



JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WASCO COUNTY & CITY OF THE DALLES

Thursday, April 26, 2012

Columbia Gorge Discovery Center
Classroom
5000 Discovery Drive
The Dalles, OR 97058

AGENDA

6:00 PM: Meeting Begins

CALL TO ORDER

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. PUBLIC COMMENT: Maximum 15 minutes, *limited to items not being heard or discussed elsewhere on the agenda.*
- III. PRESENTATION: Darren Nichols, Executive Director, Columbia River Gorge Commission
- IV. WORK SESSION: Joint Work Session between the Wasco County Planning Commission and City of The Dalles Planning Commission. The purpose of the work session will be to discuss the process and the preliminary schedule to conduct workshops, public hearings, and applications for amending the Urban Growth Boundary and NSA Urban Exempt Boundary in proximity to the City of The Dalles, and to update the Commissions on the Periodic Review Work Program effort to date as it relates to the amendments to the two boundaries.
- V. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO LAST-MINUTE CHANGES



JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WASCO COUNTY & CITY OF THE DALLES

Thursday, April 26, 2012
Columbia Gorge Discovery Center
Classroom
5000 Discovery Drive
The Dalles, OR 97058

WORK SESSION NOTES

CALL TO ORDER: The session was called to order at 6:00 PM.

I. ROLL CALL

Gorge Commission: Darren Nichols, Executive Director

County: Jon Roberts, Planning Director;

Planning Commissioners: Don Hoffman, Chair; Mike Omeg; Jill Amery; Chip Wood;
Ken McBain

Other County Staff: Jeanette Montour, Sr. Planner; Joey Shearer, Associate Planner

City: Dan Durow, Planning Director

Planning Commissioners: Bruce Lavier, Chair; Mark Poppoff; John Nelson;
Dennis Whitehouse

Other City Staff: Gene Parker, City Attorney; Richard Gassman, Sr. Planner,
Dawn Marie Hert, Associate Planner

Consultant: Greg Winterowd, Winterbrook Consultants

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments.

III. PRESENTATION: Darren Nichols, Executive Director, Columbia River Gorge Commission

Mr. Nichols introduced himself and gave his work history and background.

Common interest: working together to protect and enhance our community/city/county/scenic area

Unexpected Opportunities (savings)

Embark on a consensus of stakeholders' aspirations, concerns and issues

Project conception – PSU + UW + WSU = assessment level of consensus in the National Scenic Area (NSA)

120 stakeholders compiled (cities, state, county, tribes, federal, recreational uses, agriculture, special interest groups) series of interviews. Purpose: to help prioritize topics for discussion. Build trust, collaborate, work together

Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Area – suggestions to both commissions about an “open communication between agencies.”

IV. WORK SESSION: Mr. Durow talked about Goal 10 and 11—what to expect in terms of process

Mr. Winterowd gave a presentation.

Explanation of UGB expansion:

- Archaeology
- Buildable Lands
- Natural Features
- Key Viewing Areas

Phase II Work Program Tasks:

- Cultural Resources Management Plan and LUDO Amendments (June)
- Public Facilities Plans (June)
- Revised UGB Alternative Analysis (June)
- Local, State, Federal Coordination and adoption process

Mr. Winterowd fielded questions/comments:

Nichols – Who goes first, City, County or Scenic Area?

Winterowd – Scenic Area

It was pointed out that the UGB expansion area is located in NSA property

Hoffman – Any expansion of a UGB would reduce the overall area of the NSA

Nichols – Commission (NSA) has authority for minor amendments. Nichols feels our community, not congress, can make a definition of "minor."

Durow directed people to the City's website for all of the information used in this work session.

Winterowd – Flexibility in interpretation in regards to the UGB area

Nichols – Opportunity for this group to work together, find common ground and prepare a "unified front"

Dave Ellis (archaeological consultant) – Addressing archaeological issues, richest regions in the Northwest. Produces opportunities and challenges looking at other communities and how it has been addressed. It's a matter of deciding when and at what level of review to identify archaeological sites.

State regulates all historic artifacts on public or private lands.

Lavier – What would be expected on a site?

Ellis – Seasonal camps, temporary dwellings, chip shavings. Also human remains—very hard to predict. Other items: roots

Omeg – Asked about getting a polygon to get references for aerial photos.

Durow – will get back to him with information

Mike Elmore and Tim Ashmore of Chenoweth PUD – Public Facilities Plan – keenly interested in the process

V. ADJOURNMENT: 7:26 PM