

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

September 10, 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, Shane Bemis, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Katy Coba, Rob Drake, David Fuller, Karen Goddin, Judie Hammerstad, Mike Houck, Tom Hughes, Kirk Jarvie, Gil Kelley, Charlotte Lehan, Greg Manning, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Richard Whitman.

Alternates Present: Bob Clay, Jim Johnson, Donna Jordan, Richard Kidd, Jim Labbe, John Pinkstaff, Lidwien Rahman.

Also Present: Roger Alfred, Judy Andreen, Frank Angelo, Jeff Bachrach, Ed Barthelemy, Kathy Barthelemy, Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Jim Bernard, Tom Bouillion, Carol Chesarek, Nick Christensen, Mark Clemons, Karol Collymore, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Gordon Davis, Dan Drentlaw, Mike Duyck, Mark Greenfield, Julia Hajduk, David Halseth, Jon Holan, Tony Holt, Jim Hough, Jack Isselmann, Adelle Jenike, Vern Johnson, Joyce Kolkmann, Sam Lowry, Art Lutz, Tom Maletis, Diann Matthews, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Martha Nix, Tim O'Brien, John O'Neil, Mark Ottenad, Ron Papsdorf, Bob Peterkort, Joanne Rigutto, Dan Riordan, Ellen Rogalin, Gordon Root, Doug Rux, Sid Sin, Steven Sparks, Dick Springer, Kimilboshi Sloop, Laurie Freeman Swanson, Thane Tienson, Alwin Turiel, Matt Wellner, John Williams, Terri Wilson, Karen Withrow.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Deb provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials, and asked for comments or amendments to the August meeting summary. There being no amendments, the summary was adopted as final. Deb informed the group that a photographer was taking photos for Jim Gilbert and the Molalla Pioneer newspaper. She then asked for updates since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Gil Kelley reported that he wrote a memo expressing the concerns he raised at the August 13 Steering Committee meeting about the underlying sequence and timing of decisions in the Steering Committee process. He will provide this memo to Steering Committee members by email in the next day or two.

Deb Nudelman then asked for public comment.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Judie Andreen, Hamlet of Beavercreek, reminded the Steering Committee of the Rural Perspectives folder she handed out at the August 13 meeting. She then read a letter written by Christine Kosinski titled "Putting the Cart Before the Horse" highlighting concerns about uncontrolled traffic in rural areas due to urban development. This letter will be provided to John Williams to post on the Reserves website.

Chris Barhyte asked that future handouts be 3-hole punched.

Jim Gilbert, Molalla Community Planning Organization (CPO), reported that representatives from the CPO were not notified of the proposal to include the area north of Molalla in the study area or invited to talk about, and the decision was made at a meeting where the topic was not included on the agenda. The CPO believes that it should be included in the designation process and asks that the Steering Committee delay approval of that piece until the CPO has had an opportunity to weigh in. He does not feel it is right to make decisions without any input from the citizens. Jim provided copies of an email he sent to Lynn Peterson, Bill Kennermer, and Martha Schrader documenting his concerns.

Joanne Rigutto, Hamlet of Mulino, said she would like to reiterate what Jim said. Without public involvement, she feels that the reserves process is compromised. The citizens need to be brought in to the process when these decisions are made. As a member of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), Joanne was under the impression that members of the CPO were informed and knew what was going on but found out later on that they were not. This detracts from the credibility of the PAC's recommendations. Joanne provided copies of a letter written to the Steering Committee documenting her concerns.

Deb asked that presenters to submit their letters to John Williams so they can be posted to the Reserves website.

III. PRESENTATION OF MAPPING WORK BY BUSINESS STAKEHOLDERS

Greg Manning provided introductory remarks and explained his involvement with the Steering Committee representing business interests. The maps he presented were prepared by Group Mackenzie in coordination with the Reserves Business Coalition. These maps represent a preliminary effort to look at development constraints from an industrial and commercial development perspective of the study area. The goal of presenting these maps is to begin prompting the kinds of questions that the Steering Committee will face in the months ahead. The first map depicts the overall reserves study area. The second map attempts to identify existing residentially zoned land, accounting for about 47,000 acres. The third map calls out wetlands and floodplains. Map 4 illustrates topographical areas with slopes of 10% or greater. Sloped areas represent 135,000 acres, and because land areas with 10% slope are not developable for industrial purposes, this is a significant deduction from developable areas.

