



**Comprehensive Plan
 Citizen Advisory Committee
 AGENDA
 Thursday, October 22, 2015**

HILLSBORO CIVIC CENTER
 150 East Main Street

4:00-6:00 PM
 Conference Rm.113 B

| Time | Topic | Lead | Action |
|------|--|--------|---------|
| 4:00 | A. Introductions/Welcome | All | I |
| 4:10 | B. Minutes Review – September 24 meeting | Nick | I, D |
| 4:15 | C. Public Involvement a. Background Report b. Draft Goals and Policies | Aaron | I, D, R |
| 5:00 | D. Historic Resources a. Background Report b. Draft Goals and Policies | Debbie | I, D, R |
| 5:30 | E. Library Services a. Background Report b. Draft Goals and Policies | Laura | I, D, R |
| 5:45 | F. Upcoming Meeting Schedules and Topics | Aaron | I |
| 5:50 | G. Public Comment | - | I |
| 6:00 | H. Adjourn | - | |

I=Information, D=Discussion, R=Recommendation

Attachments:

1. September 24 meeting minutes
2. Staff Report for October 2015 meeting
3. Public Involvement
 - a. Background Report
 - b. Draft Goals & Policies
 - c. Current Comprehensive Plan language
4. Historic Resources
 - a. Background Report
 - b. Draft Goals & Policies
 - c. Current Comprehensive Plan language
5. Library Resources
 - a. Background Report
 - b. Draft Goals & Policies

Next Regular Meeting:

Thursday, November 19, 2015
 4:00-6:00pm
 Conference Room 113B/C
 Hillsboro Civic Center

For further information on agenda items,
 contact Laura Weigel, Long Range Planning
 Manager, at (503) 681-6156 or email at
laura.weigel@hillsboro-oregon.gov.



Revised and accepted by the Citizen Advisory Committee on October 22, 2015.

Meeting Summary

Citizen Advisory Committee – Comprehensive Plan Update

September 24, 2015 - 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Hillsboro Civic Center - Room 113B

150 E. Main Street

Hillsboro, OR 97123

Members Present

Mica Annis, Steve Callaway, Aron Carleson, Katie Eyre, Wil Fuentes, Bonnie Kookan, Glenn Miller, Daniel Nguyen, Ahne Oosterhof, Gwynne Pitts, Bryan Welsh

Members Excused

Marc Cardinaux, John Godsey, Tricia Mortell, Ken Phelan

Staff Present

Nick Baker, Aaron Ray, Laura Weigel

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened with introductions of the committee. Each committee member stated their favorite place in the Hillsboro Community. Walkability, closeness to light rail, parks, trees, and the historic nature of the City were main themes.

Each week the meeting packet will be posted the Friday before the meeting on the Comprehensive Plan website. Each member has their own binder to hold all information. At each meeting, the printed packet will be provided, so that it can be inserted into the committee member's binders.

Comprehensive Plan Process Overview

Laura Weigel and Aaron Ray presented a PowerPoint that outlined what the Comprehensive Plan is and what the process is for updating it. The presentation is summarized below.

Hillsboro is part of the Portland region which is governed by Metro. Metro forecasts that regionally over the next 25 years there will be 300,000 new jobs and 400,000 people in the region. All cities and counties in the region play a role in accommodating that growth.

Hillsboro has grown faster than any other city in Washington County over the last 30 years. Hillsboro will continue to grow and the Citizen Advisory Committee will help shape the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan that will help guide that growth. The Comprehensive Plan has not been fully updated since 1983. Rapid change necessitated multiple adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan which addressed immediate expansion issues but resulted in a piecemeal approach to managing the City's form and infrastructure systems.

Oregon has a unique land use planning system, unlike any other state. In the 1970's, Oregonians wanted to limit urban sprawl from encroaching into prime agricultural land. As a result, Urban Growth Boundaries were established along with 19 statewide planning goals that all cities and counties in the state must adhere to.

The City also has to comply with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept. Hillsboro plays a big role in this structure by providing a significant amount of employment land, anchoring employment on the west side.

Beginning in 1997 there was a large outreach effort to work with citizens to create a community vision, which has been updated several times over the years including just this past year. Citizens comments and the focus areas identified in the 2035 Community Plan are the foundation of the Comprehensive Plan update. The Comprehensive Plan is not meant to reinvent the wheel, but to build a stronger wheel. The Comprehensive Plan will dig a little deeper into land use patterns, the transportation system and how the City delivers public services among other topics.

The Comprehensive Plan also helps to inform other critical planning documents that the City uses to guide the growth and development of the City. Collectively these Plans serve as a kind of master plan for the City. This master plan creates the structure of how the City works, how the City provides services and what types of services it provides. It plays a critical role in creating the place in which we live, work and play.

There are seven core areas of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Bolstering Community Involvement
- Enhancing Livability and Recreation
- Building Economy and Infrastructure
- Promoting Health, Wellness and Safety
- Advancing Environmental Sustainability
- Fostering Healthy Ecosystems
- Cultivating Transportation Choices

The first step in the update process is to develop a background report for all of the topics within each core area. The purpose of the background reports are to create the framework for making goals and policy determinations. Most background reports will follow this outline:

- Introduction
- Background
- Hillsboro 2020 / Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan
- Existing Comprehensive Plan Goals
- Regulatory Context (Federal / State / Local)

- Other Plans, Programs, or Reports
- Emerging Issues, Challenges, and Trends
- Recommended Plan Updates and Policy Questions to Consider
- Resources

Staff reviews each Background Report and the policy questions and/or draft goals and polices with staff from other departments or roles that might be impacted. Then, where feasible, the same materials are reviewed with the corresponding board or commission. After that review, staff present the materials to the Technical Advisory Committee, which is made up of all the different partners and different departments across the city and our governmental and regional partners (Washington County and Metro, for example). Then, the Citizen Advisory Committee reviews and revises the materials. After CAC review, the materials are refined again prior to the Community Summits, and later, Planning Commission and City Council review.

The differences between a Comprehensive Plan and Community Plan were discussed. Committee members asked why topics such as education were not part of the Comprehensive Plan, and staff explained that non land-use topics such as education are not required by law and often don't fit well within a land use plan framework. Staff explained that these topics are better addressed in the Community Plan, which focuses on aspects of the community outside land use, and involves the work of partner agencies such as school districts. Many cities lack a document like the Community Plan and therefore aren't able to address these topics as effectively.

The project's public involvement and engagement plans were discussed. The Public Involvement Plan includes an evaluation and feedback component which will allow staff to refine public engagement activities throughout the project based on input from the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement. A project Web site is being developed, and staff are exploring plans for the first public outreach events, probably at Orenco Station Plaza later this winter. Having CAC members at these events will be very helpful.

Staff then explained how the goals and policies developed in the first phase of the project will then set the stage for implementation measures to be developed in the second phase. Staff presented an example showing how goals and policies developed in Phase 1 are connected to one another, and how they set the stage for specific implementation measures to be developed in Phase 2 to build the work plan for putting the policies in place. This example was shared with the CAC (for illustration only) in the Promoting Health, Wellness, and Safety core area:

- Topic: Access to Local Food
- Goal: Neighborhoods and development are designed and built to enhance human and environmental health.
- Policy: Promote and incentivize local, small-scale agricultural production in residential and mixed-use areas.
- Implementation measure: Review our code and make changes needed to allow community gardens in centers and high density areas.

In the development of goals and policies, a goal is a broad statement of a desired outcome. It can be aspirational, long term and ongoing. A policy is a strategy and/or program that the City will utilize to help achieve the goal. It is measurable, mid-long term and ongoing.

Upcoming Topics

A tentative topic outline for the next four meetings was discussed. October's meeting will focus on Public Involvement, Library Services and Historic Resources. November will focus on Housing. December will focus on Recreational Needs and Urbanization, and January will focus on Design & Development and Access to Local Food. This schedule is tentative, and staff will update the CAC as needed.

Charge Statement / Bylaws

The committee discussed the Charge Statement and committee By-Laws, including several highlights:

- CAC members are a liaison back to their respective groups to share information and gather input. If a CAC member's term on their standing board ends in the middle of the project, that member should remain on the CAC and report back to their former board or commission.
- Please come prepared for the meeting, reading through the materials in advance. There may be quite a bit of reading some months, and staff will do their best to keep packets as manageable as possible.
- Please do not miss more than three meetings.
- The committee will work toward consensus, although can revert to more formal votes in the event that consensus isn't clear. Minority opinions are welcome to be shared and entered into the record.
- Honor decisions that have been made and move forward to ensure that the committee can continue to make progress.
- All meetings are public, and public comment will be taken at the end of each meeting.
- Have fun!

Committee members discussed the level of formality of the meetings, and whether more formal arrangements such as Roberts Rules should be used to manage the meetings. Staff indicated that both formal and informal structures can be mixed as appropriate to the situation, and that the goal of the CAC is to provide input and advice, which is a bit of a different role than a decision-making body. The group determined that meetings would be run in a less formal, more conversational manner when possible, but Roberts Rules can be invoked when there is contention on a specific topic or when specific language needs to be more formally agreed upon.

Committee members also suggested that the CAC By-laws be renamed, as they are more related to meeting protocol and collaboration, and less focused on committee structure and operation. The group's consensus was that this document should be referred to as a Code of Conduct.

Meeting Dates & Times

The group discussed setting a standing meeting date each month, and settled on the fourth Thursday of each month from 4:00pm-6:00pm, with some exceptions to be made in November and December to

avoid holiday conflicts, in February 2016 to avoid a conflict with a Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce event, and in March 2016 to avoid conflicting with Spring Break. Packets will be distributed electronically to CAC members on the Friday prior to the meeting.

Upcoming meetings of the CAC include:

- October 22, 2015
- November 19, 2015 (3rd Thursday due to Thanksgiving)
- December 10, 2015 (2nd Thursday due to winter holidays)
- January 28, 2016
- February 18, 2016 (3rd Thursday due to Chamber event)
- March 17, 2016 (3rd Thursday due to spring break)

Comprehensive Plan Video

The Comprehensive Plan Video was shown to the Committee. This video will be used on the project Web site and in outreach activities.

Public Comment

No members of the public offered comment at the meeting.

Adjournment

With no additional business to consider, the CAC meeting was adjourned.

MEMORANDUM

To: Comprehensive Plan Update Citizen Advisory Committee

From: Laura Weigel, AICP, Long Range Planning Manager
Debbie Raber, AICP, Senior Project Manager
Aaron Ray, AICP, Senior Planner

Date: October 16, 2015

Subject: Public Involvement, Historic Resources, and Library Resources Background Report and Draft Goals and Policies Review

Requested Citizen Advisory Committee Action:

Review and provide feedback on the background reports and draft Comprehensive Plan goals and policies concerning Public Involvement, Historic Resources, and Library Services.

Background:

Three sets of background reports and draft goals and policies will be discussed at this month's Citizen Advisory Committee meeting: Public Involvement, Historic Resources, and Library Services. For each, staff is requesting that CAC members read the materials prior to the meeting. It is, of course, preferable that you read the background reports in their entirety; however, if you do not, please do read Section 8 of all of the background reports. The CAC meeting will include, if needed, discussion of suggested revisions to the background reports, although the meetings will focus primarily on draft goals and policies. The suggested revisions gathered from CAC participants will be incorporated prior to subsequent review by the Planning Commission.

Public Involvement

Statewide Planning Goal 1 requires cities to address public involvement in their Comprehensive Plans. This section was last updated in 2011. Updates to the existing goals and policies include removing all of the land use procedures goals and policies from the section (those will have their own different section), adding language regarding innovative techniques for public engagement, creating outreach strategies to engage the Latino community and other diverse communities, and publishing planning related statistics and data for public use.

The Public Involvement Background Report and draft goals and policies were previously titled "citizen involvement", but members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) suggested renaming the topic to better reflect the scope and inclusive nature of public involvement activities. In addition to the TAC, this topic has been previously reviewed by an internal staff

working group consisting of representatives from the Planning Department and the City Manager's, as well as the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI).

The draft attached to this staff report reflects suggested edits from all three groups, with edits suggested by TAC indicated in tracked changes. Feedback from the internal working group suggested language refinements to policies in proposed Goals 1 and 2, and the relocation of some proposed policies into implementation actions. Feedback from ACCI included a request to include some discussion of engagement of aging populations in the background report, as well as a suggested configuration of the new committee for public involvement as a separate entity consisting of representatives of the Planning Commission, Planning and Zoning Hearings Board, Youth Advisory Council, at-large members representing various geographic areas of the City, and additional representatives as deemed necessary by City Council.

Cultural and Historic Resources

Cities are required to adopt programs that protect historic resources by Statewide Planning Goal 5. The goals and policies were last updated in 2007. The Cultural and Historic Resources Background Report and draft goals and policies attached to this staff report have been reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee (HLAC) at meetings throughout the summer, ultimately receiving endorsement from HLAC on September 9, 2015. The Technical Advisory Committee reviewed these materials on October 8, 2015.

The draft attached to this staff report incorporates feedback received from HLAC members. Updates to the goals and policies include; extracting goals and policies related to Cultural and Historic Resources out of the larger section "Natural Resources, Open Space, Scenic and Historical Sites" to create a stand-alone section; revising the overall language to be consistent with new Comprehensive Plan style; and to further support and celebrate preservation efforts in the City. TAC members suggested no revisions to the Background Report; suggested revisions to draft goals and policies are shown in markup on the attached draft.

Library Services

Goals and policies related to Library Services are not required by Statewide Planning Goals, but the City views its library as an essential public facility, therefore warranting inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. The attached Background Report and draft goals and policies were developed collaboratively with Library staff to address important land use-related issues concerning provision of library services. These materials were reviewed by the TAC on October 8, 2015, and by the Library Board on October 15, 2015.

Cost:

Costs for preparation of these documents includes staff time only.

Attachments:

1. Citizen Involvement Background Report, draft Goals and Policies and existing Comp Plan
2. Historic Resources Background Report, draft Goals and Policies and existing Comp Plan
3. Library Services Background Report and draft Goals and Policies

Public Involvement

Background Report FINAL DRAFT

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|--|
| 06.18.2015 | Internal Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 09.30.2015 | Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.8.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> Note: Background report retitled to Public Involvement in subsequent drafts |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

1. Introduction

Proactive and effective public involvement is a cornerstone of planning practice, and focused public engagement is crucial to achieve success in land use and transportation planning initiatives that often impact the entire community. Hillsboro residents have consistently expressed an expectation that the City prioritize public engagement to maintain transparency and encourage participation through feedback in the Hillsboro 2020 and 2035 projects, including providing avenues for meaningful public involvement, access to information, and opportunities for collaboration, with transparent and inclusive public engagement practices. Public involvement is the first of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals, and a number of laws and regulations at the federal and state level compel local governments to conduct public involvement efforts.

This Public involvement background report is one of a series of papers identifying recommended policy questions and updates to the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. The intent of this report is to examine the City’s public involvement efforts as they relate to land use and transportation planning, and evaluate these efforts against relevant policies, goals, and regulations as well as emerging issues and trends. The outcome of this report is a series of policy questions and recommendations to inform the update of the Bolstering Community Involvement section of the City’s new Comprehensive Plan. This background report was prepared by City of Hillsboro Planning staff, and will be refined and reviewed through a process including a Citizen Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and City Council.

Historically, public involvement has been referred to as “Citizen Involvement” in statewide planning regulations, the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan, and even in earlier versions of this background report. Going forward, staff feels that the term “Public Involvement” better reflects the intent of broad participation and representation in public processes. Where “Citizen Involvement” is used here, it generally refers either to specific documents or bodies already in place, but the term “public involvement” will be utilized to reflect the efforts to be implemented into the future.

2. Background

The Hillsboro Planning Department conducts a number of public involvement activities including:

- Public notification of land use applications,
- Meetings and events for various planning projects,
- Providing public information available at the counter and online, and
- Conducting research and producing reports to understand how the City is growing and how to involve the public in guiding that growth.

Public involvement is addressed in Section 1 of the existing Comprehensive Plan, including goals, oversight structures, and policies related to public records availability, communication, public feedback, and public involvement-related budget needs. All of these activities are guided by Statewide Planning Goal 1, discussed in further detail later in this report.

Many land use applications require some level of public involvement, ranging from mailed public notices to open houses or other forums for informal discussion and input from residents, as required by procedures outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code (which, in turn, implement state statute and administrative rules). Some required community meetings are coordinated by the applicant, rather than the City, with the applicant submitting documentation that requirements were met. In 2014, approximately 130 applications were filed that required some level of public notice.

The department also conducts various long-term planning and transportation projects such as the South Hillsboro master planning project, overhaul and maintenance of the Community Development Code, and strategic initiatives such as the Comprehensive Plan Update project. Most of these projects have employed some sort of Web site for publicity, along with stakeholder or focus groups, and open houses to solicit input from the public. Most also result in work sessions and public hearings at Planning Commission and/or City Council. Some projects have used additional outreach and public involvement methods such as surveys, design charrettes, outreach at public events, newsletters, public tours, or other methods.

2.1. Planning Commission and Planning and Zoning Hearings Board

There are two governing bodies overseeing planning decision-making in the City: the Planning Commission, and the Planning and Zoning Hearings Board, as defined in the Hillsboro Municipal Code.

