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President’s Message

By Brian Campbell, FAICP, OAPA President

2011 was a very active year for Oregon APA. The legislative session was surprisingly busy given the fairly even split between the parties. Several controversial bills with significant planning implications passed, and several didn’t. Our Legislative and Policy Affairs Committee (LPAC) had its hands full. We had two conferences and several well-attended workshops. It took great work from our members on the conference committees and the Professional Development Committee (PDC) to pull off those events. The Education and Outreach Committee (EOC) has been revitalized and become much more active with schools and the girl scouts. In addition we made some progress in our effort to incorporate sustainability principles into the day-to-day work of planners with the creation of the Sustainability Toolkit. The Board is very grateful to all of our members who have given so much of their time to make all of these efforts successful.

While 2012 won’t have two conferences and the same legislative intensity, there are a couple of activities I would like to highlight for the coming year. First, we are having our traditional Oregon APA Conference in Bend May 10th and 11th with mobile workshops Thursday afternoon and a full day of sessions on Friday. After our very successful bi-state conference last October, we are hoping for a good turnout when holding events outside the Portland area.

This next year will also see extensive follow-up on a series of activities that have been initiated by the Fellows of AICP in Oregon and Washington, and which came to a head with the October 19th Symposium held in conjunction with the bi-state conference. Almost two years ago the Oregon Fellows began talking about major issues that concern us and what we might be able to do about them. That conversation led to a meeting of the national presidents of APA, the American Institute of Architects and the American Society of Landscape Architects at the Railvolution conference in Portland in October 2010. We then held a session on what we called a Livability Challenge at the Boston APA conference last April. After that session consultations began with a group of Washington Fellows, and the idea was born for the Symposium this last October.

The product coming out of that event and the Livability Challenge session at the bi-state conference is a document called Creating Great Communities: Game Changing Initiatives and Actions. It is a distillation of the ideas generated by the 50 planners and allied professionals at the Symposium, plus comments from the conference session, responding to the major issues that make up the current political/economic crisis. It calls for planners, designers and related professionals to build the capacity for better public decision-making, foster a greater sense of community and common purpose, and take a stronger role in reforming our existing institutions and practices to be more responsive to these issues. Five Initiatives are articulated in the document, and we are hoping to form groups of professionals from throughout Oregon and Washington to get started working on each as soon as possible. There is also a section on Building the Foundation, which concentrates on actions that the two Northwest APA chapters and their members can take to establish an organizational base for this effort, and begin communicating with national APA about ways to discuss this at the Los Angeles conference in April.

This effort is, without doubt, very ambitious.
There is certainly no guarantee that we will be successful in making a significant impact. But, quite a few very experienced people have contributed to this, and have ownership in it.

The question is: Do we collectively have the will to do the hard work to initiate changes in our professional practices and institutions to ensure that these major issues are addressed at the local/regional, and eventually state and national levels?

I have asked the Oregon APA Board to “endorse” this document. (Jill Sterrett FAICP, APA Washington Chapter president, is asking her Board to do the same.) We are not asking to “adopt” any of this as formal policy at this point, and there is no requirement for Board or staff participation in any of the Initiatives or Actions.

The Bi-State Coordinating Committee would like formal recognition by the Boards, and for this document to be circulated widely under the auspices of our organizations, and those of our fellow professional groups. The committee is looking for members who want to contribute their time and creativity to this effort.

If you are interested, please look at the document on the OAPA website, and send me an email expressing an interest in helping out on a particular initiative. I can be reached at president@oregonapa.org.

---

Visit www.oregonapa.org for:
- Award Nomination Forms and Information
- Scholarships
- Sponsorship Opportunities

Make your room reservation now!
RIVERHOUSE HOTEL & CONVENTION CENTER
- Phone: 800-547-3928
- Room Rate – $102.00 plus tax single/double. Ask for the Oregon American Planning Association Conference room rate. Room block will be released April 10, 2012.

REGISTER TODAY at:
www.oregonapa.org/BendConference/
Amendments to the Transportation Planning Rule and Oregon Highway Plan

By Matt Crall, Department of Land Conservation and Development, Kristina Evanoff, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Michael Rock, Oregon Department of Transportation

In recent years, local government officials, developers, and others have argued that the combination of the Transportation Planning Rules (TPR) with the mobility standards in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) sometimes lead to unintended consequences. One common theme was that although economic development and transportation objectives are supposed to be balanced, in practice the TPR and OHP often gave priority to transportation mobility. Another theme was that the TPR and OHP sometimes make it difficult to increase development intensities, especially in urban centers, thereby hindering state planning goals and local community objectives. To address these and related issues, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) recently amended the TPR and the OHP, respectively. The amendments streamline the regulatory process and better balance TPR and OHP policy with other state and local policy objectives.

Transportation Planning Rules (TPR)

LCDC adopted the TPR in 1991 to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12 and to provide “transportation systems adequate to serve statewide, regional and local transportation needs” (Oregon Administrative Rules 660-012-0000(1)(a)). The rules require that local governments prepare a Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Ideally a local government will have land use plans (including zoning and development regulations) that are consistent with the TSP. In reality, most local governments have land use plans that would allow development that would likely generate traffic beyond what the transportation system can accommodate without congestion, and the funding to add capacity is not reasonably likely to be available.

Although LCDC recognized this imbalance, the TPR did not require local governments to reexamine existing zoning to rebalance land use and transportation. Nor did the TPR place any additional limitations on the development of land already zoned appropriately for the proposed development. LCDC did, however, include one rule within the TPR intended to address the imbalance over time and prevent the imbalance...
from getting worse. This rule (OAR 660-012-0060, hereafter TPR 0060) only applies when a local government proposes to amend “a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map)” (TPR 0060(1)). The rule is most commonly applied during rezoning, and most of this article focuses on rezoning.

TPR 0060 requires that a local government determine whether a rezoning (or other amendment) would “significantly affect” the transportation system. TPR 0060(1) lists several possible outcomes that would constitute a significant effect, but one of them is by far the most common issue: “Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility such that it would not meet the performance standards.” If the local government determines that the rezoning would significantly affect transportation, then section (2) lists the range of potential corrective actions to “ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility measured at the end of the planning period.”

Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)

The OHP is the modal transportation plan for the state highway system adopted by the OTC in 1999 (though it has been amended frequently). It covers a broad range of planning and management strategies for state highways with policy areas that include system classification, freight system objectives, considerations for integrating land use and transportation, major improvement policies, access management objectives, multimodal considerations, and discussions of environmental resources. One area of the OHP that receives a great deal of attention is Policy 1F (Highway Mobility Policy) since it establishes mobility objectives that are reasonable and consistent with other OHP policies. The OHP mobility targets (previously referred to as mobility standards) are used to identify state highway performance expectations for transportation system planning and to review plan amendments as required by TPR 0060 to determine whether they would significantly affect a state highway.

Process: Joint Subcommittee

In response to the concerns about the interaction between the TPR and the OHP, the two commissions appointed a Joint Subcommittee in January 2011 to study and prioritize the issues that needed to be addressed, and to define the process for jointly addressing the concerns.

Over the course of three meetings, the joint subcommittee participated in a panel discussion, took some three hours of public testimony, and received at least 35 pieces of written testimony. To help assess priorities, an online survey was conducted with 84 responses received.

