

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

February 11, 2009; 9:00 am – 12:00 noon
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Core 4 Members Present: Washington County Chair Tom Brian, Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington, Clackamas County Commissioner Charlotte Lehan.

Reserves Steering Committee Members Present: Chris Barhyte, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Denny Doyle, Bill Ferber, Kathy Figley, Karen Goddin, Jack Hoffman, Mike Houck, Keith Johnson, Tim Knapp, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone, Richard Whitman, Jerry Willey.

Alternates Present: Susan Barnes, Drake Butsch, Bob Clay, Doug Decker, Jim Johnson, Richard Kidd, Bob LeFeber, Ron Papsdorf, John Pinkstaff.

Also Present: Charlie Adams, Chuck Beasley, Dick Benner, Jim Bernard, Bob Bobosky, David Bragdon, Susana Brennan, Carol Chesarek, Carlotta Collette, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Laura Dawson-Bodner, Maggie Dickerson, Jim Emerson, Meg Fernekees, Larry Harvey, Jon Holan, Tony Holt, Carl Hosticka, Tom Hughes, Adelle Jenike, Ted Kyle, Jane Leo, Art Lutz, Eric Martin, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Martha Nix, Tim O'Brien, Rod Park, Ellen Rogalin, Gordon Root, Kelly Ross, Doug Rux, Joseph Schaefer, Marcia Sinclair, Steven Sparks, Thane Tienson, Veronica Valenzuela, Ray Valone, Tom VanderZanden, David Wall, Matt Wellner, John Williams, Terri Wilson.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

Deb provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials. She then asked for comments or amendments to the January meeting summary. There being none, the summary was adopted as final. Deb then asked for updates since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Richard Whitman reported that although the eight state agencies involved in the Reserves process have many competing interests, they are committed to cooperating in a coordinated and streamlined manner to represent the state. The state agencies have been meeting and will continue to meet to make sure they are cooperating to work out their divergent interests. Because much of the work is being done at the county level, the state agencies suggest that a couple of meetings between the state agencies and the counties be built into the process. This would provide an opportunity for each of the state agencies to find out what technical work is being done at the county level and to have an opportunity to react to that information, discuss it, and provide input. This suggestion is made in the spirit of working out a constructive and cooperative way of engaging in this process.

Deb Nudelman asked Richard Whitman to explain further why the meetings with the counties and the state agencies meeting together will be helpful to the process.

Richard Whitman explained that the state agencies have some technical information that might be useful in determining candidate rural and urban reserve areas. The state agencies need to do a better job of finding out how counties are using that information and how the state's information might help. The state agencies are meeting as a group to ensure they are as coordinated and efficient as possible.

Deb Nudelman said that it will be noted in the meeting summary that the state agencies request meetings with the counties. [Action Item]

Councilor Harrington said that at the January meeting, the Core 4 reviewed the Phase 3 Work Plan and asked each of the Steering Committee members to discuss the timeline with their groups and be prepared to report to the Steering Committee whether or not the timeline felt feasible.

Deb Nudelman responded that this would be discussed later on the agenda.

John Pinkstaff asked to bring the Steering Committee's attention to two items that have been submitted to reserves county chairs by business and real estate interests. The first is a letter dated February 4 that recommends the counties include those lands listed as "unconstrained" as outlined in the Group Mackenzie mapping series in the urban reserve candidate areas. The second item is a letter, already posted to the Reserves website, from Group Mackenzie, which provides more information and a review of the Metro Infrastructure Study.

Mike Houck thinks it makes sense for the state agencies caucus to meet offline with the counties. He asked if there will be a formal response from the state at some point.

Richard Whitman responded that it is the intent of the state agencies to reach agreement on a unified state position. There will be an opportunity to hear the state's thoughts at the Steering Committee; however that will not preclude individual agencies from voicing their opinion.

Mike Houck noted that his primary interests are natural resources, so he would hate to see those interests lost in the homogenization of responses from the state.

Deb Nudelman asked for thoughts from Steering Committee members about whether the timeline provides sufficient time to conduct constituent outreach. She explained the Core 4 is asking this question because there is a lot of work to be completed and some suggestions have been made to extend some of the meetings or add additional meetings. This is a check in to see if Steering Committee members feel they are able to brief their constituents fully and bring feedback to the group within the current timeline. If there is not enough time, Deb asked for feedback about how the Core 4 and staff can better organize the process. She noted that Steering Committee members could answer yes, no, or maybe to whether they have enough time.

