

RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

January 28, 2008; 9:30 am – 12:00 noon
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Core 4 Members Present: Washington County Chair Tom Brian, Multnomah County Commissioner Jeff Cogen, Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Clackamas County Commissioner Martha Schrader.

Reserves Steering Committee Members Present: Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Katy Coba, Rob Drake, Mike Houck, Keith Johnson, Gil Kelley, Greg Manning, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Peter Ryan, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone, Richard Whitman.

Alternates Present: Aron Carleson, Donna Jordan, Julie Odell

Also Present: Frank Angelo, Chuck Beasley, Richard Benner, Hal Bergsma, David Bragdon, Carol Chesarek, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Michael Dennis, Maggie Dickerson, Mike Duyck, Mark Greenfield, Jim Hough, Jim Labbe, Bob Lefebber, Laura Masterson, Donis McArdle, Robin McArthur, Doug McLain, Craig Nelson, Linnea Nelson, Lawrence Odell, John O'Neil, Ron Papsdorf, Ken Ray, Jarrett Rose, Kelly Ross, Jonathan Schlueter, Thane Tienson, Randy Tucker, John Williams

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilor Harrington called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. and introduced the facilitator, Deb Nudelman.

Deb Nudelman gave a brief introduction, described her role as a neutral process facilitator, and then asked Reserves Steering Committee (“Steering Committee”) members to introduce themselves and explain why they are participating in this effort. She walked everyone through the agenda for the meeting and passed around a sign-in sheet. She then reviewed the ground rules for the meeting process.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

III. OVERVIEW OF ISSUES

Chair Brian gave his opening remarks. He said that the 2002 urban growth boundary expansion process had been complex, protracted, and litigious. He said that the counties felt as though they had “lost” and many citizens felt the current laws put them in a lose-lose situation. Chair Brian explained that the New Look morphed into Great Communities and soon there was consensus to go to the Legislature and pass what became Senate Bill 1011 and House Bill 2051. He said that

Washington County is establishing its own urban and rural reserves coordinating committee to get the citizens and businesses involved in this process, and they will ask Metro councilors to participate on an ad hoc basis. He said that the goal of the Steering Committee is to collect information and establish how to grow over the next 40 to 50 years while still protecting environment, creating communities, and having a thriving economy.

Commissioner Schrader gave her opening remarks. She said that Clackamas County recently experienced a 12,000 acre expansion to the urban growth boundary that has become the new city of Damascus. She said this new community is struggling with how to provide transportation, water, sewer and other infrastructure essential to a new community. She is looking forward to having a solidified plan on how to move forward and make the process of identifying new UGB areas better. Clackamas County has to balance the interests of one of the largest nursery industries in the state against the need to bring in new business. She wants to find a new and better way where the underlying assumption is certainty to the agricultural industry while still allowing expansion into other sectors. Commissioner Schrader said that Clackamas County is also organizing its own meetings with community stakeholders.

Commissioner Cogen gave his opening remarks. He explained that he is working on the Steering Committee because he feels it is important to bring the entire region together for consensus. He has seen firsthand the problems with development in other parts of the country, and he believes Oregon is attempting to do something different and important. He feels that the biggest problems with the current process are that it is contentious, that it does not provide good land for development, and that there is no long-term certainty. He said Measure 49 demonstrated Oregonians still care about the land-use planning system, but Measure 37 showed that there are big problems with the system, and that Oregon needs to develop a process to take us into the 21st century. He said that the bar is being set very high here in asking that the Steering Committee come to consensus, and that in doing so, members have to be respectful and blunt about the fact that they are going to have to compromise. He said the focus needs to remain on maintaining a land-use system that will work because if the group cannot do that, the alternative will lead to the unraveling of Oregon's land-use planning system.

Deb Nudelman asked Steering Committee members for any comments before moving on.

Sue Marshall noted that members of the Core 4 had mentioned convening meetings at the county level and asked what is happening at each county level and how that information will be communicated to the Steering Committee.

Chair Brian explained that Washington County will be conducting advertised, open-process, open meetings and solicit stakeholder input by holding public comment periods, inviting testimony, and posting information on the county website.

Commissioner Cogen explained that Multnomah County will have something similar, but that the process has not yet been developed.

Commissioner Schrader said that Clackamas County has not completely developed a process. She said Clackamas County does plan on having the information public, transparent, and available on the

website. She said she will bring any information back to the Steering Committee so that Steering Committee members will be fully informed of events in the county.

Deb Nudelman mentioned that the Core 4 Project Team also has a public involvement plan to help keep the constituents informed and engaged.

Mike Houck asked if it would be possible to put members from the Steering Committee on list serves so they can stay informed about the county meetings. [Action Item – Ken Ray said yes.]

