

## **COMMITTEE FOR THE FUTURE OF DAMASCUS**

Date: October 28, 2002

Location: Damascus Assembly of God Church  
19070 SE Sunnyside Rd.

Meeting #: 34

Attendees: 21 (see roster for names)

Meeting will be recorded and minutes will be taken to abide by public policy. Any changes to the minutes should be given to the Secretary.

### **1. Call Meeting to Order:**

Dee Wescott, Chair, called the meeting to order.

### **2. Introductions:**

There were two additional people present. They were Kim Anderson of Sunrise Water Authority and Robert Hubbard, local resident. Welcome!

### **3. Action on Minutes for the Meeting of October 21, 2002:**

Copies of the minutes were previously sent via regular mail or email. There were no corrections or comments.

**Motion to approve minutes of October 21, 2002 made by Dave Rouse, seconded by Ernie Platt and unanimously approved.**

### **4. Public Comment:** None

### **5. Communications:**

John Hartsock reported that the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) issued a ruling that further defined Metro's right to include lands in subregions normally restricted by the regional rules, if doing so would boost a particular subregion's ability to better serve their residents. The previous rules were vague and allowed wiggle room for lawsuits. This new ruling lays out the process very clearly and should allow for some small exceptions without requiring a change in the entire philosophy of which land types are brought into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). It also gave Metro until December of 2004 to work out the details of how the projected number of acres needed for employment land would be met (Task 3), without allowing the entire expansion deadline to be postponed.

## **6. Treasurer's Report:**

Julie Wagner, Treasurer, stated that \$37 was collected via the passing of the hat to bring the total to \$986.46. She also reported that a check was received from the Mt. Hood Economic Alliance grant and Julie would be reimbursing members and paying submitted bills out of this grant money as it becomes available.

## **7. Sub-Committee Reports:**

### **a. Planning—Concept Plan Process**

John Hartsock reported on his meeting concerning the development of the concept plan once the boundary decision is made. Those attending were Clackamas County Planning (2), Metro Planning (1), Happy Valley Planning (1), Les Otto, Greg Dardis and John. The general plan is for Metro and the County to develop a work plan and to use staff instead of a consultant to develop the plan. The draft of the work plan should be completed at the end of December and the group will be contacted for comments and corrections.

The use of staff instead of consultants has advantages and disadvantages. Staff has an intricate knowledge and understanding of the issues and the area, that's an advantage. Metro and County staff have poor records of being trusted by community members, that's a disadvantage. The use of staff will save money or there will be more time and energy received for the same money spent, that's an advantage. Staff at Metro and County may have pre-conceived ideas of what the area or a city should look like, that's a disadvantage. Regardless, it does not appear that hiring a consultant will be an option, due to tight funds. Gresham developed their Concept Plan using staff, had good input from the community and won awards for the design. Funding will be split by Metro and Clackamas County. It will be available in July of 2003, though meetings of the concept plan group will likely begin in the Spring of 2003.

The group has no objection to looking at the Small Town and Greenbelt Concept as well as other concepts and suggestions from the community. It also welcomes the inclusion of John, Greg and Les into the process. It is looking forward to explaining to the community the legal parameters by which the group, or anyone developing a concept or comprehensive plan, must abide. These include housing density minimums, sustainable number of jobs, Goal 5 regulations on stream corridors, EPA regulations, etc. Not to mention public sentiment.

The role of the Committee, besides having three representatives in the concept plan group, will probably include having a member of the Planning Subcommittee as a member of the group's "staff" and will likely be as a conduit of information and ideas between the community and the group. The Committee has proven that it can rally strong attendance to community forums and will elicit more constructive dialogue at meetings than those sponsored by Metro or the County. In this way, the community can stay deeply involved in the process and can voice collective preferences and disapprovals through the Committee to the group. The cost of these forums can be shared by the Committee, Metro and the County.

Randy Shannon suggested that perhaps a couple of computer kiosks could be set up in the community to gather more specific input about the issues and potential designs as the process unfolds. They could also be used to give specific information to answer questions about individual properties on demand using maps with zoom capabilities. He offered to put together a proposal on logistical specifics and cost.

**b. Public Information**

Dee Wescott, Chair, announced that Marty Beaudet resigned as Public Information Subcommittee Chair. Julie Wagner will be the interim Chair until January. Marty will continue to be an active member of the Committee and the Public Information Subcommittee. Thank you, Marty, for all your hard work and dedication!

**8. Old Business:**

**a. “What do we want Damascus to be?”**

The vision question is left on the agenda to remind all members to continue to think about it.

**b. Committee Work Plan/Schedule**

John Hartsock handed out a timeline for the Committee that spans from October, 2002 through November, 2004. Some discussion of it followed.