The Planning Commission is a seven-member body appointed by the City Council, to advise on land use issues and priorities, make quasi-judicial land use decisions,¹ and make legislative recommendations. The Commission is also charged with reviewing and approving public participation measures, including public involvement plans for individual planning projects. No more than two members may be engaged in the same occupation or profession. As discussed in more detail below, all members of the Planning Commission also serve on the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee.²

¹ A quasi-judicial land use decision (as defined by Community Development Code section 12.70.050) is made by an elected or appointed Review Authority, and requires substantial exercise of discretion and judgment in applying approval criteria. Type III procedures defined in the City's Community Development Code are quasi-judicial; these include most adjustments, conditional uses, non-conforming use expansions, planned unit developments, subdivisions, variances, and zone changes, among other application types.

² See Hillsboro Municipal Code Subchapter 2.40.

The Planning and Zoning Hearings Board (PZHB) conducts public hearings for certain land use applications, such as conditional use permits and variances. Board membership includes three hearings officers, who must be accredited law school graduates, and six lay members. Although the scope of PZHB does not itself involve public involvement oversight, two PZHB members currently serve on the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement.³

2.2. Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) and Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI)

Goal 1 requires cities to establish a public involvement committee responsible for oversight and evaluation of the city's public involvement efforts related to land use planning. The Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) was established in the 1977 Comprehensive Plan as "a group of citizens selected by the City Council to conduct the Citizen Involvement Program".⁴ Initially, the members of the Planning Commission served as the members of CIAC, with additional members appointed at the discretion of the City Council.

In 1996, Section 1 of the Comprehensive Plan was overhauled as part of the City's Periodic Review Work Program to bring the public involvement program into compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 1. These revisions included restructuring the CIAC into 18-member panel with broad geographic representation throughout the City based on designated sub-areas. This structure proved difficult to maintain both due to the size of the committee, as well as the sporadic nature of the committee's work (coinciding mostly with the initiation of major planning projects).

In 2011, the CIAC was once again restructured and returned to its original (and present) structure with the Planning Commissioners serving as CIAC members.⁵ This restructuring also required the creation of a separate, smaller advisory committee providing input to the CIAC, currently called the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI, originally named the Public Process Advisory Committee and subsequently renamed as a result of public input).⁶ The statewide Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (which reviews all changes to Goal 1-related Comprehensive Plan policies) supported the restructuring, but requested language to ensure that members would be broadly representative of the Hillsboro community. This feedback is reflected in the current structure of the ACCI:

- One liaison each from the Planning Commission and Vision Implementation Committee,
- One representative from each City Council ward, and
- Up to four additional members "representative of a broad spectrum of the community selected from an open nomination process".⁷

As currently structured, ACCI reviews Public Involvement Plans developed by staff for proposed plan revisions, major plan amendments, or upon request of the City Council or CIAC. ACCI gives feedback to staff to refine these Public Involvement Plans, and ultimately provides a recommendation to CIAC for approval, revision, or denial of proposed Public Involvement Plans. Originally, ACCI was conceptualized as a committee that could conduct more holistic reviews of communications techniques and methods

³ See Hillsboro Municipal Code Subchapter 2.44.

⁴ Section I(II)(A), Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan, adopted in Ordinance No. 2793-4-77.

⁵ Case File Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan 6-09, adopted as Ordinance No. 5987.

⁶ Ordinance No. 6009.

⁷ Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan Section 1(II)(E)(iv).

across the Planning Department (and potentially for other City departments), but the committee has not been engaged in this capacity thus far.

Despite the changes made in the 2011 restructuring, ACCI membership and engagement has remained sporadic and inconsistent. In an attempt to address ongoing vacancies on the board, the City Council approved a recommendation from Planning staff to add two representatives from the Planning and Zoning Hearings Board to ACCI. As of October 2015, ACCI has five active members, including appointments made in summer 2015 to include representatives of the Vision Implementation Committee and the Youth Advisory Council. All current members of ACCI are engaged with other City governing bodies or advisory committees.

To date, ACCI involvement has been typically limited to reviewing proposed public involvement plans for discrete planning projects such as community plans or amendments to the Community Development Code. Staff could find no record of an ACCI review of the department’s overall communications efforts.

3. Hillsboro 2020 and Hillsboro 2035

For nearly 20 years, the Hillsboro Vision and Action Committee has been one of the key driving forces behind citywide civic engagement in Hillsboro. After experiencing significant economic and residential growth beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, the community became economically self-sufficient with a strong and diverse industrial base and vital retail areas. The City also began to experience the associated challenges with growth as it more than doubled in physical size and tripled in population. As a result, the City began to face questions about how the community’s character and identity would adapt.

The City began its visioning project, called Hillsboro 2020, in 1997. The Hillsboro Vision and Action Committee reached out to more than 1,500 people to create a common vision for the City, along with strategies and actions to implement this vision. The resulting Vision Action Plan was adopted by City Council in 2000, and subsequently updated in 2005 and 2010. Vision 2020 was named a project of the year by the International Association for Public Participation in 2002.

Beginning in 2013, the City began a project to develop its next community vision, the Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan, building on the success of the original visioning project. The Plan is scheduled for release in late 2015.

3.1. Vision 2020

The 2020 Vision and Action Plan⁸ was organized into a series of focus areas, strategies, and actions. The actions most related to public involvement are listed below, with a brief note on the implementation status of each action.

| Action & Summary | Status |
|---|---|
| 1.1 <i>Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee:</i> Implement CIAC consistent with Section 1 of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. | Implemented, although some challenges remain (see section 2.2). |
| 1.2 <i>Promote Participation in Local Decisions:</i> Develop dialogue between the City, citizens, and | Implemented and ongoing |

⁸ *Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan*, Revised August 2010
(http://www.hillsboro2020.org/FileLib/H2020ActionPlan2010_Web.pdf).

| Action & Summary | Status |
|---|--|
| stakeholders to promote regular participation in local decisions and encourage volunteerism. | |
| 1.3 <i>Building Community</i> : Facilitate opportunities to build community at the neighborhood level and improve dialogue on local issues. | Implemented and ongoing |
| 1.4 <i>City-Neighborhood Communications</i> : Facilitate direct communication with neighborhoods and districts on critical issues through HOAs or multifamily housing contacts. | Implementation anticipated in 2016-2020 timeframe. |
| 2.2 <i>Access to the Web</i> : Promote, encourage, and develop online access to the City and other local government resources. | Implemented and enhanced most recently in 2013 with the launch of a new City Web site supporting mobile device access. |
| 8.2 <i>Student Involvement in Government</i> : Develop avenues for high school/college student involvement in local government. | Implemented via the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, discussed in section 7.2 |
| 13.2 <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</i> : Establish an advisory committee for active transportation investments. | Previously implemented but not currently active. This group, or a new group in a similar role, will be formed as part of the Transportation System Update project. |
| 15.1 <i>Hillsboro Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee</i> : Establish an advisory committee on historic landmarks | Implemented and currently active, coordinated by Planning Department staff. |

3.2. Hillsboro 2035

The Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan includes a broad focus area dedicated to Education and Community Involvement, including initiatives related to educational programs, workforce training, community events, and civic engagement. Of the initiatives and actions in this section, three are most relevant to land use planning and decision-making (each targeted for implementation by the City by 2020):

- Initiative 4A: Develop a cultural inclusion strategy and expand engagement to minority populations.
- Initiative 5A: Develop and promote volunteer opportunities to include diverse community members.
- Initiative 5B: Expand youth engagement in community affairs and government.

4. Existing Comprehensive Plan Goals

From the beginning, the City's comprehensive planning efforts have included significant public involvement in plan development and adoption. The original Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1977,⁹ although public involvement in planning and development dates back to the early 1970s when the City began its initial planning work.

⁹ Ordinance No. 2793-4-77

Section 1 was significantly revised in 1996¹⁰ to modernize Plan language to comply with Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1, as part of the City's Periodic Review program. Section 1 currently includes four goals related to public involvement:

- A. Design, and implement citizen involvement programs, which facilitates public involvement in major Comprehensive Plan and implementing land use ordinance revisions and assures that such actions are based on factual and complete available information. At a minimum, such public involvement programs will provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for citizen involvement as determined by the CIAC.
- B. Inform the citizens of the Hillsboro planning area of the opportunity to participate in all phases of planning through the citizen involvement program.
- C. Encourage and actively solicit citizen participation through a diverse and wide-ranging communication program.
- D. Develop, through education, a citizenry capable of effective participation in the planning process.

A fifth goal was deleted in 2011 in conjunction with the CIAC/ACCI restructuring discussed in Section 2.2. This goal stated:

Establish a City Citizen Involvement Program to be conducted by the CIAC that provides individual public involvement programs for plan revisions and major plan amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that are consistent with State Planning Goal 1 and the financial resources of the City. At a minimum, such a public involvement program will provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for citizen participation as determined by the CIAC.

Section 1 includes one map, Figure 1-1, designating eight planning subareas that were formerly used as the basis for CIAC representation. The language in the 2011 update removed all reference to this figure, but the map itself remains in the document. Figure 1-1 should be updated and referenced, or removed. Section 1 also includes public notice, hearings, and other notification requirements related to major and minor plan amendments that are more procedural in nature. Although these topics involve public notice and communication, they should be relocated to the Land Use Procedures section of the comprehensive plan.

5. Regulatory Context

5.1. Federal Regulations

Public involvement in local land use processes is not explicitly regulated at the federal level, although the City should be prepared to address specific requirements in cases where they are applicable (often due to federal funding being used for a particular project).

¹⁰ Case File Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan 8-96, adopted as Ordinance No. 4491.

5.1.1. Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in all government programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Two federal Executive Orders reinforce Title VI by requiring recipients of federal funding to address potential discrimination and barriers to broad public participation:

- Executive Order 12898 requires compliance with federal agency environmental justice programs, ensuring that diverse population groups are included in data collection, public participation, and decision making processes.
- Executive Order 13166 requires that reasonable steps be taken to ensure meaningful access to programs and activities by limited English-proficient speakers.

5.1.2. Americans with Disabilities Act

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires local governments to ensure equal access for individuals with disabilities in all programs, services, and activities, regardless of whether those programs receive federal assistance. Title II includes regulations addressing communications and meeting venues, among other topics.

5.1.3. Age Discrimination Act of 1975

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

5.1.4. Other federal acts

Other individual federal acts (for example, federal transportation or environmental protection legislation) may include more specific public involvement requirements, often including broad identification of interested parties, public outreach plans and programs, public meetings and events, mechanisms for comment, advisory panels, and public access to documents and technical information.

5.2. Statewide Regulations

5.2.1. Statewide Planning Goals

Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1 addresses Citizen Involvement.¹¹ Municipalities are required to employ an involvement program to ensure the opportunity for the public to have meaningful involvement throughout the land use planning process. Goal 1 requires municipalities to incorporate six key components in their public involvement program:

- Citizen Involvement: An officially-recognized committee for public involvement broadly representative of geographic areas and interests related to land use and land-use decisions to provide for widespread public involvement;
- Communication: Mechanisms for effective two-way communication between the public and elected/appointed officials;
- Influence: Opportunities for the public to be involved in all phases of the planning and decision-making process;
- Technical Information: Access to technical information used in the decision-making process, provided in an accessible and understandable format;

¹¹ Oregon Administrative Rule 660-015-0000(1).

- Feedback Mechanisms: Programs to ensure that members of the public receive responses from policy-makers and that a written record for land-use decisions is created and made accessible; and,
- Financial Support: Adequate resources allocated for the public involvement program as an integral component of the planning budget.

In addition to these requirements, Goal 1 also provides a number of guidelines that can be used to shape and enhance a public involvement program, including:

- Developing a comprehensive communications strategy including a variety of media;
- Involving local educational institutions and land-use-related partner agencies to develop strategies for educating local residents on land use and land use decision processes;
- Developing strategies to include local residents in data collection, plan preparation, formal decision making, implementation, evaluation, and revision phases of planning projects;
- Provision of comprehensive technical information including a variety of data sources and types, including both maps and photos; and,
- Clearly identifying how public feedback will be received and considered in planning processes, and reporting out what feedback was received and how it was used.

5.2.2. Statewide Public Meetings & Records Laws

The Planning Commission, CIAC and ACCI are considered public bodies; as such, meetings must comply with Oregon Public Meetings Law.¹² Public meetings must be held in a place accessible to persons with disabilities, and the City must provide reasonable accommodations for those with communications challenges. Records of these meetings, in addition to established records kept in land use decision-making processes, must be retained and made available to the public in compliance with Oregon Public Records Law.¹³

5.3. Metro Regulations

Metro implements its own public involvement program apart and separate from city or county public involvement programs required under Goal 1. Metro codes guide public involvement programs for the regional government itself, and do not generally place additional requirements on member municipalities. Metro ordinances have set guiding principles for public involvement¹⁴ and actions to ensure diversity and equity in its community engagement activities.¹⁵ Although compliance with these ordinances is not explicitly required, these principles and objectives should be considered when setting City goals for public engagement.

6. Other Plans, Programs, or Reports

6.1. City of Hillsboro Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Plan

In 2007, the City began a strategic planning process intended to “enhance delivery of City services in the context of our current and future community needs”.¹⁶ This process yielded goals, strategies, and

¹² Oregon Revised Statutes 192.610 to 192.690.

¹³ Oregon Revised Statutes 192.420 to 192.505.

¹⁴ Metro Ordinance 97-2433.

¹⁵ Core Area 3, Metro Diversity Action Plan, adopted as Metro Ordinance 12-4375.

¹⁶ City of Hillsboro Strategic Plan (January 2010).

actions to focus the City’s work toward meeting its mission and core values; those most relevant to public involvement are included in the table below. Although the Planning Department is not necessarily responsible for the implementation of all of these measures, this information illustrates the City’s aspirations for public involvement in general.

| Goal | Strategy | Action |
|--|---|---|
| 2. Anticipate and prepare for change and its potential opportunities and challenges | 2.1. Forecasting | 2.1d. Develop an education and communication program to inform employees and the public about trends and future needs, including a yearly economic and demographic “trends briefing” |
| 4. Nurture a culture of trust and engagement with all Hillsboro residents and community partners | 4.4 Public Engagement and Outreach | 4.4a. Develop and implement departmental outreach plans that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage inter-jurisdictional stakeholders, business community, individuals and other partners • Engage non-traditional or underrepresented communities, including different cultures, socioeconomic groups, age groups, individuals and new residents |
| | | 4.4b. Develop print, web and other media materials that educate the community about opportunities to volunteer or participate in city programs |
| 5. Ensure City services are responsive, equitable, and accessible | 5.1. Inclusive Services | 5.1a. Assess city services to identify barriers (language, cultural, socio-economic or physical). Develop and implement solutions to those barriers. |
| | 5.4. Education, Communication, and Transparency | 5.4a. Develop public information materials that communicate departmental objectives and define and explain city services. |

The Strategic Plan also set specific performance measures to evaluate progress toward meeting goals and aligning with the mission and core values. These performance measures identified outcomes, potential indicators, and data gathering methods to measure progress toward meeting goals. Performance metrics for Goals 4 and 5 were most relevant to public involvement, summarized in the table below:

| Desired Outcomes | Potential Indicators | Data Gathering |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Goal 4: Nurture a culture of trust and engagement with all Hillsboro residents and community partners</i> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public and Partners are actively included in decision-making. • A wide range of engagement methods is employed. • Processes are clearly defined and communicated • Outreach efforts maximize opportunities for participation • Ongoing education/outreach is conducted outside of specific projects • Adequate time included in projects to be collected • Public informed about how they influenced decisions • Public is satisfied that they have been heard. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in public satisfaction with outreach opportunities • Attendance at community meetings • Number of respondents to surveys and online questionnaires | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polling • Attendance Counts • Respondent Counts • Evaluation analysis • Interviews |
| <i>Goal 5: Ensure city services are responsive, equitable and accessible</i> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to services is open to all • All members of the community have clear access to information • Specific groups are not given inappropriate priority • Services are continuously evaluated and improved to reflect the needs of the community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased public satisfaction • Increased participation • Number of bilingual staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public polling • Attendance counts |

6.2. Related City Advisory Committees

A handful of advisory committees beyond those mentioned earlier also provide avenues for public engagement in planning programs:

- **Mayor’s Youth Advisory Council:** A group of 20-25 high school students whose mission in part includes providing review and comment to elected officials and City decision-makers regarding issues that have an impact on youth. YAC is administered by the Human Resources Department.
- **Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee:** A seven-member committee whose mission includes general public outreach and specific assistance to owners of historic properties in the City. HLAC is administered by the Planning Department.
- **Transportation Committee:** A four-member committee comprised of three City Councilors and a non-voting public advisor to advise on transportation and traffic system issues, plans, and programs. Transportation Committee is administered by the Public Works Department.

6.3. Metro Public Engagement Guide

In 2013, Metro updated its Public Engagement Guide,¹⁷ which governs the organization's approach to public involvement, including an extensive outreach effort to solicit community input into how Metro conducts its engagement efforts. Although this publication is not binding on the City, the public comments received during this project provide some insight on public sentiments and expectations from a public involvement program.

6.4. American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics

The American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct¹⁸ discusses public involvement in its principles regarding responsibility to the general public. Related principles include:

- We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons and to governmental decision makers.
- We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs that may affect them. Participation should be broad enough to include those who lack formal organization or influence.

