



# Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

## Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-5518

[www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



April 22, 2015

TO: Grants Advisory Committee

FROM: Rob Hallyburton, Community Services Division Manager

RE: Materials for April 29, 2015 meeting

The materials for our meeting are included in this report or attached. The only agenda item for the meeting is consideration of the committee's recommendation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on the 2015-2017 Grants Allocation Plan.

A draft plan is attached (Attachment A). Department of Land Conservation and Development staff prepared the draft based on committee input at its January 29, 2015 meeting. Much of the language in the draft is taken from on the 2013-2015 plan, and significant changes are explained in margin comments. Some additional information is provided in this report.

***Dispute Resolution grant.*** No changes to this grant are proposed. The committee asked for examples of the cases that Oregon Consensus has worked on under this grant. The last three billing reports are included in Attachment B, for your information.

***Community Development grants.*** The draft plan includes a recommendation to scuttle this new grant category if the legislature reduces the grant fund by more than \$150,000 – the amount proposed for allocation to the category. Staff recalls this concept was discussed during the January 2015 advisory committee meeting, but the specifics were not presented until now.

Also relating to Community Development grants, the draft plan includes a description and examples of targeted projects. The approval criteria are not contained in the allocation plan, but staff is interested in committee input. We propose to develop and advertise award criteria that consider some or all of the following factors, and perhaps others.

- Catalyst for other demonstrated community revitalization opportunities
- Consistent with local and regional goals and priorities
- Opportunities for job creation
- Benefit to underserved communities (that is, consideration of low-income or otherwise disadvantaged cities or neighborhoods; this could include citizen involvement projects related to plan implementation or other projects targeting specific areas)
- Fills an important gap in providing the population or a segment of the population with access to jobs, services, and recreation opportunities

- Synergy with other funding sources, particularly with RST agencies (related to interagency coordination as required by HB 4015 (2013))
- Size of the community (cities and unincorporated communities would be eligible)
- Outside MPO
- Community readiness/local support

Since this is a new program, there will be much to learn regarding demand and appropriate mechanisms for allocating the funds. The department needs to be cognizant of the limited amount of funds available for the program, but shouldn't pass up good projects due to overly strict criteria. Staff will ask for input at the committee meeting.

***Periodic Review grants.*** Staff has tried to accurately reflect the outcome of the discussion at the committee's January meeting in the draft allocation plan. A letter the department received from the city of Sherwood, and the department's response, is included in Attachment C for your information.

***Conclusion.*** All other comments, questions, and clarifications are included in the margin notes in the draft Grants Allocation Plan.



**Oregon**

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

**Department of Land Conservation and Development**

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-5518

[www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



**Land Conservation and Development Commission**

**2015-2017 GENERAL FUND GRANTS  
ALLOCATION PLAN**

**INTRODUCTION**

This plan provides guidance to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for the department's grant allocation decisions within the General Fund grant program. The plan was developed by the commission's Grants Advisory Committee with assistance from DLCD staff.

**THE GENERAL FUND GRANT PROGRAM**

DLCD's general fund grants are used primarily for Oregon communities' comprehensive planning and plan updates. The fund is divided into functional categories and made available for specific types of projects. During 2013-2015, the categories included Periodic Review, Technical Assistance, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Planning Assistance to Small Cities and Counties, and a Dispute Resolution grant to the Oregon Consensus Program.

Grant categories have from time to time been designated in department budget notes. For instance, the Planning Assistance and Columbia River Gorge grants were originally created in response to legislative direction. Whether the 2015-2017 budget contains grant-related notes will be unknown until after the commission approves this plan. DLCD will comply with any budget notes.

In 2013, the Legislature enacted [HB 2253](#), which requires the Portland State University Population Research Center to coordinate and develop population forecasts for jurisdictions statewide, and for the department to fund the work. The bill became Oregon Laws 2013, Ch. 574. Subsection 5 (6) of the bill provides, "The population forecasting program operated by the Portland State University Population Research Center pursuant to section 2 of this 2013 Act is the highest priority for the allocation of grant funding..." This was codified at ORS 197.639(6).