Based on this input, the Joint Subcommittee identified two lists of recommended items to address:

TPR Amendments

A1. Exempt rezonings consistent with comprehensive plan map designations

A2. Offer practical mitigation options for economic development projects

A3. Exempt upzonings in urban centers

A4. Address traffic at time of urban growth boundary expansion

A5. Make technical clarifications: transportation system plan (TSP) update and multiple planning periods

OHP Amendments and Guidance

B1. Exempt proposals with small increase in traffic

B2. Use average trip generation, not reasonable worst case

B3. Streamline alternate mobility standard development

B4. Corridor or area mobility standards
B5. Standardize a policy framework for considering measures other than volume to capacity ratios (v/c)


The OTC concurred with the recommendation at its meeting April 20, 2011 and LCDC initiated rulemaking at its meeting April 21, 2011.

Legislation – Senate Bill 795

The OHP and TPR were also topics of interest during the 2011 Legislative Session. Senate Bill (SB) 795 was enacted to require the commissions to review and amend the TPR and OHP. Legislators recognized that the two commissions had already initiated the review and thus SB 795 incorporated the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee. The legislation set a deadline of January 1, 2012 for adoption of the amendments resulting from the review. SB 795 also required reports to the legislature, which are available online at the OHP and TPR project websites (see below).

TPR Process

To help draft TPR amendments LCDC established a rules advisory committee (RAC) with 22 members representing a broad spectrum of interests, including local governments, economic development, transportation planning and public interest representatives. The committee met six times between June and September 2011 and proposed amendments that were published for public review and comment in October. After receiving over 30 written comments and holding a public hearing on December 8, 2011, LCDC revised and then adopted rule amendments, which took effect January 1, 2012.

OHP Process

ODOT considered the input received during the Joint Subcommittee process and earlier stakeholder efforts to draft initial revisions to OHP Policy 1F. ODOT also sought additional input from the RAC. The draft policy was the focus of an extensive public review and outreach effort in Fall 2011. Following the public comment period, staff incorporated the feedback received and prepared final draft policy revisions for OTC review. The OTC adopted OHP Policy 1F revisions at its December 21, 2011 meeting.

TPR Amendments

The TPR changes that came out of this process addressed items from the Joint Subcommittee recommendation, an item added by SB 795, and included two additional amendments added by the RAC. The complete text of the amended TPR (with a summary of the changes) is available online at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/docs/rulemaking/2009-11/TPR/TPR_Amendments-Legislative_Report.pdf.

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation

A1 – Exempt rezonings consistent with comprehensive plan map designations

The amendments added a new section (9) within TPR 0060 to address this item. It states that if a proposed rezoning is consistent with the existing comprehensive plan map designation and the acknowledged TSP, then it can be approved without an analysis of the effect on the transportation system. The intent is to avoid redundant studies when a transportation analysis has already been conducted. This amendment confirms an approach that has previously been
used in some cases; however, without specific language in TPR 0060 the treatment of these situations has not been consistent.

**Joint Subcommittee Recommendation A2 – Practical mitigation options for economic development projects**

Section (11) was added to TPR 0060 to allow for greater flexibility when land is rezoned to facilitate economic development. This section permits a local government to approve a rezoning for economic development with only partial mitigation of traffic impacts. Economic development is defined in some detail, but partial mitigation is not defined because it will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. This section gives each level of government (e.g. state, county or city) authority to determine an adequate level of partial mitigation if their facility would be affected.

The amendment creates one definition for economic development that can be applied anywhere in the state and a broader definition that can only be used in smaller cities.

The statewide definition says that a proposed rezoning is for economic development if it allows (and is limited to) uses that are “industrial or traded-sector.” These terms are further defined as follows:

“(i) ‘industrial’ means employment activities generating income from the production, handling or distribution of goods including, but not limited to, manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, processing, storage, logistics, warehousing, importation, distribution and transshipment and research and development.

(ii) ‘traded-sector’ means industries in which member firms sell their goods or services into markets for which national or international competition exists.”

A broader definition applies in cities with populations below 10,000 that are outside of a metropolitan area and outside the Willamette Valley. The broader definition adds “prime industrial land” and “other employment uses.” This would include the widest range of employment activities. Retail, including big-box retail, is an important example of a use that is allowed under the broader definition, but not in the statewide definition.

This section requires coordination with a broad range of state, regional and other local governments that would be affected by the decision. The coordination requirement does not, however, give other agencies authority to block a local rezoning decision. Approval authority belongs only to governments with direct jurisdiction over an affected transportation facility (e.g., ODOT if a state highway is affected, the county if a county road is affected and the city of a city street is affected).

**Joint Subcommittee Recommendation A3 – Exempt upzonings in urban centers**

Section (10) was added to ensure that TPR 0060 does not interfere with compact urban development in appropriate locations. This section allows local governments to designate Multi-Modal Mixed-Use Areas (MMA) where traffic congestion need not be considered when evaluating a rezoning or amending development regulations to allow more density in an existing zone.

To qualify as an MMA, the area must allow a range of uses such as residential (allowing at least 12 units per acre), offices, retail, services, restaurants, parks, plazas, civic, and cultural uses. Furthermore the development regulations for the area must be appropriate to an urban center. The zoning cannot allow (or must at least limit) low-intensity uses such as industrial, automobile sales, automobile services and drive-throughs.

If a local government proposes an MMA near a freeway interchange, the local government must get concurrence from ODOT after considering potential safety and operational impacts. For
example, there is the potential for backups on the off-ramps, the local government and ODOT must reach an agreement about how they would be addressed. These additional requirements only apply during the designation process. Once the MMA is designated, it exempts the local government from having to consider congestion, even near the interchange.

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation A4 – Address Traffic at Time of Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Expansion

This issue was included in the list because early discussion with the joint subcommittee flagged it as a potential concern. The RAC discussed this item and concluded that the current rules provide appropriate flexibility that allows local governments to address traffic at the time of a UGB expansion or when the land is actually rezoned for development. No changes were made.

Additional item from SB 795 – Avoid Further Degradation

SB 795 added an item referring to section (3) of TPR 0060. This section allows for a relaxed standard in cases where the transportation system does not meet performance standards even without additional traffic from a proposed rezoning. In this situation it would be unreasonable to require the rezoning be accompanied by enough transportation mitigation to meet performance standards. Instead, section (3) requires mitigation that “avoids further degradation,” which means mitigation proportional to the impact.

The amendments make it easier to qualify for section (3) by deleting a requirement that the system has already failed before section (3) can be used. The rule now focuses on projected future conditions to determine whether mitigation that merely avoids further degradation is acceptable. The result is that more projects will qualify for this type of proportional mitigation.

Additional Item from the RAC – Mitigation Options for Other Modes, Facilities, or Locations

The amendments to TPR 0060 add a new subsection (2) (e) with three new options for corrective actions in response to a rezoning that would significantly affect the transportation system. These options include improvements to:

- Other modes (example: the significant effect is motor vehicle traffic congestion, the mitigation could be adding sidewalks and bicycle lanes).
- Other facilities (example: the significant effect occurs along one street, the mitigation could be on another parallel street).
- Other locations (example: the significant effect occurs at one intersection, the mitigation could be at other intersections along the same highway).

This subsection requires concurrence by the governments with jurisdiction over the transportation network that would be affected, as with the requirement in the new section (11).