Gil Kelley said that he has heard a lot of debate about expansion, and noted that this process should also look at improving underperforming lands within the existing UGB. He asked how this process is going to work in concert with the New Look process.

Deb Nudelman responded that his question was a good transition as it would be addressed with the next topic of the meeting.

IV. REVIEW STRUCTURE AND ROLES OF COMMITTEE AND WORK PLAN

Councilor Harrington reviewed the material in the meeting binder for Steering Committee members. She said that in addition to SB 1011 and HB 2051 being foundations for the Steering Committee process, there are three additional foundational reports that represent major stakeholder groups. The Agriculture, Natural Resources and Great Communities reports are included in the notebooks. She said that in creating the Steering Committee, the Core 4 group tried to pull together all the sectors that have contributed to the land-use planning process over the years and that it has been a challenge to ensure a committee that is representative of many stakeholders. Each committee member has a responsibility to represent their constituency at the Steering Committee. Councilor Harrington then reviewed the Reserves Key Milestones and Making the Greatest Place Road Map documents in the binder. She said pieces from all tracks from the Road Map are incorporated into the Key Milestones and that the public involvement piece will ensure other people with information will be providing it to the Steering Committee.

Greg Specht asked if information on how big the reserves ought to be will be provided to the Steering Committee members.

Councilor Harrington said that there have been a lot of questions about numbers - where the reserves will be and how big they will be. She said that the LCDC rules state that the Core 4 must give justifications about why the sizes and locations of reserves that they make will be sensible for the next 40 to 50 years.

Gil Kelley said that he sees two primary tasks of the Steering Committee: the first is to designate where and how large the reserves will be, and the second is to determine how much of those lands will be released for development.

Councilor Harrington said that the flowchart shows that the metering question will be addressed in the “performance based growth management” track.

Chair Brian said that this committee won’t go past establishing urban and rural reserves.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked what decisions will come from non-voting members versus voting members. She asked what the goal of this process is and if the final decision will be an intergovernmental agreement.

Deb Nudelman explained that she would walk the group through the Steering Committee's processes later in the meeting.

David Morman stated that the Department of Forestry had created a background report on forest land priorities, and asked if such technical information can be made available at Steering Committee meetings. [Action Item – a process should be developed for review and distribution of materials.]

Greg Manning said that this is a hybridized process of the old and new rules, and he asked if a land needs analysis as required by the old rules is being conducted this year.

Councilor Harrington said no. She said that they are looking to complete a regional agreement as required under the new rules, so decisions will not be based on studies required under the old rules. She said that Metro staff will not be working on the old system of UGB analysis and expansion.

Chair Brian said that the region asked for a two-year extension so that they could tie decisions to the Steering Committee process. He said that the result of this process will be urban and rural reserves, but if this process fails they will have to go back to the drawing board.

Keith Johnson said he wanted to be clear on the scope of the Steering Committee and asked if there was a “drop dead” timeline for when the expansion will have to take place.

Councilor Harrington responded that HB 2051 gave an additional two years to go through this process while SB 1011 allows for the designation of urban and rural reserves. She said that Metro must give the next urban report before the end of 2009, and this report will be a pivotal piece for making an urban growth decision in 2010. She said this is a tall order but they know the old way was not working effectively.

Keith Johnson observed that the final Metro report needs to take into account all input.

Councilor Harrington said that final designations will be reviewed by LCDC.

Jeff Stone commented that this is an opportunity but also a burden. He said this is not just about urban reserves, but also rural reserves and that the Steering Committee needs to accept and evaluate information. He said that nurseries are concerned because their concerns are not the same as for forestry or other farm lands, and in the interest of not surprising the Steering Committee, he feels it is necessary to mention there will be letter coming from the nurseries describing that they have a stake in both urban and rural reserves.

Donna Jordan asked if the Steering Committee will also be looking at lands that have been allowed into the UGB but not developed.

Councilor Harrington said she is not sure of the answer and asked if that question can be brought up at a future meeting. [Action Item – add to bin list.]

Chair Brian said having an idea about numbers will help the Steering Committee understand how much development can occur inside the existing urban growth boundary and how those lands can realistically be used, as well as how much land will be needed outside the urban growth boundary and what the density will be. He said the Steering Committee should look at higher population densities to ensure adequate land supply for next 40 to 50 years.

Greg Specht asked what the chances are that when the Steering Committee gives its report and recommendations to Metro in the fall of 2009, that Metro will change the report substantially or not take on the recommendations.

Councilor Harrington stated that this is a participative approach and the group will be making recommendations together throughout the process. She said that it is fair question that they are still trying to answer.

