



RESERVES CORE 4

Summary Notes

October 26, 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), Robin McArthur (Metro), Doug McClain (Clackamas County), Marcia Sinclair (Metro), Ray Valone (Metro), John Williams (Metro). Public attendees: Ed Bartholemy, Dick Benner, Bob Bobosky, Carol Chesarek, Tom Coffee, Danielle Cowan, Mike Dahlstrom, John Holan, Patrick Johnson, Sue Marshall, Mary Kyle McCurdy, John Messner, Richard Meyer, Dennis Mulvihill, John O'Neil, Linda Peters, Kelly Ross, Doug Rux, Dick Schouten, Brian Wegener, Matt Wellner. Facilitation team: Deb Nudelman and Melissa Egan (Kearns & West).

Agenda Review

Deb Nudelman called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. Deb reviewed the agenda, noting that the focus for today will be to continue to discuss the Proposed Areas of Preliminary Agreement and Areas for Further Discussion, as well as to prepare for the afternoon session with the Metro Council.

Approval of Minutes

Due to the short amount of time since the last Core 4 meeting, the October 22, 2009 summary was not completed. It will be addressed at the next Core 4 meeting on November 9, 2009.

Core 4 Updates

Kathryn Harrington said that the Metro Council joined MPAC for a retreat on Friday, synching up on the RTP. They had a lot of good discussion, it was a very useful meeting.

Charlotte Lehan gave the group an update on their meeting with Sandy. She and Doug McClain met with the mayor and city manager about areas UR-Z and UR-13. The main priority for them is maintaining the view corridor. They prefer that there be no development along Highway 26. UR-13 concerns them. They would like it to be a rural reserve, the current uses are not ideal. It was suggested to designate it as the Mount Hood View Corridor to help achieve the goal of protecting the view. There is also the option of designating it as regionally significant industrial (RSI). Jeff Cogen asked if the intent could be stated in the IGA, and if so, how would that be done? Dick Benner said Metro could modify its agreement with the City of Sandy and Clackamas County. Thus far they have stayed away from designating particular uses, but it does not preclude making such an agreement among the Core 4. Also, IGAs can address such topics, but they are advisory only. The

legally binding provisions would come with a rural reserve. If it is designated an urban reserve, it is not binding to that level, but would have to be in an agreement with Sandy.

Kathryn added that Metro could document the intent through an agreement with Clackamas County. Doug noted that there is a two mile separation between the urban part of Sandy and UR-13. If it were designated rural, it would reduce the pressure for commercialization and signage along Highway 26. They are still in discussions about boundaries and property lines. Dick Benner said he is maintaining a list of legislative concepts and this is on the list: if you are a property owner, and your land has both urban and rural designation on the same lot, one ought to be able to split the property.

Regional Urban and Rural Reserves

Kathryn noted that the state memo highlighted some differences in how the counties made their recommendations for urban and rural designations. Dick Benner said he also saw that the state memo raised the issue, but thinks there is a strong argument that the factors have been applied consistently, with minor differences between the counties.

Deb reviewed some of the remaining issues to be discussed as mentioned in the state agency memo. Concerning the timeframe, Jeff said it seemed to him that the Core 4 has preliminarily agreed to the 20 year check-in. Tom Brian said it is an interesting idea, and that it will likely happen whether the Core 4 designate it or not. His concern is that it is another step toward increasing uncertainty. Jeff added that his understanding is that the only thing that can be done in 20 years is to re-address the undesignated areas. Dick said that the Metro framework calls for a review of urban designations every fifteen years. Jeff likes the idea of working with a 40 year planning timeframe and a specific check-in half way through. He feels this construct appropriately acknowledges that this is a process with a significant amount of “guestimation” involved. Doug said that at the twenty year check-in, you could also add to urban reserves should that be needed. Jeff said another benefit is that for undesignated land, adjustments can be made as we see how governance develops over time. Tom asked if the COO range would have to be adjusted to show the new ranges. John Williams said that yes, and that he can provide the figures after the meeting. [Action Item]. Charlotte Lehan added that she is comfortable with the 20 year check-in and 40 year planning window construct.

