

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736



METRO

TEL 503-797-1540 FAX 503-797-1793

MEETING: METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: May 24, 2006

DAY: Wednesday, 5:00-7:00 p.m.

PLACE: Metro Council Chamber/Annex

NO	AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	ACTION	TIME
	CALL TO ORDER	Kidd		
1	SELF INTRODUCTIONS, ONE MINUTE LOCAL UPDATES & ANNOUNCEMENTS	All		5 min.
2	CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS			2 min.
3	CONSENT AGENDA <ul style="list-style-type: none">March 8 & 22, April 12, and May 10 2006MTAC Appointments	Kidd	Decision	3 min.
4	COUNCIL UPDATE	Hosticka	Update	5 min.
5	JPACT UPDATE	Cotugno	Update	5 min.
6	MAY 19 TH MAYORS/CHAIRS LEADERSHIP FORUM RECAP	Kidd	Recap	10 min.
7	NEW LOOK <ul style="list-style-type: none">2035 RTP Draft Work PlanShape of the Region: Proposed Methods & ApproachInvesting in our Communities: Tools & Strategies	Ellis Staff Neill	Action Discussion Exercise	90 min.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

MPAC: June 14 & 28, 2006

MPAC Coordinating Committee, Room 270: June 14, 2006

For agenda and schedule information, call Kim Bardes at 503-797-1537. e-mail: bardes@metro.dst.or.us

MPAC normally meets the second and fourth Wednesday of the month.

To receive assistance per the Americans with Disabilities Act, call the number above, or Metro teletype 503-797-1804.

To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

March 8, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chuck Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Tom Hughes, Richard Kidd, Tom Potter, Lane Shetterly

Committee Members Absent: Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Bernie Giusto, Diane Linn, Wilda Parks, Katherine Ruthruff, Larry Sowa, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District –vacant)

Alternates Present: Bob Bailey, Larry Cooper, Tim Crail, Laura Hudson, Norm King, David Ripma

Also Present: Bill Ashworth, Oregon Realty and HCTF; Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton and HCTG; Carol Chesarek, Citizen; Kathy Christy, Candidate for Metro; Bob Clay, City of Portland; Valerie Counts, City of Hillsboro; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Sara Culp, Mayor Tom Potter’s office; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Jon Holan, City of Forest Grove; Jim Jacks, City of Tualatin; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Doug McClain, Clackamas County; Laura Oppenheimer, The Oregonian; Mike Ragsdale, GPAC; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Paul Savas, Clackamas County; Amy Scheckla-Cox, Cornelius Council; Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic Alliance; Andy Smith, Multnomah County; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons – Carl Hosticka, Council District 3, Susan McLain, Council District 4; Robert Liberty, Council District 6 others in audience: Brian Newman, Council District 2; Rex Burkholder, Council District 5; Council President David Bragdon

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Dick Benner, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Jim Desmond, Robin McArthur, Linnea Nelson, Amelia Porterfield, Ken Ray, Reed Wagner

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m. Chair Kidd asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

Chair Kidd announced that at the first MPAC meeting of each month Andy Cotugno would give an update on what the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT) was doing.

Andy Cotugno, Metro Planning Director, gave a short update on JPACT. He said that JPACT would be devoting a good portion of their time at the next meeting to scoping the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. He said they were just at the beginning of that process. He said that the biggest issue would be finances as there were a lot of expectations and not enough resources. JPACT was also finalizing the kickoff process for the funding that Metro allocates through Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). He said that JPACT was also in the beginning stages of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) allocation process.

Councilor Robert Liberty asked that Metro, JPACT, and MPAC make sure that MPAC was weighing in on big transportation issues.

