

**RESERVES STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

October 14, 2009; 9:00 am – 4:00 pm
Double Tree Hotel, 1000 NE Multnomah Street, Portland, OR

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, Chris Barhyte, Jeff Boechler, Katy Coba, Dennis Doyle, Kathy Figley, Bill Ferber, Jack Hoffman, Mike Houck, Keith Johnson, Tim Knapp, Jim Kight, Greg Manning, Tim McCabe, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Alice Norris, Lainie Smith, Greg Specht, Jeff Stone, Richard Whitman, Jerry Willey.

Alternates Present: Drake Butsch, Shirley Craddick, Doug Decker, Matt Garrett, Mara Gross, Kevin Moynahan

Facilitation Team: Debra Nudelman and Melissa Egan.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:15 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 asked if there were any suggested changes or modifications to the September 23, 2009 Draft Meeting Summary. Mike Houck was not at the last meeting, but he takes exception to the comment about protecting riparian areas within the UGB, noting once it becomes urbanized around a riparian area, protection becomes a fundamental question. There were no changes or modifications to the September 23, 2009 Draft Meeting Summary and it was adopted as final.

There were no updates from the Reserves Steering Committee members or the Core 4.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

John Mohlis is the Director of the Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council. He said there are many important factors to consider, but today the main focus he wishes to speak about is jobs. The availability of shovel ready land is critical. He feels we must be able to offer multiple shovel ready sites at all times and that the mix must include 25, 50 and 100 acre plots. He respectfully urges the Core 4 to err on the side of making sure land is available. We put our children's future at risk if we do not. The decisions the Core 4 make will greatly affect the future economic health of the region.

Michael Stricker of Sherwood, Oregon commented about the area UR-9, south of Sherwood in Clackamas County. He respectfully requested that this land not be included in urban reserves. He believes there is sufficient uncontested land to meet the needs of urban reserves. Also, he noted that Sherwood assumes a growth rate of 2.8 percent, while historically it has been only 1.5 percent. He finds this to be completely unrealistic. Within the current UGB there remains much unused residential and industrial land, and he asks why do they need more? The area is prime viticulture land and worth preserving. Michael said there are

currently 150 small vineyards and that that number is growing. He asks the Core 4 to leave it undesignated or, better yet, assign a rural designation to UR-9.

Mark Greenfield is an attorney who represents Jim Standring. He is concerned about land in the North Hillsboro area, 106 acres of land ideal for large lot industrial development. He believes there is no land in the region that is better qualified to meet criteria for development and urban reserves. This land can be developed with no foreseeable additional sewer or water expenditures. It has been identified as having state-wide significance for development. The land meets all the criteria and is very highly qualified to be designated as an urban reserve.

Michael Feves of Sherwood, Oregon is here today to address the proposed urban reserves near Sherwood. Currently, Sherwood is a very desirable place to live. Family Circle Magazine recently named it one of the ten best places to live. Doubling the size of Sherwood would ruin this. He notes that much of the currently proposed urban reserves area, UR-9 or UR-K, are not suitable, with steep slopes, surrounded by farmland. He urges the Core 4 to not designate the area as an urban reserve.

Faun Hosey is with Save Helvetia. She is here in support of the Metro COO Recommendations. She wants to preserve the land north of Highway 26 as a rural area. The agricultural industry is very important in this area and to the region. She notes that a key aspect of livability is ease of transportation. In her opinion, the current plans ignore the detrimental impact of all the potential additional traffic on rural roads. Urban expansion will cause big traffic problems for farms, as well as deadly risk to wildlife, children boarding buses, CSA customers, and cyclists.

Dan Ruediger is with Citizens for Farmland Preservation. Referring to UR-9 and UR-K, he wonders why Washington County would ask Clackamas County for land. He also wonders why Sherwood would use a growth rate of 2.8 percent. He feels that Sherwood had made a mockery of employment land. He said they already had 34,000 acres, and asked why they would need more. Do we want to ruin the livability of this area and the vineyards and other agricultural industries? He urged the Core 4 to remove UR-9 and UR-K from the list of proposed urban reserves.

Tracy Erway of Sherwood, Oregon is here to comment on UR-9 and UR-K. She said the goal of the Metro COO Recommendations is to use the land already within the UGB before expanding. Tracy would like to see us recycle, reuse and repurpose land, noting that our Urban Growth Boundary is precious. In her opinion, expansion is unwarranted, unadvised and unneeded. The UGB is there to protect farms, but there are also people in between urban and rural areas. Employment exists there. If this land is taken into the UGB, she is concerned that the people there will be pushed so far out as to not be able to work and farm.

Allen Amabisca spoke to the Reserves Steering Committee about studies he conducted on the Oregon White Oak Tree in the area north of Highway 26. Some of his findings are as follows: 1) less than 1% of historic Willamette Valley oaks exist today; 2) Oregon White Oaks are habitat to sensitive species; and 3) calculations of tree ring growth confirm that they have very slow growth and are very old. Allen strongly supports protection of the White Oak and supports the Metro COO Recommendation that this area not be designated urban reserves. It should be designated rural reserves.

Clair Klock of Klock Farm in Corbett, Oregon commented generally urban and rural reserves. He is appalled at the suggestion that the Washington County needs the proposed additional 34,000 acres of urban reserves.

He urges the Core 4 to reconsider conflicted lands and the Metro viability maps. He supports the advanced development concept, and that we ought to go up and down but not out.

Dana Krawczuk of Ball Janik, LLP, represents people who live near Highway 212. She feels the Clackamas County Board recommendation did not go quite far enough. They excluded land south of Highway 212. The reason given was that these are large tract tax lots being actively farmed. This is not true, only two of the twenty four tax lots are currently under special farm-use assessment. She said we are at a crisis in infrastructure funding. The fiscally responsible solution is to adhere to the region's policy of urbanizing transportation corridors and the County's practice of double loading roadways, as well as extending the urban reserve designation along Highway 212 corridor so that urban development is allowed one lot deep. We can mitigate provisional impacts. She thinks that all goals can be accomplished in this process. She requests that the south side of Highway 212 corridor to Highway 26 be designated an urban reserve or left as undesignated land.

Carol Chesarek of the Forest Park Neighborhood Association and member of the Multnomah County Citizen Advisory Board spoke today about the lower Springville Road area. She reports that the CAC found it to be low to medium suitability. During the CAC process, the staff agreed with that assessment. She noted that no city has requested an urban reserve in this area and that governance is a problem. She asked the Reserves Steering Committee to please help the Core 4 focus on more useful urban reserves and take this area off the to be further discussed list.

