

AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE

May 10, 1994 Hearing Room Tapes 22 - 24 MEMBERS PRESENT: SEN. RON CEASE, Chair SEN. BOB SHOEMAKER SEN. GORDON SMITH STAFF PRESENT: CHRIS WARNER, Committee Administrator PAMELLA ANDERSON, Committee Assistant MEASURES HEARD: SB 489 - WORK SESSION SB 122 - WORK SESSION SB 908 - WORK SESSION SB 1057 - WORK SESSION SB 675 - WORK SESSION SB 1067 - WORK SESSION - These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 22, SIDE A 005 CHAIR CEASE: Calls meeting to order Opens work session on SB 489 SB 489 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Greg Wolf, DLCD 010 CHAIR CEASE: SB 489 refers to farm use zones and aggregate removal Proposed amendments would provide moratoriums but not prohibit uses

Asks for sense of process, timing, and options if Departments were asked to review the larger issue and see what could be done in reference to Goal 5

019 GREG WOLF: DLCD has discussed this matter with the other agencies involved Believes could review Goal 5 process and take a look at existing statute which provides for extraction in an EFU zone, to determine whether those vehicles for resolutions of these problems are adequately SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 2

balancing the regional aggregate site needs with the regional characteristics of some of Oregon's best agricultural land.

Would do review during the interim. Would also provide additional direction to the counties currently engaged in the application of Goal 5 to clarify how we believe the Goal 5 process should be working in these kinds of cases.

In response to request from Chair Cease, would provide report to interim committee on the results of the outlined review.

039 MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves that DLCD, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, look at this issue and the relationship between aggregate and the prime agricultural lands in reference to Goal 5 and report to the committee on how best to proceed with the issue.

050 CHAIR CEASE: Emphasizes Class One through Class Four lands as those of particular interest, but not exclude other land classes. If motion is approved, will take the issue before the full committee and indicate our recommendation. 052 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Asks what the status of the lands for aggregate would be during the period of the study.

055 CHAIR CEASE: Believes status would be that the current state law and local regulations would proceed. The issue does not affect a lot of land, but it is a major issue and a conflict between two essential uses.

075 WOLF: DLCD will provide clarification to counties currently doing this work about how balancing should be occurring under the existing process. 085 VOTE: On a roll call vote, motion passes with Senators Shoemaker, G. Smith, and Cease voting Aye. 088 CHAIR CEASE: Closes work session on SB 489.

Opens work session on SB 675.

SB 675 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Dave Helgesen Pat Helgesen Dale

Blanton, DLCD .

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 3

Greg Wolf, DLCD Art Schlack, AOC Sen. Bob Kintigh

104 DAVE HELGESEN: Concerns focus on uses he sees could be incorporated into existing language. Concern has been that counties have allowed recreational activities in agricultural areas which occur at late hours and create a lot of noise. Believes "farm stand" should be defined. 143 PAT HELGESEN: Adds clarification on definition of farm stand she feels needs to be in the bill.

Lists other concerns and opinions and offers suggestions.

205 Concludes her testimony. 215 DALE BLANTON: Explains ORS 215.296 at the request of Sen. Shoemaker. 226 GREG WOLF: Reviews provisions of 5/1( '93 amendments to SB 675.

Reads legislative intent regarding some of the uses previously listed:

The proposed bill contained provisions for promotional events. That language was eliminated because the events were not land use issues. Activities such as school tours, fund raising events, and other limited duration events are accessory and incidental uses that promote the sales of farm crops raised on the farm and sold at farm stands. Such promotional activities, if added to the statute would create the misconception that other unlisted activities would be prohibited. Since the initial bill required such uses to be allowed subject to review, did not want to create the perception that a local land use hearing was required every time a farmer wanted to schedule a school tour, a harvest festival, or similar activity which is an incidental promotional event for their farm operation. Limited duration incidental public gatherings should simply be recognized as authorized activities under the land use statutes, and not regulated uses. The public's right to assemble for purposes of fund raising, education, or promotion of the sales of farm products is not an issue to be regulated by the exclusive farm use zoning. Should such occasional incidental uses become predominant use of the farm, such uses either become a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use or home occupation subject to county review. As long as such activities remain an incidental part of farm activities, there is no problem, in DLCD's opinion.