The fifth map represents current industrial areas, and from an employment clustering mindset, shows possibilities for future growth. Map 6, which was provided to the Steering Committee as a handout, combines all the development constraints from each of the previous maps. The white

areas on this map are “opportunity areas” for industrial development, which, based on GIS data, do not have commercial constraints.

Greg Manning noted that in the past few months, there has been discussion about the urgency of the Steering Committee’s work. The June 2009 deadline for recommending urban and rural reserves is quickly approaching, and Greg believes the effort put into these maps calls out the challenge of determining urban and rural reserves. There will have to be tradeoffs that will likely be difficult for all parties involved. Greg feels the Steering Committee should continue its holistic approach to mapping both urban and rural decisions. These maps are a preliminary first step, and have raised additional questions about whether current infrastructure can be mapped, if more detailed slope data is available, how these maps relate to agricultural needs, and how these maps compare with residential constraints. Greg feels these maps provide the Steering Committee with very workable constraints and expressed his interest in the Core 4 helping the Steering Committee to continue these efforts.

Rob Drake said that the mapping presentation shows the Steering Committee a perspective it may not have seen before. Rob believes the region is wrestling with a housing balance, and he thinks it has been short of industrial land. However, he believes it will be detrimental if industrial lands are not located near residential areas.

Greg Manning agreed. Residential data has not been part of the analysis so far, but it would be easy to imagine a map which included population densities as well as industrial lands.

Kirk Jarvie noted that the maps refer to each of the layers as constraints, but that some of the layers, such as slopes, are actually barriers. Other layers, such as wetlands and floodplains are constraints. He also cautioned against the use of the National Wetlands Inventory maps to determine the wetlands and floodplains as they tend to underestimate the data. Kirk suggested using hydric soil mapping as well, which may overestimate the data but would provide a range with which to work.

Greg Manning said he appreciated the comments, and as Group Mackenzie was volunteering their time, he had just wanted to start a conversation.

Chair Brian asked how many developable acres are available if the constrained lands are taken away from the 404,000 acres of the overall study area.

Greg Manning noted that the mapping exercise provides a rough estimate and he is loath to attach numbers to it. A review of the maps shows about 50 to 60% of the study area is constrained under the factors identified in the maps.

Chair Brian said that this defines and brings into focus the nature of our challenge. The lands most desirable for business are also the most desirable for agriculture.

Craig Brown raised the concern that these maps do not include the impact of the Nature in Neighborhoods program, which will protect some upland habitats in addition to the riparian areas already identified. As an example, this map does not include forests, which will be looked at in the Nature in Neighborhoods areas. A lot of the white areas on the map might have trees and consequently might not be available for development, and this will not be known until after the

UGB has been expanded. He said it is also important to realize that even though there is property that looks as though it could not be developed, that is not necessarily true.

Greg Manning reiterated that this is a first pass at the data. He hopes that counties and cities will help provide more refined information before the Steering Committee attempts to make reserves decisions.

Sue Marshall requested that all the maps be posted to the Reserves website. She noted that not all wetlands, floodplains, and upland areas are covered by regulatory overlay and protected from development. Unless there is regulatory overlay, those areas are subject to development.

Judie Hammerstad said the Steering Committee needs to recognize that there will not be a job and work balance, however there does need to be a transportation balance to ensure adequate transportation. She noted that does not necessarily refer to roads.

Gil Kelley said he is looking forward to refinements in the maps and pointed out that the process will not jump directly from these maps to making policy choices. The other piece needed before making policy decisions is to discuss the demand side of the equation, including what lands are suitable for industry and what kinds of land will be needed for the jobs coming to the area.

Greg Manning agreed that refill rates, population and employment forecast expectations, and types of jobs all factor into this conversation.

Mike Houck noted that this mapping data needs to be interpreted cautiously. Under current regulations, the land depicted on the map as constrained areas is not necessarily protected from development. Until there are regulations on those lands, they are still open for development.

IV. URBAN AND RURAL RESERVE STUDY AREA ENDORSEMENT

Ellen Rogalin, Clackamas County, provided an update on additional public feedback received since the August 13 Steering Committee meeting. 17 additional comments, which were included in the meeting packet, reiterate the feedback already received. Ellen thanked 1000 Friends of Oregon for passing out the *Blueprint for Oregon's Future* flyers, and she asked that groups inform the Core 4 of any outreach efforts they conduct so that the Core 4 can be of assistance. Ellen reminded the Steering Committee that the public involvement officers are available to support the Steering Committee and the jurisdictions, and they welcome feedback and suggestions from Steering Committee members.

