



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

December 1, 2008

Clackamas County Public Services Building, Oregon City

9:00 a.m. - Noon

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Tom Brian (Washington County), Kathryn Harrington (Metro), Martha Schrader (Clackamas County), plus Core 4 staff Chuck Beasley (Multnomah County), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), Ray Valone (Metro), 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 9:10 am and reviewed the agenda and meeting packet. Kathryn asked that the 2009 Steering Committee schedule be checked against the League of Oregon Cities and Association of Counties meeting schedules to ensure there are no conflicts. [Action Item]

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from October 31. Kathryn requested that the summary be amended to reflect her September presentation to the Oregon House Subcommittee on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Brent noted that Washington County does not necessarily agree with Dick Benner's statement on page 3 that the weighting of urban factors needs to be completed in the same manner across all the counties. After a brief discussion, it was decided that Core 4 staff will schedule a meeting with Dick Benner and County lawyers to discuss the weighting of the urban factors component. [Action Item]

There being no other comments or additions, the summary was adopted as final pending the agreed-to revision.

Core 4 Updates

Martha reported that the November 14 Clackamas County Business Alliance Urban and Rural Reserves forum went well. The Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) met on November 18 with a goal to identify candidate rural reserves and made progress

Mtg Summary_ReservesCore4Mtg120108

toward that goal. A Technical Advisory Committee meeting was also held to discuss local aspirations, and each jurisdiction indicated that they would like to determine aspirations at the local level; however it is becoming clearer that they will need to bring those findings back to the regional discussion.

Some cities in Clackamas County are concerned that they are not having sufficient say in the process. Deb noted that there are many challenges and opportunities with this process, and that there are many roadblocks and obstacles to overcome. It is critical that other counties are trying to help Clackamas County resolve the issues they face. The cities are sending signals that there are problems, and it is important that the Core 4 discuss those perceived problems with the cities to help them feel adequately represented. The conversation about fairness and representation is ongoing, and hopefully through time will lead to incremental shifts in position and encourage the cities to work together for the regional good.

Washington County is continuing to move forward with urban and rural reserve factors and make adjustments to the suitability analysis. Washington County has population and employment numbers and the planning directors have begun to have a discussion about aspirations. The next Coordinating Committee meeting will be held on December 8.

Kathryn attended a neighboring cities meeting in North Plains to update constituents on the status of the broad study areas. There will be another meeting in January or February. The Metro Council feels informed about the reserves process. Carlotta and Kathryn have been fielding questions from Washington County, while being mindful of program dependencies, such as an agreement being dependent on an understanding between the Core 4 jurisdictions and all 25 cities.

Chuck reported that Jeff attended the joint MPAC - JPACT meeting on November 12. The Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is continuing to meet and is beginning to determine candidate rural reserves areas. The CAC is not looking too much at urban suitability factors right now, and are aware of the local aspirations process.

Reserves Phase 3 Suitability Analysis Update

There was some discussion about how all the information fits together and how to move forward. Core 4 staff will determine if the Core 4 will need to hold an additional meeting before the January 14 Steering Committee meeting to continue discussing this and other topics. [Action Item]

In Clackamas County, the PAC continues to hold one meeting per month and has discussed the possibility of increasing the number of meetings. Their goal is to have candidate urban and rural reserve areas finalized by January, as well as have an idea about the amount of employment land that will be needed. The population projections and local aspirations are critical to pulling this together by the February timeframe.

At the last PAC meeting, PAC members were presented with five questions that helped to further explain the factors. The rural reserves maps will be refined at the next meeting by a group of experts. This approach takes advantage of the expertise of the members of the committee.

There was some discussion about the process of each of the committees as it relates to their making policy decisions and not just doing technical work. The PAC is aware of their obligations and is presented with information from a variety of interest groups. Rural reserves are being discussed first in Clackamas County, because rural reserves do not have the same land need component as do urban reserves.

At the last Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, members looked at factors for agricultural lands. At the December meeting, they plan to add in landscape features and forestry to get an idea of overall suitability. There is one area of conflicted agricultural lands; however the rest would most likely qualify as rural reserves. The CAC approach is to divide the county into five areas and look at land use patterns and rate areas by the factors.

Washington County continues to show their GIS maps to the public. There have been some concerns raised that Washington County is working to address. They are beginning to have the conversation about local aspirations and are also looking at the population and employment numbers. By January, the coordinating committee will be ready to identify urban and rural reserves candidate areas and will hopefully get to the micro level of analysis. Washington County will continue to work with Metro and the other jurisdictions through February and engage the Coordinating Committee, public, cities, and planning directors.

In reference to the meeting agenda, it was decided that the discussion of coordination will be tabled until after PMT staff has had the opportunity to speak with legal staff. Kathryn noted that the updated talking points in the packet were in response to the process moving from Phase 2 to Phase 3. Deb will check back with the Core 4 at the January meeting to see if there is anything that should be added to the talking points. [Action Item]

Reserves Phase 3 Public Education/Outreach

Marcia handed out a draft memo to Core 4 and the Reserves Steering Committee members providing a brief overview of the Phase 3 outreach activities. She noted that they are similar to the Phase 2 outreach activities; however they include some new tools such as radio talk shows, interactive websites, workshops and charrettes. She asked for feedback from the Core 4 about what information would be most helpful to the decision process. The suggestion was made to ask hypothetical questions. It is important to stress that this is a regional conversation and work to have people represent regional needs instead of personal agendas. This is an iterative process, and it is critical to stress that by explaining where the process has been, where it is now, and where it is going.

The public involvement staff has compiled a lengthy stakeholder list and is interested in using a variety of media to disseminate the information so that at the end of the process, people are not able to say that they have never heard of the process. Some discussion followed about what organizations could help get the information out to the most people.

There was brief discussion about Measures 37 and 49 and how any claims on those might impact the Reserves process. Currently, Measures 37 and 49 have little import to this particular program. Local planning directors can be contacted with specific questions about claims.