Commissioner Cogen clarified that the counties will designate rural reserves. The Steering Committee process will hopefully eliminate any surprises that would result in the committee recommendations being ignored.

Mike Houck said he is also concerned about being more efficient inside the UGB. He would like to get analysis information for designating urban and rural reserves.

Councilor Harrington said that they will have more information in the next meeting for clarification.

Rob Drake observed that 50 years is a long time and asked how you undo decisions made by the Steering Committee if they are the wrong decisions.

Richard Whitman said that this new approach has a lot of flexibility, as well as a lot of checks and balances. In order to follow the process under SB 1011, there has to be intergovernmental agreements and Metro cannot act unilaterally. There must be both urban and rural reserves in each county and he fully expects this to lead to balanced urban and rural reserves designations. There is review by the state at the end of this process and review by LCDC. These checks and balances should guard against any extreme results.

Councilor Harrington said it is incumbent on the Core 4 to share feedback from the three counties and Metro with the Steering Committee.

Gil Kelley said he felt the Steering Committee process is more of a mapping activity than a technical conversation involving specific numbers.

Councilor Harrington said the Steering Committee will discuss a plan to cover both approaches at the next meeting.

Deb Nudelman reviewed the draft Operating Principles with the group. She said she would like members to review the Operating Principles and submit proposed revisions and comments so that the Operating Principles can be considered and adopted at the March meeting.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

Deb Nudelman opened the floor for comment, issues, concerns, and discussion.

Mike Houck commented that there is a huge issue for him and his constituents. They have already held a caucus meeting and they are concerned the natural resource inventory material is not complete. They have held numerous meetings that brought experts in the field together and that both experts and non-experts concur on what is important for designations. He said the reserves designation process should be more holistic. He said that he is concerned that right now there is not parity between natural resources and the working landscape. He said the handout in the binder is a very general map that does not take into account the multiple layers of natural resource information. He said he would like the Steering Committee to have access to specific mapped information and experts in the field, and offered to provide it to the committee.

Mary Kyle McCurdy said she would like the three counties and Metro to solidify the public involvement process for their constituents because the Steering Committee is mostly a group of insiders. The counties' public involvement processes will hear a lot of information from people that are not represented at the table, so it is important that these thoughts and comments are brought back to the Steering Committee. She said she hopes that as the process progresses, there will be a better understanding of what agreements are on the table.

Greg Manning said that the old process was draconian and formulaic and led to decisions that have made everyone unhappy. He said that SB 1011 proposes a set of guidelines, with a holistic look for protection of key natural issues, housing, job growth, etc, and it is important to keep this process flexible and acting on those guidelines. He said he hopes the group does not start with reviewing the maps.

Gil Kelley said he thinks the maps would give a good idea what land areas would be good candidates for designation and that it is good to know there are more layers of complexity than they were presented with. He said that in an absence of maps, the group will be fighting over words and numbers without understanding what they are fighting over.

Mike Houck said he is not advocating for dueling maps. He said that he is excited about an inclusive, holistic, and integrated approach of looking at the landscape.

Craig Brown said he is interested as to the purpose and importance of the maps, as well as the importance of the resource issues.

Mike Houck stated this is not a Goal 5 process.

Donna Jordan said she sees this approach as an urban and rural reserves process. She said her understanding of what Mike said was that within urban reserves there might be rural resources.

Mike Houck restated that this is not a Goal 5 process. He said he feels there are natural resources that clearly should not be in urban or rural reserves, in order to protect and restore the resource.

Greg Specht said he feels the fundamental question is how many acres will be identified and set aside for non-rural purposes. He said the group needs to know what the demand side is and what the anticipated needs are before working with maps. He said he hopes that information comes from the technical side before deciding where those reserves will be.

Chair Brian said that a key item will be the reserves analysis methodology, which will address questions and concerns. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Deb Nudelman closed the group discussion and identified a few process items. Packets for upcoming meetings will be posted on the website at least one week in advance of meetings. She then reviewed the February 13 agenda topics. Deb said that the staff will develop an approach for receiving information offered by group and for sharing it with the group.

Ken Ray said that the staff will send an email in advance of meetings, and will also let people know if the Steering Committee members will be responsible for printing materials from the website and bringing materials to the meeting or if the information will be provided.

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:57 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.



ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR JANUARY 28, 2008

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
3.	Meeting Schedule	1/10/08	Reserves Steering Committee 2008 Meeting Schedule	012808rsc-01
3.	Member Roster	1/25/08	Reserves Steering Committee Member Roster	012808rsc-02
4.	Document	1/28/08	Reserves Steering Committee Draft Operating Principles	012808rsc-03
4.	Newsletter	Winter 2008	Making The Greatest Place: Focus on urban and rural reserves Newsletter	012808rsc-04