionally, our area provides an appropriate and necessary buffer between Forest Park and the ever-encroaching development of neighborhoods and commercial entities.	Email
07/10/09	Joseph Rayhawk	Interested individual(s)	Areas 6 and 7, including the land controlled by the East Bethany Coalition, into Rural Reserves should be rated HIGH with respect to protecting important water quality. Both areas are critical to a multi-county effort to preserve the water quality AND temperature of Rock Creek so as to mitigate any number of bad things happening to the Tualatin River and ultimately to the Willamette River.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

07/13/09	Juliet Hynams	Northwest District Association	Board of the Northwest District Association voted to support the joint letter sent by Forest Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA) and Forest Park Conservancy dated August 12, 2008 supporting a rural reserve north of highway 26. Association opposes expanding the urban growth boundary there, because we believe it will increase traffic through NW Portland. Undeveloped areas north of highway 26 are more appropriate for rural reserves.	Email
07/13/09	Jerry Grossnickle	Interested individual(s)	Expressed support for Rural Reserve designation on lands west of Forest Park to protect natural resources and to reduce carbon emissions.	Email
07/13/09	Kirk Andrews	Interested individual(s)	Designate areas that are suitable for urbanization urban, and those that are not suitable for urbanization rural.	Email
07/14/09	Carl N. Keseric	Interested individual(s)	Inquiry to County staff regarding whether proximity to properties with fair market values that significantly exceed agricultural values for farmland, or forestry values for forest land, have been considered by CAC.	Email
07/14/09	Anne Bothner-By	Interested individual(s)	Expressed concern about the impartiality of a particular CAC member	Email
07/15/09	Brian Beinlich	Save Helvetia	Submitted 91 comments from citizens who visited the Save Helvetia web site (http://www.savehelvetia.org) to submit testimony regarding the Urban and Rural Reserves process	Email
07/16/09	Audrey Botti	Interested individual(s)	Designate all study areas north of Highway 26 in Washington and Multnomah Counties as Rural Reserves	Email
07/16/09	Winona Phelps	Interested individual(s)	Designate all study areas north of Highway 26 in Washington and Multnomah Counties as Rural Reserves	Email
07/16/09	Sandra Baker	Interested individual(s)	Support exists in Germantown/Kaiser Rd areas for urban reserves designation. Many residents still do not know of reserves process. Forest Park Neighborhood Association does not represent all property owners in vicinity.	Letter
07/16/09	Jim Emerson	Forest Park Neighborhood Association	Construction of urban spaces leads to destruction of rural uses. Our successors will have the greatest flexibility to meet the needs of their day if we avoid urban reserves in our day.	Letter
07/20/09	Edward and Ruth Korver	Interested individual(s)	Urges preservation of the rural nature of Helvetia.	Email
07/20/09	Joseph L. Black	Interested individual(s)	Designate all study areas north of Highway 26 in Washington and Multnomah Counties as Rural Reserves	Email
07/20/09	Matt Wellner	Metro Land Group	Comments address urban reserves factors on point by point basis. Lower Springville Road area should be considered a candidate for an urban reserve designation to build upon existing and planned infrastructure investments. Designation will provide added economic support for growing Bethany Town Center. Provided maps of area.	Letter
07/21/09	B. Lueck	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

07/21/09	Karen Muller	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/22/09	Sandra Baker	Interested individual(s)	Indicated that Metro map that was presented at last CAC meeting showing creeks and topography is in the process of being changed. Noted that the lower creek bed is not Abbey but Alder. Included maps of her properties.	Email
07/22/09	Joseph Rayhawk	Interested individual(s)	Believes the Committee erred in rating Area 7.1 as Medium with respect to Factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, and, in rating Area 7 as Medium with respect to Factor 8. Presents arguments with respect to factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Does not think that the area will get bus service, or will be able to use public schools in North Bethany. Expressed concern over traffic congestion.	Email
07/22/09	Shawn Morgan	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/22/09	Mark Sieber	Hillside Neighborhood Association	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/22/09	Jim Johnson	Oregon Department of Agriculture	Provides definition of "conflicted lands." Area 7 is nearly surrounded by the UGB and rural residential exception land and presents some implications to the long-term viability of agriculture such as speculative land values and conflicts with adjacent land uses and traffic. But there are also trends (see other considerations in the report) related to demand for local agriculture and food security that could be factors in retaining some of this area for agriculture.	Email
07/23/09	Fred Bacher	Interested individual(s)	Provided photos which give a feel for what most of Area 7 is like. States that Area 7 meets the State guidelines for Rural Reserve status by proximity to the U.G.B., landscape features worthy of protection such as streams and a sense of place, active agricultural and forest operations, and extreme difficulty of high density development due to the many streams and steep topography.	Letter
07/23/09	Cori Bacher	Interested individual(s)	Area 7 is under ongoing threat of urbanization. Please protect Area 7 by giving it a Rural Reserve designation, and permit both the family farms and the extraordinary biodiversity this area supports to continue to thrive undisturbed into the future.	Letter
07/23/09	Cindy Reid	Interested individual(s)	Sauvie Island is going through huge changes in terms of public presence impact and anything that might help to mitigate that impact and shape any future development, is deeply important to many of us who treasure the rural and wild nature of this island. I am aware there are work meetings taking place - but they do not appear geared to inform the public or allow time for discourse.	Email
07/23/09	Michelle Bussard, Stephen Hatfield	Forest Park Conservancy	Forest Park Conservancy supports the establishment of rural reserves in areas 5, 6 & 7. Iterates importance of protecting natural landscape features contained within these areas.	Letter
07/23/09	Susan Goldfield	Interested individual(s)	Area 7.1 would have to provide its own school capacity for any future urbanization. Area schools are currently at capacity.	Letter
07/23/09	Donna Matrazzo	Sauvie Island Conservancy	Disagrees with staff assessment that Sauvie Island is a low priority for a rural reserve. Asks that the island be designated as a rural reserve.	Letter

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

07/24/09	Steve Wegner	Interested individual(s)	Please keep Oregon Green and beautiful and do not let it become what California represents; a land of greed and over use!	Email
07/24/09	Judi Murfin	Interested individual(s)	Preserve rural qualities of Helvetia.	Email
07/24/09	Jody Davis	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/25/09	Allison Amabisca	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/25/09	Elizabeth Cox	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/27/09	Annette Samayoa	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/27/09	Michelle Garner	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/27/09	Yeremi Samayoa	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/27/09	Christi Scott	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/27/09	Kris Teshera	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/28/09	Sandra Baker	Interested individual(s)	Provided background on 62 acres her and her family owns in Kaiser/Germantown Rd area. Feels significance of wildlife habitat and stream resources in area is exaggerated. Notes technical corrections made by Metro to stream mapping on her property. Indicates availability of water and sewer services, and transportation infrastructure. Feels area should be rated higher for urban suitability.	Email
07/29/09	Helen Kimmelfield	Interested individual(s)	Germantown Rd resident conveys need to preserve our pockets of rural Oregon, and they need to be large enough to maintain viable habitats for the native species that inhabit them. Only then can we be sure of a way back to our essential roots, which are and always will be rural.	Email
07/29/09	Clair Klock	Clackamas Soil and Water Conservation District	We have come to the point where there is no land that can be given to urbanization without compromising the integrity of the farming sector.	Email
07/30/09	Wade Blackburn	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/31/09	Mike Cormack	Interested individual(s)	Concerned about the farm lands and natural resources north of Highway 26, including potential impacts to natural, scenic and agricultural resources.	Email
07/31/09	Karen Martiny	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/31/09	Lesli Merhaut	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/31/09	Anke Brandstater	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
07/31/09	Michael Tevlin	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