Additional Item from the RAC – Account for Transportation Demand Management in Determinations of Significant Effect

The amendments change the definition of “significant effect” in subsection (1)(c) to allow local governments to account for transportation demand management (TDM) – or any other enforceable, ongoing method of reducing traffic generation – before determining whether the rezoning would have a significant effect.

Before this amendment, TDM was generally treated as mitigation in response to a finding of significant effect. In many cases the end result is the same either way it is calculated; however, if TDM eliminates the finding of significant effect then there is no need for further traffic analysis and it may be easier to approve the rezoning.

OHP Amendments

The revisions to OHP Policy 1F resulted in a significant rewrite to the original 1999 text. The
OHP revisions, coupled with the coordinated amendments to the TPR, achieve greater balance between transportation planning and economic and community development objectives. The revisions offer greater flexibility for local jurisdictions and the state to work with mobility targets on the state highway system, reduce burdens for development interests to address their proportional impacts, and set more realistic expectations for mobility objectives, especially in the state’s urban areas. A brief summary of the significant policy changes is provided below. The complete text of the amended OHP is available online: [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/OHP11/PolicyAdopted.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/OHP11/PolicyAdopted.pdf).

**Broaden policy considerations**

OHP Policy 1F is broadened to better implement and balance other OHP policies, policy objectives in the state’s multimodal Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), and community objectives for economic development, community development and livability.

**Mobility targets**

The revised policy changes the term “mobility standards” to “mobility targets.” The intent of this change is for mobility objectives to be thought of as a “target” level when developing transportation system and facility plans. This is where the state and local jurisdiction may jointly take a broad look at what is viable for facilities in an area and potentially consider alternative mobility objectives and targets for the area. Mobility targets are thus considered the start of the discussion rather than a required end result or solution during system and facility planning efforts. However, it is important to note that for more refined implementation purposes, such as compliance with the TPR, including TPR 0060, the mobility targets are defined, considered and treated as standards. This ensures compliance with applicable rules (e.g. the TPR) and provides legal certainty for detailed implementation of the policy.

**Reduced burden for small increases in traffic**

OHP Policy 1F establishes thresholds and provides less stringent requirements for plan amendments that may generate a small increase in traffic on congested state facilities.

**Enhanced development of alternative mobility targets**

While the initial mobility targets in the OHP remain volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c)-based, policy revisions allow consideration of other performance measures, encourage broader consideration of mobility through modes and facilities beyond just state highways, and more clearly allow consideration of corridor or area mobility targets. This flexibility is provided when developing alternatives to current mobility objectives through system and facility planning work. These considerations are in addition to previous options for changing v/c-based target levels and/or v/c-based methodologies – e.g., changing the hour of day measured or considering multiple hour measures when developing alternative mobility targets.

**Implementing actions**

The revised policy and new action statements clarify the roles and applicability of OHP mobility targets in different ODOT application areas including access management considerations (consistent with parallel ODOT efforts with changes to the access management program) and considerations for operational improvements. The policy also enhances coordination between planning and design expectations for mobility through ongoing work.

**Revised OHP tables**

The mobility tables contained in OHP Policy 1F (Tables 6 and 7) are revised to recognize changes since their original development in 1999 such as increased travel and growing financial constraints. Changes were not made to the v/c-ratio targets for facilities outside of urban growth boundaries to recognize the important functions, requirements and safety considerations of rural facilities.
Conclusion

LCDC and OTC recognized that the TPR and OHP were having unintended consequences, especially when the combination made it difficult to rezone land for economic development or for compact urban development. Working through a joint-subcommittee, the commissions recommended general issues that needed to be addressed to better balance transportation mobility with other important goals. DLCD and ODOT worked together in a coordinated process to draft amendments to the TPR and OHP consistent with these recommendations and the requirements of SB 795. Both commissions have completed the process to adopt their respective amendments; however, the commissions and agencies recognize that continued work will be necessary to implement and provide guidance on the revised rule and policy.

For more information

Additional information about the TPR amendment discussed in this article is available on the project website at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml.

Additional information about the OHP policy revisions discussed in this article is available on the project website at: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OHP2011.shtml.

Both sites will include additional guidance materials as they are developed and announcements of outreach and training events.

Email List

To receive announcement regarding training events or updated guidance documents, please send an email to matthew.crall@state.or.us to request to be added to the email list.

Matt Crall is a Land Use and Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Michael Rock is a Principal Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation, and Kristina Evanoff is a Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
Climate Smart Communities

By Kathryn Harrington, Metro Councilor

The Oregon State Legislature in prior sessions (2007), defined targets for our state to reduce our contribution to climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. There is a statewide program going on (more at www.keeporegoncool.com.) Through the Jobs and Transportation Act in 2009 (HB 2001), our metropolitan region was tasked with a program to sort out how we will reduce those emissions for light-duty vehicles, to help meet the state’s overall GHG emission goals.

To set out, we first analyzed our region’s baseline greenhouse gas emissions. Then we defined a three phase program to focus on the light-duty vehicle aspect. We now have the results of a first ever analysis for this project, what is referred to as the phase 1 findings, ‘Phase 1, Understanding Our Choices.’ Local elected bodies and advisory committees throughout the region helped shape the direction for the development of these findings. The first phase consisted of testing strategies and policies on a regional level and reviewing published research on the strategies tested. It is now an important time for all of us to understand these findings both individually and together. (For your convenience, I have attached a PDF file to this email with the various current documents for this program, though the findings document is a link as it proved to be a little too large to just email.)

The Phase 1 findings provide the information foundation for decision-making to come in future phases; Phase 2-Shaping the Direction by selecting the key elements to define alternative scenarios to be tested by autumn of year, and then Phase 3 reviewing and refining that draft preferred scenario to ultimately adopt a preferred strategy.

Phase 2, the second phase will allow more detailed analysis of alternative strategies and policies for different communities within the region. This will allow for variation and local goals to be realized even as we reach for the region-wide goal of emissions reduction. In order to proceed and succeed with the next phase, we all need to understand the first phase findings.

We have learned a lot from this first phase that I would like to share – it’s good news! The greenhouse gas emissions level defined for 2005 was 4.05 MT CO2e (that’s million tons of carbon dioxide emissions per capita.) We are required to meet a level of 1.2 by the year 2035. 2035 is the same planning time horizon for our regional transportation plan and our land use planning efforts, so it is a familiar timeframe. Our current adopted policies and programs (which extend to 2035) – plans which your community is working hard to implement in meeting its local aspirations, are estimated to get our GHG emissions level down to a 1.80 level. That is significantly good progress. New fleet and technology assumptions are expected to get the level down to 1.51. We just need to figure out how to get down to the defined 1.20 level.

From these findings, we now know that hitting these targets is possible, it is doable and within our reach. We also now know what it might take
through various policy alternatives. Near term, let’s build our understanding of this. Beyond that, in the seasons ahead (Phase 2 and 3) decisions will be made by local elected officials through-out the region together focusing on what we can and will work on to achieve the stated requirements.

This is the one state mandated policy program that is before the Metro Council this year, and it will continue into 2013. Later this year, in the fall, local elected officials throughout the region will be discussing how fine-tuning the community shaping work in each of their local communities might help satisfy the regional level requirements that the state is requiring of all of us.

Note: Climate Smart Communities Scenarios

Project Information pointer: www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=36945.