Eli Spivak is the owner and principal in the real estate development and general contractor firm Orange Splott LLC. Previously, he worked for the Housing Development Center, where he managed the development of affordable housing. Based upon his years of experience, he feels there is plenty of land to build more density. He thinks we should not add any land to the UGB. There is a substantial risk of diluting resources. To him, the market indicates that we should focus on developing the urban centers. He urges the Core 4 to cautiously calibrate the amount of urban reserves our region needs.

Linda Peters is the former Chair of the Washington County Board. She coined the term smart growth. In her opinion, the Washington County Coordinating Committee staff chose to prioritize urban reserves over rural reserves and there was no citizen participation on committee. Washington County Board of Commissioners held no hearings and took no action on the draft before the RSC today. She feels the framing of the recommendations was very much influenced by developers, and by urban creep. Each small addition creates further incentive for development. She urges the Core 4 to prioritize the COO Recommendations, saying please don't squander our natural resources for the sake of one industrial lot. She hopes for courage and wisdom as the Core 4 make their final decisions.

Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey spoke on behalf of Jan McCollum of Beavercreek, Oregon, who asked Elizabeth to give testimony because she could not be here today. Jan's comments are generally on the importance of protecting our farmland. There is an emerging local food and product movement, which is gaining strength each year. Recently, the 13th Annual Cloth and Fiber Fair was held at the Clackamas County Fairgrounds. This fair celebrates fiber producing animals, with over 160 vendors with animals and items. It drew a crowd of 10,000 people. Real money is going back into the economy because of productive agricultural land. She urges the Core 4 to make Beavercreek a rural reserve.

Leann Bennett is with the Friends of Parrett Mountain. She said that the land needed to support our population will exceed available farmland by 2020. She is strongly in favor of preserving rural lands and encourages the Core 4 to not take any more farmland and not expand the UGB at all.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TO CORE 4 ON PRELIMINARY RESERVE AREAS (PHASE 3 MILESTONE)

Deb introduced the next agenda item. The Core 4 will each offer remarks regarding the proposed areas of preliminary agreement and areas for further discussion. Then we will hear from each Steering Committee member regarding their recommendations to Core 4 on preliminary reserve areas.

Councilor Harrington made brief introductory remarks on behalf of the Core 4. She thanked the RSC for participating in this long journey to advise and give input to help the Core 4 achieve regional balance through this process. Kathryn explained that today will be a different format than the last meeting, and that the Core 4 are interested in hearing detailed, concrete feedback. The information in the meeting packets illustrate where we are headed. While there have been no decisions made, they Core 4 has developed Proposed Areas of Preliminary Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion. They need further help to pull it together and to get ready for the public involvement process. Kathryn welcomes everyone's feedback and questions.

Deb explained the memo to which Kathryn referred, the Proposed Areas of Preliminary Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion. Areas on the map are identified by letters and numbers. Letters indicate that it is an area of proposed preliminary agreement (e.g., UR-A); numbers indicate that it is an area for further discussion (e.g. UR-1). The Core 4 will give a brief overview of their sections. They need the RSC input to narrow the proposed areas of preliminary agreement and areas for further discussion.

Chair Brian thanked the citizens and property owners who have participated; it has really made a difference in the quality of the process. To begin the Reserves process in Washington County, they drew a 5-mile ring around the current UGB and examined it. In the Tualatin Valley, when the criteria were applied, there were over 100,000 acres that are suitable for agriculture. At the same time, much of that same land is also suitable for urbanization. Tom said we are now at the crunch time where we have to move from what is suitable to what is desirable. In consultation with Washington County cities, they have narrowed the proposed urban reserves designation to 34,000 acres. Tom went around the map in Washington County, commenting on the Proposed Preliminary Areas of Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion as identified by the Core 4.

UR-1	This area was proposed in COO report as an urban reserve, but it is divided by natural resources; needs further discussion.
UR-2	This is the Helvetia area, which continues to be very contentious. Thus far there is no consensus on how much should be in; there is a strong push to be in and a strong push to keep it out of the UGB.
UR-C	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-3	This is a controversial area; the RSC will hear later from cities of Forest Grove and Hillsboro. Agricultural interests are strongly opposed to adding it to the UGB.
UR-4	Needs further discussion.
UR-D	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-E	This is a proposed area of preliminary agreement, but there are wetlands to address; may need a closer look and he wants to hear more from the RSC.

UR-F	This is a proposed area of preliminary agreement, but there are wetlands to address; may need a closer look and he wants to hear more from the RSC.
UR-G	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement. This area is already concept planned.
UR-5	More conversation needed about this not being suitable.
UR-6	There is some general agreement that is suitable for an urban designation, but requires further discussion.
UR-H	The COO recommendation for this area is supported by the City of Beaverton and Core 4.
UR-I	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement. It has a natural boundary.
UR-J	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-8	Needs further discussion.
UR-7	There is general agreement that it is likely suitable, but to the north, there are further questions about wetlands, productivity, and natural boundaries.
UR-K	There is general agreement that it is likely suitable.
UR-L	This area is surrounded on three sides and is near an industrial area. It is decent but needs infrastructure improvements.
UR-R	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-Q	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.

Commissioner Lehan provided a brief overview of the Clackamas County process. She is very pleased and wants to thank the staff for the tremendous amount of hard work. There was a hearing on October 13th, at which forty people testified. She was very pleased about the number of people who were complimentary of the process, even if they disagreed with the outcomes. They have done a lot of outreach, and are still in that process. Generally, the cities of Clackamas County are not enthusiastic about expanding their borders. They are intent on developing inside their cities, which is a major difference between Clackamas and Washington Counties. Charlotte went around the map in Clackamas County, commenting on the Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion as identified by the Core 4.

UR-9	Currently there is no agreement whether it should remain undesignated or not; there are active farms in the area, particularly vineyards.
UR-M	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-N	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement; logical to bring in as residential at some point
UR-O	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement; most likely residential at some point.
UR-P	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement; most likely industrial at some point.
RR-1	There remains a lot of controversy whether this area should be undesignated or rural.
UR-S	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement; governance is an issue.
UR-10	Further discussion needed on this area, the Stafford Triangle. There is no interest from any of the three cities to take on developing this area.
UR-11	Further discussion needed on this area, the Stafford Triangle. There is no interest from any of the three cities to take on developing this area.
UR-T	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-U	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-V	Oregon City has expressed an interest in this area.
UR-W	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement. Holly Lane is suitable for urbanization, Newell Creek Canyon is not; there may be a governance issue but not likely a development issue.
UR-X	Oregon City has expressed an interest in this area.
UR-12	This area is developable, but the access is inadequate. Further discussion needed.

UR-Y	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement. The center third of Damascus is already in UGB, which has made it difficult for Damascus to do planning with current set up.
UR-Z	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement; opportunity for employment land.
UR-13	Further discussion needed on this area. It is foundation agriculture land. The Commission struggled with it, the City of Sandy is opposed.

