

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY**

December 10, 2008; 9:00 am – 12:00 noon  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

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

**Reserves Steering Committee Members Present:** Bob Austin, Chris Barhyte, Shane Bemis, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Rob Drake, Bill Ferber, David Fuller, Judie Hammerstad, Mike Houck, Tom Hughes, Kirk Jarvie, Charlotte Lehan, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone, Richard Whitman

**Alternates Present:** Drake Butsch, Bob Clay, Donna Jordan, Richard Kidd, Jim Labbe, Bob LeFeber, John Pinkstaff, Lidwien Rahman.

**Also Present:** Susie Anthony, Jeff Bachrach, Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Susana Brennan, Carol Chesarek, Karol Collymore, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Chris Deffebach, Denny Egner, Jim Emerson, John Floyd, Tony Holt, Eric Hovee, Vern Johnson, Tim Knapp, Peter Livingston, Jim McCauley, Doug McClain, Martha Nix, Tim O'Brien, Mark Ottenad, Ron Papsdorf, Ken Ray, Dan Riordan, Gordon Root, Doug Rux, Steve Shane, Marcia Sinclair, Steven Sparks, Dick Springer, Ric Stephens, Ray Valone, Fred Van Domelen, Mark Walkley, Malu Wilkinson, John Williams, Terri Wilson.

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

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves. Chair Brian was unable to attend the meeting due to a back injury, and Commissioner Schrader was out of town on business.

Deb provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials. She noted that there were no requests to speak during the public comment period. Deb then asked for comments or amendments to the November meeting summary. She noted that Carol Chesarek submitted written amendments to her testimony. In addition, Ken Ray will be added as in attendance.

David Morman asked that his comments at the top of page eight be revised to reflect that the forestry sector had provided an overview presentation, not a technical one. He asked that the last sentence be amended to include “and is also hoping for clarification of the role of the state agencies in this process.”

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. There were none.

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

None.

## **III. UPDATE ON PHASE 3 SUITABILITY ANALYSIS WORK**

Doug McClain provided an update on the progress of the Phase 3 suitability analysis work being conducted in Clackamas County. He reminded Steering Committee members that Clackamas County has a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) with 21 members representing local cities, agencies, and a variety of interests groups. At the last monthly meeting, the PAC began identifying candidate rural reserves areas with the knowledge that this is an iterative process and the maps will be updated and revised regularly. This process is the first screen, and the PAC will gradually be refining its decisions. The PAC hopes to identify the candidate rural reserves at the December 16 PAC meeting. The PAC has also had a series of informational presentations related to urban reserves and will begin the process of designating candidate urban reserves at the next three meetings. The goal is to have candidate urban and rural reserves designations available in May. Clackamas County also has a technical advisory committee that is meeting and is focused on urban reserves and local aspirations.

Bob Austin noted that the counties are listening to the coordinating committees and it is important to have their input.

Judie Hammerstad said that Lake Oswego has not been privy to any of this information at a policy level. The city is hosting a discussion on December 11 from 6:00 to 9:00 pm about Stafford Triangle. Attendees will include service providers in the area.

Chuck Beasley provided an update on behalf of Multnomah County. Multnomah County has the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) with representatives from both inside and outside of the urban area. The CAC has been reviewing technical studies for information related to identifying rural reserves. They are also beginning to review urban factors and try to have an urban suitability piece to consider at each meeting. In October and November, the CAC worked to sort out what land is most appropriate for urban and rural reserves and hopes to have a map for candidate rural reserves at the next meeting. Candidate urban reserves will be chosen by February. Multnomah County also has a technical group helping with that process.

Brent Curtis reported on the progress of Washington County's Urban and Rural Reserves Coordinating Committee (RCC). This group is supported by planning directors and meets monthly. The RCC is applying the first screen to all the areas with the hope that they will be able to identify candidate areas in January and early February. For rural reserves, the RCC is refining its analysis and hope to have factors in early February. For urban reserves, the process is closely tied to the Making the Greatest Place process and determining local aspirations. Washington County has also completed some technical work and has looked at population and employment numbers on a macro level to see what implications that modeling might have for Washington County. On a micro level, the local governments have tried to determine their capacities and how much growth they can handle. Washington County is part way through that process, which will continue into January. All those pieces will contribute to identifying urban candidate reserve areas in January, which will be selected for further focus and be run through the next set of screens by February.

