

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY**

August 13, 2008; 9:00 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:** Bob Austin, Chris Barhyte, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Rob Drake, Bill Ferber, Karen Goddin, Judie Hammerstad, Tom Hughes, Kirk Jarvie, Gil Kelley, Charlotte Lehan, Greg Manning, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Jeff Stone.

**Alternates Present:** Drake Butsch, Bob Clay, Shawn Cleave, Jim Johnson, Donna Jordan, Richard Kidd, Jim Labbe, Ron Papsdorf, Bob Rindy.

**Also Present:** Judy Andreen, Karla Antonini, Jeff Bachrach, Sandy Baker, Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Carol Chesarek, Karol Collymore, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Gordon Davis, Dan Drentlaw, Denny Egner, Jim Emerson, Patrick Foran, Sierra Gardiner, Richard Goddard, David Halseth, Jon Holan, Tony Holt, Jack Isselmann, Adelle Jenike, Art Lutz, Bonnie Merchant, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Bill Monahan, Jeff Murray, Tim O'Brien, Lawrence Odell, John O'Neil, Mark Ottenad, John Pinkstaff, Ken Ray, Dan Riordan, Kelly Ross, Doug Rux, Marcia Sinclair, Steven Sparks, Dick Springer, Ric Stephens, Stacey Triplett, Randy Tucker, Alwin Turiel, Mark Walkley, Danielle Welliever, Benjamin Williams, John Williams, Terri Wilson, Anita Yap.

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

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Deb provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials. She then asked for comments on the June meeting summary.

Gil Kelley asked that his comment at the bottom of page 5 be clarified to read “it will require some research into what technical tasks will be needed to do that.”

There being no other amendments, the summary was adopted as final pending the agreed-to revisions. Deb then asked for updates since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Greg Manning provided an update from the business coalition. They are coordinating with John Williams to prepare a series of maps based on the existing study area map that include additional information such as wetlands and topography to help frame some of the questions the Steering

Committee will have to answer in the coming months. The business coalition hopes to present these maps at the September Steering Committee meeting.

Deb Nudelman then asked for public comment.

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

Benjamin Williams, Friends of French Prairie, noted that decisions made in French Prairie will carry consequences for many years. Friends of French Prairie see evidence that demonstrates the 2040 Growth concept is driven by growth. Friends of French Prairie feel that growth must be balanced by the need for agricultural land, and our food system needs to be centered on local food. The UGB expansion and rural reserves decisions are critical in both the near term and the future. Expansion along the I-5 corridor would cover valuable farm land, and once farm land has been developed, it can never go back to the way it was. Benjamin submitted his August 12 letter to the Reserves Steering Committee for posting to the Reserves website.

Judy Andreen, Hamlet of Beaver creek, understands the importance of what the Steering Committee is undertaking and asked that the Steering Committee keep in mind the perspectives of the rural communities as they will be most heavily impacted by this process. Rural communities would like to have a voice in this process; however they have no specific representation on the Steering Committee. Judy provided a folder to Steering Committee members containing information on the benefits of rural lands and urban/rural buffer zones, and explained that members of Beaver creek will continue to pass out additional information as the process continues. Judy noted that the absence of the rural communities' opinion on this committee has implied that non-agricultural rural perspective has no value. Judy submitted her information for posting to the Reserves website.

Bonnie Merchant, Hamlet of Beaver creek, spoke to the importance of groundwater resources. She noted that groundwater is an important source of water for irrigation. Agriculture, densely located septic systems, and impermeable surfaces add to pollution of groundwater. If we continue to develop rural land, we will lose important water resources. Bonnie noted that she will submit her information for incorporation to the Reserves website.