07/31/09	Jack and Alicia Lackman	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/02/09	Ian Davies	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/02/09	Alex Fyfe	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/04/09	Stephanie Shaffer	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/05/09	Sister Marcia Hobart, ALG	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/05/09	Laura Ocker	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/05/09	Stephanie McAndrew	Interested individual(s)	Requests that all study areas north of Highway 26 be designated as Rural Reserves.	Email
08/06/09	Jim Emerson, Michelle Bussard	Forest Park Neighborhood Association, Forest Park Conservancy	To protect natural landscape features near Forest Park, commenters request a Rural Reserve to protect the significant regional resources around Forest Park, including all areas east of Cornelius Pass Road outside UGB; the northeast and southwest sides of the Tualatin Mountains west of Cornelius Pass. No Urban Reserves north of Highway 26 that would directly increase traffic on rural roads through and around Forest Park. These roads include Cornelius Pass Road, Germantown Road, and Cornell Road, all of which are already beyond capacity and cannot be expanded or improved without significant harm to wildlife and healthy streams.	Letter

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – Eastside (Government Islands, West of Sandy River, East of Sandy River)
 Emails and letters submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

Date	Name	Agency or Group	Comment Summary	Format
01/08/09	Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland	Do not designate Government Islands as an urban or rural reserve in case there is a need to expand the I-205 right-of-way.	Email
02/17/09	Jim Kight	City of Troutdale	City of Troutdale is in favor of designating the area to the south and southeast of the currently city limits and UGB as an urban reserve (as far south as Division St and as far east as its intersection with the Sandy River)	Letter
02/25/09	Dick Strathern, Council Presiden	City of Gresham	The City's general position is that there should become rural reserves designated east of Gresham. Areas east of the Sandy River and immediately adjacent on the west side of Sandy River should be the minimum areas for consideration.	Letter
02/26/09	Tom Bouillion, Planning Mgr	Port of Portland	Provided summary of Government Islands ownership and regulatory scheme. Indicated that Port does not support an urban reserve or rural reserve designation for the islands.	Letter
03/25/09	Matt Clark, Exec Dir & Teresa Huntsinger, Board Chair	Johnson Creek Watershed Council	Provided information on the Johnson Creek watershed, and expressed concern that future urbanization in the Johnson Creek Watershed could adversely impact the watershed and/or jeopardize public and private efforts to enhance and restore watershed health.	Letter
04/14/09	Matt Clark & Teresa Huntsinger	Johnson Creek Watershed Council	Requests that Multnomah and Clackamas Counties designate the entire Johnson Creek watershed outside the UGB as a rural reserve. Provided map of watershed.	Letter
05/04/09	Gordon Sester	Sester Farms, Inc	Encourages UGB to expand into the areas on both sides of Division and Oxbow Dr, east to Hosner Road. Cites encroachment and conflicts between residential uses and farms uses in area. Notes trend of farmers moving out of East Multnomah County, and into Willamette Valley.	Letter
05/19/09	Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland	Indicated that the Port of Portland would not object to either no designation or a rural reserve designation for Government Island.	Email
07/22/09	Jim Kight	City of Troutdale	CAC recommendation for a rural reserve designation east of Troutdale will effectively take away any opportunity for the City to expand in the future. Area bounded by S. Troutdale Road to the west, SE Division to the south, SE 302nd to the east, and Kerslake to the north, is reasonable and appropriate for an urban reserve designation to accomodate Troutdale's desired future growth.	Letter
07/23/09	Rich Faith	City of Troutdale	Provided map of area the City would like to see designated as an urban reserve.	Map

Multnomah County Urban/Rural Reserves Comment Summary – General
 Emails and letters submitted by public at CAC meetings or at reserves@co.multnomah.or.us (01/09 to present)

Date	Name	Agency or Group	Comment Summary	Format
01/12/09	Sue Marshall	Coalition for a Livable Future ltr to Council & Committee	Raises the need to consider equity issues and affordable housing as part of the process. Outreach should also target low-income and diverse segments of community.	Letter
02/04/09	Greg Manning, Greg Specht, Craig Brown	NAIOP, Oregon Chapter	Lands identified as "unconstrained" for employment/industrial development within the study area should be designated as urban reserves, not rural reserves. Provided a copy of a Regional Land Use Business Advisory Group Mapping Series report, prepared by Group Mackenzie.	Letter
03/20/09	Greg Cline, District Forester; Ken Cushman, Unit Forester; Jeff Hepler, Stewardship Forester	ODF North Cascade District	In reference to the map labeled: Draft "Potential Candidate Urban Reserve Areas" dated February 9, 2009, the North Cascades District does not have concerns about specific candidate rural reserve or urban reserve areas. Acknowledged pressure placed on those fringe areas between candidate rural reserve and urban reserve areas, and concerns over soils and operability, zoning, parcelization and ownership, fragmentation, existing land use conflicts and sensitive resource sites.	Letter
04/01/09	Tom Skaar, President & Dave Nielsen, CEO	Home Builders Association	Expressed concern over service availability maps used by the CAC in their process. Cites examples of errors, omissions and limitations.	Letter
04/06/09	OECD	OECD	Preliminary comments on Reserves process submitted on behalf of Oregon Dept of Agriculture, Forestry, Transportation, Economic and Community Development, Fish and Wildlife, and LCDC. Provided matrix outlining the potential for state highways in the study area to accommodate additional traffic, and the relative cost to improve those facilities.	Letter
07/30/09	Kathleen Worman	Interested individual(s)	Citizen input is a critical aspect of holding these meetings and cutting short public response time is inconsistent with its goals. This service is paid for by Multnomah County taxpayers, therefore heeding public participation is essential. Although there is a lot of work to cover in these meetings, public comment should not be the sacrificed agenda item	Email

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97201	It is important to maintain natural areas and support local farms: this strategy will prepare us for future resource needs and increase the property values in the region because we will have a wide portfolio of amenities at our fingertips.	Expand the area to include all of Sauvie Island. Working farms and close by produce will be invaluable to greater Portland's future. Agricultural activity and natural areas deserve equal distribution. I favor thinking as big as possible - and laying a framework to 'reclaim' blighted/inactive industrial & residential areas in the future to restore urban land to farming/natural areas, without adversely affecting economic and urban density that drives the economy. I think agricultural and open space adds value to the urban metro region.				What we do today should be looked at through the lens of the future identity and values the Metro region envisions for itself: efficient public transportation network, inviting and economically thriving urban centers, continued decreased carbon emissions, healthy and desirable location to live, a thriving ecosystem - green tech sector, dynamic urban cores, working farms, natural habitats and sustainably managed lands and resources.
97201	Protecting natural areas					
97201	Identification of transportation corridors with urban reserves established along those corridors.	Most maps are too small for detailed views. Urban and rural needs to be addressed by local conditions and local needs.				Transportation is key!!
97201	designation of natural features and resources, including forest and farmland as off limits for development. Contain development along transit corridors.		The Tualatin Hills and the areas around Forest Park.	The following areas should be considered as candidates for rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97201		More density in already-developed areas. No need to add urban reserves. Look at all the vacant/underused land inside the UGB! We spend so much money on Transit, let's infill around transit... adding urban reserves diminishes that goal.				
97201	Bringing in the Stafford area makes sense due to it's location and it does not portray farmland.		Gresham--look at what has happened there!	Take Stafford out of the "farmland" reserves	Gresham--look what has happend there!	