Mike Houck asked if public involvement staff were duplicating tools used in the 2040 planning process, such as a phone hotline. He recalled that over 17,000 comments were received during that process.

Ellen Rogalin responded that the high number of comments were in response to a mail-in survey. Public involvement staff are trying to collect as much feedback as possible and are expecting more input as the process moves closer to decision points.

Sue Marshall noted that there was concern about how communities are involved in the public involvement process. She believes those communities need to be engaged in dialogue and provided with more contacts to urban and rural reserves designations.

Councilor Harrington noted that the cities around the region are very engaged in the continuing and ever evolving health and welfare of the community.

Deb Nudelman asked for each of the Core 4 to provide updates from their jurisdictions.

Commissioner Schrader provided an overview of how the Core 4 and their boards will make recommendations and decisions in the urban and rural reserves process. She restated that this is an iterative process. Core 4 will bring the new information and possible endorsement from this meeting to their respective boards to receive final feedback from those groups. She said she hopes the Steering Committee can move forward with an endorsement today with the understanding that the Core 4 will have more conversations with their boards and there may be additional changes made to the study area map.

Councilor Harrington said that each of the Metro councilors is working with the counties and communities, so reports will be made specifically from the county coordinating efforts.

Commissioner Cogen reported that the Multnomah County Citizen Advisory Committee reviewed the proposed study areas in Multnomah County and endorsed this as the study area without change.

Chair Brian reported that the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee voted unanimously to endorse the area as depicted. There were a few comments but the board is satisfied that there is still possibility to change. The board plans to hear what the Steering Committee concludes and make next steps with that information in mind.

Deb Nudelman drew attention to the use of the word iterative. Core 4 want to make sure that their boards have the opportunity for public comment. Those comments will be taken to the counties and then brought back to the Steering Committee. The question being asked at this meeting is if this broad study area can be endorsed, or if there is anything else Steering Committee members need to discuss with their constituents. The critical piece to understand is that it is the Core 4's job to take the Steering Committee's endorsement to their boards to get board support and comment, and then share any feedback from the boards with the Steering Committee.

Katy Coba asked if the endorsement will include the study area with the disputed area near Molalla.

Commissioner Schrader suggested that the study areas be endorsed as is with the understanding that it is an iterative approach. She will take the discussion back to the City of Molalla and the study area may change based on those conversations with the community.

Katy Coba asked for clarification as to whether the map includes the area near Molalla.

Commissioner Schrader said no, the map does not include the area near Molalla. Multiple outreach activities were conducted, however some people are feeling that they were not included in the process. Commissioner Schrader will work with those citizens to make sure everyone feels included.

Katy Coba said it is important to remember that just because an area is in the study area does not mean that land will be designated as an urban or rural reserve. In fact, some areas will not be designated as reserves at all.

Commissioner Schrader thanked Katy for her comment. Commissioner Schrader will be having meetings with the cities, as well as a retreat with Clackamas County municipalities to understand the aspirations of the municipalities and resolve the concerns over the disputed study area near Molalla.

Katy Coba said she feels this is an important topic to revisit at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Craig Brown asked for clarification that endorsement of this initial study area does not preclude modifying the area in the future if necessary.

Commissioner Schrader confirmed that this study area can be modified because the process is iterative.

Judie Hammerstad noted that the Steering Committee has been looking at the gross area but is now moving forward to urban, rural, and undesignated areas. She thinks it is time to review study areas such as the UGB conflict at Stafford. Judie views this as opportunity to look at the whole area and determine what areas will be included in the UGB first. She does not think areas should be excluded from review.

Gil Kelly said it would be good to have a one-paragraph statement explaining what the Steering Committee endorsement means. He suggested that the explanatory statement be ratified at the October 8 Steering Committee meeting.

Deb Nudelman urged that the Steering Committee not write a paragraph, but instead asked that she be allowed to articulate verbally what the endorsement means.

Gil Kelley clarified he was not suggesting tabling the endorsement decision and instead wanted articulation of what is being agreed to.

Deb Nudelman asked that the facilitation team try to articulate the statement in the meeting summary, and language can be refined at the next Steering Committee meeting if needed.

Commissioner Schrader said that the endorsement is in effect saying that this is the study area that we are looking at. The study area is a broad swath and the Core 4 will continue to take information back to their boards for review. She said that she is only asking that the Steering Committee understand she will be looking at some local issues.

Bob Austin said he is happy to hear how the county commissioners will be addressing comments from the CPO. He was reminded of the criterion for designation of determining if there is threat of development around cities. He said he hoped thoughts from cities will be taken into account and addressed.