John Pinkstaff asked how the local discussions of candidate areas are being coordinated with Metro's regional selection of candidate areas.

Brent Curtis responded that it is not necessarily correct to say that Metro will be designating reserve areas. The work is being done at the county level and the coordinating committees will take their recommendations to the County Boards. The Boards will, in turn, bring their recommendations back to the Steering Committee and Core 4 for regional approval.

Greg Specht asked for clarification to understand the process. His understanding had been that the Steering Committee would be presented with candidate reserve areas at this meeting that would be incorporated into a regional map. He asked when this group will see candidate areas.

Brent Curtis responded that the counties are working with Metro as co-equals. The counties will be bringing the coordinating committees' recommendations to the Steering Committee, and all of the jurisdictions will have to make mutual decisions at the end of this process. The law requires that we have an agreement that identifies rural and urban reserves. For example, the Washington County Board will have to come to an agreement with the Metro Council. The Steering Committee's role is to provide suggestions and advise the Core 4 while those decisions are being made.

John Williams confirmed what Brent said. Core 4 staff is making sure the work is being coordinated. At the end, staff will be able to show how the work is being true to the factors as required by the law.

Councilor Harrington noted that Steering Committee members are hearing about the great volume of work that is being done, and some members seem to be asking if they will just see the final product or if they will see the work as it is being done and have an opportunity for their concerns and considerations to be taken into account. It is not necessarily clear how recommendations will be shared throughout this process; however it will be an iterative process. Asking when candidate areas will be identified is a fair question and it will hopefully become clearer as the agendas are queued up.

Brent Curtis noted that Core 4 and staff are working on this at many different levels. It is an iterative process. Core 4 and staff try to be responsive as we move forward and use the input we get from everywhere to refine the work and produce a better product.

John Williams referred to the upcoming meeting topics on the back of the agenda. In January and February, the hope is to bring initial candidate area results to the Steering Committee for discussion to inform final decisions that will be made by the Core 4. That regional selection process will take place at the Steering Committee level; it just needs to go through the process.

Greg Specht asked if it is reasonable to expect that the Steering Committee members will see initial results of candidate reserves designations at the January 14 meeting.

John Williams responded that the candidate areas might be presented to the Steering Committee in stages as the results are produced. Candidate rural reserves might be ready at the January 14 meeting and then candidate urban reserves will be ready after that.

Brent Curtis responded that final candidate reserves might not be ready to present, but staff will be able to provide substance and more information at the January 14 meeting.

Craig Brown noted that during the local aspirations process and in identifying the candidate reserve areas, he assumes that the cities and counties are making some assumptions for population and employment growth. He asked if staff is using the projections that were presented at the 2060 Forecast Forum on May 30 or if each city and county is using their own numbers.

Doug McClain said that Clackamas County sees the initial screening phase for identifying candidate areas in terms of suitability. The critical question of population and employment growth rates will be included in the last phase when the two candidate area maps are brought together to make the rural and urban designations. The amount of land necessary to accommodate the population and employment growth will be chosen from the candidate urban reserve areas. Other counties might have different ways of getting to that point, but the results will be the same. In January, we will see what areas are suitable, but we will not necessarily see how much land is needed.

Brent Curtis agreed that eventually we will have to get a “need” number. In Washington County, the RCC is looking at historic growth rates and modeling for Making the Greatest Place. They have started that process and are looking to find and apply the first screen for urban factors. Washington County may have additional comments on those numbers at the January 14 meeting.

Chuck Beasley responded that Multnomah County is taking into account the population and employment numbers. Multnomah County is focusing on the first screen factors for urban reserve designations such as the ability to provide services to an area. They plan on focusing first on the land suitability and will incorporate the capacity factors later.