The county might have other avenues to regulate those sorts of activities which could come under the heading of a mass gathering permit, which is not a land use permit, in DLCD's opinion.

DLCD is satisfied with the language before the committee today. Believes it puts some protection in place that was not in the original proposal, but was found to be acceptable to the sponsor.

266 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Where does a cottage industry fall under land use rules?

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation

277 BLANTON: Cottage industries employing less than five employees who are not residents of the farms, and conducted in other buildings associated with the farm, are authorized uses subject to review under the 296 standard. Most counties also impose their own conditional use permit requirements in addition to the state standard. 305 SB 675 authorizes what some people have considered a commercial use in the farm zone that has retail characteristics. 315 CHAIR CEASE: Is farm stand definition an issue? 318WOLF: Could define "farm stand" if there is enough discomfort on the question. 329 ART SCHLACK: Farm stands are not usually defined in local land use regulations. Scale of activity is linked to products and what is being sold. 345 CHAIR CEASE: Asks if whether the crops are grown solely on the farm or brought in from elsewhere is an issue. 350 WOLF: Language would allow crops and livestock to be brought in from a larger area than just the farm where they were grown. Idea was to prevent farm stands from becoming a store. Clause could be further limited if committee chooses. 360 CHAIR CEASE: Asks if it is the intent of most farmers that they be able to sell produce from all over or whether most of them just selling their own produce. 366WOLF: Understands they are primarily selling their own produce and also items from the region in which they are located. 370 CHAIR CEASE: Asks if it would serve a purpose to say "grown on their own farms and in the immediate area"? 375 WOLF: Did not discuss that point with the sponsor. 380SCHLACK: Today's language is much better than what we saw last week.

Major issues when county planning directors reviewed SB 675 were intensity or scale of the activity and the fact that farm stands should be selling produce and livestock, and conducting agricultural related activities, either grown on the site or in the immediate vicinity.

Believes reference to "state" goes too far in defining allowable sales.

Activity at farm stand should be ancillary to the farm activity.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report ~ speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 5

Feels both 51 -49% and one third are too high, and would be more comfortable with 1520% as defining something ancillary to the major activities directly related to the farming or forest activities.

430 CHAIR CEASE: If you tighten up standards more than it is now, are you still giving the local farmer some real opportunity over what they currently have? Reviews options for amendment. 450 WOLF: Believes that would clarify the law in a way which would be beneficial to farmers even in that more narrow definition. "Surrounding area" or "region" language is probably preferable to the county language. Sen. Kintigh believed "one-third" language would be acceptable. Counties can be more restrictive than the statute.

TAPE 23, SIDE A

030 CHAIR CEASE: Asks subcommittee members for their input.  
035 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Tends to favor limiting the bill to the subject farm and the local agricultural area. Thinks 20% is appropriate for other incidental items. 038 SEN. G. SMITH: Favors leaving bill as it is.

Could agree with 25%.

048 CHAIR CEASE: Proposes to define farm stand, (a) would say "grown on site or in the local agricultural area", (b) would say "25% of the total sales". 050 MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves SB 675 to full committee with proposed changes. 060 Discussion of other aspects and ramifications of bill. 075 CHAIR CEASE: Will assume for the record that the container is part of the crop and not an accessory and not considered part of the incidental. 080 SEN. SHOEMAKER: How does SB 675 differ from ORS 215.296 which allows commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use? 088 WOLF: When one of the uses grows beyond the limitations in the bill it moves into (2) is a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use, and would be subject to review by local governing body prior to its approval. 108 CHAIR CEASE: Can the counties live with the 25%?

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 6

109 SCHLACK: Yes.

This would give people now looking at selling their produce on their farm a lot more than they can currently do without getting a conditional use permit for a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use.

115 CHAIR CEASE: Reviews proposal for Sen. Kintigh. 120 SEN. KINTIGH: Can accept proposed changes. 137 Comments on changes. 145 CHAIR CEASE: Will define farm stand, tighten up "primarily", and then local definition, and will go with 25%. 147 MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves conceptual amendments as outlined. 150 SEN. KINTIGH: Announces he has no conflict of interest. Does not retail. 161 VOTE: Motion carries with Senators Shoemaker, G. Smith, and Cease voting Aye. 165 CHAIR CEASE: Closes work session on SB 675. 166 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Requests that when bill comes before committee, committee members have a copy of ORS 215.296. 170 CHAIR CEASE: Opens work session on SB 122.

