



## RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes  
October 22, 2009  
Metro Regional Center  
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

### 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), Robin McArthur (Metro), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Ed Bartholemy, Dick Benner, Bob Bobosky, Wink Brooks, Carol Chesarek, John Holan, Julia Hajdk, Sean Keys, John Messner, Judy Messner, Dennis Mulvihill, Kelly Ross, Doug Rux, Joseph Schaefer, Karen Schilling, Dick Schouten, Michael Sykes, Pete Truax, Tom Vander Zanden. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

#### Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 11:40 am. Jeff Cogen left a message that a Board meeting has come up and sent apologies that he would be late. He offered to stay later than 1:30 pm if that would be helpful, but given other people's schedules, we will end the meeting at the scheduled time. Deb reviewed the agenda, noting that the focus for today will be to debrief the October 14 Reserves Steering Committee meeting and to continue to discuss the Proposed Preliminary Areas of Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion.

#### Approval of Minutes

Deb asked for approval of the Core 4 meeting summary from October 9. There were no suggested changes and the summary was adopted as final.

#### Core 4 Updates

There were no updates from the Core 4.

#### Regional Urban and Rural Reserves

To debrief the October 14 RSC meeting, Kathryn Harrington began by saying it was useful to receive the State memo. Reading it reminded her of why they embarked upon this journey – to protect lands and plan for the future. The decision they make will only be as good as it is enduring. She would like to reflect upon the question how do they as a Core 4 want to gel this information.

Tom Brian felt that all feedback was equally important, no one group more than another. It was good to hear from the State and to learn that not all agencies were in agreement on all issues. Kathryn agreed, adding that after multiple close reads, she has found good information and some points that need clarification. Charlotte Lehan would like clarification on how the State views undesignated lands. She felt their letter was confusing on this topic. All agreed that the October 14 RSC meeting was informative, and elicited thoughtful, useful feedback to consider in the weeks ahead.

Deb asked if there were any updates from the PMT. Doug McClain from Clackamas County said that Oregon City met and changed several of their recommendations. They made changes in UR-U, UR-W, and said that the area west of 213 should be rural not urban reserve. The Clackamas County Board has not had time to consider these and has not changed their recommendations. Kathryn said that the Clackamas County Board is in tune with the regional nature of the decisions, and she is not surprised by Oregon City's request. It is more information to consider. Kathryn added that she wanted to reemphasize that all the areas designated as letters are not fully letters yet. There are boundary questions and other issues to discuss. It is all in flux for the time being.

Chuck Beasley from Multnomah County reported that the City of Gresham has expressed an interest in the area between 302 and the UGB, to the east of UR-AA. It was noted as UR-15, south of Lusted Road, west of 302. Kathryn reminded the group to always confirm that the suitability analysis has been done to these areas as we make changes going forward.

The group then went around the map, commenting on specific areas if there was new information to provide.

UR-1	No new information.
UR-2	From the State memo, they recommend that the county reconsider the line to the north; there is no good natural boundary.
UR-3	Tom Brian said that the jurisdiction is working to refine the map and their proposal. There are no conclusions yet. Kathryn Harrington proposed that the area be divided into UR-3A and UR-3B, one area containing foundation agriculture land and one with a small residential area. She thinks they should be considered separately. All were in agreement with the proposed change.
UR-4	Tom said he is not clear about the impact of the COO's report on this section. Kathryn said the COO recommends not going all the way to Highway 47. The challenge is trying to find the right natural boundary. Council is not comfortable going all the way to Highway 47. It will be left as is for now on the Areas for Further Discussion list.
UR-E to UR-16	Kathryn said that Council is not comfortable about this due to flood plains. They are leaning toward "no." She wonders if it can be changed to a number. All agreed and it was changed to UR-16.
UR-5, 6 and UR-G	Kathryn said that she and Carl Hosticka met with the Beaverton Mayor and their Economic Development Director discussed UR-5 and UR-6. Metro Council is now leaning toward UR-5 as rural and UR-6 is still in flux. Charlotte Lehan added that the agriculture representatives are not comfortable with any of UR-5 being urban and that same for most of UR-6; and not using Rosedale Road as a boundary for UR-G is preferred by them.
UR-J	Kathryn would like clarification from the State on this area. The area near UR-J should be changed to green.

UR-7	This area is in flux, finer map work is needed to find more logical boundaries.
UR-9	This area is in flux, finer map work is needed to find more logical boundaries. Kathryn wondered why this is not being considered for a rural designation. Council wants to hear more about the suitability analysis in this area. Clackamas County is strongly in favor of this remaining undesignated.
UR-8	Kathryn commented that this area is about cleaning up the lines between the city limits and a flood plain. She is not sure if there is any controversy. It could be moved to a letter. Tom would like to check first before he agrees, he does not have enough information.
UR-L	Metro is asking staff to see if this area can be extended.
UR-10 and -11	Clackamas County Commission is leaning toward UR-11 as urban, but it is still under discussion. They are not clear on the lines. The area to the north will be reduced in size, likely removing a third and making it rural. They have not drawn the line. More discussion is needed on RR-2, a small area in that may be taken out and made undesignated.
UR-12	Metro Council is interested in more information on this area.
UR-13	Doug and Charlotte are meeting with the City of Sandy today. They are concerned about foundation agriculture land in the area. Kathryn would like more information for the Council.
UR-Y	Metro Council is interested in more information on this area.

Flip Chart Notes

**UPDATES**

- UR-15 South of Lusted Road and west of Highway 302
- UR-3B North of TV Highway, south of rail road tracks, east of 341<sup>st</sup>
- UR-E becomes UR-16
- \* Purple near UR-J becomes green

October 26 Core 4 Meeting and Meeting with Metro Council

Kathryn said the Council is looking forward to meeting with the Core 4 on Monday. The intention is not to go over every area in detail, but to discuss the areas in order of priority. Kathryn went over the areas and identified their priority so staff and the Core 4 could be ready to respond with the most up-to-date information possible.

Higher priority for Metro Council

- UR-C
- UR-S
- UR-10
- UR-11
- UR-12
- UR-Z
- UR-13 – foundation agriculture land
- UR-9 – suitability

UR-K – suitability  
UR-L – suitability  
UR-G – boundaries

Summary of two areas in Clackamas to be left undesignated, need to answer why these areas are not candidates for reserves.

Second tier priority for Metro Council

UR-1 – informational needs  
UR-4 – boundary  
UR-5  
UR-6  
UR-7

Lower priority for Metro Council

UR-A  
UR-J  
UR-E

In addition, Kathryn said there are larger policy discussions to have about rural and undesignated areas, as well as neighboring cities, but there is only so an hour and a half. Doug wondered if the Council is looking for thirty minute presentations from each county or will it be more of a question and answer session. Kathryn said they are looking for brief presentations and more interactions. Robin McArthur will be facilitating on Monday.

Wrap-up/Summary

Next Core 4 meeting: Monday, October 26, 9:00 am – noon at Metro, Room 401, followed by a work session with the Metro Council from 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm in the Council Chambers. Two additional meetings were scheduled: Friday, November 13, from 9:00 am to noon and Friday, December 4, from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm.

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 1:40 pm.

Meeting summary prepared by Kearns and West.



---