Mary Kyle McCurdy understands that the Steering Committee will see recommendations for candidate rural reserves in January and possibly some urban reserves recommendations. A lot of the factors cross county lines, and she asked at what point the regional perspective will be brought in. She is not sure that everyone is on the same page, and she does not view the January meeting as providing final results, but instead as a first smorgasbord.

Brent Curtis said that the first principle everyone agreed to is that this process is occurring at a regional level. Core 4 and staff spend a lot of time coordinating on how to have similar approaches and timeframes to move forward in a coordinated way. A lot of the work is being done at the county levels, and it is then brought back to this coordinated body for coordinated decisions.

Mary Kyle McCurdy responded that she does not see coordination as the same thing as a regional perspective and asked again when that perspective will be incorporated to this process.

John Williams responded that there is technical work being done that assembles people from around the region to make sure they are on the same level with the factors and to provide the regional perspective. Core 4 staff members are coordinating their efforts to make sure that the factors are all used the same way. Staff is then bringing that information to the Steering Committee for feedback to make sure the Core 4 hears the regional voice in the decision-making process.

Councilor Harrington said that there is also a self-reinforcing theme. All seven Metro councilors are involved in this process. Staff makes sure that each of the Metro councilors is updated about what

happens at the Steering Committee, and each of the councilors is also involved at the regional level. Kathryn noted that this is a difficult concept that she struggles with as well, but all of the jurisdictions do have a lot of coordination. She has faith that it will become more apparent to all of us in the coming months because we will actually be doing the work and not just talking about doing it. There will also be time to make course corrections if they are needed.

Mary Kyle McCurdy responded that she is not expecting to see the work now, but she is hoping that the process is regional and not just the adding of local pieces together.

Councilor Harrington said that in the coming months it will be important for Steering Committee members all to talk to each other and not just to the Core 4. The information needs to be internalized so people can have the important discussions on which this whole process is dependent.

Mike Houck said he is interested in the integration of the information. Metro only recently put the final touches on the natural resources inventory mapping. He asked if the counties have been using that most recent information and who has been working on the integration teams.

Doug McClain noted that Clackamas County has been using the natural resources inventory mapping as it has come out. The most recent information will be presented at the December 16 PAC meeting, and will be used in identifying candidate areas.

Brent Curtis said yes. Washington County has talked about the natural resources factors from the beginning and it is equal to other factors being used.

Chuck Beasley remarked that Multnomah County is in the same place.

Deb Nudelman referred to the *Key Milestones for Designating Urban and Rural Reserves* chart. She noted that much of 2008 has been a lot of necessary talk, and that 2009 is where the rubber hits the road. In 2009, the Steering Committee will start to see the draft results and how county efforts correspond with regional Steering Committee efforts. The Core 4 needs to reach a unanimous agreement, so although this foundation work can feel boring, it is critical to the process. Deb noted that the group is in the technical work phase and urged the Steering Committee to keep asking the technical teams the hard questions so they can provide the best possible product.

#### **IV. MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE: EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC TRENDS PROJECT**

Malu Wilkinson referred Steering Committee members to the *Economic & Employment Trends Analysis for the Portland Metro Region – Final Report Outline* document. Metro is required to come up with forecasting for the next 20 and 50 years, and this work is being conducted concurrently to the reserves work. Metro has hired a consultant team to help provide a new paradigm for needs. The information presented here is to show how it might inform some of the work being conducted by the Steering Committee. The report is scheduled to be completed in March.

Eric Hovee, consultant with Ed Hovee and Company LLC, provided an overview of the report outline. The first part of the report focuses on job needs within the Portland metropolitan region and associated land needs. The second part of the report focuses on helping to frame choices for the area by bringing the forecasting process into alignment with Metro's 2040 design types and showing how changing market and policy assumptions affect job potentials and employment land

needs over different time horizons. The third part of the report is the forecast allocation. This looks at employment trends, variables affecting location decisions, demand assessments, and capacity and inventory approaches. The research is being conducted through literature reviews and focus groups that are being initiated this week.