Lane Shetterly, Department of Land Conservation and Development, gave an update on Measure 37 and Senate Bill (SB) 82.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for February 22, 2006:

Motion:	Mayor Rob Drake, City of Beaverton, with a second from, Andy Duyck, Washington County Commissioner, moved to adopt the consent agenda without revisions.
---------	--

Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.
-------	--------------------------------

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Carl Hosticka said that at the next meeting the Council would be considering the Open Spaces Bond Measure proposal. He said that the Ag/Urban study group had been meeting and he anticipated an update on that for MPAC soon. He said that Metro had a meeting to discuss the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and he anticipated that it would be a bigger deal than just figuring out which projects they would fund. The transportation system for years had been trying to play catch up on land use to deal with problems created by where people live. They have now realized that it will probably never catch up and they would have to start doing something different in transportation and/or land use.

5. GPAC REPORT ON ACTIVITIES

Mike Ragsdale, GPAC Chair, gave an update on the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC). He said that they had developed a work program for 2006 and started a work plan for 2007. He said that a big area of concern was operations and maintenance, and the committee was working on a comprehensive overview of finances for parks and natural spaces in the region. There was a heavy focus on institutional relationships and they wanted to aspire to a world-class system of parks and greenspaces in Oregon. He said that the role of GPAC was a convening role. During 2006 GPAC would be giving out reports on their conclusions. He said that GPAC would be looking to staff around the region to help them do the work.

6. EXPANSION AREA PLANNING FUND

Councilor Brian Newman gave a brief explanation of the Expansion Area Planning Fund (EAPF) proposal.

Mayor Chuck Becker, City of Gresham, reiterated his concern that the City of Gresham be reimbursed for the work they had already done on comprehensive planning for the land brought into their area.

Councilor Newman said that Metro had done some outreach to find out what jurisdictions had done regarding some up-front work paid out of their own general fund. He said there were other cities besides Gresham who had done or started some work. He said that Metro would try not to penalize jurisdictions that had already done some planning. Metro would go back to 2002 and try to reimburse those jurisdictions.

Mayor Rob Drake, City of Beaverton, asked how much had already been expended.

Councilor Newman said that if all the jurisdictions were taken together it was about \$1.3 million.

Councilor David Ripma, City of Troutdale, said that given the amount of money to be made by an expansion, and the possible harm to other jurisdictions that did not expand, why should the rest of the people, who were potentially harmed by the expansion, be forced to pay for planning of the expansion areas? He said that there had to be a better way to bring in money other than taxing everyone not involved in the expansion.

Councilor Newman said that issue had been discussed, and the feeling had been that the expansion affected the whole region. The expansion areas serve everyone in the region. Everyone benefits from a well-planned region. If we continue to bring land into the boundary and nothing happens, then that hurts the credibility of the land use system. Therefore there was concern to find a way to make sure the system would work and that those Metro policy decisions to bring in land would serve the entire region.

Councilor Ripma said that speaking for a jurisdiction that was under-developed and would not benefit from expansion elsewhere – whatever area that was expanding should be the area that paid for it. He said that he did not support this policy.

Councilor Liberty and Newman said that developers generally were supportive of the proposal.

Commissioner Bob Bailey, City of Oregon City, said that the City of Oregon City was supportive of the proposal. He asked Mr. Ripma how the proposal would harm or reduce development in Troutdale.

Councilor Ripma said it would force development elsewhere. He said it was the kind of thing that would force development someplace else. He said that Troutdale, Fairview, and Wood Village had undeveloped industrial land and he wondered why those cities should subsidize expansion in Washington County, and Springwater when there was developable land in their cities?

Councilor Newman explained the rate and fee process. He said that the developers that Metro had spoken with had said that the fee would not affect whether they built in other areas or not. He said that while they did not support this type of fee in the past, they realized that for planning and development to happen in some places they would need to find some sort of solution.

Commissioner Ripma said it would benefit the areas that were coming in but not everyone else in the region. He said they were the ones gaining and they should be the ones to pay. He said that he would oppose the proposal.

Mayor Norm King, City of West Linn, expressed concern that they would not raise enough money to cover costs for all new areas to comprehensive plan. He asked what Metro planned to do if there were not enough funds.

