

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

November 9, 2005 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Dave Fuller, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Tom Hughes, Diane Linn, Alice Norris, Tom Potter

Alternates Present: Larry Cooper, Shirley Craddick, Laura Hudson, Norm King, Lane Shetterly

Also Present: Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Al Burns, City of Portland; Cindy Catto, Phoenix Rising Consulting; Carol Chesarek, Citizen; Bob Clay, City of Portland; Gary Clifford, Multnomah County; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Meg Fernekees, DLCD; Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Cogan; Dave Hunnicut, moveon.org; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Steve Kelley, Washington County; Stephan Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Greg Miller, AGC; Juan Carlos Ocana, City of Portland; Laura Oppenheimer, Oregonian; Scott Pemble, Clackamas County; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Andy Smith, Multnomah County; Scott Stewart, Portland Multnomah Progress Board; Andrea Vannelli, Washington County; Liesl Wandt, City of Portland; David Zigel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons – Carl Hosticka, District 3; Susan McLain, Council District 4; Robert Liberty, Council District 6 others: David Bragdon, Council President; Brian Newman, District 2

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Paul Ketcham, Robin McArthur, Malu Wilkinson

1. SELF-INTRODUCTIONS, ONE MINUTE LOCAL UPDATES & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jack Hoffman, MPAC Chair, called the meeting to order 5:04 p.m.

Chair Hoffman asked those present to introduce themselves and to give updates or announcements as pertained to their jurisdiction.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

The meeting summary for October 26, 2005 approval was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of quorum.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Carl Hosticka said that the Council had experienced a light agenda since the last meeting and he reviewed the agenda for the next few Council meetings.

Chair Hoffman proposed that the next MPAC meeting should be on November 30 rather than November 16th. He reviewed the proposed meeting dates for the rest of 2005.

5. ORDINANCE 05-1097 FANNO AND ROCK CREEK

Paul Ketcham, Metro Principal Regional Planner, reviewed the materials included in the meeting packet for the members. He also referred to a large map displayed in the back of the room. He said that MTAC would forward a recommendation to MPAC on November 30th and that it was the hope of staff to have a recommendation to forward from MPAC to Metro Council that same night.

Chair Hoffman requested that MTAC have a recommendation in memo form for MPAC to review and then staff could draft a recommendation to forward to the Metro Council.

8. FAIRNESS, FARMLAND AND GREAT NEW NEIGHBORHOODS

Councilor Robert Liberty reviewed his memorandum to MPAC regarding “Background material for discussion at the next MPAC meeting on Farmland, Fairness and Building Great New Neighborhoods Proposal” which is attached and forms part of the record.

Councilor Hosticka informed the members that there was little time left in the year to review this material and provide an endorsement for the Metro Council.

Mayor Rob Drake asked how this proposal would be dealt with in the Metro region versus the rest of the state and how the proposal related to Title 11?

Councilor Liberty said that he felt that his proposal was moderate, reasonable, and responsive. He said that it could provide a model or approach to dealing with the issue. He said it was not a new idea and that it could be valuable in the sense that it might give people an alternative.

Mayor Drake asked if the proposal was only to acquire open spaces, uplands and wetlands? He asked if Councilor Liberty was looking for a greater payoff?

Councilor Liberty said it was not for acquired property or greenspaces. He explained how the money would be allocated (see memorandum).

Mayor Drake asked if he had talked to the ardent supporters of Measure 37 and if they had an opinion on his proposal.

Councilor Liberty said that he had talked with many people. He said that the concept had been floated and it seemed to have at least some support from the Home Builders. The focus of conversations had been heavily focused on when the money would be collected and how it would be weighted. He said that it would be important to be clear about how this money would be built into all future transactions and also to be clear that there would be more money than otherwise to pay for infrastructure.