A short newsfeed item on the project can be found at news.oregonmetro.gov/1/post.cfm/metro-council-accepts-findings-on-climate-scenario-planning?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+OregonMetroNews+%28Metro+news%29.

Kathryn Harrington is the District 4 Metro Councilor. Before entering public service, Councilor Harrington built a 22-year career in the high-tech industry.
Coastal Adaptation and Resilience Issues: A City Planner Speaks

By Kitty Fahey, NOAA Coastal Services Center

Coastal officials with adaptation and resilience plans in place stand a much better chance of weathering the challenges that accompany flood-related hazards such as tsunamis, storm surge, and sea level rise.

One of the top concerns for Rainmar Bartl, the planner for Oregon’s City of Cannon Beach, is addressing the risks posed by tsunamis. Some coastal communities in the U.S. Pacific Northwest are vulnerable to the same type of tsunami that has caused devastation in Japan, Sumatra, and Chile.

Cannon Beach has access to up-to-date inundation maps, thanks to the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries. The city also is working to establish cache sites, where emergency supplies such as tarps and energy bars can be stored and used by survivors. But more remains to be done.

Bartl and city officials are considering capital improvements that would make multi-use buildings and bridge designs more resistant to earthquakes and tsunamis. The improvements would help residents, and thousands of seasonal tourists, to evacuate “vertically,” into elevated buildings.

“Years ago, to keep downtown from flooding, the town diked a small coastal stream. We need plans in place to keep the dike from being overtopped in the event that more intense flooding, storms, or sea level rise happens,” says Bartl.

CanVis enables viewers to visualize the impact of sea level rise and other coastal changes.

CREDIT: VICKI ELMER
Digital Coast Aids Adaptation and Resilience Planning

The Digital Coast can help Oregon’s coastal planners who are confronting a wide range of adaptation and resilience concerns. Digital Coast is an online suite of data, tools, and trainings for coastal planners and other officials who want to conserve and protect coastal communities and natural resources.

Many Digital Coast online trainings and webinars have been approved for certification maintenance credits for planners. The American Planning Association is a partner in the Digital Coast effort, which is led by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Coastal Services Center.

To learn about Digital Coast resources, see the list below and visit www.csc.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/.

**CanVis Software and Training** – Enable users to create realistic simulations of coastal changes, simply by using local digital images and choosing from a library of more than 700 objects.

**Coastal County Snapshots** – Turns complex data into easy-to-understand local facts on coastal hazards or the number of jobs that depend on the oceans.

**Coastal Inundation Toolkit** – Enables planners or their technical personnel to understand the causes of inundation, visualize inundation, identify potential vulnerabilities, and communicate effectively to initiate change.

**Digital Coast Webinars** – Introduce coastal professionals to Digital Coast tools and data through demonstrations, case studies, and opportunities to engage with experts and colleagues.

**Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW) Data** – Describe six economic sectors that depend on the oceans and Great Lakes and include annual time-series data for 448 coastal counties and 30 coastal states.

**Roadmap for Adapting to Coastal Risk Virtual Training** – Helps participants characterize their exposure to hazard and climate threats and consider how plans and policies already on the books can jump-start adaptation strategies.
An Urban Design Charrette in a High School Setting

By Jon Gottshall, Beaverton’s Arts and Communication Magnet Academy

I teach photography and social studies at a public art magnet school in Beaverton Oregon. Beaverton is a first tier suburb just to the west of Portland, a town that has grown explosively over the past 25 years, since Tektronix, Intel and Nike decided to settle into the neighborhood.

Beaverton’s growth has been rapid, but the only real planning done to guide the direction of the growth has been done by METRO, the regional government that established the metropolitan area’s growth boundary and directs the regional transportation priorities.

Having said that, Beaverton has been in the process of developing and adopting a new Civic Plan, its first new growth plan in 40 years. The plan has involved a great deal of citizen involvement and input. While all the planning work, citizen involvement, and democratic processes evolved toward a progressive and workable plan, we in the public schools taught our classes as if there was nothing new to report or attend to. History classes focused on the long ago or far away, economics dealt with the broad themes of capitalist enterprise, and government and civics classes turned as usual toward national and state capitals. Never in my life have I ever had a class concerned with the town I lived in; every adult I’ve asked in the past two years, people from all walks of life, have all nodded in agreement with my experience. The more I think about it, the stranger this thought becomes. Our hometowns don’t merit any attention in school, and they never have. Why is that?

As a photography teacher, I would often have students approach me and ask about doing a series of landscape photographs, the type popularized by Ansel Adams, highlighting the beauty of unspoiled nature. I would occasionally try to redirect their efforts to pay attention to a more contemporary concern: is nature really unspoiled? Where do nature and culture meet and interact? How does our society impact the natural world? I would ask them: “do you know what the Urban Growth Boundary is? You might try to explore the concept of that boundary as a modern landscape.”

Usually I got a blank look in return for my comment. They thought the idea was interesting, but what’s this growth boundary thing? Rarely did any of my students—juniors and seniors, mostly—know anything about the single most important feature directing growth in their hometown. They hadn’t heard of METRO, in spite of the fact that their parents elect the METRO councilors, the agency collects their garbage and recycling and runs the regional zoo. Students knew nothing about Oregon’s historic land-use laws, never heard of Senate Bill 100 or knew who Oregon’s most famous governor, Tom McCall was. That this groundbreaking, nationally significant local history was not a part of our curriculum struck me as educationally negligent on our part. More than that, the issues
that my 16, 17 and 18 year-old students will face in the near future are getting more and more critical and locally focused, and I cannot see how, in our instruction, we were preparing them to understand the significance of local bond measures or zone changes. What are they to think when expansion contends for scarce funding with the maintenance or reconstruction of older infrastructure? Why might it be more important to infill instead of build on greener pastures? How will it affect their future? How will they decide which way wisdom lies?

In mulling these concerns over, I decided several years ago to propose a new class for my school: an Urban Design class that takes Beaverton as it’s core subject. In my proposal, I was careful not to discuss Beaverton as an isolated place, but to consider it in context of it’s place in the world, as a suburb facing the same issues suburbs everywhere face, as a rapidly growing—and rapidly diversifying—city in our metropolitan region, as a harbinger of change in our state and our nation. Beaverton is, in many ways, the perfect place to focus on.

Think globally, act in Beaverton

IN planning my class, I knew I needed to turn to others for help. I am not a trained urban planner, and my personal interest had not given me enough understanding of the issues and ideas to competently lead a class. Ideas have a life of their own, however. I mentioned my idea to our (then) class president, who in turn told her mother, at that time an Oregon state senator. Her mother kindly put me in touch with Beaverton City Councilor and urban planner Marc Sans Soucie, with whom I shared several productive conversations. Councilor Sans Soucie passed my name to his friend, Beaverton Planning Commissioner Ric Stephens. I met Ric at a coffee shop and discussed my idea with him, and he was very supportive, I might even say excited. I wanted the focal point of my class to be a design project, to take a site in Beaverton that was poorly designed or underutilized, and have my students redesign the site. Using what they had learned in class and their understanding of what people (like themselves) would like to see in such a place, what could they come up with? To make the project seem more authentic and serious, and less like an academic exercise, I wanted my student-teams to present their plans to the city council or the planning commission when they were finished. To kick the project phase of the class off, I had one special question for Ric: could he help me organize a day long charrette for my students? His answer was exactly what I’d hoped for: ‘Absolutely! That’s what I do! I organize charrettes all the time!’