Although the AICP Code of Ethics is not binding on the City, a number of planners within the Planning Department and elsewhere in the City are AICP-certified and are required to follow this code of ethics.

6.5. City Strategic Communications and Marketing Group

The City Manager's Office includes Communications and Marketing group that manages the City's overall branding, communications strategies, outreach to the media and to the public, and the usage of technologies such as the City Web site and social media resources. The group is developing a citywide strategic communications and marketing plan that aims to address, among other topics, the means by which City departments communicate and engage with residents, and how those communications and events are planned, implemented, and evaluated. This plan is currently under development.

7. Emerging Issues, Challenges, and Trends

The City faces a number of issues and challenges to conducting a successful public participation program. This section examines these issues, and also explores some emerging trends and opportunities that the City could leverage to improve its overall public engagement work.

7.1. Issues & Challenges

7.1.1. Public involvement oversight structure

Despite its most recent restructuring, the current CIAC/ACCI arrangement continues to suffer from lack of full participation and lack of broad representation. The membership of both public involvement oversight boards consists mostly of members of other City planning-related boards and commissions. There is no geographic representation requirement of CIAC, and the geographic representation on ACCI consists of just one representative from each of the three council wards. Although the CIAC (by virtue of having the same membership as the Planning Commission) requires

¹⁷ Metro Public Engagement Guide Final Adoption Draft, November 2013 (<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-engagement-guide>).

¹⁸ <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>

occupational diversity, the structures of ACCI and CIAC do not specifically address participation from youth, minorities, or underrepresented populations.

The current CIAC/ACCI structure is technically allowed under Goal 1, but may not withstand scrutiny from DLCD and the statewide CIAC upon plan amendment review as the ACCI has not provided the broad representation anticipated (and upon which the statewide CIAC conditioned its approval). The statewide CIAC has stated that a public involvement oversight board independent from other governing bodies is the preferred option for local governments.¹⁹ Moreover, the CIAC/ACCI structure is difficult to administer, and may not be the best approach for meeting stated public preferences (from Hillsboro 2020/2035) and City strategic goals. No periodic evaluation of overall public involvement or review of approved outreach plans has been implemented.

7.1.2. Departmental Public Involvement Plan

The Planning Department does not currently have a centralized, departmental Public Involvement Plan from which public involvement activities can be planned, implemented, and evaluated. Without such a plan in place, efforts to foster innovation and continual improvement are complicated, and it precludes evaluation, which is a key aspect of Goal 5 of the City's Strategic Plan.

A departmental Public Involvement Plan (informed by, but separate from, the Comprehensive Plan, Vision Action Plan, and City Strategic Plan) should address how the department approaches public involvement in a variety of scenarios, segments of the community, and types of projects. The Plan should also specify what sort of research and data-gathering should be conducted prior to beginning projects (such as demographic research, identification of key desired outcomes, and unique barriers/assets to participation), and should also specify how evaluation of individual projects is used to enhance future efforts.

7.1.3. Multilingual content

In Hillsboro, over 2,000 households (or 6.2% of the total households in the City) report some level of linguistic isolation.²⁰ This is higher than the rate for Washington County (4.9%) and the Portland Metropolitan Statistical Area (4.0%). Hillsboro residents that are linguistically isolated most commonly speak Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Korean.²¹ In fact, Hillsboro has nearly double the rate of linguistically isolated households speaking Spanish than the Portland MSA as a whole (4.2% in the City versus 2.0% in the region).

Currently, the Planning Department offers 2 of its 35 land use applications (Home Occupation and Mobile/Temporary Business) in Spanish. The department has not produced public notices or most meeting materials in Spanish. Counter assistance is available in Spanish when fluent employees (typically from the Building Department) are available. Web site information is available translated via Google Translate. Although the department offers translation services at public hearings,

¹⁹ *Putting the People in Planning: A Primer on Public Participation in Planning*, Third Edition (May 2008). Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, Department of Land Conservation and Development.

²⁰ American Community Survey, 2013 (Table B16002, 5-year estimate). NOTE: A "limited English speaking household" is defined in the ACS as one in which all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English.

²¹ American Community Survey, 2012 (Table 150001, 5-year estimate).

meetings, and events, staff could not recall a request for translation in the last decade. Other than the Web site, no materials are translated to languages other than Spanish.

The lack of materials available in Spanish or other languages may be a barrier to participation for certain community groups. Comments collected from the public in Hillsboro 2035 clearly indicate the community's desire to expand engagement within the Latino community; thus, the City may need to expand the amount of multilingual information that it makes available.

7.2. Emerging Trends & Opportunities

In addition to the challenges listed above, looking at emerging best practices and opportunities can help to identify areas to focus on when crafting goals and policies. Some examples are discussed below.

7.2.1. Collaborative Community Engagement

Some local governments are beginning to turn to a more collaborative approach to community engagement, particularly for projects that need to focus on outreach to historically underrepresented communities in order to be successful, or where the broadest possible involvement throughout a community is desired. In a collaborative arrangement, the City partners with existing organizations performing outreach to the target communities, providing subject-matter expertise, resources, and sometimes even funding to the partner organization, who then coordinates the outreach activities.

Locally, Washington County used this approach in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan project completed in 2014. The project was structured to have an overall Citizen Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of local organizations and institutions, but also explicitly leaving space for additional members to be added later in the process as more participants expressed interest. The project also specifically involved organizations representing Spanish-speaking residents, and included outreach to faith-based organizations established in the area. In some cases, funding was provided to some partner organizations to support their efforts. As the County found,²² these sorts of engagements can improve engagement in underrepresented communities, although they can also significantly complicate project management, overhead, and costs.

7.2.2. Youth Engagement

There are over 6,500 high school students enrolled in the Hillsboro School District,²³ yet Planning Department outreach activities often overlook these members of the public. Through the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, the City has a strong program encouraging youth involvement and civic engagement. Harnessing the participation of youth leaders on project-based and standing advisory committees, or even in governing bodies themselves, could lend an important and innovative perspective to existing public involvement efforts.

Some cities have included youth-specific events and materials in their public involvement for long-term planning projects, including working with local schools to engage students and their families

²² Public Involvement Report, Aloha-Reedville Study and Community Plan (April 2014). Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation.

²³ Facts and Figures, Hillsboro School District Public Data Portal (<http://www.hsd.k12.or.us/AboutHSD/PublicDataPortal/FactsandFigures.aspx>).

about cities and land use planning. Other cities have expanded youth participation beyond project-based engagement and into the governing bodies themselves, in both voting and advisory capacities. Locally, the City of Tualatin allows (but does not require) appointment of a youth representative to the Planning Commission.

Finally, technology (discussed in section 7.2.3 and 7.2.4) plays a critical role in youth engagement: 95% of teens use the Internet; 47% use a smartphone; and 81% use social media to some extent. Many teens have a basic expectation that most information should be quickly and easily accessible online.²⁴ Thus, expanding the technical capacity of the department is critical to sustaining youth engagement.

7.2.3. Web and mobile technologies

Hillsboro, like most cities, maintains a planning Web site to provide access to meeting agendas, ordinances, application forms, maps, and other information. The Planning Department Web site is well-used, with both the Department's home page and codes and standards page in the City's top 30 Web destinations (by page views). The most popular department Web pages contain information on maps, regulations, zoning, applications, forms, and major projects. Content on the department Web site is typically static text, pictures, and diagrams. Feedback from Hillsboro 2020/2035 has indicated that the public desires enhanced access to Web resources for City services and the use of technology as an engagement tool. Offering enhanced Web services is also consistent with City Strategic Plan actions addressing communication, community engagement, public information, and innovation.

Cities seeking to extend the capabilities of their sites have integrated more interactive tools such as games and discussion forums, online surveys, streaming video of meetings or other presentations, and more multilingual content. Cities have also been turning to existing technologies such as e-mail services to allow the public to receive notices and other information electronically.²⁵ In addition, placing more content on the Web allows for the use of automated translation services such as Google Translate, which while providing somewhat inconsistent or rudimentary translation at times, can still help to bridge linguistic gaps and allow more of the community access to planning information.

Mobile technologies present an exciting opportunity to expand awareness and engagement. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Washington County respondents to a recent Metro survey²⁶ report owning a smartphone, slightly less than other counties in the region. Half of these people report that they would be somewhat or very likely to use a free mobile app that would facilitate engagement with the City. Washington County respondents also rated the ability to connect from home or through a mobile device as the most important way that Metro could improve engagement.

Typically, mobile technologies are oriented toward improving awareness (for example, using GPS to show information about resources or projects nearby) or engagement (for example, by allowing

²⁴ Rainie, L. Pew Research Center (Internet, Science, and Tech) (2014). *13 Things to Know About Teens and Technology* (<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/07/23/13-things-to-know-about-teens-and-technology/>).

²⁵ Evans-Cowley, J., & Kitchen, J. (2011) Planning Advisory Service Report 565: *E-Government*, American Planning Association.

²⁶ Metro Opt In Public Engagement Survey, DHM Research, 2013.

users to interact with the City on their phone). The existing Hillsboro Web infrastructure automatically converts most Web content to be more effectively displayed on smartphones and tablets. The Planning Department does not currently offer mobile-specific content, services, or downloadable applications.

7.2.4. Open Data and Civic Hacking

Open data multiplies the effectiveness of the City’s technology investment by enabling interested community members to use City public data to build new tools and applications that can address issues in the communities. These grassroots public-private partnerships with “civic hackers” can yield innovative and scalable solutions that the City is unlikely to be able to efficiently implement on its own. Data sets could include land use applications, natural resource inventory information, long-range plan data, or the like. For example, King County, Washington, has published a public data set of all 27,000+ planning applications that they have received, including the case file number and address.²⁷ The department could also publish some data that it is already collecting internally – population growth, demographics, and development history are just some examples. Applications also exist beyond the realm of land use and transportation to other City functions. Similar efforts in Philadelphia have grown to regional approaches involving data from a variety of sources, including cities, transit districts, and service providers.²⁸

Even small steps toward open data are beneficial: the City, for example, does not provide a way to query currently pending land use applications. Providing additional transparency into planning decisions supports transparency and engagement directives from Goal 1, is consistent with transparency and innovation elements of the City Strategic Plan, and addresses Vision comments encouraging better use of technology.

8. Recommended Plan Updates and Policy Questions to Consider

Public involvement is poised to play a significant role in the implementation of a new Comprehensive Plan, taking the discussion of public involvement in the Plan beyond something that we have to do in order to comply with state law, and instead positioning it as something that we want to do in order to achieve our goals, measure our success, and improve our work in the future.

The key policy question to consider at this time is the structure of public involvement oversight. The existing ACCI/CIAC structure has not proven to be effective, but more complicated structures attempted in the past were too unwieldy. What should the role of the Planning Commission be in Public involvement oversight? How do we integrate and engage youth and underrepresented communities?

In addition to this key question, the following updates are recommended based on the issues outlined in this report:

1. Create a dedicated section just for Public involvement, relocating application and procedural issues to the Land Use Procedures section.

²⁷ Dataset available at <http://www.civicdata.com/dataset/d1536163-66bf-4477-89ba-fbb78bd52fa3/resource/cc9fd7fd-2602-459d-805a-f259d9a9e18a>.

²⁸ *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*. National League of Cities, April 2013.

2. Ensure that policy language regarding Public involvement oversight addresses both the language in Statewide Planning Goal 1, as well as language from the statewide CIAC manual and previous direction given to the City at CIAC meetings. Give preference to an independent oversight body. (See related policy question in section 8.1.)
3. Create Goals and/or Policies that:
 - a. Foster a culture of civic engagement, public participation, and volunteerism by creating a Planning Department Public Involvement Program that actively involves all segments of the community in planning processes by analyzing issues, generating ideas, developing plans, monitoring outcomes, and reporting achievements.
 - b. Create outreach strategies to engage the Latino community and other ethnic communities that are growing in the City. Addresses providing multilingual content to the public, both in person and online.
 - c. Develop collaboration and engagement strategies that help us reach populations that typically aren't involved, working with existing community organizations, service providers, businesses, and faith communities.
 - d. Employ innovative techniques and tools for communication and engagement, including Web, mobile, and social media technologies.
 - e. Regularly publish planning-related statistics and data for public use.
 - f. Create opportunities for youth engagement, including youth-focused initiatives and regular outreach to youth and the educational community during planning projects.
 - g. Promote transparency and accountability by creating effective means of two-way communication between City government and the Hillsboro community, emphasizing how decisions are made, how people can provide input, and how that input is taken into account.
 - h. Provide information in an accessible and easy to understand format.
 - i. Utilize broadly representative public advisory bodies to provide input on Comprehensive Plan implementation, major planning initiatives, and other projects as appropriate.
 - j. Provide adequate resources to support the City's land use related Public involvement program.

9. Resources

13 Things to Know About Teens and Technology, available at

<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/07/23/13-things-to-know-about-teens-and-technology/>.

American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics, available at <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>

Bright Spots in Community Engagement. National League of Cities, available at <http://www.nlc.org/find-city-solutions/city-solutions-and-applied-research/governance-and-civic-engagement/democratic-governance-and-civic-engagement/bright-spots-in-community-engagement>

Metro Public Engagement Guide Final Adoption Draft, November 2013, available at <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-engagement-guide>

Putting the People in Planning: A Primer on Public Participation in Planning, Third Edition (May 2008). Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, Department of Land Conservation and Development, available at http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/publications/putting_the_people_in_planning.pdf

Public Involvement

Goals and Policies DRAFT – October 16, 2015

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|---|
| 06.18.2015 | Internal Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 09.30.2015 | Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.8.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments shown as tracked changes</i> Note: Document retitled to Public Involvement in subsequent drafts |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

GOAL 1 Implement and maintain a comprehensive public information and ~~citizen~~ involvement program to spread outreach and ~~involvement~~ engagement in land use-related projects, decisions, and initiatives.

- POLICY 1.1 Develop and utilize a consistent set of procedures for notifying and soliciting input from the public as appropriate to the scale and type of proposed action.
- POLICY 1.2 Ensure and encourage ongoing dialog between the public and the City regarding land use planning and decision-making.
- POLICY 1.3 Create and maintain a ~~departmental~~ Planning Department Public Communications and Engagement Program that outlines how staff will plan, implement, and evaluate public involvement activities within the context of individual planning projects and functions.
- POLICY 1.4 Design ~~departmental~~ Planning Department public engagement activities to be accessible, inclusive, and meaningful for participants.
- POLICY 1.5 Provide information to the public in accessible and easy to understand formats, including multiple languages where appropriate.
- POLICY 1.6 Provide adequate personnel, budget, and material resources to support the City’s land use related Public Involvement program.

GOAL 2 Respect and cultivate community diversity and wisdom through inclusive, meaningful, and innovative community participation.

- POLICY 2.1 Create a local Public Engagement Committee responsible for advising the City on land use-related public involvement practices and implementing related duties described in Goal 1 of the Statewide Planning Goals, ~~structured to be~~

geographically and demographically representative of the City as a whole to include representatives from the Planning Commission, Planning and Zoning Hearings Board, Youth Advisory Council, at-large members providing broad geographic representation, and additional representatives as deemed appropriate by City Council.

- POLICY 2.2 Develop strategies to facilitate meaningful participation in planning activities that aim to build engagement across the City's diverse communities.
- POLICY 2.3 Engage existing community organizations, such as faith groups, business associations, and school districts to extend participation and engagement.
- POLICY 2.4 Identify key participant demographics and participatory barriers in the design of public involvement plans.
- POLICY 2.5 Evaluate the success of public involvement activities in mitigating barriers.
- POLICY 2.6 Create opportunities for youth to be engaged in planning projects and decision-making processes.
- POLICY 2.7 Utilize emerging technologies, methods, and techniques to enhance and extend public involvement.

GOAL 3 Ensure transparency and accountability into ~~planning~~ Planning Department processes and decisions.

- POLICY 3.1 Establish clear rights and responsibilities of applicants, decision-makers, staff, and other participants of planning projects, initiatives, and decision-making processes. Include City Boards and Commissions, committees, and other public bodies in these definitions.
- POLICY 3.2 Define and consistently communicate which aspects of planning decisions and projects can be influenced through public participation, and clearly identify the level of engagement that can be expected in public processes.
- POLICY 3.3 Maintain and publicize consistent public access to planning-related projects, statistics, data, decisions, initiatives, and documents, including both in-person and online access.
- POLICY 3.4 Provide periodic reports and evaluations of the City's land use decision processes and public engagement processes for public comment.

Section 1. Planning and Citizen Involvement.

(Amended by Ord. No. 4491/12-96 and Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

(I) Goals.

With the advice and assistance of the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC):

- (A) Design, and implement citizen involvement programs, which facilitates public involvement in major Comprehensive Plan and implementing land use ordinance revisions and assures that such actions are based on factual and complete available information. At a minimum, such public involvement programs will provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for citizen participation as determined by the CIAC.
- (B) Inform the citizens of the Hillsboro planning area of the opportunity to participate in all phases of planning through the citizen involvement program.
- (C) Encourage and actively solicit citizen participation through a diverse and wide-ranging communication program.
- (D) Develop, through education, a citizenry capable of effective participation in the planning process.
- (E) (Deleted by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

(Amended by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

(II) Definitions.

