

From: [Travis Johnson](#)
To: [Heather Richards](#)
Subject: UGB amendment comments/questions
Date: Friday, December 4, 2020 7:22:51 AM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Re: City Council Review

Councilors/CDC Planning staff,

To the average citizen, just driving from point A to point B in this town provides enough of an eyeball test and “feel” that the infrastructure is not in place to support added population numbers, whether those numbers would be living in 3 story apartment complexes or sprawling homes on 1/4 acre lots. The congestion and gridlock that we are facing needs to be addressed before consideration is given to developing more land, and that is just the everyday, visible part of the equation that “Joe Blow” can see and feel. Nevermind the sewer, water, power, emergency services, and other basic needs such as grocery stores and medical facilities that must also be in place to support added residential development. Not to mention living wage jobs/careers.

The old adage “if you build it, they will come” is true, conversely, what happens if you do not build it??? That being said, I worry for the future of McMinnville in that most residents, families, and generations that have laid the groundwork of this community do not desire for it to simply become part of the urban sprawl that is the metro area or see it become nothing more than an overpriced commuter town.

I understand that this is expanding the UGB, which theoretically only makes the land “available” for future use, providing that land owners will at some point have the desire to develop their properties. I guess my question is how does that process work in terms of fulfilling city needs? Let’s say in a hypothetical situation, the UGB is expanded to the proposed limits, and not enough land owners within that new boundary are willing or showing any desire to annex into the city? Does eminent domain come into play at that point? Does annexation require a vote by the residents, or is it at the discretion of the city council?

We have heard repeatedly over the last few weeks that state law mandates that we plan for 20 years of growth projections, what are the ramifications of not abiding by those laws?

The population projections of 2003, for 2023, have clearly not come to fruition, in fact, have fallen short by roughly 10-11k people. It stands to reason that the city is not going to gain 10-11k people in population in the next 2-3 years. Therefore should we really be held to the same land holding reserve requirement numbers that were projected and established at that time? If population projections have turned out to be roughly 43% of what was forecasted, shouldn’t we only be required to have available enough housing units and/or land holding reserves to support that many residents? It seems as though the numbers are a bit skewed in regards to that, unless I am interpreting this data incorrectly.

In closing, I do want to make it clear that I am in no way trying to discount the work that has been done in compiling this vast amount of information by the staff at the planning department. They have clearly invested a countless amount of time, energy, and resources into this project and should be acknowledged accordingly for that. I know in my personal dealings with the community development center, they have always been helpful and insightful. I certainly do not think we should be disregarding their efforts or throwing the proverbial baby out with the bath water. These are just some questions, thoughts, and concerns from a citizen who is trying to be as informed as possible. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Travis and Stacey Johnson
2325 NW Cemetery Rd.

McMinnville, OR, 97128