Commissioner Cogen thanked everyone for making it through this complex and lengthy process. He acknowledged that the Core 4 knows the heartfelt disagreements are not based on ill will, that there are a simply differences in opinion. This Reserves process has been different from those in the past, and it speaks very well that everyone has been hanging in there. Core 4 is trying to move the conversation forward and get feedback. He reaffirmed that no decisions have been made; they are just trying to get more helpful feedback. Jeff went around the map in Multnomah County, commenting on the Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion as identified by the Core 4.

UR-A	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-AA	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
UR-1	Further discussion needed.
UR-14	Further discussion needed regarding Troutdale.
RR-A	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.
RR-B	Proposed Area of Preliminary Agreement.

Jeff explained to the RSC that they did not continue the process of identifying proposed areas of preliminary agreement or areas for further discussion for rural reserves because they realized they needed to settle the urban first.

Kathryn acknowledged the counties for the significant amount of work they have done to get us this far. As Jeff said, our governing boards have not made decisions yet, so even for the areas that are letters, we still need to hear more. We are looking at it regionally. The Metro Council is very concerned about jobs, as well as preserving and protecting natural resource areas. Achieving balance is hard, but we continue to work on it. The Core 4 will continue to have discussions over the many weeks ahead, and we have a wonderful opportunity here for Reserves Steering Committee to help frame the discussion.

Charlotte added that they have focused on urban, and have spent less time on rural. That is an area where there is a large difference between the Clackamas and Washington County approaches. They are still debating on the Clackamas Council if they made the right choice. As she and Doug McClain have mentioned before, for their study area, they went three miles beyond the UGB to start. They interpreted the need for a rural designation as being used for those areas under threat of urbanization. They have had feedback that maybe they did not do it right, and should designate more rural. Charlotte would really appreciate concrete feedback on this issue. Jeff added that they want to hear about undesignated lands as well.

Chris Barhyte asked a clarifying question regarding UR-S, the Borland Road area. He noted that the three cities have said they do not want it. He wonders what is the county's theory. Charlotte responded that the area has employment land potential. Kathryn added that the Metro Council is interested in potentially urbanizing UR-S.

Next, they went around the table and RSC members or alternates gave comments or read statements. Several members submitted formal written comments, which will be posted to the Reserves website. The paragraphs below summarize their comments as given at the meeting.

Richard Whitman, Director of Oregon Land Conservation and Development, offered comments from the state agency perspective. First, he congratulated the Core 4, saying this process is different than anything in land use before and that he is excited about a successful outcome, which will hopefully create a model to use as we go forward. There is a parallel challenge at the state level, because the agencies are also responsible for advising you per their legislative mandate. He is proud to say that today the state agencies have produced a consensus set of comments on how the Core 4 ought to move forward on urban and rural reserves. These comments are in an October 14, 2009 memo, "State Agency Comments on Urban and Rural Reserves." The nine agencies are: the Oregon Water Resources Department, Business Oregon, the Oregon Department of State Lands, Oregon Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Forestry, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of Transportation and the Department of Environmental Quality.

Richard noted that several agency directors are here today and the Core 4 will hear from them later. In his comments today he wants to explicitly recognize that they are not going to say where lines should be drawn, and that he will not cover every part of the consolidated state agency comments from the memo.

In the first section of the memo, the agencies call for additional work done in terms of analysis. There are questions to answer before the Core 4 makes their final decision: what period of time is being planning for, 40-50 years? That needs to be decided. Also, concerning the issue of need regarding employment and housing, both projections have a fairly wide range in them. It would help in the transparency of the process to understand where the differences come from. Concerning transportation, the Regional Transportation Plan will show that we do not have the money to fund the state level infrastructure for any of these to work over the long term. It would be good for the region to do some more work on transportation costs of the scenarios that are being considered. There are water supply issues, and by that he does not mean the distribution network, but rather big picture issues about Bull Run, the Willamette, and other sources.

The second section addresses general high-level policy-oriented comments. They recommend that the planning period be 40 years. The region can add both urban and rural reserves down the road, but once you make those designations, you are locking it in for 40 or 50 years. The agencies also comment upon the amount of urban reserves. From Washington County and Metro in terms of need, the range estimated by the Metro COO Recommendations is a reasonable range to aim for. Richard suggests that a 20- or 25-year check-in be built in as part of implementation, and if there is a need for more urban land, it can be addressed it at that time. The concern is if the region does not deliver on that implementation by providing financing and planning for additional development, the effect will be felt largely in terms of spill-over into surrounding cities. The Metro COO assumes we will be able to hold its capture rate as in the past, but it is an area of concern.

Regarding the amount of rural reserves, Richard thanked the Core 4 for clarification on what has been happening. We need balance between rural and urban, and by that he does not mean equivalent in number. He has talked about the risk of designating too much rural reserves. Clackamas County's approach of the 3-mile boundary makes sense to him. A rural reserves designation does not protect resources. All it does is protect the UGB. Rural reserves are a tool to steer where the UGB is going to go over time. Richard added

that it is not appropriate to include flood plains in urban reserves; those areas should be undesignated or rural.

The state agency memo also discusses locational issues. Industrial land is different from other land uses; it is tied to locational characteristics, such as location relative to labor force and like-kind of industry. In the region there is a large amount of agriculture and forest land, and he feels the Core 4 could pay more attention to these areas where we have important lands for agriculture and forest purposes. Concerning undesignated lands, Richard does not like to call them undesignated lands, but he would rather call them rural. There is very little non-farm uses that occur in “undesignated” lands. We leave open the possibility that those lands could be added down the road. In terms of urban growth management, it will be the urban reserves that come in first generally, unless there is a particular regional need for a certain undesignated plot of land (e.g. for a freight yard or specialized industry). Rural undesignated lands provide the flexibility, but, the more such land you leave, the less certainty for those who need the resource lands.

Richard said the state agency comment letter was drafted before the meeting materials were received. The state agencies are generally in agreement with the proposed preliminary agreements the Core 4 has landed on for urban reserves. The agencies did not comment on every section; Richard gave the following feedback on selected sections.

UR-14	This is not an area the state agencies had on their radar screen for urban reserve.
UR-A	Support.
UR-13	Tough, but support bringing it in. Encourage further discussion.
UR-S	Stafford triangle. Support Core 4, also would support expanding this region. Recognize governance challenges, but it seems like ideal employment land.
UR-10	Support.
UR-11	Support.
South Wilsonville, French Prairie	Eight of nine agencies recommend rural reserve. Minor difference from Core 4.
UR-G	Minor difference between state agencies and Core 4. Suggest a rural reserve, creating a hard edge to protect agriculture.
UR-2	State agencies support adding this area, noting that the state legislature has already made a decision to make substantial infrastructure investment, supporting future employment growth in the region.
UR-C	Minor difference between state agencies and Core 4. Agencies would not draw line across Highway 26, would draw it across the drainage of the Waible Creek. Recommend a smaller area than Core 4 has currently identified, due to the importance of agriculture land and that there is no planning to improve the Jackson School interchange.
South of North Plains	State agencies urge the Core 4 to opt for a rural designation, rather than leaving it undesignated. They have a long history of working with community of North Plains re: their aspirations.