Mayor Tom Hughes, City of Hillsboro, said that there was a notion that somehow government creates value in property – which he said he never really thought was true as proposed by Measure 37 folks. He said there was a symmetry in how moving the urban growth boundary created wealth and how, through this proposal, that same wealth would then go back into communities and pay for things like infrastructure. He said that the devil was in the details and wondered if Metro would be able to hammer those out before moving too far forward. He also expressed concern about the potential pattern of distribution creating issues throughout the region. He wondered what the impact would be of using urban renewal as a tool for developing infrastructure.

Councilor Hosticka said that there were people concerned that if there were too many issues on the November ballot then it would be less likely that this issue would get full consideration or vote. He said that was why May looked most appropriate for this proposal. He said that there was a possibility that MPAC could refer something that was a charter amendment, an authorizing sort of document, that would essentially have people voting on the concept and then giving the authority to do it, which would then allow them to work out details later.

Councilor Liberty said that he wished there was more time to work out details, but part of the problem was other ballots and the timing of events was not in Metro's or the region's control. He suggested that they could wind up the discussion by trying to decide whether they should have another discussion on this. He presented the members with several options regarding review of the material in his proposal such as another meeting on Nov 16th to discuss only this topic, or to create a subcommittee for this issue, or they could discuss it again and make a decision/endorsement on Nov 30th.

Chair Hoffman reviewed those options again and asked the members what they would like to do about this issue.

Mayor Alice Norris, City of Oregon City, said that it would need to be presented to her council and she was concerned that there was not enough time to do that properly and to get input from the public.

Mayor Drake said he understood the timetable constraints but also agreed with Mayor Norris about presenting this issue to their jurisdictions. He suggested that MPAC request the Metro Council hold off on this issue until December 15th so that MPAC could forward their recommendation at the December 14th MPAC meeting giving them all time to understand and discuss the issue further.

Diane Linn, Multnomah County, said that she agreed that the issue should be taken back to the board and discussed further before a decision was made. She said there seemed to be some real merit in the possibilities regarding this issue.

Shirley Craddick, City of Gresham, said that she would need to have more time to learn about the topic and then to present to Gresham City Council.

Councilor Liberty said he would be available on Nov 16th to discuss the issue in more depth for anyone who wanted to come and talk more about it.

Chair Hoffman said it would remain on the MPAC agenda for Nov 30th.

Councilor Liberty offered to meet with any jurisdiction that wanted him to make a presentation.

6. VISIONING

Chair Hoffman said that they would start with local visioning and work their way up to the state plan.

Eryn Demming, City of Lake Oswego, gave a presentation for Lake Oswego. Slides from that PowerPoint presentation are attached and form part of the record. There was discussion about infill and neighborhoods.

Mayor Tom Potter, City of Portland, gave a presentation about Portland's vision. Portland had developed a number of plans over the years but not a lot had changed due to those plans and public engagement. He said that they did not want their new vision to go that same way. He said that this time they wanted to do it right and with input from other jurisdictions partnering in the region. He said that Portland was becoming much more diverse and that the citizens felt there was a disconnect between the citizens and the government. He said they wanted to develop a vision that fully engaged the communities in the government process. He said he was a strong believer in community governments. He said that they were struggling with how to maintain their infrastructure. He said that they needed to develop a system to provide funds for maintenance of infrastructure. He said that they would engage as many community people in the process as possible – 100,000 citizens at least – to shift away from balkanization of areas and think instead of the common good. He said that they had selected 50 people to serve on their vision committee to work on different approaches to gaining input from the community. He said that the City of Portland had just authorized a charter review for the first time in 80 years.

