

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

March 16, 2009; 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 Charlotte Lehan.

Reserves Steering Committee Members Present: Chris Barhyte, Shane Bemis, Jeff Boechler, Craig Brown, Greg Manning, Mary Kyle McCurdy, David Morman, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Richard Whitman, Jerry Willey.

Alternates Present: Susan Barnes, Bob Clay, Teri Cummings, Chad Freeman, Jim Johnson, Jim Kight, Jim Labbe, Bob LeFeber, Mary Olson, John Pinkstaff, Marc San Soucie, Dick Strathern, Tara Sulzen, Melody Thompson, Sabrina White-Scarver.

Also Present: Charlie Adams, Chuck Beasley, Janet Bebb, Dick Benner, Susana Brennan, Wink Brooks, William Buckley, Carol Chesarek, Tom Coffee, Carlotta Collette, Karol Collymore, Danielle Cowan, Brent Curtis, Mike Dahlstrom, Laura Dawson-Bodner, Maggie Dickerson, Dan Drentlaw, Mike Duyck, Denny Egner, Mark Ellsworth, John Evans, Rob Fallow, Meg Fernekees, Lynn Fox, Patti Galle, Mark Griffin, Julia Hajduk, Tom Hamann, Gary Hitesman, Tony Holt, Carl Hosticka, Tom Hughes, Vern Johnson, Dana Krawczuk, Steve Law, Art Lutz, Eric Martin, Laura Masterson, Robin McArthur, Doug McClain, Eric Mortenson, Matt Newman, John O'Neil, Ron Papsdorf, Rod Park, Bob Peterkort, Midge Pierce, Ken Ray, Gordon Root, Alan Rosenfeld, Kelly Ross, Doug Rux, Joseph Schaefer, Marcia Sinclair, David Smith, Steven Sparks, Veronica Valenzuela, Ray Valone, Mark Walkley, Burton Weast, Matt Wellner, John Williams, Terri Wilson, Ty Wyman, Anita Yap.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Aurora Martin.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m., welcomed everyone, made brief introductory remarks, and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials.

Deb then asked for comments or amendments to the February meeting summary. Greg Manning asked that John Pinkstaff's comments on page 2, paragraph 5, second sentence, be clarified to read "...as outlined in the Group Mackenzie mapping series in the urban reserve candidate areas." There being no other modifications, the summary was adopted as final pending the agreed to revision. Deb then asked for updates since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Mike Dahlstrom introduced the *Urban and Rural Reserves Phase 3 Preliminary Public Meeting Schedule*. Five open houses are scheduled and there will be two or three more added. All meeting times and locations will be posted on the website as they are confirmed. The meetings will provide participants the opportunity to learn more about the process, candidate areas, and factors being used in designation, and to share their perspectives on the process. Everyone is encouraged to attend one or all of these meetings, and to distribute this schedule to their constituents.

Craig Brown reported that the Home Builders Association is preparing a report to provide the Steering Committee with information on housing trends and the factors that will affect those trends in the future. This report will be presented at the April 8 Steering Committee meeting.

Greg Manning said the Business Coalition recently heard a presentation from Eric Hovee, which was helpful to understand employment numbers and employment land use trends in the area. Greg suggested that Metro make this information available to the Steering Committee to inform the process.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Tom Hamann, Multnomah County resident, said he has lived in western Multnomah County for 35 years and believes the area should be a rural reserve. He noted that much of the area is represented on the natural features map and it is home to an elk herd and many bird species. In a recent survey, only a small percentage of residents supported the expansion of the UGB into the area, however they do want to keep the wildlife. The great communities study has shown that it would be difficult to provide transportation to the region, and that the areas available for inclusion of additional transportation are already congested. In closing, Tom urged the Core 4 to continue to look at all of western Multnomah County as a rural reserve candidate area.

