

To: Villages at Mt. Hood BOD
From: Susan Corwin
Date: January 28, 2007
Subject: comparison of County supplied Notes on BCC Work Session of 1/9 with Susan Corwin's

The following note compares the contents of the key issues of the Commissioners captured in the Notes from the BCC Work Session on Jan. 8, 2007 with the notes I sent out as improved with Shirley's comments.

Unless I missed something, they appear to be basically the same except the BCC notes are terse to the extreme.

Further note: we need to remember that the comments of the individual commissioners are their own personal comments. They are not the "decision" of the BCC any more than the comments of any individual BOD member are the "resolution of the BOD"

Summary of commissioners key issues taken verbatim from the
.Notes – Board of Clackamas County Commissioners Staff Meeting – 1/9/07

in the same order (i.e. chronological) as the notes:

- 1) DZ said site has wetland issue;
- 2) designation to preserve salmon river watershed.
- 3) LP said has not been community-wide discussion of need.
- 4) LP questioned if amphitheater an appropriate use; not in urban area;
- 5) impact Hwy 26.
- 6) MS said this seem early.
- 7) Need for further discussion on disposition of Cedar Ridge property; need for dialogue.
- 8) MS said have had conversation w/ski operators; integrate w/them.
- 9) LP said look at community needs;
 - a. existing # of acres for parks;
 - b. what should be there.
- 10) BK said Cedar Ridge tax-foreclosed property we've owned for some time. Have fiduciary responsibility for maximizing site.
=>Look at comprehensively: how manage; county-wide asset.
- 11) Look at community needs.
- 12) Ask staff to look at MP.
- 13) LP said clarify rules on urban LU; may not be approved use in unincorporated.

The Commissioner's issues inserted in the notes I published, as amended by Shirley Dueber:

- 1. What is the Community need - a gap analysis between what is there and what is needed. How many acres of park exist, what is their usage, etc**
- 2. Community desire - does the community really want this?
Make sure that out of the 8000 people there is significant willingness.**

=> the above 2 were my notes on the following 3 terse notes

- 3) LP said has not been community-wide discussion of need.
- 6) MS said this seem early.
- 9) LP said look at community needs;
 - a. existing # of acres for parks;
 - b. what should be there.

3. Impact on US 26 - it is already very busy and adding more cars will require a major impact assessment

5) impact Hwy 26.

4. Hanna, Reilly, et al are investigating the same items: parking and a venue. This all needs to be coordinated/aligned....

8) MS said have had conversation w/ski operators; integrate w/them.

5. Is the urban use Amphitheater even allowed in the area per Oregon land use? (Lynn Peterson thought not and that it was a show stopper.)

4) LP questioned if amphitheater an appropriate use; not in urban area;

13) LP said clarify rules on urban LU; may not be approved use in unincorporated.

6. There are issues of wet lands, watershed drainage, and Salmon River Corridor that need to be addressed.

=> That is why BLM is willing to buy it so that it is protected from development.

=> The project would seem to be potentially detrimental to the environment and an assessment needs to be done.

1) DZ said site has wetland issue;

2) designation to preserve salmon river watershed.

7. BCC needs to resolve the best use of the land for all the Citizens of the county. Maybe BLM, maybe Condos, maybe big hotel.... (the last two sounded like they were just "for example")

=> and this comes first (this was from Kennemer).

6) MS said this seem early.

7) Need for further discussion on disposition of Cedar Ridge property; need for dialogue.

10) BK said Cedar Ridge tax-foreclosed property we've owned for some time. Have fiduciary responsibility for maximizing site.

=> Look at comprehensively: how manage; county-wide asset.

8. Dan Zinzer/Parks needs to do a mini-parks master plan for the area. note: not a \$100K but something simpler.

12) Ask staff to look at MP.

9. The Commissioners seem to be "allergic to controversy": they would like to see consensus on items brought forward by the Villages.

3) LP said has not been community-wide discussion of need.

6) MS said this seem early.

Additionally, Chris Roth noted in the [January 10, 2007 Oregonian article](#):

10. "This set a real precedent for asking for a substantial donation of property that had large value,"

11. "There needed to be a lot of answers to questions like,

a) 'What were going to be the qualifications for someone asking for this?

b) What were the uses going to be?"