

Ramsey McPhillips
SW McPhillips Road
McMinnville, OR 97128 December 4, 2020

My Name Is Ramsey McPhillips and I live at 13000 SW McPhillips Road here in McMinnville. The southern-most tip of this UGB expansion proposal toes into my 160-year old farm on Durham Lane.

by limiting the criteria to one old Remand, you are negating the most important law that has recently been passed that would have a direct effect on the numbers you are using for your calculated necessity of expansion. HB 2001. I ask this body to not pass this UGB expansion plan until you use the HB 2001 road map set up by the Oregon Legislature in 2019 that specifically rezones for infill densities inside cities of more than 25,000. The City of McMinnville had meetings about this Bill, an informal session presentation on September 8 of THIS YEAR and it is unacceptable that you would not include this law in the planning for any expansion of the UGB. McMinnville is required to adopt land use regulations and Comprehensive Plan amendments to address HB 2001 by June 30, 2022. I ask you to not impact our generational farming way of life before you pull your own urban house in order with HB 2001. You are so limited by the old Remand (your choice) that you prevent yourself from following the laws that have come along since 2003 meant to mitigate the very issues at hand in this UGB - issues of inventory, issues of housing prices, and issues of infill efficiencies. You are about to pass an ordinance for new dense housing – thereby destroying our soils when what you should be doing is destroying your own single-family housing zones to accommodate multiple dwellings and apartment units. You are obviously going to pass this ordinance and then in a very short time you will be adding more people to McMinnville via HB 2001. I really feel this is a bit of a bait and switch. Where is the study of how many people in the next twenty years could be absorbed by HB 2001? My fear is the majority of you on council, and at Planning are fine with adding more than what Portland State says our population will require. It's not fine to get a 'twofer' on the backs of the farmers. Figure out how many dwellings HB 2001 will accommodate and then use new Portland state numbers to address the true need at hand.

Have you all driven to Portland the "back way," weaving through Washington County through three or four round-a-bouts smack dab in the middle of farm land? These new slick farmland impact arterials are to accommodate commuters and the explosive growth in Washington County's cities.

I can see similar writing on the wall for McMinnville. In order to accommodate all the new traffic you are proposing, the stress to build an farmland destroying arterial that draws Hill Road all the way down to Highway 18 will be strong. This is already the back way into your proposed development. My guess is you have not all driven and considered this route in reviewing this plan. I did not hear it mentioned in the

Staff report of any of the evening presentations. I suggest you go out to the corners of Durham and Highway 18 (preferably at high-peak times) then weave through the farmland over to the corner of Hill Road and Second Street. I fear you all think the traffic will be mostly coming from downtown McMinnville but in fact, much of the traffic will be coming down highway 18, turning off on Durham, weaving through farmland the back way. The traffic coming in from the coast is already turning off at Masonville and weaving through farmland to all the new development on the North side of town. A man was just hit and killed very near this intersection three weeks ago. He was a groundskeeper blowing leaves, in front of a grandfathered in commercial business plopped in the middle of farmland who was mowed down on a rural road by a non-farmer commuter because there was no shoulder. These are the kind of conflicts you can expect by asking the southwest farmland to absorb the bulk of your development. You are opening up an expensive traffic nightmare that will take out more and more farmland from production.

I feel as though you are so frightened of people like me... those of us working to preserve the farm economy that you rushed and not fully looked creatively for other models within your own people. You have not asked yourself if going up and infilling by the new statue will lower the number of acres you need outside of the existing boundary. You are rezoning 26 acres of the Noble farm. Would zoning under HB 2001 not lower the inventory enough so that you would not need to rezone her farmland? I understand we need new housing but do we need all those proposed acres given HB 2001? If there is such strain for people to move here then have you fully looked to re zoning the Alpine district into a mini Pearl District? You have weighted the bulk of the development in one area in which none of you live or work. Why must the south of the city, as my cousin Jennifer Redmond Noble pointed out is furthest from the commuting corridors with no major arterial access off highway 18 be so heavily impacted? You say it's got to go somewhere. I agree, it needs to go on new, denser zoning in the city via HB 2001. If you go ahead, this means my farm intersections will need traffic lights, wider streets that eat away at my crops making it harder for me to farm.

In conclusion, I congratulate you on including the sliver of land adjacent to my farm into the UGB plan but ask that you do that after you deny this proposal. Your Remand is too strict a roadblock to properly plan for 2040 land use outcomes. I ask you to further study HB 2001 to re-draw the r4 and 05 zoning in the existing UGB boundary before you needlessly expand the UGB south of the city. HB 2001 is called "Housing Choices!"

Thank you very much

Ramsey McPhillips