

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY**

May 14, 2008; 9:00 am – 12:00 noon  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

**Core 4 Members Present:** Multnomah County Commissioner Jeff Cogen, Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Clackamas County Commissioner Martha Schrader.

**Reserves Steering Committee Members Present:** Bob Austin, Chris Barhyte, Shane Bemis, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Katy Coba, Rob Drake, Bill Ferber, David Fuller, Karen Goddin, Judie Hammerstad, Mike Houck, Tom Hughes, Kirk Jarvie, Keith Johnson, Gil Kelley, Greg Manning, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone.

**Alternates Present:** Shawn Cleave, Doug Decker, Kathy Figley, Jim Johnson, Donna Jordan, Jim Labbe, Bob LeFeber, John Pinkstaff, Lidwien Rahman, Bob Rindy.

**Also Present:** Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Carol Chesarek, Danielle Cowan, Shirley Craddick, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Maggie Dickerson, Mike Duyck, Jim Emerson, Julia Hajduk, Jim Hough, Jack Isselmann, Harvey Kempema, Greg Leo, Robert Liberty, Art Lutz, Jim McCauley, Bill Monahan, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Tim O'Brien, John O'Neil, Mark Ottenad, Ken Ray, Kelly Ross, Pat Ribellia, Doug Rux, Don Schellenberg, Steven Sparks, Dick Springer, Fred VanDomelen, Kevin Van Dyke, Mark Walkley, John Williams, Ty Wyman.

**Facilitation Team:** Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin.

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She then provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials and asked for comments on the April 9 meeting summary.

Bob Austin noted there were a few people who had attended the April 9 meeting whose names had not been included on the attendee list. He requested that Kathy Figley be included as in attendance.

Gil Kelley requested that several passages be amended to clarify the intent of his comments. Page 2, paragraph 6, line 3 will be amended to read "...we have to look at what population and jobs forecast should give...." Page 2, paragraph 6, line 5 will be amended to read "...have that conversation relative to other parts of the New Look effort." Page 2, paragraph 6, line 6 will be amended to read "...continuing to farm in those areas...." Page 2, paragraph 6, line 9 will be amended to read "climate change, and the challenge of providing infrastructure."

On behalf of Charlotte Lehan, Mark Ottenad requested that on page 10, paragraph 5, line 4, the word "centralized" be changed to "center-based."

There being no other comments or changes to the meeting summary, Deb confirmed that the requested changes will be made and the revised April 9 meeting summary will be adopted as final.

John Williams announced the 2060 Forecast Forum scheduled for Friday, May 30, 2008 and introduced the *2005-2006 Regional Population and Employment Forecast for the Seven-County Portland-Beaverton-Vancouver OR-WA Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA)* document. This document is the summary of the population and employment range forecast that staff promised to present to the Steering Committee in advance of the forum. This range forecast is the first step in the process that this group will be engaging in over the next year and a half and which is discussed in the *Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves* document. Core 4 staff wanted to distribute this document to as broad an audience as possible with the intention of giving the Steering Committee plenty of time to review it and be prepared to ask questions at the forum. Everyone is invited to attend the forum. Detailed information is provided in the meeting packet and the Steering Committee will be returning to the topic at other meetings, including the June 9 meeting.

Kathryn Harrington reminded the group that the *Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves* document can be found in today's meeting packet.

Robin McArthur asked that people RSVP to the 2060 Forecast Forum if they plan to attend as it would help with logistics.

John Williams told the group that additional forum information will be emailed with an RSVP requested.

Deb Nudelman informed committee members that they should feel free to speak with John Williams or Robin McArthur if they have any further questions about the 2060 Forecast Forum or related documents. She then asked the Core 4 to provide updates on their county public involvement processes.

Commissioner Cogen announced that the Multnomah County Urban and Rural Reserves Citizens' Advisory Committee held its first meeting. The meeting was very positive and productive.

Commissioner Schrader reported that the Clackamas County Urban and Rural Reserves website is active and has links to information about meeting dates and times. The Clackamas County Urban/Rural Reserves Policy Advisory Committee had a productive first meeting. In addition, Commissioner Schrader and her staff continue to visit and attend meetings of cities, hamlets, and other local governments.

