



## CITY of THE DALLES

313 COURT STREET  
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

(541) 296-5481 ext. 1125  
FAX: (541) 298-5490  
[www.ci.the-dalles.or.us](http://www.ci.the-dalles.or.us)

# AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE	AGENDA LOCATION	AGENDA REPORT #

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Dan Durow, Community Development Director

THRU: Nolan Young, City Manager

DATE: February 25, 2009

RE: Periodic Review Evaluation and Work Program Hearing

**ISSUE:** A Periodic Review of the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan is required by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) approximately every ten (10) years. Periodic Review includes three basic steps:

- 1. The City evaluates its comprehensive plan and land use regulations to see if any changes are needed.*
- 2. The City develops a Work Program with scheduled work tasks necessary to make the changes.*
- 3. The City completes the work tasks.*

Periodic Review is over when the tasks are completed and the updated plan is approved by the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

This process is to be completed through the City's Citizen Involvement Program, of which the Planning Commission has been designated the Citizen Involvement Committee to help steer the public involvement. The first step is to review this citizen involvement process and determine that there is adequate process for citizens to participate. The Planning Commission reviewed and made a positive determination at their hearing on April 3, 2008. The citizen involvement program must provide opportunities for oral and written comments during development of the work program and when it is carried out. Below is additional information on process and the schedule which further describes the time periods for agency and citizen participation.

The ORS require that a notice be published in the local paper informing citizens that periodic review is starting, and that notice must also be provided to those who request it in writing. This notice was published prior to the Planning Commission hearing last year, and another newspaper notice of this meeting was published on February 25, 2009. Notice was also sent to the standard list of State, regional, and local agencies including Wasco County. Notice was also sent to the Gorge Commission staff. In addition, all persons that have participated in the related process to amend the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and requested notice of any urban growth boundary meetings were sent a notice of this Periodic Review hearing as well.

The City Council meetings are public hearings not land use hearings. The City is not expected to collect data in its periodic review evaluation of its comprehensive plan and land use regulations as it would in a quasi-judicial land use hearing. It is expected to receive and respond to any public or agency testimony.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS** The Planning Commission, at their April 3rd hearing, considered and then recommended to the City Council the proposed Periodic Review Evaluation and Work Program. The evaluation and proposed work program was then submitted for an initial review and comment to the State's Periodic Review Assistance Team (PRAT) for comment. The PRAT's role is to coordinate State, regional or local public agency comment, assistance, and information into the evaluation and work program development process. During this same comment period, the public and other agencies had 21 days following the Planning Commission meeting for written comments to be submitted. Only two (2) comments were submitted by the Northern Wasco County Park and Recreation District and the Gorge Commission. The letters are attached to this staff report and will be addressed later in this staff report. The City Council must now review the Planning Commission's recommendation and consider any other PRAT, public, agency, or County input before making a final determination on whether a CLUP update is necessary and, if so, what the work tasks and schedule should be.

The following is the proposed schedule:

1. April 3, 2008; Planning Commission meeting to discuss, get agency and public comment, and review and recommend approval the periodic review evaluation and the proposed work program.
2. April 4, 2008; Start of the 21 day comment period for written agency and public input. Written comment period ended on April 25th with one (1) written comment received.

*[Note: Since the initial meeting with the Planning Commission on April 3, 2008, the City, State Department of Land Conservation and Development, Gorge Commission staff, County, and Warm Springs staff have been in discussions about the entire issue of urban growth boundary amendments including the specific issues of the cultural and scenic area work tasks. Because of the complicated nature between the State law and National Scenic Area Act, it has taken until now to be able to resume the Periodic Review Process.]*

3. March 9, 2009; The City Council's meeting to discuss the periodic review evaluation and work program, review agency and public comment, and approve the periodic review evaluation, the work program, and the grant application.

[Staff report due on February 25, 2009. This includes staff response to the agency comments.]