Lainie Smith noted that she finds the process confusing because the check mark is being represented in different ways. She feels it would be easier to say that there is no decision about Molalla right now, however it will be revisited at the next meeting. She does not feel the study area near Molalla should be excluded from the study area, as it is just a study area. There is a consistency issue that seems to be coming into question.

Greg Manning followed up on Craig's comment. Greg noted that we have a fairly broad-based general concurrence with the study area. A lot of outreach has been conducted and there is general concurrence with the scope of the study area. There is a set of concerns and caveats being heard from the constituency at this time concerning topics such as land constraints, infrastructure needs and flexibility of employment lands, however there is broad-based support for moving ahead.

Katy Coba said she thinks the Steering Committee will potentially have to face the question of what constitutes a revision to study area again. She does not need an answer today, but it is something to think about.

Chair Brian noted that he feels there are two kinds of revisions to areas. The first is due to working out some of the specific issues that are understood. The second is in response to our information becoming more accurate and the unknowns becoming known. The group reserves the right to get smarter. There needs to be flexibility and an understanding that it is okay to have a discussion about amending the study area.

Tom Hughes said he understands the need for flexibility, however he is concerned about how to explain this to constituents if the Steering Committee says it is endorsing study areas that will be narrowed down except in areas where they will be expanded. Tom asked when the iterations will stop.

Councilor Harrington responded that the iterations will stop at the end of Phase 3. This group reserves the right to get smarter and obtain more information throughout the process and ensure that all the information will be reviewed when making decisions.

Commissioner Schrader said this is an example of the complexity of the process. The Molalla piece has to be vetted with the board and Clackamas County, and Commissioner Schrader believes this issue will be resolved by the next Steering Committee meeting once conversations with these groups occur.

Katy Coba noted that there should be a high and clear bar to reach when changing study areas in the future.

Deb Nudelman asked for further comment and discussion concerning the urban and rural reserve study area. There being none, she brought attention to the *Key Milestones for Designating Urban and Rural Reserves* chart. The action being requested today is represented by the blue "Reserve study areas endorsed" box on this chart. Endorsement of the study areas indicates that you are comfortable moving forward with concurrently looking at the possibility of both urban and rural reserves designations on the lands within the study area. Inclusion of other inputs such as transportation, regional infrastructure, and local aspirations will be reviewed and included in determining recommended reserve areas by spring 2009. Deb asked members of the Steering Committee to raise their tentcards if they were unable to endorse the study area. Seeing no tentcards, the group's decision was unanimous for the endorsement of the study area. [*Decision Point*]

V. **NEXT STEPS IN STUDY AREA SUITABILITY ANALYSIS AND MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE WORK PROGRAMS**

Deb Nudelman called attention to the *Shaping the Region for the next 50 years* brochures that were originally handed out at the open houses and are available through Core 4 staff. She then introduced Chuck Beasley to discuss Phase 3.

Chuck Beasley provided an overview of how the suitability analysis will be conducted. This process is moving from Phase 2 to Phase 3, a move represented by the center box of the *Key Milestones for Designating Urban and Rural Reserves* chart. The suitability analysis will examine how the study area lands meet the needs of the factors. The technical team wants to provide information and a common frame of reference to allow the Core 4 to make decisions. To do that, the technical team is working with a set of 25 subareas. The technical team will present their findings in a matrix accompanied by a technical memo that provides the basis for ratings for each piece.

Topic areas to be considered and reviewed include infrastructure, natural resources, transportation, and forests, among others. For each of these topic areas, an expert review panel is being organized to provide input and advice to the technical team and to define the questions that need to be asked. The technical team has discussed strategy about how to proceed in identifying areas where conflicts between urban and rural needs will arise. Maps are available that show the agricultural limits, however more information is needed for determining urban suitability.

Chuck provided one example each of the urban and rural factors. The urban factor example is the efficient use of infrastructure investments. This is one of the early, “big screen” factors of the urban suitability analysis. The expert panel for this topic will be composed of service providers from around the region who have detailed knowledge of the service areas. The technical team plans to evaluate and rate areas on an order of magnitude, from very efficient to not efficient. This information would be incorporated into the matrix to explain choices.

The rural factor example is whether or not land is suitable for long-term agricultural use relative to conflicting uses that would impact long-term resource management. This is also known as the buffer factor. The expert panel will be composed of resource management agency staff, and they will be tasked with assessing how the edges of the rural reserves boundary relate to existing physical boundaries and whether or not these uses are compatible.

