

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION

May 22, 1997

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer) Ruth McFarland, Susan McLain, Patricia McCaig, Ed Washington, Lisa Naito, Don Morissette

Councilors Absent: None

Presiding Officer Kvistad called the Metro Council Work Session to order at 3:15 p.m.

I. OVERVIEW

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the purpose of the work session was to begin phase 2 of the Regional Framework Plan and potential expansion issues. He asked the Chair of Growth Management Committee give an overview and then have follow-up by staff. He said that they would try to have enough discussion today to get the Council up to speed on all issues.

Councilor Washington announced that tomorrow morning was the second annual east side bike commute day.

Presiding Officer Kvistad called for general overview from Councilor McLain on First Draft of Regional Framework.

Councilor McLain reviewed that all elements on the overview agenda were there because they all interrelated. Item A, the first draft of the Regional Framework Plan, was a draft review which the Council had had for a few days. What were some of the issues and concerns? Was there an item that the charter, the advisory groups or this Council through policy action had indicated that we would have in this document that was not there? Was there enough for certain items; affordable housing came to mind. First, did you find something missing in your first review. Second, as you looked at the Regional Framework Plan schedule, was there anything on that schedule as far as direction, review or time that you would like to see changed?

She said there were three different timelines. The timeline for the Regional Framework Plan, a timeline for the Regional Growth Report and a timeline that dealt with the review of the Urban Growth Boundary. If the Council wanted to take all of those together later that was fine. She wanted them to understand that it related to this particular document specifically.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked to reserve the timeline discussion for later and asked Mr. Stone to make sure all members of the Council had their timeline options handouts.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked that Mr. Fregonese walk the Council through the Regional Framework Plan First Draft.

A. FIRST DRAFT OF THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN

Mr. John Fregonese, Director of Growth Management Services, said that the first draft of the Regional Functional Plan, the Urban Reserve work, 2040, and the basic Urban Growth report in the housing needs analysis and urban growth report had all been completed so it was the end of an era for Metro. From a staff perspective we were at the end of about 4½ years of a lot of work. From here on it was implementation and management. He recognized all the people who did hard work on this.

Councilor McLain noted memo on May 20, 1997 that gave the objective for the work session on this item. They were trying to have this work done by December 31, 1997 as per charter, and the major goal

Metro Council Work Session

May 22, 1997

Page 2

on the review of the Regional Framework Plan was to give direction on what the Council thought needed to be done or was missing and needed to be added.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said we had met all deadlines and we could be proud of our work. It looked like we were solidly on schedule to finish by the deadline.

Councilor Morissette asked Mr. Fregonese if the draft timeline on the Regional Framework Plan Councilor McLain was proposing would in any way affect accomplishing these dates on this chart?

Mr. Fregonese said no, he did not see any conflict. He said he would like to talk about where we got this draft. All elements of the Charter had been addressed in one Metro document or another. This Regional Framework Plan draft was a consolidation of several Metro documents; the RUGGOS which included the 2040 growth concept, the Regional Greenspaces Master Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan and policy documents that Metro had. We had included some more background material and added some new material in the RTP, the Parks and Greenspaces area and a new chapter on Clark County. These were all basically existing policy. The Council had, in his opinion sufficient policy to adopt a Regional Framework Plan that met the intent and purpose of the Charter. There were specific policy numbers noted on the document and a Chapter 9 which explained how the policies were being used.

Presiding Officer Kvistad noted the Water Supply Plan as an example of incorporating a plan into the Metro documents for what was best for all jurisdictions concerned and not simply Metro documents.

Councilor McCaig said that description was helpful and asked Mr. Fregonese if she could get some clarification on the level of response that he expected from the Council in order to influence the outcome. She said when she looked at the calendar it appeared it would go through many committees and recommendations before it got to Council for finally adopting it. She felt it seemed contradictory to Mr. Fregonese's presentation which made it seem that 85% of the work was done and what was left was review and tweaking versus what she would assume by the way she read the calendar, that the document was maybe 50% done and the level of the workload from both MPAC and JPACT and the advisory committees and the council was greater. She requested some clarification from Mr. Fregonese and the Executive's perspectives on the level of response they expected from the Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said the Council had before them the larger documents, we were referring to the timeline under Regional Framework Plan.