The question was asked what happens if agreement about city boundaries has not been reached between the members of the Damascus Firehouse Study Group. John Hartsock answered that it may very well not be defined, but by then all issues will have been explored fully.

There are conflicting comments coming from Happy Valley Mayor Eugene Grant and Happy Valley Planning Director Jim Crumley. Mayor Grant has stated that the Comprehensive Plan of the proposed area to be annexed will be completed before the process ends. Jim Crumley has stated that the annexed area must fit into the fabric of the whole area before anything concrete can be planned.

Dee Wescott added that should Damascus decide to incorporate, a plan will be submitted to the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners (BCC) which shows the proposed boundary. Happy Valley could contest this proposed boundary to the BCC as part of the review process. (This issue is being reviewed and discussed as part of the Firehouse Group meetings with all parties participating and consensus should be obtained prior to the submittal to the BCC.) Happy Valley may appeal the final ruling by the BCC to LUBA (Land Use Board of Appeals) and further appeal LUBA’s ruling to the Court of Appeals.

Thanks to a long lag time between the submission of a request to add a vote for incorporation on the ballot and the date the BCC must decide (about 8 months), many of

these issues will have time to be worked out. However, since there is no precedent for rulings under the new incorporation regulations, it is hard to forecast exactly what will/can happen and when/why.

Another question was asked about the proposed annexation of areas to 180<sup>th</sup> Ave. by Happy Valley. If the measure on the Nov. 5, 2002 ballot in Happy Valley passes, which asks voters to give the City Council carte blanche to annex any areas for the next 10 years that are deemed to benefit Happy Valley as opposed to voters approving a specifically defined area, could the annexation take place before the November, 2004 vote for incorporation in Damascus? The answer is yes, if a majority of the property owners in the annexed area approve being annexed, or if the annexation is approved by one contiguous property owner at a time.

## **9. New Business (\*Action Item):**

### **a. General Liability Insurance for the Committee**

Dee Wescott explained in Dan O'Dell's absence that general liability insurance for the Committee is not only a good idea, should something happen to an attendee or member during a meeting or forum, but is a requirement for some grants like the Mt. Hood Economic Alliance (MHEA) grant that the Committee received in September. They had graciously allowed the Committee to proceed under the stipulation that insurance would be purchased as soon as the Committee was officially established as an entity and could afford the premium. There are two ways to pay for the insurance, which would be purchased through Wilson-Heirgood Associates (they cover the Boring Fire District and many other public agencies in Oregon): all at once and financed quarterly.

The plan would cost \$1,114.08 per year and would include the following coverage:

- ❖ \$1 million limit for each occurrence
- ❖ \$2 million limit for general aggregate
- ❖ \$1 million limit for personal and advertising injury
- ❖ \$50,000 limit for damage to rented premises
- ❖ \$5000 limit for medical expenses limit on any one person

The premium can not be paid from funds of grants the Committee currently receives, so must be funded by the pass-the-hat money collected thus far from members. Julie Wagner, Treasurer, stated that there would be just enough money to cover this premium outright but doing so would essentially zero out the account. This would leave the Committee with no funds should something come up that can not be covered by grant money. Financing the premium would cost \$93.94 per year but would allow the Committee to pay \$455.57 initially, then \$250.85 every 3 months.

After some discussion, which generated some questions that need further research, it was decided to accept this plan and pay it in installments. Some concerns voiced were that the damage to rented premises limit was too low. However, it was explained that the Committee does not actually rent space on a regular basis as an office.

The use of the church for meetings and the use of the school for public forums would not be considered rented premises. Anything happening in these places would be covered under the other categories. There was another question of whether Committee members were personally liable, should this insurance not cover a massive lawsuit. It was unclear if members would be personally liable or whether it would be officers only or no one at all. Another concern was the medical expenses limit may be too low. It was explained that minor medical expenses would be covered up to \$5000 and above that the general aggregate coverage would apply.

**Motion to accept the coverage offered by Wilson-Heirgood and pay it in installments with accompanying finance charges made by John Briece, seconded by Gary Fosberg and unanimously approved.**

**b. Thank You Notes for Forum**

Joyce Schwer, Secretary, reported that the Public Information Subcommittee suggested writing thank you notes to the people who registered at the public forum in order to show appreciation for their participation and spread some good cheer. There were approximately one quarter who could be thanked by email and the rest would need to be sent a letter via regular mail. This would require spending approximately \$150 on postage and paper/envelopes, which could be funded by grant money. The Committee would need to approve this expenditure and the content of the letter.