Brent Curtis spoke on behalf of Chair Brian. He explained that Washington County has adopted a public outreach model they have used before, and they have established the Reserves Coordinating Committee. The committee meets on a monthly basis and has held three meetings so far. The coordinating committee is advised by a technical committee, and both groups have been getting up to speed on the process.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Tony Holt, a citizen from Wilsonville, expressed his interest in this new democratic process and explained that he testified in the legislature when Senate Bill 1011 was being debated. Tony said he was horrified to learn that at only the third Steering Committee meeting there was talk about the study area extending down I-5 to Woodburn and Salem. He said that Senate Bill 1011 did not envision such a move and that extending growth down I-5 would bring strip malls and car lots and

make the area look like it does along the I-5 corridor between Tacoma and Seattle. Tony thinks doing that would be trading the very valuable agriculture industry for development, which would be a mistake. In addition, Tony said that he thought it is great that there is a provision for public comment but is concerned that the ordinary citizen will not be heard from. By coincidence, it is almost four years to the day since the entire Metro council came to Wilsonville during the UGB process for a meeting of over 200 citizens opposed to development south of the Willamette that lasted several hours. He thinks the Core 4 needs to hear first hand from the citizens in this process. Tony provided copies of the newspaper article "The lasting legacy of French Prairie" by Benjamin Williams for committee members to read.

Commissioner Cogen thanked Tony for his public comment and emphasized that the Core 4 do intend to listen to the public. He said that the group will discuss the idea of extending down the I-5 corridor later in the meeting. Commissioner Cogen added that he does not think we should be horrified to hear any perspectives or comments because hearing all perspectives is an important part of this process.

There being no more public comment, the public comment period was closed.

### **III. REVIEW OF UPCOMING STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDAS/ACTIONS**

John Williams reviewed the Phase 2 work program and provided an overview of how Steering Committee decisions inform what is coming next in the process. John reminded committee members that at the last meeting, they reviewed the study areas map in which staff provided a number of reasons why they would add or take away some land from the overall study area. At the June 9 meeting, the Steering Committee will be asked for a recommendation to send the study areas map out for public review and comment. That recommendation decision is informed by the discussions we had at the April 9 meeting as well as the discussions that will be held at this meeting. Staff will be distributing a map via email that uses watersheds, topography, transportation routes, and zoning (among other things) to refine the broad study area outline. There will be plenty of time to review this map in advance of the June 9 meeting. John then referred the group to the second page of the annotated agenda and briefly reviewed the upcoming Steering Committee meeting topics. He noted that these topics are draft and will most likely be amended as the process moves forward.

Greg Manning noted that there has been some discussion about the UGB growth in the Making the Greatest Place concept, and he wondered if that information will be incorporated into this process.

John Williams said yes. We are hoping not to replicate work, but other processes will be used to inform the Reserves Steering Committee process.

Gil Kelley said it would be helpful to understand a little about the Clark County piece. Even though the Steering Committee does not have jurisdiction in Clark County, it would be helpful to have an idea of their plans for future growth.

John Williams confirmed that the Core 4 and staff have been thinking about that topic and agree that it is important to consider outreach to Clark County.

Mike Houck said that Clark County is not interested but that he is glad to hear discussions are on the table.

Deb Nudelman asked John Williams to clarify the difference between the “ask” to the Steering Committee in June and the “ask” to the Steering Committee in September.

John Williams explained that the decision in June will be to send out the study areas map for public comment. This will be first contact for many people in the region about the reserves process, and it is important to talk to a broader audience before a final decision is made because they need to know which land we are studying and which land we are not. The decision in September will be about what lands will definitely be studied.

Rob Drake noted that Clark County sits on both the MPAC and MTAC committees, and asked why they do not have an informational seat on this committee.

Commissioner Cogen said that he cannot speak directly to that. The Bi-State Coordination Committee is tracking the Reserves process and is speaking with Clark County to at least keep them in the communication loop.

#### **IV. FOLLOW UP ON ACTION ITEMS FROM STUDY AREAS DISCUSSION**

Deb Nudelman reminded the Steering Committee that the Core 4 had requested a time out at the April 9 meeting to have a chance to reflect on questions and concerns raised about neighboring counties and to follow up with a couple of action items. The desired outcome was to reach agreement on whether to include land outside Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties in the Reserves study area.

Commissioner Cogen remind the Steering Committee that in April, there was conversation about the region’s economic growth not limiting itself to the Core 4 jurisdiction. The question was raised about the possibility of including Marion and Yamhill counties in this discussion. This is a subject that can cause some contentious debates, but before we can get into whether this is a good idea or bad idea, we need to know the jurisdictional analysis and whether those counties want to be involved. He introduced Dick Benner with the Office of Metro Attorney to present the legal analysis.