4. A preliminary grant application has been prepared based upon staff's best estimate of the cost to complete the Work Program tasks. Upon approval by the City Council of the Periodic Review Work Program, the final grant application will be submitted to the DLCDC. This preliminary grant application is based on Phase II of the two phased work program approved by DLCDC over two years ago. *(The grant application will be on the March 9, 2009, City Council meeting for approval as well.)*

The DLCDC has earmarked some grant monies to begin the work program tasks this grant cycle, which ends on June 30, 2009. It is anticipated that additional work program items will need to be completed during the next grant cycle starting on July 1, 2009. These will be brought back to the City Council for approval with the supplemental grant application. *[However, at the time of this staff report it was reported that the State had withdrawn its grant set-aside monies because of the budget problems at the State level. It is not known whether there will be any grant monies next fiscal year. If there are, cities in Periodic Review will get a higher priority for funding, which should help our chances of getting a grant.]*

The Planning Commission determined that the established citizen involvement committee, program, and proposed periodic review process and schedule, (as described above) was adequate in providing opportunities for citizen involvement. The City Council should now proceed with the following Periodic Review Evaluation of the CLUP, proposed work program tasks, and grant application.

## Periodic Review Evaluation

### Introduction

The Dalles Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and urban growth boundary (UGB) were acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in 1982; **27 years ago**. Although The Dalles has been actively engaged in planning and economic development efforts over the last 27 years, the UGB has not materially changed since its establishment. Although population growth slowed in the 1980s, it picked up all throughout the 1990's and 2000's. The current load of applications for housing has dropped off from recent record highs, but commercial and industrial applications remain at very high levels despite the national economic downturn. Growth has continued since the bulk of the UGB amendment studies were completed 1.5 to 2 years.

While the UGB has remained static, The Dalles has actively planned for the future. Major planning and development accomplishments include:

1. Adoption and implementation of a 25-year, Downtown Urban Renewal Plan in 1990 resulting in significant urban renewal development projects, with several more in process;
2. Adoption of a major update of the CLUP in 1994, and implementing zoning regulations in following years;
3. Completion of the Vision Action Plan in 1995 (two thirds of the strategies had been implemented), and an updated Vision Action Plan in 2002;
4. Planning and implementation of a large expansion of the Columbia Gorge Community College campus;
5. State designated Enterprise Zone in 1986, again in 1996, and again in 2007;
6. Completion and implementation of the Airport Master Plan, with development of a major golf

course and resort facility in the near future, and construction of a new municipal water well to serve the airport industrial and commercial development lands;

7. Adoption and implementation of The Dalles Transportation System Plan (TSP) with SDC's;
8. Completion and implementation of a Storm Water Master Plan with fees;
9. Completion and implementation of an updated Sewer Master Plan with SDC's;
10. Completion and implementation of an updated Water Master Plan with SDC's;
11. Completion and implementation of a Riverfront Master Plan in 1989, and construction of a 10-mile long, 12-foot wide, paved Riverfront Trail (almost complete) and a major Downtown/Riverfront connection project;
12. Construction of a looped, fiber optics communication system;
13. Adoption and application of a new community center mixed use zoning district;
14. Passage of a \$4 million bond by the Port of The Dalles to provide infrastructure to the Port's industrial land;
15. Attraction and siting of the Google facility and other significant new and expanded businesses to the Port industrial area;
16. Approval of the \$150,000,000 Lone Pine mixed use PUD which is under construction;
17. and, Completion of Phase 1 of the City's two-phased program to update the comprehensive plan – as approved by the Department of Land Conservation & Development (DLCD).

In 2005, the City of The Dalles worked closely with DLCD to develop a two-phased, four-year work program to update The Dalles CLUP, UGB, and land use regulations. Phase I, land use needs assessment and policy review, was completed during the summer of 2007 and was funded through a technical assistance grant from DLCD.

Phase I of The Dalles two-phased work program was extremely successful. As a result, the City has prepared and held public hearings on the following studies and plan amendments. *(Some of these, along with other information, can be found on the City's Web site at: [www.ci.the-dalles.or.us](http://www.ci.the-dalles.or.us), then click on 'Public Documents', scroll down to 'Periodic Review Amendment Documents'.)*

1. A coordinated population projection with Wasco County - adopted by The Dalles and Wasco County and approved by the State. The Dalles population is expected to increase from 15,472 in 2006 to 22,545 by 2026, at an average annual growth rate of 1.9%.
2. An Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) – which is the basis for determining industrial, commercial and other employment land needs and site requirements. The Dalles found that all of its industrial needs can be met through redevelopment of abandoned Northwest Aluminum site. However, the existing UGB is inadequate to accommodate the needs of a new regional center, a neighborhood center and a business park. Expansion of the UGB by about 100 acres is necessary to provide land for retail and business park employment opportunities.
3. A Residential Land Needs Analysis (RLNA) – which is the basis for determining residential and public / semi-public land needs. The Dalles adopted a number of efficiency measures to increase residential densities and provide a greater variety of housing types in 1993. Actual densities since then have averaged about 6.25 dwelling units per net acre. After including additional measures to increase density in the Comprehensive Plan, net residential densities will increase by an additional 12% to 7.0 units per net acre. After accounting for school, park and other institutional needs, The Dalles must expand its UGB by 541 buildable acres to meet anticipated residential and public / semi-public land needs.