Councilor McCaig said that her reason was that she did go through the calendar and had some comments about it but she did not want to preempt him.

Presiding Officer Kvistad now that we all had the documents, we can work off of them.

Mr. Fregonese said the plan was that the Council would spend the summer reviewing and looking for things that needed to be added. This was what was in the document, what did the Council want added to that, once Council settled on the draft, there could be public hearings on the draft.

Mr. Mike Burton, Executive Officer, said there were some elements that had not been reviewed before, particularly the parks area. His perception was that it was 85% finished or better. The timeline was the amount of time needed for review.

Councilor McCaig said the reason she asked that was, if the Council looked at this agenda, the lack of clarity which contributed to confusion among our roles, was that if we handed this back over to MPAC and JPACT etc. without a clear direction about this issue of whether we expected them to deal with the new issues or if those issues which Council hadn't reviewed, then by the nature of the beast they would fill the time and Council could get work redone on issues that had already been resolved. It mattered to her as the Council moved forward this document that the Council was confining itself, if that was the will of the Council, to those issues which we thought were lacking or those which were relatively new and hadn't had that kind of review, rather than basically moving on the whole document, she understood the Council

did, but making it very clear that the Council didn't expect particularly significant changes if that was the case.

Presiding Officer Kvistad noted section E talks about that very item, how the Council wanted to interrelate. He said, we as a Council were clear on how we wanted to go and how we wanted to frame the policy points.

Councilor McLain added that she agreed with Councilor McCaig about the two MPAC members present at the meeting today were here due to their interest in the MPAC role and what we wanted out of that MPAC group on these documents, especially the first, second and third one. She also agreed with Councilor McCaig about the importance of the Council to take a council vote on that direction. She also agreed with Mr. Burton that there were new items that the Council thought would need more work. The reason this Regional Framework Plan was laid out the way it was was because there were so many specialty groups, Transportation, Growth and Greenspaces and WRPAC that one needed to have time to get through those advisory calendars. She added that they were trying to following a JPACT model because it allowed for more thorough discussion and more interaction between the groups. It was at their bidding that she tried to take this work through a similar model.

Councilor McCaig asked if the Presiding Officer Kvistad would like to pursue this as it related to the timeline. When Presiding Officer Kvistad said yes, Councilor McCaig said her struggle was she liked the idea of the work session and also liked the agenda. The dilemma was whether to take the relationship between the Framework Plan calendar and the Urban Growth Report, regardless of the substance within both those documents, was an issue she would like to discuss. She noted that the culmination of both projects would be within a couple of weeks of each other in December, and that didn't make much sense. She felt the workload needed to be staggered a bit. Her question as to how we were proceeding through this, not to mention the fact that there wasn't a timeline attached dealing with a suggested process for dealing with Urban Reserves, which very well may be occurring at the same time. The level of the collective activity during September-November or October-December would be these 3; the Urban Reserves, the Urban Growth report, and the Regional Framework Plan. She asked how we could stagger the ones that needed the most work with the ones that only required cursory work done to them in the most productive way.

Mr. Burton responded that clearly the Regional Framework Plan, because it was required in the Charter, it was reasonably complete. It would be helpful to go through and clearly identified what had not been adopted and reviewed but it was not that much. The time that was spent should be on these new items.

Councilor McCaig asked if there would be any reason not to finish the Functional Plan because of technical data coming in?

Mr. Burton said that the technical aspect of this was if the deadlines were set, we would meet them.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that it was possible that we might be ahead of schedule and have to review the timeline. Our general discussion would be about where we were overall on these documents and what that meant to the overall picture.

Councilor Morissette said that he was prepared to give opinions as he had gone through the schedule on the Housing Needs. This was why he worked with the Executive to come up with an overview. He believed in direct response to comments about going through this whole thing again, which was a very important point for what a work session was, he believed that the substantive work was done. He thought there might be some information that we may want to talk about so he was not prepared to say it was a good document. He believed it was substantially done.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked that Councilor McLain speak to that.

