



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

August 19, 2009

Washington County Services Center East, Beaverton

9:00 a.m. – noon

Attendees: Tom Brian (Washington County), Jeff Cogen (Multnomah County), Kathryn Harrington (Metro), Charlotte Lehan (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: Ed Bartholemy, Carol Chesarek. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

NOTES

Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:00 am and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from July 20. There were no comments or corrections, and the summary was adopted as final.

Core 4 Updates

Jeff Cogen mentioned that Multnomah County had a Board meeting tomorrow, Thursday, August 20.

Charlotte Lehan mentioned the MPAC discussion of pre-qualifying concept planning for urban reserves. She said it is not a good idea to bring parcels of land into the UGB without a plan for governance. Doug McClain noted that Clackamas County is similar to Washington County in this regard. There are some areas where governance has not been decided, e.g. Stafford. Charlotte said that sometimes there is a logical body to provide governance, and sometimes there is not.

Kathryn Harrington updated the Core 4 that she has asked Metro staff to provide the Metro Council with a summary of County work on the suitability analysis, with the goal of providing neither too much, nor too little information, and that it be in an understandable and clear format.

Urban and Rural Reserve Suitability Analysis and Next Steps for Core 4

Chuck Beasley said that the Multnomah County CAC made their final recommendations to the Planning Commission on August 10. At that meeting, 100 people signed in and forty offered public comment. Chuck distributed two maps, the urban and rural recommendations from the CAC. He discussed the study area development of candidate urban reserves areas. He said they began by asking the CAC which areas were not fit for further study; there was consensus on the area west of Sandy and no consensus on Forest Park. He went over the maps, highlighting different areas, noting that throughout their process, they have worked with the City of Portland, the Tualatin Valley Water District and others on infrastructure issues. Doug asked if Multnomah County planned on leaving any areas undesignated. Chuck responded that, yes, there will be some undesignated areas remaining. Tom Brian noted that undesignated does not mean it is in waiting or that it is a contingency plan. Charlotte added that some undesignated areas could be a relief valve for future urbanization, and others have no chance of urbanization due to topography or location.

Doug McClain provided an update for Clackamas County. At their recent Planning Commission meeting, there was an overflow crowd, some of whom had to be turned away due to fire code. There will be another Planning Commission meeting to finish the recommendations to the Board. Doug said that in Clackamas County, there is not a lot of foundation farmland next to urban reserves, but the areas in which there is tend to generate the most discussion, e.g. “Clackanomah.” The Board will have a hearing on September 8 and the final deliberations will be on September 10. Protecting foundation farmland and preserving natural resources are priorities for the Board and Policy Advisory Committee. The biggest challenge has been on the interface between urbanization and natural features. There has been a lot of discussion and they are working hard to figure it out. Doug distributed a chart, “Summary of ratings, suggestions, options, polls, and PAC recommendations, August 5, 2009,” which showed the factors and rating that are being used to help the PAC have these discussions and make their recommendations. Doug highlighted the Stafford area, saying it has been contentious for at least twenty-five years. The sentiment he hears the most is, “let’s settle this,” and that is what they are trying to do. Tom asked what the public says about Stafford. Doug responded that they are conflicted.

Brent Curtis provided an overview of Washington County’s efforts. On August 10, the Washington County Coordinating Committee provided its recommendations, which will be followed by a public hearing on August 20. He said that they have had incredible participation by local governments, as well as citizen groups like Savehelvatia.org. In Washington County, the most contentious area is Helvatia, along with the area north of Cornelius and Forest Grove. Brent discussed how they divided the study area into sub-areas and applied the factors. Tom said some of these are going to difficult decisions, especially those that do not meet all the factors for prime farmland. The sticking point is when an area is appropriate for both urban and rural, how do you make the call. Deb asked if more in-depth information could be provided by all three counties as available. [Action Item] Marcia Sinclair suggested a field trip for the Core 4 to visit some of these areas in the region. [Action Item]

Regional Reserves Scale Proposal

Kathryn introduced this agenda item, saying Metro has been working on a proposal for refining the regional reserves scale. John passed out a draft document and discussed the variables they used to develop this scale: the planning horizon, the range forecast, capacity of existing UGB over reserves timeframe, efficiency of development within future reserves, and employment lands. This document will be more complete and detailed after the Metro COO Michael Jordan makes his

recommendations on September 15. Deb asked if he could add placeholder assumptions for bullet three, capacity of existing UGB over reserves timeframe [Action Item]. Charlotte wondered what we did with the land that has been added to the UGB over the last thirty years. Much of it is prime land still sitting there due to lack of infrastructure, and yet we have still grown. She would like to evaluate how well we have used what we brought in before. Kathryn said we do have evaluation tools and Metro has put effort toward assessment. John added that the UGR does have information on how we have been doing in this regard; also, that they are developing new targets and measures. Some assumptions being used are different than in the past, as we know growth will not be the same as in the past. The group concluded this topic by agreeing that further discussion will be needed after the COO recommendations in September.

Upcoming Reserves Steering Committee Meetings

The group reviewed potential agenda items for the September 9 RSC meeting and discussed whether or not it was necessary. It was decided that an email will be sent out to committee members to inquire if they have questions. Depending upon the response, the Core 4, PMT and Deb will decide to proceed with the meeting or answer the questions via email. [Action Item]

Wrap-up/Summary

Deb noted that in the upcoming months there will be a lot of conversations between the Core 4 and staff, and that it is important that everyone be available to each other. She asked the Core 4 and PMT staff to reach out if there are shifts or significant changes during this timeframe.

Next meeting: currently set for Monday, September 21, 9:00 a.m. – noon, at Metro. The Core 4 is considering scheduling an additional meeting on Wednesday, September 9, from noon – 3:00 pm. If scheduled, it will be posted on the website.

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 12:03 pm.

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.