

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

November 12, 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: Chris Barhyte, Shane Bemis, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Bill Ferber, Karen Goddin, Judie Hammerstad, Kirk Jarvie, Gil Kelley, Charlotte Lehan, Greg Manning, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Alice Norris, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone.

Alternates Present: Drake Butsch, Bob Clay, Jim Johnson, Donna Jordan, Richard Kidd, Jim Labbe, Bob LeFeber, John Pinkstaff, Lidwien Rahman, Bob Rindy, Marc San Soucie.

Also Present: Judy Andreen, Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Bob Bobosky, Susana Brennan, Gretchen Buehner, Carol Chesarek, Steve Cohen, Karol Collymore, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Donny Elsner, Jim Emerson, Mark Griffin, David Halseth, Jon Holan, Tony Holt, Adelle Jenike, Vern Johnson, Catherine Keith, Tim Knapp, Christine Kosinski, Art Lutz, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Rob Murch, Jim Needham, Tim O'Brien, Mark Ottenad, Ron Papsdorf, Ken Ray, Joanne Rigutto, Dan Riordan, Joseph Schaefer, Stephen Shane, Steven Sparks, Dick Springer, Ric Stephens, Thane Tienson, Jessica Tump, Ray Valone, Gayleen Weiler, John Williams.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:13 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 September meeting summary.

Greg Manning asked that his comments at the bottom of page 2 be revised to read “in coordination with the Reserves Business Coalition” and “to look at development constraints from an industrial and commercial development perspective.”

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.

Gil Kelley introduced his memo outlining concerns he raised at the August Steering Committee meeting about the timeline for recommendations to designate long term urban and rural reserves. This memo was in response to Mayor Drake’s suggestion to put those concerns in writing. Gil is concerned the Steering Committee cannot make an informed decision about 50-year needs before there is an understanding of the 20-year needs. In addition, he is concerned there will not be

enough time to communicate Steering Committee recommendations to local governments and their constituents. Gil noted that although this meeting might not be the appropriate time to do so, he would like to discuss this subject further.

Marc San Soucie reported that Mayor Drake has read the memo and agrees with Gil Kelley's comments.

Greg Specht agreed that this meeting is not the right time to discuss this memo. He said the Steering Committee needs to stick with the current timeline and that changing the timeline now would be inappropriate.

Councilor Harrington noted that there is time on the December 10 agenda for Metro staff to provide further information about work going into the Urban Growth Report that may or may not address concerns expressed in the memo.

Deb Nudelman stated that the memo is now part of the record. Project management team staff will take the memo into consideration and determine if and where it should appear on the December 10 agenda. [Action Item]

Greg Manning reported that the mapping presentation he gave at the September 10 meeting has now been presented to all of the county reserves committees. He has one more presentation scheduled with the Clackamas County economic development group later this month.

Commissioner Schrader reported that Clackamas County is continuing work on the first cut on reserve areas. She gave a presentation at a recent Clackamas County reserves committee meeting about where the Steering Committee is in the process.

Chair Brian reported that in Washington County, the urban and rural reserves steering committee approved the study area and presented the study area to the Board who approved it as well.

Commissioner Cogen reported that the Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met since the last Steering Committee meeting. That group started the conversation about urban and rural reserves and is running into challenges about making decisions before knowing the estimated population growth in the area.

Deb Nudelman drew Steering Committee members' attention to the fall joint MPAC and JPACT meeting schedule.

Councilor Harrington noted that there is information coming out of each of these meetings. Metro Council has made a commitment to try different tools and see how the different scenarios fit into the process, so it can come up with a discussion guide before making a decision in the latter part of next year.

Deb Nudelman also noted the 2009 Reserves Steering Committee meeting schedule and asked Steering Committee members to let staff know of any major conflicts involving multiple Steering Committee members.

Deb Nudelman then asked for public comment.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Carol Chesarek, Forest Park Neighborhood and Multnomah County Reserves CAC (but not speaking on behalf of the CAC), does not feel there is a clear standard for how to define which areas are subject to urbanization and which are not. She referred to the memo from staff in the meeting packet and noted that on page 2, under the second bullet, it focuses on areas potentially subject to urbanization. She said this passage seems to imply that areas not potentially subject to urbanization do not need to be considered for rural reserves. She believes it is appropriate for the initial screening to give a preference to possible rural reserves closer to the UGB, but that areas further from the UGB should not be eliminated based on this one factor in this phase of the process.