Councilor McLain said that she had heard some consensus from the Executive and some of the Councilors that it was probably 85% done. What it did not address was that it had been reviewed by all of

the parties. It was important for them to feel it was 85% done also. This calendar didn't address that time frame.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said setting up the review parameters was what they would deal with under the MPAC role. What needed to be reviewed, what didn't need to be reviewed from the different advisory committees, was really where the ball had been dropped because it was a totally new arrangement for all of us. He thought what the Council wanted to do today was to have a general discussion on each of the items and then when the Council got to the role section of the agenda, he suggested actually breaking the role out into the bigger discussion of exactly what needed to be reviewed, what information did the Council need back, what did not need to be reviewed, and a pretty clear definition of what the Council didn't want redone. The Council just needed to have work that had already been done reviewed.

Councilor McLain said that there was one other element to Councilor McCaig's question. Why did we have to do it all at once. She thought that these documents were interconnected and because of timelines that these needed to be addressed in some format and emphasis in the next eight months.

Councilor Naito said that if this was passing the nod test, she was not willing to commit a more cursory schedule prior to thoroughly going through the document herself. She believed that there was some wordsmithing to be done. She recommended that it was important to put on the record where the public could be involved.

Councilor McCaig said she had two suggested proposals looking at the Framework calendar, specifically. One, at the time of the first draft from MPAC and JPACT, Nos. 25 and 26, were getting a feel for the draft, we would be dealing with that 15% identified as new or worrisome. It made sense to her that the Council would want to hear from MPAC and JPACT at that point as well as the public, then go through the second iteration and then adoption. She would be looking at somewhere after Item 26 that there would be a full Council review of the recommendations as well as a public hearing as a way to accommodate Councilor Naito's comments and some of the other issues might speed up the back end of it.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that was one of the important things about this work session, have these issues on the table. He noted that the Council was not adopting this calendar today. This was a review of the overall work session regarding the Framework Plan. It would go back to the Growth Management Committee for finalizing these and then come to Council for final action over the next few days.

Councilor McLain said that she needed some direction from Council if they wanted the Growth Management Committee to go forward and also as the Council's liaison to MPAC. If the Council was going to go away from the JPACT model which they would be doing, they would be having full work at the Council level. It did bother her that it was time consuming, the Council could meet during Growth Management meeting times, but they were going to need to meet more than regular Council meetings to get done with this work appropriately. The Council would not have time during the regular Council meetings because of other agenda items. She would like to get some response back from others besides Councilor McCaig, if not at this meeting then in writing or personally, and find out if the Council did want the Growth Management Committee to do the work of committees or if they thought this was a time to take it back to the Council because of the nature of the issue itself.

Presiding Officer Kvistad suggested giving an overview of how he saw things happening. The Council would try to take the technical items to the Growth Management Committee where the committee members would give Council advice. But on the general work sessions from this point forward as the Council dealt with these documents and the Framework Plan he didn't think the Council could compartmentalize them as much as they had before.

Councilor Washington said in terms of the hearings on this, number one, how many hearings was the Council going to have on this, how were they going to schedule these, what was going to be the procedure? If the Council really wanted to hear from the public, he didn't think the Council could do it in just one public hearing. It had to be fairly extensive.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that he would be adding Council meeting work sessions of this kind so the Council could get up to speed on issues. The Council would notice action items as Council meetings so they could make decisions so as to how to be more responsive. It would be a balance of technical adjustments, leaving that to committee, on general overall policy questions and direction and getting closure on issues, the Council would try to schedule, as appropriate with the schedule, Council work sessions. He asked if that passed the general nod test? He asked Councilor McCaig if that met at least some of her concerns?

Councilor McLain said if Councilor McCaig needed an opportunity to spend more time on that specific calendar, then it was already 4:30, why didn't the Council have an opportunity to review some of the other items and put those calendars together as she suggested under the timeline segment because they did interrelate.

Councilor McCaig felt that Councilor McLain was right about asking for direction from the Council. She asked to respond to Councilor Washington's comment. Knowing what she knew about the Functional Plan, there seemed to be 3 components to it. She understood the first level of it now. She thought by completion of that review by our partners and by the Council on that 15% that was a logical and timely place for the Council as a collective to understand the concerns and direction of our partners rather than the last 4 meetings before the Council was ready to adopt. She said as a result when the Council got to the December meetings they would have fewer public hearings then because most of those issues they would have been collectively aware of and would have dealt with in this window of time between 8/14 and 8/18. She suggested extending the window of time.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that he was offering that very thing, adding Council meetings to accommodate when there were action items.