In 2014, the Legislature enacted [HB 4015](#), which requires certain state agencies to include considerations when exercising their grant-making authority. The bill became Oregon Laws 2014, Ch. 82. The Sec. 2 of the bill states:

**Comment [RobH1]:** The explanation of the two bills is new to this draft.

In awarding grants, loans or incentive funds for projects undertaken in connection with grant, loan or incentive programs, state agencies listed in section 3 (3)(a)(A) to (E) of this 2014 Act [which includes DLCD] shall, consistent with the programs' enabling legislation, rules and regulations, use regional priorities for community and economic development ... in the consideration of project funding decisions and base decisions of which projects to undertake upon whether the project will:

- (1) Use regional and community-based problem solving.
- (2) Support regional and community-based means of integrating state and local resources and services.
- (3) Create jobs in relation to the economy and population of the region directly impacted by the project.
- (4) Involve investment of capital in relation to the economy and population of the region directly impacted by the project.
- (5) Have community support, as indicated by the support of the governing body of the local government.
- (6) Have obtained appropriate land use and environmental reviews and authorizations prior to utilization of funds.

These two pieces of legislation affect the Grants Allocation Plan. The advisory committee's recommendation reflects these requirements.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Grants Advisory Committee's recommendations are explained below and summarized in Exhibit B. In order to encourage early participation, the department will set an application deadline for the competitive categories of grant applications, and the deadline will give local governments ample time to prepare an application while still affording the department time to review the submittals and make awards early in the biennium. Applications received by the department will compete for funding according to the directions described below.

## GRANT CATEGORIES

**Population Forecast Grant.** A new category of grant is created to respond to the legislative mandate in HB 2253 (2013). A special appropriation was provided by the legislature to help fund the grant to Portland State University for the 2013-2015 biennium, the first time PSU has prepared statewide population forecasts under the new law. This appropriation was supplemented with resources from the base grant fund. During 2015-2017, the entire cost of preparation of the forecasts is expected to come from the grant fund. There was not consensus on the advisory committee that population forecasting should be funded through a grant, but the committee recognized that DLCD must comply with the law.

**Comment [RobH2]:** New to the allocation plan.

The committee recommends that DLCD create a Population Forecast grant category and fully fund PSU's work in development of county and city population forecasts statewide. The committee further recommends that DLCD keep the grant as small as possible to conserve funds for other grants categories.

**Comment [RobH3]:** The committee gave this direction at its January meeting.

**Planning Assistance (PA) Grants.** Grants of \$1,000 have been provided to cities under 2,500 population and grants of \$3,500 provided to counties smaller than 15,000 population. These grants to smaller communities have been awarded since 1991. DLCD has few requirements for PA grants, leaving the use of the funds as flexible as possible to support planning functions and contribute to the economic development in eligible communities.

The committee recommends that DLCD continue to offer PA grants to eligible cities and counties, with the amount for counties raised to \$4,000. Any funds not utilized by eligible cities and counties will be used to fund Technical Assistance grants.

**Comment [RobH4]:** As recommended at the January meeting.

**Columbia River Gorge (CG) National Scenic Area Grants.** LCDC recognizes that counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area are responsible to coordinate and implement federal planning requirements in addition to state and local laws. To assist those counties (Hood River, Multnomah, and Wasco), the commission has provided grants to cover a portion of the cost of implementing the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Plan.

**Comment [RobH5]:** No change.

The committee recommends that the commission continue to help fund Columbia River Gorge counties' National Scenic Area planning for 2015-2017. The committee recommends funding the Gorge grants at the same levels as the 2013-2015 biennium.

**Dispute Resolution (DR) Grant.** The Oregon Consensus (OC) program at Portland State University received grants from DLCD during the past five biennia as part of the commission's commitment to help provide dispute resolution services related to land use and planning. An important aspect of OC's service includes assisting the parties to LUBA appeals to settle disputes before beginning formal arguments. OCP assesses these cases and cases DLCD participates in to determine whether they are appropriate for mediation and in some cases assists with mediation services.

**Comment [RobH6]:** No change.

The committee recommends that the dispute resolution grant be funded again at the same level as 2013-2015.

**Community Development (CD) Grant.** This is a new grant category for 2015-2017. The purpose of CD grants will be to assist local governments with projects that implement their comprehensive plans. This implementation could be site planning, streetscape or specific-area planning, establishing a mechanism to finance development or other improvements, façade improvements, community visioning and team-building, or other project that furthers a local government's community and economic development objectives.

