



RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

August 12, 2009; 9:00 am – 12:00 noon

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

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

Reserves Steering Committee Members Present: Susan Anderson, Craig Brown, Katy Coba, Dennis Doyle, Kathy Figley, Karen Goddin, Jack Hoffman, Mike Houck, Kirk Jarvie, Keith Johnson, Tim Knapp, Jim Kight, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Dick Strathern, Jeff Stone, Richard Whitman.

Alternates Present: Susan Barnes, Drake Butsch, Doug Decker, Richard Kidd, John Pinkstaff.

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman, Melissa Egan, and Peter Harkema.

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. She provided an overview of the agenda and meeting materials. There were no changes or modifications to the June 10, 2009 Draft Meeting Summary and it was adopted as final.

Deb asked the Reserves Steering Committee members for updates. John Pinkstaff, who represents business interests, mentioned the Johnson Reid study which was presented during the May RSC meeting. He noted that job growth is significantly impacted by the availability of developable commercial land. The UGR relies heavily on data from commercial properties, so it is important to understand the availability of land and the needs of large employers. In addition, he feels that the UGR relies on policy choices which are not clearly explained, as well as low end job growth assumptions by Metro. He noted that land is needed to support major employment clusters and wondered how the area will grow if this need is not met. He sees no margin for error in the urban or rural reserves designation, and feels we need “white space” around urban reserves for future correction. John said that if we do not designate appropriate urban reserves, we will put a damper on future generation’s opportunities for employment growth.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol Chesarek lives in the Forest Park neighborhood. She submitted written testimony, asking the Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee to consider whether natural landscape features are better protected in urban or rural reserves. She suggests a list of questions to consider including: Does the natural feature include large areas of otherwise developable land? Is the natural feature permanent?

When will the natural feature receive additional protection? After Urban Reserve designation? After UGB expansion? Or after city annexation? Will the protection constitute a “taking”? And, what is the quality of the resource? She is not trying to suggest that all natural features are better protected in rural areas, or that all property owners will remove trees from their land to avoid regulation, but she hopes that these questions will help broaden the dialogue.

Mike Houck commented that he finds it surreal that anyone would suggest bringing land into the UGB to better protect natural resources. To him, this notion is contrary to what he has seen over the years.

John Platt is the proprietor of Helvetia Winery. He came to the meeting to discuss Goal 1, which pertains to citizen involvement. He distributed a copy of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines, Goal 1: Citizen Involvement, OAR 660-015-000(1). John commented that the product of this process will be judged by the outcome and by what controversy is left over when the Reserves process is complete. Community involvement is significant in these processes, and should be collaborative and deliberative; thus Goal 1 is very important for both process and political reasons. John feels it is important to pay attention to all county residents and that if we do not do it right, there may not be time to do it over.

Cherry Amabisca is a member of Savehelvetia.org; their goal is to have land north of Route 26 designated as rural reserves. She handed out written testimony concerning economic productivity of employment and industrial land and the economic mapping pilot. She feels the use of a 2005 data set in projecting future employment does not take into account the recent economic downturn. She noted that despite tax benefits, businesses will go where it is cheapest to operate. Hillsboro is prioritizing solar cell and biotech, pursuing fad technology instead of foundation agriculture. She wonders what will prevent solar cell and biotech manufacturers from moving off-shore. Cherry asked the committee to please consider these issues when evaluating urban and rural reserves designations.

Elizabeth Furse is a resident of Helvetia. She addressed the Core 4 regarding the issue of certainty in agriculture. She has vineyards on her land that took eight to ten years to produce a crop. As a former member of Congress, she has seen that certainty is a critical element of success. For example, she said that the Portland region received a lot of funding for light rail because it provided greater certainty through its land use plans. Los Angeles did not receive funding because they did not have certainty. She noted that Oregon’s land use planning is unique and ought to carry long range thinking concerning agricultural values forward, not supplant them for short term gains.

Greg Mecklem is the owner of Pacific Crest Alpacas in Hillsboro, Oregon. He owns and manages 200 acres. In looking at the Washington County recommendations for urban and rural reserves, he feels they do not address the intent of OAR 660, which is about preserving prime agriculture land. He feels very strongly that Helvetia is tailor-made for a rural classification for numerous reasons, including its rich irreplaceable culture, quality of land, long-standing farm families, and wine tourists. In closing, he said it would be a shame to turn Helvetia into an urban reserve.