Councilor McCaig said her reason for opposing it was the part about separating technical from substantive.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said we would have on informational items when we had some technical specifics that we wanted to have information on, that's one thing, but when we had action items we could turn them into actual action item meetings where the Council could have open public discussion as well as technical and general policy.

Councilor McCaig said she was trying to focus on one particular piece of time so that MPAC, JPACT, all of these individuals and groups geared up to produce response at that time.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if anyone had objection to that approach.

Councilor Morissette said that the Council concept of doing the work made sense. August probably didn't make a lot of sense in relation to some of the things that the Council planned to be able to do. September would be a wonderful time for this thing to find its head and deal with review that our partners needed to do. He hoped the Council didn't do it through the committee, then give it to the Council so everybody had to figure out when they wanted to comment. He voted for the Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that the Council now knows and there was general agreement. He asked if the members of the Growth Management Committee would come back with one final draft that included that component as well as put some place markers for Council work sessions reviews if needed.

Mr. Burton said he wanted to direct staff to show Council where additions or issues came up.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked the Committee Chair, working in conjunction with the members of the Council on her committee as well as others that were interested, add 2-3 components to this to meet those concerns and to come back in short order with an actual revised time frame so the Council could all reach an agreement.

Councilor McLain said she heard 2-3 Councilors wanted to have the public hearings as we listed them under 29 for Growth Management Committee hearings as Council hearings so she would change 29 to Council hearings. The other items she heard was that it may be necessary that the Council have a work session, she personally invited the Council to come to the Growth Management Committee and this time could be shared. She suggested that the Council utilize the time on Tuesday at 1:30 that was for growth issues so that the Council didn't have to have lengthy Thursday and Friday night meetings.

Councilor McFarland asked if there were two timelines?

Presiding Officer Kvistad clarified that there were two different timelines for two different items.

Mr. Burton asked if line 29 was changed and was lines 31 through 34 being changed also.

Councilor McLain said it was her understanding from the opinions of the Councilors that they were saying that it would be back to the Council level and thus they were cutting out a Growth Management review and direction to staff and they were cutting out a Growth Management committee recommendation. As she pointed out to them as long as the Council was all at the meeting and voting, she was happy. The situation that she didn't want to see was other work slighted at the Council level because the Council didn't use this time on Tuesday afternoon at 1:30. If the Council wanted to be there for this discussion it needed to be taking place now.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that there was some agreement on the timeline. It was a good working document. He suggested the draft be finalized, one final version be brought back, and run it by all the Councilors and finalize it at the next Council meeting.

Councilor McLain said it was appropriate to put it on the Growth Management Committee for the next meeting and bring it to Council meeting after that.

Councilor Washington said he would like to have a calendar and suggesting making it simple and understandable.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said they would try to do that and wanted to determine exactly what the issues were.

Councilor Washington asked if the 26th was JPACT, Growth Management review was on the 27th and the 29th was where the Council was going to have public hearings?

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that would be a change draft with the changes.

Councilor Washington asked when public hearing would be?

Councilor Naito said that she thought it was great, this document would now be going out to the public. She asked Mr. Fregonese what an individual citizen could do right now and how can they get involved now in the process.

Mr. Fregonese said that there was an extensive public involvement process designed to capture opinions about the Regional Framework Plan, the Urban Growth Boundary, and the Regional Transportation Plan and Greenspaces protection. A number of items were out there, a survey about coming issues with request for responses back was distributed. There was a hotline at 797-1888 which recorded comments. There would be surveys that would be appearing in the Oregonian and other newspapers that people could look for in the Sunday forum in the Oregonian. There was also a new web page, www.metroregion.org which had a bunch of data including the entire text of the Regional Framework Plan.

Councilor Morissette requested a nod test. He understood this to be once that we had these documents we would have an opportunity to comment here with probably another work session scheduled. The substantive nods that he would like to get was that once the Council got responses back he would like to eliminate the committee process other than on the normal committee work and do the work on all 3 documents through the Council process so there wasn't a 2-pronged process to that.

Presiding Officer Kvistad clarified we would still need some technical discussions at the committee level but generally the changes here were to move so all the Council members were involved in the process of the technical items.