Councilor Newman said that the numbers were achieved by what the cities themselves had estimated and provided to Metro. He said that Metro got the figures directly from the cities. He explained how the fee and payment process would work.

Councilor Jack Hoffman, City of Lake Oswego, asked about the next big issue which was finding funds for roads, water, and sewer needs.

Councilor Newman said that it was definitely a big question that needed to be addressed, but he said that they should take this small step of planning areas first, and get that approved before moving forward and taking a look at the infrastructure. He said they would probably tackle that in the Big Look/New look efforts.

Councilor Hoffman said that the biggest “loser” in this proposal would be the City of Portland.

Gil Kelley, City of Portland, said it was not a tax on the City of Portland per se, but the city would clearly be the largest donor and did not stand to receive much direct benefit. He said that the city councilors felt that even though they would not see a large benefit – they wanted to be good partners and to see good planning at the edges. He said that the urban growth boundary (UGB) experiment was a fragile one and even though the City of Portland frankly disagreed with the extent of the 2002 expansion, once that decision was made they at least agreed that we were all responsible for carrying out good planning with whatever area was brought in. It was clear that there was no money available for planning in the periphery and some collective pool was needed to do that. He agreed that it did not solve the infrastructure problem, but at least the concepts would be planned for how those areas wanted to be developed.

Mayor Drake said he had wrestled with the issue of areas brought in but not developed. He said he was not crazy about the proposal. He said that citizens expected new development to pay for itself. He said that one problem with the proposal was that the tax would be on development that was already in existing areas. He said he could effectively argue that it was not his citizens’ responsibility to pay for new development. He said he would like to see new development pay for itself more because he didn’t feel that was currently happening. He said that they would have to figure out how to pay for infrastructure, especially for transportation. He said he would want to be sure that there was an airtight sunset on this fee. He said that anything new to be enacted would have to go back through the public process. He said it was fair to pay for all of the 2002 and 2004 expansions with this proposal since nobody had put forward a better idea. He said that schools should not have to pay this fee and expressed his desire to have schools excluded from this tax.

Mayor Tom Hughes, City of Hillsboro, said he was also torn about this proposal. He said that on the pragmatic side this was not a lot of money per unit, and also no other solution had been determined. He said he did have some philosophical problems with the proposal, however. Asking the development community how they felt about the fee was not prudent because they probably don’t care and because they would pass the fee along to the purchaser anyway. He said he also thought that the comment about schools was good, although he had concerns. He said that the mechanisms of a market would drive the timing of development through every phase of development. When a property approached a point and time when it looked profitable to develop it, the developer would pay for planning. He said that was a timing issue and he did not see why they were worried about some places not being planned in 15-years when the UGB planning was for a 20-year land supply. He said that should work itself out via the market. He said it also suggested that good decisions would be punished and bad decisions would be rewarded. An example of a bad decision was bringing in land that was not market affordable and land that local jurisdictions did not want to plan anyway. He said that at the time the land was ready to be developed then the developers were ready to pay for concept planning. He said that he did not see a big problem with having land left over as it would still be in the land supply. As they looked ahead to each expansion they should account for that undeveloped land already (or still) in the supply and therefore bring in less land. The minute they put this proposal on the table then the willingness of developers to pay for planning would go away and negotiations would be impaired.

Councilor Newman said that he did not run for his seat in order to impose excise tax on building permits to pay for planning the expansion areas. He said that this was a sincere solution to a problem put on the table by local governments. He said that Metro was working on the compliance report and most local governments were out of compliance with the functional plan as it related to doing this sort of planning. Metro could enforce compliance, but a more rational response was to find a solution. He said that the point regarding the schools was legitimate. The problem with exemption for schools was where would they draw the line? At a certain point, when you exempt enough entities, then you need to increase the rate in order to compensate for the lost revenue. He said that at a certain point this proposal had to sunset because of Metro's spending cap. He suggested that other solutions in the future might be a value-capture tax, or have expansion areas themselves pay for their own planning. The fees could be focused on the areas that benefited.