**Comment [RobH7]:** New section.

The committee recommends that the CD grant program receive a \$150,000 allotment from the grant fund, and that roughly half of this amount be granted through a competitive, application-

based review process and half be reserved for projects the director identifies over the course of the biennium that satisfy the award criteria.

The committee further recommends that the CD category not be funded if the General Fund grant budget approved during the 2015 legislative session does not exceed \$1.85 million.

**Comment [RobH8]:** The Governor's budget includes \$2,027,115 for grants. This provision will have the department sacrifice the new CD grant program if the legislature reduces our grant fund very much. Is this what the committee wants? Is \$1.85 million the right trigger?

**Periodic Review (PR) Grants.** These grants assist communities with the completion of periodic review work tasks and are awarded non-competitively. Periodic review must be carefully administered to maximize the overall success of Oregon's statewide planning program and to help Oregon's most populated communities successfully prepare for future development. The successful implementation of periodic review requires careful management of the periodic review schedule and the department's ability to offer sufficient grant resources. It is important for the department to help jurisdictions successfully complete periodic review programs quickly and efficiently – meeting statutory deadlines and making efficient use of scarce resources.

The committee recommends that, because of scarce resources and the department's current effort to develop rules that could create a new alternative to periodic review for many cities, no grants for new periodic review work programs be approved during 2015-2017. The committee recommends that PR grants be used only for the completion of work tasks on existing periodic review work programs, and that these grants be allotted prior to awarding general fund grant dollars for Technical Assistance grants. This is not expected to exceed \$50,000.

**Comment [RobH9]:** As recommended at the January meeting.

**Technical Assistance (TA) Grants.** These grants are used for significant planning projects and related planning activities outside periodic review and for previous periodic review work tasks authorized by the commission prior to 2007. Oregon Laws Ch. 82, Sec. 2 (House Bill 4015) affects TA grant allocations (see pp. 1–2 for a quote of the relevant section).

The committee recommends that technical assistance grants again be focused on the following topics in the listed order of priority. The priorities are for projects that:

1. Promote economic development
2. Advance regulatory streamlining
3. Natural hazards planning
4. Provide infrastructure financing plans for urbanizing areas
5. Update comprehensive plans and implementing codes to respond to changes in state law

**Comment [RobH10]:** New priority. Population forecast coordination dropped off the list.

Including promotion of economic development as the top priority for TA grants is consistent with the economic development focus in Oregon Laws Ch. 82, Sec. 2. The committee recommends that regional priorities be considered in making TA grant awards, as instructed by the law.

**Comment [RobH11]:** Response to legislative direction.

Regarding scoring criteria for TA grants, in addition to the priorities above and other considerations customarily employed by the department, the committee recommends the department give extra consideration for (1) proposals from multiple jurisdictions to address regional issues, and (2) projects that result in a product that will benefit other jurisdictions such as a guidebook, model procedure, or template.

**Comment [RobH12]:** As recommended at the January meeting

TA requests outside these priorities should be funded only after all applications of higher priority are considered.

## LEVERAGING RESOURCES

The committee does not recommend that a local cash or in-kind match be required for individual grants. Typically for a local government to provide a cash match, the match must be budgeted ahead of time, which increases the lead time for project planning. Cash matches may also be particularly difficult for small jurisdictions. The required lead time and the uncertainty of grant awards present barriers to participation for some communities and may result in missed opportunities for the program. Regardless of any hard match requirement, however, a local government must provide in-kind resources for grant administration and must facilitate the local decision-making process.

The department recognizes that matching funds provide a more fully funded project and increase the likelihood that a project will be successfully completed. Matching funds also demonstrate local or regional commitment to a project. Therefore, within the priorities above, greater consideration should be given to projects that offer hard matching funds. All funding sources that will contribute to the successful completion of a project will be considered, including cash and in-kind, local and non-local, and public and private investments.

The committee recommends that DLCD partner with other agencies and programs, such as the Transportation Growth Management Program, the Regional Solutions Teams, and Infrastructure Finance Authority, as the primary approach for leveraging DLCD grant funds. Consideration of regional priorities in grant award decisions will promote leveraging state agency assistance, as other departments are also required to employ the same priorities in their investment decisions. (See the description of Oregon Laws Ch. 82, Sec. 2, regarding funding considerations under “Technical Assistance Grants,” pp. 4–5 above.)