SB 122 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Burton Weast, Special Districts Association Phil Fell, LOC Brent Curtis, Oregon County Planning Directors Association Ken Martin, Portland Metropolitan Area Boundary Commission

Summary of SB 122, including provisions of HB 2217 is submitted for the record (EXHIBIT B).

170 BURTON WEAST: Expresses support for -5 amendments.

Summarizes SB 122-5.

Boundary commissions would review cooperative agreements but would not have veto power as long as the agreement complies with state law.

305 PHIL FELL, LOC: Concerns of League of Oregon Cities have been eased by changes made to the bill. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 7

Bill constitutes an unfunded mandate on local government, but language in the bill attempts to delay compliance with the bill until the next periodic review. That will limit the financial impact on local governments.

LOC is not opposed to the bill.

320 BRENT CURTIS: Testifies in support of SB 122-5 version.

Reviews counties' interest in discussion of the bill.

Concerned about effect of HB 2217 provisions and how that bill may impact counties and the Ballot Measure 5 situation. Our concern about that has been included in the bill.

Reviews page 13, sec. 13 (2) of the bill and expresses county planners' concern about the language in line 26.

Urges adoption of -5 version of the bill.

390 WEAST: Reviews bill to address concerns expressed by Curtis.

Intent of the language is to say that if you currently have agreements, it is not necessary to renegotiate.

Believes it is absolutely clear that (a) on 26 is subservient to (a) on line 22.

450 CHAIR CEASE: Will get an amendment or make intent clear before bill goes to full committee.

TAPE 22, SIDE B

030 FELL: Wants to check language against one city which has urban service agreements and make sure their urban service agreements cover everything required in the bill. 035 CHAIR CEASE: On the annexation issue, they would be able to put it to a vote only if they had these urban service agreements. 038 FELL: The vote would be a total vote within the city and the territory to be annexed.

040 WEAST: Believes that language protects the legitimate interests of the various units of government there and means you will not have this going on the ballot unless there was genuine consensus among the parties on how services were to be provided.

045 KEN MARTIN: Commission still opposes the bill because it doesn't see that the problem of coordination is significant. Believes this puts stringent requirements on local governments at a time when they do not have the resources to deal with them, and opens up a Pandora's box of issues that people can use to delay various proposals. Also oppose -5 amendments.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 8

Submits and paraphrases written testimony in opposition to SB 122-3 (EXHIBIT C).

080 CHAIR CEASE: Feels SB 122 is ready to go to the full committee.  
082 SEN. SHOEMAKER and CHAIR CEASE Discuss Boundary Commission concerns. 133 MARTIN: Position of Boundary Commission is that the state's perspective is what you get through the Boundary Commission, which is the agency required to look at governmental structure in a wider view, in terms of economy and efficiency. Concern is you can get agreements among all those units of government, and they may meet the minimum legal requirements, but be political decisions, rather than decisions based on good government concepts. Experience has been that that could happen and would not be the best in terms of governmental structure. 165 CHAIR CEASE: Reviews Boundary Commission history.

SB 122 provides for Metro involvement when agreements have a regional significance.

193 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Would that be true of urban service agreements that precede this 1993 Act which don't involve Metro? . 195 WEAST: Current statute requires agreements, but most people have not done them. Metro has the authority to get involved in any agreement with regional significance. Do not think there are any pre-existing agreements that would allow use of this annexation method. Metro's functional plan requirements still have to be met, so even if there is an old agreement, if it is inconsistent with Metro's functional transportation plan or any subsequent plan, that agreement would not be valid because it is contrary to the regional functional plan. Can not imagine a loophole that would allow someone to get around this. 210 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Metro will have to sign off on any annexation agreement within its UGB.

212 WEAST: If one of these coordination agreements or urban service agreements is developed with the express purpose of providing for this expedited annexation measure, can not imagine Metro determining that is not of regional significance and choosing not to become involved.

Metro is supportive, and the Council has taken a position in support of the bill. Metro staff has supported the -5 amendments.