With Ric Stephens surefooted guidance, we took two classes’ worth of students—numbering 76 in number—organized them into autonomous teams of four to five students each, and had them redesign a piece of blank asphalt known as the Westgate site. To help students with their plans, Ric invited some of his friends: people from Beaverton’s Planning Commission, the Oregon Planning Association, planners from METRO, the Westside Business Alliance, along with independent planners and landscape architects. City Councilor Sans Soucie and Mayor Denny Doyle agreed to come and start us off, and I was overwhelmed with the eagerness of these individuals to engage with my students. It struck me that there was a huge pool of trained, dedicated individuals willing to bring their skills and knowledge into public schools, just the sort of community exchange schools are also hungry for. The potential of this collaboration was a benefit I hadn’t considered before.

Students were supplied with large, high-resolution maps (thanks to the city of Beaverton) and all the tracing paper and markers they could handle. It counted as a field trip, students did not go to other any class that day. We started early in the morning and went at it for five hours, with a lunch break. My invited guests, the professional planners, moved from table to table, asking questions, making suggestions, challenging the logic and taking the markers into their own hands. I’d asked them to play both advocate and Devil’s advocate, to use their analytical skills to provoke and drive students to think more deeply about how their solutions could turn this site into an inviting urban environment.
Five hours of steady work is tiring, but youth have nothing if not stamina when they are engaged in their task. They were surprised at how complex this undertaking was, how multi-layered were the possibilities. Tissue paper was laid down and torn away, drawings became absurdly overworked and were begun again. The refrain was repeated: do not be afraid to try something, there is no wrong answer. I gave them this advice before we began: at our school we are all studying art in one form or another. It doesn’t matter whether you are a visual artist, a musician, a graphic designer or a dancer; you are all designers. You have all been trained to think like designers; use the skills and judgment you have acquired and the passion that goes with it. Yet, in all honesty, I think any individual with a brain and a beating heart is ready for this kind of work. If you wish to be fully alive, what sort of environment would you like to live in?

Toward the end of the day, each team presented their (preliminary) plans to the group. It amazed me how articulate they had become, using the language of planning and design, how thoroughly they adopted the goals and merits of their plans and how clearly they understood the need for such planning in their community. Their plans called for community centers, performance venues (which they all designated a serious lack in Beaverton currently), farmer’s markets and open-air plazas, innovative architecture for hotels, mixed-use retail and apartment buildings, and community gardens. Debriefing afterward, everyone, pros and students alike, felt that the charrette provided one of the best educational experiences they could remember, and everyone felt proud of their work.

We still had four weeks left in the semester after the charrette was over. That time was dedicated to finishing and polishing the ideas they had begun on that long and fruitful day. At the end of the semester, the students themselves chose three groups to present before the Beaverton City Council. The Mayor and the City Councilors, the members of the planning commission and the community were all delighted not just with their ideas, but with the fact that high school students were engaging in the civic process in such a positive and productive way.

Since that time, my Urban Design classes have made plans for the “Foster Site” along Hall Boulevard north of Canyon Road, taken on Canyon Road itself to make a block-long stretch of it pedestrian-friendly (and the students found themselves starring in the Fragonese Associates-produced video “Where’s Downtown Beaverton?”), added a MAX stop and created a TOD on 114th between Canyon and Center Street, and most recently, redesigned the pedestrian path and stream corridor of Hall Creek between 114th and 117th. Every design project starts with a day-long charrette, with invited professionals in attendance. Every project has been presented to city officials when the students have finished their work.

We now get our projects from the City, from the Planning Commission or the Public Works Dept. The city gets, in return, the student’s designs to consider, and a segment of the student population that knows the history and cares about the future of their hometown.

Jon Gottshall is a Photography and Social Studies teacher at the Arts and Communication Magnet Academy in Beaverton.
Welcome back, Tim Beatley!

By Dr. Vicki Elmer, Oregon Leadership in Sustainability, University of Oregon

Timothy Beatley, UO planning grad (1981) and author of Green Urbanism brought his message of biophilic cities to Eugene and Portland in late January 2012. Despite tempestuous storms and record rainfalls for the Pacific North West, almost 350 dedicated souls in Portland and 150 in Eugene attended public lectures to welcome Tim, and to hear him argue for the necessary presence of nature in our urban spaces. Beatley is currently Chair and Professor of the Dept of Urban and Environmental Planning at the University of Virginia.

Beatley’s lectures in Oregon addressed concepts in his latest book, Biophilic Cities: Integrating Nature into Urban Design and Planning. (See adjacent review).

He illustrated his points with multiple examples from Austin, San Diego, Copenhagen, the Netherlands, Paris and Finland.

“Planners especially,” emphasized Beatley, “have a responsibility to address the issue of how nature should be integrated into cities, especially as urban areas expand in size and increase in population.”

Beatley also met with city officials in Portland, including Portland’s Planning Director, Susan Anderson; and students at Portland State University. In Eugene, he joined with University of Oregon professors in PPPM and OLIS to explore how these concepts might apply to eco-district research being undertaken in Europe and China.

Dr. Vicki Elmer is the Director of OLIS (Oregon Leadership in Sustainability), a full time graduate certificate program at University of Oregon http://olis.uoregon.edu. OLIS and Portland’s Bureau of Environmental Services sponsored these events.

From left to right: Anya Dobrowolski, Timothy Beatley, and Steve Mital.

CREDIT: DR. VICKI ELMER

By Alayna Linde, Graduate Student, University of Oregon Environmental Studies Program

Timothy Beatley’s Biophilic Cities is an inspiring call for the integration of nature within the urban environment. Beatley, a professor of urban planning at the University of Virginia (and a graduate of the University of Oregon) was inspired by a publication on biophilic building design. Expanding this concept to a larger scale, he illustrates through real-world examples what the vision of a biophilic city would be in Biophilic Cities: Integrating Nature into Urban Design and Planning. Beatley claims a biophilic city is one that “puts nature first,” not only in its physical composition but its spirit, funding priorities and prevalence in the daily lives of its inhabitants. He argues that cities and nature can (and do, and must increasingly) coexist.

We often think of city and nature as antonymous terms. Beatley contends that this assessment is not only misguided but potentially harmful to human wellbeing. A great deal of nature is already contained within our cities, he says, and it is in our best interest to recognize it and more intentionally incorporate it into our daily lives; throughout his book, he explores options to achieve that integration.

In envisioning what form biophilic cities might take, Beatley has compiled diverse examples from today’s cities along with compelling theoretical ones to paint a desirable picture of a future in which urbanites are intricately connected to the natural world. From daylighting waterways to planting street trees and building green roofs, Beatley presents revolutionary current projects while positing possible directions for future
innovation. For designers and planners, the innumerable case studies woven throughout the text, as well as the analysis of barriers to implementation and strategies to overcome them, will be inspirational for work in green design.