**Comment [RobH13]:** Response to legislative direction.

The department will continue to seek opportunities for local, state, and federal investment partnership. Under current budget circumstances, projects that demonstrate regional coordination and cost sharing opportunities will be strongly considered in an effort to maximize the impact of planning grants in Oregon communities.

## IMPLEMENTATION

The department is responsible to implement this plan and to seek any necessary oversight, monitoring or further refinement by the Grants Advisory Committee. The department reports periodically on the types and amounts of grant applications received from local governments and the specific applications approved for funding.

**Exhibit A**

**GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Melissa Anderson  
City of Albany

Jon Chandler  
Oregon Home Builders Association

Keith Cubic, chair  
Douglas County

Erin Doyle  
League of Oregon Cities

Mary Kyle McCurdy  
1000 Friends of Oregon

Mark Nystrom  
Association of Oregon Counties

Kelly Ross  
Western Advocates, Inc.

John Williams  
Metro

## **Exhibit B**

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Grant funds for 2015-2017 should be allocated based on the following recommendations:

#### **Grant Program Categories recommended for funding**

Population Forecast  
Planning Assistance (PA)  
Columbia River Gorge (CG)  
Dispute Resolution (DR)  
Community Development (CD)  
Periodic Review (PR)  
Technical Assistance (TA)

#### **Grant Priorities**

- Planning Assistance grants of \$1,000 offered to cities with a population less than 2,500 and of \$4,000 to counties with a population less than 15,000.
- Columbia Gorge grants funded at the same level as 2013-2015:
  - Wasco County                      \$90,000
  - Hood River County              \$80,000
  - Multnomah County                \$70,000
- Dispute Resolution grant funded at the same level as 2013-2015: \$20,000.
- New Community Development grants funded with \$150,000 if the grant fund exceeds \$1.85 million.
- Remaining funds will be allocated to local jurisdictions to assist with the timely completion of current periodic review work tasks. This is not expected to exceed \$50,000.
- Remaining funds will be prioritized for technical assistance projects for economic development, regulatory streamlining, natural hazards planning, public facilities financing plans, and plan and code updates to address changes in state law. Projects outside these priorities are also encouraged and will be evaluated on the merits of the application.

#### **Leverage of Grant Funds**

The department should continue to coordinate with federal and state agency programs to achieve maximum results from general fund grants. Consideration of regional priorities adopted by Regional Solutions advisory committees will result in coordinated state investments.

The department should continue to track data on “other funds used” in conjunction with DLCD grant funds to complete local projects, including local in-kind and cash match, other state funds, federal funds and private funds. Does not require a local match as condition of grant approval, but gives priority to grant applications from local jurisdictions that demonstrate local commitment through cash or in-kind match and/or local partnerships.

**Oregon Consensus**

National Policy Consensus Center | Hatfield School of Government

720 Urban Center  
506 SW Mill Street  
Post Office Box 751  
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751

503-725-9070 tel  
503-725-9099 fax  
Consensus@pdx.edu

**OREGON CONSENSUS  
REPORT ON CASES SERVED  
UNDER DLCD GRANT NO. DR-GF-13-152M  
During Period of April 25, 2012 through June 30, 2012**

**Scope of Work:** *OCP shall provide a range of collaborative dispute resolution services for land use issues referred to it to the extent resources from this grant are available. Those services will include:*

- *Screening for potential for dispute resolution or collaborative services*
- *Technical assistance related to initiating or conducting a dispute resolution or other collaborative process*
- *Assessment of the potential for resolving issues through a collaborative process*
- *Designing and convening of a collaborative process*
- *Joint selection of an impartial facilitator or mediator acceptable to all parties*
- *Impartial mediation or facilitation services*
- *Case evaluation and quality control*
- *Handling all requests for mediation for cases at the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).*

Pursuant to the above Scope of Work, OC staff has provided the following services during the period April 25, 2012 through June 30, 2012.

**Cases Served and Type of Service in this period charged to the grant:**

**1. Services provided by Gail McEwen: TOTAL: \$380** *Oregon Consensus employed Gail McEwen to work with the Oregon Consensus Interim Director to handle referrals, screenings and assessments of land use issues on an ongoing basis. The following land use issues were addressed through June 30, 2012 for a total of 4 hours (billed at \$95/hour):*

Case	Type	Activities	Outcome
DLCD vs. City of Banks LUBA 2011-039,	LUBA appeal over UGB amendment	Case assessment	Mediation on hold pending results of discussion between City of Banks attorney, DLCD staff and DOJ.
Cassidy v. City of Glendale, LUBA No. 2012-033.	LUBA appeal over conditional use permit requirement to convert motel rooms to residential apartments.	Technical Assistance	After discussion, request appeared to be for legal assistance rather than mediation. Referred to University of Oregon Law Clinic.

