Land Use Planning in Oregon

Many visitors to Oregon think that what they see is how Oregon has always been. However, much of what the state is known for is the result of intentional policy and planning. PSU professor Ethan Seltzer takes us back in time for a history lesson on Oregon’s land use planning program.
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President’s Message

By Brian Campbell, FAICP, OAPA President

This is a very special month in Oregon’s history. Although most Oregonians are probably not aware of the momentous votes taken in the legislature 40 years ago, our entire state has benefited greatly from the passage of Senate Bill 100.

The provisions of this bill, many years in the making, laid the foundation for what is still the most comprehensive and far-reaching piece of planning legislation in the country. There are other states that have statewide planning regulations, but none have embedded them as firmly into law as Oregon has. Not to say that these laws cannot be controversial. They have been challenged repeatedly at the ballot and in the courts. And though they have been modified, especially with the passage of Ballot Measures 37 and 49 in the last decade, Oregon’s basic planning laws have been stoutly defended again and again by its citizens.

And there’s a reason for that. When the case for planning is laid out simply and fairly, most people respond very positively. They understand that the planning program put in place by SB 100 protects the livability of their communities, and provides the best opportunity for everyone to have a say in how their communities grow and develop. Without these provisions it’s clear the consequences would be to have a less healthy environment, less productive farms and forests, and sprawling, inefficient, and less attractive but more expensive cities and towns. Simply put, life is better here because of our planning system.

As we celebrate this special moment on May 29th, it is also important that we think ahead about the next 40 years. After all, planning is nothing if not about the future. To that end, on that same anniversary date, a couple hundred planners and related professionals will be gathering for a three and a half hour Big Ideas Forum to talk about how to make improvements, not just to the planning program, but to other aspects of our public lives as well. Partly as a result of that effort, 10 years from now at the 50th anniversary event, we hope to be able to celebrate a much enhanced planning program, more vibrant cities and towns, healthier and more productive rural landscapes, and a more resilient Oregon that is an even better place to live for all of us.
40th Anniversary Gala Dinner Program

5:30 pm  Reception
6:45 pm  Dinner

Welcome, David Siegel, FAICP and Brian Campbell, FAICP

National Perspective, Bill Anderson, FAICP President, American Planning Association

A Brief History, David Siegel, FAICP

Presentations, Brian Campbell, FAICP

Dessert

Key Note Address, Representative Earl Blumenauer

Speakers

David Siegel, FAICP has dedicated thirty-six years of his life to the creation of quality communities and environments as an award-winning professional planner and manager for public and private sector planning agencies. He is active in the community and in his profession, and is in demand as a facilitator and problem-solver for complex planning issues nationwide. One of Oregon’s few Fellows of AICP, Dave has served Oregon and the profession through over 20 years of volunteerism with the American Planning Association, most recently completing his service to the national organization as President of APA.

Brian Campbell, FAICP is President of the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association. He has over 35 years of experience in land use, transportation, and environmental planning policy development and implementation. He has worked in senior level planning management positions for the past 25 years, most recently for the City of Portland, Parsons Brinkerhof, and the Port of Portland.

Bill Anderson, FAICP integrates development economics and planning, having worked in 20 states and eight countries as a partner with Economics Research Associates (now AECOM). Anderson focuses on inner cities, community planning and regional planning. He headed up San Diego’s oldest planning advocacy group and chaired San Diego’s Planning Commission, helping formulate the “City of Villages” strategy. Anderson served as Director of San Diego’s City Planning & Community Investment Department between 2006 and 2011. He was inducted into the AICP College of Fellows in 2006.

Representative Earl Blumenauer has devoted his entire career to public service. He was elected to the Oregon Legislature in 1972, Multnomah County Commission in 1978, and Portland City Council in 1986. There, his 10-year tenure as the Commissioner of Public Works demonstrated his leadership on the innovative accomplishments in transportation, planning, environmental programs and public participation that have helped Portland earn an international reputation as one of America’s most livable cities. Elected to the US House of Representatives in 1996, Mr. Blumenauer has created a unique role as Congress’ chief spokesperson for Livable Communities: places where people are safe, healthy and economically secure.
Land Use Planning in Oregon

By Ethan Seltzer, Professor, Portland State University

Many visitors to Oregon think that what they see is how Oregon has always been. That is, that Portland has always been the livable city that it is, that the ocean beaches have always been public, and that land use planning has been a statewide concern forever. However, many of the things that we’re known for are the result of intentional policy and planning, and not as historic as some might believe. What follows is a brief review of Oregon’s land use planning history, some of the lessons learned, and the challenges ahead.

Note: This is excerpted from a longer chapter on planning in Oregon, to be published in 2014 as part of a book on state and nation-state planning in the US and Europe by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Comprehensive city planning in Oregon emerged with the growth of Portland into one of the largest cities on the west coast in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The Olmsted brothers prepared a plan for parks and boulevards in Portland in 1904. In 1912, Edward Bennett, a protégé of Daniel Burnham, prepared The Greater Portland Plan, a City Beautiful-inspired grand vision for Portland in the coming age of the automobile. The growth in that era combined with the booster vision of the time saw Portland growing to become a city of millions.

In 1919 and 1923, the Oregon legislature enabled cities in the state to plan and zone. The construction of the Bonneville Dam inspired a new round of inquiry into how the city and state should grow. Lewis Mumford came to Oregon in 1938 to consult on the best way of hosting the new growth to come as a result of the abundant electricity to be provided by the Columbia River.

Portland boomed again as a major shipbuilding and heavy industry center on the west coast during World War II. In 1947, in response to “chaotic” urban fringe growth in unincorporated parts of counties, the Oregon legislature enabled counties to zone, though few counties chose to use the new tools provided by the state.

However, the modern era of state interest in planning in Oregon began to take shape in the 1960s, when growing concerns about rapid and uncoordinated suburban growth became more pressing in the Willamette Valley, on the Pacific coast, and in Central Oregon. The population of Oregon becomes the 33rd State.

City of Portland establishes Oregon’s first land use ordinances.

Oregon legislature allows cities to enact zoning.

Oregon Supreme Court upholds City of Portland zoning ordinance.

Bonneville Dam begins to generate electricity.

1859 1918 1919 1925 1938
Oregon grew by 18% during the decade of the 1960s, with 86% taking place in the Willamette Valley, and 54% in the Portland metropolitan area.

In response, the Oregon legislature developed a number of innovative programs to address growing concerns about the quality of the environment. In 1961, the State enacted legislation to allow reduced property taxes for farmland zoned for Exclusive Farm Use by counties. In 1965, Oregon instituted a “clean water act” that required permits for point source discharges into state waterways, one of the first such acts in the nation. The bottle bill put a refundable deposit on all beverage containers, a direct response to the rising tide of roadside litter. The Oregon Beach Bill guaranteed public access to the dry sand beaches along the entire Oregon coast, and prevented the encroachment of private development on what is arguably one of the nation’s most spectacular landscapes.

In response to growing concerns about what later became known nationally as “urban sprawl,” and inaction on the part of local governments with respect to the exercise of planning and zoning authority already granted to them, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 10 (SB 10) in 1969. SB 10 required all cities and counties to adopt comprehensive plans and zoning by the end of 1971. Significantly, SB 10 envisioned planning to be carried out by local government, not by the State.

SB 10 made Oregon the second state in the nation, after California, to require local governments to create comprehensive land use plans. The bill required the development and application of zoning to implement the plans, and included ten goals that the state could use to determine whether or not the local plans had met the objectives of the law, should the state so desire. The goals included the identification of prime farmland for the production of crops, and the creation of Exclusive Farm Use zoning to protect it.

