

**Cooper Mountain Community Plan Stakeholder Listening Session  
Developer and Property Owner Representatives  
June 23, 2020, 12:30 to 2 p.m.**

**Staff Present:**

Jenny Clark, JLA Public Involvement  
Adrienne DeDona, JLA Public Involvement  
Joe Dills, APG  
Kyra Haggart, APG  
Becky Hewitt, ECO Northwest  
Jena Hughes, City of Beaverton  
Andrew Parish, APG  
Cassera Phipps, City of Beaverton  
Jody Yates, City of Beaverton  
Nick Popenuk, Tiberius Solutions

**Attendees:**

Mimi Doukas, AKS  
Ezra Hammer, Home Builders Association  
Stuart Honeyman, Property Owner  
Mark Manulik, Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt PC  
Tony Merrill, Property Owner  
Justin Metcalf, Wishcamper Partners  
Darrel Smith, MLG

**Meeting Summary**

**Welcome and Introductions**

**Adrienne** welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and meeting protocols, and lead group introductions.

**Project Overview**

**Cassera** presented a brief project background and timeline, including:

- This is a three-year planning effort that will include updated zoning designations and determining how to extend utilities to this area.
- The plan will build off the concept plan from South Cooper Mountain and will revisit the vision for the area along with project goals.
- The project intent is to provide 3,760 new homes to the area, and the team is committed to determining how best to meet this objective.

- The area has a different landscape than South Cooper Mountain. Topography will play a role in how the team will balance development with natural resource protection. Work includes best practices for hillside development.
- Stakeholder feedback and lessons learned from South Cooper Mountain will help inform this plan, along with related city planning efforts (e.g. the city's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan, Climate Action Plan and Active Transportation Plan).
- The project will apply a lens of racial equity. The city has partnered with Unite Oregon to help engage diverse, underrepresented communities on the project.
- The Utility Planning effort will look at water, sewer, and storm. Communication between the community plan and utility plan teams will be ongoing to ensure consistency in coordination. Agency partners and stakeholders will be engaged early on.
- The project is currently in phase one. Public outreach has shifted to online and phone engagement due to COVID-19. The team is hoping to shift back to more traditional, in-person open houses and workshops in the future and in the meantime will pivot to reach people however possible.
- A funding assessment will look at different funding tools the city could use to provide "backbone" infrastructure that facilitates development.

**Cassera** mentioned she would follow up with attendees with information about an online open house later this week.

**Joe** briefly touched on two draft maps from the packet: South Cooper Mountain Development map and Riparian and Upland Habitat Inventory Map.

**Adrienne** asked if there were any clarifying questions about the project overview or packet materials before moving on to discussion.

**Stuart** asked if Weir Road was considered a main arterial and whether it would have specific development requirements.

**Joe** responded he wasn't sure of the current road classification, but that the goal of the planning effort is to connect the road system so it can function as part of the network.  
*Post-meeting follow-up: Weir Road is a designated Arterial street.*

**Stuart** mentioned his property shows a constrained slope in the Local Wetland Inventory Map that is not substantial to the entire property. He asked if the slope constraint be engineered to alleviate this?

**Joe** responded there are different natural features from wetlands to slopes, and the team will be looking at the range of possibilities on how to develop within steep lands.

Other practices around the region (based on research) allow/regulate development on steep areas to varying degrees and through a wide range of planning tools.

**Darrel** wanted to verify there haven't been any onsite field assessments so far and that the inventory maps are based on existing data.

**Cassera** responded the team sent a mailer to current property owners in March to get signed consent forms to conduct on site inventory of natural resources. Where the team was not able to get access, they used existing data, such as Metro inventory maps.

### Discussion

**Adrienne** guided the group through the following discussion questions. Responses are included beneath each question.

**Discussion Question 1:** *What is your perception of market conditions and development potential for Cooper Mountain? What types of development do you see the greatest potential for, and which do you think will be most challenging here?*

- **Darrel** responded given the environment of today (with COVID-19), there is a change in attitude. Most people are interested in residential lots and want space. How density gets factored in density will be one challenge.
- **Mimi** commented on sales in South Hillsboro are doing well, which is a flatter area than Cooper Mountain. She added that Tony has a business model for multi-family apartment buildings, so she is hoping there is room for this.
- **Stuart** mentioned Cooper Mountain has been developed in a large lot format, and now the idea is to bring in density. The issue will be how to meld high density with low density and how zoning issues get resolved. There must be public input for that, which will be another challenge.
- **Mark** commented he is interested to hear if there is an opportunity for mixed uses within development parcels in terms of single families in row houses or duplexes.
- **Ezra** commented on the initial impact of COVID-19 on timeline for construction as a challenge. He wanted to highlight the need for the city to ensure long-term infrastructure being put into place before moving forward. Be sure those costly, transformative pieces are put in place. The COVID-19 housing trend shows a need throughout Washington County. The housing constraint will mean households are competing for scarcer resources. If this three-year project could become a two-year project, that could make a big difference for people looking for housing.