(A) Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC).

The Planning Commission will serve as the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee fulfilling the duties described in Goal 1 for a committee for citizen involvement. The CIAC will consider the advice of the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI) regarding citizen involvement outreach strategies for proposed plan revisions or major amendments.
(Amended by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

(B) Community Plan.

A “community plan” means any plan, planning document or coordinated set of planning policies which establishes coordinated policies and development guidelines for the development of land uses and development activities within a specific area of the City. A community plan is more detailed than the Comprehensive Plan and has Comprehensive Plan status and function relative to the specific geographic area to which it applies. It may contain a map, policy statements and recommendation relating to development densities, public facility and utility improvements and the arrangement of land uses to guide future land use decisions and implementing measures for its geographic area. A community plan shall be consistent with statewide planning goals and with the Comprehensive Plan.

(C) **Public Facility Plans.**

A City public facility plan may include a City plan for water systems, sewer systems, streets and roadways, public airports, public transit and public transportation, and other City public facility or utilities systems. It may contain maps, policies and recommendations relating to public facilities. City public facility plans coordinate programs, policies, jurisdictional responsibilities, project timing or financing for public facilities or services or for topic areas required by a statewide planning goal to be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

City public facility plans for water, sewer, storm drainage or transportation facilities including streets, roadways, public transit and public transportation may contain rough cost estimates for public projects needed to serve the land uses contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan. Except for project timing and financing provisions, a City public facility plan shall be consistent with statewide planning goals and with the Comprehensive Plan.

(D) **Functional Plans.**

City functional plans further refine and implement Comprehensive Plan policies and recommendations regarding specific topic areas of interest or concern to the City. Such topic areas include but are not limited to parks and recreation, housing, open spaces, natural resources development and conservation, historic resources, culture and the arts, economic development, environmental quality and other topic areas or elements addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. City functional plans are prepared from time to time in response to community need and are intended to guide the development and implementation of related functional programs or activities conducted by City agencies.

- (E) **Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement.**
(Added by Ord. No. 5987/10-11, Amended by Ord. No. 6009/4-12.)

The Mayor shall appoint and the Council shall confirm the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI) to serve as an advisory body to the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) regarding citizen involvement outreach strategies for proposed plan revisions, major plan amendments, or upon request by the City Council or CIAC, to the City regarding other matters of concern. Membership of the ACCI shall be comprised of up to nine members including:

- i. A Planning Commission Liaison
- ii. A Vision Implementation Committee Liaison
- iii. At-large members from three Council wards (one-each)
- iv. At-large members representative of a broad spectrum of the community selected from an open nomination process

- (F) **Plan Revision.**

As used in this Section, “plan revision” means: a revision(s) to the entire Comprehensive Plan text or map initiated by the City Council; 1) under a Periodic Review Program pursuant to ORS 197.628 conducted every 4 to 10 years; 2) to implement an adopted Regional Framework Plan or Metro Functional Plan; or 3) as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan. All Plan revisions shall be processed in accordance with the procedures specified in Part (III) of this Section.

- (G) **Major Plan Amendment.**

“Major Plan Amendment” includes any significant change to the Comprehensive Plan text or map initiated by the City Council or Planning Commission. A “significant change” is one that amends or refines both the Plan text and map, has operative effect over a large geographic area and is likely to have significant environmental, energy, economic and social consequences. Major plan amendments include but are not limited to Plan amendments that incorporate community plans as part of the Comprehensive Plan or incorporate portions of public facility plans as part of the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with State statute and regulations implementing Statewide Planning Goal 11. All major plan amendments shall be processed in accordance with the provisions specified in Part (III) of this Section.

- (H) **Minor Plan Amendment**

As used in this Section, “minor amendment” means any change to the Comprehensive Plan which is not a major plan amendment. Minor Plan amendments include all quasi-judicial, site-specific amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Map. All minor plan amendments shall be processed in accordance with the procedures specified in Part (IV) of this Section.

(III) Plan Revision and Major Plan Amendments.

(Amended by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

Plan revisions and major plan amendments shall be processed as legislative procedures. The following process shall be used when conducting any plan revision or major plan amendment of the Comprehensive Plan:

- (A) For each proposed plan revision or major plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, the City Planning Department will:
 - (1) With the advice and assistance of the CIAC, establish and conduct a citizen involvement program which provides for public involvement and input into the proposed revision or amendment which complies with Statewide Planning Goal 1 requirements. At a minimum, such a public involvement program shall provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for public involvement in all phases of the planning process applicable to the proposed plan revision or major plan amendment as determined by the CIAC.
 - (2) Identify issues to be addressed and related information and data to be collected, reviewed and made available for public review. Inform citizens of these issues; and provide opportunity for citizen access to the related information and data; and for citizen input on these issues.
 - (3) Notify affected government agencies of planning activities; invite review and comment.
 - (4) Collect relevant information and data.
 - (5) Analyze each issue and identify proposed actions which address the issue sufficiently. As part of the public involvement program for the plan revision or major plan amendment:
 - (a) Compile and combine the issue, relevant data and information and actions into text format and make copies of

such text available for review and comments by citizens and affected government agencies.

- (b) Compile comments received from citizens and affected government agencies for consideration by the Planning Commission. The Planning Department shall prepare written responses to comments and make the responses available for public review and to the Planning Commission during its consideration of the proposed plan revision or major plan amendment.
- (6) A Planning Commission public hearing on a plan revision or major plan amendment shall be conducted after completion of the tasks set forth in Section (III)(A)(1 through 5) above and the citizen involvement program for the plan revision or major plan amendment established by the CIAC. Notice of any public hearing by the Planning Commission or City Council on a plan revision or major plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City a minimum of 20 days prior to the date of the initial public hearing. Any such notice shall contain:
- (a) A summary of the plan revision or major plan amendment.
 - (b) The time, date and place of the hearing.
 - (c) The location(s) at which copies of the plan revision or major plan amendment summary may be obtained.
 - (d) A statement that all interested persons may appear and provide testimony and that only those persons making an appearance of record may appeal the determination of the Planning Commission or City Council.
 - (e) A general explanation of the requirements for submission of testimony and the procedure for conduct of the hearing.
- (7) The Planning Commission may recess the hearing in order to obtain further information or provide additional notification. Upon recessing for these purposes, the Commission shall announce the time and date when the hearing will be resumed.
- (8) After hearing the plan revision or major plan amendment, the Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of denial, approval, or approval with modifications of the plan revision or major plan amendment to the City Council.
- (9) The City Council shall hold a hearing during its consideration of a plan revision and may hold a public hearing on any major plan

amendment. Notice of the hearing shall be provided in the manner prescribed in subsection (III)(A)(6). After consideration of the plan revision or major plan amendment, the City Council may adopt or deny the plan revision or major plan amendment.

- (10) The Planning Department shall keep copies of adopted text of the plan revision or major plan amendment on file at the City Hall and City Library for inspection by the public and shall notify citizens and government agencies that copies of the adopted text are available for inspection.
- (11) The final City Council decision on a plan revision or major plan amendment may be appealed in accordance with applicable State statutory provisions, relating to appeals of decisions amending an acknowledged comprehensive plan.
- (12) The Planning Commission shall also establish and publicize a procedure whereby interested individuals, community organizations and public agencies may request to be included on a regular mailing list of parties to be notified of the initiation of proposed plan revisions or major plan amendments.

(IV) Minor Plan Amendments.

(A) Minor Plan Amendment: Plan Text.

- (1) On its own volition, the City Council or Planning Commission may initiate a minor plan amendment to the text of the Comprehensive Plan by order whenever a need for such a revision is documented. A minor plan amendment, proposing a change to the text of the Comprehensive Plan, shall be processed pursuant to legislative notice and procedures. (Amended by Ord. No. 5891/12-08.)
- (2) Notice of any public hearing on a minor plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan text shall be by two (2) publications in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Hillsboro not less than five (5) days, nor more than twenty (20) days prior to the date of the hearing.

(B) Minor Plan Amendment: Plan Map.

- (1) A minor plan amendment proposing a change to the Comprehensive Plan Map designation shall be processed pursuant to quasi-judicial notice and procedures and may be requested at

any time by a property owner(s), a person(s) purchasing property under contract, or a person(s) who has the written consent of the property owner. A minor Plan Map amendment may also be initiated by the City Council or the Planning Commission where:

- (a) The land use on the subject property has changed substantially since the adoption of the Plan Map designation, and is inconsistent with the current Plan Map designation; or
- (b) The subject property has passed from public ownership and use to private ownership and use, or the reverse; or
- (c) The current Plan Map designation on the subject property is inconsistent with the surrounding properties, based on earlier Plan map changes, and development of the subject property under the implementing zone of the Plan Map designation would have substantial adverse effects on the surrounding properties; and
- (d) The proposed designation is supportive of and implements goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

(Amended by Ord. No. 5938/5-10.)

- (2) Approval of a minor Plan Map amendment shall be based on demonstration that all of the following criteria are satisfied:
 - (a) The property is better suited for uses proposed than for the uses for which the property is currently designated by the Plan;
 - (b) A need exists for the proposed Plan Map designation that is not already met by existing Plan Map designations in the general area; and
 - (c) The proposed designation is consistent with relevant goals and policies of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan.

(Amended by Ord. No. 5938/5-10.)

- (3) Notice of any public hearing on such a minor plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Map shall be by two (2) publications in a newspaper of general circulation in the City not less than 5 days nor more than 20 days prior to the date of the hearing and by mailing written notice not less than 20 days prior to the date of the hearing to owners of property within the area enclosed by lines parallel to and 500 feet from the exterior boundaries of the property involved

using for this purpose the name and address of the owners as shown upon the current records of the County Assessor. In addition, the written notice shall be mailed to the community or neighborhood association and the Citizen Participation Organization within which the property is located and to State, county and city agencies or individuals who request such notice. The contents of the written notice shall comply with the applicable State statutory requirements. The failure of a person to receive the notice specified in this section shall not invalidate any proceedings in connection with the proposed minor revision.

- (4) A complete application and supporting information addressing the specific criteria for Plan Map amendments shall be filed with the City Planning Department. In order to defray the costs of processing, the application shall be accompanied by a fee as established by the City Council under Subsection (3) of this section. A complete application must include documentation of a neighborhood meeting in compliance with Subsection (4) of this Section. (Amended by Ord. No. 4132/3-93; 5312/10-03, Ord. No. 5597/1-06, and Ord. No. 5777/8-07)
- (5) For the purpose of establishing or revising the fee cited in subsection (2) above, the City Council shall hold a public hearing. Notice of such hearing shall be published in the local newspaper, and the proposed fee schedule shall be available in the Planning Department and on the City's web site. (Added by Ord. No. 5597/1-06.)
- (6) Prior to submittal of an application for a Minor Plan Map Amendment, the applicant shall hold a neighborhood meeting at a location in the closest practicable proximity to the subject site. The meeting shall be held on a weekday evening or weekends at any reasonable time. Mailed notice of the meeting shall be provided by the applicant to the surrounding neighborhood, at the same notification radius required by the City for the minor Comprehensive Plan Map amendment. The applicant shall also post notice of the neighborhood meeting on the site at least seven days before the meeting.

At the neighborhood meeting, the applicant shall provide preliminary details of the major elements of the development, including number and type of dwellings if applicable, proposed uses, street, lotting, and parking layouts, approximate building locations and heights, and approximate locations for open space and natural resource preservation as applicable. Opportunity shall

be provided for attendees to ask questions regarding the proposal. The applicant shall prepare meeting notes of major points, issues, and responses concerning the development proposal that were discussed at the meeting. Only one neighborhood meeting per development proposal is required, but the applicant may hold more meetings if desired.

The neighborhood meeting notes, list of parties notified, dated photographs documenting site posting, copies of all materials provided by the applicant at the meeting, and a signature sheet of attendees shall be included with the development application upon submittal.

Compliance with the provisions of this section is a jurisdictional requirement of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. Applications shall not be submitted without this documentation, or submitted prior to the neighborhood meeting. If submitted, such applications shall not be accepted by the City. (Added by Ord. No. 5777/8-07)

(Renumbered by Ord. No. 5938/5-10.)

(C) Minor Plan Amendment - General Procedures.

- (1) A public hearing shall be held by the Planning Commission on any minor plan amendment.
- (2) Recess of hearing. The Planning Commission may recess a hearing in order to obtain further information or provide additional notification. Upon recessing for these purposes, the Commission shall announce the time and date when the hearing will be resumed.
- (3) After hearing the proposed minor plan amendment, the Planning Commission shall deny or forward a recommendation of approval or approval with modifications to the City Council.
- (4) Any party to a proceeding on a minor plan amendment may appeal the recommendation on the amendment of the Planning Commission to the City Council by filing such an appeal with the City Recorder within fifteen (15) days of the mailing date of the Planning Commission's Notice of Decision on the amendment.
- (5) The City Council may hold a hearing on the proposed minor plan amendment. The Council shall hold a hearing on any appeal of a Planning Commission decision on a minor plan amendment. If a public hearing is held, notice for such a hearing shall comply with

the applicable notice requirements relating to minor amendments to the Plan text or to the Plan Map as set forth above. After consideration of a proposal or an appeal, the City Council may adopt or deny the minor plan amendment or uphold, reject or modify the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

- (6) The applicant shall be notified in writing of the City Council decision.
- (7) The Planning Department shall keep copies of the adopted minor plan amendment on file at City Hall and the City Library for inspection by the public and shall notify citizens and government agencies who have requested notice that copies of the adopted amendments are available for inspection.
- (8) The Planning Commission shall also establish and publicize a procedure whereby interested individuals, community organizations and public agencies may request to be included on a regular mailing list of parties to be notified of the initiation of proposed minor plan amendments.

(V) Community Plans, Public Facility Plans and Functional Plans.

A Community Plan, a Public Facility Plan or a Functional Plan may be initiated by the City Council or Planning Commission at any time in response to community need. Community Plans shall be adopted by the City Council as major plan amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan Text or Land Use Map as applicable.

Adoption of Public Facility Plans shall comply with applicable State statutes and regulations relating to portions of public facility plans required to be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Those portions of public facility plans required to be included in the Comprehensive Plan shall be adopted by ordinance as major plan amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text or Map, as applicable. A Functional Plan shall be adopted by City Council Resolution.

- (VI) Plans available for public review.** The Planning Department shall keep copies of the Comprehensive Plan, the City Community Development Code, adopted Community Plans and Functional Plans on file at City Hall and at all branches of the City Library for inspection by the public. The Planning Department shall notify citizens and government agencies that copies of such adopted plans are available for public review and distribution. The Planning Department shall notify citizens and government agencies that copies of the adopted plan are available for review.

- (VII) Continual review process.** During the 4-10 years period between scheduled major reviews of the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to ORS 197.628 Periodic

Review requirements, the City Planning Commission, with the assistance of the Planning Department, shall continually review the Comprehensive Plan and may initiate major or minor revisions of the Plan in order to address Citywide or community needs. As part of this responsibility, the Planning Commission shall schedule and conduct a Public plan Review Process once every two (2) years according to a schedule determined by the Planning Commission to consider such requests for Plan revisions from any property owner, City agency, government agency, or business or community organization.

- (VIII) Communication.** As part of its responsibility to oversee the City's Citizen Involvement programs, the CIAC will advise and assist the City on techniques, methods and processes which may be used by City departments, the Planning Commission and the City Council to establish and maintain effective and continuing communication and dialogue with the various segments of the community on the Comprehensive Plan, Plan implementation measures, Community Plans, Functional Plans and City programs that implement the Comprehensive Plan. The CIAC will also review the effectiveness of communication techniques and methods being applied in the various public involvement programs for major and minor revisions of the Plan and recommend necessary improvements and refinements. (Amended by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)
- (IX) Feedback mechanism.** Comments and recommendations resulting from the public involvement programs established for major and minor revisions of the Comprehensive Plan and Community Plans and Functional Plans will be collected and summarized by staff. Copies of the summarized comments will be made available for public review at the City Planning Department. The Planning Commission recommendations and City Council decisions on major and minor revisions to the Plan, Community Plans, and Functional Plans and the rationale relied upon by policymakers to reach such recommendation and decisions will be made available to the public in the form of a written record.
- (X) Financial support.** The City Council will guarantee to the best of its financial ability that the CIAC has the financial support necessary for a successful citizen involvement program.
- (XI) Selection process.** It will be the policy of the Mayor and City Council of Hillsboro to actively solicit volunteers to fill vacancies or expired terms of Planning Commission/CIAC positions. Volunteers will be solicited through the use of articles in the local newspaper and City newsletter, personal contact with citizens who have demonstrated interest in the past, and contacts with local citizen groups and service organizations. Each citizen applying for a position on the Commission/CIAC will be asked to submit an application and a resume. After review of the applications, the most qualified applicants may be interviewed by one or more Council members. (Amended by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

(XII) (Deleted by Ord. No. 5987/10-11.)

Historic Resources

Background Report

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|---|
| 9.16.2015 | Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee (Endorsed) – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.08.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – no comments |
| | |
| | |

1. Introduction

“Rehabilitating historic properties conserves taxpayers’ dollars, conserves our local heritage, and conserves the natural environment. Rehabilitating historic buildings and using the infrastructure that is already in place to serve them is the height of fiscal and environmental responsibility.”