Through this 50-year progression of state action, from enabling legislation for city zoning in 1919, to SB 10 in 1969, the State of Oregon had gradually stepped up its engagement with local land use planning, zoning, and resource management. However, most plans adopted under SB 10 requirements tended to simply reiterate existing land use trends and agreements, leaving the conditions that brought about SB 10 largely unaddressed.

With little to show from SB 10, Governor Tom McCall launched several projects from his office...
to bring new attention and a sense of urgency to the need for comprehensive land use planning. Population growth forecasts suggested that a million new Oregonians would join the state by the year 2000, a number that was shocking to a state with barely 2 million residents in 1970.

In 1970 McCall was elected to a second term on a platform that included the need to correct the flaws of SB 10 and to develop effective comprehensive planning and zoning initiatives at the local level, where the land use decisions were being made. Despite the acknowledged ineffectiveness of SB 10, opposition to planning carried out directly by the state remained strong. Attention focused less on the role for the state as a planner, and more on the role of the state for creating accountability, extending funding to local governments for planning, and coordinating plans with each other.

Much has been written about the development of new legislation for the 1973 session of the Oregon legislature, and in particular the creation of Senate Bill 100 (SB 100) and accompanying bills to remedy the defects in SB 10. SB 100 continued the requirements in SB 10 for cities and counties to write mandatory comprehensive land use plans and adopt zoning based on the plans. But it added several elements that would prove key to its long-term success.

The first was direction to the state executive branch to develop and adopt statewide planning goals. SB 100 specified several policy subjects that the state planning goals must address, but it also created the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), a home for planning at the state level, and a policy making body, the Land Conservation and Development Commission with broad powers for creating and adopting new goals and procedures.

Another key element of the legislation was that it set a deadline for local adoption of comprehensive plans, and specified that if local governments failed to meet the deadlines, that the state goals would directly control land use decisions. Additional fiscal penalties for non-compliance also were included in SB 100. Although local governments largely failed to meet the initial deadlines, most had complied by the mid 1980s.

As with the efforts preceding SB 10, SB 100 was constructed with the assumption that planning,
zoning, and land use decision-making would continue to be a local government activity. In Oregon, the state sets a planning framework with its statewide planning goals, but (for the most part) there is no state-level plan. Instead, a “quilt” of city and county comprehensive land use plans implement the statewide goals, along with local priorities, and collectively address land use on 100% of the State’s land area.

The Oregon program is a rules-based program. That is, the heart of the statewide planning program is the goals, and the state writes the rules used to determine whether the goals are being adequately served. With Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, leading the program, participation is intended to be broad-based, as is the classification of who may appeal any local decision. In the landmark Fasano v. Board of County Commissioners of Washington County (1973) decision, the Oregon Supreme Court established that quasi-judicial land use decisions, like legislative decisions, must also include procedural protections designed to ensure fair and open decision-making.

Among other protections, the court decided that decisions must include written and adequate findings and prior notice of applicable standards and procedures, allowing all affected persons to participate effectively. The Fasano decision also clearly established the principle that zoning was subservient and intended to implement the County’s comprehensive plan. In a later decision, Baker v. City of Milwaukie (1975), the court extended this link between zoning and plans to city comprehensive plans.

In addition, the principle that the development allowed by right in plans should not be impeded by actions that contravene plans has been defended and established. Oregon planning has provided owners, neighbors, and communities with certainty, making plan implementation the product of predictable processes rather than protracted and contentious negotiations. In Oregon, plans aren’t trivial, they must be directly and publicly addressed in land use decision-making, and carry with them specific expectations and responsibilities.

In 1976, the four coastal goals were added to the statewide planning program, linking Oregon’s Coastal Management Program to the comprehensive land use planning occurring in coastal areas. In 1979, the Legislature created the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), a three-judge panel comprised of attorneys appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate, to create a faster path for appeals than offered by the then-tortuous path through the county-level state Circuit Courts.

Like SB 10 before it, SB 100 has been challenged directly at the polls. An early referral effort in 1973, the year the bill was signed, failed due to a lack of signatures. Counting Senate Bill 10, repeal campaigns went to the voters in 1970, 1976, 1978, and 1982, failing each time. In 1998, a measure (Oregon Ballot Measure 65) to repeal the statewide planning goals went to the voters and failed. In recent years, measures 7, 37, and 49, asserting the need to protect property rights by challenging the ability of local jurisdictions to use regulation as a mechanism for plan implementation, have passed and altered the landscape for planning in Oregon going forward.

Acknowledging the plans submitted by the cities and counties took much longer than expected. Though most plans were adopted and acknowledged by the early 1980s, the last appeal of the initial set of plan acknowledgements took place in 1986. More recently, two new cities have

---

Voters defeat measure to eliminate state oversight of land use planning by 61% to 39%. 1978

Metro created in the Portland metropolitan region, the nation’s first and only directly elected regional government. 1979

Voters defeat measure to repeal Senate Bill 100 by 55% to 45%. 1982

Last comprehensive plans acknowledged by LCDC. 1986
been incorporated and are proceeding through the acknowledgment process. All of Oregon’s 36 counties and 242 cities have adopted and acknowledged comprehensive land use plans, which provide the guidance for all land use decision-making at the local level. These plans cover most of the non-federal lands in the state, and together create a quilt that collectively, serves as the statewide product of Oregon’s land use planning program.

In Oregon, only cities and counties can adopt comprehensive land use plans. Metro, the regional government in the Portland metropolitan area, can and has adopted functional and growth management plans that create a regional context for planning within its jurisdiction, consistent with the statewide goals and linked to city and county plans in the Portland area.

More recently, a consortium of cities in Southern Oregon, along with Jackson County, have developed and adopted a regional growth management and transportation plan for that area, which will be implemented through city and county plan amendments that are consistent with the regional plan (and which, in turn, must be consistent with state goals). This regional plan was recently acknowledged by LCDC, using legislation adopted to encourage voluntary efforts to plan at a regional scale by allowing local governments that do so more flexibility in terms of compliance with state planning requirements.

In sum, the history of state interest in local planning and zoning in Oregon began in 1947 by enabling counties to plan and zone to protect farm and forest land, and now in the present with targeted efforts within regions to address both old and new challenges. In the 1940s, urbanization in and around fast-growing Willamette Valley communities was threatening farming, one of the foundations for the Oregon’s resource-based economy and the basis for creating and maintaining the working landscape that had defined, for many, their sense of place.

However, by the early 1960s, county inaction left gaping holes in the fabric for managing growth, and stronger tools were needed. The state acted to provide relief to local property tax assessments for farmland owners, actually enabling farmers to secure property tax assessments based on farm use rather than speculative development value, if that land was zoned for exclusive farm use as a consequence of an adopted county land use plan.

County inaction persisted and SB 10, a mandatory requirement for local planning and zoning by both cities and counties, was the State’s newest attempt to corral local land use decision-making. However, what happened next happened in an entirely new and novel environment. The nascent national environmental quality movement took off, and earth day in 1970 became a rallying point for citizens concerned about the unaccounted for and unaddressed impacts of human activity on the environment. Federal acts governing air quality, water quality, and the pre-project assessment of environmental impacts were enacted into law, but similar legislation for land resources failed to gain passage. It was also “the 60s,” a time of profound questioning of existing institutional and social relations.

Together, these social and political forces made the environment for SB 100 profoundly different than for SB 10. SB 100 didn’t rewrite constitutional expectations for rights to property, and it didn’t give the state a free hand in planning.

