



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

December 16, 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), Maggie Dickerson (Clackamas County), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Tim O'Brien (Metro), Karen Schilling (Multnomah County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro), Aaron Wilson (Metro). Public attendees: Cherry Amabisca, Ed Bartholemy, Wink Brooks, John Cherry, Carol Chesarek, Nick Christensen, Danielle Cowan, Denny Egner, Julia Hajduk, Jon Holan, Carl Hosticka, Jeff Jorgenson, Bill Kaer, Herb Korr, Eric Martin, John Messner, Judy Messner, Richard Meyer, David Nielsen, Linda Peters, Rick Peters, Pat Ribellia, Jeannine Rustad, Doug Rux, Dick Schouten, Jim Stranding, Pete Truax, Matt Wellner. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:15 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. To help frame the conversation, Deb noted some important topics:

- Map
 - Acreage / Need
 - Jobs / Housing Balance
 - Buildable Lands
 - Regional Perspective
- 40-50 years
- 20 year check-in
- IGA
- Public Involvement

Approval of Minutes

The December 4, 2009 Core 4 meeting summary was approved as final.

Core 4 Updates

Jeff Cogen said that the Multnomah County Board approved the recommended reserves designations at their December 10 meeting. The Board has solid consensus on the east side. On the west side of the county, there are options that would be considered. If the Core 4 were to put out a map with options, Jeff said the Board is interested to know what the public says about the different options.

Tom Brian said the Washington County Board held a second public hearing last night on reserves. They heard some interesting and informative testimony. He will share more specifics later in the meeting.

Charlotte Lehan said the Clackamas County Board had a work session on Tuesday, December 15. They remain concerned about total acreage and the impact on agriculture. At the same time, they can see any of the four major areas for discussion coming into the UGB.

Kathryn Harrington said the Bragdon/Hosticka proposal map has been shared with MPAC, there has been additional extensive discussion, and it was approved by a narrow majority. They are looking for a proposal that includes fewer foundation farmland acres. They continue to have concerns about quality relative to quantity. She noted a few “hot spots,” or controversial areas which are still in discussion. They continue to be dedicated to creating a best effort proposal to be released for public comment in January.

January Public Comment Update

John Williams gave a brief overview of the upcoming public comment period in January and reviewed the timeline for getting to decisions on the IGAs in February. John distributed a draft schedule. He said that if each board wants to have a joint public hearing with the Metro Council, that is fine and it needs to be scheduled immediately. Jeff and Tom felt the joint hearing would be more useful for the IGAs, Charlotte said she could go either way. Each will check with their boards, PMT and public involvement staff to solidify the schedule and get feedback to John. [Action Item] Deb said it sounded like the window between February 8, which is the last Core 4 meeting before the IGA adoption, and February 25, when Metro will take action on the IGAs, is a good time for the counties to do their own IGA adoption process. This will come as close as possible to the simultaneous and concurrent adoption that Metro and the Core 4 have been striving for.

Regional Urban and Rural Reserves

There were three maps available for this conversation: the Core 4 Proposed Areas of Preliminary Agreement, 12/3/09, the David Bragdon/Carl Hosticka Proposal, 12/11/09, and the Robert Liberty/Rod Park/Rex Burkholder Proposal, 12/15/09. Notes were made directly on the maps to indicate areas of concurrence or changes that need to be made.

Jeff began, noting his strong preference for using the 12/3/09 Core 4 map as the basis for his comments. He distributed the Recommendations and Rationale for Reserve Designations for Multnomah County. Jeff reviewed the Multnomah County recommendations, noting the two

options he referred to earlier. One is that area 5 is currently undesignated; the board would consider a rural designation. The other is UR-7A and UR-7B. They recommend it be rural with two possible alternatives for UR-1 and the area 93 bridge; they could be undesignated or urban.