Beatley’s nature is urban nature—impacted or influenced by humans, by default. His view of biophilic cities is first and foremost anthropocentric; nature is considered important for the benefits humans may draw from it (better health, reduced heat island effect, education and recreation, etc.) rather than for its intrinsic value. This difference is more than semantic, as it does not inherently ensure the preservation or protection of nature considered less beneficial to humans (or that which falls outside of city limits). So, while biophilic cities would undoubtedly have wonderful impacts for their human and natural inhabitants, they promise little in terms of the preservation of worldwide biodiversity or yet undeveloped natural spaces. Consequently, biophilic cities are not necessarily the solution to global climate change. What the book uniquely offers are ideas for incorporating nature into cities in a way that is beautiful and restorative of the human-nature disconnect.

Overall, planners, designers, and people from all levels of city involvement—from citizen to mayor—can find inspiration and insight from this book on how nature within our communities can be celebrated, preserved and enhanced to the benefit of all.

Alayna Linde is a Masters student in the Environmental Studies program at the University of Oregon. She wrote this review for an OLIS (Oregon Leadership in Sustainability) class, Fall 2011.
Wind in your face: Dispatches from a citizen planner on the front lines of Oregon’s growing renewable energy business

Planning Commissioner’s Column by David Sykes, Chairman Morrow County Planning Commission

Here is the line-up. Hay farmer, banker, utility manager, newspaper publisher and homemaker are on one side. Three lawyers, four sound engineers and eight angry homeowners are on the other. Welcome to ground zero in Oregon’s expanding renewable energy business.

The scene is a county planning commission hearing to revoke the conditional use permit of a large wind farm in the windy Columbia River George area of Eastern Oregon. Homeowners near the farm contend the towers make too much noise and it’s the citizen county planning commission’s task to sort the whole thing out.

For some people wind energy is an abstract, maybe even mystical endeavor, of clean energy helping the planet and reducing green house gasses. But to these citizen planners, tonight is about something completely different. There is nothing more real than dealing with the effects of actually putting up 262-foot white towers with 81 ton rotors on the end, over and over again across the land.

Aside from the arguments of renewable energy, its economics and whether global warming is real, these planners are dealing with what are the actual consequences of converting hundreds of acres of wheat and range land, into what one inhabitant describes as “an enormous power plant.”

“I made a deliberate and well-thought out purposeful decision to return to the farm with my husband 26 years ago,” one woman writes in a letter to the local newspaper. “I also came to the farm because I love the privacy, the out of doors, and the immense blue sky – and learning to live with, struggle with, and become a part of nature and helping plants to grow. I like being part of the chain that helps feed the world. I have no desire to live in the midst of an enormous power plant. Looking to the north – both east and west, I am so saddened. Beautiful, productive farmland is being covered with cement and machinery and big red lights.”

The question on this particular night, however, is not what wind farms look like, but how do they sound? Accusations are made that noise from the installed wind towers is ruining sleep, and causing health problems for nearby residents. “It sounds like a jet that never takes off,” a man with a thick beard and angry look tells the planning commissioners. Another man, who through every meeting sits in the front row staring at individual commission members, describes how he and his
wife are losing their health, thanks to the noise of the wind tower blades.

The planners listen to more than an hour of citizen complaints, as well as lawyer and hired sound technician testimony. Next up is the wind company with more hours of testimony. The technicians talk of dBAs, ambient noise, graphs, charts and thick packets and binders of data are produced.

As the competing sound experts, some of whom have flown in from the east coast, talk on, the commissioners contemplate: What is right? What is fair? The wind farm has a huge investment; the citizen’s health must be protected.

Outside the wind keeps blowing, blades keep turning, and the wind farm applications keep coming.

Oregon wind farm.

CREDIT: CAFE´ FOUNDATION

David Sykes is the OAPA County Planning Commission Representative.
Eco-Industrial Development

Editor’s Column by Ric Stephens

Industrial land use and development are in the midst of a paradigm shift from focusing on ‘things’ to focusing on ‘relationships’; from mechanical models to systems models; and from static plans to dynamic programs. The paradigm shift from traditional industrial development to eco-industrial development illustrates each of these elements.

Traditional, Euclidean zoning patterns segregate urban land uses into a pattern of commercial, residential and industrial areas. In essence, industrial development is “quarantined” in areas that minimize threats and hazards.

This isolationism of land uses is a by-product of 19th Century health and safety conflicts no longer relevant to 21st Century impact mitigation techniques. With the exception of heavy manufacturing, there are few industries today that cannot be integrated into the urban fabric. In fact, it is the integration of products, services, energy and materials that is key to the new paradigm.

A hidden connection is stronger than an obvious one.
— Heraclitus of Ephesus

The historical development model was a linear flow of material, energy and service inputs with product and waste outputs for each industry. A systems approach in which these inputs and outputs are integrated could ultimately result in the eliminating aggregate flow of waste material. [See attached Industrial Development Models exhibit]

An eco-industrial development may be viewed as a dynamic system with integrated infrastructure flows and the objectives of sharing resources, enhancing productivity, and reducing / removing the waste stream.

Eco-industrial development (EID) has a variety of related terms including:

- Industrial Ecosystem
- Eco-Industrial Cluster
- Eco-Industrial Development
- Eco-Industrial Network
- Eco-Industrial Park
- Industrial Ecology
- Industrial Symbiosis
- Sustainable Technology Park
- Zero Emissions Cluster

Each of these may have subtle differences, but they are all essentially focused on “…developing new local and regional business relationships between the private sector, government and educational institutions in order to use new and existing energy, material, water, human and infrastructure resources to improve production efficiency, investment competitiveness, community
and ecosystem health.” [Canadian Eco-Industrial Network]

In addition to these benefits, eco-industrial development helps create sense of place and sense of community—both critical elements for healthy and vibrant cities.

Eco-Industry & Eco-Districts

EID should not be confused with eco-industry which includes activities which produce goods and services to measure, prevent, limit, minimize or correct environmental damage to water, air and soil, as well as problems related to waste, noise and eco-systems. This includes cleaner technologies, products and services which reduce environmental risk and minimize resource use. [OECD/Eurostat] This definition includes goods and services in areas such as:

- Air pollution control
- Analytical services
- Engineering & consulting services
- Environmental monitoring & instrumentation
- Process optimization
- Renewable energy
- Resource recovery
- Waste management
- Wastewater treatment
- Water utilities

Eco-industrial development may include eco-industry, but is not limited to environmentally-related goods and services. Eco-industrial development considers the “three pillars” of sustainability: environment, community, and economy. Eco-districts have parallel concepts.

There exist limitless opportunities in every industry. Where there is an open mind, there will always be a frontier.

— Charles Kettering

Eco-Industrial Development Models

[Diagram showing traditional linear flows versus eco-industrial circular flows with various labels and features listed on the diagram, including increased efficiency, expanded capacity, improved sustainability, enhanced image, and increased value. Credit: Stephens Planning & Design, LLC]
with EID in terms of techniques and objectives, but are often directed towards mixed-use development without an industrial component.

**Eco-Industrial Development Tools**

The eco-industrial development model has application to virtually any and all project types from greenfields to existing industrial parks.

**Eco-Industrial Development Education & Training**

Education and Training are necessary to develop a unified understanding and approach to the creation of eco-industrial development. These programs range from EID overviews to detailed EID operations and management.

**Industrial Assessment**

An Industrial Assessment is necessary to inventory resources, identify infrastructure and evaluate eco-industrial opportunities and constraints. The assessment may also consider public-private sector participation, inter-governmental agreements, and funding programs.