Voters pass Ballot Measure 7, a property rights measure to amend the Oregon constitution to provide landowner compensation when government land use regulation decreases the value of property by 54% to 46%.

Oregon Supreme Court rules Measure 7 unconstitutional because it addresses more than one issue.

Voters pass Ballot Measure 37, a statute to replace Ballot Measure 7 by 61% to 39%.

Voters pass Ballot Measure 49 to curtail Ballot Measure 37 and limit the claims that can be made by property owners by 62% to 38%.

and land use decision-making. However, the notion of a much stronger state role, created to achieve state-level goals that expressed clear ambitions for core values held by state residents, was now both possible and desirable.

**Lessons Learned**

The Oregon planning experience is often pointed to as a model for the nation. Oregon has accomplished many things that other states have either only recently engaged or have tried and failed to do. However, Oregon engaged in land use planning not to create a model but to solve a set of inter-related problems that are somewhat unique to its economic and political geography, and in the end, limited in scope. It is not a planning program for all purposes, as it addresses a number of things well and many others not at all.

Today, elements of the system put in place by Senate Bill 100 in 1973 have become not just central parts of the civic discourse of the state, but part of the cultural life of the communities of Oregon. Several clear lessons can be learned from this experience:

• **Planning Matters.** Land use patterns in Oregon have changed, and urban form in Oregon is different than in neighboring states.

• **Things Take Time.** The modern era of planning in Oregon has it roots in almost 100 years of state and regional activity. The Oregon Statewide Planning Program enacted by Senate Bill 100 in 1973 is best viewed as a key moment in an ongoing and robust continuum of effort.

• **Controversy never ends.** Land use planning has and continues to be contentious and will always be so. The fundamental tension in American society between the rights of individual land owners and the larger public good pervades all discussions of land use planning and will frame them for all time to come.

• **Winning means being able to Collaborate and Compromise.** Everything that Oregon has accomplished has occurred via the creation of coalitions.

• **The Landscape keeps us Honest.** At the end of the day, it’s the landscape of Oregon that creates our common frame of reference. Senate Bill 100, like other notable Oregon innovations—the “Bottle Bill,” Beach Bill, and others—tend to be innovations of preservation rather than innovations of creation.

• **Many Issues Remain.** This story is far from over, the challenges not yet completely met:

  a. Regulation is only one tool for accomplishing the goals set forth in Oregon’s planning program. However, many issues...
await the development of effective, long-lasting non-regulatory strategies.

b. Key questions regarding the impact of planning on the economy, and on the use of planning to promote economic development, continue to be debated. Every time the economy slows down, calls for loosening land use requirements get louder.

c. Big infrastructure projects continue to raise questions about sprawl, and force discussions about presumed tradeoffs between jobs and the economy.

d. Sustainable funding for infrastructure needed to implement plans, and for ongoing planning itself is tangled in the ongoing crisis of government funding at the local and state levels.

e. Though Oregon planning is known for agricultural land preservation and the use of UGBs, it’s not known for creating greater conditions of equity and justice in society, and for making social justice as important a statewide planning goal as the efficient establishment of urban transportation systems.

f. Fairness, an issue raised by opponents of land use planning, is far from settled and secure, and as a consequence, the battle over how much and how far land use planning, particularly its implementing regulations articulated in zoning, should affect private and local decisions continues.

g. Regionalism and regional planning, rejected in the adoption of Senate Bill 100, is an issue in Oregon that never goes away.

h. The goals are almost 40 years old, and most comprehensive plans are now between 25 and 30 years old. Though the state system calls for the “periodic review” of all acknowledged plans, that aspect of the program has not been sustained by the legislature or embraced by local jurisdictions. The “expiration date” for many plans is fast approaching, and there is no statewide strategy for keeping the plans up to date and relevant.

i. Many issues that are being brought into planning systems in other places, like climate change, species recovery, and the local affects of globalizing economies, to name a few, are not being addressed directly through land use planning in Oregon.

In short, though much has been accomplished, much remains to be worked out. Again, regarding Oregon’s land use planning as settled and done, rather than as an engaging set of questions and as continuing to evolve, is risky, at best.

**Conclusion**

Oregon’s land use planning program is statewide in scope, but it is not a state planning program. Instead, most planning is done by cities and counties, just as it has been since city planning was set in motion in the US in the early years of the 20th century. The closest thing Oregon has to a plan for the state is the “quilt” made up of all of the comprehensive plans developed by cities and counties, all the plans of operating state agencies, and all of the planning efforts of Metro and other regional bodies, all consistent with the common framework provided by the statewide planning goals. Whether this is a more effective route than an actual state plan, as is the case in New Jersey or Maryland, remains to be seen. This approach is rightfully regarded more as a coordinated program of local planning than as an exercise of state-level planning, but its persistence and results, shaped by statewide, state-level concerns, are clear.

Ethan Seltzer is a professor in the Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University.
40 years of planning in Oregon

Arnold Cogan, FAICP, first Executive Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

SOURCE: DLCD

People and the Land workshop conducted by the newly created DLCD in 1974 to develop the first 14 statewide planning goals.

SOURCE: DLCD

Save our coast, our farmlands, our timberlands

A No on 10 ad. The 1976 Measure 10 would have repealed SB 100. It was defeated 57% to 43%.

SOURCE: DLCD

Hector Macpherson, a Linn County dairy farmer and Oregon Senator. He was one of the authors (and biggest supporters) of SB 100 and articulated the importance of planning to support and preserve farmland.

SOURCE: DLCD

Left to right: DLCD staff Ron Eber, Rob Hallyburton, and Richard Whitman.

SOURCE: DLCD


SOURCE: ED SULLIVAN

Left to right: Henry Richmond (former Executive Director of 1000 Friends, Dick Benner, Bob Stacy (former 1000 Friends staff attorneys).

SOURCE: MARY KYLE MCCURDY

I-5 Woodburn interchange in the 1950s (top) and roughly 10 years later.

SOURCE: DLCD
Population forecasts in 1970 projected that Oregon would add another one million people by 2000. In light of this population growth and subsequent development, Governor Tom McCall initiated several projects to raise awareness about the need for comprehensive land use planning. The publication of the Lawrence Halprin-directed report, “The Willamette Valley: Choices for the Future,” created two future growth scenarios for the Willamette Valley and illustrated the impacts of all these people on Oregon’s farm and forest lands.

There is a shameless threat to our environment and to the whole quality of life—unfettered despoiling of the land. Sagebrush subdivisions, coastal condomania and the ravenous rampage of suburbia in the Willamette Valley all threaten to mock Oregon’s status as the environmental model for the nation...The interests of Oregon for today and in the future must be protected from the grasping wastrels of the land.

— Governor Tom McCall, 1973

Left to right: Former DLCD Director Lane Shetterly, LCDC member Marilyn Worrix, and former LCDC Chair John VanLandingham.

SOURCE: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
As planners and Oregonians throughout the state celebrate the 40th anniversary of the passage of SB 100 that laid the foundation of Oregon’s current statewide land use program, it’s important to remember that there have been many attempts to repeal it. Oregonians voted four times between 1976 and 1998 to reject appealing SB 100. However, two significant ballot measures passed in 2000 and 2004 revealed the vulnerability of our statewide planning program. Another ballot measure passed in 1998 introduced attention to property value through notices. As we celebrate the 40-year anniversary of our planning program, let’s also take this time to remember our past in an effort to become more insightful and adaptive in our future.

1998 – Measure 56

While some might argue that Measure 56 had little impact on the planning program, the measure initiated discussions with landowners concerning their property value. Under Measure 56, legislative notices were required to contain a simple yet cautionary language printed in boldface across the top. This message read (in part): “... adoption of this ordinance ...may reduce the value of your property.”