Alan Rosenfeld, West Linn resident, referred to the letter from Chris Jordan, West Linn city manager, regarding *Objections to Clackamas County's determinations of Candidate Rural Reserves*. This letter outlines the reasons for Chris' conclusion that Area 'Q' in the Stafford Triangle should be classified as a candidate rural reserve area. Alan summarized a few of these reasons, including Stafford Triangle's overabundance of steep slopes, two riparian areas, and that it serves as a rural buffer with important natural landscape features. These are a few features that lead Alan to the conclusion that Stafford Triangle Area 'Q' is best as a rural candidate area.

Dana Krawczuk, Ball Janik LLP, referred to her letter regarding a *Request to Consider Designating the SW Corner of Highway 26 and Highway 212 as an Urban Reserve Candidate Area*. She noted that her clients believe this area will be critical to development in the future, and she asked everyone to consider the comments made in the letter and reconsider extending the candidate reserve area to include additional land area, as outlined in the attached map.

Midge Pierce, West Linn resident, provided comments on Area 'Q' in the Stafford Triangle. She noted that in addition to steep slopes and transportation issues, there are concerns about how to build and fund the infrastructure needed to urbanize the area. She also emphasized the importance of Area 'Q' as a buffer between the communities of West Linn, Lake Oswego and Tualatin, and that there is a need to preserve the riparian areas.

Gordon Root, Canby resident, is interested in where staff obtained the information for the preliminary urban and rural reserves service suitability maps. He said the map is incorrect that the Pete's Mountain area has limited serviceability. Not only is the area serviceable, but the Pete's Mountain Water Company already services much of this area and could expand service to the entire area. He also noted that West Linn has extended its sewer service across the river, and Pete's Mountain is a great location for senior executive housing. Gordon encouraged the Steering Committee to make judicious use of white space on the maps as neither urban nor rural reserves areas.

Gordon said that there would be a high probability that the designation of some of these areas as rural reserves would trigger Measure 49 claims.

Deb Nudelman thanked everyone for their comments and reminded everyone to submit their documents in writing to Metro if they would like them posted to the Reserves Steering Committee website.

III. RURAL AND URBAN RESERVE CANDIDATE AREAS

Deb Nudelman introduced Chuck Beasley to provide the Multnomah County approach to identifying rural and urban reserve candidate areas.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked that staff help Steering Committee members get a flavor of the county reserves meeting discussions by explaining what decisions were easy to make and what decisions were difficult to make.

Chuck Beasley provided an overview of the Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) approach in identifying candidate reserve areas. The CAC combined the map-based data from the existing agriculture, forestry, and landscape features maps. The CAC then discussed this information in break-out sessions before discussing it as a full group. The process is outlined in the March 6, 2009 Staff Report titled *Initial Assessment Methodology and Results* included in the meeting packet. The CAC recommended that all areas in Multnomah County should be considered for rural reserves, and they identified a number of areas for further study as candidate urban reserves.

The candidate rural reserves in Multnomah County are further illustrated on the *Candidate Rural Reserves in Multnomah County* map included in the meeting packet. The *Candidate Urban Reserves in Multnomah County* map illustrates areas for further consideration as urban. Areas in tan show where there was strong consensus that the areas should not be studied further for urban reserves. Chuck noted that there are still some issues about serviceability along the northwest end of the county that need to be explored.

Greg Specht asked for clarification whether the information being provided by the counties is original, or if it has been modified by Metro staff.

Chuck Beasley answered that the information from the counties has not been modified by Metro.

Chair Brian noted that the information submitted by Clean Water Services in Washington County was in draft form and it is expected that there would be a follow up meeting to refine the information. Chair Brian asked if that second, cohesive look has been done in all three counties, or if the information being reviewed is still in draft form.

Chuck Beasley responded that there was not a strong consensus for some areas at the March meeting, so the CAC will be looking at additional information for the areas they struggled to identify as urban candidates.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked how it would affect the Steering Committee's schedule to provide recommendations on candidate areas in April if the Steering Committee is still waiting on

Multnomah County for final recommendations on candidate urban and rural reserve maps. She noted that making recommendations in April does not leave time for public involvement.