**2. Services provided by Laurel Singer, Interim Oregon Consensus Director. TOTAL: \$3,610** *Laurel Singer worked on the following land use issues through June 30, 2012 for a total of 38 hours (billed at \$95/hour).*

Oregon Consensus has been facilitating on-going meetings to explore issues related to the current method of population forecasting for land use decisions within the state. A core group of approximately 17 stakeholders has been meeting since June 2010 to define the issues related to the current system and determine next steps to creating improvements. As part of this process, OC has also helped facilitate interim committee meetings and as needed convenor meetings in addition to core group meetings to advance the goals of the group. Through the process, the “core group” agreed that a statewide forecasting system would provide efficiencies and savings to the state and has been working to create a legislative concept for submission to the 2013 state legislature. From January – June 2012, OC staff facilitated two core group meetings, along with three interim committee meetings. The meeting preparation, writing of meeting summaries, travel, facilitation and project management of these activities have required approximately 15 hours/month for a total of 90\* hours of work at the senior level. *\*Only 38 of the 90 hours are billed to the DLCD grant.*

**Oregon Consensus**

National Policy Consensus Center | Hatfield School of Government

720 Urban Center  
506 SW Mill Street  
Post Office Box 751  
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751503-725-9070 tel  
503-725-9099 fax  
Consensus@pdx.edu**OREGON CONSENSUS  
REPORT ON CASES SERVED  
UNDER DLCD GRANT NO. DR-GF-13-152M****During Period of July 1, 2012 through May 30, 2013**

**Scope of Work:** *OCP shall provide a range of collaborative dispute resolution services for land use issues referred to it to the extent resources from this grant are available. Those services will include:*

- *Screening for potential for dispute resolution or collaborative services*
- *Technical assistance related to initiating or conducting a dispute resolution or other collaborative process*
- *Assessment of the potential for resolving issues through a collaborative process*
- *Designing and convening of a collaborative process*
- *Joint selection of an impartial facilitator or mediator acceptable to all parties*
- *Impartial mediation or facilitation services*
- *Case evaluation and quality control*
- *Handling all requests for mediation for cases at the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).*

Pursuant to the above Scope of Work, OC staff has provided the following services during the period July 1, 2012 through May 30, 2013.

**Cases Served and Type of Service in this period charged to the grant:**

**1. Services provided by Gail McEwen and Dale Blanton: TOTAL: \$4,009.00** *Oregon Consensus employed Gail McEwen and Dale Blanton to work with the Oregon Consensus Interim Director to handle referrals, screenings and assessments of land use issues on an ongoing basis. The following land use issues were addressed through May 30, 2012 for a total of 42.2 hours (billed at \$95/hour):*

Case	Type	Activities	Outcome
Parks Land Use Forum Steering Committee	Land use policy development	OC facilitated policy meetings between the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD), DLCDC and the Oregon Department of Agriculture.	These policy meetings were in conjunction with an OPRD-funded series of forums where park planners, local governments and agricultural and land use interests developed ideas for next steps for eliminating confusion and uncertainty around the siting of parks on farm and forest lands.
Gearhart Neacoxie Barn	Land use dispute over Conditional use permit	Case assessment	All parties were not in favor of mediation.
Bend Central Oregon Community College	Land use dispute over proposed development at Central Oregon Community college.	Case assessment	All parties were not in favor of mediation.

