

COMMITTEE FOR THE FUTURE OF DAMASCUS

Date: March 10, 2003

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

Meeting #: 42

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: None

3. Action on Minutes for the Meeting of March 3, 2003:

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

Motion to approve minutes of March 3, 2003 made by Dan O'Dell, seconded by Dave Zopf and unanimously approved.

4. Public Comment: None

5. Communications: None

6. Treasurer's Report:

John Fromwiller, Treasurer, stated that the account update will be given at the next meeting, as the information was not immediately accessible.

7. Damascus CPO Report:

Barb Ledbury, Damascus CPO Chair, reported that since she had received no additional permit applications there would not be a meeting this month.

8. Sub-Committees Elect Chair:

Dee Wescott explained that the subcommittees will break up into two groups and elect a chair so that people who participate in more than one subcommittee can have the

chance to vote in both. Planning and Services/Public Safety will meet first, Public Works and Public Information will meet second and Finance/Executive Committee will meet at 8:30 to elect a chair for Finance and have a short work session. After chairs are elected, there will be a work session for Planning and Services/Public Safety.

Dee announced results of the elections. The new (or renewed) chairs are:

Greg Dardis	Planning
Dave Zopf	Services/Public Safety
Dave Rouse	Public Works
Tim Giorgi	Public Information
Dan O'Dell	Finance

Congratulations, folks!

9. Subcommittee Meetings:

a. Planning--

i. Develop Work Plan

ii. Define area neighborhoods or grid for representation during the concept planning process

b. Services/Public Safety—Develop Work Plan

10. Open Agenda:

a. Firehouse Study Group

John Hartsock, Vice Chair, reported that Jeff Tashman, consultant, presented an overview of the study that he will undertake on behalf of the County. He will determine the cost of the infrastructure necessary to provide services to the newly expanded area of the UGB (Urban Growth Boundary), identify the major issues or problems and determine possible sources for financing. Services studied will be sewer, water, roads, surface water management and public facilities. He stressed that “The study is not intended to lead to decisions on land use, governance or capital improvement planning.”

The study delineates sub areas for phase development, identifies various land use categories (such as low density residential, mixed use retail, industrial/general and many categories in between) and projects a timeline for development and related infrastructure needs within the sub areas. The study assumes, generally, a west to east development pattern. Some services, like sewers, will be accomplished within the next ten years in most newly developed areas. Other services, like transportation, will be accomplished over a longer span of time, perhaps twenty years or more.

Potential sources of revenue include SDCs (System Development Charges), various types of districts (urban renewal, special, assessment), bonds, local tax option levies, and regional revenue sharing. Preliminary observations indicate that transportation will be the most difficult service to fund.

After John mentioned that the Carver area would be first on the agenda to be serviced due to a failing septic system, the question was raised of what governance entity would be responsible for that area. John answered that it is up in the air at this point. The County has indicated that areas outside of city boundaries would not be allowed to develop, so areas that need to develop would have to be annexed into existing cities or become a city. Since the County does not want to assume governance of any area slated for urbanization and Carver and the Trillium development are too small to be financially viable candidates for becoming cities in their own right, the County would advocate for another city, such as Happy Valley or a future Damascus, to annex them.

John continued that the Memo of Understanding between the members of the Firehouse Study Group (representatives of Happy Valley, Gresham, the County, Metro, Boring Fire District, Clackamas Fire District, Sunrise Water Authority, Damascus CPO, Rock Creek CPO, Boring CPO and the Committee) is making progress:

- Mayor Grant of Happy Valley has indicated that he understands the economic importance of allowing a potential new city to include areas east of 172nd and is considering the benefits and drawbacks of the regional revenue sharing idea.
- Dee stated that the area in Pleasant Valley that just developed a concept plan may be best serviced by Gresham. To facilitate this, Michael Jordan, County Commissioner, has indicated that he would discuss a boundary change with Multnomah County to allow that area to become part of Multnomah County. As a result, Gresham would not have to hassle with governance in two counties. This same reasoning could be applied to the area in the Springwater Corridor Phase I that currently falls in Clackamas County.
- The Fire Districts have indicated that they, too, may alter boundaries to facilitate servicing new areas slated for urbanization.