4. An Energy Conservation Program. The Dalles CLUP includes a new section designed to increase energy efficiency. Conservation measures include nodal mixed use development, investment in transit facilities, solar access provisions, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled through urban design.

5. A Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) for the UGB and four alternative UGB expansion study areas. The Dalles conducted a detailed BLI that considered redevelopment potential (especially in industrial areas), residential infill, and more intensive development of vacant sites within the UGB. The Comprehensive Plan now includes policies to protect stream corridors and to restrict development on slopes of 20% or greater to minimize impacts on scenic views and to address potential slide hazards. Automatic density transfer provisions ensure that urban densities on buildable land will increase. **After accounting for development of buildable land within the UGB, The Dalles still needs to expand its UGB by approximately 641 gross buildable acres to accommodate Year 2026 growth needs.**

6. A UGB Alternatives Analysis consistent with Goal 14, ORS 197.298 priorities, and the Urban Growth Boundary administrative rule (OAR Chapter 16, Division 24). The Dalles applied the buildable lands methodology used inside the UGB to four study areas on the Oregon side of the river to determine the capacity of each study area. The City considered ORS 197.298 priorities by avoiding expansion into high value orchard and wheat areas, carefully analyzed public facilities costs, and minimized adverse social consequences (scenic impacts) by proposing expansion into adjacent exception areas and Hidden Valley – an area with relatively poor agricultural soils that is not highly visible from key viewing areas in the Columbia River Gorge.

7. An Urban Reserve Area land needs projection and alternatives analysis, consistent with OAR Chapter 660, Division 021. The City projected land needs through the Year 2056 based on a coordinated population projection adopted by both the City and Wasco County. After including nearby exception areas and the relatively poor, non-irrigated soils in Hidden Valley, longer-term growth was directed away from irrigated cherry orchards to higher-elevation, non-irrigated wheat lands outside the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area boundary. The City Council adopted the Urban Reserve Area in 2007, and is ready for review and adoption by the Wasco County Court.

8. Draft findings to support a “Minor Amendment” to the Columbia River Gorge Management Plan to “exempt” area within the proposed UGB from the provisions of the act. The analysis showed how the UGB / Urban Exempt Area proposal minimized potential scenic impacts and avoided “special management areas.” By expanding the UGB into adjacent exception areas and Hidden Valley – an area hidden from most “key viewing areas” by hills and ridgelines – the City believed that it had made a good faith effort to minimize potential scenic impacts, preserve highly scenic orchard lands, as required by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act (NSAA).

9. A reorganized and extensively revised CLUP. The Dalles CLUP has been reorganized into a four volume set: Volume I – Plan Policies; Volume II – Background Studies; Volume III – Public Facilities Master Plans; and Volume IV- Implementation. New policies have been drafted to ensure consistency with Statewide Planning Goals 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. Policies addressing scenic, archeological, historical, and ecological impacts are also included in the draft plan, to address issues raised by Gorge Commission staff.

10. A proposed Comprehensive Plan Map showing generalized plan urban and future urban plan

designations for the entire URA and UGB area.

The City has conducted a series of work sessions and public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council for the proposed comprehensive plan amendments, the 20-year UGB and urban exempt area proposal; and the 50-year URA. The UGB and URA proposal is supported by detailed findings demonstrating compliance with applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals. The DLCDC reviewed the proposed UGB and accompanying plan amendments favorably.

However, the City Council has delayed adoption of the CLUP and UGB amendment package pending review by the Columbia River Gorge Commission (Gorge Commission). Under federal law, the area proposed for UGB expansion must first receive an “Urban Area Exemption” under the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act (NSAA). The City has prepared preliminary findings for a “minor amendment” to the Columbia River Gorge Management Plan to “exempt” the proposed UGB expansion area from further review under the NSAA. However, Gorge Commission staff has advised the City that substantial original research and evaluation is necessary to support such an exemption. (See NSAA discussion below.)