Richard summed up his comments by addressing the role of the RSC in the implementation questions, saying there will be agreements between Metro and Counties, which will call for implementation measures. The involvement of the RSC will still be useful as the process goes forward, because we will still need to have conversations about implementation details.

Deb asked the other representatives from state agencies for their comments.

Katy Coba is the Director of the Department of Agriculture. She agreed with Richard, that we are in brand new territory in land use planning. In her view, the designation of rural reserves is going to be key. The state agency letter, on pages 6 and 12, discusses the role of rural reserves. The priority should be to designate rural reserves where there is a threat of urbanization. For example, section RR-B; it does not appear to be where there is a threat of urbanization. She would ask for further thought and discussion on this section and the intent behind the designation. Jeff Cogen asked a question for clarification, wondering if Katy meant that in her opinion, a rural designation ought to be used only where the land is directly adjacent to an urban area. Katy responded yes. Less rural reserves is better and they should be strategically designated. Richard agreed with Katy, and added that when we are speaking about a regional perspective, it is a more appropriate pattern for rural reserves. Jeff asked for clarification of his understanding, that per statute, rural reserves are designated due to threat of urbanization or the 3-mile rule. Richard responded that that is correct.

Charlotte said that part of page 9 of the agency memo is a little confusing. It raises a problem that has been raised with the area outside of the 3-mile zone, and that is the issue of residences popping up in forests. The counties get asked why they didn't reserve more. Richard responded that neither urban nor rural designations protect natural resources; there are other tools we can use and should talk about putting them in place for those purposes. Doug Decker of the Department of Forestry agrees. They looked at density of structures and tree cover in the study area, and the correlation may not be viable in forest lands.

Tim McCabe is the Director of Business Oregon. He is primarily concerned about urban reserves. The impact will be felt state-wide because this region is the economic driver for the state. Growth is often sporadic and uneven, so there is uncertainty, but we can provide for greater certainty by designating sufficient urban reserves. Chris Barhyte asked a follow-up question about undesignated lands. His understanding is that if we leave it undesignated, then we have the option to go back and correct it if the land becomes needed. He thought we were trying to take uncertainty out of this. He is just trying to understand the difference. Kathryn said that in reviewing the Clackamas County process, she understands that Clackamas used undesignated as something which also indicates that an area did not qualify for urban or rural, so the land is being left as is. We need further discussion on these topics to be successful in meeting the test for sufficient lands for the 40-50 year timeframe. Charlotte said that when speaking about Clackamas County, she should have mentioned that she was not talking about acres, and that they only looked at criteria and did not even add up the acres until the Citizen Advisory Board was done. The unreserved areas were left as such because they did not meet the test to be reserved.

Tom noted that in Washington County, they started to apply factors and criteria as objectively as possible, only after going over suitability factors. Directing his comments to Richard, looking at agency letter, page 7 refers to minimizing transportation costs and maximizing existing use. Tom said that collectively millions of dollars have been put into Highway 26. It seems to him that there is a decent case to be made for maximizing the use of those investments. In addition, on page 10, it says that the least suitable highways are I-5 South and I-205. Then, on page 12, section 5, the 6th bullet says access to major interstates, with I-5 being most desirable. He wanted to note that he sees inconsistencies in what the state agency memo appears to say at different points.

Bill Ferber of the Oregon Water Resources Department has been working with water for 30 years. On behalf of OWRD, he wants to ask the Core 4 to keep water in mind throughout the reserves process, not in

an isolated silo. If ever there are any questions, he said please do not hesitate to call Water Resources Department for assistance.

Kevin Moynahan of The Department of State Lands commented that section B11 in the agency letter clarifies that not all urban reserves will be ultimately developable. A designation as an urban reserve or rural reserve does not change their statutory responsibility. They will still handle applications, mitigation, and analysis as usual.

Jeff Boechler of the Department of Fish and Wildlife commented on UR-E and UR-F, supporting Richard's comments on the importance of flood plains and riparian habitats. He encouraged the Core 4 to please work with Metro natural resources staff when refining the lines on these areas.

Matt Garrett of the Oregon Department of Transportation said that the needs far outstrip the revenues. He said the Core 4 ought to look at the whole system as these policy decisions are made. Matt encouraged everyone to follow an investment strategy and make healthy decisions.

Doug Decker of the Department of Forestry thanked Richard for putting together an excellent letter. He encouraged each county to think about forests, and the social, economic and environmental values of the citizens in our region.

Keith Johnson of the Department of Environmental Quality said that DEQ has more to do with the implementation phase of reserves, making sure that things such as water quality are carefully considered and managed. Water quality is already limited in this area, so we have to look out for it.

Jack Hoffman, Mayor of Lake Oswego, spoke about the regional theme of this process, noting that there are regional differences between Washington and Clackamas Counties and that it is not right to assume Clackamas cities are anti-growth. They each have aspirations and how they attempt to accomplish them may look differently. The Clackamas County cities are saying we want to adopt the principles adopted in 1995 and the COO Recommendations. They are working toward accepting density and accepting growth, looking for new types of cluster housing and more density. Jack quoted a recent Wall Street Journal article that said: "The nations sprawling suburbs may have been a good place to grow up but they are not a good place to grow old." Jordan's key theme of making the most of what we have, protecting the UGB, and walking our talk all support the kind of development we want to see. Lake Oswego does that now, and have been for the past ten years, by investing in infrastructure, sewers, and water projects. There is at times frustration with Metro; they encourage investment in the present infrastructure, but on the other hand, he hears that Stafford should be urbanized. Lake Oswego does not have the capacity or resources for concept planning, zoning, and infrastructure development for the Stafford Basin. The criteria should not just be closeness to Portland. In his opinion, Stafford is not strong candidate for rural reserves because there are no significant natural resources and topography issues, and it is also not a strong candidate for urban reserves due to governance issues. Lake Oswego, West Linn, and Tualatin do not want to provide governance. It is a big issue, maybe an insurmountable one. In summary, Jack asked that the Core 4 apply regional thinking to Stafford to see if it really is an appropriate candidate for an urban reserve.

Alice Norris, Mayor of Oregon City, concurs with Jack. Oregon City is on the edge, and it has to look to the future. Alice commented specifically on three areas and how Oregon City would like to see them designated: UR-U, undesignated; UR-12, undesignated; and UR-W, should be divided. The area to east should be

designated urban, the rest should be designated rural. She believes these changes will keep Oregon City livable.

