



## **RESERVES CORE 4**

Summary Notes

February 23, 2009

Clackamas County Public Services Building, Oregon City

9:00 a.m. – noon

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

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

#### Agenda Review

Deb called the meeting to order at 9:07 am and reviewed the agenda. Tom was unable to attend and sent his regrets. Kathryn requested confirmation that the revised March 16 Steering Committee meeting date has been reflected on meeting materials. Staff will confirm. [Action Item]

#### Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from January 26. There being no comments or additions, the summary was adopted as final.

#### Core 4 Updates

Kathryn reported that there is a lot happening in the Making the Greatest Place process, including the employment and economic trends report, the first ever preliminary UGR, and regional transportation plan updates. Metro will also be holding informational presentations in the next few weeks for newly elected officials.

Jeff reported that Multnomah County is facing serious budget deficits and is having a difficult time eliciting attention to Reserves process updates.

Deb reported that she and Charlotte met recently for a convening interview, the same as Deb conducted with the rest of the Core 4 at the beginning of this process.

#### Debrief and Action Items from February 11 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting

Deb summarized the concerns raised at the February 23 meeting, including reservations about extending or adding meetings and receiving materials in advance of meetings. About half of the Steering Committee members felt that the timeline was moving too quickly, while the other half felt the timeline was difficult but necessary. The Core 4 discussed what to do about the meetings in light of there being no clear preference from the Steering Committee. It was decided that they will continue to hold the extended times, and will only use the additional time as needed.

The Framing Growth Forecasts and public involvement updates went well also. Some committee members would like more information, and staff is meeting with these individuals as needed.

#### Briefing on Rural and Urban Reserves Initial Screening

Staff from each county provided an update concerning the suitability analysis process and how they are coordinating their processes.

Chuck reported that the Multnomah County Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) held a study group last week and will be meeting next on Thursday, February 26. He presented maps incorporating the region-wide preliminary water, sewer, and transportation suitability analysis provided by the technical team. Based on those maps, as well as physical constraints, the CAC will develop suitability for areas ranked from 1 to 3, where 3 is the most suitable for urban reserves. The goal for the Thursday meeting is to further analyze those areas and develop recommended areas.

Doug reported on the status of the Clackamas County Policy Advisory Committee's (PAC) progress. He reviewed the *Clackamas County Schedule for Candidate Reserves* and noted he met with C4 earlier this month. The PAC will be meeting on March 3 to continue refining the potential urban and rural reserve areas. Doug also distributed maps showing the region-wide preliminary water and sewer suitability analysis data. He reviewed the Clackamas County *Urban Reserves Initial Screening Water and Sewer Serviceability* map and noted this is staff's attempt to complete some of the initial screening work on behalf of the PAC. There was some discussion about the role of transportation suitability, and the concern was noted that just because an area is suitable for transportation does not mean it will be connected to the rest of the grid. This concern will be placed in the bin list.

Clackamas County is working with the cities to determine where and how the cities would like to grow. Where there is congruence between city aspirations and suitability, this will be an argument for leaving the area as a candidate reserve area.

There was discussion about "undesigned" lands and how this can be presented to reduce negative connotations. There was discussion about how accurate the suitability of lands is and how other regions may or may not have been viewed as suitable prior to development. It was noted that as soon as these maps were made available, people began providing feedback about the assumptions made to the map. As additional information becomes available, it is placed in the public record and staff will investigate it as needed. Doug noted that certain areas on the map denote areas where water and sewer serviceability would go to neighboring cities, and would not be an urban reserve for Metro. This will be looked at in more detail later and will be moved to the bin list.

Brent presented maps showing the progress of the suitability analysis process in Washington County. He stressed this is a screening process and decisions are being made along the way. He noted that the urbanization forum, which includes the county, cities, and service districts, is continuing. He distributed the *Draft Urban and Rural Reserves Planning in Washington County Phase 3 Interim Staff Report* which details the process being used to weight factors and identify candidate rural and urban reserves. Brent agreed to add an amendment the title of the Group Mackenzie map to demonstrate it shows the suitability for employment and industrial development. [Action Item]

The information represented in the presentation of the Washington County maps is taken from the factors in the law as applied to rural and urban reserves. The next set of screening will include information about water, sewer, and transportation suitability as well. Brent will confirm the maps are available on the Washington County website. [Action Item]

At the conclusion of the staff presentations, there was some discussion about the coordinated efforts, and ensuring that the county efforts are not disjointed. Concerns were raised to make sure the counties are coordinating their designation efforts at their edges.

There was also some discussion about the public involvement efforts and next round of open houses. John will add the open house schedule to the next Steering Committee agenda. [Action Item]

#### March 16 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

Deb reviewed the proposed March 16 Steering Committee meeting agenda. After some discussion of the order or the meeting topics, the update on the Making the Greatest Place will be moved to earlier in the meeting. It was also decided that the Core 4 will request feedback on the suitability maps presented at the February 11 Steering Committee meeting.

In order to facilitate a dialogue among Steering Committee members, staff will incorporate questions in upcoming agendas. Staff will provide these questions to Core 4 in advance of Steering Committee meetings. [Action Item]

There was some discussion about additional groups presenting information to the Steering Committee and who should be allowed to present. As many groups have already done presentations, and they are there solely to provide advice, groups will continue to be allowed to present as time allows.

It was requested that the “second screen” results be presented to the Steering Committee in May or June to more fully describe the process. [Action Item]

#### Wrap-Up

Deb reviewed upcoming meeting dates and adjourned the meeting at 12:10 pm.

This meeting summary was prepared by Kearns and West.