- Donovan Rypkema, Place Economics

“How will we know it’s us without our past?”

-John Steinbeck, Grapes of Wrath

This Historic Resources background report is one of a series of papers identifying recommended policy questions and updates to the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. The intent of this report is to examine the City’s historic resources preservation efforts as they relate to land use and transportation planning, and to evaluate these efforts against relevant policies, goals, and regulations as well as emerging issues and trends. The outcome of this report is a series of policy questions and recommendation to inform the update of the Enhancing Livability and Recreation section of the City’s new Comprehensive Plan. This background report was prepared by City of Hillsboro Planning staff, and will be refined and reviewed through a process including other City stakeholders and the Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee, resulting in ultimate approval by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

This Background Report consists of the following sections:

1. Introduction
2. Historic Context
3. Regulatory Background
4. Current Regulatory Structure
5. Regulated Sites – the Cultural Resource Inventory

- 1 6. Non-Regulatory Directives
- 2 7. Emerging Opportunities, Issues, Challenges and Trends
- 3 8. Recommended Plan Updates and Policy Questions to Consider

4

5 2. Historic Context

6 The indigenous people in what would become Hillsboro were the Atfalati, a band of the
7 Kalapuya tribe. The Atfalati were hunter-gathers who migrated with the seasons across the
8 Tualatin Plains from Lake Wapato near Gaston to Willamette Falls. To improve foraging for
9 their staple foods – acorns and venison – the Atfalati for generations burned the underbrush on
10 the Tualatin Plains, creating the now rare oak savannah grasslands. Small pox and other
11 European diseases devastated the Atfalati by the 1850s, and their descendants now live at the
12 Grande Ronde Reservation.

13 The first Europeans and Americans arrived in the late 1830s: former mountain men including
14 Joe Meek and retired Hudson’s Bay employees known locally as the “Red River Settlers.” Meek
15 and David Hill played integral roles in the 1843 Champoeg Meeting, during which the decision
16 was made that the Oregon Country would become American. Prior to officially becoming an
17 American Territory in 1849, the Oregon Provisional Government divided the country into four
18 districts. The County seat of the extensive Twality District was Hill’s cabin in the tiny
19 community then known as Columbia. Following Hills’ death in 1850, the settlement was
20 renamed in his honor, as Hillsborough. ¹

21 Sternwheeler steamboats on the Tualatin River in the 1860s and Ben Holladay’s Willamette
22 Pacific Railroad in the 1870s created prosperity in the growing town as farmers exported their
23 crops to Portland and beyond. Flour and lumber mills were built at the railroad station south of
24 town. Downtown Hillsboro’s most prominent landmarks, the Porter Sequoias at the county
25 courthouse, were planted in 1880. But the misbehavior of the workers in the downtown
26 saloons earned 1880s Hillsborough the nickname “Sin City”.

27 During the 1890s, wooden buildings were replaced by brick and stone, and the city created
28 districts for power and water. Cultural amenities such as brass bands, literary societies, and
29 temperance groups began to civilize the growing community. Rural influences remained in the
30 annual stallion shows held downtown, the horse-breeding farm and racetrack at the former
31 county fairgrounds just west of downtown, and in the neighboring community of Reedville,
32 where prominent Portlanders Simeon Reed and William Ladd bred imported European livestock
33 at their country estate.

34 Between 1900 and 1920, the town more than doubled in size. Hillsboro became a working city,
35 with mills and factories processing grain, dairy products, and lumber. Cultural amenities
36 included two theaters and the 1914 Carnegie Library.

37 East of Hillsboro, the Oregon Nursery Company bought almost two square miles of ground for
38 its nursery stock operations, and platted the company town of Orenco for their workers, many

¹ Hillsborough was changed to Hillsboro by the Post Office in 1892.

1 of whom were recent immigrants from Eastern Europe with backgrounds in nursery work. Two
2 interurban train lines arrived in 1908 and 1912, opening up new markets for local agriculture.
3 Determined to erase its former Sin City image, in 1913 Hillsboro voters prohibited the sale of
4 liquor in town, six years before the Volstead Act ushered in Prohibition.

5 During the Depression, both interurban rail lines shut down, but some growth continued as
6 Works Progress Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps programs built a new post
7 office and improved Shute Park. During World War II, employment in Portland's shipyards
8 fueled local housing growth, and the city received another economic stimulus when the federal
9 government funded extensive improvements to the fledgling Hillsboro airport as a national
10 defense project.

11 The war effort also included what in hindsight was a heinous act: Executive Order 9066, signed
12 by Franklin D. Roosevelt in February 1942. That Order resulted in the forced relocation and
13 internment of Japanese - American families throughout the Western states, including prominent
14 families in Hillsboro. The effects of the draft, employment in war-time industry, and the
15 relocation of Japanese-American citizens greatly reduced the supply of available farm labor.
16 FDR's agreement with Mexico in 1942 allowed Mexican workers to take jobs in the US on a
17 contract basis. This was the Braceros Program, the first recorded influx of Mexican and Latino
18 immigrants into Washington County.

19 By war's end, Hillsboro's agricultural economy had shifted from subsistence crops to food
20 processing and nursery stock, but a larger transformation was coming. In 1951, just east of
21 Hillsboro, Tektronix began manufacturing oscilloscopes. It was the first seedling in the Silicon
22 Forest, the concentration of high-tech firms along the Sunset Highway that brought a new wave
23 of immigrants from around the world.

24 Since then, Hillsboro's industrial base has broadened to include biotech and sustainable energy
25 manufacturing. Historic Downtown now competes with newer centers such as Tanasbourne
26 and AmberGlen, and Old Orenco has been surrounded by newer development in Orenco
27 Station. Nevertheless, the historic sites in the Downtown and Old Orenco, together with
28 dispersed sites throughout the community, remain as reminders of our roots.

29

30 3. Regulatory Background

31 The City's historic resources program was originally based on a mandate of Goal 5 of the
32 Statewide Planning Goal 5 Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces.

33 3.1 Statewide Planning Goal 5 – Requirements

34 Goal 5 requires local governments to adopt programs that will "protect natural resources and
35 conserve scenic, historic and open space resources for future generations," declaring that "these
36 resources promote a healthy environment and natural landscape that contributes to Oregon's
37 livability." Guidelines for historic resources in Goal 5 include the following:

- 38 • Plans providing for open space, scenic and historic areas and natural resources
39 should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and

1 water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development
2 actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such
3 resources.

- 4 • The National Register of Historic Places and the recommendations of the State
5 Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation should be utilized in designating historic
6 sites.

7 Required implementation of Statewide Planning Goal 5 is specified in further detail in Oregon
8 Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-16 as follows:

9 Step 1 – Inventory Goal 5 Resources

10 Step 2 – Identify the potential conflicting uses which could negatively impact the
11 inventoried sites;

12 Step 3 – Determine the Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy (ESEE)
13 consequences of the conflicting uses; and

14 Step 4 – Develop a program to achieve the Goal, by “resolving” conflicts on specific
15 sites in one of three ways:

- 16 • To protect the resource fully by prohibiting the conflicting uses;
- 17 • To allow the conflicting uses fully, notwithstanding the impacts on the
18 resource; or
- 19 • To limit the conflicting uses by partially protecting the resource.

20 These steps are discussed in the Subsections below.

21 3.2 Hillsboro Cultural Resource Inventory Work

22 To comply with Goal 5, the City undertook a preliminary Cultural Resources Inventory process
23 in 1983. Two levels of resources were identified: primary and contributory. Primary resources
24 were those identified as culturally significant and worthy of some form of preservation effort.
25 Contributory resources were those not highly significant in themselves due to lack of
26 uniqueness or excessive alteration, but which did contribute to the historic character of the
27 neighborhoods around the primary resources. Both primary resources and contributory
28 resources were identified in the city limits at that time. However, funding expired before
29 research could be completed. The City placed 18 of the most significant primary resources on a
30 provisional Cultural Resource Inventory in October 1983. In December 1983, the City
31 recommended that 13 resources in the unincorporated Planning Area around Hillsboro be
32 placed on the County’s Cultural Resource Inventory.

33 During Hillsboro’s Comprehensive Plan acknowledgement process in 1984, the Land
34 Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) found that additional work was needed on
35 Goal 5 in order to comply with OAR 660-16. The City’s acknowledgement order in March 1984
36 therefore included a schedule for completion of the Goal 5 process for cultural resources.

37 The second phase of the Inventory process beginning in November 1984 was limited to
38 research and consideration of the 165 sites identified in the earlier work. In addition to

1 compliance with Goal 5, the 1985 Inventory work had a second purpose: to insure adequate
2 representation of Hillsboro on the Oregon Statewide Historic Inventory, which at that time had
3 no Hillsboro sites listed.

4 Following the additional research, each of the 165 sites were scored based on four factors used
5 by the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the Register of Historic Places:

- 6 • theme;
- 7 • interpretive potential;
- 8 • architectural and historical importance; and
- 9 • contextual integrity.

10 Based on the scoring, 74 primary sites and 19 contributory sites were identified as significant.
11 Fifty primary sites not already on the Inventory were officially added in May 1986, bringing the
12 total number of resources to 68. In 2010, the City added the Pioneer Cemetery to the Cultural
13 Resource Inventory. In 2013, following completion of the Island Annexation process, nine
14 additional County Resources were added to the City Inventory, based on the provisions of
15 Section 132.

16 3.3 Comprehensive Plan Language

17 Historic Resources are addressed in Section 6 of the Comprehensive Plan: Natural Resources,
18 Open Space, Scenic and Historical Sites. These policies and measures were originally adopted in
19 1985, but have been significantly updated since that time, to address several factors:

- 20 • The adoption of Station Community Planning Areas and light rail zoning in 1996
- 21 • The acceptance of the Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan in May 2000 (see
22 Section 6.1 of this Report).

23 3.4 Zoning Ordinance and Community Development Code Implementation

24 The first iteration of a Cultural Resources Management Ordinance was adopted in September
25 1983 as Section 132 of the Hillsboro Zoning Ordinance HZO. HZO Section 132 was also updated
26 in 2007 to reflect the requirements of the Certified Local Government program (see Section 6.3
27 of this Report). In 2014, the City completed and adopted the Community Development Code
28 (CDC). The CDC is the consolidation, updating and reformatting of the city's land use
29 regulations, previously contained in four separate documents: Volumes I and II of the Zoning
30 Ordinance (HZO); the Subdivision Ordinance (HSO); and the Density, Design and Open Space
31 (DDOS) Standards and Guidelines. As part of that process the City modified cultural resource
32 regulations as described in Section 4 of this Report.

33

34 4. Current Regulatory Structure

35 Historic resources are currently regulated under two sections of the CDC: Section 12.27.300
36 CRO Cultural Resource Overlay; and Section 12.80.030 Cultural Resource Alterations,
37 Relocations, and Demolitions. These Sections are attached as Appendix A.

1 **4.1 Cultural Resource Overlay zone**

2 Under HZO Section 132, historic sites were designated as such by City Council resolution, and
3 records kept by the Planning Department. Although the City has periodically contacted
4 resource owners regarding the status of their properties, in several cases inappropriate
5 alterations were made because new owners were unaware of the status of the site. In order to
6 strengthen and reinforce the status of historic sites, an overlay zone was created in the CDC in
7 2014, which is now codified as Section 12.27.300. The overlay zone applies to all designated
8 resource sites. As part of the zoning, this status will be shown on title searches and other legal
9 documents, providing better notification to owners and potential buyers.

10 Under HZO Section 132, all cultural resource alterations beyond routine maintenance were
11 required to be approved through a Type III quasi-judicial process including a public hearing.
12 This process may have had the unintended consequence of discouraging restoration or
13 adaptive reuse projects. In the CR Overlay zone in the CDC, a new Type II administrative
14 application was established to allow desirable improvements under a less onerous process.
15 “Routine maintenance” was also more broadly defined, to allow that type of work without any
16 land use approval process at all.

17 **4.2 Additions to or Removal from the Cultural Resource Overlay Zone /**
18 **Inventory**

19 Section 12.27.300 contains the process and criteria for the addition of new sites to the overlay
20 zone/ Inventory; the criteria for addition are based approximately on criteria in the National
21 Register of Historic Places. Conversely, a process and criteria for removal from the Overlay /
22 Inventory is also listed. There are two circumstances which could result in removal: either
23 objection to listing by the original owner; or persuasive demonstration by the current owner
24 why the site no longer qualifies as a cultural resource.

25 Regarding the first circumstance, pursuant to ORS 197.772, the city cannot designate a cultural
26 resource against the objection of the owner at the time of designation. Objections filed by
27 owners at the time of designation are on file in the Planning Department, and those owners
28 could request removal. However, since most of the sites on the Inventory were originally
29 designated in the 1980s, very few have remained in the same ownership since that time.

30 Regarding the second circumstance, the burden of proof for demonstration of non-qualification
31 as a cultural resource is substantial, barring discovery of factual error in the original inventory
32 data collection. Although “de-listing” has been requested by some later property owners
33 subsequent to the original placement, none have formally begun the process.

34 **4.2 Cultural Resource Alterations, Relocations, and Demolitions.**

35 Section 12.80.030 sets out the regulations for Type II and Type III Cultural Resource Alterations,
36 including procedural types, submittal requirements, and approval criteria. Subsection
37 12.80.030.H also provides for demolitions of historic structures to be delayed to allow
38 opportunity for relocation if practicable, photographic documentation and/or salvage of
39 selected architectural features. As mentioned above, the CDC also more broadly defines

1 “routine maintenance” of a historic site, to allow that desirable type of work without requiring
2 a land use approval.

3

4 5. Regulated Sites – the Cultural Resources Inventory

5 As mentioned above, there are currently 81 sites on the Inventory. These can be grouped
6 geographically into three areas, briefly described below:

7 Historic Downtown: As expected, the largest concentration of historic sites is in the downtown
8 commercial core and in the neighborhoods immediately to the north and south. The earliest
9 sites date from 1880, but the majority were constructed between 1890 and 1940. Residential,
10 commercial, and institutional buildings are included, consistent with the self-contained small-
11 town of that era. Four of Hillsboro’s six National Register sites are in the downtown area.

12 Architectural styles in the downtown vary, based on the longer period of historic development
13 (1890s-1940s) and the broader economic spectrum present in the area. Among residential
14 sites, there are more Craftsman-style homes than any other category. Other styles include the
15 American Foursquare (aka Old Portland) and Queen Anne (aka Victorian). A few examples of
16 Spanish or Mediterranean Revival are present, and one Second Empire Baroque. Among the
17 commercial buildings, the predominant style is Italianate, with individual examples of Mission,
18 Art Deco, and Neo-Classical, among others.

19 It should be noted that few if any structures are “pure” examples of any architectural style.
20 Many may have been compromised from the date of construction, reflecting the original
21 owner’s desire or financial situation. Others have been remodeled until their original style is
22 difficult to discern.

23 States of repair / restoration also vary widely. Some formerly neglected structures have been
24 or are in process of being restored, others are candidates for “demolition by neglect” status.
25 Others have been inappropriately altered and may no longer merit inclusion on the Inventory.
26 This latter category, however, is somewhat subjective, especially if the inappropriate alteration
27 resulted in preservation of a structure which might otherwise have been lost to demolition by
28 neglect.

29 Old Orenco: The second-most concentrated area of historic sites is the “company town” of
30 Orenco. In this area, the historic structures date from a shorter period – 1900 to 1930. Again,
31 residential, commercial and institutional structures are present, consistent with the then self-
32 contained townsite.

33 Fewer architectural styles are present among the designated sites in Orenco: the majority of
34 homes are bungalows with Craftsman detailing. The residences of the former president and
35 vice president of the nursery company are Arts & Crafts style. The single commercial building is
36 Italianate; the institutional building (a church) is Gothic Revival.

37 As is the case in the Downtown, states of repair / restoration vary widely. However, Old Orenco
38 has experienced a relatively higher rate of infill than has downtown, due to the sparser original
39 development pattern. In some cases, the increased levels of infill have contributed to
40 restoration and repair of the original homes.

1 An integral part of Old Orenco’s historic character is its streetscape: narrow, rural road style
2 streets without curbs or sidewalks, and 100+-year old elms as “street trees.” Although not
3 included in the official Inventory, the Orenco Elms have been recognized by the Oregon Travel
4 Experience Heritage Trees Program.

5 Dispersed Sites: A few of the inventories historic sites are located outside the Downtown and
6 Old Orenco areas. These include a few structures and three non-structural sites: the Methodist
7 Meeting House; the Sewell Clay Works sites; and the Pioneer Cemetery. With the exception of
8 the Pioneer Cemetery, future development of these archeological sites will require special
9 attention, especially in the case of the Methodist Meeting House site, which is reputed to
10 include burials.

11 Two of the City’s six National Register sites are in the Dispersed Sites category: one (the Harold
12 Wass Ray House) is not on the City’s Cultural Resource Inventory.

13

14 6. Non-Regulatory Directives

15 6.1 Hillsboro 2020

16 Strategy 15 “Protect and enhance historical and cultural sites and other resources.” has five
17 Action Items, two of which (creation of a Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee (HLAC) and
18 creation of a volunteer Hillsboro Historical Society) have been accomplished. However,
19 concerns remain regarding the long-term viability of both of these bodies, as described in
20 Section 7.3 of this Report. The remaining three actions and their status are summarized below.