Jeff Stone said that communications among the agricultural community is not something that has been lacking. He noted that if the Steering Committee meetings are extended to full day, there are many Steering Committee members who might have commitments in the legislature and they will not be able to stay for the Steering Committee meeting.

Kathy Figley responded maybe.

John Pinkstaff said the timeline is okay, but there is a lot of work to do.

Mary Kyle McCurdy responded maybe. She said it is difficult to absorb all of the information presented in these very large Steering Committee meetings and to make sure she is informed enough to take the information to her constituents. She noted that receiving a lot of information and seeing big maps is not very helpful, and she suggested that a smaller meeting format at which maps are on the table would be helpful.

Mike Houck agreed with Mary Kyle.

Ron Papsdorf concurred with Mary Kyle and noted that their public involvement is working well.

Greg Specht said maybe. He agrees with Mary Kyle that there is a lot of content, and he is not sure it will be very productive to hold all-day meetings.

Tim Knapp noted that as a small cities representative for Clackamas County, the problem he faces is trying to assimilate the information and get clear with what different municipalities want. He is not confident the group is on the time table at this point. If there were more time, it would be well utilized. Many of the Steering Committee members are volunteers, and he does not think meetings lasting until 4:00 pm would be productive or that people could attend. He would like staff to consider other options.

Alice Norris concurred with Tim. She said that the Steering Committee's work has changed because of new people, and the group needs to be very specific about what it needs to do.

Bob Clay reported that outreach has been working well at the city level, however, the planning commission and city council have busy schedules so getting information back and forth has been very challenging.

Chris Barhyte thinks about 99% of citizens are not aware of the Reserves process and he does not think they will be concerned until there is a map available to engage them. He believes the April to July timeframe is enough time to get out and inform the cities. The next step will just be to engage the citizens.

Richard Kidd agrees that most citizens are unaware of the process. He said that most of the handouts do not provide enough information in advance. He agreed that if there are maps with which to engage people, it might make upcoming meetings more interesting. All day meetings are good, but he noted that it would turn into a 9:00 am to 7:00 pm meeting for most people because of the MPAC meetings.

Craig Brown said he is not sure how productive it would be to lengthen meetings. He thinks the substance of this process so far has been fairly slow. The review of the maps will take some time as well and he thinks completing that in a couple months will be difficult.

Jack Hoffman is concerned that the southern jurisdictions are not on board. He noted that many people are new to this process and his elected officials are not on board. Jack said he is concerned about the timing and thinks there is too much information to cover in three meetings. He agrees

that a lot of information is distributed at the Steering Committee meetings that he does not have time to read before the discussion. The group is too large. He sees a need to have more discussions and to start engaging. He is concerned 9:00 am to 4:00 pm meetings will not work. It will be most important to make sure the southern jurisdictions, such as West Linn, Milwaukie, and Estacada, are comfortable with the decisions being made.

Councilor Harrington responded that the parallel track of the Neighboring Cities program might help bring new members up to speed on other work being conducted.

Jerry Willey is concerned with extending the time constraints. He would like the Steering Committee to be committed to the timeline and get through this process. He noted that the more time we have, the more time there will be to debate.

Denny Doyle said he remains cautiously optimistic about meeting the deadlines and thinks there will be enough time to involve the citizens. He agreed that the longer the committee procrastinates, the longer the debate will last.

Jeff Boechler reported that the Department of Fish and Wildlife has not conducted outreach yet because the products have not been sufficient to take out to people. He noted that their constituents are sitting at the table and are represented by Mike Houck and Mary Kyle McCurdy.

Councilor Harrington noted that at the beginning of the process, the Core 4 tried to organize a committee to represent all interests. Once there is product at the end of the process, it will be very important that the state agencies are on board with to make a successful product. The state agencies have a very important job through work at the state level and through incentives programs to help make this process successful.

Doug Decker said the challenge is to provide a sufficient quality of data and advice to each of the three county levels.

Bill Ferber agreed.

Keith Johnson responded that he did not have much to add to what had already been stated.