Chuck Beasley responded that staff will provide more information at the April meeting to allow the Steering Committee to provide informed recommendations to the Core 4.

Deb Nudelman clarified that the Steering Committee should look at these maps as the counties' best effort recommendations. The county reserves committees will continue discussing and revising the candidate areas where they are struggling regarding recommendations, however the Core 4 is asking that Steering Committee members take today's information to their constituents for feedback.

Chuck Beasley noted that at this point in time, the colored areas on the maps are the recommendations.

Mary Kyle McCurdy observed that where the counties are struggling is where everyone will be struggling with designation. She said she would like to hear about why the counties are struggling. She noted that she will not wait to gather feedback, but that we need to respect the process and the CAC.

Deb Nudelman responded that this is a process of layering information and feedback.

Jim Labbe seconded Mary Kyle's request to know what the county committees' felt was easy and hard in identifying candidate areas. He asked for clarification that the West of Sandy River was easy to identify as a candidate urban reserve area.

Chuck Beasley confirmed that it was because the suitability of the area to provide services was clear.

Jim Labbe noted that there has been investment in the Johnson Creek Watershed and that the Johnson Creek Watershed Council will be voicing their concerns about potential designation of the Johnson Creek area as an urban reserve candidate area.

Greg Manning observed that all of the candidate urban reserve areas are overlaying candidate rural reserve areas. He asked staff if they know what type of technical data they will be looking for to make a recommendation for an area, such as Sauvie Island, to be urbanized.

Chuck Beasley said staff is still examining infrastructure data. There are some unique infrastructure requirements for Sauvie Island to support urbanization that need to be discussed further, such as building two additional bridges.

Craig Brown asked if, in determining serviceability, consideration has been given for technology. He noted some things that might be difficult to accomplish now might be easy to accomplish at a later time given advances in technology.

Chuck Beasley responded no, as there is no way to factor in that information.

Brent Curtis provided an overview of the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee (RCC) approach in identifying candidate reserve areas. Brent reminded the Steering Committee that the RCC is composed of elected officials, board members, and members of the agricultural

community. Brent said he meets several times a month with the planning committee and with the RCC once a month. He also reminded the Steering Committee that this information is going through a series of screens that become finer and finer as the process progresses. The Washington County process for identifying candidate reserve areas is outlined in the February 9, 2009 Phase 3 Interim Staff Report titled *Urban and Rural Reserves Planning in Washington County* included in the meeting packet.

At this point, Washington County has chosen to include all lands from the study area as candidate rural reserves as illustrated in the *Potential Candidate Rural Reserve Areas* map included in the meeting packet. To identify candidate urban reserve areas, Washington County took information from GIS data, city aspirations, and the Group Mackenzie development constraints map and condensed it into one map. The results of the determination for candidate urban reserve areas are shown in the *Potential Candidate Urban Reserve Areas* map.

Brent said he thinks these maps are sufficient to mark what point the RCC has reached in the process. The RCC will take into account any comments received from the Steering Committee. Brent also noted that it is impossible to explain what decisions were hard and which ones were easy as everyone has a different point of view on that.

Jim Labbe noted that he does not see a reference to how the natural features are being used in the analysis and asked if they are being considered.

Brent Curtis responded that there remains a lot of additional information, such as the natural features map, that will be important as the process moves forward. The GIS data provided just one layer and Washington County will continue to look at the natural features, agricultural, and forestry maps as they continue to refine the candidate areas.

Greg Manning noted that in leaving the entirety of the study area lands in Washington County as candidate rural reserve areas, there is obviously more area as candidate rural reserves than as candidate urban reserves. He said the test of rural reserves is that they are areas threatened by urbanization, and in light of that, he asked why the land areas are so different when by definition, they should be much more similar.

