



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

May 4, 2009

Washington County Services Center East, Beaverton
9:00 a.m. - noon

Attendees: Tom Brian (Washington County), Jeff Cogen (Multnomah County), Robin McArthur (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: Tom Coffee, Carol Chesarek, Meg Fernekees, Matt Grady. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Peter Harkema (Kearns & West).

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda Review

Deb called the meeting to order at 9:05 am and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from March 30. There being no comments or additions, the summary was adopted as final.

Core 4 Updates

Jeff reported that public outreach events were going well and that the events had been very well attend. Charlotte informed the group that public outreach activities in Clackamas County had going well and were well attended. Tom said that the public meetings in Washington County had also received high attendance.

Urban Reserves Preliminary Residential Capacity Range

John Williams provided an overview of the preliminary urban reserves preliminary residential capacity range. He noted that at this point only the residential forecasts are available; however, the employment forecasts are likely to be available by Thursday, May 7.

Two scenarios were presented, based on those in the preliminary Residential Urban Growth Report but extended out to the reserves timeframe. John described three main variables that created a range of dwelling units that may need to be accommodated in urban reserves. They are the high and low population range forecast, the ability to plan for between 2050 and 2060, and the range of capacity that may be contained within the existing urban growth boundary. John explained that the low capacity scenario contains the following three assumptions:

- Current policies and investment levels, historical development patterns
- Almost all vacant land develops
- Refill rate 27%

John then explained that the higher capacity scenario contained the following three assumptions:

- Investment made in centers and corridors to stimulate development
- All vacant land develops
- Refill rate climbs to 40%

The group asked a series of clarifying questions regarding the preliminary residential capacity scenarios and assumptions. John explained that residential capacity ranges are based on current zoning and assume no change. There was some discussion regarding the use of the assumed refill rate of 27% for the low capacity scenario. Some members felt that there is little vacant land remaining and therefore there will be less land to refill. John provided the group with clarification on how Metroscope evaluates the available land supply and evaluates how likely areas are to develop.

John explained that the low range forecast would require 4,000 new units, while the high range would require 302,000 units and that this growth is outside the urban growth boundary.

Jeff asked what actions had the potential to increase capacity within the existing urban growth boundary, saying that urban renewal has proven difficult to implement and may not be likely to increase in the future. John suggested that transportation infrastructure and local financing strategies other than urban renewal have been shown to be effective. Robin noted that financing growth both inside and outside the existing UGB will be difficult in the future, so a key question is where does the region want to focus limited resources.

There was considerable discussion about the timeline for knowing what growth is expected to occur inside the Urban Growth Boundary. Some members felt that this information would be important for the Core 4 to make a fully informed decision about Urban Reserves. Robin explained that Metro is currently gathering information on local communities' aspirations and that the information is likely to be available for the next meeting or the one after. Jeff noted that this ongoing regional effort would provide important information for Core 4 decision making, in particular the draft UGR and the 40 – 50 year land need, and that it may make sense to delay county recommendations and a Core 4 decision until the numbers were available. Charlotte noted that the numbers are likely to be informative but that there are many unknown variables that are likely to influence density and population in the future. For example, economic realities in the future may encourage more multigenerational living, which could utilize capacity in existing housing. It was noted that the original intent of the Reserves schedule was to allow for urban reserves to be in place prior to growth management decisions in 2010.

Dick Benner explained that there is a statutory test for efficiency measures inside the UGB, but not for urban reserves. Metro will have to demonstrate to LCDC that any efficiency measures we rely upon *inside* the UGB – such as investments in Centers – are ‘reasonably likely to occur’ during the planning period. Some people will argue that the same ‘reasonably likely to occur’ test should apply to any measures we might take to reduce the amount of urban reserves we need. There is no such test in the reserves statute or rules. But we will have to show some basis for our urban reserves efficiency assumptions.”

The group explored the idea of interim Urban Reserves but concluded that this would leave the Urban Growth Boundary decision “stuck” with the undesirable priority lands criteria.