Based on the EOA and HNA, Goals 9 (Economy of the State) and 10 (Housing) cannot be met unless and until the UGB has been amended to include a 20-year land supply. Compliance with Goal 14 (Urbanization) is a necessary but not sufficient condition for amending The Dalles UGB. Compliance with the NSAA is also required for such an amendment. Moreover, detailed master planning for Goals 11 (Public Facilities) and 12 (Transportation) cannot proceed with any certainty until there is an approved UGB. Therefore, the City cannot meet its obligation to provide sufficient buildable employment and residential land without approval of an “urban area exemption” by the Gorge Commission.

The Dalles is the first City to propose UGB / Urban Exempt Area amendments that are intended to ensure a 20-year land supply as required by Goal 14, Urbanization. *[Note, the City of Hood River submitted a UGB / Urban Exempt Area amendment for the limited purpose of a school expansion late in 2008. Since then, the Gorge Commission voted to not accept any more urban area amendment applications until July, at which time they will re-evaluated their work load and budget and either extend the current ban or begin accepting applications again.]* Although the City made a good faith effort to address NSAA requirements, Gorge Commission staff felt that the City had not done enough to justify an urban area exemption from the NSAA. The Gorge Commission also held a work session on the matter and agreed with staff that additional comparative analysis of potential cultural and archeological impacts, scenic impacts, and ecological impacts is required. Moreover, the City has been advised that the capacity of Dallesport – across the river in Washington State – must also be considered before granting Urban Exempt Area status.

## Evaluation

**Factor 1:** There has been a substantial change in circumstances including but not limited to the conditions, findings, or assumptions upon which the comprehensive plan or land use regulations were based, so that the comprehensive plan or land use regulations do not comply with the statewide planning goals relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization.

Does the economic development element of the comprehensive plan need to be updated? Yes.

(A) Does new information on national, state, or local economic trends show any changed circumstances since the plan was last updated? Yes. Does the new information need to be incorporated into the plan? Yes, as determined in the Economic Opportunity Analysis. The draft, updated comprehensive land use plan (CLUP) reflects this information.

(B) Has there been a change in your community's assessment of the types of industrial and commercial businesses that are most likely to develop in your area? Yes. Does your community have sufficient buildable sites that are suitable for these types of uses? No. As determined in the EOA and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(C) Is your plan out-of-date regarding an accurate inventory of suitable industrial and commercial sites? Yes. As determined in the EOA and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(D) Does the inventory of commercial and industrial land identify sites that are available now or can be made available quickly? Yes. That is, does the inventory address a short-term supply of employment land (i.e., ready for construction within one year of application for building permit or request for service extension)? Yes. As determined in the EOA and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(E) Does the inventory identify sites needing additional attention in order to make them suitable for industrial or commercial uses (e.g., wetland delineation, transportation improvements, provision of water or sewer)? Yes. As determined in the EOA and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(F) Are there sites zoned industrial that are unlikely to develop because of transportation access issues, environmental factors, topography, or other constraints? Possibly.

(G) Is there less than a 20-year supply of vacant or redevelopable buildable employment land (industrial, commercial, institutional, and other employment lands) within your community's urban growth boundary? Yes. As determined in the EOA and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(H) Does your community have an insufficient supply of industrial and commercial sites that can be served by public facilities projects, either existing or scheduled to be built within the next five years? No

(I) Has your community lost suitable industrial sites through rezoning for other uses? Yes.

(J) What plan or regulatory amendments are needed to respond to changes in economic development trends in your community? Answer: See the draft, updated CLUP for recommended changes. *The Land Use and Development Ordinance (LUDO) will need to be updated upon adoption of the CLUP ordinance amendments.*

2. Does recent information on population and housing trends suggest a need to update your comprehensive plan or land use regulations? Yes.

(A) Has the city adopted a population projection coordinated by the county? Yes. How old is that forecast? 2007. Does it need to be updated to extend at least 20 years into the future from now? No.

(B) Has the distribution of household incomes remained consistent in the community since the housing element of the comprehensive plan was last updated? Yes, please see Residential Land Needs Analysis.

(C) Are the costs of new housing units affordable based on projected household incomes? Answer: Don't know, no data available.

(D) Does the city provide the types, locations and densities of housing needed by all of its residents? Answer: Yes.

(E) Are buildable residential lands being developed at the rate projected in the comprehensive plan? Answer: No. As determined in the Housing Needs Analysis and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP. One reason for this is the lack of buildable land within the existing UGB.