**Discussion Question 2:** *One of the Metro conditions is “The four cities shall allow, at a minimum, single family attached housing, including townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, in all zones that permit single family housing in the expansion areas.” In addition, HB2001 requires the city to allow duplexes on every lot in zones that allow single-family detached housing. The City is committed to this goal. What are your ideas for how to successfully implement these “middle” housing types? The rules and decisions about infrastructure sizing have to happen early, during the community planning as well as at the subdivision phase. Do you have questions or ideas about how that should work?*

- **Darrel** commented on concept ideas for four-unit structures to make it more of a townhouse concept. This is a matter of spending time to investigate what type of structure we can come up with to accommodate multi-unit housing and taking topography into consideration.
- **Anthony** mentioned he supports multifamily housing because it offers more choices for density on other pieces of property. It gives more flexibility to the rest of the area because of density requirements.
- **Mimi** expressed how, with middle housing, you must start with what you are trying to achieve: home ownership vs rental housing. There are liability issues with housing in Oregon and risk of class action lawsuits. She mentioned an example at Reeds crossing where there was a plan for affordable housing, but no builders wanted to do it because of legal risk. If the goal is rental housing, then apartments make sense. If the goal is having small homes that are for sale, there is a market for that. She would like to see some daylighting of this issue. In general, housing options must be viable in a marketplace. She further explained with a condo there is conjoined ownership and builders need to get liability insurance to protect against construction defects (something that can be found wrong with the building). Liability insurance is expensive because the risk is high. For a triplex, it would not be financially worth it.
- **Stuart** encouraged the city to consider land unconstrained by slope for higher density development in order to avoid too much engineering or construction cost; providing more latitude on the rest of the property.
- **Cassera** asked about implementing regulations from HB2001, and if the group knew how the sizing of infrastructure might be influenced by the range of housing types allowed.
- **Darrel** answered the infrastructure isn't going to change all that much and density won't play a huge role. Development should err on the side of larger versus smaller on pipe size. It's better to get into the planning stages and downsize rather than upsize. He said this would be something to consider as the city works on infrastructure.

**Discussion Question 3:** *What are the lessons learned about paying for and constructing infrastructure from SCM: what worked well, what did not work well? Are there tools or approaches you have seen in other communities that you think should be considered here?*

- **Darrel** answered it is important to come up with different funding mechanisms, and to involve different property owners if joint utility is needed.
- **Jody** noted the combined Utility Plan effort is happening at the same time as the Cooper Mountain Community Plan to establish some spine infrastructure that allows people to develop throughout the plan area. There needs to be proportionality or something to put the right code in place. It will be helpful to consider mechanisms that do not currently exist in city codes.
- **Stuart** responded infrastructure is expensive and there will be lines that need to be drawn as properties are developed. Develop the property and then send facilities in the direction of their neighbor. To fund projects like that early, there has to be access to infrastructure. If projects get approved and are built, it will create revenue for builders and developers contributing funds to different programs.
- **Mimi:** commented she appreciated hearing from Jody about sequencing. South Cooper Mountain had some sticking points regarding infrastructure for private entities and log jams that occurred. Making sure the backbone infrastructure is accessible and prioritizing frontend development is important. In terms of tools, there are finance tools to consider. South Hillsboro as an example, but their system is complicated: it has Local Improvement District (LID) plus an incremental tax on individual lots. Tools are available but need to have real participation with all stakeholders.
- **Nick** asked about other areas developers have been involved with where the infrastructure finance plans seemed to work well.
- **Jody** said a 'pay when you connect' model gives a more proportionate cost. This is not yet in the existing toolbox for the city, but it is an option. Broad based LIDs can be profoundly complex or straightforward, depending on the situation.
- **Mimi** mentioned Frog Pond in Wilsonville as an example. The city is reimbursed through a supplemental development fee which allows the city to proactively build infrastructure. Timing is more certain and bigger chunks of infrastructure are possible.

**Discussion Question 4:** *What other opportunities do you see that will make the Cooper Mountain Community Plan a success?*

- **Darrel** stressed the importance of open dialogue and community involvement.

- **Anthony** mentioned the importance of collaborative communication and coordination related to policy between developers, the city, property owners, etc. This will mean better decisions so that the end product is something everyone is proud of.
- **Stuart** felt making it a walkable area was a real opportunity and designing around existing natural resources.
- **Cassera** commented on the previous concept plan: it provided a framework for the project that will be factored in to meet requirements related to HB2001 and other Metro conditions of approval.

### Next Steps

**Adrienne and Cassera** thanked everyone for their participation, reiterated project next steps, and adjourned the meeting.