Dick Benner referred the Steering Committee to the memo regarding the Designation of Reserves in Neighbor Counties that was included in the meeting packet. The first question that arose from the last meeting was whether Metro could designate urban reserves in other counties. The answer is no. The statute for Metro defines the limits of its potential jurisdiction to Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties, and Metro cannot have a UGB that extends beyond the limits of that jurisdiction. The second question was whether other counties can designate urban and rural reserves. The answer is yes. Those counties would not be designating reserves under Senate Bill 1011, but there are separate statutes that allow them to do it. The third question was whether Metro can enter into an agreement with neighboring counties to designate reserves in those counties. While there is no express designation for other counties to designate rural reserves, that does not mean those counties could not designate rural reserves. There is the limitation that their rural designation not trump the UGB process under Goal 5 or other state priorities. Dick would be happy to answer any additional questions on the subject.

Commissioner Cogen said that based on that analysis, the Core 4 decided we could not forcibly include the neighboring counties in this process. Core 4 members have had conversations with Marion and Yamhill counties to inform them of what we are doing in this process and to let them know that some people think the counties might want to join. While they are tracking what the Steering Committee is doing, Marion and Yamhill counties have both declined to join the process. Core 4 will keep communication open with the neighboring counties, but it is a moot point to discuss whether it is a good or bad idea to extend into these counties because it will not happen.

Greg Specht said that the real estate committee accepts the fact that this committee does not have jurisdiction to go south. He said that he takes umbrage with the comment that adding development south along the I-5 corridor will make the area look like Seattle. He said that the real estate committee is not about finding land for strip malls and used car lots, but rather they are looking for flat land and an understanding of where the jobs are going to go for the population forecast.

Commissioner Cogen said there are no bad suggestions so we appreciate you bringing forth your questions.

Councilor Harrington said she wanted to address the perception that the Core 4 and Metro Council have only just started outreach to neighboring counties. This has been an ongoing process and the Core 4 has been reaching out.

Gil Kelley said that eventually there might be some diplomacy but that might be far off. He said that at the April 9 Steering Committee meeting, committee members discussed two maps: one was the official map and the second was a sphere of influence map to allow committee member to begin to understand what other counties are thinking. He said this is an important concept to visually keep in our heads as it will serve us in future conversations.

Councilor Harrington said that the *2005-2060 Regional Population and Employment Forecast* document handed out at today's meeting shows that sphere of influence.

Judie Hammerstad agreed with Gil Kelley. She said that the Steering Committee obviously does not have jurisdiction in Clark County and cannot plan for them, but we do need to know what their plans are. In addition to considering including them in our process, Judie would like a liaison between the Steering Committee and Clark County to be included in this process.

Tom Hughes said that we have a process that allocated some of our growth into neighboring counties, and it is good to know what they are doing. In reality, however, it does not matter what we say. Marion County will make up their own mind and that decision will be driven by market forces.

Greg Manning said the business coalition met last week and spent some time discussing the proposed study areas map. Even with a study area of 400,000 acres, the business coalition could not formulate the adequacy of that study area without job forecasting and employment numbers as well as a model for land demands with an analysis of the topographic and infrastructure concerns for that area. He said that the business community looked at the proposed study areas map and cannot form any decisions. He said he thinks any decision will have to be informed by other factors and we do not have those facts yet.

Commissioner Schrader said that the Core 4 have talked to Marion County as well as Yamhill County. Those conversions are informal and are moving forward well. She suggested that under the auspices of the commission of neighboring counties that the Core 4 find out what districts Marion and Yamhill counties are in and use that as an opportunity to have more formal conversations at a district to district level in the commission of neighboring counties. She said she would like the opportunity to talk to Core 4 about that.

Commissioner Cogen confirmed that he thought that was a good suggestion.

## **V. INTRODUCE AND DISCUSS RURAL RESERVE FACTORS**

Commissioner Schrader introduced Brent Curtis to discuss this topic. She reminded the Steering Committee that these are the factors that will inform our decisions.

Brent Curtis said that this started at the grass roots level to map the agricultural and natural features in the area. The first formulation of that study happened at Metro under the Shape of the Region study. Those ideas turned into a regional consensus when we created Senate Bill 1011. The next step was to go to LCDC to help flush out Senate Bill 1011, and to that extent we have the urban and rural reserves rule. The factors for rural reserves are found in the rule and also in the law, but the right place to look is the rule. What is important to know is the rule neglects a lot of good work that was done. Our job is to look at the rural reserves factors at this meeting, but this is only the beginning.