Jim Johnson reported that he has been connecting okay with the county staff. He asked what the process is going to be at the county level to decide who will make the recommendations. He asked when the Steering Committee members will have a chance to tell the county boards their thoughts about the recommendations being made.

Karen Goddin reiterated the concern about getting information far enough in advance to review it. She is worried about the compression of time as we move forward and said she wants to make sure the committee gets it right and not just gets it done.

Lainie Smith said she agreed with what Richard Whitman mentioned about the state agencies' outreach to counties. Her concern is whether that can be done within the timeframe outlined here. She said she is not sure about whether we can do that. She agrees that it would be good to get materials before the meeting.

Richard Whitman recognized that the process is challenging. He thinks the Metro and county staff is doing a great job, and he appreciated the briefing that staff provided to his constituents.

Sue Marshall said she finds the timing challenging in this process. She provided a letter at the last meeting to show who is benefitting from this process, and she noted that this is complex information to get out to a population that is not historically engaged. Sue noted she would like some help in doing targeted outreach. Sue said that she does not think she would be able to attend all day meetings.

Mike Houck said he is not sure if he heard Jeff Boechler's comments correctly. He wants to disabuse the notion that just because he, Jim Labbe, and Mary Kyle McCurdy are at the table that natural resources interests are represented completely. He appreciates the fact that all the state agencies are at the table. They are very valuable and it broadens the perspective and the input. Mike noted that some of the maps in the handouts are difficult to read and suggested that different colors could be chosen.

Chair Brian observed that more and more people are attending the Steering Committee meetings. He said that there never seems to be enough time to conduct public outreach, and that even with advertised town hall meetings all the citizens will not be reached. He agrees that 99% of people probably do not know what the Steering Committee is working on. The timeline is tight, but he thinks the committee needs to stay on time through reasonable and rigorous effort. It is difficult to say if all-day meetings would be productive, but it might be worthwhile if they are broken up through different activities.

Commissioner Lehan agreed that this is an ambitious schedule. Perhaps the goals are not attainable, but it is too important to rush to decisions for the sake of a deadline. The complexity of this is on different levels and there is also an issue of getting to those layers that have been stumbled through internally as a county. She thinks Clackamas County is on track in getting the commissioners in the loop on the timeline. She said it is important to make sure the process proceeds in an organized manner and everyone gets the right information in the right order.

Councilor Harrington noted that the process and timeline are challenging, but that the group remains committed. She said she empathizes with the struggles Steering Committee members are facing, but everyone is faced with challenges. She noted that the Metro Council is mindful of two important commitments. The first is that Metro got a one-time, two year extension to complete the urban growth report by the end of 2009, and is trying to have reserves established before the next round of decisions for expanding the UGB. The second commitment is to the Steering Committee that designations will be made in a collaborative fashion. The message she is trying to convey is that the Core 4 are struggling with the same situation, yet remain committed and are giving it their best.

Deb Nudelman noted that staff will take everyone's comments and concerns under consideration and will look at the length of meetings and providing materials in advance of the meetings. [Action Item]

II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

III. FRAMING GROWTH FORECASTS IN THE CONTEXT OF URBAN RESERVES

John Williams noted that in follow up to the discussion held at the January Steering Committee meeting about population and employment forecasts for urban reserves, he will talk about the use of growth forecasts and will provide an update on the information requests from Washington County.

John then provided an overview of the changes made to the *Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves* document, which has been updated in response to the concerns raised about the population and employment forecasts. Staff is trying to keep this document focused on reserves, but there is other information coming in. The first page, which discusses the philosophy of this process, is largely unchanged. Most of the revisions have been made to the timeline on the second page to reflect the updated timeline, provide a context for the screening work, and how this process will help frame regional policy decisions.

John reminded the Steering Committee that at the January Steering Committee meeting, several members had expressed an interest in meeting outside of the Steering Committee to discuss the population and employment forecasts. John reported that the group met and discussed some of these topics already. There is a challenge with the timeline and how to coordinate both the 20-year and 50-year timelines. There is also a desire for more detailed information about these other programs and how they connect with the Reserves process. The intention is to keep incorporating information from those tracks.

Lainie Smith noted that numbers five and six of the timeline discuss the region's capacity for accommodating future growth. She asked if that refers to growth based on existing assumptions.