220 MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves -5 amendments with proviso that we still need to have Sec. 13 (status of previous agreements) checked. VOTE: Without objection, -5 amendment is adopted with caveat. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 9

MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves SB 122 as amended to full committee with do pass recommendation.

VOTE: On a roll call vote, Senators Shoemaker, G. Smith, and Cease vote Aye.

235 CHAIR CEASE: Closes work session on SB 122.

Opens work session on SB 908.

SB 908 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Gary Conkling, Representing Beaverton School District Tanya McCombs, Portland School District Greg Wolf, DLCD Bruce Anderson, Oregon State Homebuilders

240 CHRIS WARNER, Committee Administrator: Reviews SB 908-2 amendments and changes needed. 267 GARY CONKLING: Reviews changes to SB 908: Bill refers to specific school districts that are experiencing high student enrollment growth. A city or county that just contains a small portion of a high growth district is not inadvertently brought under these provisions. A school district in high growth circumstances has an obligation to provide for a 20 year school facility plan that would be made part of a city or county comprehensive plan. A school district would be obliged to develop a school adequacy criteria for its individual facilities. Have provided that a city or county, through a cooperative agreement, would attempt to work out those criteria by consensus. Have changed what a high growth district is so that it is even more narrow than before. There is a 1994 deadline for all districts that would fall into this provision. Have provided for a situation where school districts, in coordination with cities or counties, could opt into these provisions on a voluntary basis. Would only affect large school districts with high growth. In response to request from Sen. G. Smith, bill is intended to make sure that a city or county is dealing off the same deck as a school district. Hopes the criteria can be the basis of consensus so that you have an objective baseline to determine whether you have room in particular schools. Purpose is to do planning. Currently, the only way school districts are involved is to be asked at the point of a development application whether they can handle the kids. We are trying, with the 20 year plan, to answer the objections of some of our critics who say school districts need to plan in advance. 360 SEN. G. SMITH: Asks if some other language could be used to reflect that schools are not asking for veto power, but involvement.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks represent a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 10

370 CONKLING: Open to any reasonable language.

Feels comfortable with amendments as do other members of the work group, with the exception of the home builders. Amendments are intended to respond to concerns expressed around the table.

404 TANYA McCOMBS: Concern was that under original bill, a decision to close a school would be a land use decision and would subject school districts to the entire land use appeal process. 440 GREG WOLF: Indicated in the work group that I did not believe that closing a school is a land use decision. Believes the issue is whether this bill would make it a land use decision. DLCD not believe it would.

TAPE 23, SIDE B

030 WOLF: Continues his testimony.

Notes language on page 3, line 26, SB 908-2 amendment to indicate closing a school is not a land use decision.

058 BRUCE ANDERSON: Homebuilders' problem with the bill centers around Section 2.

Not opposed to having planning done for schools and have always supported that idea. Believes the cooperative agreement process should lay out how school districts are to be kept informed on planning taking place and growth occurring, and provide a line of communication with cities and counties. Current cooperative agreement process has not yet been pursued by school districts.

Concerned that involving school districts in the comprehensive plan would present the potential for their involvement in declaring moratoriums.

If bill goes through as it is, is not sure Homebuilders could support it.

Believe other deadlines in bill are good ideas. If it is not school districts idea to declare moratoria, maybe we should say that in the bill.

Advisors have told him language in the bill is not clear and specific.

095 CHAIR CEASE: Can move bill forward to full committee with a recommendation, or take it to the full committee and indicate there is still one major issue to resolve. With language being suggested, not sure there would be anything left. 102 CONKLING: Thinks the choice represented by the proposal from the homebuilders is to say we will let you know about the growth going on as opposed to our proposal which puts school districts in the hard position of being engaged in the planning process. School districts have been criticized for not being part of the process. Are now saying we are willing to do it and try to do it through formal terms and with formal responsibilities.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SE NATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 11

Intent is not to tell cities and counties what they can and cannot approve, but to say let's be partners with the cities and counties so that we can plan with them, including planning for the finances in some reasonable way that does justice in comprehensive planning efforts as well as to the individuals who wind up applying for developments and get whipped around in a process which is unfair and uncertain.