Christine Kosinski, Hamlet of Beavercreek, reminded the Steering Committee of the Rural Perspectives folder that was handed out at the August 13 meeting. She then read a letter she wrote titled "Don't Go Down a Slippery Slope! Natural Hazards" discussing concerns about natural hazards such as steep slopes and areas subject to landslides. This letter will be posted on the Reserves website.

Gil Kelley agreed that the location of steep slopes is an important topic and asked if the Steering Committee could get a report at the next meeting about LIDAR mapping and feasibility from Metro staff.

Councilor Harrington responded that the Core 4 can take the request and see if and when that can be done, but it is not in a position to commit Metro staff time. [Action Item]

III. UPDATE ON BROAD STUDY AREA MAP ENDORSEMENT

Deb Nudelman reminded the group that at the September 10 meeting, the Steering Committee was asked to give an endorsement of the broad study area map, which it did. Each of the Core 4 took that consideration back to their boards and commissions. Deb noted that the check mark of having the boards give their approval is a small check mark but it is a critical one to make sure everyone is being rigorous and moving forward. She then asked each of the Core 4 to provide a report on the decisions of their boards.

Chair Brian reported that the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee discussed the study area, recommended it to the Washington County Board, and the Board approved the study area. There were a number of questions about the Steering Committee process, such as how to narrow the study area of 400,000 acres to the necessary area of reserves without knowing population and employment numbers.

Commissioner Schrader reported that she presented the broad study area map to her commission and they are in agreement that the broad study area is a good place to start. Clackamas County technical staff has begun work on how to apply the factors.

Councilor Harrington reported that the Metro Council adopted a formal resolution that passed 7-0 to endorse the broad study area. She appreciates all of the input from the Steering Committee and that of other advisory committees.

Commissioner Cogen reported that the Multnomah County CAC endorsed the broad study area. It was then brought before the Board of Commissioners in a briefing, and the Multnomah County commissioners all gave head nods in approval for the broad study area.

Lidwien Rahman asked for clarification if the broad study area included the piece of land north of Molalla.

Commissioner Schrader confirmed that piece is not included in the broad study area.

Deb Nudelman stated the records will show that the study area has been endorsed. She noted that the technical work will be occurring through the spring when the Steering Committee will come to its next set of decision points.

Chris Barhyte asked for confirmation that as the process continues, and if other areas are found that make sense for inclusion into the study area, that they will not be precluded from being considered.

Councilor Harrington said yes. As was stated in the last meeting, this group reserves the right to “get smarter.”

IV. LOCAL FOOD SYSTEM PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Weston Miller, Chair of the Portland Multnomah Food Policy Council (FPC), presented information from the FPC urging the Steering Committee to keep direct market farms in mind as it recommends designations for urban and rural reserves. The FPC has prepared a set of maps to be used as a tool for designating urban and rural reserve areas. He noted that agriculture and growth are often contradictory land use patterns and the FPC is concerned there will be less agricultural land available as the region grows. He noted that regional and urban food supply is emerging as a hot topic as consumers grow more interested in small ecological footprints, food security, food system education, and supporting the local farm economy. Support of the local farm economy can be done through direct market farm strategies such as CSAs, farmers’ markets, farm stands, and direct sales to groceries and restaurants. There has been an increase in Oregon in direct market farms, and it is becoming a significant sector of the economy. The average size of the direct market farms is 45 acres, and 19% of those farms are within the UGB. Agriculture is a vibrant industry in the region and this process provides an opportunity to maintain the current base while enhancing the industry through policy.

Gil Kelley asked what percentage of farms are located within the study area if 19% of farms are within the UGB.

Jim Johnson responded that it would be about the same number. The 19% includes all urban areas within the region. At the beginning of the mapping exercise, it became obvious that local food production is no longer niche marketing but rather is becoming an important and mainstream agricultural base. The main farmers’ market in Portland is going to have to expand because it cannot handle the number of people who visit it. In addition, 2-3% of value of fruit and vegetable sales in Portland come from farmers’ markets.

Lidwien Rahman noted that the map is missing a couple of farmers’ markets such as the Hillsdale market on Sundays and the Multnomah Village farmers’ market on Thursdays.

Jeff Stone said this further demonstrates the complexities and priorities that agriculture has in Oregon. He reminded the group that the nursery industry is one of the largest in the state. The Oregon State University Extension Service tries to show varying degrees that agriculture touches all our lives.

Charlotte Lehan pointed out a minor mapping error. Charbonneau is inside the UGB and is not foundation agriculture land.

Greg Specht asked if there were specific criteria, such as dollar sales or length of time selling to farmers' markets, used to list these farms as vendor farms.