## **III. RESERVES PHASE 2 OUTREACH RESULTS**

Mike Dahlstrom introduced the August 13 memo from Reserves Core 4 Technical and Public Involvement Staff regarding the *Report on activities in Phase 2 of the Reserves Work Program including a preliminary summary of public input and Coordinated Public Involvement Plan updates* and gave a brief overview. The opportunity for public input will continue through Friday, August 15. The public outreach to date has met all the activities outlined in the coordinated public involvement plan. The intent was to build awareness of the process, explain how this process fits with other processes being conducted, and to gather input on the reserves proposed study area. Staff from the four jurisdictions has been working collaboratively on this effort and attended all the open houses, which were held to provide elected officials opportunities to meet with their constituents and hear their perspectives. In addition to the open houses, Core 4 public involvement staff conducted outreach with Committees for Citizen Involvement (CCIs). Staff made presentations and provided information to business groups, agricultural groups, neighborhood associations, and environmental groups. In total, the Core 4 and staff has met with and solicited comments from over 650

community residents. More than half of the input has been received from mail-in questionnaires and online.

Mike Dahlstrom reviewed the summary of the public input heard to date. There is a preliminary list of suggestions for study areas in the packet as well as other factors and specific suggestions provided to technical team. There has been little substantive feedback on the study area itself. The public involvement team requests that people visit the county and Reserves Steering Committee websites. After August 15, all information will be compiled and made available to the Steering Committee with the final Phase 2 summary.

Sue Marshall asked how the Core 4 and staff expect to answer the unresolved questions on page 3 of the memo.

Mike Dahlstrom explained that once the time period for public comment has ended, the public involvement staff will develop a FAQ sheet and bring the questions the planners are not able to answer to the Core 4 and the Steering Committee.

Councilor Harrington noted that Metro and the three counties have other planning efforts in the community and are trying to put this process in the greater context of making the greatest place.

Charlotte Lehan asked if more open houses will be held as the process continues.

Mike Dahlstrom confirmed that there will be additional open houses. Each phase of the process has a public involvement component. Staff will be going back to the community at key milestones using a variety of outreach tools to provide for the most extensive outreach.

Charlotte Lehan noted that the map at the open house in Tualatin, which showed where people lived, illustrated that the majority of the people at that meeting were from Wilsonville or farther south. Charlotte asked if staff would consider moving the meeting location in Tualatin to ensure a broader input base.

Mike Dahlstrom responded that there are no set locations for open houses. Future open houses will be held in various locations to enable staff and elected officials to meet with the most people possible.

Deb Nudelman then asked each of the counties to provide updates on their county advisory committee efforts.

Mike Dahlstrom reported that at the most recent meeting of the Washington County coordinating committee, the committee reviewed the Steering Committee suggestions. They will continue to consider and provide input on them through the August 15 public input deadline.

Chuck Beasley reiterated that there was a high degree of coordination between all the parties that organized this. He then reported that the CAC met on July 31<sup>st</sup> and discussed the results of the open houses. There were no comments about changing the study area for Multnomah County, and the CAC recommended by consensus to go with the study area map as proposed.

Commissioner Schrader provided an update on the Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The PAC accepted the proposed broad study area with a minor exception near Molalla by the city's urban growth boundary. They also decided not to ask for inclusion of the Highway 211 area discussed previously. The PAC will continue to meet through the summer and fall and have requested as much opportunity to comment on technical information as possible. The Clackamas Board is also meeting with city mayors and the planning commission.

Councilor Harrington noted that all Metro councilors are liaisons to this project and are very involved in this process, the open houses, and the county coordinating committees.

Deb Nudelman summarized that this public involvement process is new and unprecedented. It is critical that Steering Committee members serve as a conduit of information between the Steering Committee and their constituents. At each phase, the public involvement is an iterative process. Deb encouraged Steering Committee members to take information out to their constituents and bring feedback to the Steering Committee so at the end of this process, the group is at a place where people can support the recommendations. This is a crucial juncture to wrapping up Phase 2 and moving to Phase 3. She then asked the Steering Committee members who had attended open house for comment or observations.