III. THE ROAD AHEAD

On behalf of the Core 4, Commissioner Cogen addressed the Reserves Steering Committee to respond to questions about the Core 4’s goals and expectations for the RSC’s remaining meetings. He noted that with only three more meetings, the Reserves process is nearing the end. The counties

have all been working hard this summer on suitability analyses and will present the results of their efforts later in the meeting. He encouraged committee members to read and explore the website. Today's meeting and the two September meetings will be opportunities to share data and analysis and hear feedback from Reserves Steering Committee members. The Core 4 will then craft their recommendations based on the Reserves Steering Committee's feedback and the available data. Ultimately, each of the counties will develop intergovernmental agreements with Metro. There are a few more opportunities, including full day meetings with break-out sessions, for more in-depth feedback. The Core 4 hopes the committee members are sharing information with their stakeholder groups and bringing those perspectives to the process.

Keith Johnson asked if the Core 4 could summarize how the decisions and final recommendations will be made. Commissioner Cogen explained that the Reserves Steering Committee is to provide recommendations to the Core 4, which will then come to an agreement on what should be urban and rural. Then, the counties will develop intergovernmental agreements with Metro.

Greg Specht wondered how recommendation and decision making would happen both procedurally and logistically, given the variety of interests and opinions on the Steering Committee. Deb responded that for this process, she hopes that all committee members are working together on behalf of the region, bringing their expertise to the table. The Reserves process is working to build a construct to set the bar higher, making it possible to do business differently. She said that each member should bring feedback from the various entities they represent back to the Steering Committee where dialogue can happen across constituent groups. She noted that the Core 4 hopes that this type of dialogue can begin at the next full day meeting.

Commissioner Cogen agreed and added that everyone is here because they bring something to the table; if we speak with one voice, great, but even if we do not, all voices will still be heard. Deb said that at upcoming meetings the Reserves Steering Committee members will likely work in small groups, which will report back to the full Steering Committee. Common themes may emerge which will help us move forward and develop recommendations. Chair Brian continued that at upcoming meetings there will be a lot of discussion and reporting, and then the Core 4 will take that and consider it along with all the other data.

Katy Coba commented that the intergovernmental agreements happen between Metro and individual counties and asked the Core 4 to clarify the differences between the urban and rural agreements. Councilor Harrington noted that per legislation, the designation of urban and rural reserves need to happen simultaneously. Metro will have agreements with each of the three counties; we chose to set the bar higher to make a regional, highly collaborative decision. Dick Benner of Metro added that decisions are not made by intergovernmental agreement. There will be recommendations, followed by hearings in the spring; then agreement will be put in place, with the Core 4 meeting again to consider any adjustments.

Katy Coba asked if there will be any type of state review of the Reserves outcomes. Dick responded that the final recommendations will go to the Department of Land Conservation and Development for review. Katy asked when the Core 4 would like to hear any issues that Steering Committee members identify that might be of concern to the state. She recognizes that this is a local effort but encouraged the Steering Committee and Core 4 not to neglect the state perspective until too late. Councilor Harrington noted that the State of Oregon has been represented on the Reserves Steering Committee and that the Core 4 appreciates the time the state agencies have put into this process. At the same time, she would appreciate it if there was one clear voice from the state. Chair Brian thanked everyone for their comments and said that the earlier we identify issues, the better. Deb

added that the state agencies have been writing to and meeting with the Core 4 representatives and staff throughout the process and they should continue to do so.

IV. Economic Productivity of Employment and Industrial Land: Economic Mapping Pilot, June 2009

Karen Goddin of Business Oregon introduced the presentation. Her agency has been in discussions over the last several years about industrial land and economic clustering. The Commission and legislature has asked them to conduct a review of their industrial land certification program, which has been a longstanding interest and need of theirs. She noted that the economic analysis included in today's presentation is a pilot project, not full study. Their intent is to use this approach around the state to look at industrial lands and economic modeling. It is tool to help inform discussions.

Mike Williams of Business Oregon presented the PowerPoint. He described their methodology and approach. They looked at the types of businesses that cluster in areas. For their productivity analysis, they looked at payroll, real estate market values, and property taxes. The data sources used were from: Metro, RLIS (Land Data, GIS), Oregon Employment Department, ES202 (Confidential Payroll & Employment), Washington County and Assessor Data. 2005 data sets were used for consistency across data sets. Mike acknowledged that there are economic cycles and that a better analysis would involve looking at several years of data, but he feels this is a good model. 2005 data does not consider the recent downturn, but it also does not include the businesses that are there now which were not in 2005, for example, Genentech. Thus, it goes both ways.

In this pilot, Business Oregon determined that the most important factors for high tech employers are: highly skilled, specialized workforce; water supply & cooling capacity; electrical power capacity; seismically stable, low-slope land; freeway, public transit, executive airport; specialized chemical and gas inputs; and a local government that is experienced with large, high tech facility planning and delivery needs.

