

**DAMASCUS FIRE HOUSE STUDY GROUP**  
**MEETING NOTES**  
**MARCH 5, 2003**  
**DAMASCUS FIRE HOUSE**

Members Present: Chuck Becker, Bob Frentress, John Hartsock, Milo Haas, Barb Ledbury, Les Otto, Michael Jordan, Dee Wescott

Others Present: Maggie Dickerson (Clackamas County), Jeff Dulcich (City of Happy Valley), Gary Fosberg (Damascus CPO), Jonathan Harker (City of Gresham), Clint Holmes (City of Happy Valley), John Seagraves (Boring Water District), Larry Sowa (Clackamas County Commission), Bob Stacey (1000 Friends of Oregon), Jay Sugnet (City of Portland), Jeff Tashman (Clackamas County consultant), John Thomas (Sunrise Water Authority), Ethan Seltzer and Shayna Rehberg (Portland State University)

---

**Update on Concept Planning by Maggie Dickerson, Clackamas County**

Maggie Dickerson, Project Manager for Damascus Concept Planning and Long Range Planner at Clackamas County, reported that funding has been recommended for concept planning following a recent presentation to Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee on Transportation (TPAC). This indicates preliminary approval and inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Concept planning will bear a very close relationship to Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) work to be done for the area's Sunrise Corridor.

Products of Damascus Concept Planning will be similar to those of the Pleasant Valley Concept Planning process. However, some of the products will contain less detail than Pleasant Valley products while possessing a greater emphasis on transportation issues.

Public involvement for concept planning will be modeled on that conducted by Clackamas County for the Conversation with Damascus process. The county and Metro would like to see even greater levels of involvement, though, and will be collaborating with Committee for the Future of Damascus in order to encourage a process that is more citizen-driven and community-owned. Public involvement efforts will kick off at the beginning of 2004, unless goal setting can begin earlier than that, maybe as early as fall, 2003.

Dickerson shared both a concept planning tasks memo and map of the concept planning study area (enclosed). Concept planning tasks to be done within roughly the next year would be predominantly data collection. The "secondary" study area as depicted in the map could act like urban reserves, indicating prospective land for inclusion in the UGB in the future so long as designated for particular land uses like industrial. Parallel funding and public processes within the whole study area should be occurring through a variety of DEIS/EIS and Sunrise Corridor work, UGB and annexation issues, and incorporation and tax base projections.

It was posed whether there might eventually need to be a second ring of community participants in Damascus concept planning, such as the citizens and officials of neighboring jurisdictions like Milwaukie.

In about another year's time, workshops to develop and review scenarios and alternatives will be held during Damascus Concept Planning, again, similar to those held for Pleasant Valley. The alternatives will then undergo extensive evaluation during the EIS process.

Chuck Becker inquired as to how incorporation efforts related to the concept planning timeline, especially at the points of November 2004 and 2006. John Hartsock and Michael Jordan responded that the Committee for the Future of Damascus would submit a financial feasibility plan for a prospective City of Damascus to Clackamas County by early 2004. Then two attempts at incorporation – in November 2004 and November 2006 – would be permitted before opening area up to be annexed to existing cities and to be otherwise provided with governance. Putting a limit on the number of incorporation votes would put a reasonable limit on the amount of resources the county would need to expend in hosting an incorporation vote and offer a general guide for timing of governance options other than incorporation should that be the outcome.

A summary of the timeline for Damascus Concept Planning, thus, entails:

- Metro TPAC and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) approval on April 10;
- Metro Council approval by the end of April;
- Contracting and data collecting throughout the year;
- Goal setting this spring to fall; and
- Workshops for developing alternatives in roughly Spring 2004.

## **Discussion of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

### *Conversation between City of Happy Valley and Committee for the Future of Damascus*

John Hartsock offered to work out slight differences in defining “communities” in Principle A – Concept Planning (p. 2) between he and Gene Grant. He felt this would be a simple clarification of language. Hartsock also offered to reconvene with Grant to clarify language regarding the “vicinity of 172<sup>nd</sup>” as a boundary between Happy Valley annexation and Committee incorporation efforts. Happy Valley and the Committee are collaborating to commission a survey of residents between the former UGB and 180<sup>th</sup> (Clackamas County Fire District #1 boundary) to see whether residents identify more with Happy Valley or a future Damascus. A copy of the RFP is enclosed.

The area currently being considered for the incorporation vote November 2004 roughly spans west to Rock Creek (about 152<sup>nd</sup>), south to Highway 212 and the Clackamas River, east to the new UGB, and north to county boundaries. The Committee for the Future of Damascus has yet to set down and hard pencil that out.

## *Springwater Phase II*

Because of shared drainage, John Hartsock felt that City of Gresham makes sense as the manager of surface water in the Sunshine Valley area south of Gresham across county boundaries, known also as Springwater Phase II. Clackamas County Water Environment Services (WES) and City of Gresham should work out wastewater management and Sunrise Water Authority, Boring Water District, and Gresham water services need to discuss water provision for Springwater Phase II.