Brent Curtis responded that might be the single greatest issue. At this level of screening, Washington County could not more clearly define what subject to the threat of urbanization means, and consequently did not want to exclude any land. He assumes that as more information becomes available about what the land need will be in the next 40 to 50 years, it will be more obvious what lands will be threatened by urbanization. Without understanding the need, there is no credible way to say what lands will need to be protected as rural reserves.

Chair Brian said that the potential candidate rural and urban reserves are large areas, however Washington County felt it was premature to narrow them down without additional data, such as population and employment numbers. He further noted that information is coming into focus and there will be a lot of changes made to these maps in the next three months. Chair Brian noted that the Clean Water Services had been waiting for another meeting to refine the sewer and water suitability. He asked if that information is available for Washington County yet or if the analysis is still being conducted.

Brent Curtis responded that because Washington County compiled these maps in early February, water and sewer maps were not available to them at that time. He does not feel that anything has been lost as Clean Water Services had indicated the information was draft and that they would need to review and revise that draft. Brent noted that staff will continue to meet with Clean Water Services and conduct additional levels of analysis for sewer, water, and transportation.

After a brief break, Richard Whitman clarified a point made during public comment concerning Measure 49. Richard noted that there is a provision in Senate Bill 1011 that authorizes the reserves effort and provides that urban and rural reserve designations do not create a claim for compensation under Measure 49. As there is currently no anticipation that additional restrictions would be placed on reserve areas, there would not be Measure 49 claims after designation either. Richard also noted that reserve designations will not affect right to farm laws.

Doug McClain provided an overview of the Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) approach in identifying candidate reserve areas. Doug has explained the process for identifying candidate rural reserves in past meetings and will focus this meeting on the process for identifying candidate urban reserve areas, as outlined in the March 9, 2009 document titled *Clackamas County's Urban Reserve Candidate Areas* provided in the meeting materials. Doug noted that in answer to Chair Brian's question, the PAC is still in discussion with water and sewer providers and is still working on revisions to the suitability map.

The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners has reviewed the maps and have outlined a few guiding principles, which are listed in the Clackamas County staff report. In addition, the PAC has been working diligently to reach candidate recommendations. Doug stressed the point that we are early in the screening process. He noted that the *Rural Reserve Candidate Areas for Evaluation* map provided in the packet leaves out one area that will be included as a candidate rural reserve. That is an area that extends into the Stafford Basin, and which is zoned as exclusive farm use. To identify candidate urban reserves, the PAC created a composite map using a variety of data inputs. This *Preliminary Urban Reserves Candidate Areas & Service Suitability* map is provided in the meeting packet. Doug reminded the Steering Committee that this is an iterative process and candidate areas continue to be refined.

Doug noted that there are several issues raised that have been difficult to deal with. The most troubling of these issues for the rural side is the question of whether an area will be threatened by urbanization. As the process moves forward, choosing areas to identify as rural reserves or undesignated areas will be more difficult. The urban side contains hotspots as well, including the Stafford Basin and the area east of Damascus and Boring. Property owners have expressed concerns about serviceability of the areas, and the PAC has expressed concerns that information about transportation is difficult to ascertain and transportation costs are high. The PAC is also eager to answer the land need question, which will affect some of the decisions they need to make.

Greg Specht referred to the letter provided by him, Greg Manning, and Craig Brown to the Core 4 on February 4 asking that the lands identified by Group Mackenzie as unconstrained be considered as candidate urban reserve areas. He asked if the information provided by Group Mackenzie was considered in this analysis.

Doug McClain responded that the PAC was aware of that letter, however the PAC felt that the best place to begin looking at suitability was with the ability to provide sewer and water, not necessarily if

the land is flat or parcelized. Doug said it would be wrong to say that the information provided in the Group Mackenzie letter was not considered.