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97203	Expanding the UGB where it makes sense to expand it, i.e., as close to the Portland city center as possible.	In Washington County, remove the Helvetia area from candidacy as urban reserve. This is valuable and beautiful rural countryside that should be preserved as much as possible. Expansion of mass transit into these areas is impractical at best, and development is too far removed from the urban center of Portland.	Helvetia area in Washington County.	In Clackamas County, exclude from rural reserve consideration those areas such as the Stafford Basin that are natural UGB expansion areas. UGB expansion should be limited in further outlying areas to keep the concentric ring of high density population as close to the Portland City Center as possible, but not limiting growth of areas within that concentric ring and adjacent to urban communities such as West Linn and Lake Oswego. Affluent suburban areas should not be limited in their urban development simply because those citizens prefer being surrounded by rural areas. Growth should expand for the good of the entire metro area.	On the premise that urban growth should be allowed in areas within the "population ring" of the Portland Metro Area, the Stafford Triangle in Clackamas County is an obvious area to permit growth, it being the final "piece of the pie."	Forty or fifty years is a long time for reserves in an area with a highly fluctuating population. While it is great that Metro wants a long term plan, that plan should retain some amount of flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. For instance, growth restriction is a wonderful concept, but if housing prices eventually become completely unaffordable for "regular people," then the system is failing itself.
97203	Establishment of rural reserves adjacent to existing protected natural areas such as Forest Park.	Multnomah and Washington counties - please remove West Hills and Helvetia area from consideration.	Multnomah and Washington counties - please remove West Hills and Helvetia area from consideration.			
97203	1. reducing the growth of the growth boundary. It is not much of a boundary if it keeps expanding whenever developers desire. 2. preserving viable farmland within striking distance of the best markets for its products. As oil becomes more expensive transportation of local farm goods will become more expensive. 3. Using the highest quality croplands for food production, not suburban lawns. 4. Maintaining the rural character of Oregon farm country by keeping farm lands affordable.	The reserves for Washington County are too large. Prime farmland should be kept and protected as farmland.	yes, the reserve areas in Washington county			
97203	more rural reserves, less urban reserves. We need farmland to feed the people who live here	Washington County just north of Bethany along Springville road should be an rural reserve. This is prime farmland that i have been farming for 3 years. Supplying the folks of St. Johns with fresh organic produce.	yes, north of Bethany along Springville road	More of them		How can we be considering taking in a million more people to the metro area while using good farmland to house them. We need the farmland that is now surrounding the city to feed us now and in the future. If people want to move to portland then they need to live in the city not on the land that feeds the current citizens.

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97205	Configuring urban reserves to preserve streams, wetlands, wildlife areas, open space and views.		Government Island should be eliminated from study. It's obviously unsuited for urban development, and its highest value is wildlife habitat, recreation and open space. The portions of the northwestern block along the Multnomah Channel and the west hills should be eliminated. The west hills area should be reserved for further Forest Park expansion, and the Multnomah Channel area is unsuited for urban expansion because future sea level rise caused by climate change will make the area more prone to flooding. The Sandy River gorge should be eliminated from further study. Its highest value is wildlife habitat and scenic value.			
97205	Configuring urban reserves to protect streams, wetlands, wildlife areas, and open space.					
97209		Helvetia area (all of Washington County north of Hwy 26) be removed from Urban Reserve consideration and West Hills should be removed from Urban Reserve consideration.				
97209	Generous preservation of farm land and focus on infill within the urban spaces, rather than allowing urban sprawl.	The proposed 160, 000 acres of proposed urban reserves in Washington County and the cities of Hillsboro, Cornelius, North Plains and Forest Grove should be reduced. If reserved for urban growth, this land will severely damage the future of agriculture in the western part of our region.	The proposed 160, 000 acres of proposed urban reserves in Washington County and the cities of Hillsboro, Cornelius, North Plains and Forest Grove should be reduced. If reserved for urban growth, this land will severely damage the future of agriculture in the western part of our region.	Increase rural reserves within the 160, 000 acres of proposed urban reserves in Washington County and the cities of Hillsboro, Cornelius, North Plains and Forest Grove should be reduced. If reserved for rural growth, this land will protect the future of agriculture in the western part of our region.		Increase urban density and efficiency of public transportation & infrastructure to make a more livable and environmentally sustainable urban environment for the region's increasing population. Increase rural reserves to protect farmland so that protect and promote our ability to feed ourselves and the increasing regional population. Thank you for protecting our UGB and planning for the future--this work greatly impacts the livability and natural resources of our region!
97209		Helvetia area be removed from Urban Reserve consideration.	Please remove the West Hills from Urban Reserve consideration.			
97209			Helvetia, Banks, Forest Grove.	Make Helvetia, Banks and Forest Grove A rural reserve.		
97209	Prevent Helvetia from becoming more housing - protect the beautiful farmlands!!!!	DO NOT include Helvetia!!!!	Helvetia, North of 26 - DO NOT make this MORE housing.	ADD Helvetia		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97209	Protection of working farms to continue providing local families with food is most important to me. It's one of the most important reasons I moved to this area of the country last year.	The candidate urban reserve factors are too large in Washington County. Land within the current UGB should be developed more densely before expanding.	Washington County candidate areas are too large.	It is important to protect land within the rural reserves. Also, the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97210	To prevent my local CSA from being destroyed.	yes, the Helvetia area in washing ton county should be protected				
97210	designation of all land north of 26 as rural reserves support of "urban homesteading". --increasing food production within urban boundaries remove the west hills from urban designation	If anything, increase rural reserves.	all land north of 26!!! This is some of the richest agricultural land in the nation! How can we support a growing population if we cannot feed them with the food we grow?? Isn't the PURPOSE of Metro to support sustainable growth? Suburban subdivisions are not sustainable growth. Giveaways to national and international corporations is not sustainable growth. Supporting local food production and distribution IS.	leave it alone!!!!!!!!!!!!		Make it more open and inclusive. I read the Oregonian daily and am otherwise a pretty involved and well read person--in fact I write for publications such as Food Front about sustainable agriculture--yet this is the first I've heard of the "process" (an email from a farmer friend) KEEP YOUR PRIORITIES STRAIGHT. I don't know how many more times I can say this. Food is humanity's most basic need. The Willamette Valley is some of the most fertile farmland in the nation. It should be used for growing food, not housing people in auto dependent subdivisions or building corporate parks. Your responsibility as an organization is to promote SUSTAINABLE GROWTH and growth only when it is sustainable.
97210	Land Conservation					
97210			The areas west of Skyline and east of Bethany. The lands are too steep for appropriate development, there are no services/ they will be very expensive to permits, a buffer is needed along the skyline corridor for the benefit of Forest Park and for the wildlife corridor north and west.			
97210	protect sauvie island, nw mult co, EFU areas	Please protect small acreage farms and woodlands. pls protect sensitive stream corridors and riparian areas - assist with invasive species; large scale land management goals.	areas on nest slope tualatin hills - rock creek, abbey creek watersheds critical for wildlife corridors / habitat & cool/clean water exclude conflicted areas west mult co			
97210	Our property will be 'designated' rural reserve...I'd like the zoning overlays to NOT become more restrictive. The "what does it mean" sheet talks of zoning change (or not).		Areas along Forest Park - as population increases, the demands on "escape" and natural areas increases... more park/rural reserve space needs to be protected.			We can't develop if the natural resources - water, etc. are not available to meet population needs - basic supplies need to be part of the equation.