Rob Drake noted that there has been discussion at MPAC about the UGB expansion and how best to serve people. He recalled that during the last legislative session, a boundary expansion was asked for through 2010 and the inclusion of some properties into the UGB has been in discussion for a while. Rob asked if there will be a priority ranking for the properties that have been in play for some time and have money invested in them for development. He thinks it is logical that those properties would be set aside and not included in the reserves designations.

Chuck Beasley responded that this process is completely new. Evaluations are based on a set of factors that were outlined by the legislature. If certain areas have already been studied extensively, it seems that those areas will have a lot of information available to make designations. There are, however, no special areas.

Councilor Harrington noted that the Reserves Steering Committee is only looking at what land will be a reserve and what will not be.

Charlotte Lehan said that in the 2004 industrial land study, it was assumed that if land was near a city, it had infrastructure available. Charlotte noted that just because a sewer line is adjacent to land, does not mean it has the capacity to serve that area. She asked if that engineering information will be examined as well as the service providers' level of commitment to provide services.

Chuck Beasley said the technical team will be relying on the service providers to answer those types of questions.

Lainie Smith said that having service providers provide high, medium, and low rankings to land areas might not reflect the true needs and available services. Once potential urban reserves have been identified, the fact that some services are more expensive will need to be looked at as well.

Alice Norris mentioned the idea raised at the August 13 meeting of designating rural reserves first. She asked what the timing is for how these analyses will proceed. She asked if the desires of a group of participants who might be willing to have land designated as urban or rural reserves will be factored into the analysis or if that property will be analyzed the same as other properties.

Chuck Beasley responded that this is a technical analysis, and the technical team will remain as objective as possible. The desires and needs of people is part of the outreach work and not the technical work. In terms of designating rural reserves first, anything within three miles of the UGB could be chosen.

Alice Norris asked if that would be a Core 4 decision that would be referred to the Steering Committee.

Chuck Beasley said the counties could do that, however he does not think that would happen. Everyone wants to see what areas would be great for urban and rural reserves and what the best use is for the land in the region.

Gil Kelley encouraged the technical team to think about the ability of urban reserves to serve high-capacity transit.

Councilor Harrington said that in the description of the process Chuck provided, she was reminded of information handed out at previous meetings. Phase 3 will continue through April and there is a process of screening factors. This is an iterative process, moving from the large study area map to smaller, more specific study areas. On the agenda for the December 10 Steering Committee meeting is a presentation of the initial study area suitability results, so the Steering Committee will be hearing some of this information.

Chuck Beasley said that this process is new and it is unclear what the process will look like, so it will be critical to report on information about the work to the Steering Committee.

Councilor Harrington said that in subsequent iterations, our confidence will increase about what we are looking at.

Mike Houck noted that there are significant landscape changes due to climate change. He said that asking engineers to provide simulations will provide one response, and asking experts in green infrastructure will provide different perspectives and approaches. He asked if people experienced in looking at those alternatives are being included in the expert panel as well.

Chuck Beasley said he does not have an answer to that question. He said the technical team has discussed whether or not conversations of experts will take place region-wide to account for those perspectives.

John Pinkstaff agreed that it is important to have more input and information from all angles. The service providers need to be included in the panel to determine whether or not services can be made available. It might also be helpful to include engineers from the development side to do due diligence and advise clients if it will be feasible to provide their services. Engineers could also provide scope to show developers how much it would cost to upgrade the system. John also suggested adding the expertise of someone with knowledge of wetlands.

David Morman reminded the Steering Committee that rural means forestry land as well. He appreciates the descriptions of the technical process, and noted that it would be more helpful to have some of this in writing. He requested that the technical team provide a chart or memo that explains what the workplan is, where the 25 subareas are located, what the matrix will look like, who the experts will be, and what is the schedule and duration of the process.

Charlotte Lehan said that service providers might have some concerns about the infrastructure. They have commitments to existing developments that are either under way or planned, so having an engineer say that something is possible might not give the whole answer. This is not just a technical question.

Chris Barhyte asked how this process will determine what businesses need and what will attract them to the area. This is a world economy, so even if we designate the industrial lands, how can we provide what those businesses will want. He asked at what point that question will be answered.

Chuck Beasley said the technical team does not have an answer and will have to review that concern. Chuck noted that the subareas are simply meant to provide a reference to the technical team and will not have an impact on the designation of study areas.