The Shape of the Region process provided two important inventories. One of those was presented for the Department of Agriculture by Jim Johnson and provided an analysis of agricultural lands that went beyond the soil types to an understanding of the agricultural economy. When we went to legislature to get the LCDC rule, we worked backward from the study to replicate and enumerate factors that Jim Johnson used. To a very major extent, the factors found in the law and rule have already been fundamentally applied to agriculture. The natural landscape features came from the Greenspaces program but received influence from many different experts, and to a great extent we had inventory and worked backward to find the factors. The inventory is already there for us to use. We had originally said that forestry might not be shored up as much as agricultural land, but forestry land and factors were added into the bill with language parallel to that used for agriculture factors. There are not as many factors for forestry. Our job today is to talk about the inventory and factors.

Deb Nudelman asked if there were any questions about the factors themselves or on the topic in general.

Bob Rindy said that he understood toward the end of the process that the Department of Forestry had provided a discussion paper and had done some mapping.

Brent Curtis confirmed that in the rulemaking process, a discussion paper and some mapping were provided and Doug Decker will speak to that in his presentation. Brent said that we will not be starting from scratch and we will be talking today about how to include the work that has already been done.

Katy Coba asked Bob Rindy to speak to the balance of urban and rural reserves in this process.

Bob Rindy said that the administrative rule requires that there be a balance of urban and rural reserves but that he is certain that balance does not necessarily mean equal amounts of land. There are individual factors for urban and rural reserves but LCDC will look at balance as the overarching factor. LCDC will not look at two designations to be sure that they balance in amount of land being reserved, however it is a good idea to keep balance in mind and to think about it early on in the process. Bob said he will admit that there is enough generality to that term that there will be a lot more discussion among ourselves about what that factor actually means.

Brent Curtis said he thinks Bob Rindy is correct. There is not an equivalency factor – just balance. In Senate Bill 1011, we wanted to create win-win situations and balance interests so that one interest does not trump another. We are moving away from the clean, bright line standards to an understanding that factors need to be balanced. This is not an equivalency test, but it is important to strike a balance between urban and rural reserves.

Bob Rindy added that the term implies that each influences the other. In the end, whatever has been designated as an urban reserve will have to be compared against rural reserves and vice versa. In each designation, you will have to do something equivalent on the other side. There is a relationship between the designations and although it may not be land equivalency, that is still a piece to look at. He is interested in how the Steering Committee will strike that balance as it goes through this process and would like this group to have an agreement on what balance means.

Brent Curtis said he has no doubt that the Steering Committee will have that discussion over the coming months. The importance of the process we are trying to follow necessitates that discussion so everyone knows we have looked at the topic in depth.

After a short break, Doug McClain said he wanted to reinforce that the following presentations would only be an introduction to the factors. He encouraged presenters to keep their presentations to the 15 minutes allocated to them and told the Steering Committee members that there will be discussion about the factors after all of the presentations have been made. He then introduced Jim Johnson from the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

Jim Johnson said he would not talk too much about the study, but he will talk about the factors that stem from that study. He talked the group through his *Designation of Rural Reserves Agricultural Land Factors* presentation. He said that these factors can be found in both the statute and the rule, and that there is a provision or two in the statute that is not addressed in the rule. The factors as related to agriculture stem from work that the Department of Agriculture did. Jim also referenced the *Oregon Agriculture and the Economy* report that is posted on the Metro website.

Doug McClain introduced Mike Houck, Director of the Urban Greenspaces Institute, to present an overview of the natural landscape features.

Mike Houck gave his presentation on *Mapping Natural Landscape Features: Criteria, Methodology, and Objectives*. He explained that he had been asked by the Greenspaces policy committee to have a natural resources component for creating a map for the New Look process. This was done to provide an image of Portland's natural resources and to inform the urban and rural reserves process. Mike explained the process of creating and compiling the maps and then rapidly went through some aerial images of the area. In conclusion, Mike added that there are some factors that we have not

looked at, including steep slopes, but these are still important considerations. He also stressed that they have had input from the people who are most knowledgeable about the ecological landscape, such as federal and state agencies and Metro.

Doug McClain introduced Doug Decker with the Oregon Department of Forestry.