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97210	Our property will be 'designated' rural reserve... I'd like the zoning overlap to NOT become more restrictive. The "what does it mean" sheet talks about zoning change (or not).		Areas along Forest Park - as population increases, the demands on "escape" and natural areas increases... more park/rural reserve, space needs to be protected.			
97211	Minimal or no expansion of the urban growth reserves and of the UGB. Save the rural areas for farmland and natural areas and develop the businesses and housing developments in the urban areas where there is already the infrastructure.	Limit the development of the rural areas of Washington County to the smallest possible areas.	Washington County areas are too large.	Protect "Foundation Lands" within the urban reserves		
97211	preservation of open spaces					
97211	Preserve the area north of Helvetia as a rural reserve which has a farm feeding more than 50 families	Preserve the area north of Helvetia Exit on Hwy 26 in Washington County as a rural reserve. There is at least I working farm which does a CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) for more than 50 families which not only needs to be preserved but the land around it needs to remain rural and undeveloped to avoid the pollution of traffic, etc. if the land surrounding it were to be developed. it has been in existence for more than 10 years and provides lots of healthy produce for so many people.	I'm not sure, exactly what the designation of the land I referred to above is but it should be preserved as rural.			
97211				Mult Co Folkenberg area for future residential development we need the increased tax base		
97211	High quality farmland is preserved within close proximity to urban centers. Any new development occurs in areas with or planned for high capacity transit. Protect and enhance natural areas and ecosystem functions. New development uses low impact development techniques, at a minimum.	Washington County. Candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation.	Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above. Clackamas County, Stafford basin/ north of the Willamette river: Focus urban reserves adjacent to I-5 and I-205 interchange. Exclude area north of the Tualatin River up to Lake Oswego.	All Counties. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97211		I ask that the Helvetia area(all WA. county North of hwy. 26) be removed from urban reserve consideration and that the West Hills also not b considered for possible Urban Reserve.				

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97211	I would like to see Helvetia designated as a rural reserve and taken out of consideration as an urban reserve.	Helvetia should NOT be an urban reserve but should rather remain rural.	Helvetia should be excluded from further study as an urban reserve. I am a member of a CSA on NW Dick Road and am extremely concerned about the impact of urbanization on this small family farm and many others. We live in Portland because of our proximity to family farms and rural/natural areas and would be devastated to see further development in this area.	Helvetia should be included as a Rural Reserve		
97211		Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?		I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97211	Don't understand question . . . less development, more nature.			3. Metro and the Counties should designate important natural landscape features and high value farmland as rural reserves that will be off-limits to urbanization. Specifically, Metro and the Counties should be considering the following additional areas as candidate rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97211	I would like to see important landscape features, critical habitat, and farmland protected. I'd like to see development occur in our existing urbanized area as much as possible.					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97211	No more expansion, please.	1. Metro and the Counties should limit the size of new urban reserves in order to save natural areas, farmland, and limited tax and ratepayer dollars available for public infrastructure. We need to save public dollars for new infrastructure to build great communities inside the existing UGB. Focusing development in our existing centers and corridors will also support vibrant walkable communities better served by transit, save rural lands, and help the region and the State achieve goals for reducing green-house gas emissions. 2. In accordance with state law, Metro should not designate urban reserves where important natural landscape features and high value farmland could be lost or irreparably jeopardized by future UGB expansions.	Metro and the Counties should designate important natural landscape features and high value farmland as rural reserves that will be off-limits to urbanization for the next 40-50 years. Specifically, Metro and the Counties should be considering the following additional areas as candidate rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County			
97211	Protected natural areas that are not included in urban reserves					We have lots of low density sprawl within our current UGB. We should not expand the UGB or add urban reserve designation to land outside the UGB until we have significantly increased the density in areas that are currently low density sprawl.
97211	Making West Multnomah County a rural reserve	I think West Multnomah County should be a rural reserve	West Multnomah County			
97211	Balance of job opportunities with retention of farm and forest and natural areas/parkland.					
97212		Please do not reclassify Helvetia! I believe it should be preserved.		Please do not reclassify Helvetia! I believe it should be preserved.		
97212	Designate more land as rural reserve, e.g., north of Hwy 26.		No. of Hwy 26.	Eliminate area N of 26 from consideration as urban reserve.		Only that I fought for this issue for almost a year, talking to Metro and to local groups. Since then, the rest of the world has fallen in love with Portland. I think it is because our efforts precluded the sprawl that besets the communities where our new arrivals grew up.
97212	preserving and supporting current farmlands and promoting the addition of more		Helvetia	Helvetia		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97212	Preserving the current natural and farm areas around the Portland Metro area, and wiser use of areas currently called 'urban': building up, not out; siting communities where public transit is completely accessible; dense urban housing; and vertical use of urban land (parking structures going up, not out; growing vegetation on horizontal and vertical surfaces to deal with rainwater run-off, etc.)	All land in the study area North of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES, NOT URBAN DEVELOPMENT!	All the study area north of Highway 26.	See above		I thought we already designated the UGB in order to eliminate this whole argument-- what happened?? I'm not very savvy in terms of local zoning, but this seemed like a simple, elegant, and effective solution to save some of the finest farmland and most beautiful natural areas in the world-- those just outside our urban area. As I am sure you are aware, the preservation of farm and natural land is of the utmost importance in our increasingly degraded world-- Oregon has long stood as an exemplary champion of these ideas. I find it disheartening that these changes are even being considered. I am happy to make my home in a very dense urban area where I have very little land I can call my own. I feel this way because I believe it is my moral duty to do so. I find the best employment, educational, and cultural opportunities for my family inside an urban area, but this does not mean that I have no opinion about the destruction of the beautiful natural areas that lie beyond it. Please act to protect, rather than erode away these precious lands! Th
97212	A plan that protects farmland and natural features and encourages redevelopment in the existing UGB.	remove West Hills remove Helvetia area from urban reserve consideration	west hills Helvetia			
97212	preservation of valuable natural areas and agricultural lands near and within the metropolitan area. development within the existing UGB rather than expansion of the UGB. Nearby access to nature!	In accordance with state law, Metro should not designate urban reserves where important natural landscape features and high value farmland could be lost or irreparably jeopardized by future UGB expansions. Therefore, the following additional areas should be considered as candidate rural reserves and should be off limits to urbanization for the next 40-50 years: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County				
97212	Continuing to encourage urban density, strong public transportation, and discouraging unchecked sprawl					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97212	Save the farms, develop the city's unused parking lots and buildings, save the city's park's and green spaces, though.		WA County North of 26			
97212	Not expanding the urban growth boundary and preserving farm land/farming communities	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are much too large. There are existing spaces being used inefficiently, so why expand further before you can make better use of existing infrastructure?	Washington County candidate areas.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		Encourage Washington Co to have public citizens on their advisory committee.
97212	Protection of as much land as possible in its natural state. Protection of forests without logging.					
97212	Viable farmland within 30 miles of Portland, along with public transport to service the farms.					
97212	-Much more Rural Reserves Space. - Rural Reserve in Helvetia and land North of Hwy 26. -Less Urban reserve space so that pressure is put on developing the more intensely within the UGB - A process that takes into consideration rising infrastructure costs and global warming	-Limitations on infrastructure costs necessary to accommodate land brought into Urban Reserves (i.e.- set threshold amount of funds; if improvements cost more than threshold they should not be considered as good urban reserve land). -Access to existing transit facilities and resources. New transit lines are expensive. Urban reserves should be nearer to what exists or what is planned for transit services.	Foundational farm land should be excluded. Food access and security is extremely important if the region wishes to continue on a path toward sustainable development.	- Rural reserves should take into further consideration farms that feed people! The economic factors applied to the farm industry don't adequately account for the positive effects of sustainably and locally grown food. All foundational land should be given greater weight in determining whether an area can be turned into an Urban Reserve. This land should be a Rural Reserve, period.		Development patterns inside the UGBs do not support Great Communities!! We need denser urban development in the core and more time for suburbs to efficiently fill in the spaces they have. The Urban Reserve candidate areas in Washington County are too large.
97212	Farm land being protected from urbanization.	The areas of Washington County north of Hi-way 26, especially Helvetia and the West Hills should be REMOVED from urbanization consideration.	The areas of Washington County north of Hi-way 26, especially Helvetia and the West Hills should be REMOVED from urbanization consideration.	Helvatia and West Hills in Washington County north of hi-way 26 do not need further study to remain rural reserve maps	The same - Helvatia and WEst Hills in Washington County north of hi-way 26 should be excluded from further study as a rural reserve.	