Dick Strathern appreciated the presentation, and said he is also having thoughts about how it impacts our regional thinking. Because it was focused on the development of one area, this presentation contradicts the overall charge of the committee. He reaffirmed that he found it to be an outstanding presentation, he does not mean to diminish it, and that would like to see this type of analysis for other area throughout the region. He sees this as a tremendous lobby effort for one part of the region. Karen explained that this economic pilot project is meant to serve several purposes. They had to start somewhere to look at economic clustering and felt there was not any economic data out there that spoke to these issues. She sees this pilot project as a first step and an important contribution to the regional perspective.

Jack Hoffman commented that it would have been interesting to have an economic analysis on other Title 4 lands. What was missing for him was analysis on the loss of agriculture productivity. This type of information would be helpful to the conversation as we go forward. Mike said there is a longer version of this presentation, which he would make available via the website. Jeff Stone asked if in the pilot, Business Oregon had looked at economic data for current land use. Mike responded that they wanted the focus to be industrial and had not looked at the current land use information. Jeff said that when you look at undeveloped areas, be cautious. There is already use going on, maybe just not what Washington County wants.

Mary Kyle commented that she felt this presentation does a good job summarizing the importance of industrial and manufacturing jobs but does very little to explain why these jobs have to occur outside our existing Urban Growth Boundary. There was further discussion on the economic pilot study. Deb asked Mike to put supporting information on the website. [Action item.] Commissioner Lehan commented that simply because local aspirations are for continued development of high tech, does not mean it will occur. When you take something as specific as Intel and a high-tech cluster, she does not know how one can presume to replicate it; market forces may not allow us to replicate it.

Commissioner Harrington said that she heard some mixed messages in the presentation concerning infrastructure. It is rather difficult to understand what assumption regarding infrastructure has gone into this pilot. Tim Knapp added another comment about infrastructure, asking in what way does this analysis encompass labor. For example, how many employees can you get to the site? He said that 90% of the employees of the largest employer in Wilsonville come from outside Wilsonville. This greatly impacts transportation costs on a limited network of roads and he wonders if this type of factor was part of the methodology. Mike responded that no, it is not. They looked at a lot of factors, but probably not as nuanced of an analysis as is needed to get at the answer to that question.

V. Understanding the Natural Features Dataset and Map

In this presentation, Jonathan Soll, Science and Stewardship Manager for Metro, and Tommy Albo, GIS Analyst, explained to the Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee how they got from the original Natural Landscape Features Inventory to the one we are using today, which was refined for the purposes of the Reserves process. The original Natural Landscape Features map included data from ODFW, Title 13, Nature Conservancy 2006 study, flood plains and wetlands data, alternative futures analysis and other professional input. To increase the accuracy and bring the inventory up to date, they removed three outdated datasets: Portfolio sites (TNC 2006), Conservation Opportunity Areas (ODFW 2005), and the Willamette Synthesis 2008 draft. They were replaced with the Willamette Synthesis 2009 data. They achieved a great deal more precision than with the maps they were originally working with.

Tommy said that it recently came to their attention that the counties were struggling to incorporate the different layers of this data. It appeared they were not taking full advantage of it. Metro worked with county technical committees to make it more user-friendly and put it in an understandable context and format. Jonathan encouraged the RSC to contact him with questions or to get data: jonathan.soll@oregonmetro.gov, (503)797-1727. Mike Houck commented that he is glad this information was shared; this is infinitely more useful to the planning community.

VI. Break

VII. Rural and Urban Reserve Suitability Assessment

Deb introduced the next agenda topic, noting that due to time constraints, we will have 10-15 minutes for each county update and hold questions until the end. Each county will present the current status of suitability assessment work and anticipated work products leading to the September 23 presentation of suitability recommendations. County leads will stay after noon for further questions.

Councilor Harrington added that she has received a lot of questions on rural reserve designated land and undesignated land. She asked Dick Benner to address this. Dick spoke to the topic and provided the following summary via email after the meeting:

Undesignated Land: "Land that is not designated either urban or rural reserves remains subject to existing county zoning and the statewide planning goals. It cannot be added to the UGB without a demonstration that urban reserves are not adequate (very difficult until urban reserves are fully used). Zoning cannot change unless the county takes an exception to the applicable statewide planning goals."

Brent Curtis gave an update on Washington County's efforts. He said that on August 3, Washington County issued recommendation along with highly detailed analysis. The recommendations went to the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee on August 10. There were many people in attendance. The committee only received the recommendation and will be proceeding to extra-legal public hearing on August 20. They mailed a post card to residents in the study area to invite them to this hearing. In September, the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee will consider recommendations and they will be presented to the Reserves Steering Committee. A CD with the recommendations has been provided to all Reserves Steering Committee members today, along with a summary.