Kathryn Harrington inquired if the board had weighed in on the regional perspective. Jeff said no, not specifically. He did check in with them on the 40 – 50 year timeframe issue, and the board is comfortable either way. Kathryn mentioned the Council's concern with foundation farmland being brought in as an urban reserve, saying that if some is brought in, the impact would have to be reduced elsewhere. Jeff said that some of his board members feel similarly, others are not as driven by this principle. Kathryn said given the close proximity of the undesignated area to the UGB, she feels it will continue to come up and over. She and the Council would prefer to have it settled. Jeff said that they are looking to public comment to help focus the board on this particular question.

Tom Brian used the 12/11/09 David Bragdon/Carl Hosticka Proposal map as the basis for his comments about Washington County, saying that it closely reflects the majority view of the board. He said the board is comfortable with this being the map that goes out for public comment in January. Tom reviewed the proposed reserves designations, noting where significant issues remain to be discussed, boundaries to be decided or where there is full concurrence. Deb asked if his board had discussed the topic of a three mile boundary for rural designations. Tom said he has not heard a downside of designating a rural reserve if the area meets the factors. Kathryn mentioned North Plains and took issue with it being considered outside the Metro boundary. Tom said they will be doing their own urban reserve designation process with LCDC. They requested their area be shown in white on the map.

Charlotte Lehan worked from the 12/15/09 Robert Liberty/Rod Park/Rex Burkholder Proposal map, noting she is more comfortable with the acreage shown on the Liberty map than the Hosticka map. In addition, she said her board prefers a 40 year planning window rather than 50. Charlotte went around the map, noting where significant issues remain to be discussed, boundaries to be decided or where there is full concurrence.

The four main areas in play are Clackamas Heights, Stafford, UR-9 and UR-17. Charlotte stated that from her perspective, each of these areas has trouble meeting the factors for an urban designation and are conflicted agricultural land. They know they cannot save all this land, but they want to try. All cities are on record with strong letters of opposition to bringing these areas into the UGB. The board feels that if one area must come in, Clackamas County could support bringing in UR-17 first because it makes the most sense and has the most support. They would be comfortable with this if the total acreage was closer to the Liberty map.

Kathryn Harrington used the 12/11/09 David Bragdon/Carl Hosticka Proposal map as her reference point. She said that all seven Metro Councilors agree that they want a proposal with fewer than 28,000 acres, particularly fewer foundation agriculture acres. She passed out a letter dated December 16, 2009 to Lynn Peterson and Members of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners from David Bragdon and Metro Councilors in response to their letter concerning Stafford Area Designation. Kathryn went over the "hot spots," and explained the Metro Council view on them. She said she realizes that aspects of their proposal may be tough pills to swallow, but they have in mind the regional perspective.

Deb asked the Core 4 how they would like to map to go out for the public comment period, and how the “hot spots” can best be depicted. Kathryn said she wants to see one best effort proposal with alternatives, which could be additional maps with descriptions. The Core 4 agreed that was a good approach.

After the break, Deb asked John to make notes directly on the map, so the Core 4 could outline the areas of concurrence and the areas which will be shown with alternatives. Metro will work on the map, develop language for the descriptions and circulate among the PMT to ensure that it resonates with all. Staff will have to team with their Core 4 member to ensure it meets with their approval.
[Action Item]

Deb asked the Core 4 for their opinions on the 20 year check in and the 40 – 50 year planning window. All agreed to a 20 year check in; Tom and Jeff lean more toward 50 years, Charlotte is more comfortable with 40 years, and Kathryn likes 40 years but the Council is not yet settled on that.

Concerning IGAs, the Core 4 would like to see definitions on what constitutes a minor, medium or significant adjustment. Dick Benner will be having a meeting on this and will have more information ready for the January 11 Core 4 meeting. [Action Item]

Wrap-up/Summary

The next Core 4 meeting is Monday, January 11, from 9:00 a.m. to noon at Metro. There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 12:10.

Meeting summary prepared by Kearns and West.

