

DEPT OF

OCT 08 2010

LAND CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT

October 8, 2010

To: Mr. Larry French
LCDC
Urban and Rural Reserves

From: Objector #36 Sandra J. Baker (Barkers Property of 62 acres located in West Multnomah)

This was not a fair, open or transparent process.

1. In my written objection I addressed my concerns regarding the MCAC process and below are some brief examples.

I did not receive mailing notification when this process started or any notification from the FPNA. I was informed by a personal friend in Washington co. Other property owners I made contact with were also unaware and didn't even know they were considered to be inside the Forest Park area.

When I first started attending these meetings there was only one other private property owner.

After the first or second meeting I attended, Carol Chesarek emailed Mr. Beasley, Karol Collymore and Jeanne Lawson (facilitator), dated 1/16/09, stating that I made her uncomfortable and I was trying to influence CAC members. She requested "audience members to stand 3 ft back, not interact and have public comment at the beginning of the meeting so "audience members could be heard and then leave". I believe it was at this same meeting she was introducing an Elk sighting map of her area-west side Multnomah. In addition, she got her request regarding how audience members were to interact. *(I will send by mail a copy of this Email, it is from my public records request file.)*

3/22/09 meeting. We (my brother and I) presented a very detail mapping regarding the aquifer problem and the 83 potential buildable lots in and around Germantown and Old Germantown; this is a rural residential area averaging 5 acres. This was a very big concern of Jim Emerson - FPNA. My brother is a geologist and flew in from Houston to present. He was given 2 minuets. This is a factual problem and violates locking this area out under the rulings. *(This is in the MCAC records, but will mail a copy)*

At the final critical part of this process 2 of my testimonies were not included and/or misplaced. My information did not get presented to the CAC and this was during a final decision making meeting.

Minutes were reworted (favoring rural) and corrections, which were obvious, not changed.

Chesarek. (CAC member) was secretly emailing (campaigning) to rural reserve advocates without the CAC member's knowledge. How does this not violate the process? This email was in my objection information dated July 12, 2010.

Finally, I believe there were numerous interpretations to validate rural vs. urban. *(I will email a sample correspondence from my public record request.)*

Material presented was a bombardment of advocacy for rural reserve.

I have made numerous attempts since 1/09 addressing this concern. Letters, emails, oral testimony and phone calls. In my attempts not one official contacted me regarding this.

2. Objection to the final Factor rankings by Multnomah County

We meet the required factors for urban reserve.

At the beginning of the MCAC process it was obvious to members that our area should be urban. Things seemingly started to reverse at the latter part of the CAC meetings.

In correct mapping on our property. There is a creek identified on the west side of our lower 24. This is not a yr around creek. Metro removed it from their maps (although limited) but all mapping in regards to our property was incorrectly presented to the CAC to determine factor rankings.

Our property is in a non-irrigation area. There is an aquifer problem and we have had to drill a second well. We are not surrounded by large Ag or Forest land. Cannot participate in the CSA program

How can two counties, Multnomah and Washington, have such differing factor rankings and considerations regarding property basically within the same similar area? Our property abuts Washington county and the future North Bethany expansion.

Metros' arbitrary line through the center of rural residential. How can one side be important land and the other is considered conflicted land. This doesn't make sense.

Lastly, SB 1011: if property is designated as rural reserve this does not change the existing land use regulations, it does not change their use or value of property.

To be subjected to this policy as Rural reserve for the next 50 under SB 1011 is reckless and naïve. Our property will be limited, challenged and devalued by this new zoning.

Thank you,

Sandy Baker
503-690-2031

French, Larry

From: Donnelly, Jennifer [jennifer.donnelly@state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2010 9:07 AM
To: larry.french@state.or.us
Cc: Whitman, Richard
Subject: FW: Emailing: Wd0000105
Attachments: Baker exception.pdf

This is Sandy's revised exception letter.