Gil Kelley felt the open house in northwest Portland was a little abstract. He noted that this might be okay at this phase; however people may have been confused that they were doing a suitability analysis. This confusion might account for the fact that there were not many concerns about the proposed study area. As the process moves forward, the public involvement staff needs to be clear about what this process is, how people can be engaged, and how to explain the process to people so they can appreciate the decisions being made.

Greg Manning reported that the business coalition has been conducting a similar public involvement process on a smaller scale. They have been conducting outreach and getting involvement and feedback from other business associations in the community.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked if the only expected recommendation for changes to the proposed study area map is the proposed change near Molalla. She requested that all information about potential map changes be distributed to the Steering Committee as far in advance of the September meeting as possible.

John Williams responded that there have only been two proposed changes to the study area – near Molalla and the area near Highway 211. Core 4 and staff have not heard of any other proposed changes.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked John if he expected staff to come up with new additions to the study area.

John Williams responded that he did not.

Councilor Harrington reminded everyone that the proposed study area map was adjusted prior to going out for public comment. There has only been one change arising from public input and concerns.

John Williams noted that the deadline for feedback is August 15, so there is still time for additional public comment.

Ron Papsdorf asked if the Core 4 and staff have thought about how to evaluate the thoughts and suggestions arising from the public involvement process.

John Williams responded that they will be providing the constituent responses to the Steering Committee members so committee members can review them with their constituents.

Deb Nudelman said that part of the preparation for the September meeting is for Core 4, staff, and committee members to review the responses and be able to support the recommended study area during the September meeting, or be prepared to have a discussion about their concerns.

Bob Rindy asked if this process includes a plan to report to the State's Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC).

John Williams said that Core 4 and staff expect to learn from this process. The open houses were important to provide an introduction to the Reserves Steering Committee process. The concept of educating constituents about the Reserves process was discussed more than the proposed study area map itself, although that will most likely change at future public outreach efforts. The process so far has demonstrated that there is a good coordinated process. Public involvement staff will be using different techniques to reach as many constituents as possible and can definitely provide an update on lessons learned to the CIAC.

Chris Barhyte noted that in discussions he has had with his constituents about the proposed study area map, they have not discussed changes to the map. He feels that the message that has been sent is that we are looking at a big area of land. Chris would hesitate changing much at this point because he does not feel many people know that changing the study area is an option. He thinks people will be interested and participate more as additional information becomes available and more decisions have been made.

#### **IV. MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE AND URBAN AND RURAL RESERVES PROGRAMS**

Robin McArthur provided an overview of how the urban and rural reserves program fits into the larger context of making the region a vibrant place to live and work. She introduced the *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture (2008-2011)* chart, the purpose of which is to provide a high level overview of the process showing how all the tracks fit together. All of the key decisions are a means to an end with the goal of understanding the aspirations of local communities in 20 and 50 years. The *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture (2008-2001)* chart indicates both the products of each phase in the process as well as the group making the decisions.

Councilor Harrington reinforced the idea that in addition to seeing connections of things through this architecture chart, there are other things planned to support this, as exemplified in the forward-looking schedules for MPAC and JPACT.

Gil Kelley appreciates the approach of framing this in phases oriented around choices. The word "choice" implies that the conversation is centered on discussion. However, he is concerned that there is a decision-making structure underneath this that is not clearly expressed. His understanding

is that the process is iterative and that the process starts with the population and employment forecast, and then moves to a discussion about the urban and rural reserves. The process will then move to the urban growth report, followed by the UGB decision for the first 20 years. Gil is concerned the two middle steps are reversed or should occur concurrently. He feels there should be a discussion about choices and the underlying sequence of discussions before any decisions are made about designations. Steering Committee members are still having hard time explaining to people how these two processes are not separate but are actually together. He would like both topics to be discussed fully before reaching a decision point.

Robin McArthur responded that the Core 4 want to make sure local discussions about choices feed into the urban growth discussion. They want to have urban reserves in place before they make the next decision about the UGB. The conversation stems from what our communities want to become as they grow and how that adds up into the regional capacity.