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97212	Numerous CSAs are situated in Washington County areas slated to be urban preserves. It would be better to keep these areas rural, to limit building and maintain these farms. I believe much urban growth could happen in areas that are already urban, but under utilized or under functioning. For example, again strip malls could be converted into higher density housing. This would accommodate growth, while enabling currently rural areas to stay that way. Keep the urban designations to a minimum, and away from working farms where possible. Otherwise the sprawl continues, and these farms' ability to serve local consumers is diminished. We're seeing more and more the benefits of eating locally-- reduced carbon footprint, healthier food, healthier local economies -- so let's do what we can to keep local farm areas viable.	See my previous comment re: keeping local farms and CSA producers "rural".	see previous comments. My own CSA is located near North Plains, and numerous others are there as well, so definitely that area. I know of another CSA near Troutdale (Dancing Roots). But really, any area where these small farms are located.	see previous comments		Glad we have processes like this in place, and that you solicit (and hopefully take into account) public input.
97213	protect wild areas Protect the farmlands		Helvetia (north of hwy 26) should be classified as reserved rural, NOT reserved urban.	Helvetia (north of hwy 26) should be classified as reserved rural, NOT reserved urban.		
97213	* All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES * All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves * Cities should be required to use existing land efficiently - replace vast parking lots with multi-story parking garages; redevelop underused areas into mixed-use communities served by mass transit.	* All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES * All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves * Cities should be required to use existing land efficiently - replace vast parking lots with multi-story parking garages; redevelop underused areas into mixed-use communities served by mass transit.	* All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES * All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	* All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES		As a city family, we treasure our close-in csa where we can help grow and harvest our own food. We welcome redevelopment within existing urban land. We wouldn't be able to be so involved if the farm were pushed out of Helvetia another 20-50 miles. And, Portland is famous for protecting its green spaces. Please honor that legacy. Please protect our farmland, forest land, and natural spaces. These are treasures which should not fall for more endless development.
97213	Retain rural reserve status and preserve 'close-in' working farmland, in Helvetia, north of Hwy. 26 where my CSA is located. My family enjoys the ability to help harvest and visit the farm where our food is grown.					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97213	Minimizing urban reserves and maximizing rural reserves - because once property is urbanized, it cannot go back.	Washington County is destroying agricultural opportunities in favor of urban sprawl - that I will have to pay for!!! The cost of urbanizing ag land far exceeds the amount of SDCs that are charged - and we taxpayers foot the bill. Has anyone contemplated the cost of this expansion? The grab for that amount of land is not sustainable - shame on them!		Western and northern parts of Washington county, especially the areas around Forest Grove. These are working farms for the most part - some leased, some owned.		
97213	We need to protect our farm land. Farms provide healthy, sustainable food and enrich community.	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Washington County candidate areas are too large.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		I belong to a CSA out in Helvetia. Having a small family run farm to take my family to on weekly basis is essential. My children understand where their food comes from and they connect with the earth. This is the direction we need to move in - locally grown organic food for the future of the planet and civilization.
97214	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves	
97214	keep the cities in the cities - stop the sprawl	Remove Helvetia from Urban Reserve consideration. Remove West Hills from Urban Reserve consideration		Keep Multnomah County and Washington County in Rural Reserve Area		
97214	no more new developments outside the urban growth boundary. keep rural land rural and develop a dense city with more public transit and bike/walk options.	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES. Cities should be required to use existing land efficiently - replace vast parking lots with multi-story parking garages; redevelop underused areas into mixed-use communities served by mass transit.	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be REMOVED from consideration as URBAN reserves.	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES.		keep the rural spaces rural. we don't want a sprawling city. we don't want to have communities like east vancouver. we want to have farms and forests and native, wild land close. the west hills should not be further developed. helvetia should not be further developed. thanks!
97214	Urban growth boundary; strict protections of natural areas; dense urban and suburban development.					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97214	Keeping development within the existing UGB, or expanding only where farmland isn't impacted.		I work near the Helvetia area, and it seems an obvious candidate for a rural reserve. With all the development in the immediate vicinity (Tanasbourne, Bethany), there's obvious thirst for more land. However, a simple drive or bike through the Helvetia area north of highway 26 shows what functioning farmland it is. Let's preserve that. We don't need more chain restaurants, malls, and cookie cutter houses. We need locally produced vegetables, local livestock, and open land.			Jobs are important, as is accommodating forecasted growth. But there are plenty of opportunities to do both before expanding the UGB. Pushing forward with the progress of "city centers" in town, encouraging development in under-developed areas within the UGB (like Damascus), and encouraging density where appropriate along urban corridors all could help address these needs without eliminating farmland, forest land, or natural areas.
97214	Save the best farmland from urbanization. Protect local "foodshed" and potential foodshed lands.					
97214	no more sprawl! more cycleways and streetcar, we need dense zoning and trains. We need to become like europe and asia! Please help before it's too late!	i'm just not familiar yet.				
97214	Remove the Helvetia area and the west hills from consideration for urban reserve.		Helvetia Area, west hills; remove these two from consideration.		Helvetia Area, west hills; remove these two from consideration.	
97214	Keeping urban growth boundaries. Using urban areas more efficiently, and protecting rural areas (farms & forests) from sub-urban sprawl.	The West Hills and Helvetia (Washington Co.) should be removed from the urban reserve maps.	the west hills & helvetia areas (see above) should remain rural reserves	I think we should preserve as much rural area as possible, and try to contain/maintain well-planned urban areas.		
97214	Protecting rural landscapes for beauty close to the city, and food production.	The areas north of hwy 26 and the West Hills should be removed from consideration.		The areas north of hwy 26 and the West Hills should be considered for rural reserves.		There are many areas within the UGB that could be further developed for commercial and residential uses. I do not feel that we should take more of the precious Willamette valley's natural areas (which would be nearly impossible to get back) for short-term gain.
97214	Protecting all current undeveloped land outside of the city. This unspoiled natural and rural beauty so close to the city center is a critical characteristic that make Portland special.	I'm disappointed by the amount of land being considered for Urban Reserve, especially in Washington County. This area should be reduced drastically or eliminated.	As much land should be removed as possible, particularly the West Hills and Helvetia area. Once this area is gone, we'll never get it back.	Much more land shall be added to the rural reserve area.		
97214	Keep as much of the area surrounding Portland rural and wild and bikeable					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97214	preserving high quality farm land. purchasing more natural areas to prevent their development. design review of all developments or other ways to insure quality development. Implement all the proposals in the Portland Climate Action Plan and expand it to the rest of the region.	i don't know.	I don't know			
97214		Please reserve Helvatia!!! Keep the working farms operable and keep the open spaces!	Helvetia!	Helvetia		
97214	I used to live in the Boston Metro area and there are so many farms on public land that is owned in trust by town or regional governments. This has left a landscape of working farms throughout the Metro area that was really incredible. In addition many of these farms, since they were already not privately owned, chose to operate as non profits and provide many educational benefits to the community as self-titled "Community Farms". Many of these farms were not in the outer suburbs, but truly within the network of suburban development around the city. I would love to see the Portland area have something along these lines. It would encourage small business, public-private entrepreneurship, good public health habits, and provide many community benefits.					
97214	Minimizing urban growth onto and near farmland					
97214	Compact urban reserves across the region and rural reserves which protect foundation and important farmland under threat of urbanization.	Washington County: Urban reserves are too big! Urban reserves should not be placed on foundation farmland or where transportation corridors are already overcrowded. Please better consider the costs of infrastructure to the taxpayers in the areas in which we are most likely to grow. Local aspirations have nothing to do with actual housing and growth needs. Please make it clear to the cities that they should be making better use of their existing infrastructure.	The large land mass around Hillsboro and Forest Grove is foundation farmland and should be preserved for future generations to enjoy the local harvest.	Washington County rural reserves should be better placed to protect the land under threat of urbanization, not just the land most likely to stay rural.		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97214	Maintain the current urban growth boundary and encourage sustainable development of business, neighborhoods, and infrastructure within that.	Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation.	Yes, Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97214	Designated space for rural as well as urban agriculture to remain intact if not to be increased.					
97214	Making sure existing working farms and natural areas stay the way they are. They are incredibly important to our health, and to the health of other living creatures on this Earth.					
97214	Protection of existing farmland Protection of prime farmland not currently being farmed Maintenance of the current UGB (no expansion) Support of development that builds walkable neighborhoods within the existing fabric.	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Yes, Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97214		The Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too big. Land within the Washington County Urban Growth Boundary isn't dense enough in its current state.	Yes, the Washington County areas are too big.	I would like to see the land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture protected within the rural reserves.		
97214	We should not expand the UGB	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Washington County	It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves •□Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed •□Mollala River corridor and floodplain •□Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff •□Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97214	One that preserves high value farmland, and future growth that increases the density of urban centers and maintains to the greatest extent possible the valuable open spaces on the urban fringe.	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Washington County.	It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97214	keeping farm land protected under rural reserves					We have been Community Supported Agriculture farm subscribers for nearly 8 years. We depend on the local farms in the area to provide our family with healthy, local and organic foods (year round.) Our farm is in North Plains, and we hope this area, along with other working farm land, will be preserved.
97214	Less new land developed on the edge of the region, more density and more high-quality greenspace within it.					
97214	Being able to continue to integrate shared open spaces with development.					
97215	Ensuring the #1 priority is current urban growth efficiency and density.	Washington county. Area north of Hwy 26 in the Helevetia area should be designated rural reserver areas.	Washington county. Area north of Hwy 26 in the Helevetia area should be designated rural reserver areas.	Washington county. Area north of Hwy 26 in the Helevetia area should be designated rural reserver areas.	Washington county. Area north of Hwy 26 in the Helevetia area should be designated rural reserver areas.	none
97215	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES		All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97215	Keep Helvetia as farmland. Do not designate it as urban reserves.	First, take Helvetia off your list of urban reserve areas. It is excellent farmland, and rural areas like this provide fresh CSA produce and environmental amenities like clean air and water, to nearby suburbs and cities, as well as emotional and spiritual benefits. Second, re-examine the assumption that we have to have "growth" under the conventional definition of economic growth. Growth for whose benefit? How about measuring quality of life and not just dollars earned or spent? The country of Bhutan measures their success this way. I am not convinced that there must be ANY urban reserve areas, or that the Metro area needs any more cities than it currently has. Our strong tourism industry is largely due to our having retained farmland like Helvetia. Our quality of life rests on farmland like Helvetia. Drop the idea that it should be designated as urban reserve. Consider that you might be asking us the wrong question altogether.	Helvetia farmland in Washington Co.	See above.	We need more rural reserves altogether.	
97215	Maintaining current rural reserves		Rural reserves north of Highway 26.			
97215						
97215	Protect open spaces/farms/forests	Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Yes, Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97215	protection of the Helvetia rural reserve area	please protect the Helvetia farming community as a rural reserve	Helvetia commnity of Washington county			