(F) Is there a significant difference between the gross amount of residential lands developed since plan was the last updated and what the plan data predicted? Yes. As determined in the Housing Needs Analysis and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(G) Are your zoning and development ordinances well organized and user-friendly? Yes, for the most part, but there is always room for improvement. Are your residential development and design standards for needed housing clear and objective? Yes. When did your community last evaluate its development processes and standards? Last year. Reviews are done annually. Are there provisions that should be amended or eliminated to better reflect your community's vision? Yes, especially as determined in the draft, updated CLUP.

(H) Have all of your ordinances been amended to fully comply with the federal Fair Housing Act and state manufactured home statutes? Yes.

(I) Does your community have minimum density requirements for each zoning district? No

Does your community have a minimum average density policy for overall residential development? Draft plan policies call for establishing a density range and for automatic density transfer / cluster provisions which would have the effect of density averaging. These policies must be implemented, however, by amending the zoning ordinance.

(J) Are the zoning ordinance densities consistent with the comprehensive plan? Not completely. The proposed work program calls for updates to the zoning ordinance consistent with draft plan policies regarding residential density ranges.

(K) Has the mix of housing types (i.e., single-family and multi-family) constructed since your last plan update been built as expected? No.

(L) Have housing providers been successful in satisfying the housing needs of low income citizens and citizens with special housing requirements? If not, what actions need to be taken to address these needs? Not sure. The Mid-Columbia Housing Agency has developed low income housing as well as 24 units provided as part of the Commodore II project..

(M) Does the comprehensive plan include a thorough, up-to-date residential buildable lands

inventory and housing needs assessment? Yes, As determined in the Housing Needs Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory, and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP.

(N) Is there a 20-year supply of vacant or redevelopable buildable land or land with infill potential in the following categories? Answer: No, not within the existing UGB. The **proposed** UGB includes an adequate supply of buildable land for needed housing types identified by statute and in the Residential Land Needs Analysis completed in 2007.

(O) If a shortage exists in any of the categories above, how will the discrepancy be resolved? The existing plan has shortages, the draft, updated CLUP resolves these shortages. Has your jurisdiction considered or pursued opportunities such as re-zoning, up-zoning, adopting a redevelopment or urban renewal plan, encouraging infill development, partnerships with private or non-profit housing developers, discouraging conversion of rental apartments to condominiums, or adding land to the UGB? Yes, in the draft, updated CLUP.

(P) What plan or regulatory amendments are needed to respond to changes in population and housing trends in your community? As determined in the Housing Needs Analysis and reflected in the draft, updated CLUP. See also Residential Land Needs Analysis.

3. Do the plan and ordinances adequately account for limitations on buildable lands from natural resources and hazards? Yes, as determined in the draft, updated comprehensive land use plan.

(A) Have the plan and ordinances been updated to comply with OAR 660, Division 23 (the Goal 5 rule) regarding wetlands, riparian corridors, and wildlife habitat? The existing CLUP does not but the draft, updated CLUP does address these. However, the NSA requirements are greater and will need to be reviewed to a higher level.

(B) Has the jurisdiction received any new, updated, or revised information regarding floodway or floodplain boundaries or geologic or other hazards that needs to be addressed in the plan? No.

4. Are public facility and transportation plans and financing mechanisms adequate to accommodate planned growth in a timely fashion? The City's water, sewer, storm and transportation master plans have all been recently updated to meet the current CLUP needs. However, these master plans will need to be further updated upon approval of the updated CLUP as part of Phase II of the two phase planning update.

(A) Has the jurisdiction been unable to provide services for development of residential and employment land according to the schedule in the public facilities plan? No. However, this will need to be reviewed in the update of the master plans based upon the Updated CLUP.

(B) Have there been changes to any of the following conditions that were not anticipated by the public facilities or transportation systems plans? Yes.

- Changes in population, housing or employment Yes, based upon the updated CLUP
- Urban growth boundary amendments Yes, as anticipated in the updated CLUP

- Master plan updates All recently updated
- Major plan map or zoning amendments Yes.
- Significant consumers or users that were not anticipated Yes.
- Facility projects built or delayed Yes. Wastewater treatment plant upgrade
- Other

(C) Have any of the conditions in (B) above changed to the extent that the plan or the project list in a public facilities or transportation system plan needs to be revised? Yes,

(D) Does your list of short-term public facility projects need to be updated? Yes, based upon the draft, updated CLUP

(E) Does your community satisfy state and federal standards for the quality of water supplied, quality of water discharged from your treatment plant, and quality of storm water discharge (if applicable)? Yes.