**OREGON CONSENSUS  
REPORT ON CASES SERVED  
UNDER DLCD GRANT NO. DR-15-148**

**During Period of October 14, 2013, through June 30, 2014**

**Scope of Work:** *OCP shall provide a range of collaborative dispute resolution services for land use issues referred to it to the extent resources from this grant are available. Those services included:*

- *Screening for potential for dispute resolution or collaborative services*
- *Technical assistance related to initiating or conducting a dispute resolution or other collaborative process*
- *Assessment of the potential for resolving issues through a collaborative process*
- *Designing and convening of a collaborative process*
- *Joint selection of an impartial facilitator or mediator acceptable to all parties*
- *Impartial mediation or facilitation services*
- *Case evaluation and quality control*
- *Handling all requests for mediation for cases at the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).*

**Metolius Transfer of Development**

- Triangle Consultants 11.25 hours @ \$230 = \$2587.50
- Laurel Singer 6.75 hrs @ \$179 = \$1208.25

**Greller v City of Newberg (October /November 2013)**

- Elaine Hallmark 1.25 hrs @ \$158 = \$197.50

**Touchmark Heights**

- Elaine Hallmark .42 hrs @ \$158 = \$66.36

**Yamhill Co-Gibson-Eola Hills Neighbors facilitation**

- Laurel Singer 2 hrs @ \$179 = \$358.00
- Jim Jacks 9.25 hrs @ \$158 = \$1461.50

**Clackamas County LUBA Appeal**

- Elaine Hallmark 2 hrs @ \$158 = \$316

**State Parks Land Use Forum**

- Elaine Hallmark .76 hrs @ \$158 = \$120.08

**Hood River Valley Residents' Committee**

- Peter Harkema 3 hrs @ \$158 = \$474.00
- Gail McEwen 1.25 hrs @ \$158 = \$197.50

**OSU Cascade Campus Siting**

- Laurel Singer 1 hr @ \$179 = \$179
- Elaine Hallmark 1 hr @ \$158 = \$158

**City of Newberg LUBA (May 2014)**

- Laurel Singer 2 hrs @ \$179 = \$358.00
- Michael Mills 15 hrs @ \$158 = \$2370

**Cases Served and Type of Service in this period charged to the grant:**

Case	Type	Activities	Outcome
LUBA 2013-074 (after October 14, 2013)	LUBA appeal over Touchmark Heights subdivision in Washington County.	Case assessment	As a result of discussions during the case assessment, the petitioners and developer met without a mediator and reached an agreement. The LUBA appeal was subsequently dismissed.
LUBA 2013-099, Greller v City of Newberg	LUBA appeal over zoning ordinance amendment	Case assessment	All parties were not in favor of mediation
LUBA 2014-030, Morton vs. Clackamas County.	LUBA appeal over cell phone tower construction	Case assessment	All parties were not in favor of mediation.
LUBA 2014-039, Hood River Valley Residents Association vs. Hood River County	LUBA appeal over park development	Case assessment	Land use application was withdrawn during case assessment.

**Other Land Use Work done by Oregon Consensus Program during the period of June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014 (not charged to the DLCD grant award).**

Case	Type	Activities	Outcome
LUBA 2012-044, Lane County	Technical Assistance	Question regarding process for dismissing LUBA appeal after agreement was reached in mediation.	Oregon Consensus contacted LUBA. LUBA provided the procedural information and the appeal was dismissed.
LUBA 2013-074 (prior to October 14, 2013)	LUBA appeal over Touchmark Heights subdivision in Washington County.	Case assessment	As a result of discussions during the case assessment, the petitioners and developer met without a mediator and reached an agreement. The LUBA appeal was subsequently dismissed.
Tumalo Collaborative Process	Request for information on convening a collaborative process to build effective collaboration and communication regarding planned and proposed developments in Tumalo.	Technical Assistance	Proposal under review by Deschutes County Board of Commissioners.



City of Sherwood  
22560 SW Pine St  
Sherwood, OR 97140  
Tel 503-625-5522  
Fax 503-625-5524  
www.sherwoodoregon.gov

Mayor  
Krisanna Clark

Council President  
Sally Robinson

Councillors  
Linda Henderson  
Dan King  
Jennifer Harris  
Jennifer Kupper  
Beth Cooke

City Manager  
Joseph Gall, ICMA-CM

Assistant City Manager  
Tom Pessier, P.E.



2009 Top Ten Selection



2007 18<sup>th</sup> Best Place to Live



March 12, 2015

Jim Rue, Director  
Department of Land Conservation and Development  
635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150  
Salem, OR 97301

Re: PRIORITY FUNDING FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

Dear Mr. Rue,

In a recent conversation with City staff, I learned that DLCD is not currently considering priority funding for periodic review in the upcoming biennium, but rather providing technical assistance grants for planning work on a competitive basis.