Weston Miller responded that all the farms that were included are direct marketing to farmers' markets in the Portland area. This number does not include any farms that are selling exclusively to restaurants or groceries.

Greg Specht clarified that he was trying to understand the size of the farms.

Jim Johnson said that the database is extensive but incomplete. The City of Portland collected information from farmers' markets, CSAs, and farmers in the tri-county area. The farms range in size from one tenth of an acre to 500 acres. The estimated number of farms is conservative.

Chris Barhyte noted that the cities have a challenge to protect that agricultural resource.

Deb Nudelman introduced Sheila Martin, Director of the Institute of Metropolitan Studies at Portland State University.

Sheila Martin gave a presentation summarizing Portland State's recently released Food System Sustainability Assessment. The scope of analysis included everything from the soil to associated health impacts of what people are eating to how the waste from packaging is disposed. All of Washington and Oregon were considered in collecting the supply data and the demand data was derived from the seven-county Portland metropolitan region. Researchers gathered information from reliable data sources, literature, and stakeholder interviews. The findings concluded that some farmers would like to expand the size of their farms but land prices have increased as the amount of urban land is increasing. There has been a rise in cash receipts, but those do not tell whole story without adjusting for inflation. Agricultural land competes for food and non-food uses, although some areas are not appropriate for non-food crops. Water is critical to the food system and the amount of groundwater being used is increasing as are concerns about the impact of agriculture on water quality.

Other challenges facing the farming community are rising energy prices and an increasingly aging work force. However, farm production is a linchpin of the entire food cluster. If farm production in an area stops, then other areas of food system would disappear as well. Direct selling is important as it significantly increases the amount of consumer dollar the farmers are able to keep.

Chair Brian asked if the study has numbers on how many of the small farmers are engaged in second jobs.

Sheila Martin responded that many families earn money from other areas as well.

Chair Brian asked what percentage of the farms participating in farmers' markets engaged in selling at several locations.

Sheila Martin noted that there has been discussion about the need for better infrastructure and storage facilities to make it easier for farmers bringing food from far away to participate.

Jim Johnson noted that almost 100% of farms participating in farmers' markets are engaged in other channels. 98% of farms in Oregon are family-owned, and there are not many industrial farms. However, 42% of the total acreage in Oregon is managed by 6% of the farms. He noted that the footprint of Oregon agriculture is large but the data is skewed by small family farms.

Sue Marshall was pleased to see that community gardens were included in the study. There are 1,000 people in Portland on waiting lists for community gardens. She noted it is good to know there are green spaces to support the food system, and they provide additional benefits to recreation and health.

Greg Manning observed it was stated that 2-3% of produce is grown locally. He asked if there were numbers showing how much of the food dollars spent in the Metro region is produced here.

Sheila Martin responded that they have not been able to find that out and does not know of any source for information to show how much food that is produced locally is consumed locally.

Jeff Stone noted that some of the information is market-based, as with the farm-to-schools program. The point is valid and one to which the agricultural community hopes to get an answer.

Weston Miller pointed out the need for more research in the valley to get a picture of the whole impact to agriculture in the Metro region.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked for clarification as to where the information about 2-3% of produce being grown locally comes from.

Jim Johnson responded that the 2-3% statistic comes from information from the Portland farmers' markets.

Jim Labbe noted that early on in this process, maps of natural features were prepared and he is curious to know how that work is progressing.

John Williams responded that some mapping work has been completed. Each of the Core 4 jurisdictions has that information and it can also be made available to this group, possibly in electronic format before the next meeting. [Action Item]

V. PHASE 3 SUITABILITY ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

John Williams reported on the Reserves Phase 3 suitability analysis work program on behalf of the Core 4 project management team. He said the project management team is focusing on the broad work first followed by the screening and iterative approach. Integration with the broader Making

the Greatest Place work is also being done. The initial screening focuses on identifying candidate areas to be studied in more detail. On the rural reserves side, overlay mapping is being used to identify general areas of suitability. While this would not mean an area would have to be strong in all three areas to be defined as rural reserves, it could be used to identify candidate areas. Also, staff is looking at ways to determine if an area could be subject to urbanization over the next 40 to 50 years since that is a potential tool for selection of rural reserves under the factors.

On the urban reserve side, expert panels of utility and service providers have been convened to get an idea of serviceability to different areas. That information will be brought back to the Steering Committee to inform its recommendations. The second piece in the initial screening for urban reserves is the broad-scale mapping of factors such as proximity to population and employment centers, development constraints, and slope and wetlands factors.