### Appendix A: Follow-up Conversations

#### Follow-up Conversation with Ezra Hammer, Home Builders Association

**Question 1:** *One of the Metro conditions is “The four cities shall allow, at a minimum, single family attached housing, including townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, in all zones that permit single family housing in the expansion areas.” In addition, HB2001 requires the city to allow duplexes on every lot in zones that allow single-family detached housing. The City is committed to this goal. What are your ideas for how to successfully implement these “middle” housing types?*

- **Response:** Give Brian Martin (at the City) the resources to make it happen. He has been deeply engaged and is prepared to bring ideas to the table. HB2001 implementation will precede the Cooper Mountain Community Plan. He has been advocating for more flexibility at the local level for implementation of HB2001. The City will have the opportunity to guide this process for expansion areas; they will be able to control minimum lot sizes in expansion areas.

**Question 2:** *The rules and decisions about infrastructure sizing have to happen early, during the community planning as well as at the subdivision phase. Do you have questions or ideas about how that should work?*

- **Response:** It would be unreasonable to uncouple zoning regarding housing size from infrastructure needs to allow for middle zoning. The bulk of housing will come from PUD process. It makes sense to plan conservatively (i.e. planned for larger pipe infrastructure and downsize if needed as plans come in). Redevelopment of existing newly developed housing is unlikely. Consider that more and more xeriscape landscaping will occur in the future with climate change, which will impact infrastructure needs.

**Question 3:** *What are the lessons learned about paying for and constructing infrastructure from SCM: what worked well, what did not work well? Are there tools or approaches you have seen in other communities that you think should be considered here?*

- **Response:** The city hasn't determined what they want for Purple Pipe, which they should have planned for infrastructure long before the sub-development planning. Infrastructure planning should occur during the community plan phase.
- **Cassera** added the City doesn't have the funding tools in place that other jurisdictions have to collect fees through development. They are looking for other ways to build infrastructure earlier.

**Question 4:** *What other opportunities do you see that will make the Cooper Mountain Community Plan a success?*

- **Response:** The city does a good job at long term land use planning, but there is room for improvement with infrastructure plans. Existing open spaces are another opportunity to consider. The UGB is a unique tool in Oregon; we are seeing a lot more variety in housing types, becoming denser with the PUD process. Large scale property owners can develop higher density housing. The three-year timeframe seems extensive. The city should consider compressing the timeframe to two years to address the current issue with housing unaffordability.

### **Follow up Conversation with Justin Metcalf, Wishcamper Partners**

**Question 1:** *What is your perception of market conditions and development potential for Cooper Mountain? What types of development do you see the greatest potential for, and which do you think will be most challenging here?*

- **Response:** As designed/envisioned, it's perfect for high to moderate density residential development with parks. With the current regulations in Oregon (UGB), there isn't a lot of opportunity to develop. The pre-planning involved prior to development, provides a framework for developers to work within that makes it easier.
- **Cassera** asked if there are other facilities/services needed to support affordable housing.
- **Justin** replied that transit is one of those factors and it's not planned for the Cooper Mountain area, at least not in the near term. He suggested providing incentives for developers to put in lower priced housing to diversify neighborhoods, but need to balance placement of housing types.

**Question 2:** *One of the Metro conditions is "The four cities shall allow, at a minimum, single family attached housing, including townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, in all zones that permit single family housing in the expansion areas." In*

*addition, HB2001 requires the city to allow duplexes on every lot in zones that allow single-family detached housing. The City is committed to this goal. What are your ideas for how to successfully implement these “middle” housing types?*

- **Response:** It doesn't seem feasible to build a duplex to rent and make money; there won't be an overwhelming amount of investors to build and rent out duplex homes. Will need to think about how the neighborhood ages and how duplexes and townhomes are blended with single-family homes. It can become disjointed over time as the neighborhood ages. Architectural and design standards can resolve these issues. Consider clustering townhomes and duplexes to create appropriate blending of housing types.

**Question 3:** *The rules and decisions about infrastructure sizing have to happen early, during the community planning as well as at the subdivision phase. Do you have questions or ideas about how that should work?*

- No response.

**Question 4:** *What are the lessons learned about paying for and constructing infrastructure from SCM: what worked well, what did not work well? Are there tools or approaches you have seen in other communities that you think should be considered here?*

- **Response:** Cost sharing agreements work well when roads are required. With South Cooper Mountain, there were no plans for secondary roads to the last development; it was just connecting the dots. It seems as though problems are kicked down the road to the next user, but he is unsure how to avoid that.
- **Cassera** added there has been an internal discussion amongst staff and recognition this is a problem that will hopefully be resolved with Cooper Mountain, which will include considering more detailed planning up front.
- **Justin** suggested a collaborative process amongst all area property owners and developers up front to plan and avoid isolation of parcels as development takes place.

**Question 5:** *What other opportunities do you see that will make the Cooper Mountain Community Plan a success?*

- **Cassera** also asked about the community-based partners Wishcamper is working with to provide services to tenants.
- **Response:** Appreciate the City's willingness to collaborate and seek input. Wishcamper recently established a relationship with IRCO and one other organization to provide services and programming for residents to advance their socio-economic status and overcome inequality in services such as health, education, etc. Wishcamper provides their own residential services. He suggested the City contact Lynn McConnell, Affordable Housing Manager, at



the City of Bend to learn more about how they were able to create a separate, streamlined development process for affordable housing.