From: sandy baker [mailto:sjbaker12@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2010 5:01 PM
To: Donnelly, Jennifer
Subject: Emailing: Wd0000105

corrected...i hope

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

October 8, 2010

To: Mr. Larry French
LCDC
Urban and Rural Reserves

From: Objector #36 Sandra J. Baker (Barkers Property of 62 acres located in West Multnomah)

This was not a fair or transparent process.

1. In my written objection I addressed my concerns regarding the MCAC process and below are some brief examples.

I did not receive mailing notification when this process started or any notification from the FPNA. I was informed by a personal friend in Washington co. Other property owners I made contact with were also unaware and didn't even know they were considered to be inside the Forest Park area.

When I first started attending these meetings there was only one other private property owner.

After the first or second meeting I attended, Carol Chesarek emailed Mr. Beasley, Karol Collymore and Jeanne Lawson (facilitator), dated 1/16/09, stating that I made her uncomfortable and I was trying to influence CAC members. She requested "audience members to stand 3 ft back, not interact and have public comment at the beginning of the meeting so "audience members could be heard and then leave". I believe it was at this same meeting she was introducing an Elk sighting map of her area-west side Multnomah. In addition, she got her request regarding how audience members were to interact. *(I will send by mail a copy of this Email, it is from my public records request file.)*

3/22/09 meeting. We (my brother and I) presented a very detail mapping regarding the aquifer problem and the 83 potential buildable lots in and around Germantown and Old Germantown; this is a rural residential area averaging 5 acres. This was a very big concern of Jim Emerson - FPNA. My brother is a geologist and flew in from Houston to present. He was given 2 minuets. This is a factual problem and violates locking this area out under the rulings. *(This is in the MCAC records, but will mail a copy)*

At the final critical part of this process 2 of my testimonies were not included and/or misplaced. My information did not get presented to the CAC and this was during a final decision making meeting.

Minutes were reworded (favoring rural) and corrections, which were obvious, not changed.

Chesarek. (CAC member) was secretly emailing (campaigning) to rural reserve advocates without the CAC member's knowledge. How does this not violate the process? This email was in my objection information dated July 12, 2010.

Finally, I believe there were numerous interpretations to validate rural vs. urban. (I will email a sample correspondence from my public record request.)

Material presented was a bombardment of advocacy for rural reserve.

I have made numerous attempts since 1/09 addressing this concern. Letters, emails, oral testimony and phone calls. In my attempts not one official contacted me regarding this.

2. Objection to the final Factor rankings by Multnomah County

We meet the required factors for urban reserve.

At the beginning of the MCAC process it was obvious to members that our area should be urban. Things seemingly started to reverse at the latter part of the CAC meetings.

In correct mapping on our property. There is a creek identified on the west side of our lower 24. This is not a yr around creek. Metro removed it from their maps (although limited) but all mapping in regards to our property was incorrectly presented to the CAC to determine factor rankings.

Our property is in a non-irrigation area. There is an aquifer problem and we have had to drill a second well. We are not surrounded by large Ag or Forest land. Cannot participate in the CSA program

How can two counties, Multnomah and Washington, have such differing factor rankings and considerations regarding property basically within the same similar area? Our property abuts Washington county and the future North Bethany expansion.

Metros' arbitrary line through the center of rural residential. How can one side be important land and the other is considered conflicted land. This doesn't make sense.

Lastly, SB 1011 summarizing that since this does not change the existing land use on private property owners placing property in Rural reserve for the next 50 is reckless and naïve. Our property will take limited and devalued by this new zoning.

Thank you,

Sandy Baker
503-690-2031

French, Larry

From: sandy baker [sjbaker12@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2010 4:28 PM
To: larry.french@state.or.us
Subject: Emailing: objections to upcoming process
Attachments: objections to upcoming process.docx

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
objections to upcoming process

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

French, Larry

From: sandy baker [sjbaker12@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2010 4:28 PM
To: larry.french@state.or.us
Subject: Emailing: objections to upcoming process
Attachments: objections to upcoming process.docx

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
objections to upcoming process

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.