When Measure 56 was adopted, planners working for government didn’t give much thought as to answering questions about property value. Our proposed regulations were intended for the public good and we naturally thought that people would understand and accept these regulations. However, after issuing Measure 56 notices, it was apparent that landowners were interested in learning more about the new regulation and how it may reduce property value (as the notice said).

Annoyed by the plethora of questions concerning property value, some governments attempted to discourage these inquiries by adding messages below the Measure 56 statement like: No determination has been made as to how this ordinance will reduce property value. Additionally, many Oregon planners did our part to further discourage these cumbersome questions by providing stagnant responses like: I don’t know how this will impact your property value. We’re just required to say so in the notice.

As we delivered these replies, I wonder what ran through the minds of many landowners. Perhaps these owners began to think long and hard as to how land regulations could impact their property value. They might have asked questions like: What’s the purpose of providing this statement if it’s not decided as to how my property value will...
be impacted? Should I not be compensated? And, possibly: What’s government hiding from me?

2000 – Measure 7

Measure 7 offered something more than a simple disclosure statement about property value. The title of the Measure 7 read: “Amends Constitution: Requires Payment to Landowner if Government Regulation Reduces Property Value.” For decades we had a system in place that protected our farms, forest, and natural resource areas. What would happen to this system if Measure 7 were to pass? What would happen to our beautiful “cake” as constructed under SB 100?

With voter approval of Measure 7 in 2000, we thought of new responses to questions received from our Measure 56 notices. We also withdrew many of our notices in light of uncertainty to the claim potential under Measure 7. Fortunately, a legal challenge to Measure 7 was successful in 2002. The cake had been saved (at least for a short time). This was a huge relief for many planners. However, the feeling was short lived as another measure would come in the wake of Measure 7. It came in the voter election of November 2004 and it contained a similar ballot title.

2004 – Measure 37

When Measure 7 was defeated in court, we hoped the same fate for Measure 37. We knew there would be legal challenges, but the technicality that had defeated Measure 7 was not so apparent in Measure 37. Hope for a legal defeat materialized in a Circuit Court decision of 2005. Our SB 100 cake had survived again. However, victory was short lived when the Oregon Supreme Court reversed the Circuit Court decision in 2007. After the Supreme Court decision, we resigned ourselves to accepting that Measure 37 was here to stay. There were feelings of despair and uncertainty for the future of land use planning in Oregon. Someone had taken a big bite into our SB 100 cake and its structure was unstable.

As we struggled through this new system of property value wild cards, we also wondered how something as unique as our statewide system could be taken away so easily. We wondered about saving the integrity of our SB 100 cake. How much had been eaten away by Measure 37? Some began to wonder if a new cake should be baked – one that takes a Big Look at all ingredients before placing in the oven. Fortunately, a fix was in the works. Accordingly, a modified recipe was formulated by the Legislature in 2007 and brought to the voters that same year.

2007 – Measure 49

Measure 49 was both a compromise and a deterrent. Most of us voted in support as we knew of the consequences should it fail. Passage of Measure 49 offered a partial restoration of the SB 100 cake but it also removed a big slice. While Measure 49 clarified some of the questions we had under Measure 37, we wonder today whether new regulations will trigger certain Measure 49 claims. The experience raised our awareness of the property rights movement and we remain cautious in this new post Measure 37/49 era.

If we’re to save our SB 100 cake for future generations, we need to become more insightful and adaptive to future challenges. We might begin by answering those “property value impact” questions a little differently than we have in the past. In 2003, the Legislature softened those words of Measure 56, but the heart of the message remains and we can expect property owners to continue their inquiries. While it’s difficult (and perhaps inappropriate) to answer how certain regulations might impact someone’s property value, we can explain how the notice provides an opportunity to voice these concerns — among others. We can also take the time to describe how a proposal will restrict or prohibit something that is currently allowed, in addition to describing the public good.

Happy anniversary SB 100! You survived the attack of the property value measures. We’ll see what challenges await you in the years ahead.

Scott Whyte is a Senior Planner for the City of Beaverton and a former Board Member for the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association.
UO graduates help shape and lead 40 years of Oregon land use system

By Joe McAndrew, Graduate Student, University of Oregon

McCall. Macpherson. Daly. These are the most commonly heard names referring to the passage of SB 100. However, University of Oregon graduates Maradel Gale, Ron Eber, and Dick Benner have all played an influential role training future planners and implementing Oregon’s unique program.

This month marks the 40th anniversary of the passage of Oregon’s land use law, SB 100. This law created the most innovative and progressive land use program in the country, and no state has a law that rivals its success. Every one of its 36 counties and nearly all incorporated cities have state acknowledged plans to protect farm and forest lands with urban growth boundaries, which limit the potential for urban and rural sprawl, and preserve natural resources and greenspaces. One needs to just drive along I-5 through the Willamette Valley to understand this fact: Oregon has chosen to grow differently and it’s working.

Governor Tom McCall signed SB 100 into law on May 29, 1973. Over the last 40 years, the law’s success has required an army of vigilant advocates to ensure its success and stave off full frontal assaults from upset citizens, oppositional legislators, and ballot referendums. The University of Oregon has been a nurturing ground for many of the bill’s most ardent supporters, whether Oregonians or those who moved to the state to learn how and why Oregon is a leader in sustainable development, environmental preservation, agricultural success, and urban livability.

This is a story of three UO graduates who have, with countless others, lifted up and ensured SB 100’s success, which many can agree is a true gift to the State of Oregon.

PPPM Associate Professor Emerita Maradel Gale, JD ’74, taught and nurtured hundreds of students who went on to directly impact the law’s development. However, before she joined the ranks of the PPPM faculty, Gale was at the forefront of the Oregon land use program’s development. In 1968, she became the first president and volunteer lobbyist at the State Capitol for the Oregon Environmental Council. In this role Gale successfully lobbied on legislation for increased funding for bike and pedestrian paths, prohibition of billboards along highways, and helped create the Nuclear Thermal Energy Council, which disallowed utility companies from siting new nuclear power plants without public input and vetting.

Gale’s biggest land use success was the creation and appointment to the Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Council. Gale

Maradel Gale
Commission, which established a planning process for Oregon’s coastal region. “Prior to the creation of the Commission, city councilors, county commissioners, and port directors had formed a coastal organization with the goal of maximizing development throughout Oregon’s coasts,” says Gale. “They were fighting to get ports in every one of Oregon’s estuaries.”

“I was proudest to get estuary designations that allowed some degree of development in areas like Coos Bay and Astoria, but also preservation for others with greater natural resource benefit. This was not a popular concept on the coast at that time, but thankfully it happened.”

In 1971, Gale enrolled in the UO law school. In 1974, during the week of her last law school final, Gale gave a lecture to the UO Masters Program for Urban and Regional Planning (a pre-cursor to the current Community and Regional Planning program). Her lecture on “Politics and Planning” resulted in a new career and hire for the department, where Gale taught Legal Issues in Planning and the Environment and numerous other courses.

“The department was the first school throughout the country to bring a lawyer on its faculty,” says Gale. “Most of the planning programs around the country didn’t teach a legal planning course, and subsequently we saw many more departments developing legal planning courses and bringing many more people with legal experience on their faculty.”

Students such as Ron Eber, MURP ’75, were behind the creation of the Legal Issues class.”My peers and I pushed really hard to develop the Legal Issues class, because we felt that this was something that planners needed to know, and was missing from the department,” says Eber. He was glad this work paid off, because Gale’s class prepared his peers and him to become engaged in the implementation of SB 100 and fight for its success.