John Williams confirmed that the Urban Growth Report analyses current capacity under existing policies, but also discusses trends and policy choices that could impact future growth patterns.

John Pinkstaff asked what the opportunity will be for review of the assumptions used in the forecast if the 40-50 year forecast is finalized in March.

John Williams responded that the forecast is a component of the Urban Growth Report, but it is not the final Urban Growth Report. The 20-year forecast will be available in March for public and technical review. The 40-50 year forecast will reflect comments received since the first draft was provided in May 2008. Staff will address the comments received on that draft and intend this release to be used as final due to the timeline of upcoming decisions. John also noted that the population and employment forecasts are providing ranges, not points.

He noted that many people have asked for more information on MetroScope scenarios. He explained that MetroScope is a tool based on economic data that relies on the specific inputs and assumptions that are put into it. Staff has received a number of questions about what assumptions were made in the first round of scenarios released in October 2008, how those assumptions affected the outcomes, and what future MetroScope scenarios will be. There was also a request for MetroScope to run some models that use alternative land supplies to understand what the impact would be, since the scenarios run in the fall were based on current state law.

The Core 4 and staff have convened a working group, which includes the City of Portland, Metro, and each of the counties, to act as a review panel of MetroScope inputs. This will result in a

technical memo to explain what inputs were chosen and why those inputs were chosen. This technical group is also working to ground truth the base set of assumptions to most closely represent what is on the ground.

John reported that the Reserves Project Management Team (PMT) has begun discussing the request to analyze alternative land supply geographies. This work would be conducted on a conceptual level, but it could be a valuable part of the decisions about candidate areas. John also noted that the MetroScope model is only one tool being used in this process, and it is important to think about MetroScope and other models in the context that they are going to be used.

Craig Brown noted that no model is better than the assumptions that go into it. He recognizes it is a complex model, but he asked if the Steering Committee can find out what those specific assumptions are.

John Williams responded that the technical group is working on a technical memo to explain the assumptions and the inputs in that model. This will be available in March as an appendix to the preliminary Urban Growth Report.

Sue Marshall asked who is on the technical workgroup.

John Williams explained it is staff from Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties, Metro, and the City of Portland.

Sue Marshall asked how the technical workgroup is different from the PMT.

John Williams answered that the PMT does not include the City of Portland, and that it is also reaching out to other cities. He noted that the preliminary work is just a start. It frames the growth, but it is not an answer. There is a draft Urban Growth Report that comes out in the fall of 2009 that can reflect changes agreed to by the region. March will be good opportunity to understand what the inputs to the model are.

Craig Brown questioned putting the preliminary forecasts into the model, and asked what the scope of the assumptions that go into the model will be.

Councilor Harrington noted that the Making the Greatest Place project is a very complex, iterative, and collaborative process. There are a lot of major moving parts that are interconnected. The process of having the first ever preliminary Urban Growth Report in the spring will work as one of the tools to frame up. The tools John has talked about are the starting points for looking at these different policy decisions, to help move through the process of refining choices.

Jerry Willey observed that item five on the document reflects growth and local aspirations. He asked how Core 4 staff is getting the information about local aspirations from cities in Washington County.

John Williams responded that this is probably not the best forum for discussing the Urban Growth Report. The counties are working on aspirations and will be reporting back to staff to incorporate aspirations into the process.

Jerry Willey said if cities have already determined their aspirations, they should be encouraged to get that information to staff immediately. Jerry noted that the preliminary Urban Growth Report is seeking input from local partners, and he asked who those partners are and how that information will be communicated.

Councilor Harrington responded that Metro staff is involved with each of the counties. Metro has made presentations to each of the city councils in the discussion of the Making the Greatest Place process. Aspirations have also been discussed at MPAC. Metro is trying to be respectful of where each city is based on the changing composition of city councils. Metro is using an extensive process to gather information to work with staff and communities to understand what they are hoping to achieve. This is an iterative process.

Jerry Willey said that this group has the responsibility to make sure this report is accurate. He encourages everyone to make sure they get the aspirations information that is needed from the cities.

John Pinkstaff asked how the information produced by MetroScope will be presented; if there will be a baseline with alternative scenarios based on particular assumptions, or will the final version be a composite based on all the assumptions. He thinks it would be helpful to have a list of multiple options.

