



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

August 4, 2008, 9:00 a.m. – noon

Clackamas County Public Services' Building, Oregon City

MEETING SUMMARY

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

NOTES:

Agenda Review

Deb called the meeting to order at 9:08 am and reviewed the agenda. The Core 4 agreed to table the I-5 to 99W question until Chair Brian is able to participate in the discussion. Kathryn asked that an update on the neighboring cities meeting be included on the agenda. Martha asked that the Core 4 address the question of when the most productive time is for Steering Committee and advisory committees to provide input.

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for and received approval of Core 4 minutes from June 27.

Updates

Martha provided an update on the neighboring cities meeting. She noted that the Clackamas County Business Alliance has been asking when and where the best place is to have their voices heard. The point was made that there are two questions being asked: 1) whether an area is in the study area or not, and 2) if an area should be designated as urban or rural reserve. The first question is being address now, and the second question will be addressed after the broad study areas decision in September. Steering Committee meetings are open to everyone and will include brief public comment periods for concerns to be raised but are mostly for people to come and listen. Phase III will have a robust public involvement process.

Martha reported that the Clackamas Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) discussed the study area boundary near Molalla and will make their recommendations to the Steering Committee. PAC is eager to become more involved and do not want any meetings cancelled.

The question was raised about how engaged city councils and planning commissions are. Kathryn suggested including Wilsonville's recent joint Council/Commission agenda in the next MPAC meeting packet and explaining that Metro would support more city meetings like that.

Jeff provided a brief update of the open houses and Citizen Advisory Committee meetings in Multnomah County. There is interest in understanding how the technical work will be completed and how citizens can add feedback and input to the process.

Brent provided a brief update of the open houses and Coordinating Committee meetings in Washington County. Representatives from the farming community have been included on the Coordinating Committee.

John provided an update of the neighboring cities meeting. Core 4 staff spoke with the neighboring cities about the value of bordering the reserves study area or not. The cities have been supportive of the study area with one minor change around Molalla. In addition, Tim O'Brien has been talking with cities to get an idea of their aspirations to include in the Metroscope model.

Key elements in work program to create urban reserves

Robin presented the *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture (2008 – 2011)* chart. The comment was made that this information needs to be internalized to prepare for a successful Phase 2. Everyone needs to have time to read this information so that it can be digested and prepared for a productive conversation. The regional conversation will be kept at a fairly high level over the next few months to allow everyone to understand all the choices before diving into the specifics of the reserves areas. One question is what the Steering Committee role will be in the regional conversations. Staff is planning a series of meetings to discuss the aspirations of local jurisdictions. Core 4 staff could work with subregional groups to understand what they want to become and show people whether or not their choices add up to regional aspirations.

The concern was raised that there will be new elected officials in January 2009 so some of these key logistics need to be anchored by then. Conversation followed about how to explain where the technical work is being done and how to fit in other input and integrate it. Core 4 staff will develop talking points to assist in answering questions regarding the timeline and decision points. This will include how and when people can get involved.
[Action Item]

The question was asked what to focus on for the next few Steering Committee meetings. Steering Committee members, as well as advisory committees, want to be involved and need to know where to go to provide input and feedback. The application of the factors will be discussed at the August 27 Core 4 meeting and the September 10 Steering Committee meeting. The Steering Committee needs to understand the complexity and difficulty of the decisions being made so they better understand the challenge of including them in the process.

Deb and Brent will provide an update regarding this topic to Tom. If the rest of the Core 4 do not hear from Tom, they can assume Tom is in agreement.

Brainstorming Questions for Reserves Steering Committee

Deb reviewed the questions that were raised at the June 27 Core 4 meeting: 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? Deb also introduced the questions suggested by Carol Chesarek's August 1 email. Discussion followed and the Core 4 agreed that a few questions would be asked at the August 13 meeting. Others will be included on the upcoming meeting topics list so Steering Committee members can be prepared to answer them at future meetings. [Action Item] Additional questions include: How do the Steering Committee members see Phase 3 working for them? What have Steering Committee members done to date to interact with their constituents and what they anticipate doing in Phase 3?

Editorial Boards Strategy

There was discussion about the editorial boards strategy. The focus of the work is currently on regional choices more than it is on Reserves. Jeff reported he has been having conversations with the Oregonian and the Reserves topic has come up. Interest was expressed in having talking points for the *Regional Choices Engagement Architecture*, as well as frequently asked questions that include an explanation about the first round of public involvement and what will happen in Phase 3. [Action Item]

Reserves Budget

Core 4 staff is working to schedule a time for the Core 4 to meet with Richard Whitman of the LCDC. [Action Item] An interest was expressed in thanking the LCDC and the state at the August 13 meeting for their participation in this process.

Record Keeping

Core 4 staff reported that the joint protocols the counties and Metro have set up for record keeping are working well. The concern was raised that the nature of record keeping will change as the process becomes more specific. Email is more difficult to keep records of and distribute than letters, so elected officials will work with their policy advisors to enter emails about the reserves process into the public record.

August 13 Reserves Steering Committee Agenda

Deb provided a review of the draft August 13 Reserves Steering Committee agenda. The Core 4 decided not to have introductory remarks for each topic.

Kathryn asked for further refinement of the draft open house meeting summaries before they are presented to the Steering Committee. Suggested edits include: more detail for the Beaverton summary, clarification about the natural resource protections, inclusion of an author for the northwest Portland summary, and a review of the number of attendees. [Action Item]

There was some discussion about how to present the questions so they do not appear like convening questions. Discussion followed about how to engage Steering Committee members and what the relationship should be between Core 4 and the Steering Committee.

Wrap-Up

Deb adjourned the meeting at 11:40 am.

Submitted by
Debra Nudelman and Aurora Martin, Kearns & West

