



## RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

November 13, 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), Mike Dahlstrom (Washington County), Matthew Hampton (Metro), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Tim O'Brien (Metro), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Cherrie Ambisica, Ed Bartholemy, Wink Brooks, Drake Butsch, Mark Crasbach, Carol Chesarek, Nick Christensen, Jon Holan, MaryKyle McCurdy, John Messner, Judy Messner, John O'Neil, Linda Peters, Pat Ribellia Doug Rux, Dick Schouten, Steven Sparks, Michael Sykes, Tom Vanderzanden. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

### Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:25 am. Everyone in the room introduced themselves. Deb reviewed the agenda, saying that the goal for today is to strive to reach as much agreement as possible on a refined proposal for urban and rural reserves, hopefully arriving at the next iteration of the map.

### Approval of Minutes

The October 22, 2009 and October 26, 2009 Core 4 meeting summaries were adopted as final.

### Core 4 Updates

The Core 4 had no updates.

### Reserves Intergovernmental Agreements

Dick Benner could not be here today, so John Williams provided an overview of the memo included in today's meeting packet, "Elements of Intergovernmental Agreements to Adopt Urban and Rural Reserves." The PMT worked with Dick to develop the memo which outlines the required and optional pieces of IGAs. The optional elements listed in the memo are examples; other documents or information may be added to the IGAs. Charlotte Lehan inquired about how an RSIA designation might fit into the IGAs. She wondered if there was any direction imbedded in the required elements. Doug responded that some reserves will carry conditions which will be put in the reasons or findings. He said a model could be the UGB decision in 2004. Dick will need to weigh in on this question.

Kathryn asked how do the findings and rationale fit into the required elements of the IGAs? John said that something like a narrative will be included so the agreed upon intentions of the Core 4,

Metro and Counties will be clearly stated. Kathryn asked for further clarification, wondering in what part of the document it would be housed. Doug said it could be structured like an exhibit, e.g., Exhibit A is a map, Exhibit B is the findings, or “pre-findings” because it would not yet be a legal document. For clarity, a narrative or rationale will be added as Required Element #12 to the memo. [Action Item] Doug said that the PMT could do a draft IGA for one of the areas so the Core 4 would have an example to work with and comment upon for the December 4 Core 4 meeting. [Action Item]

Jeff Cogen noted that it is essential to determine to what degree these are legally binding and for what time period. Deb said it would be useful to ask Dick to draft language regarding Metro’s policy on unresolved governance issues, and its relevance to and application within the Reserves process. Kathryn added that it pertains to the UGB as well as reserves. Charlotte said she is not suggesting we do determined governance, she just does not want to repeat the mistake of expanding the UGB and then trying to figure out services. The PMT will work with Dick to flesh out the process by which governance is determined; this will be added as Optional Element #4 to the memo. [Action Item]

Regional Urban and Rural Reserves

Deb introduced the next agenda item, suggesting the process of going around the map, reaching agreement where possible, and keeping discussion brief so the Core 4 has time to address each area. John re-drew the lines on the map as the discussion went along. The chart below shows the refined proposals which were the result of the discussion.

**Refined Proposals**

**Area as of 11/9/09    Re-named with 11/13 refined proposals**

UR-14	UR-14A	Adjacent to Troutdale – 210 acres
UR-15 & AA	UR-15	Springwater east/East of Gresham
UR-Z & 13	UR-Z13	Boring, with buffer on Highway 26
UR-Y		Lot line adjacent, and white becomes green
UR-X		Same
UR-W		Same
UR-V		Same
UR-U		Small extension on 213, both sides
UR-Q		Same
UR-R		Same
UR-T		Same
UR-12		Only Urban if short of land; parking lot for now. If removed, undesignated
RR-2	Delete from rural list	RR-2 goes away – add Parrot Creek Canyon to RR
RR-1	Delete from rural list	Off discussion list. Stays green as rural

UR-S*		Proposed all purple; not all in agreement with change – governance concerns
UR-L		Keep UR; bring in rest of quarry
UR-11		Could come in as urban
UR-10		Would stay undesignated
UR-O		Same
UR-P		Same
UR-M		Same
UR-N		Same
UR-#__		Name it
UR-9		Ask Dick what is the best way to designate if interest is to hold it for connector project and not otherwise developed and unavailable; reduce size/n. portion
UR-K		Linkage to UR-9 and UR-L; stays same for now
UR-7	UR-7A & UR-7B	Top half becomes rural; 7A, consensus on urban; 7B, still in discussion for rural and boundary
UR-8		Move it to the urban letter list
UR-J		Same
UR-I		Same
UR-H		Same
UR-5		Not urban
UR-6		Notch out SW corner still under discussion
UR-G*		Depends on boundary. Some would want it rural to protect edges; then could go to Rosedale Road as the edge of urban
UR-D		Same
UR-16		Under discussion
UR-F		Under discussion
UR-3A & 3B*		Still under discussion; UR-3B could be a letter, subject to boundary discussion
UR-4*		Still under discussion as related to the outcome of 3A and 3B
UR-C		Still under discussion
UR-2	UR- 2A & UR-2B	Shrink it down to south of West Union (2A); rest needs more discussion (2B). Rest of Helvetia area comes off, 5,600 acres.
UR-B		Same
UR-A		Off the table
UR-1		Under discussion

### Wrap-up/Summary

In summary, Charlotte said she is concerned about the amount of foundation agricultural land that is being considered for urban designation. She feels the Core 4 must ensure there is a real need. All agreed to this principle. Kathryn commented that she brought forward some information on rural

designations at the last meeting, which did not get discussed today. Metro will produce a refined map along with acreage. [Action Item] Metro will also distribute via email the informational map showing the 3-mile ring extending from the UGB. [Action Item] Deb asked the Core 4 to review the 3-mile map and consider where it might make sense to use that construct. Tom Brian would like to be sure that the Core 4 explores both the pros and cons of the 3-mile construct.

Next Core 4 meeting: Friday, December 4, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at Multnomah County.

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 12:10 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.