Brent discussed their process and how they arrived at their recommendations. Their urban reserves draft recommendation includes 33,800 acres and their rural reserves draft recommendation includes 108,800 acres. Some areas remain neither urban nor rural, they are undesignated. Brent said that all cities in Washington County participated except Gaston. Banks and North Plains participated but will go through a separate process for urban and rural reserves. Concerning natural features, they spent a good deal of time reaching out to Mike and Metro staff to incorporate the data they shared earlier in the meeting.

Chuck Beasley of Multnomah County provided an update on the recommendations from the Reserves Citizens Advisory Committee and Staff. The CAC met the last three Thursdays of July to develop recommendations. They had a hearing with the Multnomah County Planning Commission on the suitability analysis and recommendations. It was well attended and they received a lot of public comment; the orientation meeting for the public that was held prior to the Planning Commission hearing was also well attended with a lot of public comment.

The candidate areas in Multnomah County have been refined. The CAC developed area factors assessments and recommendations from candidate areas. For rural designations, the assessments were based on County zoning, resource management on exception lands, parcelization, hazard maps and wildlife habitat. For urban designations, they assessments were based on mobility, connectivity, and walkable communities, plus a buildable lands analysis. Both urban and rural reserves recommendations benefitted from input from the public. Their next steps are to brief the County Commissioners on August 20, followed by a public hearing on September 10.

Doug McClain presented on behalf of Clackamas County. He noted that he has retired as Planning Director, but will continue to work for Clackamas County to finish the Reserves process. Doug reported that the Board of County Commissioners is scheduled to hold a work session on September 8 to develop final recommendation on urban and rural reserves. There will be a public hearing that same evening. They will meet again on September 10 to finalize the recommendations. The Clackamas County Planning Commissioners meeting, was so well attended they had to turn people away due to the fire code. Approximately 50 people testified.

The Planning Commissioners will consider what they heard and provide feedback to the Policy Advisory Committee. The Policy Advisory Committee has revised the rural recommendations. Doug explained that the role of Policy Advisory Committee is not necessarily to reach consensus and have an up or down vote, but to analyze, discuss, and surface issues. The PAC has two additional meetings and then will develop its final recommendation. He also noted that they have not yet put the urban and rural maps together and resolve inconsistencies, such as some areas being designated as both rural and urban.

Doug noted that the County very closely analyzed 2007 Metro and 2008 Metro natural resources data. This information has been considered and he believes they are doing a good job of recognizing its significance. Looking at urban reserve map, he said there are several areas that were not part of the urban reserve candidate areas initially. They call them discussion areas. They also re-analyzed the French Prairie area due to the volume of public comment. In addition, they looked at larger area around Oregon City, because they provided additional areas and asked us to consider them.

Sue Marshall commented that when she looks at the Washington County maps, the recommendations seem to come solely from planners and staff. She hopes there is some reflection of the wishes of citizens. She noted that citizens were not at the table for this process, and she would like to get a flavor for what the dissenting views may be, along with response from planners and how they weighed that information.

Mary Kyle offered a related comment, saying in terms of public outreach she heard that counties have sent out post card notices to rural residents. She thinks there ought to be outreach within the UGB as well. The results of this Reserves process will it impact people living in all areas, not just the study areas. She would like to see aggressive outreach throughout the region.

Brent said they have reached out and do realize it is an interest both inside and outside the UGB. Washington County will continue to conduct outreach throughout the region.

VIII. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Deb thanked everyone for their participation today. The next Reserves Steering Committee meetings are on September 9 from 9:00 – noon, September 23 from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., and October 14, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. The meetings will be held in different locations and when the logistics are set, we will send out information by email.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Egan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR August 12, 2009

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
2.	Letter	8/12/09	To: Core 4 and Reserves Steering Committee From: Carol Chesarek	081209rsc-01
2.	Document	none	Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines, Goal 1: Citizen Involvement, OAR 660-015-000(1) From: John Platt	081209rsc -02
2.	Letter	8/12/09	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Cherry Amabisca Re: Economic Productivity of Employment and Industrial Land: Economic Mapping Pilot, June 2009	081209rsc -03
2.	Letter	8/12/09	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Dr. Greg Mecklem	081209rsc -04
5.	Memo	8/5/09	To: Reserves Steering Committee From: Metro Staff Re: Understanding the Natural Features Dataset and Map	081209rsc -05
7.	CD	8/3/09	To: Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee From: Brent Curtis, Planning Manager, Department of Land Use and Transportation, Long Range Planning Washington County Staff Report to the Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee, Urban and Rural Recommendations, draft	081209rsc -06