Councilor Morissette said that he would like to see the work that was done once and prior to changes, have the changes go to work session of the Council and recommendations be that way so that the Council could do that process once. Then once the Council was done with that he would like to turn the documents over in a reasonable process. They all needed to have the opportunity to comment over the next period of time, to be able to say this was the timeline and with the work session a timeline on what the Council thought was reasonable. What the Council was trying to do here was wordsmith a fairly complicated process and he thought the Council needed to be able to have a little bit of time to do that. The substantive item was that prior to changes in the document, these would be made at a Council level. Once that was done, the Council would turn that over to the partners with an agreed schedule that the Council would have a discussion on, that the Council had had some opportunity to make some recommendations on. After that it would come back to the Council, all three documents in various stages, and the Council would handle them for the final approval at the Council level.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he saw no disagreement on that.

Councilor Morissette said he covered A, B and C with that.

Councilor McLain said she would in no way change the opportunity for partners to be involved. She wanted to make sure the public hearings would be noticed way ahead of time to allow the public plenty of opportunity to become involved.

B. URBAN GROWTH REPORT

Presiding Officer Kvistad brought up the Urban Growth Report.

Councilor McLain asked Mr. Fregonese to just go through his technical report because of the late time.

Mr. Fregonese said there was a tremendous amount of information and they were preparing an Executive Summary for the Council. He summarized the summary by noting Resolution No. 96-2392B where the council adopted a list of variables. They had adopted 9 variables, i.e., rate of infill and redevelopment, the amount of land set aside for schools and parks and a number of other issues like that.

He said the Council directed the Growth Management staff to bring back the 3 documents; the revised Urban Growth Report which brings the 2015 forecast to 2017, so there was a 20 year land supply from 1997; a 2017 allocation which allocated the growth throughout the region. Because of Council's choice of variables, Metro could not allocate all that growth inside the Urban Growth Boundary. The Council did choose Urban Reserves and rank those Urban Reserves so Metro did allocate to those Urban Reserves. The process the Council had was a review every 5 years. To get out to the year 2017 the Growth Management Department considered this adjustment and also an adjustment around the year 2005. There were about 40,000 units outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

The Growth Management staff did a buildable lands capacity analysis as a basis of a number of the variables Council picked. They used the Council's variables, they redid the calculations and updated the buildable lands capacity analysis. That gave them the capacity starting in 1994 of 206,000 households at that time. They then did a housing needs analysis. A housing needs forecast was done, which was really looking at what were the jobs that were coming here, and based on those jobs what were the

demographics of people that were going to be coming here. Based on that, what was the needs of the housing that was going to be provided based on demographics and income, what was the capacity going to provide and what was the market going to provide, and what was the need for affordable housing. They had also summarized all of the housing policy in state law and in RUGGOS and made findings on those which were in the housing needs analysis. Finally, this was the baseline Urban Growth data, this was 9 types of data on urban growth. Many of them related to the forecast so the Council could track the Urban Growth Report forecast with what had actually happened in the recent past. That was not something the Council had to adopt. The other two items had to be adopted to comply with 2709 and code for Urban Growth Boundary legislative review.

The Council specifically asked these questions be answered in Resolution No. 96-2392A.:

- a) complete 2017 forecast
- b) update buildable lands inventory
- c) revise housing needs analysis
- d) update lands estimate for schools and parks
- e) report on new policies
- f) update vacancy rate data
- g) identify any surplus vacant lands

He said that these answers would be found in the Urban Growth Report introduction.

If the Council looked at the Urban Growth report specifically it did have the updated 2017 forecast and the housing needs. They revised the buildable lands inventory and capacity analysis using Council approved variables. They did a very detailed analysis last time they took those variables and the results could be found in the summary of the Urban Growth report.

The Housing Needs Analysis was revised. The Growth Management Department did a section of legal findings and affordability. They integrated the housing needs analysis with the Urban Growth Report and the baseline Urban Growth data. Mr. Fregonese noted that the numbers were consistent throughout in terms of where did the 248,000 households go, what kinds were they, where were the needs, how did they match up with income, how did they match up with what was actually been happening in the market. The Council would be able to find a fairly integrated report.