Deb Nudelman said it is critical to know that the Core 4 staff is working hard on Phase 3 tasks and wants to provide sufficient information to build credibility for the methodology. Deb urged the Steering Committee not to stop pushing the technical team to continue having the highest level of credibility in their work. Staff will provide a technical memo at the next meeting explaining the Phase 3 suitability analysis work. *[Action Item]*

Brent Curtis reminded the group that it can review the study area for both urban and rural attributes, however at the end of day it needs to know how much land will be required over time. Brent referred to the *Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves* document which outlined that Metro would present long-term population forecasts by the end of May, and break down those projections by timeframes and subareas. Metro will provide revised 2035 and 2060 projections by the middle of September, which will also allocate the overall population and employment to

different subareas. This will be an iterative process to see how we will accommodate growth to 2035 and then to 2060.

Brent noted that different subareas will have different ways of looking at those numbers. One way is to take the different numbers and engage at a technical level, looking at the geography of an area and determining what existing plans call for. Another way is to look at aspirations by local governments and see which governments are interested in taking on more growth within existing cities. The Steering Committee has been working at a leisurely pace up to this point. However, at the technical and policy level, there is now going to be a lot more urgency. A combination of both the bottom-up and the top-down approaches will be used to determine what growth is needed inside the boundary as well as outside the boundary.

Councilor Harrington recognized that particularly the mayors know that they and their staff have been very engaged with Metro on Making the Greatest Place, and she does not think that they have been working at a leisurely pace so far. However, she said that this process will now go into hyperdrive mode. Councilor Harrington reviewed the *Regional Choices Engagement: Framing Our Choices* handout that illustrates the other work being conducted. MPAC and JPACT is going over some of the information, and scenarios will be discussed at meetings in October and November.

Brent Curtis noted that Chris Barhyte had raised a question about population and employment numbers. Metro has proposals that take a closer look at what the underlying employment needs are. There are also economic development organizations that are looking at short-term plans. The Steering Committee has the benefit of advice from these groups we move forward.

Chair Brian referred to the December 10 meeting listed on the *Regional Choices Engagement: Framing Our Choices* document and asked how the group will be positioned to make decisions about preferred policy choice alternatives given the need to determine the needs from everyone.

Councilor Harrington responded that it refers to information passed out from previous JPACT meetings that included scenarios work. The December 10 meeting is taking the scenario work from the sequence of previous meetings. This action, however, is not a decision of the Steering Committee.

Deb Nudelman noted that this discussion is included in the Regional Choices Engagement Architecture piece. This work includes defining strategies and priorities and will progress into refining choices.

Mary Kyle McCurdy raised a concern about local aspirations. She noted that scenario planning is taking into account a longer timeframe than the current 20 year time frame used in land use planning. She noted that local aspirations from 40 to 50 years ago are very different than the aspirations of today, and it is important to make sure future aspirations are able to change in scenario planning.

Deb Nudelman said that the staff is having the same concerns and is working to address them.

Deb Nudelman noted that Core 4 staff has indicated there is a chance the October 8 meeting will be canceled and will inform Steering Committee members by email if that happens. Deb noted that the upcoming October, November, and December meetings all have check points, and she encouraged

Steering Committee members to push back if they feel they are receiving too much or too little information.

Judie Hammerstad announced that the Big Look process has finished all the stakeholder meetings and is starting to hold town hall meetings. The first will be held September 18 from 6:30 to 8:30 pm at Portland State University.

Katy Coba asked if dates have been set for the Steering Committee meetings in 2009.

Deb Nudelman confirmed that staff is working on putting together a calendar. [Action Item]

I. SUMMARY

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:52 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
2.	Letter	Undated	“Putting the Cart Before the Horse” Submitted by Christine Kosinski	091008rsc-01
2.	Email	7/29/08	RE: Urban Reserve Study Area from Jim Gilbert to Lynn Peterson, Bill Kennermer, and Martha Schrader	091008rsc-02
2.	Letter	Undated	From Joanne Rigutto to Reserves Steering Committee	091008rsc-03
3.	Map	9/4/08	Metro Reserves Study Area: Map 6 Development Constraints	091008rsc-04
4.	Flyer	6/2/08	1000 Friends of Oregon Blueprint for Oregon’s Future	091008rsc-05
5.	Brochure	Undated	Urban and Rural Reserves: Shaping the Region for the next 50 years	091008rsc-06
5.	Document	Undated	Regional Choices Engagement: Framing Our Choices – Fall 2008	091008rsc-07