130 SEN. G. SMITH: Suggests addition of "nothing in this Act shall be construed to give school districts power to declare a moratorium".

133 CONKLING: Do not know that school districts would ever claim they had the power or are seeking the power to declare building moratoriums. Cities and counties make determinations about land use applications. That is not school districts' business. Do not believe school districts would object to the intent of the language. Would be willing to work with other members of the work group on the particular language if it needs to be more artfully stated. 140 SEN. G. SMITH: Understands homebuilders' objection to be that they don't want schools to have the



power to declare moratoriums. 147 FELL: Would like to see language in section 2, lines 16 and 19 addressed.

Proposal to eliminate language in sections 3 and 4 (funding section) on page 2 of staff report will affect our position on the bill. , 160  
CONKLING: Funding for technical assistance was intended by Senator Cohen to come from a different source. Technical assistance money will be provided, but not from the General Fund so there was no need to reference the General Fund.

175 CHAIR CEASE: Can take the bill to the full committee and argue the issue of the homebuilders' amendment and the veto question or can ask you to take another look and bring it back to the subcommittee.  
180 CONKLING: Would prefer moving the bill forward. Makes commitment to work with the parties relative to the concern Senator Smith and Phil have raised to see if the issue can be more artfully stated and make very clear that school districts do not believe they now have, nor are they trying to get the ability to veto development. If we can provide those assurances, we will provide the amendment to the full committee.  
190 MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves to send SB 908 to the full committee with no recommendation, but feels it is an important piece of legislation with a couple of items that need to be worked out.  
196 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Are we sending the bill to the full committee with the -2 amendments as further amended?

lbeoo mmutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or wmmanzo ~  
ltements made during this se~on. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 12

198 CHAIR CEASE: Yes. We still have the veto issue, the funding issue, and the conflict between the homebuilders and supporting group to resolve. 202 VOTE: On a roll call vote, Senators Shoemaker, G. Smith, and Cease vote Aye. Motion carries. 204 CHAIR CEASE: Closes work session on SB 908.

Not yet ready to move on SB 1057 or SB 1067. Committee needs to be brought up to date on proposed amendments to the bills.

Opens work session on SB 1067.

SB 1067 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Sen. Rod Johnson Art Schlack, Oregon County Planning Directors Assn. Keith Bartholomew, 1,000 Friends of Oregon

220 SEN. JOHNSON: Tried to make the intent of SB 1067 more clear with the SB 106 7-2 proposed amendments. Distributes copy of letter of support for SB 1067 and proposed amendments from Evan Boone of the Oregon Pilots Association (EXHIBIT D). Reviews proposed SB 1067-2 amendments. 350 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Does not see provision that if the use permitted under this bill is abandoned, that right of use expires.  
358 SEN. JOHNSON: Jerry Ames of the Aeronautics Division showed me statutes or regulations that allows the Division to withdraw registration status if an airport is abandoned. 364 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Does that work under section 3 (1)? 370 SEN. JOHNSON: Could add language to give Aeronautics Division authority. 385 ART SCHLACK: County Planning Directors continue to express some concerns with SB

1067.

Believes there needs to be a clarification that we are talking about lawfully established uses.

"Substantial period" may mean different things to different people.

Have talked to Senator Johnson about language that could be inserted.  
SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May10,1994-Page13

Concerned with removal of the local review authority and responsibility as it relates to airports which have been reviewed through the local planning process. Would be more comfortable if local planning was still a part of the proposal.

445 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Had testimony from the Aeronautics Division that the lawfully established part is met by the provision that the bill only applies to airports that are licensed or registered with the Division.

455 SCHLACK: Believe you can receive that license from the state without having a local land use approval before the fact and can go to the state and get a registration and take that to the county planning department to go through the process. Some uses can be established that may have a state aeronautics certificate that would not be recognized from a local planning perspective.

TAPE 24, SIDE A

030 KEITH BARTHOLOMEW: Agrees with Mr. Schlack's points.

Thinks we have come to a point of trying to plan transportation facilities in an intermodal fashion, unifying transportation planning rather than segregating the planning of transportation facilities.

Thinks that this bill moves in the opposite direction by bifurcating the planning and permitting of airport facilities away from local governments.

Emphasizes there are a number of activities associated with airports that are not subject to license by the state Aeronautics Division. Gives example.