Malu Wilkinson added that the economic and employment trends analysis will be presented to MTAC, JPACT, and the Metro council as well, and Steering Committee members will be able to provide feedback as the analysis moves forward.

David Morman asked for comment on how this analysis accommodates global sector industries, such as forestry.

Eric Hovee responded that the report does not focus on what is happening outside the UGB. What is important to the study is the manufacturing linkages of those industries, and on focus groups such as agriculture and machinery.

Chris Barhyte noted that at the January 14 and February 11 meetings, the Steering Committee will be talking about local aspirations, and a lot of cities have already been doing work. He noted that if the economic and employment trends analysis report comes out in March, then it seems like the information will be a little behind for all the work that has been done by cities and counties.

Malu Wilkinson responded that the committee working on the analysis includes local staff and is subject to periodic reviews with DLCD to try to coordinate its efforts. We are hoping the work other jurisdictions have already completed will serve as a baseline. Our task is to look at demand on a regional scale. We understand the issue and are working hand in hand with local cities and counties as the work progresses.

## **V. MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE: LOCAL ASPIRATIONS**

Chris Deffebach, Land Use Planning Manager with Metro, provided an overview of the December 8 *Local Jurisdiction Growth Aspiration Requests* memo she wrote to the Steering Committee. Metro has asked each of the area planning directors to provide information about how their community is planning to grow. This information will be used in a variety of ways that will configure to the overall Making the Greatest Place process. There are a number of questions designed to better understand the barriers to growth facing communities, their aspirations, and how this affects policy and investment choices. Metro has asked that this information be submitted by the end of January 2009. This information will be summarized to help draw relationships between how the region hopes and plans to grow with how to prioritize investments.

This is an iterative process and each community is at a different point in their planning process. It will be good to have a new foundation and better understanding of where communities are hoping to grow, and will provide an alternative to some of the Metro modeling so we can hear from you and understand where communities are investing. This is the first step in a process that will evolve over time.

Sue Marshall noted the inconsistencies with what the different jurisdictions are doing. She asked how citizens are being engaged in determining what the local aspirations are. In addition, she noted that Metro has adopted certain characteristics of Making the Greatest Place that deal with equity,

and she asked if that information will be shared with local jurisdictions to understand how people with the fewest resources will be impacted. The striving for equity needs to be folded into this process in some way so citizens understand what is being discussed.

Chris Deffebach responded that each city actively engages its citizens as it develops its plans. Metro expects that all the information received will have been reviewed and discussed by the communities, however the review may occur at different times because communities are in different places in the process. The information collected from the aspiration requests is being used to show how the region is growing and if the sum of how we are growing contributes to the regional plans. This includes a consideration of equity in areas such as regional transportation growth.

## **VI. PHASE 3 PUBLIC OUTREACH/EDUCATION PROCESS**

Marcia Sinclair introduced members of the reserves public involvement team, which includes Mike Dahlstrom from Washington County, Susana Brennan from Multnomah County, and Ellen Rogalin from Clackamas County. In March, they presented a coordinated public involvement plan for Phase 2. The Phase 3 public involvement plan will focus on the suitability of land for urban and rural reserve designations in the context of the amount of growth that can be included inside the UGB. The *Reserves Phase 3 Public Involvement Process Update* memo provided in the meeting packet outlines outreach activities and tools to be used, such as interactive websites. The public involvement team is small and has a limited budget, so they are placing a priority on things to support the reserves process. The public involvement team expects to explore the implications of each designation and share aspirations. The Phase 3 public outreach will begin in January, with a lot of work to be scheduled in February and March.

Sue Marshall noted that information about economic and employment trends seems to be the basis for much of this process and asked if the public involvement team will include that information as well.

Marcia Sinclair said yes. The problem is that in some of the public outreach meetings, it is often the first time citizens have come to a meeting so the amount of information can be overwhelming. That is one of the reasons to have an interactive website so people can have more information going forward.