“Maradel’s class was by far the hardest class that I took. She taught it like a law school course and it was a real challenge to us. Her course probably did more to prepare me for a career than anything else. I used the practical skills from that class almost everyday for over 30 years, whether it was researching the background of a statute, the case law or understanding statutory construction. Planners must know how to implement broad policy and legislative pronouncements to develop plans and regulations that are effective to achieve the desired outcomes. Understanding our legal and administrative system is where the rubber
Eber became Gale’s first graduate teaching fellow in her Legal Issues course. He joined the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development as a summer intern in 1975 and worked for it full time from 1976 until his retirement in 2008. During that time he was involved in all phases of implementing SB 100, especially the state’s longstanding policy to protect farmland including the development of legislation and administrative rules, the review of local plans and zoning codes, local land use decisions and legal appeals. Upon retirement and still to this day, Eber is looked to as Oregon’s preeminent farm and forestlands specialist and recently published a history on Oregon’s efforts to protect farm land from 1961 to 2009.

Dick Benner’s career, JD 75, intertwined with both Gale and Eber at different times. Benner enrolled in the UO law school in 1972, and took up land use causes early on through a position for OSPIRG assigned to monitor the Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission, on which Gale was a commissioner. In 1975, Benner became one of two initial staff attorneys with 1000 Friends of Oregon along with UO law school classmate Bob Stacey. Stacey later became planning director for the City of Portland, the executive director of 1000 Friends, and is currently a Metro Councilor.

Benner spent 12 years with 1000 Friends as the lead attorney on coastal and rural land use cases, where he ensured Oregon’s cities, counties, and the state were upholding SB 100’s goals. In 1987, he accepted the position as executive director of the newly formed Columbia River Gorge Commission, which oversees the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. He directed development of the commission’s staff and development of the Scenic Area’s management plan. Upon completion of the plan, he accepted the position as director of the Department of Land and Conservation Development in 1991.

“That was a very difficult job. My moving into this position coincided with a fairly dramatic turn to the political right in the Oregon Legislature, who were not fans of the program,” says Benner. “Much of our work was defensive, trying to save the land use program and trying to keep a budget for the agency, which was always under attack.”

Even so, Benner and his colleagues, including Eber, were successful at implementing two changes to the program that have real and positive impacts. First, he oversaw the implementation of Oregon’s Transportation Planning Rule, which requires integration of the state’s land use and transportation systems to emphasize the reduction in reliance of automobiles.

“As this rule started to be defined and enacted, it became clear what a big deal it was because it became the first real recognition of the interconnectedness of land use and transportation,” says Benner. “However, it was a titanic struggle within state government to truly enact this rule. Thank goodness for Governor John Kitzhaber, because the Oregon Department of Transportation resisted this all the way. They wanted nothing to do with the land use program, because they were dominated by highway engineers who had no notion of the linkage between the land use patterns and the transportation patterns. Ultimately, the Governor told the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Department that they had to climb on board, and Oregon is starting to see the benefits of this rule today.”

The second success was his work with Eber and others to redefine Oregon’s farmland protection statutes. In 1993, Eber was on assignment as a special assistant to Governor Barbara Roberts’ Natural Resources Policy Advisor Ann Squier. At the outset of this process, both Benner and Eber were fearful the whole farmland protection section of the law was at risk because the House
had leverage to block the agency’s budget in the legislature and hold it hostage in order to force the Senate to agree to changes to weaken the laws designed to protect farm and forest lands from conflicting development. They worked tirelessly over the summer of 1993’s extended legislative session to gain compromises from all parties to pass HB 3661, which amended policy on standards for dwellings in farm zones, placed fixed minimum lot sizes for farmlands in statute, and created the definition of “high-value farmland,” and “finally provided some peace in the countryside, so to speak,” says Benner.

Benner left DLCD in 2001 and became the senior assistant counsel for Metro in Portland, where he witnessed the benefits of Oregon’s land use law up close. Benner says, “Portlanders drive about 20 percent less than average cities of its size. We attribute this not to reduced number of trips, but to shorter trips. The trips are shorter, because we are growing with a more compact urban form. Portlanders do a higher percentage of commute trips made by bike than any city in the United States. They ride transit more. The per capita carbon emissions are below 1990 levels.”

“After 40 years, we are getting to where we set out to go,” Benner concludes.

Gale, Eber and Benner have deep appreciation for Oregon’s land use law as it has taken shape and evolved. “I see myself not just as an advocate of the land use law, or a practitioner of it, but also as a student of it,” says Benner. Eber believes that the law offered him “a great appreciation of the democratic process as well as the responsibility we have as the citizens to those of us here today, as well as to future generations.”

Oregon’s land use law is truly a gift to the state of Oregon, and it isn’t just the work of Gale, Eber and Benner’s passionate advocacy, but thousands of Oregonians who have ensured its success. However, understanding the battles that these three UO graduates faced in educating, communicating, and fighting for Oregon’s land use program over the last 40 years will be important to the success of its next 40 years. Two things are certain: first, change is inevitable for the law, but the foundations of having urban growth boundaries, farm and forestland protection, housing, transportation, and extensive opportunities for citizens to be involved in an open and transparent public process will live on; second, the UO stands ready to continue its development of professionals ready for this task. It’s up to today’s students to pick up the fight to see Oregon’s land use program through for another 40 years.

Joe McAndrew is a graduate student in Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon.
OAPA bids farewell to executive director, welcomes new staff

By Pat Zepp, Becky Steckler, AICP, and Stephanie Kennedy

In June, the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association bids a very fond farewell to its Executive Director Pat Zepp. We will welcome two familiar faces to staff: long time volunteer and periodic contractor Becky Steckler, AICP will take the role of Program and Policy Manager and conference coordinator Stephanie Kennedy will be the Chapter Administrator.

Pat bids the Chapter farewell

Since I can clearly remember Governor Tom McCall and his impact on many critical arenas in the State of Oregon, it seems amazing to me that 40 years have elapsed since the passage of SB 100. The results of its passage are visible throughout the state and its various communities today and detail many of the most important tenets of the planning community. I would like to add my congratulations to the Oregon planners on this milestone.

Ten years ago I did not know that the field of Urban Design and Planning existed. After ten years of working with the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association it feels that I know more than I ever wanted to…

I have benefitted greatly from working with all of you in the OAPA for this past decade and hope that I have provided the kind of membership service you should expect as a professional organization. I know that you will be moving forward with the assistance of quality administrators and volunteer leaders. The best is yet to come for the OAPA!

Thank you for this wonderful opportunity and the great friendships.

Becky Steckler, AICP takes a new role with OAPA

After 10+ years as an OAPA volunteer (Board member, OPJ Editor, Awards Chair, Conference Chair, LPAC member, Education and Outreach member, as well as research and much more!) I’m thrilled to be the new Program and Policy Manager for the Chapter.

As a native Oregonian, I have a deep love of this state and its people and landscapes. My experience growing up in Sisters, getting my Masters in Community and Regional Planning from University of Oregon, and now living in Portland gives me an appreciation and better
understanding of the challenges of small and large communities in rural and urban settings.

I've worked at consulting firms (ECONorthwest), the state (DLCD and the California Coastal Commission), cities (Portland Parks and Recreation and multiple municipal clients while at ECONorthwest), and non-profits (Sierra Club, 1000 Friends of Oregon, and OAPA). This diverse professional experience will help me better understand the needs of members and planners across the state.