John Williams noted that the population forecast is a MetroScope input. He noted that this is a question that cannot be answered quickly, so he requested the topic be discussed offline. John Pinkstaff agreed. [Action Item]

Jeff Stone said that when you look at the Urban Growth Report, agricultural land and jobs are not counted within the UGB.

Deb Nudelman said that a lot of heavy lifting has been done by staff since the January meeting to address the concerns raised during that meeting. She hopes this update creates a check mark for people so the timeline is not only understood, but is acceptable enough as the process moves forward.

IV. PHASE 3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Mike Dahlstrom provided an update on the Phase 3 Public Involvement process. He said there is recognition that the public involvement process needs to gain some traction. As soon as lines are placed on a map, it inspires involvement. The public involvement team's mission is to get this information out to the public. They have held regional open houses and have shifted the time schedule to coordinate all three jurisdictions. There will be an additional round of open houses in April. Mike encouraged involvement from Steering Committee members and noted that the public involvement team is happy to help support local jurisdictions in conducting their own outreach. Metro is also helping to develop a web-based mapping tool, and there will be another online survey.

Mike reported that a reserves logo will be distributed soon, and he asked everyone to incorporate it into their outreach approach. Now that there are lines on a map, the public involvement team is hoping for much greater public participation than in March 2008 and are looking forward to what outreach will look like at the end of the summer. Mike encouraged everyone to talk to neighbors and friends to give people an idea of what we are doing and to provide feedback.

Deb Nudelman encouraged Steering Committee members to talk to the public involvement team about any questions or concerns they have about the public involvement process.

V. URBAN AND RURAL RESERVE INITIAL SCREENING RESULTS

John Williams addressed the concern raised about getting meeting materials in advance of the meetings. In this case, he said staff is getting the information to the Steering Committee today and staff asks that Steering Committee members review the materials and be prepared to discuss them by the March meeting.

John then presented an overview of the urban reserves initial screening process. This is outlined in the memo to Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee from Core 4 Project Technical Team regarding *Urban Reserves Initial Screening*. He noted that the screening of the factors becomes more iterative as the process progresses. In the initial screening for urban reserves, two factors are being studied in detail. The remaining six factors will play a bigger role later on in the process. The work has been guided by the technical team which is acting in a coordinated way. The technical team has convened groups of technical providers from around the region, focusing on sewer, water, and transportation. Through these discussions, the technical team has developed preliminary suitability land analysis maps. John asked the Steering Committee members to keep in mind that the maps are preliminary and their purpose is to provide Steering Committee members with something to think about in the future.

Mike Houck asked for clarification on why only two factors are being studied at this time.

John Williams responded that the factors seemed to break down in two different ways. The remaining six factors talk about design and will be more important later in the process when we start evaluating how those areas might look.

Tim O'Brien presented an overview of the memo regarding *Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Water Service Within Reserves Study Area*. The technical team worked with the Regional Water Providers Consortium on a geographic basis. In the initial meetings, they focused on four criteria: proximity to current service providers, topography, use of existing resources, and the source. The memo outlines the iterative process they went through to create a map showing high, medium, and low suitability areas for providing water services.

Sue Marshall noted that in reviewing the map provided with the memo, it appears that Washington County has a lot of water. She does not know that to be the case and asked what assumptions went into that. If there are layers and layers of assumptions, she hopes the committee members can understand them before they get too buried in the layers.

Tim O'Brien responded that was taken into consideration when talking to water providers. Currently, there is additional capacity at some treatment plants, and a lot of planned transmission.

Deb Nudelman noted that some of the questions can be answered on page three of the memo.

Mike Houck thinks the location of natural resources is fundamental to where urban reserve areas should be. Natural resources are constraints to feasibility. The analysis of suitability should be done

on the basis that they should first avoid wetlands of floodplains, then minimize impacts, and then mitigate impacts. Cost should not be the only factor.

Jeff Boechler asked for confirmation that the initial screen was not constrained by existing water rights. Upon receiving an affirmative answer, he clarified that this exercise was completed to determine if the region can expand, not to say whether there is water available. That will be discussed in later screens. Tim O'Brien said yes.