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97215	Limit the size of new urban reserves with no urban reserves where important natural landscape features and high value farmland exist. Set these areas aside as rural reserves off-limits to urbanization for the next 40-50 years.		These should be additional candidate rural reserves: * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County	Counties should consider the following natural features adjacent to the existing UGB as candidate rural reserves: • Nature Conservancy Conservation Priority Areas. • ODFW Conservation Opportunity Areas. • Metro Habitats of Concern. • Tier 1 and 2 Acquisition Target Areas under the 2006 Regional Bond Measure. • Floodplains along major rivers and their confluences. • Farm or forest lands providing buffers between the above landscape features and existing or future urbanization. The following should be candidate rural reserves: * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		There needs to be a more rigorous, credible and thorough means for evaluating the importance of surrounding natural areas, assessing their ecological value and the potential impacts from encroaching urbanization.
97215	Preserve as much farmland as possible.					
97216	Keep Helvetia as farmland. Do not designate it as urban reserves.					
97217	preserve small family farms in and around the Portland Metro area. Although, we have a need for urban development, we also must preserve the livelihoods of small farms. The Helvetia area is of particular interest because it is comprised of top quality agricultural land, that cannot be replaced. Once these lands are developed, these valuable crop lands will be permanently removed from production, and the community as a whole will suffer. Please avoid designating the areas north of Highway 26 as urban development lands.	I would like to see the preservation of small family farms in and around the Portland Metro area. Although, we have a need for urban development, we also must preserve the livelihoods of small farms. The Helvetia area is of particular interest because it is comprised of top quality agricultural land, that cannot be replaced. Once these lands are developed, these valuable crop lands will be permanently removed from production, and the community as a whole will suffer. Please avoid designating the areas north of Highway 26 as urban development lands.	Please exclude the Helvetia region North of Highway 26.			
97217	creating a boundary that limits development to the urban centers keeping in mind cultural significances.		land that is already being farmed on the city limits.			

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97217	Preserve class 1-3 soils for farming and high site index land for forestry	Exclude the west of Sandy river area in Multnomah County	Exclude the west of Sandy river area in Multnomah County			Thank you for doing this.
97217	Retention of Class 1-3 soils for farming. Retention of high site index soils for forestry.	Do not include class 1-3 soils	Area west of sandy river in Multnomah Co.			
97217	Reducing the urban growth boundary, especially in Washington County	Yes. Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too big - they should be made smaller.	Yes - Washington County candidate areas are too big.	I think that it's critical to protect ODA designated Foundation Land. Also, There are a number of natural areas that should be protected inside of rural reserves: Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff		
97217	preservation of high quality farmland	Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Yes, Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above.	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97217	maximize areas of natural, forest, and farm preservation!					
97217	Keep the UGB where it is!		Natural areas and productive agricultural land	Include the following areas: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97217	Focusing growth inside the current UGB. There appears to be enough space within the current UGB to accommodate projected growth. I would like to see limited or no new urban reserves.	Metro should not designate urban reserves where important natural landscape features and high value farmland could be lost or irreparably jeopardized by future UGB expansions.	Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County			

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97217	No Urban Reserves. Large Rural Reserves.	Eliminate or massively shrink urban reserves. Focus public infrastructure inside the UGB to redevelop parking lots and other underutilized sites appropriate for development.	High value natural areas and farm land. Examples: Don't encroach further on Forest Park. Stay clear of the Clackamas River. Avoid Tonquin Geological Area Make Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff a Rural Reserve. Don't urbanize south of the Willamette or on high value agricultural land and floodplains in Washington County. Avoid lands that drain to the Sandy River.	Expand them to include high-value natural features in Clackamas County, including: Toquin Geologic Area Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Willamette and Mollala River Floodplains Johnson Creek Deep Creek		
97217	Have natural areas and clean water streams in and around the city for people to enjoy walking, biking and observing wildlife. Bring birds and other wildlife back to the city. Create habitat for birds and other native wildlife.					
97217	If the area between Washington County and City of Portland were included in the UGB: 1. less prime farmland west and north of Hillsboro would be lost by development in NE Wash Co. 2. Better control of natural areas could be obtained by urban restrictions. 3. More efficient use of tax-payer money by building outside of the present CIGB. There would be no tax abatement in the newer areas. 4. Better communities could be developed if you start with good planning.	Multnomah - NW Hills between Skyline and the Washington Co line should be placed in the urban reserve area.				
97218		Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Yes, Washington County candidate areas are too large. See above	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves * Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		no