Greg Specht said it seems disingenuous that the recommendations from the business community were discarded at the very first filter. He noted that there is a new water treatment plant which will provide water south of the Willamette River. Greg said that the land south along I-5 should be considered as an urban reserve.

Teri Cummings agrees that information about population and employment forecasts is necessary to understand the amount of land that will be needed. Teri questioned why the counties did not begin by looking at areas that need to be protected, as the OAR talks specifically about protecting landscape features. A lot of focus is being placed on housing, etcetera, however it is important to look at where it is safe and reasonable to build first. Teri is concerned that the Clackamas County process might be behind schedule. The county is still working to coordinate a meeting about water and sewer and yet the maps are designed solely around where water and sewer can be provided. She is concerned we have not fully thought about what is involved with a rural designation and that the map only shows the Stafford Triangle as a candidate urban reserve.

Patti Galle, mayor of West Linn, noted that she has been told this is the listening phase, however she does not feel as though anyone is listening. The City of West Linn has plenty of documentation demonstrating its interest in the Stafford Triangle remaining rural. She noted that it may be theoretically possible to provide water to the Stafford area, however that area has an aging and inadequate water system. The cost of providing the needed infrastructure to provide water to the area would be a burden to the taxpayers, not just the developers. She respects the wishes of the hamlets, however West Linn did not make them build there, and their infrastructure is dependent on West Linn. Patti concluded that labeling the Stafford area as an urban reserve would not be good.

Craig Brown is concerned that we are looking at this in terms of development in the next five or ten years. He noted that there may be areas that may not be good to develop in near term, but would be good for development in long term and those need to be considered as well. He does not understand why the area south of the Willamette River is listed as having low water suitability or, given the unique freeway access there, why it is not an urban candidate area. He said that seems like a political decision and not a practical one. He also noted that looking at the map, it appears there are areas to the north and south that are highly suitable as well. He asked why the areas in the northern and southern parts of the study area were removed from consideration.

Doug McClain replied that the northern area was removed due to the proximity of the Clackamas River and to the slope of the area. The southern area was removed due to the slope of the area and difficulties with providing transportation.

Mary Kyle McCurdy asked that laser pointers be available for future presentations so Steering Committee members can understand what areas of land are being discussed. She asked if there are still undesignated areas around Canby and Molalla, and if so, why they are undesignated. She also asked if cities around the edge of the UGB were asked to talk about their areas of interest because of serviceability issues.

Doug McClain responded that serviceability issues were the primary reason to include a discussion about the interests of cities outside the UGB. Clackamas County also received input from the cities

of Molalla and Happy Valley, although their areas of interest did not extend past the UGB. For Canby, some of the undesignated area is a state park.

Greg Manning noted that they are all aware of the tremendous cost of transportation. He observed that neither Langdon Farm nor the area south of the Stafford Triangle are being considered as candidate urban reserve areas despite the fact that they are right next to existing freeway infrastructure. In light of that, Greg asked if there was the intent made in county committees to weight transportation differently than water and sewer because those areas were considered highly suitable for transportation, but low suitability for water.

Doug McClain said it would be inaccurate to say that the transportation component was weighted higher or lower. The ability to provide infrastructure was considered, however the difficulty is that the information is challenging to use. The information available to the county committees did not consider infrastructure within the existing UGB, and they did not feel it made sense to show how a grid pattern could be used in an area without comparing it to the existing grid pattern within the current UGB.

Mary Olson concurred with West Linn and said the City of Lake Oswego does not support the urbanization of Stafford Triangle and is not prepared to supply services to that area. She noted that the City of Lake Oswego does not have a seat at the PAC. Mary asked for an explanation of the light green areas shown on the *Preliminary Urban Reserves Candidate Areas & Service Suitability* map south of the Stafford Triangle and on the southwest portion of the map. She also asked that transportation suitability be given more weight on serviceability maps.

Doug McClain responded that the area has low suitability for providing water. In addition, the topography is fairly steep so there are some concerns about including them as candidate urban reserves.

