



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

December 9, 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), Dick Benner (Metro), Brent Curtis (Washington County), Mike Dahlstrom (Washington County), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Tim O'Brien (Metro), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Ed Bartholemy, Bob Bobosky, Wink Brooks, Carol Chesarek, Nick Christensen, Tom Coffee, Carlotta Collette, Julia Hajduk, Jon Holan, Carl Hosticka, Mary Kyle McCurdy, John Messner, Richard Meyer, John O'Neil, Rod Park, Linda Peters, Pat Ribellia, Jeannine Rustad, Jim Standring, Michael Sykes, Randy Tucker, Pete Truax, Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:12 am. She reviewed the agenda, noting that the two main topics are continued discussion of urban and rural reserves and an overview of public involvement activities for the draft intergovernmental agreements.

Approval of Minutes

The December 4, 2009 Core 4 meeting summary will be reviewed at the December 16, 2009 Core 4 meeting.

Core 4 Updates

Charlotte Lehan presented a letter from the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners which clarifies their position on Stafford. It was sent by email to the Metro Council and distributed today in addition to the meeting packet.

Jeff Cogen said there is nothing new to report today and that the Multnomah County Board will discuss reserves designations tomorrow.

Tom Brian said the Washington County Board met last night for a public hearing on reserves. It was well attended and approximately 40 people testified. There will be another public hearing next week.

Kathryn Harrington said she has a significant update today. She and other Metro Council members have had one-on-one conversations with the Core 4. At the December 8 Council work session, David Bragdon and Carl Hosticka presented a proposal map to the Council, which included some modifications to the most recent version of the map. Carl is joining the Core 4 meeting today to discuss this proposal.

Regional Urban and Rural Reserves

Metro Councilor Carl Hosticka presented his proposal map titled “David Bragdon/Carl Hosticka, 12/08/09,” (12/8 proposal map). He said that he considers it to be a platform to be used to continue discussions. It is not final but it does get us closer to a specific, concrete proposal. Carl reminded the group that an urban designation does not mean the area will urbanize immediately; it opens the opportunity for the future. Carl then went around the map, discussing the areas and rationale for their proposed urban designations.

In Multnomah County, they adopted the county recommendations with some minor changes. In Washington County, they modified some of the county recommendations. For example, they want to ensure that Rock Creek becomes a boundary. The lines can be refined but the objective is to have development only on one side, with the creek and associated wetlands as a natural boundary. Concerning Helvetia, they propose one parcel become an urban reserve, one parcel be left undesignated and half of the area become a rural reserve. In their view, rural reserves can create a policy natural boundary where there is no actual natural boundary. Regarding Stafford, they would rather see it develop as planned low density urban rather than high density rural. In Carl’s view, this is the only area on the map that still needs significant discussion.

Brent Curtis asked when they were developing their proposal map, did they use a certain number of total acres or some other method for making decisions. Carl said they did not use any number of acres as a goal. He said that the period of the technical analysis as the focal point for decisions on reserves is ending, and that now is when vision and values are the focus. Carl said the Metro Council is interested in specific amendments to this proposal. Chuck Beasley noted that Multnomah County provided a tax lot specific map and he wondered if Carl and David used this while developing their proposal. His concern is the outer edges of the rural designations. Carl said they only dealt with rural reserves as they directly related to urban reserves, not outlying areas. Chuck will provide the information to make adjustments to the 12/8 proposal map. [Action Item]

Jeff asked if the 12/8 proposal map has support from the full Metro Council. Carl said it was only presented yesterday, so they are not quite at that point yet. They still need to take in feedback and do a formal proposal. Carl said his proposal adds up to approximately 28,000 acres, thus it is at the high end of the range. If there is heartburn over the number of acres, he wants to point out that if every acre were developed over the planning forecast range, it would only increase the urbanized area by twelve percent during a period in which the population is projected to double. Tom Brian added that he appreciates Carl’s efforts to help narrow the discussion.

Deb said that for the remainder of this discussion, she proposes the Core 4 go around 12/8 proposal map, noting areas of full concurrence and areas for further discussion. Areas to be discussed will be circled on the map to continue to narrow the discussion and so Kathryn has concrete feedback to bring to the Council at their December 10 session. The group went through the proposals for each county, indicating full concurrence for numerous areas.