(F) Are financing sources sufficient to cover the cost of capital construction projects? Yes, for many water, sewer, and storm projects. No for many transportation projects.

(G) Do the financing sources need revisiting to meet future needs? What actions will be taken to address this issue? Yes. Annual budgeting process.

5. Is there new information affecting the comprehensive plan that has not yet been incorporated into the plan? Yes, mostly having to do with the NSA requirements.

(A) New information provided by state agencies is listed on the attached sheet. Does any of this information need to be addressed in your plan? If so, how? Yes, staff has been in communication with Mark Radabaugh, the Warm Springs Tribe, Gorge Commission staff, the Port, OECD, and ODOT throughout the Phase I process and continuing in the periodic review evaluation process.

(B) Is there any other new information available relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services or urbanization that needs to be included in your plan? The draft, updated CLUP addresses these issues.

6. Have changes in local goals or objectives occurred since adoption of the comprehensive plan that require amendments to the plan or land use regulations relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization? Yes.

(A) For example, does the adoption of a regional economic development strategy or changes in economic opportunities necessitate modification of plan policies? Yes, as indicated in the EOA study, and included in the draft, updated CLUP.

(B) Are there new community goals or objectives (or changes to existing ones) that need to be addressed in the comprehensive plan? These have been addressed in the draft, updated CLUP

(C) Are there goals, objectives, or policies in the comprehensive plan that are no longer applicable and should be deleted or amended? Yes, for the existing CLUP

(D) Have all plan policies that obligate your jurisdiction to implement specific provisions in the future been carried out (e.g., a policy to complete planning for a wildlife habitat or historic resource when more complete inventory information is available)? If not, what additional planning work needs to be carried out in periodic review? The updated CLUP will need to be implemented through the LUDO.

7. What major activities or events affecting land use have occurred that were not anticipated in the plan, but which may necessitate updating the plan? For example, did a major new employer site in your city, with unanticipated effects on roads, water, sewer, and/or housing supply? Over the past several years new, and existing, businesses have developed in The Dalles creating the need for more industrial and commercial land areas.

**Factor 2:** Decisions based on acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations are inconsistent with the goals relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization.

Are land use decisions made according to your acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations achieving the purpose and intent of Statewide Planning Goals 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14?

(A) Have prospective employers passed over the city because permitting procedures were too onerous or because approved plan changes have reduced or eliminated your supply of available and suitable employment sites? No.

(B) Do your plan policies and zoning regulations provide for the housing needs of the residents of the jurisdiction? No. Are any housing types needed now or in the next 20 years not permitted in the jurisdiction? No. Are applications for needed housing getting denied because of discretionary approval criteria or conditional use permit requirements? No.

(C) Have developments permitted by your plan and code exceeded the capacity of transportation, water, sewer, or storm water management facilities? No.

(D) Do your plan and code allow development of inefficient land use patterns that increase the costs of public facilities and services and consume an unnecessary amount of land, such as through large minimum lot size standards, no maximum or average lot size standards, excessive on-site parking space requirements, excessive block length and street width standards, excessive yard setback and buffer standards, a predominance of large-lot single-family zoning, no mixed-use development, no provision for accessory dwelling units (“granny flats”), or one-story height limits on commercial and industrial development? Few, if any, of these situations exists in the CLUP or implementing ordinances.

2. Are any of your implementation measures inadequate to carry out the policies of the comprehensive plan relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization? Yes, as determined in the draft, updated CLUP. For example, does your plan identify a targeted employer, but your industrial zone does not permit the use? Yes. Has your jurisdiction adopted a transportation system plan, but not implementing

ordinances adequate to carry out the plan? No.

- Does the TSP call for major improvements to state highways for which ODOT has not agreed that funding for the needed improvements are “reasonably likely” to be provided during the planning period? ODOT does not have sufficient funds for the foreseeable future.
- Does the plan address the state’s objective of reducing or stabilizing “VMT” (vehicle miles traveled per capita)? Yes, as determined in the Energy Conservation Program.

**Factor 3:** There are issues of regional or statewide significance, intergovernmental coordination, or state agency plans or programs affecting land use which must be addressed in order to bring comprehensive plans and land use regulations into compliance with the goals relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization.