Chair Kidd said he would like to entertain a motion.

Tim Crail, Multnomah County Citizen Representative, asked about the estimates from cities and how legitimate they were. He worried that the jurisdictions could come back and say that they wanted double what they had originally asked.

Councilor Newman said that Metro would be the banker. He said that Metro would not sign intergovernmental agreement contracts that exceeded the amount agreed upon. He said that Metro would not form commitments that could not be paid for.

Commissioner Bailey asked if this proposal was to authorize a collection mechanism at this time. He asked if the proposal included policies and procedures for allocating funds to jurisdictions.

Councilor Newman explained the process outlined in the proposal.

Commissioner Bailey said it seemed that there would be cases where allocating some funds would help get a jurisdiction over the planning hump, but they would not expect for all costs to be paid and he wondered how the amount granted to each area would be allocated.

Councilor Newman said that those agreements would be reached through intergovernmental agreements (IGAs). He said that the recommendation was to make it as easy as possible.

Motion:	Councilor John Hartsock, City of Damascus, with a second from, Mayor Chuck Becker, City of Gresham, moved to recommend that MPAC accept the Expansion Area Planning Report as presented to MPAC, and to include payback to those jurisdictions that had already had an outlay of funds for the 2002 and 2004 boundary expansions, and to forward that recommendation to the Metro Council.
---------	--

There was more discussion about government resources, the market, developers and the planning process and how all those factors related to developing land over the 20-year land supply rule.

Chair Kidd called for the vote.

Vote:	Yea: Bailey, Becker, Cooper, Crail, Darcy, Drake, Duyck, Hartsock, Hoffman, Kidd, King, and Potter. Nay: Hughes and Ripma. The motion passed.
-------	---

7. OPEN SPACES BOND MEASURE

Jim Desmond, Metro Greenspaces and Parks Director, distributed resolution 06-3672A and the corresponding staff report. Those handouts are attached and form part of the record. He reviewed changes that had been made by the Metro council to the previous version of the resolution.

Chair Kidd asked for a motion.

Motion:	Mayor Drake, City of Beaverton, with a second from Nathalie Darcy, Washington County Citizen Representative, moved for approval of Resolution No. 06-3672A as presented to MPAC and to have the approval and Resolution forwarded to the Metro Council for consideration.
---------	---

Commissioner Andy Duyck, Washington County, said he felt that the resolution had deviated from what it was originally intended to be. He said that the resolution now included much outside the regional boundary area. He said that the Metro council was very aware of those deviations and issues because they had received plenty of testimony on that subject. He said he felt that the program was being crafted to include things that people definitely wanted, but also included a lot of what people didn't want.

Mayor Becker asked if there was a map.

Mr. Desmond said there were maps but that he had not brought them along this time, since they had been viewed before.

Mayor Becker asked what areas were included outside the urban growth boundary (UGB)?

Those areas were discussed.

Commissioner Duyck said that some of those areas outside the regional boundary would probably never come within Metro's jurisdiction. It was very likely that no future expansions would occur in that direction, and yet Metro would impact resource industries and outlying neighbors and yet those entities would not have representation at Metro to respond to the resolution.

Mayor Becker asked if there was need for protection of those areas.

Mr. Desmond said that those areas were chosen by a panel of biologists, scientists, and natural resource experts who were asked what areas they thought Metro should include in the measure. The ones outside of the UGB were primarily on the Westside and all were considered important to the health of the Tualatin River. The inclusion of those lands was primarily due to concerns about water quality in the Tualatin Basin.

Mayor Becker asked if Metro had done outreach to get help with those areas from other jurisdictions – jurisdictions located outside the UGB.

Mr. Desmond said that they had tried to leverage help from other agencies both inside and outside the region. He named organizations that Metro had engaged, volunteers, community groups, public and private agencies involved in stewardship of sites, etc.