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97218	A heightening of counter-sprawl characteristics that set the PDX Metro area apart, as well as the processes that have led to that admirable distinctiveness. More specifically, a regional greenbelt with long-term protection.	Ideally, any and all; virtually no proposed urban reserve area meets any, let alone all, of the eight factors given, thus they should not be considered for future development. Sufficient land already exists within the current UGB to accommodate estimated pop. increases.	Northwest Multnomah Co., specifically "Northwest-south" area, is the most direct corridor for wildlife into Forest Park, which is of value to the entire metropolitan area; to urbanize NWS (either from Skyline ridge or through Bethany expansion) would only have a negative effect on Forest Park and city center, in addition to the NWS area itself.	Again, any and all areas - they should attempt to encompass all available lands as nearly every one is relevant to Natural Landscape Features.	Not at all. Ony mixed-use infill at high densities can create viable, livable communities. Arguments against density (high crime, congestion of traffic, etc.) generally derive more from unconscious ethnic bias and/or corporate interests than from an objective assessment of the situation. Once an area is developed, it remains that way forever.	
97218	Efficient use of existing urban land and underused areas while protecting the most farmland that is rich and productive, increases our local food resources, protects us from high transportation costs and eases contamination issues with non-local food, and allows the possibility of greater specialty food export, increasing those jobs.	Please remove the Helvetia areas (the area in Washington county north of Hwy 26) from Urban reserve consideration.	The Helvetia area (the area north of Hwy 26 in Washington county) and the West Hills area in Multnomah and Washington Counties should be removed from urban reserve consideration.	We sould think about designating farm area forever. The only way to stop truly save our farmlands is to designate the rich areas in perpetuity so that it doesn't allow developers to influence the process. Our farming areas are places where, once gone, can rarely be recovered. We have seen how important farming is to our area and feeding ourselves locally should be an important part of our ongoing safety in potential disasters, if nothing else. I would posit that our farms are more inportant and valuable as population increases, not less.	I approve of the currently proposed designations for the rural reserves.	I have heard that Vancouver, British Columbia has a strong farm preservation system. I think the point is that by permanently designating farm areas for food production and natural areas to preserve our water and air resources from pollution, we force urbanization into the areas least suitable for farming and takes the natural pressure from developers out of the process. It's really the only way to protect these areas in the long run with increasing population growth.

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97218	Thriving local agriculture (CSAs, urban silviculture, urban farming), protected green spaces and undeveloped lands, livable neighborhoods with more effective transportation alternatives.	Washington County candidate areas are too large. The UGB here could accomodate another 500,000 residents without any changes at all. I had to commute to Hillsboro for two years because Oregon's largest employer decided to build campuses on farmland. The Max was inadequate, so I was yet another car on the road. Allowing more sprawl in Washington County will not solve this, but make it worse. I'm very disappointed to see such a large candidate area covering these precious lands, much of it prime agricultural land. From my experience of Washington County, I believe the current urban lands are not developed efficiently enough to warrant any expansion. I also believe the only kind of development we'd see in these newly-acquired areas is more of the same: high-profit development of ugly industrial parks covering excessively large areas, excessively large homes dotting the formerly productive landscape, excessively wide and fast streets. Compare a satellite map of Portland from 20km elevation to Cologne, Germany at 20km. Portland city has less than 600k residents.	90% of the urban reserve area for Washington County is not needed. The land that has already been paved ought to be used more efficiently first.			
97218	Eliminate non-organic chemical use in parks. Use more of our park space to grow food and all our other green spaces now not being used for anything. Encourage city farms instead of lawns. Increase the number of live stock allowed in city limit and increase classes on management of the live stock.	Yes, Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large. Very little land within the current Washington County UGB is developed at urban densities that make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nor does the current pattern of development in Washington Co fit most of the other factors that must be considered for urban reserve designation. What suggests that the giant tracts of urban reserve candidate areas would be developed any differently?	Washington county UGB	I support Factor 4. It is important to protect land designated as "Foundation Land" by the Oregon Department of Agriculture within the rural reserves. In addition, I would like to see the following Natural Features to be protected within the rural reserves Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed Mollala River corridor and floodplain Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County The large lots on NE Simpson and Ainsworth to be designated PDX Farmers Quarters and used as a local food supply.		PDX UGB is a unique way in which we stop the spread of suburbs. Having grown up in LA where no restrictions existed and we lost all our green to cement I can testify that it is worth higher unemployment to preserve our way of life and secure a local food supply.

