



## **RESERVES CORE 4**

Summary Notes

September 21, 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), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Ed Bartholemy, Dick Benner, Carol Chesarek, Tom Coffee, Chris Foster, Pat Johnson. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

### **NOTES**

#### Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:15 am and reviewed the agenda.

#### Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 minutes from August 19. There were no comments or corrections, and the summary was adopted as final.

#### Core 4 Updates

There were no updates from the Core 4.

#### Updates on County Recommendations

Brent Curtis said that the only changes in the data that will be presented on 9/23 are very small and are due to re-calculations of GIS information. He and his staff have spent time preparing materials and a guide for the upcoming RSC meeting.

Chuck Beasley said that the Multnomah County CAC forwarded their recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners. Jeff Cogen noted that the Board made no changes or specific recommendations, and validated the suitability work done by citizens and staff.

Doug McClain provided an update for Clackamas County, saying that they have had numerous changes made by the Board. In preparation for the 9/23 RSC meeting, they created a chart with a

brief summary of the Board's discussion and rationale. The Board spent most of last week in reserves conversations. Doug went over some of the more significant changes that were made to Stafford, Newell Creek Canyon and the Clackanomah area, and noted that they are still in the process of meeting with property owners. He said they are also still grappling with the question of what to do with the ribbons of rural designated land dividing urban areas. They are working to refine their recommendations of these types of areas. Tom Brian wondered about protecting Beaver Creek and Doug responded that no matter the designation, it is still protected by Goal 5.

### Strategies for a Sustainable and Prosperous Region

Kathryn Harrington introduced Metro COO Michael Jordan's "Making the Greatest Place: Strategies for a sustainable and prosperous region" recommendations. This document represents four years of work concerning how the region has been growing, and how to put all the planning and values into action. It discusses maintaining and improving our quality of life, contains feedback from the public, and discusses creating jobs for people here and those who will be coming here. It also discusses challenges, such as protecting natural resources. The full set of recommendations fills two large binders; a CD will be available for everyone instead of paper copies. Kathryn said they will be going on what she refers to as a "listening tour," to hear feedback from the public at six open houses and five public hearings.

John Williams continued, pointing out highlights in the Executive Summary. The three umbrella topics are: 1) Make the most of what we have: Invest to maintain and improve our existing communities; 2) Protect our urban growth boundary: To the maximum extent possible, ensure that growth is accommodated within the existing boundary; and 3) Walk our talk: Be accountable for our actions and responsible with the public's money. John said a baseline assumption is that most growth will happen within the current UGB because there remains a tremendous amount of zoned capacity. Another important baseline assumption is that development patterns will continue to change, and that the region will continue to see different markets and different industries, which will lead to different types of growth in the future.

Concerning urban and rural reserves, the themes from the COO recommendations are: prioritizing lands which will strengthen and compliment existing communities; prioritizing lands which compliment compact growth; supporting key job creation in four main geographic areas: N. Hillsboro, S. Sherwood/W. Wilsonville, Stafford, and near Highway 26; using urban and rural reserves to protect farmland; and finding hard edges using natural features wherever possible.

Charlotte Lehan commented on the issue of edges, noting she has changed her mind on this issue over time. Clackanomah scores high on both urban and rural, and there is no way to make a hard edge with a natural resource. The notion of allowing an undesignated buffer between rural and urban has come up, but she feels it does not work for foundation farmland, and that it also is not allowed under statute. They try to stay away from using roads as edges; good planning will have both sides of a road compatible and similar.

Tom Brian questioned how we will know if the COO's recommendations contain adequate capacity unless we see allocations by county? John Williams responded that they know where the vacant lands are and can make assumptions on how they will be utilized. He said that Tom is correct, that there is no proposal or specific allocation and that it is more of a policy level discussion. Tom added that he feels the estimated results are just not being put out there. If 70-80% of projected growth will go into the existing UGB, what does that look like? He feels that would be very useful information. He has a lot of experience in this and knows that fast-tracking industrial land does not

work; land must be ready to go, with the stricter rules and safeguards that they have talked about. Kathryn said that Metro is not in the business of doing allocations, they look at market responses. Tom said that Metro has the information and he would simply like to know what it means. Kathryn said there is no one-size-fits-all allocation methodology. Tom agreed, but added that it would be good to know some details on the “is this sufficient” question.

Charlotte Lehan clarified that a lot of what is in the COO recommendations is allowed under current zoning. Tom said he just wants to make sure that the baseline assumptions are realistic. Jeff asked a question for clarification on Tom’s concerns about recruitment. Tom continued, referring to the issue Richard Whitman brought up – which side is it better to err on? The UGR contains a set of assumptions and he just wants to see how they will play out. For example, he said Portland has identified 140,000 developable units – that’s only 300,000 people. Kathryn referred back to Jeff’s question on recruitment. When land is brought in for industrial and employment uses, and then it gets used in another way, how do we create a system that is supportive of the evolving marketplace while at the same time including adequate protections? Jeff brought up the idea of industrial sanctuaries, to which there had been a lot of resistance in the past. Tom said we are in a different environment than eight to ten years ago, and perhaps we could have that discussion now. In the short term, we need employment lands for the next 10-20 years; they have two or three clusters which need flat land, and that he wishes there was more on jobs, housing and balance in the COO recommendations.

#### September 23 Reserves Steering Committee Meeting

Deb went over the agenda for the upcoming RSC meeting, looking for feedback on how to make the information gathered from the small group discussions as useful as possible for the Core 4. Kathryn suggested staff make a poster with the public meeting and hearing dates for the COO recommendations sessions. Deb also said we need to be clear about what it is we are asking the RSC to do at the 9/23 meeting, and how it may be different from but related to what we ask for at the 10/14 meeting. We want the small group facilitators to help achieve maximum participation from all RSC members. Some guiding policy questions will be developed by staff for the small group discussion. [Action Item] The report out session will be kept brief.

#### Wrap-up/Summary

Next Core 4 meeting: Wednesday, September 30, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 pm, at Metro. The Core 4 is considering scheduling a tour on Wednesday, October 7, from noon – 5:30 pm.

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

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.