Lainie Smith noted that there has been a lot of discussion about transportation. There is a need for more and better analysis of transportation issues. The Oregon Department of Transportation will be looking at transportation from a statewide perspective and thinking about long distance travel on the highway. She said she is concerned that development outside of the UGB would affect performance of the highways inside the UGB. She noted that ODOT will have comments prepared before the April meeting.

Jim Labbe asked for elaboration on how the PAC used the natural features inventory to create the Clackamas County maps.

Doug McClain responded that the PAC did have the information about the natural resource features, and they also expect to receive additional information about landscape features from ODFW. Doug noted it might be most helpful to discuss how the natural resources features information was used outside of the Steering Committee meeting.

Commissioner Lehan noted that regarding natural resource lands, her presumption is that the natural features would be protected wherever they occur. They do not have to be designated as rural for them to be protected. If an area is an urban reserve, it will not necessarily be developed from fence row to fence row.

Jim Labbe agreed, however he thinks some natural features need to be protected via rural reserves designation.

Chris Barhyte said his assumption is that each county has discussed the candidate urban and rural reserves and those areas will be brought to the Steering Committee to vote on to agree or disagree. He noted that if there are substantial changes to the maps, he is not sure that we can get four people to agree. Chris said staff needs to have the revised maps available to the Steering Committee before the April meeting.

Deb Nudelman said the value of the Steering Committee is to provide the Core 4 with a regional perspective. Comments to the counties are critical, and the counties will, in turn, compile those comments from around the region. Deb noted there would be concern if there was not critical feedback, and that it just shows this is controversial and critical work.

Chris Barhyte wanted to make sure the group knows that this table is not the only place to provide input. It might be worth taking concerns back to the county level for debate and then bringing the outcomes back to the Steering Committee.

Deb Nudelman said there are recommendations being made by each of the counties, however the ultimate decision rests with the Core 4 jurisdictions. The feedback from the Steering Committee is critical to keep moving toward the best possible recommendations and outcome for the region.

Teri Cummings recommends that as far as the Core 4 mapping is concerned, it remain a work in progress and all the information from Lake Oswego and Canby be included in considerations. She hopes that that the Stafford area and Pete's Mountain be kept in as both candidate rural and urban reserve areas. She noted that there is a public involvement meeting scheduled for April 14 or 15 and said that West Linn would like to offer to host that meeting.

Greg Specht said that basing the urban candidate areas on water and sewer suitability seems to skew the results for the whole process. He is happy to hear that ODOT will be conducting surveys, and noted that seems like another argument to consider Group Mackenzie's unconstrained lands for urban reserve consideration. He asked for clarification on the process for recommending candidate reserve areas at the April Steering Committee meeting.

Councilor Harrington responded that the proposal being made today is for a recommendation of candidate rural and urban reserve areas for further consideration. The Steering Committee is being asked for feedback today, and asked to report on additional comments and feedback from constituents at the April meeting. The idea is to take a vote to establish a firm set of candidate areas for consideration and further evaluation in order to make recommendations in July.

John Williams noted that the screening process will look at all of the eight urban reserve factors. We have already discussed that some factors should be focused on earlier or later in the process. As candidate reserve areas are evaluated, we will be looking at all of the factors in more detail to provide a complete analysis of the identified areas.

Teri Cummings asked what the objective is for maximum citizen involvement. She asked if there was a reason the next Steering Committee meeting is on April 8 and the next public involvement meeting is not until a week after that.

Deb Nudelman responded that the Core 4 is trying to compile layers of feedback. The first interest is to provide the Steering Committee with the best effort composite from the staff and county committees. The Core 4 wants to receive more feedback next month from Steering Committee member constituents and will then distribute the candidate reserve areas for public comment. After the public comment, there will still be time to consider adding information to the maps.