I'm looking forward to working with the OAPA Board of Directors to craft a new Five Year Strategic Plan, as well as support OAPA committees and help the volunteer leadership provide the high-quality professional development workshops and conferences you've come to expect. I'll also provide policy research and support to the Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee and hope to work on research and educational activities for members across the state.

In addition, I hope to reach out to planners across Oregon and help bring the training and services you need to your communities. If there is a committee or program you'd like to work on, let me know. I'm hoping to get more volunteers involved with OAPA.

I'm looking forward to working with all of you in the coming years.

Introducing Stephanie Kennedy, Chapter Administrator

I am excited to start a new venture with OAPA! It has been great getting to meet so many members while working on the annual conference over the last five years. I am looking forward to getting to know more members and learning even more about the planning industry. I come to you with a deep commitment to association leadership and building a community. I have been both a meeting professional and association executive for more than 20 years, managing multiple associations. I have a strong background in technology and customer service and hope to take OAPA to a new level of success.

I am married and have three boys — 15, 13, and 10. We have two bulldogs. In my free time I enjoy reading, watching my kids' sports/activities (we are currently in baseball mode), walking, spending time with friends and family, and traveling.

Thank you for this great opportunity to be a part of your association. Please do not hesitate to contact me - I am only a phone call or an email away to support OAPA members!

Take the OAPA Planner Survey!

In an effort to better serve planners across the state, and in light of the 40th anniversary of Oregon's Statewide Planning Program, the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association is surveying both members and non-members about OAPA programs and activities. The survey will help OAPA leadership better understand what issues and activities are most important to planners, and improve the services we provide.

Everyone who completes the survey will be entered into a drawing to attend either the 2013 Legal Issues Workshop in December or OAPA's 2014 annual conference. The survey will be active until June 30, 2013! Please respond today.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/OAPAVision40
OAPA Committees get the work done!

By Jon Makler, OAPA Professional Development Officer, Jeannine Rustad, OAPA Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee Chair, and Angela Lazarean, OAPA Education and Outreach Chair

Most of the work of the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association would not get done without dedicated volunteers. Besides the conference committee, the three most active committees are the Professional Development Committee (PDC), the Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC), and the Education and Outreach Committee. The article describes some activities that kept these committees busy this past year.

Professional Development Committee

The Professional Development Committee has some perennial events that continue to strengthen the planning profession. In September 2012, the Oregon Transportation Summit offered members a chance to get the latest research from student and faculty researchers at Oregon universities in addition to speakers from around the state and beyond. The keynote speaker, Eran Ben Joseph of MIT, discussed the urban design attributes of parking lots.

In December 2012, the Legal Issues Workshop once again drew a capacity crowd of 150 people. As always, the workshop included the popular Case Law Review session, this time with Ed Sullivan, Dan Kearns, and Michael Robinson. The Workshop included an examination of “Big Cases that Shaped the Planning Program” in the 40 years since SB 100, Oregon’s growth management program, was passed.

In February 2013, the committee sponsored a “Rebuilding Communities” symposium held in Portland and Eugene. Susan Hopkins (Downtown Detroit Partnership) and Tim Ganey (DLR Group) offered insights into how communities recover from economic decay and from natural disasters, using case studies from Detroit, Michigan and from Joplin, Missouri.

Finally, the Portland Development Commission co-sponsored several events this year. The 2012 Housing Land Advocates Conference, “Taking Shelter: Affordable Housing in a Changing Economy,” occurred in September 2012 and “Expanding Health Impact Assessment Practice in the Pacific Northwest” was held in Portland in February 2013.

Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee

The Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC) is responsible for developing and implementing the Chapter’s legislative and policy action program. LPAC members are appointed by the Board president.

The 2013 legislative session has been a bit slower on the land use front than in other full sessions. LPAC is tracking roughly 70 bills. As in past years, expansion of allowed uses on wineries on land zoned for exclusive farm use is a significant issue. Two winery associates came to a compromise with assistance of the Governor’s office and, as a result, SB 841 has been moving forward. Unfortunately, land use interests were not at the table in the drafting of this bill despite its broad implications to farmlands. OAPA has

Congratulations!

OAPA would like to congratulate the following members for earning entry into the American Institute of Certified Planners in the last year:

• Ray Delahanty, AICP
• Barry Gordon, AICP
• Michael Greenwald, AICP
• Elisa Hamblin, AICP
• Sarah Logiudice, AICP
• Briana Meier, AICP
• Nicholas Snead, AICP
• Spencer Williams, AICP

• Sarah Logiudice, AICP
• Briana Meier, AICP
• Nicholas Snead, AICP
• Spencer Williams, AICP
faced an uphill battle in attempting to bring balance to the proposal to ensure that allowed uses are subordinate to farm uses. SB 841 is now in the House of Representatives, where we have proposed amendments to the bill.

An exciting and positive outcome from this session is the expected passage of HB 2253 and 2254. These two bills are the result of a year-long effort of the Governor’s Urban Growth Advisory Committee (UGAC). The UGAC is “a collaborative team of experienced land use practitioners” that has been working to design “changes to key aspects of the state’s land use program” (See the Nov/Dec 2012 OPJ article Streamlining Urban Growth Management: Proposed Legislation on UGBs for the 2013 Oregon Legislature for more information on this work). HB 2253 will require Portland State University Population Research Center to issue population forecasts for land use planning that are currently produced by counties. This concept will “create a simplified, faster and less expensive way to prepare and adopt population forecasts for growth management purposes” (Nov/Dec OPJ, page 28). HB 2254 creates option for cities with population of less than 10,000 to project need, based on population growth, for inclusion of land within urban growth boundary and establishes priority for selection of land for inclusion.

Looking ahead, LPAC is working to become a key player in policy and rulemaking activities. To this end, a Policy Options Subcommittee is being formed. This Subcommittee will facilitate LPAC and OAPA participation in state and regional efforts to develop policies, programs, plans and administrative rules that occur outside of annual legislative activities. Interested parties should contact Richard Ross (richardross@earthlink.net).

Education and Outreach Committee
The Education and Outreach Committee serves as an ambassador to the planning profession and is responsible for promoting the art and science of planning in Oregon to communities, students, educators, interest groups, the media, and public at large.

In 2012 our committee worked on several projects and events. We hosted our 2nd annual Healthy Communities Speaker Series by bringing guest speaker Jeff Tumlin to three metro areas. Jeff discussed the importance of linking transportation in all aspects of life and land use planning and left us with 8 steps on creating healthier, walkable cities.

Secondly, committee member Jessica Nunley continued working with Newberg Middle School 6th graders and the Design Star program. The program was created in 2006 in response to an APA National Community Planning Month initiative asking local planners to engage young people. Over the past five years, the program has evolved into an annual collaboration between Newberg city staff and middle school teachers and has been integrated into the curriculum.

The Design Star program received the American Planning Association’s 2013 National Planning Excellence Award for Public Outreach. The program was honored for its success in engaging almost every Newberg 6th grader in critical thinking about community planning, and encouraging and empowering them to be creative in finding ways to be involved with improving their community.

Finally, committee member Ethan Erickson, Executive Director of the Oregon nonprofit Tsuga Community Commission (TCC), opened registration this week for a new program, Neighborhood PLACE: Parks Learning and Community Enhancement. This social capital improvement project will be piloted in three Portland Neighborhoods this summer with funding from Metro, Neighbors West Northwest, Southeast Uplift, the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association, and Tsuga Community donors.