John Williams noted that the 20 and 50 year discussions will occur at the same time, and he will explain how those processes are being completed later in the meeting.

Rob Drake asked for clarification to Gil's point that the process was reversed. He asked that Gil explain his concerns in a memo and distribute it at the next Steering Committee meeting. Rob said that he likes the idea of choices and noted that there are always rolling choices and this is an ongoing discussion. The same topics have been discussed at MPAC for the last 16 years.

Mary Kyle McCurdy noted that the *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture (2008-2011)* chart discusses adoption of urban reserves areas but does not include rural decisions. She asked when the rural reserves will be adopted.

Robin McArthur responded that in the past, there was discussion focused more on numbers than on what we want to accomplish as a region. In this process, the goal is to embody more local aspirations in decisions.

Gil Kelley commented that six months does not seem like enough time to complete Phase 2 and that recommending urban and rural reserves should be in Phase 3. It is difficult to explain to people why decisions are being made about reserves before having a discussion about numbers and what land will be needed.

Robin McArthur said that this is an iterative process, and it is important to have both pieces of information on the table. For example, if the region does not increase its density, the proposed reserves area will need to be much larger.

Gil Kelley suggested this confusion might be cleared up if the chart described recommended areas "suitable" for reserves.

Robin McArthur agreed staff could review the language.

Charlotte Lehan is concerned that most of the boxes on the chart are about urbanization, and they do not have a foundation about what we need in terms of rural reserves or what our obligation is. She said that the distinction should be made that urban reserves are something we need while rural

reserves are something we have an obligation to preserve into the future for the whole state of Oregon. She does not see that the rural reserves are represented by this chart.

Robin McArthur responded that staff can revise the chart to reflect rural reservations as well.  
[Action Item]

John Williams introduced the *Process to frame, refine and make regional growth management choices* chart. He explained that there will be an iterative discussion between local and regional governments to discuss what their aspirations are. The diagram shows that the processes are going to be integrated and informed by each other. Three tracks of work will be ongoing into the fall, and the work on the local aspirations is a critical component. Conversations need to be held about what is happening in existing communities and what would need to be added on for both a 20 year and 50 year time frame. We need to look at range forecasts for different regions and how to allocate that type of growth over the long term.

Range forecasts will be presented to different groups in the region in the fall, and we will provide tools to have the discussion with communities about their aspirations for their centers. Discussions will also focus on the implications of different scenarios. The plan is to work with smaller groups around the region to talk about local aspirations, and then bring together those smaller groups and have a regional forum in the spring of next year to talk about what those local aspirations mean for the shape of the region. John noted that the 20 year forecast does inform the 50 year forecast and vice versa.

John Williams addressed the question of how big the reserves are going to be. He said there needs to be a discussion about aspirations and the future shape of the region before there is a discussion of size. The suitability of lands for both urban and rural reserves will be discussed and then brought together with the regional direction on the scale of future growth in order to produce a recommended set of reserves. He noted Mary Kyle's concern about the representation of rural reserves and said that both urban and rural reserves are represented in the *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture* chart but they are illustrated in different locations.

Charlotte Lehan noted that the blue box at the beginning of the *Process to frame, refine and make regional growth management choices* chart lists desired outcomes such as global warming and a healthy environment. She does not see how those are included in the architecture document. She asked for clarification about how those will be measured.

John Williams responded that staff is currently looking for indicators to measure each of the desired outcomes and plan to integrate those into the aspirations.

Charlotte Lehan noted that some outcomes, like transportation, have specific boxes on the architecture document while reducing global warming and equity do not.

Councilor Harrington said that part of the reason those outcomes are not listed specifically is that those values are integrated into multiple boxes. This integration should be seen as we go through the process in the next few months.