The baseline Urban Growth data could be the basis for performance measures. This was an attempt to look at the data gathered and see if they could match up the baseline urban growth data with some key forecasts and goals like employment or multi-family density or lot size. It tracked assumptions in forecasts to actual performance and showed the recent past compared to 2040 Growth Concept. When one looked at that the table of key indicators one could see they were doing quite well according to the estimates in the growth report. The growth report although it was a higher capacity than the current plans showed, the current market was there that adopted that forecast and had a very legally defensible document being able to show that all the assumptions were based on something the market was doing or a trend the market was taking that it could go in this direction. He thought this was a very helpful document to add to the record.

The bottom line that everyone wanted to know was the 41,000 household deficit amounts to about 4,100 acres if you build it 10 units per acre gross. The Urban Reserves were not just net buildable acres. They had needs for roads, streets, parks. There was wetlands and creeks out there and there was a lot of development. There was 8,000 people in the Urban Reserves, all of whom had houses with small lots. Looking at the average Urban Reserves, they estimated that the 4,000 acres would take about 7,000 to include 4,000 buildable acres. It was greater than Tier 1.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that this was one of the areas where the Growth Report was a document intact and in fact. When the Council was sending it off for review, the Council meant for a broader based review and not to be revamped or rebuilt. This document was as it was with technical comments coming from our local partners which was helpful for Metro and the Council to understand the document.

Councilor Morissette said not to forget the 1,000 acres of parks, operating from the original analysis.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that the revised drafts were not for revamping to change the numbers, they were for making sure they were accurate and what it was we asked for.

Councilor McCaig said she wanted to question the manner in which Presiding Officer Kvistad just portrayed that. She thought there were some controversial substantive issues still pending within the Urban Growth Report, and it was correct to say that it had been reported back from the Executive with the numbers as we preliminary requested them, but that in sending this back out to MTAC and MPAC her understanding was that there was in fact some areas that both MPAC and MTAC have noted that they disagreed with the Council's conclusions. That was one of the reasons for the compromise of a draft Urban Growth Report which wasn't adopted at the time.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that there was a bit of controversy. The reason it wasn't adopted wasn't to do with that controversy, it had to do with had the Council adopted the growth report early on, it would have kicked in 2709 because it would have been a land use decision. The Council put it off until now so we would have the extra time to review where we were a little bit further down and give our staff the additional time for review. It wasn't necessarily to deal and redeal with those issues that may have been controversial. It was to basically hold it until after we had made the Urban Reserves decisions so we didn't kick in 2709 as a major component.

Councilor McCaig said if the Council left the discussion with the Presiding Officer's statement pending which was the Council thought this was relatively a minor review, and we expected the recommendations to come back to us relatively whole, she didn't agree with that and she didn't think that was the way the Council left it when they completed their work in the Growth Management Committee last year about it because she knew Councilor Morissette and McLain and she really struggled with the 9 variables and there wasn't always agreement. What the Committee moved forward they moved on the condition that it was a draft. She hoped MTAC and MPAC took a hard look at the Urban Growth Report and gave the Council their best judgment on whether the variables, etc., were correct.

Councilor McLain added that she had already indicated the importance of the Functional Plan numbers had been given credit and she saw in that short report where she thought they were there, but she wanted to make sure they had been given enough weight and she thought another portion of that was that they had indicated that there was unfinished work in the Functional Plan which was still not finished, like Title Three. They had stream buffers and water protection elements that took space and they needed to analyze those issues too. Finally, the Urban Growth Report was the facts. What they had to do was to determine what the Council was going to do with the facts.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if there were any other questions on the UGR.

Councilor McCaig said that it was her assumption that there would be two places where they would involve the full Council. And the Council would work out whether we would also recruit a public testimony at that time. She thought it passed the nod test but it would be in that August/September timeline. And the nod was that those decisions would come back before the full Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad referred that to the Committee Chair.

Councilor McCaig said the original schedule said it was coming back before the entire Council. What the Council was trying to do today was make sure the full public hearings were a little bit earlier in the schedule and those hearings were in front of the entire Council. As the Council worked through the last schedules they would do that.

Councilor McLain said she wanted not just a public hearing in front of the full Council but that the full Council itself have work sessions where they grappled with some of those issues and solved them.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he would have a schedule to bring back to the Council as soon as they had had the option to plug in all the variables the Council had been discussing.