Results of the initial screening work will be discussed with advisory committees at upcoming meetings and then will come to the Reserves Steering Committee. Some areas might be eliminated from consideration and others might not be, however it is still early to make that decision. If some areas are eliminated, then staff can focus their work on further analysis elsewhere. There is an anticipated round of public outreach in early 2009 as that will be a good point for an update about the process and where it is at so far.

Judie Hammerstad noted that in Clackamas County, the advisory committee is composed of representatives from smaller cities. Apart from being on the Steering Committee, there is no other way for larger cities to participate in the process. She asked if each of the counties is structured in the same way.

Commissioner Schrader said there was a reason why the county came up with the composition of the committees in the way they did. The Core 4 felt secure that larger cities would be active in the region and at the Steering Committee. She noted that the Core 4 tried to balance the weight of the larger cities with opportunities available and had no intention of excluding anyone from conversations. She asked if that is a concern, that it be discussed. All information being disseminated at the regional table is extremely transparent.

Judie Hammerstad is concerned how the Core 4 will be making decisions. Each PAC will feed into the Boards' decisions, so larger cities have to make another attempt to get their information into that decision. She feels the cities should have a say in the whole process because they will be the urban service providers.

Commissioner Schrader noted that Judie mentioned the C4, which includes all the municipalities in Clackamas County coming together. The Core 4 is attempting through that structure to make sure each city has significant input.

Greg Specht said he is looking forward to the work product that will show what the candidate areas are. He asked if there is a way to distribute that information electronically before the December 10 meeting.

John Williams answered that he will take that request back to the project management team and see if that can be done. He noted that staff will notify the Steering Committee in advance about what can be done by when. [Action Item]

David Morman appreciated the food system presentations. He noted that the forestry sector provided a mapping overview presentation in May. He would be happy to make that information available again electronically or through an additional presentation. He believes it is unclear right now how to make sure the technical information provided by the forestry sector is correctly interpreted, and is also hoping for clarification of the role of the state agencies in this process.

Lidwien Rahman said she is on the technical panel for transportation. When the panel last met, it focused on scenarios to build transportation infrastructure and specifically, a road network. She pointed out that there was no assessment done on the current system and its ability to accommodate existing as well as future traffic. She feels it is important that this is considered as part of Phase 3. She is also concerned that TriMet was not represented at the meeting.

John Williams noted that TriMet was invited to the meeting but was unable to attend. Staff understands that all modes of transportation need to be included. In this phase, staff is gaining a broad understanding of issues and will get more specific as the process proceeds.

Gil Kelley drew attention to the diagram on page one of the memo. With respect to the governance characteristic, he asked when the question of the growth that has occurred in unincorporated areas of Washington County will be dealt with.

Chair Brian noted that issue is being raised. There is clearly a large unincorporated population. Once population and employment goals are identified, the answer may be more clearly defined. There are some areas that cities would like to have in their jurisdictions and others they are not interested in. Governance decisions are going to be identified over the next 12 months.

Gil Kelley said he does not see this as a screening issue.

Chair Brian agreed he does not think it is possible to do a clear early screening on that issue.

Sue Marshall commented that certain cities are moving forward with designations independent of this process. She asked how the early designation of reserves around the city of Hillsboro fits in to this process.

John Williams answered that different cities around the region are in different phases of their planning for the future. The Core 4 is working with all cities to coordinate a consistent view of the future. While some cities are out ahead a little, it does not mean they are separate from this process.

Councilor Harrington noted that the reserves around the city of Hillsboro are not a formal designation but rather an expression of their area of interest.

Chair Brian said that both the counties and Metro have been talking with cities to know what their interests are and some have moved more quickly through that process. Hillsboro has identified areas they would like discussed as possible reserves areas.

Greg Manning asked that when the first pass at candidate reserves areas is released if a suitability analysis that led to those decisions will be released as well.

John Williams confirmed that staff will be able to explain all recommendations made about the suitability of reserve areas.

Greg Manning noted that there will be discussion from the business coalition about how to digest and inform the peer review of that information.

John Williams said that the initial mapping work that was done will have to be refined in order to make findings down the road. There will need to be an understanding of how sections of land will respond to each of the factors, and staff will conduct a more detailed analysis to inform policy decisions that need to be made. On the urban reserves side, there are a couple of things to do when candidate areas are identified, such as constraint mapping. The screening metaphor will be important in this phase. At this phase it is not possible to get to a very specific level of detail. Also, it is not enough to understand detailed analysis of suitability, but they also need to understand where the region is headed and how much capacity needs to be included. In early 2009 we hope to have some initial understanding from local governments about what their aspirations are, as well as some initial population and employment numbers. That is a critical piece of the puzzle for making reserves decisions.