Susan Anderson of the City of Portland asked the RSC and Core 4 to remember that 40-50 years from now, our communities will be very different. The projections are that a third of the people will be Asian, Latino, or African American. The future will not be like the past and we cannot continue to believe in an unrealistic dream that most people will be living in one- or two-person households. We will have higher energy costs. Only 20-25% of children will live in two-parent households. People will be living longer and we will want our independence, but without cars. We will need mobility within a much more compact urban form. We are already heading there. Last year, 50% of all housing starts in region were in Portland. Susan just want to make sure that we look at urban reserves cautiously. We will not step back and un-do them. The region has a strong track record of redevelopment, and investments in centers and main streets have paid off. Without exaggeration, she or her staff receive calls every day from cites who want to be Portland.

Broadly, in terms of urban reserves, Susan thinks we should stay on conservative side. A business would never plan for 40 years without looking at 20 years. It is important that the city stays flexible, too, if, for example, we decide to have not as much urban reserves and instead develop a fast-track for industrial lands. Concerning Portland's industrial lands and industrial sanctuaries, these areas are important to the growth of the entire region. Portland is committed to cleaning up our brownfields. The stage has been set well by the COO Recommendations. We should work hard to invest, maintain and improve the existing infrastructure. Also, recognize that agriculture is a job. Before being with the City of Portland, she owned a nursery, so is quite aware of the positive impact of agriculture on our region, economically and otherwise. Finally, Susan commented on investment strategies. There are a lot of investment mechanisms to learn about, which could change the model currently used for funding infrastructure.

Mary Kyle McCurdy of 1000 Friends of Oregon read a portion of her written comments. She said that the Portland metropolitan area faces a future of climate change, population growth, globalization, and changing demographics. We can treat these challenges as opportunities for leadership and innovation, or we can dwell in the past, rest on our laurels, do things as we have always done them, and slowly wither away our quality of life and national reputation. Climate change is accelerating at a faster rate than previously predicted. The state has set greenhouse gas reduction targets, and the US Congress is in the process of adopting requirements for greenhouse gas reductions from states and regions. Congress will be passing major legislation in the areas of climate change, transportation, and housing that will reward regions that are effectively working to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through changes to land use and transportation patterns.

As well as the Metro area is doing relative to other urban areas in the United States in reducing vehicle miles travelled, the RTP indicates that given our increasing population and current land use and transportation patterns, we will not reach the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emission from the transportation sector by any amount by 2035 if we stay our current course. This is unacceptable, both from a policy and legal perspective.

Our population is growing, aging, and becoming more diverse, and the preference for urban living with many cultural opportunities is growing – greatly outweighing the preference for suburban living. In the 2004 American Preference Survey conducted by the National Association of Realtors and Smart Growth America, well over 50% of those surveyed expressed a preference for neighborhoods with sidewalks, opportunities to shop and eat, a mix of income, ages, and ethnicities, and transit access. In 2010, the number of those turning

65 accelerates dramatically, and they are living active lives quite a bit longer. This, plus smaller family sizes and having children later in life, contributes to the fact that by 2040, 72% of the households in this region will be without children, up from 68% today. Prior to increasing energy prices and the housing industry collapse, 51% of those surveyed expressed a preference, when they retire, to live in a city or suburb close to a city; only 19% preferred a traditional suburb away from a city. The preference among all groups for various types of attached and small lot housing is also increasing, and is greater than the preference for large lot housing. The United States faces an infrastructure crisis that dwarfs that of other industrial nations, and that is just as true in this region. The repair and maintenance of our existing roads, bridges, sewer and storm water systems exceeds the region's collective infrastructure budgets and current financing tools.

Much of manufacturing is leaving the region and the United States due to various globalization factors. Instead, the Portland region is seeing growth in creative industries; research and development in software and hardware; and local business development – many of which have gained national and international stature – in food, wine, beer, and outdoor equipment and clothing. Some of these new businesses are focused on “green industries” of solar and wind manufacturing, “green” research and development, and sustainable industries of organic foods and wines.

The United States faces an infrastructure crisis that dwarfs that of other industrial nations, and that is just as true in this region. The repair and maintenance of our existing roads, bridges, sewer and storm water systems exceeds the region's collective infrastructure budgets and current financing tools.

We recommend that in designating urban and rural reserves, the region should meet and embrace these changes, and truly lead the nation in addressing climate change, by focusing new jobs and housing in mixed-use centers and corridors; providing transportation choice; ensuring every neighborhood environment is walkable and bikeable with places people depend upon (grocery stores, schools, parks) not only within walking or biking distance, but in an environment that is safe and welcoming; using our existing infrastructure more efficiently by reusing and redeveloping land and buildings; and maintaining and enhancing the region's agriculture industry. In doing so, Metro has the opportunity to lead the nation in being truly green, not merely using “greenwash,” and to enhance the livability of an already great place.

We recommend that the designation of urban reserves be conservative in time frame and population projection. Our ability to predict future land and other needs is at best an art, not a science. Every urban growth boundary (UGB) delineated by Metro and every other city in Oregon since 1973 has proven to be larger than needed for the time frame predicted; that is, we have used less new land than anticipated.

The costs of erring on the too-large side are too great and irreversible. Once land is designated as available for urbanization, even if that might not happen for decades, farmers will no longer make long-term investments in crops, wells, irrigation systems, machinery, or other agricultural infrastructure. Land speculation begins: a significant amount of farming is on leased lands, and already during this reserves process, farmers have lost leases because the land owners are hoping their land will be in the urban reserve and they do not want the land to appear to be in farm use. The region has limited funds and financing tools for infrastructure, which should be carefully focused where growth is certain during the time frame, rather than spread in a scattershot fashion over an area that might never develop. Therefore, we recommend using the year 2040 and the lower level of the “middle third” population and employment range the COO recommends. In summary, the 1000 Friends of Oregon agree with much of the proposed preliminary areas of agreement and will submit a detailed response in writing.

Mara Gross is with the Coalition for Livable Future. Her comments are limited to general principles regarding the suitability of specific areas, but not about the advisability about how much we want to expand as a region. She supports focused investments within current UGB and a compact, efficient urban form for several reasons. There are limited funds available in the region, and development at the edges costs double or more. Also, there continue to be issues around the credit crisis. Preliminary data has come out around the RTP which shows that state and federal projects make global warming worse, more so than doing nothing. She passed around a chart showing the data she referred to. Further, three quarters of the road dollars are to build more road miles, which is very expensive and leads to more driving. An expanded UGB leads to more driving, which will have a negative impact on our regional efforts to address climate change. Mara's final point was about affordability. It is not true that expansion leads to greater affordability. She is concerned that a greater burden is placed on those with the fewest resources. Rather than just creating lines on a map, this process needs to address broader issues. In doing IGA's, it is important to address the issues she mentioned and to create performance measures to check progress.