Is the level of coordination between the city and county, other cities, special districts, and state and federal agencies adequate to effectively implement the comprehensive plan? Yes. Do your urban growth boundary management agreement and/or urban service agreements need to be updated? Yes.

(A) Do you share resources or facilities with other jurisdictions? Yes. Are these adequate for all the jurisdictions involved? Yes, in most areas. Do you have agreements regarding allocation of resources, capacity, etc.? Yes.

(B) What special districts provide services within your urban growth boundary? Chenoweth Water PUD. Are these special districts participating in your planning process? Yes. Does the city have management agreements with those special districts providing services within the urban growth boundary consistent with ORS 195.065? No, but coordination of water service delivery is done.

(C) Is the city/county urban growth management agreement functioning to adequately coordinate land use decisions inside the urban growth boundary? Yes.

(D) Are there other coordination issues that need to be addressed? No.

2. What regional or state plans, programs or issues affecting land use may call for amendments to the comprehensive plan in order to bring your plan and land use regulations into compliance with the statewide planning goals related to economic development, housing, public facilities and services, transportation, and urbanization?

(A) Have you contacted appropriate state agencies to participate in your periodic review process? Yes.

(B) Has a state agency notified you of an adopted plan or program affecting land use that needs to be addressed in your plan? If yes, what is the plan or program? Yes, DEQ and the Mile Creeks TMDL study.

(C) Are there housing needs identified in the statewide or county Consolidated Plan that have not been addressed in your comprehensive plan? These have been addressed in the draft, updated CLUP

(D) Does the plan address the Regional Investment Strategy for your area? Yes. Are there actions

needed to coordinate with or implement the strategy? No

How has the city coordinated transportation issues with other local governments and the state? Yes. Transportation issues have been coordinated with the ODOT and Wasco County. These include the Chenoweth IAMP, Lone Pine roundabout, annexation of county roads within the existing UGB, and development of the annual street development list.

- Does the plan contain strategies for dealing with access management, new commercial development accessed by state highways, or the potential impacts of any new major transportation system project? Yes, in the draft, updated CLUP.

**Factor 4:** The existing comprehensive plan and land use regulations are not achieving the statewide planning goals relating to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization.

1. What other issues relating to the periodic review standards need to be addressed within the scope of periodic review? The National Scenic Area standards for Urban Area exemption.

2. What local issues related to economic development, needed housing, transportation, public facilities and services and urbanization would you like to address within your periodic review work program? See attached, draft work program

(A) Has your jurisdiction been successful in complying with the statutory 120-day time limit for final action on development permits? No. If no, what has been the cause of delays? The requirement that new hearings must be held with the City Council from the planning commission.

(B) Do you feel your plan and land use regulations are difficult to implement? No, but there is always room for improvement. Should steps be taken to streamline the plan, zoning ordinance, and permit process? Yes, where ever possible.

**This is the end of the evaluation for whether a periodic review work program should be developed.**

The Planning Commission recommends that a Periodic Review Work Program is necessary to complete the work to update the CLUP, amend the UGB, National Scenic Area UEA, and establish the Urban Reserve Boundary.

The Northern Wasco County Park and Recreation District submitted a letter (attached) asking that in the next 20-year period an additional 110 acres of ‘green space’ be included into the City’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This would bring the City up to the national standard for communities this size. A goal of creating this additional 110 acres of ‘green space’ could be included in the revised Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Dalles needs a combined total of 889 gross buildable acres of residential land to meet residential and public/semi-public land (green space) needs through the Year 2026. Of the 889 gross buildable acres needed, 348 acres are within the existing 2006 UGB. The second attached letter is from the Gorge Commission. The suggested changes are included in the Proposed Work Program.

## **WORK PROGRAM TASKS**

*[See included pages on the Work Program & Grant Proposal Summary and Supplemental Document]*

*After the staff presentation on the Planning Commission's recommended Work Program tasks, the City Council should then receive any agency or public input on the recommended Periodic Review Evaluation and Work Program tasks in the public and agency testimony portion of the meeting.*

**[PUBLIC AND AGENCY TESTIMONY]**

## **PROPOSED MOTION**

*Staff and Planning Commission recommendation:....move to approve the Periodic Review Evaluation, Work Program, and Grant Application and direct staff to apply for the necessary funding to complete the Periodic Review Process*