Mayor Chuck Becker emphasized that, indeed, service provision above all needs to make sense. Incorporation scenarios should be allowed to play out and for residents to choose their cities from the UGB east and the county line south. However, in equipping Springwater Phase I with services, the City of Gresham would like to know if they will also be providing services to Springwater Phase II. Gresham would like to be a full service city in which areas to which it is providing services are formally within the city boundaries. Yet the city will not fight the possibility that, in some cases, the best and most efficient service may be provided by a separate jurisdiction or service district.

Again, the area emerging as the focus of incorporation efforts as well as Clackamas County fiscal modeling includes land south of the Multnomah/Clackamas county line and between the new UGB and a western boundary to be clarified by Happy Valley and the Committee for the Future of Damascus over the next month. In other words, this area of focus currently includes land being considered for Springwater Phase II.

Commissioner Larry Sowa asked whether cities like Gresham will be stretching across county lines. Mayor Becker responded that for the purposes of planning and service provision, is best to keep land under one jurisdiction despite county boundaries.

## *Pleasant Valley Area C*

Pleasant Valley Area C has become a topic of conversation not just in terms of governance but in terms of fire service provision. Milo Haas gave an overview of the situation as outlined by a meeting of the chairs and chiefs of local fire districts. There is a common eastern/western boundary between Clackamas County Fire District (FD) #1 and Boring Rural Fire Protection District (RFPD) #59. Clackamas County Fire District #1 shares a northern boundary with Portland fire services, with whom Clackamas has an IGA. Fire districts are not as concerned about lines and boundaries more than how to invest in their services and build stations. An example of this is the land and fire station secured by bonds and planned by Clackamas close to Pleasant Valley Area C.

Dee Wescott advocated for a regional strategy for station siting that would serve people regardless of jurisdictions. To this end, he wants to hold discussions between Gresham, Boring, Clackamas and fire districts. This would entail bringing in Riley Caton, Chief of Gresham Fire and Emergency Services, in addition to the Mayor and City Manager. Boring RFPD #59 is currently engaged in an audit process with Sandy and Estacada fire districts with the hopes of

identifying efficiencies and improvements to be gained, including the possibility of merging districts.

Gresham Fire and Emergency Services is also beginning an evaluation and feasibility study process, according to Chuck Becker. Part of the process will be to evaluate the structure and management of present stations, for instance, analyzing the ration of emergency calls to fire calls. Gresham is also involved in agreements with Portland such that one station is served by Gresham serves for five months of the year and then by Portland for the other seven months of the year.

It was agreed that Mayor Becker would contact Gresham's City Manager to coordinate with Chief Caton and that Ethan Seltzer would facilitate the first meeting between Gresham, Boring, and Clackamas County fire service representatives.

Commissioner Sowa did have an additional set of comments on the MOU that he will flesh out and return to the group with by next meeting.

## **Summary and Next Steps**

So, in summary, the MOU is becoming more specific about boundaries. This understanding will be tested by the first annexation requests to file into the offices of existing cities adjacent to the Damascus area.

For the May meeting of the Damascus Fire House Study Group, there will be updates from MOU "work groups" including confirmed language clarifications from City of Happy Valley (Gene Grant) and Committee for the Future of Damascus (John Hartsock) and initial meetings of City of Gresham, Clackamas County FD #1, and Boring RFPD #59 regarding fire service provision. The May meeting will also feature updates on procedures and findings from Jeff Tashman's capital financial analysis for Clackamas County. Phase 2 of the financial analysis concerning operations costs will be receiving a key Clackamas County Commission meeting on April 17, in the interim of the next study group meeting.

The June meeting marks the last meeting contracted for the Damascus Fire House Study Group. Ethan Seltzer asked that the group be ready to evaluate next steps at that time and to determine whether to continue the study group. Mike Jordan, moving from his post at Clackamas County to Metro, personally plugged for the continuation of the group and the value of coming to a table monthly that promises to pay off great dividends in the future. As for renewing the study group contract, the Clackamas County Commission would likely accept being a contracting agent but funding would still need to be secured.

As a final matter of business, Dee Wescott, on behalf of the Committee for the Future of Damascus, asked for signature support on a grant request that the Committee is filing with the Mt. Hood Economic Alliance in order to perform financial feasibility studies of incorporation.

**Next Meeting:**  
**Damascus Fire House Study Group**  
**Wednesday, May 7, 2003**  
**7:00 p.m.**  
**Damascus Fire House, 20100 SE Hwy 212**

**Enclosures:**

Metro/Clackamas County Concept Planning Tasks Memo

Damascus Concept Planning Map

Happy Valley/Committee for the Future of Damascus RFP

March 20, 2003 MOU comments matrix