Doug Decker talked the committee through his presentation titled *Forest and Forestry Considerations for Metro Rural Reserves*. He passed out two GIS maps (*Forest Cover in the Portland Metro Area* and *Land Use in the Portland Metro Area*) that were taken from his presentation. He also referred the Steering Committee to factors in the *Criteria for Consideration of Forestlands with Future Rural Reserves* document in the meeting packet. Doug also mentioned a study that focuses on land use changes; updates to which will be provided later in the year. The maps Doug presented compared forestry lands against land use patterns. Doug believes it is in the best interest for the economic viability of the region to keep forest lands as forest land.

Mike Houck said that in addition, Jim Labbe sent a memo to Metro staff. The natural features do not have tiers, but he understands that would be helpful. He also feels it is important to have people involved take look at the process.

Deb Nudelman thanked all the presenters and noted that the presentations will be available on the Metro website. She encouraged the committee members to continue having open conversations with each other and to use the roster available to them to contact other members of the committee.

Bob Rindy said one of things about Jim Johnson's study that seemed particularly important when they were doing the rule-making was that the Department of Agriculture had looked at areas that were particularly conflicted. He feels that this group should look at those conflicted areas and use that to drive its analysis. He wondered if the same kind of analysis will be done for forestry lands and natural features.

Mike Houck responded that the maps that Jim Labbe has produced show where lands overlap and where they complement each other.

Brent Curtis said it is important to note that Jim Johnson used different tiers of activities. Mike Houck indicated they have not done an equivalent on natural features and forestry is still figuring this overlap out as well. There is a lot to discover in this process.

Commissioner Cogen said he would like to have that information as he feels it would be useful.

Doug Decker said he thinks that information is available and will use the agricultural work as a model.

Gil Kelley noted that there has been discussion about zooming out to look at the larger framework of the landscape. On the other hand, he would also like to be able to zoom in. He asked if the maps being produced allow us to do that and to what level.

Doug Decker said that the forestry maps can definitely be scaled down.



Mike Houck said that the further out we get, the harder it is, but that we do have the ability to work at various scales. When we started this mapping project, we were told not to go to the parcel level, but further on, we were told to be more specific. That is why it is important to know about the different data layers that are more specific.

Jim Johnson said that the idea was to present this as broad and conceptual but more information is available.

Mike Houck said that over time progress is being made and the ability to get to more specific levels increases weekly.

Jim Johnson said that they subregionalized the entire metropolitan region. The question asked of the Department of Agriculture was what the viable lands were. When you ask about viability for agriculture, you are talking about blocks of land. The bottom line is that we have regionalized the area and you can have all the layers from parcel size down to soil types.

Sue Marshall asked if any information has been included on maps about landslides and flood plains.

Doug Decker said that they have looked at landslides because they feel that is important.

Mike Houck agreed and said that they know over time it will become an even bigger issue.

Greg Specht asked if anyone has created maps showing areas that are not already covered by the other maps.

Jim Johnson said that is the planning process when you will start overlapping maps and making decisions.

Craig Brown said he is concerned that the 5-mile buffer might not be large enough in some areas. He said it will depend on how aggressively these lands are protected for agriculture and natural features.

Keith Johnson said he would like to share a few pieces from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) standpoint. The department is charged with being an active partner in protecting and restoring Oregon's environment. DEQ is a regulatory agency so they do not really have any jurisdiction to apply a specific factor. However, there are a couple areas that DEQ would like to weigh in on, and those areas have to do with TMDLs and area-wide designations that impact water. The governor charged DEQ with some specific rulemaking regarding green house gasses, air emissions and toxics. DEQ does participate in DLCD periodic reviews to ensure documental compliance. Keith will forward that information to John Williams to be posted on the Reserves website.

Mike Houck responded to the question of looking at a larger area than the 5-mile buffer. He said that we should be looking at that and the implications for that, but we should also look at how we are using lands within the UGB and if we are using those lands as sufficiently as we can or if we should be increasing population densities.

Gil Kelley said we need to do some urban modeling and that it should be part of the exercise; if not

at this table, then we should look into how to merge the processes. When he looks at population numbers, he sees that there are a lot of people coming to this area in the next 50 years. The ultimate place for that growth is looking up the I-5 corridor to Woodland and beyond, so having a conversation with Clark County is really important. They are still part of the community and economy of the area. It is good to have conversations with them off the table, but it might be important to bring them to the table as well.

Judie Hammerstad said the things we are talking about today are compatible to those discussed by the Big Look Committee, and although some of the Big Look areas are outside the Metro area, we should make sure the things we are talking about and doing are compatible. The Core 4 may want to have conversations with the chair or co-chair of that committee.