Jim Labbe commented that performance measures are being developed for long-term purposes. We need to be mindful that it will be easier to apply some of these measures to certain things more than others and it is important to think about what we can evaluate them.

Alice Norris assumes “local aspirations” refers to what local jurisdictions want, and she is concerned that the Core 4 is making an assumption that local governments have had that discussion. She is concerned about the timeline because elections are approaching and there will be a new group of elected officials who will need to get a handle on the aspirations of their communities. A six-month time frame might not be enough time to have that conversation.

Chair Brian said he seconded that concern. In Washington County, there are thirteen cities that all have their own aspirations. In addition, 40% of the population lives outside cities. Many people have strong feelings about urbanizing and increasing density. It is difficult to organize all the desires of the cities and subregions, however it is important to tie into those local aspirations.

Commissioner Schrader said she shares the same concern. Clackamas County does have a technical advisory committee that includes planning staff from the municipalities. She is also meeting with the mayors and her planning director to start getting a handle on what the local aspirations are. This could potentially be a big disconnect in how we are communicating with each other, but we are doing the best we can to move ahead.

Councilor Harrington said she takes comfort in the point raised by Mayor Drake that land use planning is never done and continues to evolve.

John Williams noted that staff has also heard the concern that the conversation needs to occur and they are sensitive to the need to develop methods and tools to discuss this topic.

Craig Brown asked about the forecasting. It is important to have as accurate a forecast as possible. If this process is successful, the region may be growing much faster than the US as a whole. He asked if the rate of growth issue will be revisited.

John Williams responded that the population and employment forecast release in May was a review draft. An endpoint will be set for people to submit their comments, and the 20 and 50 year forecasts are being revised in response to comments already received.

Greg Manning asked if part of the Steering Committee’s objective is to make recommendations to specific locations based on the forecasting numbers.

John Williams asked for clarification if the question addressed the implementation after reserves designations have been made or choices that need to be made about specific measurements.

Greg Manning said he was thinking in terms of recommending to jurisdictions what changes they would need to make to accommodate recommended reserves designations.

John Williams noted that conversation will take place elsewhere than the Steering Committee. The implementation may have to happen at local levels.



Councilor Harrington said that part of what this group is doing is unprecedented. She suggested that the richness of the Steering Committee discussions is being taken back to cities by the mayors and councilors and the richness of the city conversations is being brought to the Steering Committee as well.

Judie Hammerstad noted that local governments are already required to make density recommendations. She said that when it is time to implement a plan, this committee will hopefully be generating enough interest to be able to do so. If we want to build within our UGB, we will have to accommodate that, however there cannot be an expectation that is what will happen.

Chair Brian said that point underscores the importance of weaving in local aspirations to our conclusions. There is no doubt that in the end, cities and counties will have many different recommendations.

Gil Kelley appreciates that staff is trying to integrate the work programs, however he does not know what diagram to use in the end. He asked if there could be a box in Phase 3 of the chart that explains specifically the role and the tenure of the Steering Committee. Gil said he also appreciates Councilor Harrington's response to Charlotte's concern that equity and climate change are implicit in the boxes, however he feels it would be beneficial to explicitly put these outcomes in boxes. His third point is that some of the language in the boxes might be confusing to those not familiar with the process and that we should choose one diagram to use.

Chris Barhyte asked for clarification about the aspirations of local cities. He wants to be clear we are not creating policies that allow each city to have its own aspiration. He would like an understanding of how policies will be created for each jurisdiction.

John Williams noted that this conversation is being structured so that local governments will work individually and then come together as a group to have a discussion about what their local aspirations will mean for the region. The process will be structured to have iterative discussion points.

Deb Nudelman asked if there is anything else Steering Committee members would like to add regarding questions and concerns they might have about how this phase of the process will work for them and their constituents.

Rob Drake responded that he does not think that question can be answered. There is no way to know yet if we are or are not hitting the right point because we have not yet been down the road. It is important at this point to keep an open mind and keep the process fluid so that as we make the final decision, we have not already made too many decisions along the way.