060 CHAIR CEASE: Closes work session on SB 106 7.

Opens work session on SB 1057.

SB 1057 - WORK SESSION Witnesses: Ken HUSB Y, ODOT Brian Gregor, ODOT Lucinda Moyano, Dept. of Justice Brent Curtis, Oregon County Planning Directors Assn. Keith Bartholomew, 1,000 Friends of Oregon

070 KEN HUSB Y: Reads written testimony reviewing reasons for, provisions of, and purpose of SB 1057 (EXHIBIT A). Gives example of project which is still on hold because of legal proceedings.

140 BRIAN GREGOR: If SB 1057 does not pass, in addition to the goal exception and a plan amendment, the highway alignment would have to be rezoned to something other than farm, for properties going through farms.

These minute. conhu' materials which paraphrase and/or sununarize statemenk made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation

marks report · speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings. please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 14

None of the highway projects that went across farm lands were rezoned.

Have been working with Brent Curtis of Washington County to resolve the concerns he raised at a previous work session. Have made some progress but still have a significant point regarding the exemption of minor realignments from the goal exception process.

Curtis has told us that the County Planning Directors believe the goal exception should be required only for new roads and major alignment, and we see some merit in his position.

Does not think consensus can be achieved with various players about the definition of the minor realignment.

Want to continue to work with the County Planning Directors, DLCD, and 1,000 Friends of Oregon but we believe research on our part will be required to allay any fears about the adverse impacts. Believe it is very important not to delay the basic law change we are requesting.

If the bill does not pass, thinks ODOT will be faced with spending time and money developing new zones and dealing with legal challenges which will limit our focus on making planning processes better.

180 LUCINDA MOYANO: Reviews modifications to SB 1057 following meeting with Brent Curtis and Washington County's legal counsel. Page 3 (t) should be (3) and modified to read "other transportation facilities and improvements not listed in (2) may be established in areas zoned for exclusive farm use where an exception to applicable statewide planning goals, including goals related to agricultural lands, has been adopted. Goal of taking it out of (2) and making it a separate subsection is that it won't be subject to provisions in ORS 215.296. Same sort of thing is listed under ORS 215.283 on page 7 and (f) will be made (3). (3) will read "subject to ORS 215.283, other transportation facilities and improvements not listed in (2) may be established, subject to the approval of the governing body or its designate, in any area zoned for exclusive farm use where an exception to applicable statewide planning goals, including goals related to agricultural lands, has been adopted. Changes have been agreed to by parties involved thus far. 215 BRENT CURTIS: Planning Directors are aware of the impact of the Schrock v. Linn County court case and agree a solution is needed. Disagree with solution offered by ODOT and DLCD. Submits and reviews May 10 letter and proposed amendments from Planning Directors Association (EXHIBIT E). Washington County proposed revisions to 4/1/93 draft of SB 1057 is submitted for the record (EXHIBIT F).

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. SENATE AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES May 10, 1994 - Page 15

315 There are other issues that have not been discussed which go beyond the issues we are now confined to. Fixing the Schrock case as

proposed by ODOT or Planning Directors is doable. Thinks system is benefited by Planning Directors proposal. Emphasizes that the Western Bypass will be required to have an exception. 360 KEITH BARTHOLOMEW:  
Is comfortable with language Ms. Moyano read into the

record.

Not as comfortable with some of Mr. Curtis' suggestions.

Intent of SB 1057 is to make technical corrections to the way we all thought Chapter 215 was supposed to work. Intent was not to launch into a new policy area to change major state law on the relationship between transportation and land use.

States reasons he is not comfortable with supporting either formulation presented by Mr. Curtis.

440 CHAIR CEASE: Closes Work Session on SB 1057 and adjourns meeting.

Transcribed by, Pat Zwick (/

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

A - SB 1057 - Ken HuSB v, ODOT - 2 pages B - SB 122 - Staff- 2 pages C - SB 122 - Ken Martin. Portland Metro Boundary Commission - 2 pages D - SB 1067 - Sen. Rod Johnson -1 page E - SB 1057 - Brent Curtis - 4 pages F - SB 1057 - Brent Curtis 3 pages

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks represent a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. ~ .