Charlotte noted that the tenor of the 12/8 proposal map discussion felt like it was leaning more toward a 50 year planning window, when before it seemed more like 40 years. She is also interested in seeing a breakdown of acres for each county for foundation, important, and conflicted farmland, as well as natural resources and employment lands. [Action Item] John Williams said that staff will calculate some numbers over the break. Charlotte also has concerns about how undesignated land appeared to be used in the proposal, that it may not have been based upon the factors. Carl responded that everything in their proposal was based upon the factors.

Charlotte wondered why on the 12/8 proposal map, Clackamas County loses the part of Stafford they said they wanted and get the part they said they do not want. In addition, if it is to be urbanized, she wondered why they did not go all the way to the river. Carl’s comment on wanting low density urban instead of high density rural does not make sense to her. It is too costly to put in services to plan for low density. The Core 4 continued discussion on other areas in Clackamas County and postponed the remainder of the Stafford discussion until after the break.

Breakdown per acre from the 12/8/09 David Bragdon/Carl Hosticka Proposal Map

	Urban – Conflicted	Urban – Important	Urban - Foundation
Washington Cty	2,516	1,015	10,169
Clackamas County	11,985	554	1,130
Multnomah Cty	144	-	1,022
Total	14,645	1,569	12,321

Total urban acres: 28,535

	Rural – Conflicted	Rural – Important	Rural - Foundation
Washington Cty	4,465	23,802	102,228
Clackamas County	7,620	31,395	24,933
Multnomah Cty	-	9,153	38,244
Total	12,085	64,300	165,405

Total rural acres: 241,790

The above numbers were calculated by Metro staff during the break in response to Charlotte’s request. Returning to the Stafford discussion, Charlotte said that Clackamas County wanted to keep the connection open to Borland, it makes the most sense for ease of future governance. She added that the infrastructure issue is about driving density. When it costs more, you have to have more expensive homes or larger numbers of less expensive homes. Both West Linn and Lake Oswego are interested in center-based development, not expansion. Also, both cities are growing in the opposite direction, away from Stafford. If the goal is transit-friendly, walkable development as the COO

Report said, she feels the 12/8 proposal does not meet that. Jeff noted that the southerly portion of UR-S does not appear to be on the 12/8 proposal map and he wondered why. John said he would ask Carl. [Action Item] Kathryn said that the majority of the Metro Council believes that Stafford should have urbanization. Charlotte responded that it is important to look at the issue of need to determine if there is a reason to bring in expensive to serve, low productive land. She is suggesting this area be undesignated, not rural, to leave open the possibility for future urban designation if they are wrong or if the need arises. Charlotte proposes bringing in UR-S and leaving the rest undesignated.

Deb said the Core 4 still need to have discussions on need and the 40 or 50 year planning window. Tom added that we still do not know the performance of the lands designated in the 12/8 proposal map, as well as the jobs – housing balance on a regional scale. He added that it really sunk in for him today, upon reading the letter from Clackamas County, that they only have two employment areas. Charlotte agreed, noting that with the 12/8 proposal map, they lost some employment land. Deb noted several items for the Core 4 to think about in preparation for the December 16 meeting: review highlighted areas on 12/8 map, consider need, amount of acreage, jobs/housing balance, 40-50 year timeframe, 20 year check in, public outreach and draft IGAs.

January Public Comment Overview

John Williams gave a brief overview of the upcoming public comment period in January and described the timeline for getting to decisions on the IGAs in February. He asked Mike Dahlstrom to provide a summary of the planned activities. Mike said they have been educating the public to raise awareness about the reserves process and will solicit further input in January. They will have Google Earth on-line so people can get tax lot specific information. They will collect feedback through surveys, open houses, fliers in English and Spanish and Metro will have a telephone hot line. The results will be provided in time for the February 8 Core 4 meeting.

Flip Chart Notes

Action Items to Prepare for 12/16 meeting topics

- Review highlighted areas on 12/8 map
 - Consider need
 - Amount of acreage
 - Jobs/housing balance
 - 40-50 year timeframe
 - 20 year check in
 - Public outreach
 - Draft IGA
1. Multnomah County refine rural edges per the Multnomah County recommendations
 2. Know breakdown
 - a. By county
 - b. By acres
 - c. How much is foundation, conflicted, natural resources and by county
 - d. Employment land
 3. Ask Carl why the southerly portion of UR-S did not get included in 12/8 proposal

Wrap-up/Summary

The next Core 4 meeting is Wednesday, December 16, from 9:00 a.m. to noon at Metro.

There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at noon.

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.