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97218	An approach that identifies opportunities for protecting and restoring our natural resources to an optimal condition for long-term sustainability including economic opportunity and equitable distribution of the benefits of that environmental protection and economic opportunities.		* Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed * Mollala River corridor and floodplain * Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff * Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County	While I am an advocate for sustainable forestry and agriculture, I am also a strong advocate for retaining natural areas purely for their value as natural areas and of course, the benefits that go along with those areas. These lands are nearly gone in this country and preserving them is vital to the health of our planet.		Please develop measurable, specific criteria that examines the social impacts of decision-making on people of color in the Metro region. People of color and the impacts to them and their communities is rarely done in planning processes such as these and the result historically is that fewer benefits of environmental protection and economic opportunity accrue to communities of color. Native Americans, Latinos, and African-Americans in the Metro region all share this experience over time. It is time for it to stop. How to reverse this trend? Create measurable, specific criteria that look at the impacts of your decision-making on these communities. Create accountability mechanisms to hold leaders accountable for these decisions. Reach out to these communities and ask for their priorities.
97218	Do NOT consider West Hills for an urban reserve. Remove the Helvetia area from Urban Reserve consideration. Build up, not out. We don't need more mansions or look-alike homes in suburbia. We need continuation of small family farms and we will need more small family farms in the future as oil becomes more scarce. Keep rural rural. We need food, not lawns.	Do NOT consider West Hills as a possible Urban Reserve. Remove Helvetia area from Urban Reserve consideration.	Do NOT consider West Hills as a possible Urban Reserve. Remove Helvetia area from Urban Reserve consideration.	Do NOT consider West Hills as a possible Urban Reserve Remove Helvetia area of Washington county from Urban Reserve Consideration	Do NOT consider West Hills as a possible Urban Reserve Remove Helvetia area of Washington county from Urban Reserve Consideration	Protect and encourage small family farms. We need more local food, not more useless lawns for suburbanites. Times are changing. Oil is becoming more scarce. No farms = no food.
97220	Farmland protection.	The areas in Washington County are too large. Urban development in Washington County should make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.	Washington County candidate urban reserve areas are too large.	Within the rural reserves, some natural features should be specifically protected: Clackamas Bluff and Deep Creek Watershed, Mollala River corridor and floodplain, Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff, and Johnson Creek Watershed in rural Clackamas County		
97221	To ensure that we have natural areas that are ecologically healthy, yet accessible to the growing metro population.		I think that several areas surrounding Forest Park in Washington County should be RURAL reserves and not ever marked for development	Areas surrounding Forest Park are candidates. I am supportive of rural reserves areas across the Tualatin Mountains, North Bethany and Sauvie Island.		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97221	Controlled development and protection of natural lands in the urban area and outside	Protection of Molalla River, Deep Creek, Clackamas River, Canemah area, and natural lands in urban areas such as Johnson Creek and Tryon Creek				
97227	maintaining working farms, forest land, and natural areas will create more space and jobs in the long run.					
97227	focus on more systematic development of existing urban areas, maintaining quality farm, rural, watershed and forest areas in close proximity urban areas	Please remove Helvetia from Urban Reserve consideration Please remove the west hills from urban reserve consideration	Please remove Helvetia from Urban Reserve consideration Please remove the west hills from urban reserve consideration			We can make much more efficient use of the existing urban land. This in combination with management and preservation of rural land will give the urban land higher value and higher stability in the long run.
97227	Ensuring that policy encourages dense, transit-oriented development in the existing urban core. Guaranteeing the continued existence of working farmlands close-in to the city - they are an invaluable economic asset and contribute to the vibrancy of Portland's culture.					
97232		All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES		All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES	All land in the study area north of Highway 26 should be designated as RURAL RESERVES	
97239	A formal policy of slowing population increase with the goal of zero growth, to be effectuated by increasing restrictions on land use zoning for single-family detached dwellings.	The "change" should be to stop changing them. Urban reserve areas should not be subject to the periodic review for the purpose of maintaining "a twenty-year supply of buildable land" as lobbied into law by the unholy trinity of bankers, realtors and house-builders. NOBODY wants to confront the simple fact that this process is unsustainable on the face of it. Even here in Smugsville-on-the-Willamette, we will ultimately be forced to admit that our vaunted have-our-cake-and-eat-it Triple Bottom Line floats on the fantasy of simultaneous maximization of multiple variables.	Any area with Class One agricultural soil. The buzz-word du jour in Sustainable City is a joke in the face of our passive acceptance of the "inevitability" of more people wanting more housing in the "country" outside Sustainable City and plunked on that flat land that house-builders find most profitable. The same flat land that might eventually have provided the localized food supply that would give a bit of validation to the myth of Sustainable City.	They should be treated by the same criteria as the urban reserve areas. They should be reserved in perpetuity for their present natural/forest/agriculture resource value.		The reserves process sets us apart from Atlanta and Las Vegas in that it will enable us to take longer to become Los Angeles. When planning boundaries are rubber bands and not walls, the growth processes that the planning process attempts to discipline are made merely less myopic, less chaotic, less wasteful, less undemocratic and, ultimately, less unsustainable. Instead of our children being screwed, it'll be their children. One could argue that that constitutes progress of a sort. After all, the grown-ups in Atlanta, Vegas and L.A. are already screwed.
97239	Focusing development in areas that are already zoned as such and maintaining the viability of rural areas for farming, natural and scenic values.	The concept of an "urban reserve" further encroaching on currently rural land is suspect. All areas on the map that extend urban reserved into land currently being used for farming should be removed and remain in a rural character.	As a native of Washington County, I believe that the areas set aside as "urban reserves" are too large.	I support Factor 4 as well as Natural area protections for the Molalla River area.		
97239	Preserve lands for growing food, especially those areas with good soils.					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Westside (West Hills, Sauvie Island, Multnomah Channel)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97239	Be liberal in apply rural reserves. Concentrate urban density in areas within the already urbanized areas. Require protection of tree canopy in the urban areas. Include "green" development and redevelopment practices. In other words require development in the urban areas that will support human health and quality of life in the high density areas as well.	Do not designate urban reserves in the Tualatin River floodplain in Washington County, the Tualatin Mountains in Multnomah and Washington Counties, and the Willamette Narrows/Canemah Bluff, Mollala River Floodplain, and the Tonquin Geological Area in Clackamas County.	Do not designate urban reserves in the Tualatin River floodplain in Washington County, the Tualatin Mountains in Multnomah and Washington Counties, and the Willamette Narrows/Canemah Bluff, Mollala River Floodplain, and the Tonquin Geological Area in Clackamas County.	Designate the Tualatin River floodplain and wetlands in Washington County, the Tualatin Mountains in Multnomah and Washington Counties, and the Willamette Narrows/Canemah Bluff, Mollala River Floodplain, and the Tonquin Geological Area in Clackamas County as rural reserves.		Redevelopment inside the UGB should be conducted in such a way that it does not degrade the quality of life that already exists. Accompany requirements for increasing density in the UGB with protections for tree canopy, natural areas, open spaces. Also require green redevelopment practices such as green streets, ecoroofs, and terrestrial restoration as mitigation for increased density.
97239	not having growth					

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Eastside (Government Islands, West of Sandy River, East of Sandy River)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97009		Areas north of study area along Hwy 26 should be URBAN RESERVES		Areas along major roads should be urban reserves	Areas near major highways and already having existing businesses	
97009		Have not been able to access the map		Have been unable to access the maps	Boring area along major highways	
97009	Keep masses of people where they belong – in the cities!					
97019	Maintaining UGB at the Sandy River. Designating Multnomah County East of Sandy River as rural reserve.		Multnomah County East of Sandy River			
97060	I would not object to fairly large parcels for housing.	Multnomah County; 322nd & Victory Road. Include in urban reserve.				
97060	Would like to see zoning changed to smaller one to five lots.	Multnomah County. 322nd & Victory Road				
97080		See accompanying letter - Sester Farms, Inc. dated May 4, 2009				
97080	Include Sam Barlow HS into the urban area to control traffic and allow sidewalks for students.	Multnomah County east. Include Barlow HS in URBAN area for kids' safety.			Barlow HS area. Safety!	
97080	Identifying the APPROPRIATE areas for urban and rural reserves.	Multnomah County; east of UGB, west of Sandy River. Should be included in urban reserves. Land has gentle, rolling slopes, ideal for development, close to roads and schools.				
97080	Keep area rural		97080. Last open and farming in Multnomah County.			
97080	Mostly urban reserve; some rural.					
97080	My optimal outcome would be to enable commercially viable farms to continue to generate returns, while allowing smaller, non-commercially viable plots to have further development, while fostering new commercial (not necessarily farming) ventures in the area.			Multnomah County; areas along Orient Dr., Pleasant Home and Troutdale Rd. Factors include having too small of lots to be commercially viable as farmland, and areas that are split between commercial land and rural land that are unbuildable due to water areas.		

Candidate Urban and Rural Reserves Questionnaire Online Survey Responses - Eastside (Government Islands, West of Sandy River, East of Sandy River)
 Received April 2009 through a "virtual open house" on the Metro web site

ZIP code	Outcome best meeting interests identified?	Applying UR factors - specific changes to the candidate UR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further UR study?	Applying RR factors - specific changes to the candidate RR maps?	Area that should be excluded from further RR study?	Additional comments re reserves process?
97080		Multnomah County; east (Oxbow Place) -- move this area out of urban development consideration.	Multnomah County east. Our area is productive/prime agricultural land and the Sandy River is a watershed area and is possibly one of the most scenic rivers/waterways in the state and definitely the county. Area also includes small area of old growth forest -- should not be disturbed.	Multnomah County east (Oxbow Park/Sandy River) -- would prefer this area be all rural. Stop UGB for next 50 years or more.		
97080	Don't extend the UGB any farther east so there's a buffer between the Sandy River and the UGB. The farm land is still good.		Multnomah County. North of US 26. It's some of the last farm land east of Portland. Once it's gone, it's gone.	Multnomah County. Keep east Multnomah County that's out of the UGB rural.		The pesticides local nurseries use and the amount of them being used undoubtedly will effect any new houses built (well, the people in them anyway). Soils should be well tested for them if this land is ever included in the new UGB. Literally tons of pesticides have been used -- just check -- the types and amounts are staggering. I'm guilty of it, too.
97080	Keeping hwy access, houses set back from hwys and the land looking natural and beautiful. We must curtail ugly development and allow for future road widening. Don't put houses against highways!			Multnomah County - at AKAnderson and 282nd. Candidate areas appear to be very large. Could a line within the area be marked to show an alternative (smaller) expansion?		Odd pieces of land, non-functioning should be taken from a reserve and marked developable.