Craig Brown said he wanted to follow up with the need to reevaluate densities. He does not think that is the way to look at it. Today, we have to project the amount of growth and use the density standards that are currently in place. He does not feel that this forum is the place to discuss growth densities, but if that is not the intent, he would like to know that now.

Gil Kelley said we need to have a back and forth conversation about that.

Craig Brown responded that his understanding is that determining population densities is not something for this committee to decide so we need to provide for growth following the current standards.

Councilor Harrington said she thinks Gil Kelley is right that the purpose of this committee is to have a dialogue. We are not supposed to come up with another set of numbers but to look at options and determine what type of course we are going to chart.

Rob Drake said he continues to be intrigued with the idea of having more coordination and conversations with Clark County. He said a lot of great work has been done in last five years and he wonders if anyone is interested in having the Core 4 talk about what we are doing with Clark County. Rob said he has seen a lot of evolution in this region and now there is a lot of collaborative work, as well as positive dialogue and conversation. He asked why this group should not take advantage of that relationship and that the Core 4 should consider including a representative from Clark County. He said we should look at this holistically because what is happening in Clark County will impact the people who the Steering Committee members represent. He asked the Core 4 to formally consider this.

Commissioner Cogen said that is an appropriate thing to put on the next Core 4 agenda and at the very least, the Core 4 will talk to Clark County. There is no jurisdictional way that they join our process, but there is no downside to talking to them and inviting them to talk to us.

Rob Drake said he would still urge the Core 4 to be more specific and have Clark County join this group, even in an ex officio capacity. He does not know how we can not consider the overall impact of Clark County during this process.

Deb Nudelman confirmed that there was an agreement that the Core 4 will visit with Clark County representatives and discuss their potential for Steering Committee participation (for example in an ex officio capacity.) [Action Item]

Commissioner Schrader concurs with Commissioner Cogen and said that one of the items suggested to the Core 4 was to look at formalizing some of these conversations with neighboring entities. She said it could also be brought up at a District 8 meeting of the commission of neighboring counties.

Tom Hughes said he would like to respond back on the issue of making sure we are maximizing the amount of efficiencies and use inside the UGB. It strikes him as one of the advantages to this group that we have so many perspectives. The difficulty is that we are taking a 50 year look to how the region will absorb that population and adjust to fit it. He said this group needs the planning community around the table to give us an idea what zoning will be appropriate for the next 50 years. This is an appropriate group to look at adjusting desires and outcomes because we look at it from diverse perspectives.

Bob Austin compared this process to an onion and explained that we have to look at other factors in outlying communities. Those discussions will take place in a variety of forums, but population and numbers cannot ignore the outside influence of those communities. Those discussions need to happen and he asked how well prepared we are to look at that.

Doug Decker said he should have some data about forest land to look at from Clark County.

Mike Houck said that the natural features map already looks at a larger area than just the 5-mile buffer.

Deb Nudelman said that from a process perspective, the committee members represent many constituents and are bridges to other important conversations. She said those overlays are complementary to this process and to think about how committee members can bring those critical pieces here.

## **VI. SUMMARY**

Deb Nudelman summarized action items. She reminded the group of the May 30<sup>th</sup> forecasting event and that the Key Milestones chart passed out at the January meeting is a good reference to know where the group is in the process.

Mike Houck said he hopes the group will follow up on the action item of getting a planner's view of the natural resources in the area.

Councilor Harrington informed the group that in addition to the forecast event, there is an infrastructure workshop to wrap up some significant work on May 28 at 4:00 pm at the Oregon Convention Center.

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:51 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.



ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR MAY 14, 2008

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1.	Document	5/13/08	2005-2060 Regional Population and Employment Forecast for the Seven-County Portland-Beaverton-Vancouver OR-WA Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA)	051408rsc-01
2.	Article		The lasting legacy of French Prairie	051408rsc-02
5.	Chart	4/7/08	Rural Reserve Factors	051408rsc-03
5.	PowerPoint	5/14/08	Designation of Rural Reserves Agricultural Land Factors	051408rsc-04
5.	PowerPoint	5/14/08	Mapping Natural Landscape Features: Criteria, Methodology, and Objectives	051408rsc-05
5.	PowerPoint	5/14/08	Forest and Forestry Considerations for Metro Rural Reserves	051408rsc-06
5.	Map		Forest Cover in the Portland Metro Area	051408rsc-07
5.	Map		Land Use in the Portland Metro Area	051408rsc-08