Mike Houck of the Urban Greenspaces Institute noted that several people have expressed support for the COO Recommendations, and he adds his support. He will not use his time to go through the areas, instead he will submit written feedback for the Core 4's consideration. He wants to push back a little on rural reserves. He had hoped we would use it to make a strong statement about our sense of place. A designation makes a difference; it may not offer protections, but it shows intent. Mike has many comments on the COO Recommendations, mostly pertaining to climate change. He took a tour of the Cornelius area with Richard Meyer. There is an area within that site, which if FEMA were to re-map it, it would all be flood plain. As we look at urban reserves, he feels that climate change should be first and foremost. Metro has done a fabulous job of documenting potential hazard areas. Mike offered the word "adaptation" for everyone to think about. If we follow the planning we are discussing, he cautions that we may not make any progress. He will submit maps with detailed comments soon. There are some significant areas in Washington County to think about, he is particularly concerned about UR-E. Lastly, he appreciates that the state agencies have weighed with specific comments.

Kathy Figley, Mayor of Woodburn, is primarily concerned about things at the local level, underscoring what Richard Whitman said about the risk of the UGB being construed too narrowly and what can be done down the line to correct it. Spill-over is already a reality. From McMinnville on the large side, to Barlow and Donald on the smaller side, these communities are experiencing it. "Spill-over" may not be right term, but she is referring to people who live in small towns who commute to employment. Agriculture just does not generate well-paying jobs. People want economic betterment while retaining their roots. Many do not think urban areas are where they want to live; they cannot afford what they like and do not like what they can afford. People have different ideas of a good life is and have different tastes. A lot of people live in our towns for the space, yard, and sense of community. People vote with their feet, from the residential point of view. From the employment point of view, she does not think utilizing the most restrictive, hold the line philosophy on the UGB will be beneficial to all types of employment. If clusters and large lot development are not available, in the long term, they will move outside of the UGB. If employment moves out of UGB, what are we losing? We need to consider this. She is not advocating tremendous expansion, but hopes the Core 4 consider the possible unintended consequences.

Finally, Kathy mentioned Yamhill and Marion Counties, saying their points of view are relevant even if they are not in the process. All of us would respect and agree with what has happened in Canby or Molalla with undesignated. The City of Newberg gave testimony and strong support for rural designation for the area south of Sherwood, keeping a separation between Newberg and Sherwood. It is appropriate for agriculture

and natural resources reasons. As a matter of consensus, she heartily supports the Clackamas County French Prairie recommendation for rural reserves. She recognizes the infrastructure cannot take more traffic without significant additional investments. In closing, Kathy appreciated the opportunity to be at the table and looks forward to continued open lines of communication.

Denny Doyle is the Mayor of Beaverton. He wholeheartedly supports the notion of a 20-year check-in for reserves. The City of Beaverton continues to be committed to cooperatively working with the county and Metro. He is concerned about UR-H because Beaverton is land locked. Considering their aspirations, and that the population is projected to increase by 40-50,000 people, there is limited possibility to grow beyond current acreages. About 50 percent of UR-H is buildable, but you would be hard pressed to locate a school in there. He would also like further discussion about UR-6.

His general comments, which Kathy also touched on, are to not force growth on areas that do not want it. Obviously, we will build transit and density. He was recently in Minneapolis, it is quite amazing how much they use the Portland area as a model and copy us. He worries a lot about affordable housing. Not everybody is a graphic artist and wants to go to the pub. Lifestyles are different. We need the tax base to provide for all. He has faith that we will come through this as a region. Other areas of the country are truly impressed with our UGB. Compromise is what it is all about. He maintains a strong sense that it is going to happen, despite all the worries and naysayers. He will provide maps with specific comments for the Core 4 to consider.

Chris Barhyte is a Councilor for the City of Tualatin. He said they went through a process to develop their local aspirations, asking what our residents want their community to look like in 2050. Residents did not want to add overwhelming density. The basic message was that they don't like sprawl and don't like density. Washington County created a system to assess rural and urban criteria. This was discussed with the overlay of local aspirations. As we gathered data, we looked at re-development infill. Each city within Washington County had a different philosophy and methodology, but all contributed to the process. It became clear that growth could not be accommodated within current UGB, and that is how we got to 34,000 acres for urban reserves. He encouraged the Core 4 to focus on local aspirations as they decide on urban and rural reserves.

Jerry Willey is the Mayor of Hillsboro. He said he is focusing on trying to define and identify what is going into the region in terms of employment and housing. The cities have a bigger challenge because they cannot just focus on what makes a perfect environment. We have to strike a balance. Many people would say that happiness is having a job. He agrees with the 20-year check-in. Jerry is primarily concerned with the risk of under-estimating, more so than over-estimating. He just listened to the 1000 Friends and disagrees with what they said, even though he thinks he is an environmentalist. He is glad Solar Industries is not here to listen to us speak negatively about sprawling industry.

We face many financial challenges. How do we provide water for the region? Do we stop envisioning how we do that because the price tag is now a billion dollars? No, we become creative. Another example is the Jackson School Road interchange; it functions perfectly now, but we may have to re-design it in thirty years. We plan with a vision of how to accomplish the goals of the region. He does not want to be limited by the notions of not having enough money – you have to go out and find it. Finally, we are not in conflict with the 1000 Friends and environmentalists. But in his mind, we have to give opportunity in future, by not limiting the number of acres brought into urban reserves. If we do not use it, it is nothing lost. If we do not have it when we need it, it could be a huge loss.

Tim Knapp is the Mayor of Wilsonville. He said that generally the cities support the Clackamas County Recommendations, with a few exceptions. West Linn wants UR-10, be a rural reserve. For UR-11, they are happy leaving it undesignated. In Wilsonville, they want UR-9 to be rural not urban. The French Prairie area should be designated as a rural reserve. Several concerns have been discussed about an urban designation for that area, and he believes it would detract from rather than support economic variability of the area. He strongly supports keeping I-5 usable, and believes that designating French prairie as urban would negatively impact I-5. Furthermore, he supports the idea of a 20-year check in.

The small communities he is speaking for each have their own values. Preserving their individual sense of place is essential, they do not see themselves as just a part of a sprawling metropolis. He believes this can be accomplished, along with safe and reliable transport, clean air, and fairness and equity for citizens. This does not mean we want the same things as downtown Portland. Yes, more density and commercial nodes, but not like Portland. Tim suggests that we look at clustering in a broader sense. Across the region and nation, people look at Portland as a cluster itself. The small communities have a special role to play, and provide an alternative lifestyle. He thinks that the varied communities can together help the region achieve its goals.