Mayor Tom Hughes, City of Hillsboro, reviewed the Hillsboro 2020 Vision, related history, and implementation. He said that their success was what led to the large city that Hillsboro had become. He said that in the 80s the city council had decided to have two (2) jobs for every three (3) people and they succeeded very well. He said that they also had a huge influx of people in Hillsboro, which also led to their great growth. He said that the city probably had the largest Latino population north of Sacramento. He said there had been a drive to get citizen involvement in land use planning when they realized that they really needed community participation in creating a community plan and not just a land use plan. There was great participation from organizations, businesses, and community citizens in helping create the community plan. His advice was don't schedule meetings and invite people to come, but rather go to their meetings, including farmer's markets, church groups, neighborhood associations, etc. He said that going to the community via their churches was a very good way to reach out to the community. He said that translation of their brochures into Latino really helped, especially after they had people in the community do the actual translation. Due to these efforts the City of Hillsboro had experienced a high level of community participation. He distributed a brochure for a town hall meeting "Hillsboro 2020 Vision: A Hillsboro 2020 Vision Implementation Committee Publication, Spring 2005" which is attached and forms part of the record. He also distributed the Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan, May 2000 for the members. A copy of that plan is attached and forms part of the record. He specified six broad elements where the community expressed a desire for connections. He said that the City of Hillsboro followed many of the community's expressions of the vision into the development of their City Hall and Plaza.

David Bragdon, Metro Council President, gave a little history on Metro's visioning in the past. He said it would also lay a good foundation for the future. He said that one observation he had made was that there was a difference between the vision and the implementation. He said that another thing to understand was the difference between the regional plan and the local plans. He briefly reviewed the existing vision and talked about the "new look" at the regional vision. The new look mostly deals with how the Metro Council makes decisions and how they can implement those decisions. He said that the region had grown much more quickly than had been projected, which was another reason why Metro was taking a "new look" at the vision and how to implement the underlying values of that vision. He said that they decided to take a strong look at the tools that they had been using to achieve that vision. He distributed two handouts, which are attached and form part of the record. He discussed the mayors' forum and the presentation that MPAC had on September 28, 2005 from Andy Cotugno regarding the new look undertaking. He reviewed the main points of both handouts including the questions from the white handout which would be discussed at the next mayors' forum.

There was discussion about how to reach the members of the communities and especially the new comers in the communities including in-migration and up-and-coming generations regarding these issues.

Lane Shetterly, LCDC Director, reviewed the process of obtaining members for the task force for the state "Big Look." He discussed the history of the task force and he indicated that the first three months of their work would be intense as they would develop a work plan under a limited timeline. He said that an interim report was due in 2007, and the final report was due in 2009. He said that originally that seemed like a long time, but it didn't anymore. He said that he wanted the task force to drive its own agenda, own the work plan, and to produce some suggestions for a statewide level vision. He said that there were strong efforts to engage the community and citizen comments. He said it was important that all the efforts (local, regional and state) should stay coordinated. He said that he felt that folks were still very engaged in land use planning in the region.

7. LCDC RULEMAKING

Mr. Shetterly distributed a handout, which is attached and forms part of the record. He reviewed that handout for the members.

9. APPOINT NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Chair Hoffman appointed Mayor Chuck Becker , Mayor Tom Hughes, and himself as the Nominee Appointment Committee. The committee would report to MPAC their recommendations for 2006 at the December 14th meeting and a vote would be taken at the first meeting in January.

There being no further business, Chair Hoffman adjourned the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR NOVEMBER 9, 2005

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#8 Fairness, Farmland, etc.	11/9/05	Memorandum from Robert Liberty to MPAC regarding "Background material for discussion at the next MPAC meeting on Farmland, Fairness and Building Great New Neighborhoods proposals"	110905-MPAC-01

MPAC Meeting Record

November 9, 2005

Page 6

#6 Visioning	November 2005	Neighborhood Planning in Lake Oswego, Eryn Deeming, Project Planner	110905-MPAC-02
#6 Visioning	Spring 2005	Hillsboro 2020 Vision, A Hillsboro 2020 Vision Implementation Committee Publication	1109005-MPAC-03
# 6 Visioning	May 2000	Hillsboro 2020 Vision: Vision and Action Plan, May 2000	110905-MPAC-04
#6 Visioning	Fall 2005	Metro Flyer: How do we grow from here? A new look at regional choices	110905-MPAC-05
#6 Visioning	Fall 2005	How do we grow from here? A new look at regional choices	110905-MPAC-06
#7 LCDC Rulemaking	November 2005	Department of Land Conservation and Development: LCDC Policy Agenda for 2005-07	110905-MPAC-07