Neighborhood PLACE is a free, one week day camp program for participants age 9 – 14 from a given neighborhood. It’s an innovative curriculum that introduces youth and teens to local land use issues, involves them in experiential education field trips, and results in a service learning community enhancement project at the end of each week.
2013 OAPA Awards

By Stacy Humphrey, OAPA Awards Chair

At its April meeting, the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association Board of Directors approved the 2013 chapter awards. Awards are given annually by the Board to recognize projects and programs of exceptional merit in the field of planning and to recognize persons who have made outstanding contributions to the field. This year’s awards will be presented at the Oregon Vision Turns 40 OAPA annual conference held in Portland in May 2013.

Award Winners

Professional Achievement in Planning
- Envision Eugene, City of Eugene
- Urban Forestry Code Revisions Project, City of Tigard

Special Achievement in Planning
- Community Service Center, University of Oregon

Student Achievement in Planning
- Connect Cascade Locks, Portland State University Master’s in Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Project, Danielle Fuchs, Michael Ahillen, Sarah Bronstein, Ellen Dorsey, Sara Morrissey, Chloe Ritter

Distinguished Leadership by a Professional Planner
- Matt Spangler

Distinguished Leadership by a Community Planner
- Ric Stephens

Betty Niven Award for Distinguished Leadership in Affordable Housing Advocacy
- Betty Tamm, Executive Director, NeighborWorks Umpqua

Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official
- Amy Houghtaling, Mayor, City of Falls City

Professional Achievement in Planning

The Professional Achievement in Planning Award recognizes individuals or organizations for a comprehensive planning program, plan, plan element, plan inventory, implementing measure, or special planning project of exceptional merit. This year, the Professional Achievement in Planning Award recognizes two projects: Envision Eugene from the City of Eugene and the Urban Forestry Code Revisions Project from the City of Tigard.

Envision Eugene, City of Eugene

The Envision Eugene effort was a response to a State Legislative task to adopt a new Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), separate from the City of Springfield, and ensure sufficient land for 20 years of growth. Envision Eugene did that by:

- Capitalizing on leadership changes.
- Engaging the public.
- Focusing on collecting best outcomes rather
than worst fears as articulated by a polarized public.

Public involvement efforts through Envision Eugene provided greater engagement opportunities to the broader public than what is typically seen in public processes. A Community Resource Group and a Technical Resource Group were created and incorporated a broad range of stakeholders. These groups were entrusted to do technical analyses that fed directly into the decision-making process. This allowed a direct influence on outcomes, provided assurances on the value of public involvement, and ensured results that had broad community support.

The legacy of Envision Eugene will be how a previously fractured community came together to build a common vision. As the process evolved, the conversation shifted from a contentiousness focus on the urban growth boundary to what kind of future the community desired for itself. The end result is a recommendation to expand the urban growth boundary by about 3 percent while population grows 20 percent as well as a broadly supported vision for Eugene’s future.

For more information, see: www.envisioneugene.org

Urban Forestry Code Revisions Project, City of Tigard

For several decades, Oregon municipalities have been recognized nationally for implementing comprehensive, multi-disciplinary urban forestry programs that contribute to economic, social, and environmental community well-being. It is well documented that urban forests treat stormwater runoff, provide indirect benefits by reducing the urban heat island effect, reduce air pollution, store and sequester carbon and provide wildlife benefits, to name a few.

The City of Tigard Urban Forestry Code Revisions Project demonstrates the city’s commitment to preserving, enhancing, and maintaining their urban forest. Further, the project offers noteworthy citizen engagement and urban forestry contributions and practices for other municipalities to consider when undertaking similar approaches.

What is noteworthy is that the City of Tigard implemented a multi-year project, starting in 2008, which successfully incorporated a City Council vision, newly revised Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, and a Council directive, resulting in a comprehensive rewrite of Community Development Code and Municipal Code urban forestry regulations.

A Citizen Advisory Committee, including developers and environmental advocates, and a multi-agency Technical Advisory Committee provided input to City staff as the plan was developed. In addition, a peer review process was utilized to test new development standards for the full range of development scenarios. The Tigard City Council unanimously adopted these regulations in January 2013. The successful project collaboration was evidenced by the broad-based letters of support accompanying the City’s nomination for an Oregon APA Award from the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland, Tualatin River Keepers, and members of the Citizen Advisory Committee, including consulting arborists.

Programmatically, Tigard’s new regulations and Urban Forestry Manual allow for flexible standards and incentives to facilitate preservation of the city’s remaining tree groves through the waiver of density requirements, flexible setbacks, lot sizes, street widths, and building heights. They also implement equitable tree canopy regulations by providing developers with four options ranging from preservation, fee-in-lieu, planting, and discretionary review. Lastly, the City established a consolidated permit system to make the land use permitting process clear, consistent and user friendly.

For more information, see: http://www.tigard.or.gov/community/trees/.
Special Achievement in Planning

The Special Achievement in Planning Award is granted to a project, program, individual or activity that has exceptional merit and has made a significant contribution to the field of planning. This year, the Special Achievement Award recognizes the University of Oregon, Community Service Center.

The Community Service Center - celebrating its 40th anniversary this year - is an interdisciplinary organization that connects students to Oregon communities to help solve local issues and improve the quality of life of Oregon residents. It includes four service areas:

- The Economic Development Administration University Center
- The Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience
- The Community Planning Workshop
- The Resource Assistance to Rural Environments

In a given year, the Community Service Center touches nearly 5,000 community members, provides over 1,000 training hours to community members, provides nearly 250 community meetings and presentations and engages 125 students.

Elements of the Community Service Center have been exported to other campuses nationwide such as Cornell University and the University of Maryland. Additionally, some planning agencies such as the City of Cincinnati, Ohio are exploring how to take elements of the Community Service Center back to bear on their community.

More information on the Community Service Center is available at: http://csc.uoregon.edu

Student Achievement in Planning

The Student Achievement in Planning Award is granted for a project of exceptional merit in the field of planning and executed by a student, group of students, or class. This year’s Student Achievement Award recognizes the Celilo Planning Studio out of Portland State University for their project: Connect Cascade Locks: A Recreational Trails Plan for Economic Development. This project was one of three nationwide student projects recognized by the American Planning Association in Chicago this past April.

The Port of Cascade Locks approached PSU’s graduate school program to develop a community trails plan. The Celilo Planning Studio project accomplished this by knitting together the assorted recreational assets in Cascade Locks, combining them with community resources and aspirations, and then creating an economic development strategy to capitalize on community assets and promote aspirations.

To achieve this outcome, Celilo Planning Studio implemented traditional planning tools to achieve outstanding outcomes. Two surveys were conducted: one for community residents and one for recreationalists such as hikers, bikers, and
sailors. The results from these were synthesized to identify community priorities that aligned with recreationalists. Community forums, a virtual open house, and casual conversations outside the local grocery store continued the conversation and refined an approach to community economic development that built upon the amazing natural environment and community in Cascade Locks.

The final product from Celilo Planning Studio includes recommendations for trails, trailhead amenities, business, marketing, and trail stewardship. It has been adopted by the Port Commission, the City Tourism and Downtown Revitalization Steering Committee, and the City Council. The community of Cascade Locks has hosted new recreation events including the Double Cross Cyclocross Race and the Volkswalk Columbia River Gorge Biennial Classic. The Port has installed new trail signs and built a new 18-hole disc golf course. A trails hub is being planned to tie the various trails together in downtown.

The business community has embraced the plan as well. Thunder Island Brewing is making beer, a Native American fish market and a new coffee stand are breaking ground, and the Cascade Locks Ale House has opened to critical acclaim.

Celilo Planning Group includes Danielle Fuchs, Michael Ahillen, Sarah Bronstein, Ellen Dorsey, Sara Morrissey, and Chloe Ritter.