Jim Kight is the Mayor of Troutdale, In Troutdale, they are going through a heart transplant. Fed Ex is building a hub and employment center for over 1,000 people. He sees this as the beginning of great things for East Multnomah County. Also, the Columbia Cascade River District is being developed, which will also attract people and jobs. They have significant infrastructure changes and upgrades to work on, such as the traffic backing down I-84. Employers want to know if they can get people to and from the work places, so they are looking to make improvements. Troutdale is asking for 775 acres, which he thinks is very conservative, and with the employment in development, he thinks it is a logical choice.

Shirley Craddick is a City of Gresham Councilor. They have been reviewing and looking at corridors to redevelop and improve density. Gresham has an imbalance in residential and employment lands, there is a lot more residential. Shirley offered some comments on specific areas. They support UR-AA being brought into urban reserves, creating connectivity with UR-Z. They support RR-B as a rural designation. For the area south of Lusted Road, south to the Clackamas County line, they also recommend an urban reserve designation, and they also support UR-14 urban reserve. Gresham is asking for these initial lands, because they are trying to increase amount of employment lands and these areas are suitable for that purpose. They will submit written comments with further details for the Core 4 to consider.

Jeff Stone represents agricultural interests. He greatly appreciates that agriculture has been discussed a lot around this table. The main issue is certainty. Undesignated lands concern him. He thinks they have the opportunity to destabilize agriculture. When he testified before the state agriculture board two weeks ago, he also shared that undesignated areas causes him trepidation. Agriculture is an industry in which planning is essential. Also, Jeff wants to dispel that myth that nurseries and home builders are adversaries. This is not so, they work together on developments. Enough reserves are need to be enabled both to flourish. Urban reserves provide certainty for growth, rural reserves provide certainty for agriculture. While at the same time, it is not as cut and dry as that. Richard Whitman mentioned that a rural designation does not provide protection for natural resources. We need to keep that in mind. When you look at urban and rural, you are making a choice. Agricultural land is already employment land. There needs to be a critical mass. We are blessed with very robust nurseries, farms, and wineries. No one foresaw the wine boom 50 years ago, but they have taken hold. Jeff wondered how does the Reserves Steering Committee instruct the Core 4. There currently is not a common denominator for rural designations. His barometer is is the area under threat of

development. There needs to be balance, and hopefully having three counties and Metro go through this process, discussing aspirations and tradeoffs will lead to that outcome.

Greg Manning represents business interests. He, Greg Specht, and Craig Brown have worked with the Portland Business Association, a coalition that has met twice a month for two years. The context we have been working in is the worst economic downturn in our lifetimes. This coalition contributed to the Reserves process by supporting additional studies and analysis. They started with constraints maps. The large study area only included a small amount of flat, dry lands. These ideal employment lands were concentrated in Washington County and along the I-5 corridor. So, it is no surprise that that is where the recommendations are. Next, they sponsored two peer reviews of both UGRs. Their conclusion was that we can fit a million more residents in our current UGB. They have expressed concerns about this. Further, there is an assumption in the UGR that new employment sites can be handled by a separate, Metro-led process. Greg disagrees.

Reserves are not a growth boundary decision, but they are our future growth potential. Throughout the ups and downs of the economy, we want to support economic growth. We want to ensure we designate the best quality lands, and we want a range of housing choices close to where folks work. He supports the Washington County recommendations. He wants to support Multnomah County, with inclusion of Troutdale. And he wants to support Clackamas County, with the recommendation of keeping RR-1 in Clackamas County undesignated.

Greg said the business leaders are confused. They have worked for two years with this group, and have arrived at a set of recommendations of 47,000 acres. Then, from Metro, hear that 21,000 will be sufficient. Thus, the confusion. The health of our crippled regional economy necessitates that we find the right solution.

Drake Butsch represents urban development interests. He went over a PowerPoint, "Urban and Rural Reserves: Comments and Recommendations on Behalf of the Housing Industry." His presentation contained specific recommendations on numerous areas of the map. For Clackamas, they agree with this Board recommendation for 3,550 acres of urban reserve. This area is key for employment with direct access to Highway 26. Per the Metro COO Recommendations, some areas immediately north in Multnomah County may also be suitable for an urban designation. Furthermore, additional urban reserve areas should be considered to address Troutdale's future housing needs.

In Oregon City, they agree with the Board recommendation for 2,870 acres of urban reserve, but have reservations about voter annexation requirements in this area. South of Damascus should be undesignated for now and revisited during future urban reserves decisions. Prior to adding future growth to Damascus, substantial progress must be made in dealing with the challenges faced by this area. These 1,720 acres are better suited for another location at this time. The Stafford Triangle area should be identified as urban reserves. Furthermore, per the Metro COO Recommendation, areas south and southwest of I-205 should be considered for urban reserves to create support for the I-205/Stafford Road interchange. Pete's Mountain should be undesignated consistent with the PAC, Planning Commission and staff recommendations. This area simply does not meet the requirements for a rural reserve designation.

East of Wilsonville/South Stafford is possibly the best urban reserve candidate in the region, and they recommend an urban reserve for the area in its entirety. South Sherwood/West Wilsonville should be an urban reserve. Natural areas will be protected in this urban fabric. In Forest Grove and Cornelius, they

support the approximately 3,300 acres shown around the Cornelius and Forest Grove city limits as an urban reserve. Additional areas between the northerly city limits and Council Creek may present added urbanization opportunities. For South Sherwood/West Wilsonville, they also support the inclusion of these approximately 2,000 acres as urban reserves to provide for housing and employment needs. For Bull Mountain/West Sherwood, they support the inclusion of these approximately 4,300 acres as urban reserves to provide for housing and employment needs. For South Hillsboro/Cooper Mountain, they support the approximately 7,900 acres shown within South Hillsboro and Cooper Mountain. In East Bethany, the approximately 2,600 acres are within Multnomah County would serve as a logical expansion of a new urban area, North Bethany, that is well underway. This is a great opportunity to leverage planned and existing infrastructure investments. Furthermore, within an urban setting, needed north-south connectivity could be realized that would be beneficial to all residents in the area.

In Forest Grove and Cornelius, although they support the areas identified by the Coordinating Committee as urban reserves, they recommend retaining the area east of Highway 47 as undesignated for future consideration. In North Hillsboro/Helvetia/Cornelius Pass, they support these areas as urban reserves, which encompass approximately 8,600 acres. They wish to stress the importance of an urban reserve designation on both sides of the Highway 26, especially near interchange locations where substantial investments already have been made.

Undesignated lands must be dramatically increased to be applied as a safety valve in preserving opportunities for future generations.