There was some discussion on the content of the letter. One suggestion was that it contain results of the forum as well thank you and to mention when the next forum might be. After being discussed, it was decided that the results would be printed in the next edition of the Observer as well as having been printed in the previous edition of the Firebreak. Since it is unclear exactly when the next forum may be, it would be safe to say to look for one “early next year”.

**Motion to send a thank you to participants of the public forum via email or regular mail made by Randy Shannon, seconded by Mike Hammons and unanimously approved.**

**c. Next Forum**

The discussion of when the next forum would be also included concerns about what the topic would be, how involved the concept planning group would be, how much the forums would be directed by the group vs. the Committee and who would pay for them.

The question of when the next forum would be will most easily be determined after the concept planning group lays out the work plan. At that point, it will be more obvious at what point the group will need information from the community to set into a plan or has something to show the community that needs to be evaluated. Should the Committee determine that it needs information from the community before the concept planning group does, the Committee can set up a forum to do that. If the Committee just feels the need to get out information, other means, like the Observer, the Firebreak and

flyers, will be used to disseminate information. The most likely time for the next forum will be April, which will allow enough time to see the group's schedule, obtain input from the community to be used in developing a draft of the concept plan and complete a first draft perhaps by the end of summer.

It is impossible to determine a topic for the next forum at this time. However, again, if the information needed by the concept plan group is different than that which the Committee needs, there is no reason the Committee would not be able to add questions to a forum sponsored by the group or hold one of its own should there not be enough time to piggyback onto a group-sponsored forum.

The concept planning group will need to gather input from the community at various stages in the process and, in the best-case scenario, will actually be driven by the Committee who, in turn, will be driven by community sentiment. The Committee will be the conduit between the group and the ideas of the community. The Committee will also facilitate the community forums while the group pays for the forums. Since the Committee is offering its services as facilitators, the group does not need to hire facilitators, thereby saving them money. As a result, the Committee becomes an asset (not hired help), retaining its apolitical status and maintaining its stance to represent the community first and foremost.

### **c. Next Meeting**

Dee Wescott explained that the Committee will take a break from weekly meetings during the months of November and December; however, there will be a regular meeting on Monday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, at 7 pm at the Assembly of God Church in order to update the Committee on issues of interest as well as gather to wish each other a happy holiday season. Weekly meetings will resume probably on Monday, January 7<sup>th</sup>, though a confirmation note will be sent via regular mail or email as that date gets closer. Subcommittees can use this time to meet and accomplish goals set forth in the strategic plan.

## **10. Open Agenda:**

Debbie Gardiner asked whether the method Metro uses to determine its numbers for future growth and the need for housing and jobs to accommodate that growth takes into account the current local economy and its effect on population projections, or whether those numbers were based on projections from the boom time of the 80's and early 90's. She cited an article in the Business Journal that quoted the Port of Portland numbers which projected a much lower growth rate than Metro's projections which could require half to no additional land needed to accommodate the growth. Debbie also stated that commercial vacancy rates in the Sunset Corridor are at 40% and other places, like Portland and Lake Oswego, have 20% vacancy rates. She asked if Metro takes those numbers into account as well when deciding to increase the land needed for commercial/light industrial uses. She wondered if Metro's numbers could be off enough to not require the kind of expansion that they have proposed.

It was explained that the statistician who crunches Metro's number, John Yi, has been accurate in his projections over 95% of the time and the process has been going on for over 30 years, taking into account current criteria as well as a multitude of factors that span cycles over time. The current projections assume a 28-30% infill rate, which is a very high rate and takes into account the Metro philosophy of building high density city centers. It was added that in a later article, the statistician for Port of Portland stated their projections were not intended to be used to determine housing and employment needs and that Metro uses more elaborate and detailed criteria to attain their projections. Since growth projections are designed to span 20 years, current vacancy rates are only a small consideration in the equation. Interestingly, 40-50% of growth, and therefore housing need, comes from people growing up in an area and wanting to stay in that area, the rest from an influx of people, which is usually associated with a better economy. Lastly, a planning mantra is that planning must be done before the need is apparent or the area will be playing catch-up for years. Though an area is planned for development, it is not economical for developers to build without the market demanding it. Land will remain vacant until there is a need to fill it.

**11. Executive Session:** None

**12. Adjournment**

**Actions Decided:**

1. Purchase liability insurance for the Committee and pay for it quarterly.
2. Send thank you letters to participants in the public forum.
3. Work in conjunction with the concept planning group as the best way to be a voice to the community's wishes.
4. Suspend weekly meetings until after the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year, with the exception of a general meeting on Monday, December 16<sup>th</sup>.

**Actions Pending:**

1. Next forum date and topic.
2. Concept planning group work plan.