Jack Hoffman said he would like to see who is volunteering to provide water and who will pay for pipes. He said he is also concerned about the sixth assumption that water supply is not an issue. He has heard differently for the Clackamas River and thinks this issue needs to be addressed.

Tim O'Brien responded that they are talking to different providers. The providers may have capacity, but they do not necessarily have customers.

Richard Kidd said he assumes this is the first cut on this and that additional iteration will be made.

Keith Johnson asked if it would be possible on future versions of the map to identify the source, such as groundwater or surface water.

Councilor Harrington said that she is seeing the memo for the first time as well. She noted that there is an outline in each packet to show who has been actively participating in the technical work.

Maggie Dickerson presented an overview of the memo regarding *Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Sanitary Service Within Reserves Study Area*. She noted that the technical team pulled together an expert group as outlined in the memo. The expert group completed ratings sheets and translated the map to GIS. Areas where sewer would be taken care of by outlying cities were excluded. From the review, the technical team learned that there will be some areas where it will be easier to provide sewer than others, although there are no areas where it will be cheap to provide sewer. For the most part, additional sewer infrastructure can connect up with current and existing facilities, and the simplest areas would just require investment inside their area.

Commissioner Lehan asked the state agencies to clarify the new outfall issues, and where there might be outfalls and where not.

Keith Johnson responded that he is not in the water quality program, so the answer is probably going to depend on the surface body of water that the outfall is going into. He is not sure about the restrictions for the Clackamas River and would have to speak with someone in the water quality program. [Action Item]

Richard Whitman said it would be good to have someone from DEQ on the technical group. There is a three basin rule that prohibits any additional discharge. There are also total maximum daily load pollution limits on every surface body of water in the Portland area that retains discharge to varying degrees. He said that getting focused on the natural systems to provide that supply or to absorb additional supply is important early on.

Mike Houck said the City of Portland just invested \$1.6 billion in managing sewer overflow. He asked if the analysis is looking at sewage or if storm water management is included as well.

Maggie Dickerson responded that the group had discussed storm water as an issue, but decided storm water would not have a large affect on location factors, and it was not directive of where reserves should go. The technical team will provide a memo on storm water at a later point.

Mike Houck said that he thinks it will definitely be a critical design question to look at where storm water goes.

Craig Brown asked for clarification as to why two maps were provided with the memo.

Maggie Dickerson noted that the map in the appendix was created by the expert group. The second map was created from that to show suitability levels for urban reserves. She noted that the technical team will need to provide a new map as some of the colors were displayed incorrectly.

Deb Nudelman said that new maps will be forthcoming. [Action Item]

Ray Valone presented an overview of the memo regarding *Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Transportation Services Within Reserves Study Area*. The technical team created a hypothetical transportation network to see what an area would need if it did urbanize. This was modeled after transportation plans. They also referred to the two maps developed to look at water and sewer suitability. Suitability was ranked based on cost per lane mile, cost per added lane mile, and the number of intersections per square mile. There were a few caveats to this analysis, which are outlined in the memo. Ray noted that if resources allow, the technical team might be able to model some of the final candidate areas to give information about how it links to the system.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked if the transportation analysis includes regional bike trails.

Ray Valone responded this would be included in the six urban factors related to design which will be reviewed later.

Mary Kyle McCurdy suggested that bike trails and transit be raised in priority. She noted it sounds like many of these layers of mapping are being used in other areas of mapping, and she said that raises concerns. She thinks having additional workshops for Steering Committee members to have this explained and to discuss the issues would be helpful. These are preliminary maps and she pondered when Steering Committee members would be able to provide input.

Mike Houck said that transit and bike paths are as fundamental as natural resources.

Lainie Smith said she would like to see modeling of the final candidate areas to see how it would affect what already exists within the UGB.

Ray Valone responded that it is the technical team's intent to provide modeling.

Councilor Harrington recognized that the staff from the various jurisdictions has put in a herculean effort to get this going and she thanked everyone for that effort.

Deb Nudelman said this reporting was an attempt to make sure the process is transparent and to share the level and intensity of the work. She hopes the group will be able to do more of this. She noted that all meeting materials are posted on the Reserves Steering Committee website.