Councilor Morissette said he did get a nod test. That change would be with the full Council. And Councilor McLain would work out the schedule with the Council to help figure those timelines out so it was not being done in Growth Management and then again at Council and the Council was all in agreement.

Presiding Officer Kvistad what the Council normally did was that the Chair of the Committee would basically set the agendas at the Council work session and head off the discussions. That was the process.

Councilor Morissette clarified that the substantive debating of the changes and agreements would occur and then the Council would have the public hearing.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that Councilor McLain had agreed to go back through and bring back to the Council the schedules based on today's discussion.

Councilor McLain said it would be back in front of the Council after the next Growth Management meeting.

C. URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY REVIEW

Councilor McLain said that the third component had always been the Urban Growth Boundary Review which was why the Council had done all this work. That was the major task and responsibility. There had been much discussion about how much time Metro needed to give the Functional Plan to work before we would start with an actual movement of the Urban Growth Boundary and did we need to move it at all. Councilor Morissette and Executive Officer Burton had provided a timeline today that was the third component of this 3 part package. One must do the master planning up front if one was going to go by Metro Code which indicated that Urban Reserve planning must be done before it could be included in the Urban Growth Boundary. They had indicated that first tier noncontroversial pieces that were out of the courts were not being reviewed at the state level that were interested areas for local jurisdictions and the local jurisdictions wanted to do the planning and come and work with Metro on the planning, that process had to be set out and reviewed with them to see if it worked. The Council was indicating that work needed to be parallel so the Metro was not left with the last lot in the region being used and then the Council start talking about master planning. The Council would also see that Mr. Burton and others had talked about when the first legislative amendment would possibly be if you got done with the original Framework Plan work, the Urban Growth Boundary work, and the review of the local partners. They were indicating a timeline of June 1998 as the target goal for that first portion of that amendment. There were many issues there. When one talked about a legislative amendment they were not necessarily talking about all the first tier, they were talking about the first tier that could possibly be master planned by that time. Then there were legal issues. Had we met our 2709 needs of the 20 year land supply and if we step it out will we still be able to meet the letter of the law? We also had the John Chandler home builder's bill that Councilor Naito had talked about which had indicated that they wanted us to have met that need possibly in a 2 year time frame because they understood that we had these Urban Reserve planning regulations in our Metro Code. There was much to talk about in this session. It would probably take an hour or two to work through both the schedule and the basic issues.

Councilor Morissette said he would like the Council to look at that and just give him comments as they went forward. He would like to find out if there was a consensus. He thought it was important that there were some jurisdictions that had a desire to do a legislative amendment. If the Council could send a signal that now if the jurisdictions chose to start master planning some of those first tier properties that was probably a pretty good idea. This might help Metro set up a good system for others to follow. He requested a nod from the Council for the jurisdictions who desired to begin first tier master planning to be able to do this.

Presiding Officer asked for objections or comments about that.

Councilor Naito said she would really like an opportunity to go through the Growth Report before she nodded off on anything like that so she was out of a nod test on that.

Councilor Morissette said he would wait.

D. TIMELINE

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if there was objection to the timeline before Council.

Councilor Naito noted the timeline, she was interested in how that interplayed with the legislation, unfortunately she was going under the 5:15 adjournment time. She had some other commitments. She did think this might take some time, she was willing to go along with the legislative timeline that Chandler was proposing. She didn't know if the Council wanted to have a discussion about that. There were others here who may not, there were also performance measures in there Council might want to discuss. Maybe this should be done in the Growth Management Committee. That was moving through pretty rapidly. She guessed she was just at a loss because she also thought it was really important to discuss the overall role of MPAC. The Council had a lot of things on the agenda today. She thought the Council did accomplish a lot in terms of agreeing on some of the initial timelines and the process and public involvement. She didn't want to rush through these things. On the other hand she knew people had come specifically for these. She didn't think we should rush.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that on the Urban Growth Boundary review the Council had some things before them that people wanted to take a look at so he suggested setting this aside for the next work session. That would be one of the first issues the Council covered. He felt that they were pretty much done with the timeline issues with the exception of the last one which everyone wanted to review. That would go with the Urban Growth Boundary review. If the Council had any comments or questions on that timeline, he asked that the Councilors get back to Councilor Morissette or Councilor McLain on it as soon as they could so the Council could get that under way and have all the timelines together for the members of the Council. He called for anything else on this particular issue before he set it aside and went on.