Councilor Susan McLain referred to the agriculture study done by Metro where they tried to determine what the agriculture industry really needed. The Metro Councilors agreed in an amendment put forward at Metro Council the previous week that the study, as well as the discussion in the refinement process if the bond measure was to pass, would help assist them to answer that question on two levels: 1) regarding the greenspace and urban growth boundary amendment process level, and 2) the integrated issues regarding conflicting needs for the same pieces of land, whether it be parks or agricultural industries. She said that they would be putting interested parties on notice that they would integrate work of dealing with the agricultural studies, urban issues, and greenspaces.

Commissioner Duyck said that the members needed to understand that the areas under question were not in any danger of development. Most of the areas were flood plains; they had been that way for hundreds of years and would continue to be that way. There were many tools at their disposal to prevent any type of degradation. He talked about the 8-year process undertaken related to Goal 5 and Nature in Neighborhoods protection. He said the justifications for putting those particular areas on the Bond Measure map did not stand up to scrutiny.

Mr. Crail said he was concerned that forwarding this ballot would be asking the voters for too much this year with schools being in such great crisis.

Vote:	Yea: Bailey, Cooper, Crail, Darcy, Drake, Hartsock, Hoffman, Hughes, Kidd, King, Potter, and Ripma. Nay: Duyck and Becker. The motion passed.
-------	---

Mayor Becker said his opposition was due to the properties included outside the boundary.

8. HOUSING CHOICE TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT

Councilor Rex Burkholder reviewed the main points of the report and gave an overview of the charges given to the committee. He said that the committee's last meeting would be next week. He reviewed future steps for the members.

Chris Deffebach, Long Range Planning Manager, reviewed comments from MTAC, which was included in the meeting packet.

Councilor Liberty said every time Affordable Housing came up for discussion at MPAC the members agreed that it was a regional discussion and that it was an important issue.

Mayor Drake said that there were two points that MTAC made the previous week which had to do with serious reservations about linking affordable housing to greenspaces and transportation funding, which he said that he agreed with. The other serious reservations were about inclusionary zoning. He wondered if there was a way to address finding a voluntary way of dealing with it, without taking it to the legislature. He said that beyond those points the report did nice job of addressing the salient issues.

Councilor Hoffman said that they must make an effort not to trivialize the local variation – one size did not fit all. This was an important concept to remember.

Councilor Liberty said that he thought the task force had been very cognizant of the issue that some places had more affordable housing supply than others. He said that the primary concern was toward areas that were not meeting the burden. He said the emphasis should be that everyone had a stake in

fixing this issue. He said that in the growth concept it explicitly said that concentrations of poverty were something to be avoided from a regional perspective.

Nathalie Darcy, Washington County Citizen Representative, said she searched a website called "Housing Connections" which was a local website to search for housing. It would help locate, based on your salary for your area, affordable rent units. She said she plugged in what she thought would be typical rent for someone with 30% of average income, which calculated out to about \$400. She then did a search of the region (all four counties) for rental units renting for around that amount. She wanted something that would be available within 60 days for \$400 a month and she said she found about 20 possibilities. When she drilled down by individual county, however, most of those opportunities were located in Multnomah County. For Clackamas County and Washington County there was only one rental unit available for each. She said that showed a huge regional inequity.

Chair Kidd said that he recently had a discussion with some developers regarding including some habitat for humanity units in a new development. He said that the developers did not seem interested in talking about inclusionary zoning in their new projects, although they said they would be willing to provide it somewhere else. He said that inclusionary zoning was difficult to impose on builders on small amounts of land.

Councilor Liberty said that there was a mix of housing needs categories. He said that he had heard that 20% of the homeless had jobs. So you could go from complete subsidy to no subsidy. He said he was worried that the market on rental housing was getting down to 70%-80% and as soon as the single family home building boom died down that would start to rise and the problem would get a lot worse. He said they would need to be thinking about strategies where there was a big, modest, and low government investment scale and they needed to make sure that they did not lose a whole bunch of low income housing when this happened.