## **VII. LOOKING FORWARD TO 2009**

Deb Nudelman noted that there will be some changes to the composition of the Steering Committee due to the recent election. There will be at least five open positions as mayors Rob Drake, Tom Hughes, Judie Hammerstad, Charlotte Lehan, and Bob Austin will all be leaving office. The Core 4 sent a letter to each of these people requesting that they propose a new member to replace them on the Steering Committee.

Charlotte Lehan observed that many alternates are impacted by the elections as well, so there is more change on the Steering Committee than the five people that were mentioned.

Deb Nudelman agreed that this was an important reminder. The key message is that efforts are being made to fill those seats. At a minimum, the Core 4 hopes that the people leaving the Steering

Committee will help brief the incoming members. In addition, the Core 4 is hoping to hold a workshop to help the new members catch up as soon as possible.

Deb referred to the upcoming meeting topics on the back of the agenda. Staff is working to forecast what substantive topics will be coming in front of the Steering Committee and requests some patience on how topics get rolled out.

Deb then asked if any of the departing members would like to make closing remarks.

Judie Hammerstad said that it has been a pleasure representing Lake Oswego. She had hoped that the Steering Committee would have moved forward more quickly; however she knows that Lake Oswego will be well represented. Judie looks forward to seeing some wise decisions come out of this process as those decisions are going to set the stage for the region for the next 40 years. She is sorry she will not be a part of that.

Bob Austin echoed what Judie said. He cannot think of another region in the country that is going through this same process of looking at potential future scenarios instead of just reacting. He thinks everyone should take a lot of credit for that.

Charlotte Lehan noted that there is a lot of turnover of mayors in Clackamas County, so there is uncertainty about who might fill her position. The Clackamas County commission is also in flux. Charlotte noted that she would hope to be able to continue with this process, and Clackamas County will definitely be continuing to participate.

Tom Hughes said that he is not quite ready to say goodbye because he is contemplating alternative futures that might have him back. He has enjoyed the work, dealing with regional issues. He thinks it is remarkable to gather such an august body around the table to talk about these issues. He believes that this process will create a better product than if this group were not convened, and he urged Steering Committee members to remember that as we move forward.

Alice Norris thanked all the departing members for their hard work and the group also applauded their efforts.

Deb Nudelman noted that Rob Drake had to leave early but before leaving, gave his thanks and appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Steering Committee.

Councilor Harrington appreciates the time and effort everyone has put into this process. The Reserves process is a generation shaping event for the region. Everyone involved in this process has made a decision to approach urban growth in a new way to have more certainty and collaboration in land use planning. This regional Steering Committee is part of that experiment, and we have a lot of work ahead of us. There is nothing certain yet with these decision-making tools. The scenarios work is another technique that is new to this process. Kathryn thanked everyone for their open minds and noted that she is pleased to see that many people have graduated from peer advocacy to participating in the collaborative process. She said it is a pleasure to work with everyone and she looks forward to 2009.

Commissioner Cogen thanked the five mayors and everyone for sitting through long meetings and helping the Core 4 work through this process. We have created the foundation for this process.




The next step will be moving from recommendations to decisions, from the “easy stuff” to the “hard stuff.” The objective of this group is to provide input. Some members have been prolific with providing input and some have not been as much. He hopes that in the upcoming year, everyone around the table will start providing more input. These are going to be very difficult decisions and the Core 4 will need input from everyone.

#### VIII. SUMMARY

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman wished everyone a happy holiday season, said she looks forward to seeing them in 2009, and adjourned the meeting at 11:17 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.



#### ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR DECEMBER 10, 2008

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
4.	Outline	12/09/08	Economic & Employment Trends Analysis for the Portland Metro Region – Final Report Outline (Discussion Draft)	121008rsc-01
6.	Memo	12/08/08	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Chris Deffebach RE: Local Jurisdiction Growth Aspiration Requests	121008rsc-02
2.	Memo	10/22/08	From: Matthew Butts of Group Mackenzie RE: Review of Materials and Findings	121008rsc-03