Councilor McLain said the element that Councilor Naito brought up on the John Chandler Home Builder's bill and the performance measures that were in there, she thought that the local jurisdiction partners, Clackamas County and others, needed to really look at those performance measures. Metro made a good faith effort to engage MPAC in a subcommittee on the performance measures. She believed that those performance measures that were in that particular bill were similar but extensive, there were 11 of them. She did think the Council needed to do some quick review independently of that particular document, she knew she had. The Council needed to give some signals to their partners and partners needed to give signals to the Council on how they were feeling about that. She thought it got in the way. That was something that she personally didn't support. She didn't want to rush that segment of it. She would agree that the performance measures dealt both with the Regional Framework plan and with the Urban Growth Boundary review. It was something the Council needed to have a strategy on.

Presiding Officer Kvistad indicated that since the Growth Management Committee was coming up maybe there should have a general discussion at the Growth Management committee about options. Maybe not specific solutions to it but maybe what was meant under general review at the committee to come back to Council at our next work session and more than likely at our next week's Council meeting the Council would have an update as well so that the Council could continually monitor this because regardless of what happened it would shift these timelines. There may be several changes in terms of what the Council was dealing with. Nothing here was cast in stone. The Council was just trying to get them as clear as possible so they had the guidelines still as the Council started moving forward. So if that would be comfortable for the Council to do it that way he thought it would probably be helpful.

Councilor Naito said next week there was no Council meeting. Her only concern was that the following week could be too late because the bill would probably be on the House floor sometime next week.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said there was a Council meeting next Thursday.

Councilor Naito clarified that there was not Council meeting next week.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that was right, it was the fifth week of the month so the Council would not have a Council meeting next week.

Councilor McLain said that Councilor Naito and herself would be working on this and if any of the Councilors had concerns to talk to either of them independently because she didn't think there would be a formal action today, there couldn't be, and she didn't think there would be a meeting where the Council could take a formal action.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said at this point the Council just needed to monitor it and make adjustments depending on where the Council was then.

Councilor Morissette said if he was not in the loop when the decision was made on the position he hoped it wasn't represented as a Council position unless the Council had all voted on it. At whatever time that the Council scheduled the next work session he asked that they look at the timeline, the one that Mike worked on with the staff. He had done a global one and in everything he had ever done he had looked at the issue he was dealing with and then tried to figure out how you figure the components that go through the process with that. He hoped the Council would review that and give him comments, aye, nay or change, however they may be so the Council could draw some conclusion to that as well as he believed it was appropriate where people wanted certain things to happen to give them direction to be able to accomplish those things. The Council had been in this process for many many years. If someone still thought the Council was not going to move the boundary at some future point he supposed they wouldn't want to support what he had tried to do with letting local jurisdictions and first tier property planning for those areas to move ahead. Short of that he thought it would be very helpful to get the process going so it didn't just keep dragging on.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said at the next meeting they would finalize the calendars the best they could based on whatever happened in the legislature, the Council would have a review of the urban growth boundary, both timeline and general issues.

E. MPAC ROLE

Councilor McLain said the general issue had to include MPAC's role.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said MPAC's role was the third item. The Council wanted to have that as a major portion of the discussion because they had differing opinions on what that should be on the different items, he wanted to make sure the Council was as clear on that as the Council be on that as a group and where the Council could come to consensus that was great and where they couldn't, that would just be what it was. He called for anything further comments on these? Seeing none they would schedule the next work session for as soon as possible with everyone's schedule.

F. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Metro Council Work Session
May 22, 1997
Page 13
Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT TITLE	TO/FROM
052297cw-01	5/21/97	Memo re: timelines	Morissette/Burton
052297cw-02	5/12/97	Memo re: timelines UGR & Framework Plan	Council/McLain
052297cw-03	10/3/96	Res. No. 96-2392B	/Susan McLain
052297cw-04	5/20/97	Memo re:work session items	/Susan McLain
052297cw-05		G.M. Survey brochure	
052297cw-06	May 97	Regional Framework Plan Discussino Draft	