Brent Curtis provided an update on the rural reserve initial screening work, and presented a Powerpoint with updates from Washington County. He noted that there will still be many more screens and iterations to go through to refine the candidate rural reserve areas. At this point, Washington County has not eliminated any areas within the study area and outside the UGB for studying as rural reserves. He explained the three maps they used to create the candidate reserves area map. One map uses GIS tools to emulate the factors in the administrative rule, one incorporates city aspirations, and one looks at the constrained and unconstrained lands as outlined in the map provided by NAIOP. At the Washington County Coordinating Committee meeting on March 2, they will try to reconcile these three maps. Brent noted that Washington County is looking forward to hearing input from the state agencies on this as well.

Jim Johnson commented that the first factor for rural reserves is that they are under the threat of urbanization. He said to say lands such as those at the top of Chehalem Mountain are under threat of urbanization brings into question the credibility of the study.

Brent Curtis thinks the threat of urbanization is the most critical. He noted that there is still more work to do.

Jim Johnson said the state agencies think it is important to have a discussion about what factors are being used to determine the threat of urbanization.

Brent Curtis agreed and looks forward to that discussion. [Action Item]

Mary Kyle McCurdy appreciates that at this point, the maps are going to be broad. She is concerned, however, that there will not be steps between this and the presentation of final candidate areas. The map of potential candidate urban reserves still includes more land than the other maps. That may be okay at this point, but the information will need to be whittled down in stages before agreeing on a recommended map.

Brent Curtis agrees and responded that the Steering Committee will be able to see the interim maps. The counties have agreed in a general manner to work together collaboratively at both local and regional levels.

Mike Houck said he is pleased to see certain headwater areas are off the table. He also looks forward to seeing the next iteration of the maps that take into account finer screens.

Doug McClain provided an update on the rural reserve initial screening work being conducted in Clackamas County. The data and process that Brent discussed is similar to what is being done in Clackamas County. The Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) is working to create an aspirations map to demonstrate what growth, if any, people want at the edges of the UGB. The PAC is meeting regularly and has accelerated their meeting schedule. They have set aside the rural reserve area map for now, but there is an expectation that there will be considerable refinement of that map. The PAC is still determining how to use the rural reserve criteria, and expects to continue this iterative process. They expect to produce a map for candidate areas on time.

Chuck Beasley said at the January Steering Committee meeting that there were some areas in Multnomah County where they had not resolved the rural reserve areas. The Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) discussed the issues and decided not to take any of the undecided lands out of consideration for rural reserves. These areas included Government Island and the East of Sandy river area. The CAC will be reviewing and refining those areas as the process moves along. At the next CAC meeting on February 24, they will be looking at the water and sewer maps, as well as the constraints map to review urban reserve areas.

Mike Houck said this gets back to the public involvement track. Two years ago, Metro hosted a group of about 300 people to review sub-regional maps. He urged staff to factor in the information collected from that group.

Jim Johnson asked what the timing is for providing input on specific areas that Steering Committee members may need to say yes or no to for candidate areas.

Deb Nudelman encouraged everyone to connect with the project management team. There will be continued discussion of the rural and urban reserve initial screening at the March 16 meeting; however she asked Steering Committee members not to wait until March to provide their input. If Steering Committee members would like to discuss a particular issue or get clarification, they should discuss that with staff right way. There is a lot to do in very little time, and she requested that people keep reviewing the information on the website and continue talking to each other and staff.

VI. SUMMARY

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Aurora Martin".

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR FEBRUARY 11, 2009

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1.	Letter	2/4/09	To: County Reserves Committee Chairs From: NAIOP, Greg Manning, Greg Specht, and Craig Brown	021109rsc-01
3.	Document	2/10/09	Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves – Updated February 10, 2009	021109rsc-02
5.	Memo	2/9/09	To: Core 4, Reserves Steering Committee From: Core 4 Technical Team RE: Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Water Service Within Reserves Study Area	021109rsc-03
5.	Memo	2/9/09	To: Core 4, Reserves Steering Committee, County Coordination Committees From: Core 4 Technical Team RE: Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Sanitary Sewer Service Within Reserves Study Area	021109rsc-04
5.	Memo	2/11/09	To: Core 4, Reserves Steering Committee From: Core 4 Technical Team RE: Preliminary Analysis of Providing Urban Level Transportation Service Within Reserves Study Area	021109rsc-05