Deb Nudelman noted that due to time constraints, the Core 4 will not provide updates on their county processes.

VI. REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Malu Wilkinson provided a summary of the results from the Regional Infrastructure analysis that began a year ago. The executive summary of the report is provided in the meeting packet. She noted that infrastructure is key to supporting future growth. In order to meet growth needs and support the current population, the analysis looked at not only pipes, pavement and wires, but also parks, plazas, parking structures, schools, and civic buildings. Results showed that residents have an expectation that basic infrastructure will be provided. Infrastructure is facing funding challenges as both federal and state spending on infrastructure is declining and local funding is restricted. The Infrastructure Advisory Committee found that the state needs about \$10 billion in upgrades to accommodate the growing population, and about half of that gap is not currently funded. Transportation takes the largest portion of infrastructure investment, and a large amount of money is devoted to maintenance.

Water and sewer issues are causing additional challenges. The region will need more water and standards governing how water is treated and returned to the system are becoming more stringent. Different infrastructure for retaining water year round is also needed. About 150 new school facilities will be needed by 2055. Additional parks, open spaces, and civic buildings help make the area a good place to live, although bonds have been difficult to get passed. The study also concludes that the region will need two to three new 400 MW power plants, which will also bring the challenge of how to site transmission lines.

Another piece studied in the analysis was how the public can best invest in infrastructure. Experts agree that compact growth reduces infrastructure costs. The analysis looked at 17 case studies, five of which were in urban redevelopment locations. In order to standardize costs, the analysis looked at Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU). Metro has also recently received feedback from the business community, as well as other groups, about how to improve this work. Because of the wide variation

between projects, it is difficult to make comparisons between sites. In North Main Village, the cost of needed infrastructure was about \$8,000 per EDU, while the SW Tualatin concept plan would cost an estimated \$180,000 per EDU. The biggest issue right now is infrastructure funding. Regional costs for roads, bridges, and transit account for the largest portion of the cost, however no one is directly paying for the regional system even though everyone is benefiting from it. The focus of Metro's infrastructure work is to encourage efficiency and better manage the demand for infrastructure.

Greg Manning thanked Malu for referring to the peer review completed with Group Mackenzie that did call out some of the generalization between infill and the limited number of case studies that were being reviewed. Greg looks forward to working with Metro in expanding the report.

Chris Barhyte asked if the analysis considered the impact of infilling on surrounding areas.

Todd Chase responded that if the improvement was adjacent to a site, then the financial impact was picked up in the cost. If it was not adjacent, then it was not included in this analysis. He agreed that is a glaring omission in this study.

Chair Brian noted that on the development side, if the infrastructure is available in an area to accommodate an additional "X" number of people, then the costs for infrastructure are cheaper. However, if a threshold is crossed at which point the infrastructure has to be replaced, then the calculations will be different. The group should not ignore what happens when an additional school, park, or fire stations needs to be sited in an area that is being suburbanized. He noted that growth costs money. He asked if there is a way to create an optimum density cluster as a way to drive the desired policies. He noted the committee needs to make sure that there are industrial lands to meet where people live and adequate employment land where there are new residences.

Councilor Harrington noted the analysis is limited by the number of case studies. She suggested that as there is a refinement in this process, additional requests for different kinds of data will reveal the other areas where people want information but the data is not available.

Malu Wilkinson confirmed that the analysis was limited based on available data and in discussing the report, it needs to be clear what the limitations of the analysis are. She responded to Chair Brian's question that the analysis does not assume that everyone commutes to center. She noted that they will need to be clearer about the assumptions.

Deb Nudelman noted that the PowerPoint slides and memo will be available on the Metro website. She will work with Core 4 staff to determine if this topic needs to be revisited at the December 10 meeting. [Action Item]

VII. SUMMARY

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 12:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.



ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR NOVEMBER 12, 2008

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1.	Memo	11/10/08	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Gil Kelley RE: Timeline for Reserves Committee Recommendation	111208rsc-01
2.	Letter	Undated	“Don’t Go Down a Slippery Slope! Natural Hazards” Submitted by Christine Kosinski	111208rsc-02
4.	PowerPoint slides	11/12/08	Planting Prosperity and Harvesting Health: Trade-offs and Sustainability in our Regional Food System	111208rsc-03
6.	Memo	10/30/08	To: Malu Wilkinson From: Todd Chase RE: Potential Infrastructure Cost Criteria and Draft Rating System Approach	111208rsc-04