Deb noted the state memo discussed the issue of ensuring there are adequate employment lands. Kathryn said that there was good discussion on this topic at the MPAC retreat. They discussed the need for strategic development of industrial clusters, the strategic designation of rural reserves, and the current gap in sited large lots. Tom said he was surprised that the state memo said for rural designations, it has to be on the verge of being threatened. If so, then that changes some things. Jeff said he had a slightly different read on this issue in the memo. Dick also did not read it that way; threatened by urbanization is only one of the factors. Charlotte said she feels like the counties should be consistent and would take under consideration moving the green out. She does not have strong feelings about it either way, she just wants to get it right. Jeff said we can do what we think is best, even if it different from what the state stays. Their memo is one of many pieces of information for us to consider.

The Core 4 briefly discussed the issue of spill-over. Tom said that an example of an issue that can arise from spill-over comes from his past experience as a legislator in Newberg. They tried to expand the clean air testing area because of all the traffic. It did not happen, but it shows the type of issue that can come up and how local governments and agencies may be called upon to respond.

Concerning transportation, the Core 4 will need to look at the impacts of this overlay. Kathryn said a key concern is to make the most of what we have instead of land expansion. Jeff noted that the state memo discusses the Shute Road interchange. Tom agreed that we need to maximize the existing investments. It is a planned project with funding in the pipeline. There are also improvements to Highway 26 to be done. Kathryn agreed that it is far less expensive to expand Highway 26 to three lanes than it is to build something new. Tom reiterated his concern for jobs, housing and regional balance. If we do not have balance, and we just force more commuters through the tunnel, then we will have made a mistake. He does not want to institutionalize long commutes.

The Core 4 discussed the issue of urban reserves which contain wetlands, as noted in the state memo on page 8, section 11. Jeff said we need to consider this as a region. Dick agreed that consistency is a good idea on this issue. Metro has no authority to protect wetlands through urban reserves, but lands maintain their existing zoning no matter their designation, so protections are still built in. Charlotte cautioned that we remember that the total area of impervious surfaces have a big impact on the watershed. Tom added that he has heard a suggestion of requiring on-site retention for run-off. That was done in Tigard at the low end of the Tualatin River. The water was held, but was released at the wrong time, making flood conditions worse. He said we need to be careful about one-size-fits-all planning.

The Core 4 continued to discuss issues and topics noted in the state memo. Forestlands were mentioned briefly. Charlotte noted that one issue is residences popping up in forest lands. Doug said there are a lot of provisions to address such things as wild fire management. None of that will change with this process. Charlotte brought up the issue of undesignated lands and the state perspective as stated in the memo. They appear to use them only as a buffer, not relating them back to the factors. She thinks that is wrong and a significant policy issue that needs to be addressed. Clackamas County used it for areas that scored low on urban and low on rural factors. She thinks the state approach incorrectly interprets the statute. Dick said that he questioned Richard Whitman on this topic, and Richard said he would need to think about it and get back to him. Charlotte noted that there is a significant difference between “foundation” and “important” agricultural lands. If we lost “important” agricultural land, it would not cause a cascading negative affect for agriculture. Tom said he is still struggling to give undesignated a meaning, other than just not qualifying.

Considering the next several weeks of meetings ahead, Deb asked the Core 4 for their thoughts on how to arrive at their best effort proposal by the December 16 Core 4 meeting. There are important public involvement activities to consider and schedule, for both the urban and rural reserves process and then later for the IGAs. John Williams said the PMT will meet and develop a proposal regarding public involvement and bring it to the Core 4.

Wrap-up/Summary

Next Core 4 meeting: Monday, November 9, from 9:00 a.m. to noon at Multnomah County. There was no additional business; Deb adjourned the meeting at 11:25 pm.

Meeting summary prepared by Kearns and West.