21 15.3 Historic/ Cultural Sites Education calls for provision of educational materials to
22 property owners on appropriate preservation practices, assistance on identifying
23 sources for historic research, and building connections with other historical
24 preservation advocacy groups.

25 15.4 Identify Historic Sites is self-explanatory, but in addition calls for obtaining grants
26 for designation of resource sites.

27 15.5 Historic Structure Incentives calls for development of tax and other incentives to
28 restore and update historic structures.

29 For each of these actions, the HLAC is identified as the Lead Partner. However, the HLAC’s
30 ability to accomplish these actions is heavily dependent on availability of staff support.

31 6.2 Hillsboro 2035

32 The draft Hillsboro 2035 Vision and Action Plan includes a single initiative for historic resources,
33 under the Livability and Recreation Vision Area Statement: “Preserve heritage homes and
34 structures where financially feasible”. The Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee is listed as
35 the Lead partner for this initiative.

36

1 6.3 Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee

2 As described above, the HLAC was formed in 2008 as the result of an action item in the
3 Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan. It is an advisory committee to the Planning Commission
4 and the City Council and its duties are set out in Municipal Code Section 2.48.020:

- 5 • making recommendations to the PC and council regarding alterations to designated
6 sites in the Overlay zone, and on additions to or removal from it;
- 7 • providing public education on historic sites
- 8 • advising City Council on landmarks preservation, including preservation programs, such
9 as tax incentives
- 10 • providing technical and economic information on preservation to property owners; and
- 11 • obtaining and maintaining certified local government (CLG) status; and
- 12 • securing grants and developing local financing programs to encourage preservation of
13 historic resources.

14 As mentioned above, the HLAC’s ability to accomplish these actions is heavily dependent on
15 availability of staff support.

16 The HLAC normally meets once a month, but meetings are cancelled several times a year due to
17 absence of specific agenda items.

18 Since creation of the HLAC, the City has initiated two new historic preservation awareness
19 programs and is poised to begin a third program. The Preserving Historic Hillsboro Awards are
20 given out each year to property owners demonstrating outstanding stewardship of their
21 historic properties. Awards are presented at City Council during May, which is National Historic
22 Preservation Month. Hillsboro Heritage Plaques are available for purchase by owners of
23 designated historic properties, with the city paying 50% of the cost of the plaque. Plaques are
24 displayed on historic buildings and visible from the street. The newest program will be the Joan
25 Kraemer Memorial Preservation Grants: small grants (\$2000) to property owners for
26 reimbursement of eligible maintenance of historic buildings.

27 6.3 Certified Local Government Program

28 Hillsboro became a Certified Local Government in October 2008. As a “Certified Local
29 Government” (CLG), the City participates in a preservation partnership with the Oregon State
30 Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the National Park Service (NPS). In return for taking
31 on certain responsibilities such as reviewing proposed alterations to historic properties, CLG’s
32 receive benefits, including a close working relationship with the SHPO and eligibility for
33 matching grants from the State’s apportionment of federal preservation funding.

34 To be “certified,” Hillsboro must maintain certain qualifications:

- 35 • Establish and maintain an adequate and qualified landmarks commission, that conducts
36 meetings in conformance with State public meeting statutes
- 37 • Designate local landmarks

- 1 • Review proposals to alter, demolish, or remove local landmarks
- 2 • Review National Register nominations
- 3 • Enforce local, state and federal preservation legislation and ordinances
- 4 • Provide training opportunities for landmark commissioners

5 From 2008 to 2012 Hillsboro applied for and received CLG matching grants from the state to
6 support several preservation-related projects, including inventorying resources in the historic
7 downtown and Orenco neighborhoods, updating the Cultural Resources interactive page on
8 the Planning Department web site, and preparing informational materials such as HLAC
9 newsletters and walking tour brochures.

10 6.4 City Ownership of Historic Sites

11 The City currently owns three historic sites, two inside and one outside the City limits.
12 Preservation and appropriate use of these sites is now the responsibility of the Parks and
13 Recreation Department.

14 Malcolm McDonald House (Historic Orenco): the McDonald House is a well-preserved
15 Craftsman residence, originally built in 1912 for the president of the Oregon Nursery Company.
16 After the company went bankrupt in the 1930s, the house and surrounding farm were owned
17 and occupied by several families before their sale to Orenco Woods Golf Course in 1964. It
18 then served as the pro shop and caretaker’s residence for the course. The Elks Lodge
19 purchased the house and course in 1969, and in 1999 leased the house for use as a home for
20 young, single mothers. The Elks sold the property in 2007, but plans for development collapsed
21 during the recession. In partnership with Metro and the Trust for Public Lands, the City bought
22 the McDonald house and most of the former golf course in 2013. Plans are currently in process
23 for the majority of the course to become a nature park, and the Parks Department is currently
24 completing plans for the McDonald House to become a community center and offices. The
25 McDonald House is on the City’s Inventory and on the National Register of Historic Places.

26 Andrew Jackson Masters House (Reedville neighborhood): The Masters House is outside the
27 city limits of Hillsboro, at 20650 SW Kinnaman Road in Aloha. The house was built in the
28 Classical Revival architectural style in 1853, making it one of the oldest surviving houses in
29 Oregon. It was originally located on a 638-acre donation land claim. After A. J. Masters was
30 shot and killed by a neighbor in 1856, the Widow Masters remarried twice and continued to live
31 in the house until her death in 1896. The property was repeatedly divided and the house
32 passed through a succession of owners, finally sitting on a 2.0 acre remnant. The last private
33 owners donated the house and site to the City of Hillsboro in 2000 for its preservation,
34 restoration, and use as a museum or interpretive site. The Masters House is on the County
35 Cultural Resource Inventory, and has been approved by the State for placement on the National
36 Register of Historic Places.

37 Pioneer Cemetery: Hillsboro Pioneer Cemetery is located at the western edge of the city, north
38 of SW Baseline Road. It contains some of the oldest graves in Hillsboro, including those of
39 David Hill, the City’s namesake; members of the Tongue family; William Hare, state legislator
40 and former mayor; and John Shute, banker and donator of Shute Park. It is composed of three

1 originally separate but adjacent cemeteries: the International Order of Odd Fellows (IOOF)
2 gardens and the Masonic gardens, both platted in the late 1800s; and the Tongue Family
3 Cemetery, added in 1965. The northeastern portion of the East IOOF was acquired by
4 Washington County in the early 1900s to inter indigent residents of the County “poor farm:”
5 those graves remain unmarked. From 1952 to 1989 the Hillsboro Cemetery Endowment
6 Association provided regular maintenance at the cemetery through fundraising efforts and
7 sponsorships. The City took over the maintenance and records for the cemetery via the
8 dedication of properties in 1973. Recently, the City Council has approved a Master Plan for the
9 site and funds for first phase improvements are included in the 2015-2106 City budget.

10

11 7. Emerging Opportunities, Issues, Challenges and Trends

12 The City faces a number of issues and challenges to conducting a successful historic resources
13 program. This section examines these issues, and also explores some emerging trends and
14 opportunities that the City could leverage to improve its overall historic resources work.

15

16 7.1. Emerging Opportunities

17 7.1.1 Updating the Cultural Resource Inventory

18 The Cultural Resource Inventory (CRI) has not been updated since 1985. Even the more
19 recently added resources in Old Orenco were originally designated before 1990. In the
20 30 years lapse since, many structures built between 1935 and 1965 have become
21 potentially eligible for addition, including the currently popular “atomic ranch” styles
22 formally known as “mid-century modern.” Using Certified Local Government grants, the
23 City undertook surveys of the Old Orenco neighborhood and the Downtown
24 neighborhood in 2008 and 2012, respectively: this information will be used in updating
25 the Inventory.

26 7.1.2 Extending Preservation Grants

27 The FY 2015-2016 budget includes \$10,000 for the Joan Kraemer Memorial Preservation
28 Grants. These small grants (\$2000 maximum per site) will be available to owners of
29 Resource sites, to partially fund necessary maintenance. The purposes of the grants is to
30 create incentives not only for maintenance of designated resources, but for nomination
31 of additional sites and structures as well.

32 7.1.3 Supporting Downtown Revitalization Programs

33 Three downtown buildings (Morgan-Bailey Building; American Bank; Hill Theater) are
34 designated cultural resources. Several more buildings have had inappropriate façade
35 “improvements” which if removed might reveal designation-worthy sites beneath. The
36 City’s Economic Development Department is currently working on reactivating the
37 downtown storefront revitalization program, which could add much needed visibility and
38 support for historic preservation not only in the commercial area, but in the adjacent
39 residential neighborhoods.

40

1 **7.1.4 Revising Code to reduce enforcement issues**

2 Code compliance issues are dealt with in Hillsboro on a complaint-driven basis. However,
3 determining compliance with historic preservation requirements can be subjective and
4 difficult. "Routine maintenance" to a cash-strapped site owner could be perceived as an
5 inappropriate alteration by a preservation purist. One way to reduce code interpretation
6 and enforcement issues may be to revise the CDC to raise the threshold for alterations
7 requiring a land use approval process. However, resetting this threshold will require
8 careful consideration of what the community is willing to accept regarding visible
9 changes in historic structures.

10 **7.1.5 Educational opportunities for owners**

11 Several for-profit and non-profit organizations in the Portland Metro area provide
12 educational programs on maintaining and restoring older homes. With staff support, this
13 information could be brought to Hillsboro owners via distribution of printed materials or
14 workshops. Such preservation classes could also be opened to historic site owners in
15 adjacent communities, strengthening relationships among Washington County cities.

16 **7.1.6 Cooperation with Hillsboro Historical Society**

17 The Hillsboro Historical Society (HHS) was formed in 2000 in response to a Hillsboro 2020
18 Vision and Action Plan Strategy. HHS's mission statement is to "protect and preserve our
19 historic properties and to educate and engage the public in appreciating the value of our
20 heritage." Recently HHS has struggled to retain focus, energy, and membership as key
21 board members experience "burnout." HHS is actively seeking partnerships with other
22 heritage and humanities organizations. If the Society stays active, it would be a willing
23 partner for the City's historic preservation efforts.

24 **7.1.7 Creation of community centers on city-owned properties**

25 The master plan for the McDonald House in Old Orenco has been prepared, and includes
26 use of the structure as community meeting rooms, classrooms and staff offices. The
27 master plan for the Masters Plan will be prepared in 2015 and 2016: potential uses
28 include community meeting rooms, community gardens, a heritage field museum, and
29 other possibilities.

30 **7.2 Emerging Issues**

31 **7.2.1 Demolition by neglect**

32 Demolition by neglect can be defined as passive destruction of a building through
33 abandonment or lack of maintenance. There are several scenarios that can contribute
34 to demolition by neglect: impoverished owners; difficulties arising from unsettled
35 estates; absentee landlords; or simple neglect on the part of an owner. Occasionally
36 property owners may attempt to circumvent legislation aimed at protecting historic
37 properties by intentionally not maintaining a property so it can be demolished under
38 the criteria of "deterioration beyond repair."

39 **7.2.2 Pressures on resources' context (McGill property)**

40 Some historic properties such as the McDonald House and the McGill House in Old
41 Orenco, on the (?) Imbrie Farmstead; the Master House on SE Heathcliff Lane; and the

1 Mincemoyer House at Baseline and 231st, were originally “country estates” situated on
2 substantial lots, and usually several acres. As these sites were overtaken and enveloped
3 by the growing city, economic pressure resulted in the development of the majority of
4 the lot being developed. In most cases, the historic outbuildings have been demolished
5 and replaced with new development. Only recently has any consideration been given to
6 requiring that new development provide any mitigation for this impact, in terms of
7 increased setbacks or changes in design to respect the historic house.

8 7.2.3 Benefits & costs of CLG status

9 As mentioned earlier in this report, Hillsboro has been a Certified Local Government
10 since 2008. CLG status was sought originally as a means of pass-through Federal grants
11 from SHPO, and the City did receive those grants for several years after its designation.
12 However, Federal grants are time-consuming to administer, and city staff eventually
13 opted to seek internal funding instead. Training opportunities and better access to SHPO
14 staff are the main benefits of the program that the city currently receives. In 2010 and
15 2011, the city was contacted twice by SHPO, investigating alleged Code violations of
16 unauthorized alterations of cultural resources. Although no formal action was taken by
17 either party, the city remains concerned that a preservation advocate may again use the
18 CLG status to force strict enforcement of the CDC provisions, as described in the
19 Emerging Challenges section.

20 7.2.4 Non-structural aspects of historic preservation

21 These aspects include the following:

- 22 ○ Preservation of artifacts including ephemera (photographs, newspapers, letters, etc.)
- 23 ○ Recordation of oral histories

24 The City Manager’s Office is currently planning for artifacts displays in a proposed new
25 Archives area. Phase 1 of the Pioneer Cemetery Master Plan will be funded in FY 2015-
26 2016, and the City Recorder is coordinating a “Monumental Moments” program there in
27 September. “Non-structural” programs such as these can raise support for preservation
28 of historic structures.

29 7.3 Emerging Challenges

30 7.3.1 Absence of Constituency

31 Hillsboro’s strength has traditionally been economic development and new projects,
32 rather than historic preservation. As described by Economic Development Director,
33 Mark Clemons “We don’t spend a lot of time looking in the rear view mirror.” In addition,
34 due to its rapid growth, at least 2 out of 3 residents have lived here 30 years or less.
35 Although there has been strong community support for some historic sites when they
36 were threatened by demolition, non-structural preservation issues (as described above)
37 seem to receive less attention and support in the community. Building a constituency
38 would require a commitment of time by either city staff or volunteers – preferably both.

7.3.2 Prioritization / Lack of Staff Time

Absent establishment of historic preservation as a City priority and lacking a community constituency, Planning staff struggle to continue providing support to the HLAC for desired and worthy non-structural preservation projects, such as the Preserving Historic Hillsboro Awards, Heritage Plaques, and the Joan Krahmer Memorial Preservation Grants. Discussion should be given as well to succession planning for future support of HLAC and historic preservation.

7.3.3 Insensitive Infill

In both the Station Community Residential – Downtown Neighborhood Conservation (SCR-DNC) and Station Community Residential-Orenco Townsite Conservation (SCR-OTC) zones, all new structures including accessory buildings are subject to Development Review. Infill development can be expected to increase as UGB constraints become even more effective and the popularity of these neighborhoods grows (see emerging trends in the follow section). However, current residents may object to infill that meets Code standards but does not meet their own subjective expectations for quality of materials, etc.

7.3.4 Code Enforcement

Three factors make historic preservation code enforcement a challenge. First, Hillsboro’s policy on code enforcement aims first to rectify fire and life safety issues, which are seldom involved in cultural resource alterations involving application of inappropriate exterior materials. Second, heavy-handed enforcement of historic preservation code requirements in other cities has eroded overall community support for preservation, especially in cases where property owners are required to remove the inappropriate materials and replace them with (generally) more expensive and compatible products. Third, many resource owners have limited funds available for preventative maintenance, especially when Code provisions may require use of more expensive materials. Planning staff’s policy have therefore been to tread lightly on code enforcement, but this policy has raised concerns with active preservationists.

7.4 Emerging Trends

7.4.1 Adaptive reuse of historic properties

Adaptive reuse is the process of adapting historic structures for purposes other than those for which they were originally built. Allowing more options in reusing historic buildings has provided economic incentives to save many structures, such as the Carnegie Library, the Tongue Estate, the Bump House, the Wehrung House, the Imbrie Farmstead, and others.

7.4.2 Social Media

More and more historic preservation organizations and advocates are using social media to meet their audiences’ expectations and organize events, raise funds, and generally increase awareness, especially among younger audiences. Facebook, Twitter and YouTube reach potential supporters who can recruit others easily through the same

1 medium. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has co-sponsored a “Partners in
2 Preservation” campaign whereby historic sites “compete” for grants by generating points
3 on social media. The Preservation Alliance of Minnesota sponsored a moderated Twitter
4 conversation at #builtheritage and used other social media platforms including Storify
5 and TweetAchivist to transcribe and preserve the conversation.