**Eco-Industrial Network**

The Eco-Industrial Network requires a public-private partnership that promotes communication and coordination within the eco-industrial community. This effort may include structuring an administrative/regulatory program, creating an intranet/local area network, and preparation of organizational materials.

**Eco-Industrial Park Vision, Concept & Master Plan**

An Eco-Industrial Park Master Plan facilitates business cooperation, infrastructure efficiency, and environmentally-friendly and sound development. Master Plans may include development principles, site plans & elevations, development standards & design guidelines, infrastructure & implementation action plans. Master Plans for existing sites focus on redevelopment and retrofitting for EID.

Additional EID tools include business plans, public involvement, construction plans, sales, marketing and communication.

The eco-industrial model has specific application to all employment areas and should be part of an essential community development toolkit.

---

*I have been impressed with the urgency of doing. Knowing is not enough; we must apply. Being willing is not enough; we must do.
— Leonardo da Vinci*

*Ric Stephens is the Principal for Stephens Planning & Design LLC and the Editor of the Oregon Planners’ Journal.*
Youth Plan TOO—Toward One Oregon

By Ethan Erickson, Tsuga Community Commission

Our sense of belonging to a given place, community, or state is something that develops over time and with increasing life experience. Youth often have a limited awareness of local places, community functions, or cultural traditions outside their own.

Classroom curriculum discusses Oregon’s unique history and the diverse ecological regions that exist in our Oregon, however youth have typically spent less time in the classroom and or at home discussing the cultural norms that change from county to county. More than just addressing culture and community identity, there are few extra-curricular or summer programs in Oregon that engage students in the technical aspects of community design and land use planning.

Tsuga Community Commission (TCC) conducts and responds to needs assessments identifying opportunities in youth development and community enhancement to build custom residential camp programming with complimentary professionals and collaborative organizations to produce sustainable social capital networks within and between Oregon youth communities. TCC responded to the calls presented the book, Toward One Oregon: Rural-Urban Interdependence and the Evolution of a state. This collection of academic papers edited by Michael Hibbard and Megan Smith of the University of Oregon, Ethan Seltzer of Portland State University, and Bruce Weber and Beth Emshoff of Oregon State University, asks for specialized organizations such as TCC to facilitate intentional gatherings where Oregonians engage in conversations about our collective future.

Ethan Erickson, TCC’s Founder, Executive Director, and Community Planner, responded specifically by developing the Youth Plan TOO – Toward One Oregon program. Erickson and his staff are very excited about working with community building youth development programs and their participants to join together with many of the hands-on components of their various programs, and build them around the idea that youth in Oregon ought to better understand the nuances and interdependence of our diverse communities – to be active participants in them.

All cultural norms from our urban and rural, farming and technology, coastal and high desert, military and civilian, Native American and newcomer, even Ducks and Beavers (or “neithers”) will all be honored and celebrated while we decide together, as Oregon’s next great generation of local leaders, what is important to each other, our communities, and what we can always celebrate together as a state.
A variety of uniquely designed and facilitated summer camp activities, with community surveys before and after camp, allow participants this summer to investigate community design, population size, food systems, Oregon geography, land use goals, citizen engagement processes, and our complex biodiversity through a shared lens of each other’s sense of belonging to those things, and what we’ll all come to know as our shared stories and favorite places. TCC staff are excited to facilitate teambuilding and recreation activities that will help us have a very traditional yet unprecedented and impressive week of summer camp – with a strong twist of shared Oregon pride.

The Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association, the University of Oregon Resource Assistance for Rural Environments program, Oregon State University Extension, Multnomah ESD, and other organizations with a statewide perspective endorse TCC as the most fitting organization to facilitate this process of local, regional, and statewide collaborative governance.

More information is available at:

- www.tsuga.org
- www.facebook.com/pages/Youth-Plan-TOO-Toward-One-Oregon

Ethan Erickson is the Executive Director of the Tsuga Community Commission
Oregon Legislative Session 2012

By Jeannine Rustad, Legislative and Policy Affairs Committee Chair

It was expected that the short session for 2012 would be centered on budget issues and non-controversial bills. Contrary to expectations, there are a few bills on the land-use front poised to spark debate in the legislature.

Ten Land-Use Bills Poised to Spark Debate

As with 2011, there are several bills that would have a chilling effect on public participation. House Bills 4032 and 4049 both would limit the right to appeal a land use decision or limited land use decision to persons owning property within a distance (yet to be determined) from the property subject to an application. In 2011, there were five similar bills, none of which passed.

Another bill that has re-emerged is House Bill 4095, which is similar to 2011 House Bill 3615. This bill would allow Jackson, Josephine and Douglas Counties to enter into intergovernmental agreement. The counties would then be authorized to petition the Land Conservation and Development Commission to establish regional definitions for “agricultural land” or “forestland,” or both, for purpose of regional planning under statewide land use planning system.

While OAPA has expressed concerns over this authority, what is most problematic is that the bill “appropriates moneys to the Department of Land Conservation and Development to make grants to counties that agree to petition the commission for regional definitions.” The bill proposes that $600,000 be appropriated for this effort ($350,000 to the counties and $250,000 to state agencies).

By contrast, in 2011, HB 5032 reduced Department of Land Conservation and Development’s budget by approximately $6 million, including a reduction in local government grants of over $600,000. With the need for updated population forecasts subsequent to the 2010 Census and the lack of a county match for the work proposed, it may not be the best of economic times to expend such a large sum of money on a pilot project that benefits few.

Destination resorts have also made an appearance in this session. Senate Bill 1584 would “authorize development of resort-style amenities by owner of heritage guest ranch [and] exempt development from specified provisions of land use planning statutes, statewide land use planning goals and acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations.” Should this bill move, OAPA will oppose it as contrary to sound planning, as well as for targeting one specific property (it being our long-standing position that local planning problems should not be the subject of the legislature).

House Bill 4004 would restrict the ability to protect wetlands. Specifically, the bill would:

- Establish a Commission on Soil Research within Department of State Lands.
- Prohibit Department of State Lands from adopting rules related to wetlands delineation that specify methods that exceed those set forth in federal supplements to the wetlands.
delineation manual.

• Prohibit department from rejecting wetland delineation report prepared by two or more soil scientists certified by Soil Science Society of America.

• Prohibit department from imposing on removal or fill permits and wetland conservation plans conditions that require measures beyond replacement of functions and values of impacted water resources or requirements that exceed those set forth in federal law.

• Prohibit department from adopting rules that impose requirements that exceed those set forth in federal law. Declares emergency, effective on passage.

It wouldn’t be a legislative session if the Department of Land Conservation and Development didn’t come under attack. Senate Bill 1590 would abolish a number of state agencies, including DLCD by 2015.

House Bill 4090 threatens efficient delivery of urban services and ability of a local government to plan for orderly urban growth. This bill would allow an “owner of real property that is located within urban growth boundary and, due to certain impediments, not provided with sanitary sewer or water services to cause public or private provider of sanitary sewer and water services to connect service facilities and serve property if owner pays all costs to connect and deliver service.”

There are two bills relating to the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR):

• Senate Bill 1543 – authorizes “a local government to approve a quasi-judicial zone change consistent with comprehensive plan map designation for real property without determining whether zone change has significant effect on existing or planned transportation facility. Requires Oregon Transportation Commission to make annual report to legislative committees about funding available for certain transportation projects.” The first part of this bill seems redundant with recent TPR amendments. The second requirement was expected as a follow up to rule making undertaken by ODOT and LCDC in 2011 to address legislative concerns regarding the TPR and Oregon Highway Plan.

