



RESERVES CORE 4 Summary Notes

June 27, 2008, 9 - noon

Multnomah County Building, 501 SE Hawthorne, 6th Floor, Room 625, Portland

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Jeff Cogen (Multnomah County), Kathryn Harrington (Metro), Martha Schrader (Clackamas County) plus Core 4 staff Chuck Beasley (Multnomah County), Dick Benner (Metro), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Robin McArthur (Metro), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Carol Chesarek. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Aurora Martin (Kearns & West).

NOTES:

Agenda Review

Deb called the meeting to order at 9:16 am and reviewed the agenda. Katherine asked that the following topics be included on the agenda: publicity and open house talking points, the letter Metro received from Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI), and an update on the Washington County stakeholder breakfast.

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for and received approval of Core 4 minutes from May 19.

Updates

Staff provided an update on the June 19 LCDC meeting. There was a suggestion to make presentations to the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) and the League of Oregon Counties (LOC) sometime in the fall. Martha will follow up with AOC and John will follow up with LOC. [Action Item]

Jeff provided an update on the presentation he gave to the Bi-State Committee. There appears to be an inclination by Clark County to be engaged with this process in some degree. John will follow up with Clark County about having someone make a presentation to the Steering Committee. [Action Item]

The open houses in Beaverton and Forest Grove were each attended by over 50 people. Comments are being submitted both at the open houses and online. Staff will meet on Monday to discuss how best to coordinate and distribute the comments to everyone. [Action Item]

The concern was raised that Core 4 and members of their boards have not yet received talking points. John will ask Marcia Sinclair and Ken Ray to have these prepared prior to the July 17 open house in Gresham. [Action Item]

Confirmation was requested that the editorial boards piece has been captured. Ellen Rogalin is working on how best to do the editorial boards. This will be discussed at August 4 Core 4 meeting. [Action Item]

The request was made to distribute the open houses schedule to better help Core 4 and boards coordinate attendance at each meeting. [Action Item]

Clackamas County shared public comment they received from Beaver Creek. In response to these comments, the request was made to clarify, at all opportunities, that this is a regional project and not just a Metro project.

The concern was raised about rural representation in a letter from the MCCI. Metro will provide the Core 4 and staff with copies of the MCCI letter as well as Metro's response.

Brent provided an update about the parallel efforts of the Urbanization Forum. There was a discussion about governance of unincorporated areas and how policies could be put in place to solve the problems being faced.

Brent provided an update on the stakeholder breakfast held June 11. Attendance was low, but those who attended were engaged.

Core 4 members and staff provided additional brief updates on their public involvement efforts since the last meeting.

The concern was raised that commodity agriculture not be the only voice the Steering Committee is hearing about agriculture, but that the voices of small farming and CSAs are included as well. John will work with the Project Management Team to have a discussion of how the Steering Committee will be handling the role of the small farm to market processes at upcoming Steering Committee meetings. [Action Item]

The question was asked if there is a consistent form or set of protocols in place for recording conversations during this process. Dick noted that there is no legal requirement in the statute to make a record of each phone call or conversation, however it does require the four governments have one set of findings. This topic will be discussed at the next Core 4 meeting to allow Core 4 to ask questions and make comments. [Action Item]

Key elements in work program to create urban reserves

There was discussion about how to answer the questions of how the work will be completed and also how the process will be explained. The following summarizes the key elements:

Key Elements to Create Urban Reserves:

- What is the population and employment forecast for 2060?
 - 7-county forecast review draft – refinement to 3-county
 - employment trends projected underway
- How much of this growth will be located within the existing UGB?
 - how much available capacity is there?
 - define infill and refill assumptions and ground-truth locally
 - identify barriers and opportunities to realizing local aspirations
- Where might additional growth be located and what might be the capacity of that land?
 - ask 4 subregions (Wash Co./Clack Co./Portland/East Co.) to provide preferred scenarios using 2040 design types as building blocks (also a tool for second bullet above)
 - technical analysis of study areas

The point was raised that determining where to allocate additional growth cannot be done without knowing the population and employment forecasts and how much growth will be located within the UGB. Staff commented that this is an iterative process and the product in September will be a “base case” that is based largely on what the rules are now. In addition, scenarios will be developed to illustrate possible choices and effects and take into account the regional transportation plan (RTP) approach, investment levels, and land supply.

There was discussion about how to strategize and structure the roll-out approach to get readiness in the region for the scenario results. Dick noted that it is easy to get nervous about how to do the work, but that it is important to remember that we are not bound to a specific number. Instead, it is important to remember that the Core 4 is trying to identify the right land to urbanize and the right land to protect. Deb asked the Core 4 to help keep people in the brainstorming process and not jump to making decisions too soon.

The concern was raised that there is a level of understanding that the Core 4 still needs to internalize. There was discussion about ensuring the elected officials are preparing themselves to be ready to make decisions. Deb noted she can begin helping the Core 4 ready their boards for this discussion in September or October.

Reserves study area analysis process

The process for how to analyze study areas will potentially be shared with the Steering Committee in August. The result of the analysis is a technical memo that will be produced in the spring of 2009 that describes how the factors apply to various subareas. The PMT will determine how to present the work program to the Core 4 on August 4.

There was discussion to clarify how to get from recommending reserve study areas to endorsing reserve study areas.

The Core 4 decided to cancel the July 9 meeting based on the amount of work to be done and to be mindful of the Steering Committee's time. One of the ideas for moving forward is queuing up questions for open discussions. Potential questions for the Steering Committee include: What obstacles or barriers do they see that could interfere with the success of this process and how would they break those barriers down? What do they see as success leading to the key milestones?

Reserves budget update

Staff provided an update on their meeting with DLCD and reported that DLCD will not be funding the Reserves grant request. There was discussion about other options for funding this process. Chuck will draft a memo to the boards explaining the situation, reminding all four boards that they have agreed to cover the costs jointly, and showing what expenses have been and what they will likely be in the future. [Action Item] In addition, staff will schedule a meeting with Richard Whitman and the Core 4, possibly for July 9. [Action Item]

Clackamas County Reserves PAC request

The Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee again raised the issue of expanding the reserves study area to Highway 211 at their most recent meeting. Martha is doing a check-in with both the Core 4 and the Clackamas County board. There was discussion about how the question should be presented. Staff and Core 4 should be clear how this piece is being handled in Clackamas County so that each county can give the same message.

Kearns & West involvement in I-5 to 99W Connector Project

There was discussion about the potential of Kearns & West facilitating the I-5 to 99W Connector Project. Concerns were raised that Deb's role in both processes might compromise her perceived neutrality in the Reserves process, and Deb asked for Core 4 feedback on how to move forward. Core 4 will confer with their colleagues involved in the Connector project and strive to have an answer to Kearns & West by July 11. [Action Item]

Wrap-Up

Deb adjourned the meeting at 12:08 pm.

Submitted by

Debra Nudelman and Aurora Martin, Kearns & West, Inc.