Chair Brian said it seems too early to eliminate candidate status from the areas that are contested or have mixed attributes. Transportation is needed wherever population and employment land is sited. The question is where the best place is for that land. He noted that sewer and water suitability is easier to deal with than transportation, and until we know the need for capacity in the future and what forecasted population and employment numbers are, areas probably should not be eliminated.

Commissioner Lehan said that transportation is probably the biggest limiting factor because we are out of capacity on the Boone Bridge and there is no alternative in that area for crossing the Willamette River. This is a fragile connection, and we have not even talked about where we would put another connection across the Willamette River.

Deb Nudelman observed and acknowledged how complex this topic is, however due to time constraints she noted that the group had to move to the next topic.

IV. STEERING COMMITTEE FEEDBACK ON INFRASTRUCTURE SUITABILITY

Craig Brown is concerned that there are certain areas on the maps that the counties say are not serviceable, and yet as demonstrated today, adjacent districts and jurisdictions are saying they are willing to serve those areas. He noted there seems to be a conflict there.

Deb Nudelman encouraged everyone with additional concerns to bring them back to this group and be as explicit as possible.

V. SUMMARY

Deb Nudelman reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings and reminded the Steering Committee they will be asked to recommend rural and urban reserve candidate areas for further evaluation to the Core 4 at the April 8 meeting.

Chris Barhyte asked if an area is designated as a candidate rural or urban reserve if it can be changed to the other designation later, or if it is taken out as a candidate reserve area if it can be reevaluated later.

Brent Curtis responded that the whole process is iterative and adjustments can be made if needed. The Core 4 will need to take into account public input, and they reserve the right to make adjustments. People are asked to provide input as early as they can to be able to work through those iterations.

Chris Barhyte said he had understood that once an area was off the table for consideration, it was off for good. He would like that to be clarified. He would also like clarification on how an area goes from a rural to an urban designation.

Craig Brown asked that an official statement be made that designations of either urban or rural reserves can still be changed.

Deb Nudelman responded that areas designated as either candidate urban or rural reserves can be evaluated as the other in the event that is seen as necessary as the areas are studied in more detail. Additionally, areas that have been taken out of the study as candidate reserve areas can be brought back in for consideration if the Core 4 feel those areas warrant further evaluation based on new information. Staff confirmed this statement.

Mary Kyle McCurdy said she hopes the Steering Committee does as rigorous homework as they can. She does anticipate that some areas will come forward as both candidate urban and rural reserves. If we know there is an area that could be designated as both, then that area will be evaluated for both. She is worried that some of the areas of the maps are very broad and is concerned there will not be enough time to evaluate all that information within the designated timeframe.

Councilor Harrington observed that a number of concerns were raised about corrections needing to be made to the maps, and she asked for assurance that the maps will be updated as soon as possible. Staff confirmed that they would be. [Action Item]

Teri Cummings stated for the record that the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee will not be holding a March meeting, so they will not have the opportunity to take the information gathered today about candidate reserve areas back to their constituents for review.

Alice Norris responded that it would be possible.

Deb Nudelman asked that everyone strive to put their comments and concerns into writing and distribute them before meetings to aid with discussions.

There being no further business, Deb Nudelman adjourned the meeting at 11:59 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Aurora Martin".

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR MARCH 16, 2009

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1.	Schedule	3/16/09	Urban and Rural Reserves Phase 3 Preliminary Public Meeting Schedule	031609rsc-01
2.	Letter	2/23/09	To: Rick Gruen and Clackamas County Reserves Policy Advisory Committee From: Chris Jordan RE: Objections to Clackamas County's determinations of Candidate Rural Reserves	031609rsc-02
2.	Letter	3/13/09	To: Core 4 Members and Regional Reserve Steering Committee Members From: Dana Krawczuk, Ball Janik LLP RE: Request to Consider Designating the SW Corner of Highway 26 and Highway 212 as an Urban Reserve Candidate Area	031609rsc-03