The Core 4 felt that the range information would be more useful if combined with employment needs, which are not yet available. The Core 4 suggested a combined presentation might be appropriate at the June Reserves Steering Committee meeting, after further Core 4 review. *[Decision Point]*

Reserves Milestone Timeline

There was a discussion about what new information would be available if the Reserves process were delayed. John explained that by delaying the Reserves process the Core 4 would have estimates of capacity numbers, including ranges inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary, as well as the Suitability Analysis of the candidate areas. Metro is hoping to have initial (not final) direction on the UGB capacity from MPAC in September. Deb noted that it will be important to consider when in September this information would be available, as the Reserves Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for September 9. John went on to explain that the Suitability Analysis could be delivered out of the county processes into a regional look by July, at the earliest. Some PMT expressed an interest in allowing for additional time to allow for additional coordination with cities. In addition, it was noted that the technical timeline will be shaped by the work product needed (i.e. preliminary recommendations at a regional level vs. compilation of various county recommendations). The group considered these issues, decided to lengthen the Reserves process, and requested that the PMT develop a draft calendar for an extended Reserves process. *[Decision Point] [Action Item]*

Rural and Urban Reserve Candidate Areas

John began the conversation on Rural and Urban Reserves Candidate Areas by drawing the group's attention to a summary of Reserves Steering Committee comments included in the meeting packet. Each of the three counties then provided a brief update on input received regarding the Rural and Urban Reserves candidate areas since the April 8 Reserves Steering Committee meeting. Chuck said that the meetings had been well attended and that there were no changes to Multnomah County's candidate area map. Doug then provided a handout which summarized the written comments and comments that Clackamas County received at public meetings. He explained that this round of public meetings had been better attended; citizens had expressed an interest in focusing development inside of the Urban Growth Boundary and retaining natural areas. He said that there were divergent views expressed regarding the Stafford Triangle area and that others had suggested a "no growth" policy for Clackamas County. Doug reminded the group that it may be necessary to consider how to legally consider the interaction between rural reserves and nearby cities' Urban Growth Boundaries. Charlotte suggested that it may be necessary to create buffer zones of undesignated areas around the cities that would allow for both rural reserve designations and Urban Growth Boundary expansions. Doug concluded by explaining that there were no changes to Clackamas County's candidate area map since the April 8 meeting. Brent then provided a brief summary of the public comments that Washington County had received regarding the candidate areas. He explained that there had been a high level of attendance at the public meetings and most of the comments had been about areas that were already receiving a lot of attention. He said that the Washington County Farm Bureau remained very interested and will be presenting their aspirations at the WCRCC meeting. There is a growing interest from large commercial farm operations in the process and some have expressed an interest in having land designated for Urban Reserves. He concluded by saying that Washington County has no changes to the candidate reserves map.

It was noted that current candidate area maps are for consideration and that the candidate area designations can be changed. Deb then asked the Core 4 members for their guidance on moving forward with the Rural Reserve designations for further evaluation. All members agreed with moving forward with the current maps. *[Decision Point]* Deb asked the Core 4 member for their guidance on moving forward with the Urban Reserve designations for further evaluation. All members agreed with moving forward with the current maps. *[Decision Point]*

Deb suggested that a Core 4 member report out to the Reserves Steering Committee on the candidate areas, including public comment, public outreach, and today's meeting. Charlotte agreed to provide this overview at the RSC's May 13 meeting. *[Action Item]*

May 13 Reserve Steering Committee Meeting

John provided an overview of topics for discussion at the May 13 Reserves Steering Committee meeting as follows:

- Welcome and updates
- Citizen Input
- Housing Presentation
- Candidate Area Decisions (including comment summary)
- Timeline Update
- Making the Greatest Place Updates:
 - Residential Urban Growth Report
 - Employment Urban Growth Report
 - Aspirations

The group discussed the various topic areas and possible agenda ordering. It was agreed that Deb and John would work together to provide a draft proposed agenda. *[Action Item]* Charlotte will provide a brief overview of the Candidate Area decisions and the public outreach and comments. *[Action Item]* Jeff agreed to provide a description of why the Core 4 recommends the Reserves process should be extended and the PMT and Deb will report out on what the next big steps are. *[Action Item]*

Wrap-Up

Deb reviewed upcoming meeting dates and adjourned the meeting at 12:30 pm.

This meeting summary was prepared by Kearns and West.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RWA' followed by a long horizontal line.