6 7.4.3 Integration of historic preservation with other heritage / humanities programs

7 Across the country, heritage and humanities groups (arts and culture) are coordinating
8 their programs and outreach to reach broader, and in most cases, overlapping audiences.
9 Locally, the following groups are potential candidates for cooperative efforts with HLAC
10 and the City on historic preservation:

- 11 • Washington County Museum / Washington County Historical Society
- 12 • Hillsboro Arts and Culture Council (HACC)
- 13 • Regional Arts and Culture Council
- 14 • Washington County Visitor’s Association

15 7.4.4 Building Codes

16 As a general rule, building codes standards are easier to apply in new construction and
17 more difficult to apply to existing historic structures, but there is a spectrum of
18 difficulty. At the least restrictive end is repair and restoration of single family
19 residential structures for continued single family residential use. Code-compliant
20 options are available for changes such as window replacement to meet requirements
21 for historic integrity. On the other hand, such options may be cost-prohibitive. At the
22 opposite end of the spectrum are upgrades of commercial buildings, or conversion of
23 residential buildings to non-residential use. Code requirements in these situations are
24 onerous. Some cities have made specific provisions in their own ordinance to provide
25 some relief from these requirements:

- 26 • Relaxed Seismic Upgrade Requirements
- 27 • Provision for “less than full” code upgrade requirements
- 28 • Waiving some ADA requirements
- 29 • Allowing single pane wooden windows for remodels in historic houses
- 30 • Providing Code handbooks to help owners, developers and building professionals
31 understand various building code provisions (example: Portland)

1

7.4.5 Rising Popularity of “Authentic” Neighborhoods



2

3

Downtown Hillsboro

Streets (at Tanasbourne)

4

5

6

7

8

9

As early as 1961, author Jane Jacobs postulated that “urban renewal” (demolition of older mixed use urban areas and their replacement with large-scale new construction) destroys the vitality and diversity of urban neighborhoods. Using demonstrations projects such as the Preservation Green Lab in Seattle, documentation is growing that revitalized downtowns and neighborhoods can have as much or more “density” in terms of 24/7 intensity of activity than newer developments.

10

7.4.7 Sustainability

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Historic preservation can be an important component of promoting sustainable development – witness the saying “The greenest building is the one that’s already built.” The National Trust for Historic Preservation estimates that the construction, operation and demolition of buildings account for 48 percent the United States’ greenhouse gas emissions, and that only 20-30 percent of construction waste is recycled or reused. Additional statistics document energy costs; 65 years will pass before a new energy efficient home recovers the energy lost in the demolition of an existing house.

20

8. Recommended Policy Questions and Plan Updates to Consider

21

22

23

24

Although policies and implementation measures were updated and reworked in 2007 when the HLAC was created, the Comprehensive Plan update provides an opportunity to raise and resolve several issues presented in the Emerging Issues, Challenges and Trends section of this document. Some of these issues are summarized below.

25

8.1 Policy Questions to Consider

26

27

28

29

30

8.1.1 “Sticks vs. Carrots” - Code Enforcement vs. Incentives? Or both?

Historic site owners may or may not be aware of the impacts of otherwise routine maintenance such as window or siding replacement placement or roof or foundation repairs. When owners undertake inappropriate alterations, strict Code enforcement would require either that the alteration be undone (replacement of new vinyl windows

1 with the original wood windows or equivalent) regardless of cost, or that the owner
2 undertake a Cultural Resource Alteration (CRA) process. This type of enforcement in
3 other cities has been politically hazardous and has resulted in lower bodies' decisions
4 being reversed at City Council. It also provides disincentive for owners to consent to the
5 additions of their properties to the Inventory. Staff favors providing incentives for
6 preservation of historic structures. The City currently has non-land use related
7 incentives, such as stewardship recognition awards and small grants. Land use
8 incentives may include allowing additional types of land uses, waivers of building permit
9 fees (such as those provided for alternative energy systems), and others.

10 ***Should the City consider policies encouraging land use incentives for maintenance of***
11 ***historic sites?***

12 8.1.2 City Ownership of Historic Sites

13 With the City-initiated acquisition of the McDonald House, the donation of the Masters
14 House, and the adoption of the long range master plan for improvements at the
15 Pioneer Cemetery, the City-as-owner has taken on the role of preserving historic sites.
16 Several other sites have been mentioned as possible candidates for city ownership as
17 community centers, satellite offices, or other uses. (Example: the vacant train station
18 east of First Avenue south of SE Cedar. Such buildings provide both opportunities and
19 challenges in their own right, including heightened community expectations.

20 ***Should the City emphasize historic buildings (over 50 years old) where available when***
21 ***considering acquisition of future city facilities?***

22 8.1.3 Historic Preservation vs. Redevelopment in Downtown

23 In promoting downtown revitalization, the City almost always uses the term “*historic*
24 *Downtown Hillsboro*”. Yet only a few of the buildings in the core of the downtown are
25 regulated under the Cultural Resource Overlay zone. The provisions of the SCC-DT zone
26 allow for redevelopment up to 5 stories in the core, but do include some design
27 guidelines to ensure compatibility of new construction with remaining older buildings.
28 But Planning staff have pointed that the design standards in CDC Section 12.61.400 apply
29 only to new construction and may not be applicable to privately-financed façade
30 alterations.

31 ***Should the City encourage designation of additional buildings in the downtown core to***
32 ***protect and enhance its “historic” aspects? And should the City reinforce and***
33 ***strengthen design requirements, at least on key block faces, to ensure preservation of***
34 ***historic character?***

35 8.1.4 City’s Role in Preserving Historic Sites

36 As described in the enforcement vs. incentives section above, the choice of policies the
37 City uses to encourage preservation of historic sites can be have positive or negative
38 effects on preservation. A passive role with few incentives, rigid enforcement, and a *laissez*
39 *faire* position on passive or active demolition would meet the technical requirements of
40 State law, and would consume fewer staff resources. An active role with more incentives
41 (financial, technical, or recognition), negotiated and conciliatory enforcement, and active

1 involvement to find demolition alternatives would also meet the requirements of State
2 Law, but would require a much larger commitment of staff resources. The Comprehensive
3 Plan currently encourages a more active role, including several projects to be undertaken
4 by the HLAC:

- 5 ○ obtaining and maintaining grants or creating other financial incentives for
6 historic preservation
- 7 ○ providing technical or economic information on preservation of historic and
8 cultural landmarks
- 9 ○ providing public outreach and education to the public and to owners of cultural
10 resource sites.

11 As described in Section 7.3.2 of this report, accomplishing these types of projects will
12 require committing a significant level of staff time.

13 ***Given continuous competing commitments, is the City willing to continue and even
14 increase staff support to encourage preservation of historic structures?***

15 **8.1.4 City's Role in the Broader Sense of Historic Preservation**

16 As described in Sections 7.2.4 and 7.4.3, historic preservation programs of the future will
17 likely include both non-structural aspects of historic preservation such as ephemera and
18 oral histories, and coordinated outreach with other heritage and humanities groups
19 including arts and culture and tourism groups. However, the Statewide goals do not
20 include such aspects. Supporting a broader historic preservation program could be done
21 as the City has done for the arts, but as mentioned above would require committing a
22 significant level of staff time.

23 ***Given continuous competing commitments, is the City willing to continue and even
24 increase staff support for a broader, more inclusive historic preservation program,
25 including non-structural preservation and coordination with other heritage and
26 humanities groups?***

27 **8.2 Plan Updates**

28 The following suggested Comprehensive Plan updates are based on the current language
29 and do not reflect any of the policy questions raised in the previous section.

30 **8.2.1 Establish a goal specifically for cultural resources.**

31 Goal A of the Natural Resources, Open Space, Scenic and Historical Sites section of the
32 Plan is "Preserve, protect and maintain for present and future residents of Hillsboro and
33 surrounding community open space, historic sites and structures." There are
34 fundamental differences between preserving and maintaining community open space
35 and preserving and maintaining historic sites and structures: new open space can be
36 acquired or created, but "new" historic sites cannot. A separate goal for cultural
37 resources should be created, as has been done for natural resources.

1 8.2.2 Revise or delete the definition of “historic area”.

2 The current definition is “Land with sites, structures, or objects that have local, regional,
3 state or national historical significance.” This definition is identical to that in OAR 660-
4 023-0200, although staff has been unable to find where it is used in that OAR. In the
5 Comprehensive Plan, the term is used only in other definitions related to natural
6 resources - “State Goal: Natural Resources, Scenic and *Historic Areas* and Open Spaces”.
7 The definition is inconsistent with other terminology in the Comprehensive Plan and the
8 CDC. OAR 660-023-0200 also defines “historic resources” as “those buildings, structures,
9 objects, sites or districts that have a relationship to events or conditions of the human
10 past.” This term is much more consistent with the definition of “cultural resource” in
11 the CDC: “Any building, structure, site or object included in the Cultural Resource
12 Inventory and therefore subject to the provisions of this Ordinance.

Cultural and Historic Resources

Goals and Policies DRAFT – October 14, 2015

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|---|
| 9.16.2015 | Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee (Endorsed) – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.08.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments shown as tracked changes</i> |
| | |
| | |

GOAL 1 ~~Preserve and~~ protect, and utilize historic and cultural sites that have architectural integrity, create a sense of place, contribute to neighborhood character, and/or reflect local community history.

POLICY 1.1 Coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Office, Washington County Museum and other historic and heritage advocacy groups to provide educational resources to property owners on best practices for maintenance, restoration, rehabilitation and reuse of historic sites.

POLICY 1.2 Apply design and development standards to new development in historic neighborhoods such as downtown and Old Orenco to maintain their unique character.

POLICY 1.3 Maintain and update the Cultural Resource Inventory as sites become historic.

POLICY 1.4 Apply balanced regulations that recognize both property rights and community interests in preservation.

POLICY 1.5 ~~Provide ongoing Support support to~~ the Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee ~~in its advisory role to the City Council and Planning Commission.~~

POLICY 1.6 ~~Adapt and reuse historic buildings to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and promote stewardship.~~ Promote adaptation and reuse of historic buildings to encourage preservation.

POLICY 1.7 Retain existing structures to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and promote sustainability.

POLICY 1.8 Recognize and publicize examples of good stewardship of historic sites.

POLICY 1.9 Support and celebrate public ownership of historic sites that represent our common civic heritage.

POLICY 1.10 Build support for preservation by raising public awareness.

DEFINITIONS

Architectural Integrity: The degree to which the structure or site has kept its original massing and detailing.

Cultural Resource: Any building, structure, site, or object included on the Cultural Resource Inventory.

Cultural Resource Inventory: The list of buildings, structures, sites, and objects within the City recognized by City Council Resolution as being culturally significant.

Cultural sites: Areas characterized by evidence of an ethnic, religious, or social group with distinctive traits, beliefs and social forms, including archaeological sites.

Historic sites: Land with sites, structures and/or objects that have local, regional, statewide or national historical significance.

Section 6. Natural Resources, Open Space, Scenic and Historical Sites.

(I) Goals.

- (A) Preserve, protect and maintain for present and future residents of Hillsboro and surrounding community open space, historic sites and structures.
- (B) Provide a livable and attractive environment.
- (C) Promote and encourage development in character with the natural features of the land.
- (D) Identify and provide appropriate protection for “significant” Goal 5 natural resource sites including wetlands, riparian corridors and wildlife habitat areas, including Habitat Benefit Areas not within the Significant Natural Resource Overlay District throughout the City. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01 and Amended by Ord. No. 5728/3-07).

(II) Definitions.

- (A) **Historic area.** Land with sites, structures, or objects that have local, regional, state or national historical significance.
- (B) **Open space.** Consists of lands used for agricultural or forest uses, and any land that would, if preserved and continued in its present use:
 - (1) Conserve and enhance natural or scenic resources.
 - (2) Protect the air and water.
 - (3) Conserve landscaped areas, such as golf courses, that reduce air pollution and enhance the value of abutting and neighboring properties.
 - (4) Enhance recreation opportunities.
 - (5) Preserve historic sites.
 - (6) Promote orderly and efficient urban development.
 - (7) Protect bird rookeries, spawning beds and wildlife habitat areas .
- (C) **Green Corridor.** In accordance with the provisions in Title 5, Neighbor Cities and Rural Reserves of the adopted Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, the areas located between the City of Hillsboro Urban Growth Boundary and the City of Cornelius Urban Growth Boundary including the Tualatin River, McKay Creek and Dairy Creek waterways including their floodplains, wetlands, Title 3 lands and the upland areas north and south of those waterways as shown on the Hillsboro 2040 Concept and Boundaries Map (Figure 14-1 to Subsection 14(B)(2)) are designated as a “green corridor” by this Plan for purposes of comprehensive plan consistency with Title 5 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. (Added by Ord. No. 4901/5-00.)

- (D) **Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Site.** In accordance with State Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas and Open Spaces, a significant Goal 5 natural resource site is a natural area listed in the adopted “*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*”. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01).
 - (E) **Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Consequences Analysis.** In accordance with State Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas and Open Spaces, the ESEE Consequences Analysis is an evaluation conducted by the City of the natural resource sites identified on the adopted “*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*”. Through this analysis, potentially conflicting uses on listed resource sites are identified, and the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences of the conflicting uses are determined. The ESEE Consequences Analysis considers both the impacts on the significant natural resources and on the conflicting uses. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01).
 - (F) **Natural Resources Management Program.** In accordance with State Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas and Open Spaces, the City will develop a “Natural Resources Management Program” that describes the degree of protection appropriate for each significant natural resource. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01)
 - (G) **Habitat Benefit Areas.** In accordance with the Tualatin Basin Fish & Wildlife Habitat Program, areas shown on Metro’s Regionally Significant Fish and Wildlife Habitat Inventory map as containing Classes I, II, and III riparian corridors/wildlife habitat and Class A Upland Wildlife Habitat. (Added by Ord. No. 5728/3-07)
 - (H) **Cultural Resource.** Any building, structure, site, or object included in the Cultural Resource Inventory and therefore subject to the provisions of this Ordinance. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
 - (I) **Cultural Resource Inventory.** A listing of sites within the City recognized by City Council resolution as being culturally significant. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (III) **Policies.**
- (A) **Open space.**
 - (1) The City shall assure at the time of development the preservation of open space at a level which maintains a balance of land uses within the planning area and shall encourage the creation and maintenance of open space in the urban area. A funding mechanism for public acquisition of open space shall be developed and utilized in appropriate situations.
 - (2) A process shall be developed and utilized which determines the suitability of lands for open space and provides a method for preserving suitable open space lands.

- (3) The City shall promote and encourage development patterns and other techniques which preserve open space within the planning area.
- (4) The City shall promote and encourage individuals, groups and service clubs, in conjunction with adjacent property owners, to clean and maintain the beds of areas along Dawson, Dairy, Rock, Beaverton and McKay Creeks. In addition, where appropriate, public access easements to the creeks should be established.
- (5) (Deleted by Ord. No. 3450/3-84.)
- (6) Outdoor advertising signs (billboards) shall be regulated, especially in nonindustrial and noncommercial zones.
- (7) Signs located throughout the City should be aesthetically pleasing, though not restricted in design as to significantly limit their economic purpose. Specific sign design standards shall be applied in Station Community Planning Areas and along designated pedestrian streets. (Amended by Ord. No. 4454/8-96.)
- (8) (Deleted by Ord. No. 5268/5-03)

(B) Floodplain. The floodplain of the Tualatin River and its tributaries is being encroached upon by urban development. The floodplain is an asset to Hillsboro by providing for drainage and holding of stormwater runoff, providing fish and wildlife habitat, desirable open space, and potential land for future recreational development.

- (1) All land within the 100-year floodplain (elevations as established by the Army Corps of Engineers on the best topographic maps available) should be preserved as much as possible for open space, fish and wildlife habitat, urban buffers, neighborhood boundaries, future recreational development, drainage, and runoff retention.
- (2) In order to provide for efficient urban development within the urban growth boundary, minor areas of cut and fill and certain uses involving structures may be necessary within the floodplain. Such cut and fill activity and structures shall be regulated so as to minimize the land area affected and to prevent significant deterioration of the floodplain resource. All floodplain alterations and permanent structures, except those allowed as permitted uses, shall be subject to review by the Planning Commission.

Certain open space, utility, transportation, and environmental mitigation uses may also be allowed as permitted uses in the floodplain, subject to administrative review, as specifically allowed in Section 12.27.100 of the Community Development Code (Amended by Ord. No. 4641 and Ord. No. 6096/9-14).

- (3) Agricultural and residential uses not involving structures, temporary structures which can be removed during periods of flood risk, recreational uses such as picnic facilities, and underground utility facilities do not represent a significant threat to the preservation of the floodplain resource. Such uses may be appropriate in the floodplain fringe. (Amended by Ord. No. 3309/4-82.)

(C) Cultural Resource(s). Identification and management of cultural resources promotes public awareness and appreciation of the community's history; advances community pride and identity; contributes to the community's economy; enhances local property values, identifies conflicts that can arise between preservation of cultural resources and alternative land uses, and provides means through which such conflicts can be mitigated. (Amended by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)

- (1) The City shall work closely with the State Historic Preservation Office, the Washington County Museum, Hillsboro Historical Society, property owners and all interested parties to encourage the preservation of cultural resources within the planning area by educating property owners and the public about the appropriate methods of restoration, rehabilitation and reuse of cultural resource sites. (Amended by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (2) Station Community Planning Areas shall include policies and design and development standards to preserve and enhance the character of historic neighborhoods such as downtown and the original Orenco community. (Added by Ord. No. 3450/3-84 & Amended by Ord. No. 4454/8-96.)
- (3) The City shall maintain and update as appropriate its inventory of cultural resource sites and its zoning regulations regarding the management of such sites. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (4) The City shall establish a Landmarks Advisory Committee for the purposes of advising the City Council and the Planning Commission on policies and programs pertaining to historic preservation within the City of Hillsboro. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (5) The City shall endeavor to develop financial and other incentives to encourage property owners to restore, maintain, or adaptively reuse their cultural resource sites. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)

(D) Green Corridor. The designated green corridor between the City of Hillsboro and City of Cornelius will serve as a rural separation between the two cities. In the green corridor the City will not support urban development. (Added by Ord. No. 4901/5-00.)