Judie Hammerstad said that we have to determine where the top priorities are. Designating urban and rural reserves will not have the same weight, and she reiterated that we need urban reserves and want rural reserves. In a number of areas, there are going to be tradeoffs and we will need to determine what the tradeoffs are.

Tom Hughes made the point that there are other factors leading to a productive agriculture industry than soil types. He thinks it would make sense to determine rural reserves before designating urban

reserves. This is an important opportunity to say we value agriculture and rural reserves, and to give some security to farming community.

Sue Marshall said her ongoing concern given the timeframe is that the public, and not only the cities, be engaged with reserves and the greatest place work that is under way. The public need to be engaged in adopting the performance indicators in a proactive way.

Mary Kyle McCurdy is concerned that the local aspirations discussion is more amorphous than what she had imagined, and what it will mean that the local aspirations piece comes so late in the process. She would like the information about policy consequences and factors to be provided up front to citizens in their local aspirations discussions so that those discussions can be meaningful.

Bob Austin hopes all elected officials are taking this information back to their own communities. He addressed the concern about having various flow charts and said he thinks all of the charts are necessary to have on hand for use depending on the audience.

Charlotte Lehan said that she thinks it makes sense to designate rural reserves first before designating urban reserves.

Chris Barhyte said he would like to see a report describing what the agricultural land around the metro area produces to better understand what the current use of agricultural land is and what is meant by soil type.

Jim Johnson responded that a lot of that is already available in the analysis done for Metro.

Chris Barhyte clarified that he would like to know more specifics about what crops are being grown to understand what would be protected when we discuss protecting agricultural land.

Jim Johnson said the region does not have homogenous agricultural production and it cannot be said that one agricultural product is dominant. He said that it is important to look at the capabilities of the land and not just what is being grown on it now.

Councilor Harrington noted that the Department of Agriculture has made a wealth of information available to the Steering Committee. In addition, both the agricultural industry and non-agricultural industries grow and change over time.

Jeff Stone said that we are market driven, so agriculture represents nursery and forestry, in addition to food production. It does not do much good to protect lands that do not face development pressures.

Jim Johnson noted that the subject of local food production is not going away. It is important not to look only at what is currently growing on the land, but what the land's ability is to adapt to changing demands.

Jeff Stone stated that agriculture is the second largest industry in Oregon.

Charlotte Lehan noted the increase in wheat fields on the western side of the state.

Jim Johnson reported that 90,000 new acres of wheat were planted in western Oregon this year.

Jim Labbe said that there is a host of non-market value services that need to be considered in this conversation as well.

Tom Hughes said that in a discussion of rural reserves, we need to answer the question of why we are preserving agricultural lands. He feels the answer goes beyond food security to a variety of economic and social reasons, all of which need to be taken into consideration. He noted that the Steering Committee needs to consider that there may end up being three categories of reserves: urban, rural, and others.

Gil Kelley said he endorses Tom Hughes' comment. He asked how to get to the vision of what the will be if we use the process we have used before. These are very distinct discussions and he feels it is not too soon to begin those discussions.

**V. SUMMARY**

Deb Nudelman reminded the committee that they will be asked to provide support for the broad study area map at the September 10 Steering Committee meeting. Deb asked that the committee members read the available information and discuss the issues with their constituents. John Williams is the contact if additional information needs to be distributed in advance of the September meeting.

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:47 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.



**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR AUGUST 13, 2008**

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

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOC TYPE</b>	<b>DOC DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
2.	Letter	8/12/08	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Friends of French Prairie	081308rsc-01
2.	Letter	8/13/08	"The Rural Perspective" Submitted by Judy Andreen	081308rsc-02
3.	Memo	8/13/08	Report on activities in Phase 2 of the Reserves Work Program	081308rsc-03
5.	Chart	8/6/08	Process to frame, refine and make regional growth management choices	081308rsc-04