

Washington County Reserves Coordinating Committee
November 3, 2008 Meeting Summary

DRAFT

General Meeting Notes / Action Items

(1) Acting meeting chair, Mayor Rob Drake opened meeting at approximately 1:35 p.m.

Attendance:

Committee:

Jim Hough, City of Banks
Rob Drake, City of Beaverton
Jef Dalin, City of Cornelius
Dave Waffle, City of Cornelius
Richard Kidd, City of Forest Grove
Ron Shay, City of King City
Aaron Johnson, City of North Plains

Keith Mays, City of Sherwood
Gretchen Buehner, City of Tigard
Chris Barhyte, City of Tualatin
Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin
Kathryn Harrington, Metro Council,
District 4
Clark Balfour, Special Districts

Staff:

Brent Curtis
Steve Kelley
Brian Hanes
Mike Dahlstrom

Jim Tice
Steven Shane
Aisha Willits

Public:

Mary Manseau, CPO7
John Williams, Metro
Mark Ottenad, City of Wilsonville
Thane Tienson, Landye Bennett
Bernstein
Bob Bobosky
Marc San Soucie, Beaverton, Washington
County Planning Commission
Wink Brooks, consultant
Art Lutz
Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro
Nora Curtiss, Clean Water Services

Carol Chesarek, Forest Park NA
Steven Sparks, City of Beaverton
Doug Rux, City of Tualatin
Kelly Ross, Western Advocates
John Holan, City of Forest Grove
Curt Zonick, Metro Parks
Gary Virgin, RROMAC
John Floyd
Jeff Bachrach, Newland Communities
Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic
Alliance (WEA)
John O'Neil, MLG

(2) Public Comments: Approximately 24 members of the general public were in attendance. No comment was offered.

(3) Project Updates

a) Phase 3 Technical Analysis – Proposed Methodology

Brent Curtis introduced the initial methodology that Washington County staff are utilizing to begin assessment of the Reserves Study Area. Referring to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) OAR Administrative Rules, Mr. Curtis discussed

DRAFT

how the study area will be refined by evaluating it first with a coarse screen and then with successive analysis through finer and finer screens. The screens are the DLCD urban and rural factors and the refinements are closer scrutiny and application of those factors.

Washington County staff presented a series of maps illustrating the county's approach. The first screen for rural reserves for instance, applies the: 1) Agricultural Land Inventory and Analysis study from the Department of Agriculture; 2) Wildland Forests from Department of Forestry; and 3) Natural Landscape Features Inventory from Metro. These studies are overlaid on the Washington County Reserve Study Area map and begin to identify areas more or less suitable for potential rural reserves.

Staff also presented a draft of the urban and rural criteria overlaid on the Washington County study area. The urban criteria were factors derived from the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 660-027-0050, - 0060.)

Staff discussed how relative values and relative weighting of those values affect the suitability for potential reserve areas.

Reserves Coordinating Committee (RCC) members provided several comments regarding the methodology and initial mapping efforts including:

- Identify state and federally protected areas, such as the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, and remove them from the study area.
- Consider eliminating proximity to UGB as a criteria.
- Consider replacing proximity to cities with proximity to services or serviceable areas.
- Use caution when applying Great Communities factors and be cognizant of the impact of changing one factor and the effects on others – they may be dramatic.
- Determine how and when the RCC can further discuss value and weight assignments to factors.
- Consider how UGB expansions will ultimately affect adjacent areas.
- Consider when and how individual cities' aspirations will be included in discussion.
- Understand long-term implications of decisions – near-term and future governing bodies will be held to these decisions and the RCC is expected to make well-informed recommendations.
- Discuss how future refinements will be managed – it appears county staff is comfortable with current iteration, yet cities must conduct thorough discussions with councils and communities.
- Recognize the difference between what are and are not policy decisions when considering values and weighting.
- The rural factors, as presented, are all favorable to rural reserves designation except for proximity. That factor is inverted – being closer has a higher value which is not necessarily better for that reserve.
- Consider how natural features could be protected under either urban or rural reserves designation – there could be more protection within an urban reserve.
- Slope may not be as significant a factor as currently considered – south county has developed much slope areas – as it may require different weighting.

- Discuss how the Washington County approach will dovetail with the regional efforts both in timeline and parallel application of factors.
- Graphic displays are very helpful to better catalyze discussions – illuminates need for cities to come up to speed quickly and have thorough discussions.
- Consider providing large printed versions for future meetings as a continual reference point.

In addition the RCC requested timely delivery of population and employment allocation estimates to more fully consider reserves creation.

Staff reinforced the utility of these screens and maps, to wit, these do not provide answers. The intention is to allow discussions on relative values and trade-offs for the group's consideration.

(4) November 12 RSC Agenda:

The group did not discuss this agenda item.

Steve Kelley, Washington County staff, presented a DRAFT 2009 meeting schedule and asked RCC members to review and provide feedback prior to the December meeting. Mr. Kelley will then provide a revised calendar.

A brief discussion followed regarding need for additional meetings beyond those scheduled. The group agreed interim meetings may be needed to conclude the project.

Staff noted all materials from this meeting will be posted on the web and members will be notified of those postings.

Meeting adjourned at approx. 3:00 p.m.