As you may or may not know, the City of Sherwood Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 1991 when we had a population of just over 3,000 people (3093). 24 years later, our community is quickly approaching a population of 19,000 citizens. Our Comprehensive Plan assumptions and projections expired in the year 2005. The City has paid to have the following components updated, but as you can see, the updates are being completed as our budget and political will allows.

- Economic Needs Analysis 2009
- Transportation System Plan 2014
- Water Master Plan 2015
- Sewer Master Plan scheduled for 2015
- Stormwater Master Plan scheduled for 2015
- Housing Needs Analysis scheduled for 2015-2016

Having been recently elected, and being a proponent for citizen involvement and smart growth, I would like to take advantage of the momentum we have in place to update our entire comprehensive plan in an effort to map the future of our community as we move forward.

As you can imagine, this will not be economically feasible without the help of grants. We have been informed by our local DLCD representative, that there are other Cities who have expressed an

interest in entering into periodic review as well. My concern is that we will miss out on this opportunity should the DLCD decide to move forward with funding only technical assistance grants that will likely be awarded to Cities with larger staffs, and more resources than we can afford to expend on chasing grants.

Mr. Rue, I urge you and the Commission to reconsider your budget, and re-establish priority funding for those communities that wish to enter into periodic review. Our state faces enormous pressures to grow, and while we can accommodate that growth, it is inherent upon each and every one of us to participate in consciously planning for its arrival. Putting priority funding onto the back burner will result in many communities simply reacting to that pressure and failing in their ability to provide opportunities for that growth to be well thought out, discussed with the community, governed, and served by existing community services.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Krisanna Clark". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Krisanna Clark  
Mayor, City of Sherwood  
503-625-4200  
sherwoodmayorclark@gmail.com

CC: Land Conservation and Development Commission, Ann Debbaut, Metro Regional Representative, Brad Kilby, Planning Manager



# Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-5518

[www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



April 22, 2015

Krisanna Clark, Mayor  
City of Sherwood  
22560 SW Pine St.  
Sherwood, Oregon 97140

**RE:** Grant funding for periodic review

Mayor Clark:

Thank you for your letter regarding assistance to cities to complete periodic review. As I'm sure you can imagine, the demand for grants to update land use plans is always considerably greater than the amount of funds we have to provide, so difficult choices must be made. Those decisions are guided by a grants allocation plan approved each biennium by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

The plan is developed by the grants advisory committee, which is appointed by LCDC. The committee is comprised of representatives from local government and other stakeholders interested in how this department uses its grant fund. Cities are represented by the League of Oregon Cities and a planner from Albany. More information on the Grants Advisory Committee is available at [http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/pages/grants\\_advisory\\_committee.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/pages/grants_advisory_committee.aspx).

The advisory committee met in January 2015 to begin discussing its recommendations for the 2015-2017 biennial Grants Allocation Plan. It was at that meeting that the committee discussed allocating fewer resources for periodic review than has been the practice in past biennia. The committee is scheduled to meet again on April 29 and I expect a recommendation at the conclusion of that meeting. I will share your letter with the committee.

The department agrees with you that keeping comprehensive plans up to date is extremely important. LCDC has expressed an interest in partnering with cities rather than mandating completion of periodic review over local objections. Your sharing that Sherwood is interested in completing the process is valuable information for our assessment of demand among cities to complete periodic review.

Periodic review is the formal way to update a comprehensive plan, but other options exist. Specifically, the grants allocation plan includes a category called technical assistance grants. These grants are used to support local government efforts to update elements of their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations. Your letter referred to grants that "will likely be awarded to Cities with larger staffs" and how Sherwood doesn't have the resources to

pursue grants. Please be aware that 80 percent of the technical assistance grants to cities this biennium went to jurisdictions smaller than Sherwood. We make our grant-application process as efficient for applicants as we can.

This information about technical assistance grants is not intended to contradict your point regarding the need for periodic review. We agree with you that periodic review is a valuable tool for Oregon cities, and we will continue to seek resources to make the tool available.

We appreciate your interest in keeping your comprehensive plan updated and relevant for the needs of the city. Regardless of the outcome of the grants allocation plan, we are committed to assisting local governments— admitting that our financial capabilities are limited.

Yours truly,



Rob Hallyburton  
Community Services Division Manager

cc: Anne Debbaut, DLCDC Regional Representative  
Brad Kilby, Sherwood Planning Manager