



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

July 20, 2009

Multnomah Building, 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Jeff Cogen (Multnomah County), Kathryn Harrington (Metro), Charlotte Lehan (Clackamas County), plus Core 4 staff Chuck Beasley (Multnomah County), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Ed Bartholemy, Carol Chesarek, Tom Coffee. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman, Peter Harkema and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

Agenda Review

Peter Harkema called the meeting to order at 9:35 am and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

Peter asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from June 22. There were no comments or corrections, and the summary was adopted as final.

Core 4 Updates

Kathryn Harrington noted that the Metro Council appreciated Core 4 members coming to a Metro work session earlier this year, and said that she hopes the Core 4 can join Metro for a session in October. Jeff Cogen said that it would be helpful to schedule the session soon. [Action Item]

Charlotte Lehan shared that Doug McClain has retired and Clackamas County has retained him as a consultant for work on the reserves project. In addition, Clackamas County has hired Gil Kelley as consultant, he will be working on the reserves process until he leaves for Harvard. She noted that one of Gil's focuses will be on areas that are "semi-rural," looking at Stafford as an example. In Doug's absence, Charlotte provided an update on Clackamas County's suitability analysis. Clackamas County PAC is meeting weekly, has completed their analysis of rural reserves, and recently started work on urban reserves. She noted that the PAC recommendations on rural reserves were presented to Board of Commissioners and that little concern was expressed about the recommendations.

Update on Urban and Rural Reserve Suitability Analysis

Chuck Beasley said that the Multnomah County CAC has been meeting regularly and is hoping to finish their work on urban and rural reserves by next Thursday. The following week they hope to finalize recommendations, which will be presented to the Planning Commission on August 10. Chuck provided a handout of the CAC recommendations to date, as well as a number of maps of areas of particular discussion. Kathryn requested a map that shows only contours for the Forest Heights area. Chuck said he could provide that information, and noted that the contours would likely look a lot like the area along the power lines near Germantown Road. [Action Item]

Brent Curtis provided an overview of Washington County's efforts. He reported that he is working closely with the planning directors. Over the next couple of weeks, the planning director will come to conclusions about urban and rural reserve recommendations. On August 10, the Washington County Coordinating Committee will provide its recommendations, which will be followed by public hearing on August 20. Brent said after the public hearings, the County will proceed into Core 4 regional discussion.

Some expressed concern about prioritized form of County recommendations in terms of suitability. There was considerable group discussion about the importance of communicating the type of guidance the Core 4 desires and needs from the counties and the Reserves Steering Committee. It was noted that it would be useful to ask for recommendations on broad concepts and assumptions, such as suitability and prioritization of the candidate areas. Others noted that Reserves Steering Committee members will likely want to provide input on the population and employment numbers.

Kathryn reminded the group about the overlap with other current planning projects and suggested that it would be helpful to review similarities and differences among the projects that impact each other. There was some discussion about the effectiveness of breakout groups in the MPAC process and the potential application of breakout sessions in the Reserves process. It was agreed that to be effective the groups would have to include diverse representation. Others noted that as the Reserves process moves forward it will be important to remind RSC membership that we are relying upon them to move beyond being advocates for positions and move to problem solving with the Core 4 and staffs.

Deb asked if there were additional topics for discussion before moving to the August 12 meeting agenda. Charlotte said that she continues to have concerns about the treatment of natural resources in the Reserves process. She noted that in Clackamas County many areas are being recommended for rural designation under an often incorrect belief they will receive greater protection in a rural reserve.

There was considerable group discussion on this issue. The group agreed that it is important to provide clarification on the issue at both the county and Reserves Steering Committee level. Others noted that some clarification might happen when urban and rural reserves are looked at together. Deb suggested that it might be helpful to use a portion of the September or October meetings to provide a demonstration of various potential outcomes for specific example locations (e.g. rural designation versus urban designation).

August 12 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting

John passed out draft agendas for the August 12 meeting and noted that meeting documents should be distributed to Reserves Steering Committee members a week in advance. There was considerable

discussion about the importance of familiarizing the Reserves Steering Committee members with the form of data and recommendations. Others noted that it would also be important to provide an overview of the remaining time/meetings in the Reserves process from both a process and a content perspective. Jeff said this would be an opportune moment to reiterate very clearly the role of the Reserves Steering Committee and what the Core 4 want from them. Deb and the PMT agreed to revise the agenda, adding a section to frame out the rest of the Reserves Steering Committee meetings and Core 4 expectations. [Action Item]

There was some discussion on providing a final opportunity for OECDD to make a presentation on economic and employment mapping. It was agreed that, given project time constraints, the August meeting would be the final available time for such a presentation. The PMT agreed to contact OECDD to determine if they would be ready to present. If so, they will be added to the agenda. [Action Item].

Kathryn noted that as the process moves forward it would be important for the Core 4 to have additional conversation regarding the IGA phase.

The group then reviewed upcoming meeting dates and had some general discussion about potential meeting topics. It was agreed that October 28 should be held as a possible second meeting date for the Reserves Steering Committee in October. [Action Item]

Wrap-up/Summary

Deb noted that in the upcoming months there will likely be a lot of conversations between all of the Core 4 and staff, and that it is important that everyone be available to each other. She noted that the highest level of benefit will come from good collaboration right up until the end of this process.

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 19, 9:00 a.m. – noon, Washington County

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 11:06 am.

Meeting summary prepared by Kearns and West.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Egan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.