(E) Natural Resources Management Program
(Added by Ord. No. 5268/5-03)

- (1) The City shall adopt a Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance that contains procedures to implement its Natural Resources Management Program including describing the degree of protection appropriate for each significant natural resource site including wetlands, riparian corridors and wildlife habitat throughout the City based on its Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Decision, which shall be adopted as findings.
- (2) The Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance shall include a map which generally identifies the extent and location of significant wetlands, riparian corridors and wildlife habitat areas and their impact areas, as identified in the adopted "*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*" and its supporting document the "*City of Hillsboro Goal 5 Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment Report*", and the ESEE analyses, completed pursuant to the Goal 5 and Oregon Administrative Rules 660, Division 23 provisions.
- (3) The maps contained in the adopted "*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*" and its supporting document the "*City of Hillsboro Goal 5 Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment Report*", as amended in May 2003, shall only serve as a base inventory in order to establish the Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance map and will not be amended in the future.
- (4) Procedures for amending the Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance map shall be contained within the Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance.
- (5) Development projects located in or partially within the overlay area for the Natural Resources Management Program Ordinance map shall address preservation of wildlife habitat, natural vegetation, wetlands, water quality, open space and other natural resources important to the ecosystem in the vicinity of the proposed development site. During the Development Review process, development projects and subdivision applications in Station Community Planning Areas shall address the potential impacts of proposed projects on these resources, shall address provisions of Section 12.27.200 of the Community Development Code, and shall incorporate measures to mitigate any impacts that result from the proposed development (Amended by Ord. No. 6096/9-14).
- (6) In accordance with the Tualatin Basin Fish & Wildlife Habitat Program, encourage land developers and property owners to incorporate habitat friendly practices in their site design where technically feasible and appropriate. Habitat friendly development practices include a broad range of development techniques and activities that reduce the detrimental impact on fish and wildlife

habitat associated with traditional development practices. (Added by Ord. No. 5728/3-07).

(IV) **Implementation Measures.** (Added by Ord. No. 3130/6-80.)

- (1) The floodplain ordinance shall establish standards regulating cut and fill activity, permanent structures, and other urban-related uses in the floodplain fringe which provide for efficient urbanization, while at the same time protecting the majority of the floodplain resource. (Added by Ord. No. 3130/6-80 and Amended by Ord. No. 3309/4-82.)
- (2) The City shall continue to participate in the Jackson Bottom Area Coordinated Resource Management Plan. (Added by Ord. No. 3130/6-80.)
- (3) The City will work with the City of Cornelius, Washington County and Metro to develop an intergovernmental agreement restricting urban development in the designated “green corridor”. (Added by Ord. No. 4901/5-00.)
- (4) The City shall establish and maintain a Cultural Resource Inventory in order to identify the cultural resources within the planning area. This Inventory shall be updated as determined appropriate and as required. (Amended by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (5) As a section of the Community Development Code, the City shall adopt a Cultural Resource Management Ordinance which contains procedures to: 1) maintain the Cultural Resource Inventory; through additions or removals as necessary; and 2) review applications for alteration, demolition, or relocation of a Cultural Resource. (Amended by Ord. No. 5801/10-07 and Ord. No. 6096/9-14).
- (6) The Landmarks Advisory Committee shall be authorized to initiate and review applications for nominations to or deletions from the Inventory; to review applications for alteration, demolition, or relocation of a cultural resource; and to make findings and recommendations to the Planning Commission. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (7) The Landmarks Advisory Committee may also formulate annual work plans, based on neighborhood outreach, to encourage on-going historic preservation efforts within Hillsboro. Such plans may include, but are not limited to: initiating and completing projects and activities related to obtaining and maintaining grants or creating other financial incentives for historic preservation; providing technical or economic information on preservation of historic and cultural landmarks; and performing public outreach and education to the public and to owners of cultural resource sites. (Added by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)
- (8) The City shall amend its Comprehensive Plan to adopt the “*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*”, with the “*City of Hillsboro Goal 5 Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment Report*”, which includes a Local Wetlands Inventory (LWI) and Assessment

and Riparian Corridor and Upland Wildlife Habitat Inventories and Assessments and identifies significant natural resource sites, adopted as supporting findings. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01).

- (9) The City shall conduct an Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Consequences Analysis in accordance with the OAR 660-023-0040 ESEE Decision Process, which includes identifying conflicting uses, determining the impact area for significant natural resources, analyzing the ESEE consequences, and determining whether to allow, limit, or prohibit identified conflicting uses for significant natural resources listed in the adopted "*List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro*". (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01).
- (10) The City shall develop and adopt a *Natural Resources Management Program* including policies and regulations that will be applied to conflicting uses in each natural resource area and its impact area identified in the ESEE Consequences Analysis. (Added by Ord. No. 5066/9-01).

(Amended and Renumbered by Ord. No. 5801/10-07)

Library Services

Background Report DRAFT

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|---|
| 10.07.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.15.2015 | Library Board– <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

1. Introduction

The Hillsboro Public Library is a department of the City of Hillsboro, as well as one of 14 Washington County Cooperative Services member libraries that share a countywide collection of almost 2,000,000 items. The Hillsboro Public Library provides free library cards, programs and services to all residents living in Washington County. Services are also available to residents of Clackamas, Clark, Hood River, Klickitat, Multnomah, and Skamania counties through a reciprocal borrowing agreement between Washington County libraries and these counties.

"Hillsboro Public Library enriches and strengthens our community by supporting the pursuit of connection, inspiration, and lifelong learning."

While the provisions of the library services is not mandated by Statewide Planning goals, the City of Hillsboro finds that its library is an essential public facility and plays a critical role in building and maintaining community. Therefore, it was determined to include this critical function in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

This Library background report is one of a series of papers identifying recommended policy questions and updates to the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. The intent of this report is to examine the City's library system as it relates to land use and transportation planning, and evaluate these efforts against relevant policies, goals, and regulations as well as emerging issues and trends. The outcome of this report is a series of policy questions and recommendations to inform the update of the Enhancing Livability section of the City's new Comprehensive Plan. This background report was prepared by City of Hillsboro Planning staff, and will be refined and reviewed through a process including a Citizen Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and City Council.

2. Background

The Hillsboro Public Library first opened its doors on the corner of Second Avenue and Lincoln Street in 1914. As Hillsboro grew quickly beginning in the 1960s, the City needed to expand its library facilities and relocated to the Shute Park facility in 1975. A second library facility was added in 1990 when the Tanasbourne Town Center Library became a branch of the Hillsboro system when the area annexed. As growth continued, additional space was needed. In 2007, the City opened a new Main Library building in the Dawson Creek Business Park, and the Tanasbourne branch closed. In 2013, the City expanded the Main Library building by finishing the second floor of

the facility, and began an extensive remodeling and modernization program of the Shute Park branch, completed in 2014.

Today, the two locations provide over 92,000 square feet of library space and a collection of more than 350,000 items. The Hillsboro Main Library is a 77,000 square foot building which includes rentable spaces for community organizations and events. The Library houses almost 300,000 items on two floors. The story time room and materials for young people are on the first floor, along with movies, music, large print books, and materials in various world languages. The second floor contains adult nonfiction and fiction, an art gallery area, a quiet reading room with newspapers and magazines, study rooms, and conference rooms. Public computers are located on both floors. Study rooms, conference rooms and computers may be reserved and used with a library card.

The Shute Park Branch Library is over 15,000 square feet, with 57,000 books, CDs, DVDs, magazines and other items. The 2014 renovation added 140 new seating places to accommodate more visitors.

Access through public transportation is offered to the Shute Park Branch can be reached by the 57-TV Highway-Forest Grove bus line, and to the Main Library through bus line 46-North Hillsboro. While the circulation of library materials continues to trend downward slightly in Hillsboro as in most libraries, Hillsboro remains the third busiest library in the state, behind the Multnomah County Library and the Beaverton Libraries. At more than 30 circulations per resident annually, there is still clearly a demand for physical materials, including books and DVDs.

3. Hillsboro 2020 and Hillsboro 2035

The City began its visioning project, called Hillsboro 2020, in 1997. The Hillsboro Vision and Action Committee reached out to more than 1,500 citizens to create a common vision for the City, along with strategies and actions to implement this vision. The resulting Vision Action Plan was adopted by City Council in 2000, and subsequently updated in 2005 and 2010. Beginning in 2013, the City began a project to develop its next community vision, the Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan, building on the success of the original visioning project.

3.1. Vision 2020

The 2020 Vision and Action Plan¹ was organized into a series of focus areas, strategies, and actions. The actions below are in the Expanding Educational & Cultural Horizons Focus Area under:

Strategy 37: Ensure that Hillsboro’s library system is accessible and valuable for all members of the community and ensure that it remains an integral part of the community’s resources.

| Action & Summary | Status |
|---|---------|
| 37.1 Maintain and enhance easy access to libraries throughout the community, improving the number of facilities, location, hours of operation and availability of resources. | Ongoing |
| 37.2 Support the use of libraries as resource centers and provide programs for all members of the community including youth, family, adults and the community’s multi-cultural population. Such programs could include outreach efforts throughout the community. | Ongoing |

¹ Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan, Revised August 2010 (http://www.hillsboro2020.org/FileLib/H2020ActionPlan2010_Web.pdf).

3.2. Hillsboro 2035

The Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan identifies two actions pertaining to the library.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Livability & Recreation Focus Area</p> <p>Initiative 3: Expand Hillsboro’s inventory of community events, festivals and family activities citywide.</p> | <p>Action C: Expand the role of libraries as activity and education centers by adding programming and locations (e.g. Tanasbourne).</p> |
| <p>Education and Community Involvement Focus Area</p> <p>Initiative 2: Embrace and expand alternative and lifelong learning opportunities.</p> | <p>Action C: Establish Community Learning Information Centers (CLIC) at Hillsboro Libraries and other locations, where residents can obtain one-stop access to program offerings and schedules provided by PCC, City Parks and other extended learning partners.</p> |

4. Regulatory Context

There are few regulations which govern the provision of municipal library services from a land use planning perspective. Library services are not addressed in statewide planning goals, and there are no Metro regulations that apply.

5. Existing Comprehensive Plan Goals

There is one goal in the existing Comprehensive Plan under Public Facilities regarding Library facilities which states:

(I) LIBRARY FACILITIES.

(1) Library needs and activities shall be monitored in the future to determine the need and optimum time for physical improvements.

6. Other Plans, Programs, or Reports

6.1. Washington County Cooperative Library Services (WCCLS)

The libraries in Washington County work together in a spirit of cooperation that extends beyond local boundaries in order to provide excellent countywide library service to all residents. WCCLS is governed by the Board of County Commissioners and the majority of funding for local public library service comes from the County. WCCLS is a partnership of the County, nine cities and two non-profit associations. Meeting the needs of all residents — from large and small cities and the unincorporated area — requires a good deal of give and take on the part of all libraries and their governing bodies. By sharing materials between libraries the size of the "collective" collection is ~~almost 2,000,000~~ ~~about 1.6 million~~ items.

6.2. Library Board

The seven member library board is established ~~by~~ ~~as~~ ~~per~~ the State of Oregon in ORS 357.490 and subchapter 2.36 of the Hillsboro Charter. Members, who meet monthly, are appointed by the Mayor at the consent of the City Council. The Board serves in an advisory capacity to City Council. Among other tasks, the Library Board

“selects sites for a Library building and/or location of Library facilities with the ultimate site to be approved by the City Council.”

6.3. Library Strategic Plan

The Library has a Strategic Plan for 2014-2017 which focuses on four priorities: Reading Readiness, Lifelong Learning, New and Popular Materials, and Student Success. The mission of the Hillsboro Public Library is to provide materials and services to help community residents of all ages and cultural backgrounds to meet their informational, educational, professional, and recreational needs. Because a democracy is maintained by an informed citizenry, the City of Hillsboro promotes lifelong use of its Library as a resource for daily living and decision-making. The plan does not address future facilities or criteria for siting them.

6.4. Standards for Oregon Public Libraries: Oregon Library Association

In the fall of 2012, the Public Library Division of the Oregon Library Association, in association with the Oregon State Library, convened a committee of library professionals from across the state to review and rewrite the Standards for Oregon Public Libraries. There are a number of standards that are not applicable to land use planning, however there are a few that could be.

Assessment/Planning—The library provides adequate space to implement the full range of library services that are consistent with the library’s long range plan, current community needs based on on-going assessment, and the standards in this document.

- The library’s facilities plan is reviewed and analyzed every 5 years using community input and analysis.
- Usage statistics are maintained and compared to space allocations in order to plan library facilities to meet current needs of the community.
- The library provides adequate space to implement the full range of library services that are consistent with the library’s long range plan and the issued standards.

The document also provides the state figures on the square feet of facilities per resident.

| Population | Mean | Median | High | Low |
|---------------|------|--------|------|------|
| Over 100,000 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.89 | 0.37 |
| 50,000—99,999 | 0.52 | 0.42 | 0.97 | 0.09 |

Hillsboro currently has 92,000 square feet of Library Facilities and 95,310 residents; therefore, Hillsboro’s square foot per capita is .96 and on the high side compared to the state facilities overall.

7. Emerging Issues, Challenges, and Trends

7.1. Issues & Challenges

Hillsboro’s Library Facilities are in top-notch condition and there is a high number of square footage per resident. However, the Main Library is surrounded primarily by industrial uses, not residential; therefore the facility it is not easily accessible by residents walking or biking. The Main Library can be accessed through public transportation through bus line 46-North Hillsboro, although the bus line only runs Monday-Friday so access is difficult. Additionally, both of the facilities are located on the west side of town and therefore are not as easily accessible to the high number of residents living on the east side.

The Shute Park Branch location on TV highway and the frequent service bus line – as well as the relative proximity to the MAX – means there are a great deal of patrons at this location who need non-library services and support.

7.2. Emerging Trends & Opportunities

In addition to the challenges listed above, looking at emerging best practices and opportunities can help to identify areas to focus on when crafting goals and policies.

7.2.1. Continuing demand as a key gathering venue

As the ability to access information online increases, whether through improvements to broadband access, the proliferation of non-desktop devices, or additional online resources, including ebooks, the role of the library as a community gathering place becomes even more essential. Both here in Hillsboro and in communities across the country, the library remains a key place for residents and visitors to meet, work, and connect; in many communities, the library is the only place to do so that does not involve an additional investment of resource.

While the City has excellent facilities, there is anticipated continued demand for working and gathering space in the community. Study rooms at the Main Library facility are often booked between 90 and 97% of open hours; meeting room use for both facilities is at approximately 50%, with little to no availability during popular hours (such as 5 to 7pm during the week). Even the slowest days see between 500 and 1000 visitors; the average is closer to double that for both facilities.

7.2.2. The Book-O-Mat

The Book-O-Mat kiosk is the first of its kind in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, and holds approximately 400 new books and DVDs for checkout. Users can also return library items, browse the e-Book collections, and download titles.

The stand-alone automatic kiosk is located on the Tom Hughes Civic Center Plaza, the Book-O-Mat brings library services to another part of our community in a high-traffic, high-visibility location. With farmers markets, festivals, and other events, the Downtown location it serves residents from around the City, in addition to those who work and live close to Downtown.

7.2.3. The Library of Things

The Hillsboro Public Library is expanding the collection of bakeware, kitchen gadgets, and tech toys as a part of the Library of Things, which takes the concept of borrowing from a library to the next level. The Library of Things currently includes Arduino kits, Finch robots, Makey Makey Kits, Ozobots, Kill-A-Watt Energy Monitors, and more. Staff believes that Hillsboro is the first public library in Oregon that offers a collection of bakeware and kitchen gadgets. Items can be checked out for seven days, ~~but are not renewable~~. Nearly 60 bakeware items have been borrowed almost 400 times since the library first added them to the catalog in November 2014. The latest additions include a food dehydrator, ice cream maker, deep fryer, large crockpot, canning kit, a tortilla press and more.

8. Recommended Plan Updates and Policy Questions to Consider

Library services will continue to play a key role in enhancing our community's livability and appeal to residents of all ages and backgrounds. As there are few aspects of the existing Comprehensive Plan that relate specifically

to library services, there are no specific updates to recommend. Instead, the key questions for further discussion center on how the updated Comprehensive Plan could serve to help sustain and enhance the Library's service to the community. Specific questions for consideration include:

1. How can the library continue to support and enhance the city's vibrancy and sense of community?
2. How can the library enhance accessibility to library resources for all community members?

Library Services

Goals and Policies DRAFT – October 15, 2015

Review History

| Date | Reviewed By |
|------------|---|
| 10.07.2015 | Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| 10.15.2015 | Library Board– <i>Comments Incorporated</i> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

GOAL 1 Ensure that Hillsboro’s library system is accessible and valuable for all members of the community and that it remains an integral part of the community’s resources.

POLICY 1.1 Maintain and enhance easy access to ~~library resources~~ libraries throughout the community, improving the number of facilities, locations, hours of operation and availability of resources.

POLICY 1.2 Foster the evolving role of libraries as valued community gathering spaces.

POLICY 1.3 ~~Ensure that all~~ Locate new library facilities ~~are convenient to~~ near safe and accessible transportation facilities, including transit routes and other multi-modal options, ~~and that disperse~~ facilities ~~are dispersed~~ geographically.