



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes
January 26, 2009
Metro Regional Center
9:00 a.m. - Noon

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Tom Brian (Washington County), Jeff Cogen (Multnomah County), Kathryn Harrington (Metro), Charlotte Lehan (Clackamas County), plus Core 4 staff Chuck Beasley (Multnomah County), Dick Benner (Metro), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), 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 9:04 am and welcomed Charlotte Lehan to the Core 4. Deb then reviewed the agenda and meeting packet. She suggested that due to scheduling constraints, the agenda be slightly modified to most efficiently make use of the Core 4's time and availability. The agreed-to changes included reviewing the new members list and debriefing the January 14 Steering Committee meeting first.

The Core 4 reviewed the list of new Steering Committee members. Kathryn asked that staff contact Beaverton and Hillsboro to see if they have alternates, as they are currently not listed. [Action Item]

Deb asked for any concerns or reservations about approving the new Steering Committee members. There being none, Deb noted that the Core 4 has full support for the new Steering Committee members. Staff will contact each of the new members and offer to discuss the Reserves Steering Committee process with them to help them get up to speed. [Action Item]

Debrief from January 14 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting

There was discussion about the concerns raised at the January 14 meeting regarding the initial screening and availability of population and employment numbers. There is concern that not enough information is being presented to the Steering Committee now and that members do not feel as though they are being included or have an investment in the process.

The Core 4 expressed interest in hearing feedback from the Steering Committee about the timing of this process and if they would prefer to extend meetings or add additional meetings. There was some discussion about the possibility of extending the deadline for an agreement on final reserves designation. A final decision on extending the process deadline would require additional information on the reasoning behind the need to extend the deadline.

Deb noted that it is better to have people speak up and vocalize their concerns than not. She requested the Core 4 remember the “no surprises rule,” whereby any information about potential stakeholder concerns be shared with the rest of the Core 4 as soon as possible.

There was discussion about the best way to engage the Steering Committee in discussion. Possible options included preparing questions to ask the Steering Committee and allow people to respond specifically to those questions, or for the Core 4 to enter into discussion with the Steering Committee and work through concerns publicly. After some discussion, the group agreed they preferred the option of posing several prepared questions to the Steering Committee and allow them to weigh in and provide feedback on substantive issues.

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from December 1. There being no comments or additions, the summary was adopted as final.

Core 4 Updates

John reported that staff recently met with LCDC. LCDC is very interested in the Steering Committee process and staff committed to keeping LCDC informed and updated as the process moves forward.

Action Items from January 14 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting

There was discussion about concerns raised at the January 14 Steering Committee meeting about population and employment numbers and the perceived lack of clarity some members have about the process timeline. Staff noted there were three specific requests for information as outlined in the memo from Washington County, including base case scenario information, alternative geographies scenarios, and information about the technical components of the work.

There will be a preliminary urban growth report available in March with updated 20- and 50-year forecasts, which will include a base case scenario. It was noted that the demographics of the population are changing and the forecast will include a discussion of how historic demographic trends may change in the future. There was some discussion about the meetings of planning directors that the counties have been convening. Staff will strive to coordinate a joint meeting for these groups in advance of the February 11 Steering Committee meeting to discuss regional aspirations. [Action Item]

It was also noted that in addition to aspirations, it would be productive to provide population and employment forecasts as well. It should be stressed that the numbers are a starting point for discussions and are not binding. The view was expressed that not providing these numbers fuels a perception that decisions are being made behind closed doors and that the process is not transparent.

In addressing the second issue of alternative geographies, it was noted that the base case scenario will reflect existing state law but it may be useful to analyze the impacts of different geographies as part of the urban reserve evaluation process. There was discussion about funding and how that would affect and inform decision-making as well. Development in both centers and edges requires infrastructure funding, which will continue to be scarce.

Regarding the third request, Metro is working on a technical memorandum that documents the assumptions used in the MetroScope scenarios.

Staff will be meet with the subgroup for population and employment numbers and will update the *Framing Growth Forecasts in the Context of Urban Reserves* document to help explain the process and timeline more completely, striving to complete it in advance of the February 11 meeting. [Action Item]

Briefing on Rural and Urban Reserves Initial Screening

The discussion of the rural reserves screening process will be revisited at the February 11 meeting. In addition, the urban reserves screening process will be presented. There was some discussion about how the information will be presented to the Steering Committee. Extensive discussion ensued about where each of the county coordinating committees is at in the process. Maps are being created that depict the cost effectiveness of providing services such as sewer and water to candidate areas.

Each of the counties will strive to have technical memos and maps of candidate reserve areas available by March. The County Advisory Committee recommendations on urban and rural reserve candidate areas may not be available until the April Steering Committee meeting. For the February 11 meeting, staff will provide the information they have and allow the Steering Committee to weigh in with their opinions on the process.

There was some discussion about who is doing the work. Staff reported that the technical teams are composed of engineers and technical experts.

Discussion of Reserves Steering Committee Role

There was discussion about how to address concerns Mary Kyle McCurdy raised at the Steering Committee meeting about the role of the committee. Brent spoke with her after the meeting and her main concern is that she would like to see a degree of regional dialogue and not just a joining of parts.

There was further discussion about engaging the Steering Committee and getting information to and from them in other ways. This will be an ongoing effort as the process moves forward.

February 11 Reserves Steering Committee Agenda

It was noted that preferably, the follow up to the January 14 meeting related to population and employment numbers should be brief and that the majority of the meeting be spent discussing the rural and urban reserves initial screening process. Deb will work with staff to incorporate today's discussion into an agenda. [Action Item]

Wrap-Up

Deb reviewed upcoming meeting dates and adjourned the meeting at 11:48 am.

Mtg Summary_ReservesCore4Mtg012609