In conclusion, Drake said that he feels sometimes we are playing to the end game of UGB expansion. The net outcome of not having enough land is what concerns him most. Regionally, we have to focus on housing affordability. We cannot expect infill to completely address the issue.

Greg Specht represents construction and real estate. He began by saying thank you to the Core 4 for their public service and thick skins. Quality of life requires having a job. The decisions we make can help prevent a reoccurrence of the dire economic situation we find ourselves in today. To allow for expansion of existing businesses, we must have an adequate supply of large tracts of land, adjacent to transportation and housing. To compete, if we have to assemble property from several owners, or if we have to go through a fast-track, it will not work. We must have land on which employers can grow. To assume this corporately owned land will be available to others is just not credible.

Metro predicts that 24 percent of all development will be refill. To overstate the refill percentage as Metro has done, is to understate our actual need for land. The risk if we get it wrong is that we will lose existing jobs or fail to attract new ones. It will affect our children. There is no risk if we over-designate urban land, it will simply remain undeveloped. Under-designating is a great risk to our future.

Concerning I-5 and Highway 26, to presume development should not occur north of Highway 26 is to ignore the fact that it is already there. The business interests he represents ask that Core 4 err on the more urban reserves. If you make the right decision, you will help the region achieve its economic goals. Thank you and good luck!

IV. NEXT STEPS AND WRAP-UP

Deb wondered would be most helpful at this point. Susan Anderson responded that she wants less aspiration, more fact, saying if someone is really not sure about something, now is a good time to ask. Jeff Cogen encouraged the Reserves Steering Committee to stay engaged, noting that the Core 4 still has decisions to make and needs input. Kathryn Harrington said she is open to continued advice on urban, rural and undesignated issues. They have heard your comments today, need to assess what they have heard, and re-group with each other and their respective governing bodies. She can see the path moving forward and feels they need time to go through this vast amount of information gathered today. She thanked the RSC for the thoughtful feedback.

Mike Houck wondered about the time line for input. Rural reserves were not discussed very much today, and he thinks there are still significant issues to discuss. The RSC is done here, but it would be helpful to have some folks get together to discuss rural reserves. Jeff responded that the Core 4 are still meeting together and with their boards, and assuming we get there, we will have IGAs. There will be collective and individual processes over the next four months. Kathryn agrees that rural reserves have gotten less attention thus far. She wants the RSC to know the Core 4 are working on it.

Deb said that it would be great to have written feedback by the end of the day on Friday, October 16. She asked the RSC to please send everything to Laura, who will distribute it to Core 4. As much as possible, we want to get everything into a proposed preliminary agreement, and then continue with the subsequent policy level work. Process-wise, they need to finish urban, and then move on to rural and undesignated. The Core 4 will talk to their boards and members of the RSC individually. There will be opportunities for additional public comment. This is not over, but we have achieved a milestone today.

Tom Brian thanked everyone. He has learned a lot through the process, regardless of whether we agree or disagree. We all have different views and he believes that we are all being sincere. It can be easy to personalize and demonize, but sees that has mostly been avoided in this process. He truly appreciates everyone's participation.

Charlotte Lehan reminded folks that she started this process on the other side of the table, and then she replaced Martha Schrader when she went to the Senate. This has been an exhilarating process. She appreciates the heartfelt opinions from people about where they live and the land they love. It shows how many people care about the region.

Tom added that he really wants to thank the Metro staff and each county staff for their work over the last three years. Thank you for helping make this an excellent process!

Kathryn Harrington invited everyone to last Metro COO open house, and extended her thanks and appreciation to staff, as well. She thanked the agencies, who have also put in a lot of time and effort to make this process happen, saying we will continue to work together. To the business community folks, thank you very much for continuing to bring that aspect to this table. Over twenty two months ago, when the New Look program was changed to Making the Greatest Place, Michael Jordan proposed having this RSC. It took a lot of work, investment and time, and we will continue to hold up our end of the bargain and come to agreement. Finally, to the interested public who come and contribute to these meetings, thank you.

Jeff Cogen said he feels more hopeful now than he has in the past about finding some common ground. He appreciates how respectful everyone has been, which sets them up nicely to model that on the Core 4. We have been working very hard to find common ground, and hopefully we will get there.

Deb added that your willingness to disagree here has been very helpful. The RSC offering the Core 4 their diversity of opinion helps the Core 4 know how to proceed. You have opened doors to conversations that we are not closing today. Deb encouraged everyone to keep in touch and to continue to provide valuable feedback.

Jeff thanked Deb, saying she did a great job facilitating!

Meeting adjourned at 3:36.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by the Kearns & West facilitation team.



ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR October 14, 2009

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
2.	Document with map	No date	From: Mike and Tanya Striker	101409rsc-01
2.	Letter with maps	09-30-09	From: Mark Greenfield	101409rsc -02
2.	Document	10-14-09	From: Michael Feves	101409rsc -03
2.	Document	10-14-09	From: Faun Hosey	101409rsc -04
2.	Document	10-14-09	From: Allan Amabisca	101409rsc -05
2.	Document	10-14-09	From: Clair and Beverly Klock	101409rsc -06
2.	Letter with maps	10-08-09	From: Dana Krawczuk	101409rsc -07
2.	Document	10-14-09	From: Carol Chesarek	101409rsc -08
2.	Letter	10-14-09	From: Eli Spivak	101409rsc -09
2.	Letter and Booklet	09-26/27-09	From: Jan McMahon (testimony given by Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey)	101409rsc-10

AGENDA ITEM	DOC TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
2.	Map, letter, news article	09-08-09	From: unknown source	101409rsc-11
2.	Memo	10-14-09	From: Linda Peters	101409rsc-12
3.	Letter	No date	From: State Agency Representatives: Richard Whitman, Matt Garrett, Katy Coba, Dick Pedersen, Tim McCabe, Roy Elicker, Marvin Brown, Ruben Ochoa, Louise Solliday	101409rsc-13
3.	Memo	10-14-09	From: 1000 Friends of Oregon (Mary Kyle McCurdy)	101409rsc-14
3.	Memo and maps	10-16-09	From: Mike Houck	101409rsc-15
3.	Letter	10-14-09	From: Kathy Figley	101409rsc-16
3.	Document	10-14-09	From: Chris Barhyte	101409rsc-17
3.	Letter and memo	10-09-09	From: Richard Kidd, Bill Bash, Jerry Willey, David Hatcher and John Kinsky	101409rsc-18
3.	Document	10-14-09	From: Jeff Stone	101409rsc-19
3.	Presentation	No date	From: Drake Butsch	101409rsc-20
3.	Letter	10-14-09	From: Greg Manning	101409rsc-21
3.	Document	10-14-09	From: Greg Specht	101409rsc-22
3.	Letter	10-15-09	From: Ron Carley and Jill Fuglister (via RSC member Sue Marshall)	101409rsc-23