Additional materials may be accessed at: http://www.connectcascadelocks.com

**Distinguished Leadership by a Professional Planner**

The award for distinguished leadership by a professional planner recognizes an individual who has made an outstanding contribution to the field of planning and to his or her community. This year’s award recognizes Matt Spangler for his lifelong contributions to the planning profession and to his community.

For much of Matt’s career he worked for Lincoln County and served as their Planning Director from 1986 to 2009. Under his direction, Lincoln County adopted its Comprehensive Plan, which was the first coastal county plan to be acknowledged. He also worked on the Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan, the first of Oregon’s deep draft development estuary plans to be acknowledged. Ron Eber, retired from DLCD, commented that Matt “...kept his cool and was successful in explaining the complexities of the land use program.”

Matt Spangler has also participated in professional organizations. He served many years on the Board of Directors of the Association of Oregon Counties Planning Directors and was its President in 1991. He also served on the OAPA Board of Directors from 1989-1991 and served on the Awards Committee in 1991.

Today, Matt is the Senior Coastal Policy Analyst for the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development where he serves as the department’s lead policy specialist for coastal resources utilizing his more than 35 years of experience as a local government planner and planning director on the Oregon coast. Robert Bailey, retired Manager of the Oregon Coastal Management Program and the person responsible for bringing Matt to DLCD, stated:

“When I finally was able to hire Matt I felt like...”
I was a minor league baseball manager who had just acquired Derek Jeter from the New York Yankees. I felt we had hired a guy at the top of his game and he proved me right. We were able to leverage his knowledge, personality, and professionalism to nearly two dozen jurisdictions on the north coast.”

**Distinguished Leadership by a Community Planner**

The award for distinguished leadership by a community planner recognizes an individual who has volunteered their time and made an outstanding contribution to planning and to community. This year’s award recognizes Ric Stephens. Ric’s contributions to planning and to his Beaverton community run deep and include:

- Seven years on the City of Beaverton Planning Commission
- Public Information Officer for the Beaverton Community Emergency Response Team
- Two years as Planning Commission representative to the OAPA Board
- Co-chair of past Oregon/Washington planning conferences
- Author of a variety of planning literature including:
  - Planning Board Games
  - Planning Infographics
  - Can you Hear me in the Back?
  - Plannerese Dictionary
- Managing editor for the Oregon Planners Journal for the past year
- Regular panel organizer for conferences (past sessions have included Humor in Planning and Hearings from Hell).

Ric has also taken on a strong community role to introduce the next generation to planning and community involvement. He’s helped arrange sessions for international speakers to meet with students and understand how people contribute to community throughout the world. Mr. Stephens has also organized student presentations in front of the Planning Commission, helping cultivate a connection to local governments, community involvement and public speaking.

**Betty Niven Award for Distinguished Leadership in Affordable Housing Advocacy**

The Betty Niven Award for Distinguished Leadership in Affordable Housing Advocacy recognizes an individual or organization that has made an outstanding contribution to the planning field’s ability to help communities more effectively meet the housing needs of Oregonians with limited means. This year’s award recognizes Betty Tamm, Executive Director of NeighborWorks Umpqua.

Betty has grown NeighborWorks Umpqua from an organization of one with no budget 20 years ago to an organization with 55 staff that has rehabilitated 150 single-family homes, created 418 units of affordable rental housing and led
construction on 36 single-family homes built by the people who live in them. Her latest project is building permanent housing for homeless veterans, a $12 million project that will include 10 family units and 44 individual units and will be completed this November. Under her leadership, NeighborWorks Umpqua has received awards from the State of Oregon, Housing and Community Services Department for Innovative Partnerships, and from the Housing Assistance Council for Rural Sustainable Housing Development.

Ms. Tamm has taken on leadership roles to further her affordable housing advocacy. She has chaired the Oregon CDC Association, has represented rural Oregon on the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle’s Affordable Housing Advisory Board, was appointed by Governor Kulongoski to his Brand Oregon team, was appointed by Governor Kitzhaber to represent Oregon CDC’s for the Community Incentive Fund, and is an active member of Rural Local Initiatives Support Corporation Advisory Board.

**Betty Tamm, Executive Director of NeighborWorks Umpqua**

The Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official award recognizes an elected official who has made a contribution to planning and to community. This year’s award recognizes Amy Houghtaling, Mayor of Falls City.

**Amy Houghtaling, Mayor of Falls City**

Under Mayor Houghtaling’s leadership, the City undertook a Transportation and Growth Management project to create a Transportation System Plan. Shortly after receiving the grant, the City Administrator position was vacated and Ms. Houghtaling stepped in to ensure this key project would be completed. During the TSP process, Ms. Houghtaling was instrumental in identify strategic players to guide this process and sought participation from key businesses in the area. Additionally, Mayor Houghtaling sought creative ways to garner greater public involvement such as coordinating project tables at seasonal community events, including the local football games.

**Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official**

The Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official award recognizes an elected official who has made a contribution to planning and to community. This year’s award recognizes Amy Houghtaling, Mayor of Falls City.

Special thanks to Awards Committee members Stacy Humphrey, Chair (City of Gresham), Katie Mangle (City of Wilsonville), Peter Gutowsky (Deschutes County), Alwin Turiel (City of Hillsboro), Marguerite Nabeta, Ken Pirie (Walker Macy), Carla McLane (Morrow County), Steve White (Oregon Public Health Institute) and Sandra Fox (City of Klamath Falls) for their diligence and enthusiasm in reviewing this year’s nominations.
Oregon’s Planning Culture

By Ric Stephens, Editor, Oregon Planners’ Journal

With the passage of one of the most comprehensive and progressive pieces of statewide planning legislation in 1973, SB 100 set the stage for a deep awareness and promotion of flourishing environments, equitable economies, and vibrant communities. Four decades of avant-garde physical planning and social engineering have created a second generation of citizens who accept and expect a high level of environmental design.

From a “participated” public to an engaged citizenry

The statewide planning goals begin with citizen involvement, and Oregonians are engaged with planning programs and projects at all levels of scale. Public involvement in Oregon spans numerous traditional and innovative activities from design charrettes to social media. On Arnstein’s “ladder of citizen participation” many communities have achieved the highest level of ‘citizen control’ through activism and “ballot box planning.” For many Oregonians, “planning is religion.”

Balancing nature and society

The most definitive and controversial land use regulation adopted in 1973 was Oregon’s response to sprawl, the urban growth boundary (UGB). Now a model for other states and countries, the UGB establishes a community’s “line in the sand” for urbanization. This has further established a planning culture with a vision of an urban/rural dichotomy reinforced by decades of land use decision-making. Simultaneously, Oregon is deepening this relationship through the incorporation of urban agriculture and biophilic design.

Glocalization

“Think global, act local” is another element of the Oregon planning culture that is evident in both small practices (banning plastic bags) and large-scale programs (HB 3543 Global Warming Actions). The Oregon planning culture has a strong global consciousness and concurrent ‘political will’ unlike the federal government or majority of states. Collectively these features attract national and international planners who are seeking insight on multi-modal transportation, ecodistricts, compact city forms, and many other facets of the Oregon planning culture.

Two years after enactment of SB 100, a team of consultants including Christopher Alexander, wrote a book on their recommendations for the University of Oregon campus-planning. This book, The Oregon Experiment, became the foundation for the seminal planning book A Pattern Language. This ‘language’ is spoken fluently in Oregon, and the ‘experiment’ continues.

Ric Stephens is a planning consultant and educator in the Pacific Northwest and internationally. He is currently working on projects in China and teaching at the University of Oregon and Marylhurst University.
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