John ended by stating that there was preliminary discussion that the County might limit the number of elections that the Damascus area would have to pass an incorporation measure before allowing neighboring cities of Happy Valley and Gresham to begin annexing large parts of the area. These would take place potentially in November of 2004 and again in 2006, if necessary. Reasons for limiting attempts to two are that putting a measure on the ballot is expensive (incorporation measures are paid for by the County) and residents and developers must be allowed to develop land in a reasonable amount of time (large-scale development is not allowed without a concept and comprehensive plan crafted by whatever entity has governance of the area). Elections that include a tax issue need to pass by a single majority in general elections (even-numbered years) and by a double majority at other times. Hence the goal of voting for incorporation in the 2004 or 2006 elections.

b. Memo of Understanding between the Committee, CPOs and County/Metro

The Memo of Understanding (MOU) between the Committee, the three CPOs and the County and Metro has not yet been signed. The County is reviewing it and the

Boring CPO is not happy with it as written. Some members of the Committee agree and a discussion concerning whether or not to submit a more strongly worded document giving the Committee and CPOs more of a voice in structuring the concept plan process and in determining the outcome of the concept plan ensued.

Arguments in favor of a more strongly worded document were:

- Only a partnership will allow the Committee and CPOs to affect the process and help determine when a plan has community support, otherwise they act only as a conduit of information. They then risk being considered arms of the County and losing their credibility in the eyes of the community;
- If they lose credibility, they effectively lose the trust of the community to advocate their desires should they be different than those of the County;
- With a stated partnership, it is more likely that the County will listen to the community and actually incorporate its desires into the plan, unlike what it has done many times in the past. If that, indeed, is their intention, then stating it in the MOU shouldn't cause a problem;
- A more strongly worded document does not mean the Committee and the CPOs will not work with the County/Metro, only that the Committee and the CPOs would not be beholden to them.
- Since it is our community we should have a defining voice in how it will be developed, not just be asked to choose from what the County creates.

Arguments opposed to a more strongly worded document were:

- The County/Metro has no legal obligation to work with the community to draft a plan, only to gather community input on a plan and they are already going to great lengths by agreeing to an MOU in the first place;
- The County/Metro hold all the purse strings and thereby hold all the cards;
- The County/Metro by law have ultimate approval of a concept plan, not the community;
- If the Committee and CPOs push too hard, the County is within its right to sidestep these organizations and proceed with the community outreach on its own.
- A more strongly worded document does not change the exit strategy of the Committee and CPOs should the plan proceed down a path that these organizations cannot support. Therefore there is little reason to rock the boat at this time.

It was decided that Diana Lobo, Joyce Schwer and Les Otto would attempt to write an addition to the MOU that might be acceptable to all. Barb Ledbury pointed out that the adopted concept plan in Pleasant Valley did not look anything like the initial plan. After all the input from the community was taken into account, the final plan was an amalgamation of many ideas. It is likely the same will happen here.

c. Foster Road Presentation

Dee mentioned that Kristin Hall from Metro would like to present the Foster Road plan to the Committee. It would be a short, half-hour presentation with a Q & A period following. After some discussion, it was decided that since there is a fifth Monday in March and the new meeting schedule has nothing slated for a fifth Monday, that it would make a good night for this presentation. The date is March 31st.

11. Executive Session: None

12. Adjournment

Actions Decided:

1. Foster Road presentation on Monday, March 31st, 7pm.
2. Chairs for the subcommittees.

Actions Pending:

1. MOU for the Firehouse Study Group.
2. MOU for the Committee/CPOs and the County/Metro.