• Senate Bill 1544 – this bill proposes to exempt land of statewide economic development significance from certain transportation planning requirements and access management standards. Declares a specific site in the City of Redmond to be such a site.

On a positive note, House Bill 4026 would increase the number of Court of Appeals judges from 10 to 13, effective October 1, 2013. This could fit well with on-going review by LCDC and the courts on how to expedite periodic review appeals.

This promises to be a fast-moving session. If you have questions or comments, please contact the Legislative and Policy Affairs Committee Chair, Jeannine Rustad (jeanniner@ci.hillsboro.or.us). Detailed information on bills can be found at: http://www.leg.state.or.us/mag/home.htm.
PORTLAND MAYORAL CANDIDATES FORUM: WE’D ALL LOVE TO SEE THE PLAN

March 14, 2012, 7:30 – 9:30 pm
Aladdin Theater, 3017 SW Miwaukie Ave., Portland, OR
The future Mayor of Portland will help shape the quality of life and the future of our neighborhoods, our largest city, our metropolitan region, and our state. This forum is designed to give us all a “beyond the sound bite” insight of the candidates’ understanding of the issues, their views and their leadership skills – and to hold them accountable for what they tell us. Portland State University Urban Studies and Planning Professor Sy Adler will moderate.

Tickets: $5 for PSU students, OAPA and ASLA members at the door (with student ID or member coupons) – $10 at the door or Ticketmaster (no discounts).

For more information, go to www.oregonapa.org.

AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONFERENCE
Open your eyes to new possibilities when you join thousands of planners from around the world in Los Angeles on April 14-17, 2012.

REIMAGINE THE CITY
REIMAGINE YOUR CAREER
REIMAGINE THE POSSIBILITIES
Take a fresh look at the work you do every day and a first look at the challenges you’ll face tomorrow. Join APA in Los Angeles for the 2012 National Planning Conference: the world’s largest planning event with four days of unparalleled networking and learning opportunities. Hear from experts. Connect with colleagues. Pick up new skills. Move your career forward. Imagine the possibilities.

To register: go to www.planning.org/conference/.

SAVE THESE DATES: MAY 10-11, 2012. IT’S TIME TO PLAN FOR REAL SUSTAINABILITY!
The Oregon Chapter of APA invites you to the Riverhouse Hotel and Convention Center in beautiful Bend Oregon for the 2012 Statewide Planning Conference. This year’s theme is Real Sustainability: Sage Advice from the High Desert.

You will have three (3) tracks to choose from (or mix and match):

- AICP Nuts and Bolts (for CM Credits),
- City and County Planning Directors, and
- Real Sustainability.

OAPA is pursuing approval of CM credits for all three sessions. In addition, we are also planning two (2) mobile workshops for Thursday afternoon.

For more information, please visit our website at www.oregonapa.org.

DOOR TO TGM GRANTS SWINGS OPEN
Local governments have until March 16 to submit pre-applications for Oregon Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grants. The grants may be used to plan a variety of improvements: safe routes to school, comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian networks, transit-oriented development, downtown streetscapes, parking management strategies, multi-modal streets, and Transportation System Plan updates. TGM grants typically range between $80,000 and $200,000.

By submitting pre-applications (these are short and simple), local governments are put in touch with TGM staff that can discuss project ideas and help with the submission of a full application.

Here’s the updated TGM grant schedule for 2012:

- March 16: Pre-applications due
- April 16: Full application packets available on-line and mailed to pre-applicants
- June 15: Final applications due
- July-Sept.: Application review and project selection
- October 1: Grants announced

Local governments interested in TGM planning grants should contact their regional TGM representatives to discuss potential projects. For more details: see Transportation and Growth Management Grants & Incentives.

Free Technical Assistance: There is no deadline for requests to the TGM program for Outreach, Code Assistance, and Quick Response services, which are free to local governments in Oregon. Through Outreach, local governments receive support for educational workshops,
public lectures, or lecture series on transportation- and land use-related topics. (For examples of presentations, click here.) Through Code Assistance, localities can get help with zoning and development code revisions aimed at maximizing transportation choices, especially alternative modes. Through Quick Response, TGM helps local governments with an immediate need for design assistance with imminent development projects.

For more on the TGM program, call 503.373.0050, ext. 277, or click here.

PLPR 2013, Feb. 13-15, 2013: Save the Date!
The organizing committee for the 2013 PLPR is excited to invite you to Portland, Oregon for the second meeting of our association in North America. The conference will be held at the campus of Portland State University in downtown Portland from the 13th through the 15th of February. (Please see First Stop Portland at: http://pdx.edu/fsp/ for a brief but excellent overview of the city.) The conference theme has been (tentatively) framed as “Property Rights and Planning in a Changing Economy” — reflective of the challenges of globalization and the enduring economic downturn on our communities and professional practice. As always a wide variety of papers are welcomed! Significantly, the conference coincides with an important anniversary in Oregon’s planning history: the passage in 1973 of Senate Bill 100 which established the state’s land use program. We expect to have a few sessions that bring advocates and opponents of the system together to critically reflect on the state’s growth management past and future.

We look forward to hosting you in Portland! Expect great food, fine wine, excellent research papers and stimulating conversations, and, of course, some rain!

Oregon’s Cool Planning Handbook Wins National Excellence Award from APA
The American Planning Association conferred a “National Excellence Award” on Cool Planning: A Handbook on Local Strategies to Slow Climate Change, a publication created by the Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program (TGM) and Otak, the Lake Oswego-based consulting firm. The handbook gives step-by-step guidelines to help communities reduce their carbon footprint through community development, land use, and transportation planning.

Cool Planning offers how-to strategies, examples and case studies that states and towns nationwide can implement. It presents a complex subject in an easy-to-follow format, written for local officials, planning commissioners, planners, community organizations, and developers.

The handbook puts smart growth and progressive transportation planning principles into the climate change context and explains their relevance and effectiveness. The handbook provides guidance on planning strategies that can become elements of a climate action plan or a community’s comprehensive plan, and tools for measuring a plan’s effectiveness.


Architect Ettore Maria Mazzola to Receive the IMCL International Urban Design Award
Professor/Architect Ettore Maria Mazzola, University of Notre Dame, School of Architecture, Rome Studies Program, will be the recipient of the 2012 IMCL Conference International Urban Design Award to be presented at the 49th IMCL Conference in Portland, OR, May 20-24, 2012.

The theme of the 49th International Making Cities Livable Conference, Planning Healthy Communities for All, is a theme that Professor Mazzola’s work perfectly exemplifies.

Professor Mazzola’s work has consistently led the way in envisioning urban environments that celebrate community and lift the spirit. His designs are hospitable for all, and show special concern for more vulnerable population groups such as children, elders and the poor.

His project to replace a monolithic, low income housing block near Rome (Corviale) with a genuinely livable urban fabric, without disrupting the community, provides an exemplary model for urban renewal throughout the world. For more information, please see Regenerate suburban districts – proposal for the “ground-scraper” Corviale in Rome.

Professor Mazzola’s books include: The Sustainable City is Possible (2009); and Architecture and Town Planning, Operating Instructions, introduction by Léon Krier (2006). Please visit Professor Mazzola’s Profile.