Councilor Ripma said that he had concern about any program that would be adopted, such as the housing score idea, because it would put a great burden on a small city's resources. Any program that was adopted should count the existing supply and some credit should be given for maintaining that supply.

Councilor Rex Burkholder said that the affordable housing concern was not an easy issue, and he thanked the MPAC members for the time that they had placed on this issue. He thanked the committee for the hard work that they had put into the report. He said that they had identified a lot of good ideas to pursue.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR MARCH 8, 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#5 Greenspaces Bond Measure	3/1/06	Letter to David Bragdon from Tom Brian, Washington County Chair re: 2006 Greenspaces Bond Measure Regional Target Area	030806-MPAC-01
#6 EAPF	3/8/06	Memorandum from Mayor Chuck Becker, City of Gresham to MPAC Chair, Mayor Richard Kidd and the members of MPAC re: Expansion Area Planning Fund	030806-MPAC-02
#7 Open Spaces Bond Measure	3/3/06	Greenspaces Bond Measure Resolution No. 06-3672A: For the Purpose of Submitting to the Voters of the Metro Area a General Obligation Bond Indebtedness in the Amount of \$227.4 Million to Fund Natural Area Acquisition and Water Quality Protection	030806-MPAC-03
#7 Open Spaces Bond Measure	3/3/06	Greenspaces Bond Measure Resolution No. 06-3672A Staff Report: For the Purpose of Submitting to the Voters of the Metro Area a General Obligation Bond Indebtedness in the Amount of \$227.4 Million to Fund Natural Area Acquisition and Water Quality Protection	030806-MPAC-04

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

March 22, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chuck Becker, David Fuller, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Charlotte Lehan, Richard Kidd, Alice Norris, Wilda Parks, Chris Smith, Larry Sowa

Committee Members Absent: Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, Bernie Giusto, Tom Hughes, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Diane Linn, Tom Potter, Katherine Ruthruff, Larry Smith, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District –vacant)

Alternates Present: Martha Schrader, Dresden Skees-Gregory

Also Present: Robert Austin, City of Estacada; Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Carol Chesarek, Citizen; Valerie Counts, City of Hillsboro; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Shirley Craddick, City of Gresham; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Kay Durtschi, MTAC; Meg Fernekees, DLCD; Stacy Hopkins, DLCD; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Steve Kelley, Washington County; Linda Malone, City of Sandy; Katie Mangle, City of Milwaukie, Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Doug McClain, Clackamas County; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons –Robert Liberty, Council District 6 others in audience: Rod Park, Council District 6

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Dan Cooper, Kim Ellis, Robin McArthur, Linnea Nelson, Tim O'Brien, Kathryn Sofich

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m. Chair Kidd asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

Mayor Chuck Becker, City of Gresham, wanted to make sure that his testimony on the Bond Measure at the previous meeting was clear; he said that he did support the Bond Measure.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for March 8, 2006 and MTAC Appointment:

Deferred to the next meeting due to lack of quorum.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Robert Liberty gave an update. Notes from that update are attached and form part of the record.

5. 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Councilor Rod Park gave an overview of the regional transportation situation. His talking points related to the overview are attached and form part of the record.

Councilor Liberty said that there would be \$4-\$10 million dollars to spend. What would that do for your city or county? He said that what Councilor Park had described was fundamentally different from how things had been done in the past. Don't look at the RTP as a bunch of projects that would be considered alone, but rather look at the whole region and use that as tool to plan. Take the RTP millions and look to what could be accomplished with it. Would it be a means or would it be the ends? He said that the Metro Council had discussed it and they felt it was a means. He said it would be a vote on what they wanted the investment to add up to. He said that this issue was very pivotal. He said that there was a lot of interest in having a bigger scale discussion and not treating this as a technical discussion but rather a regional investment priorities discussion to attain a certain quality of life for the region.

6. NEIGHBOR CITY PRESENTATIONS

Councilor Park introduced Mayor Austin and Mayor Malone.

Chair Kidd said that they had been invited to share growth issues about their communities.

Mayor Bob Austin, City of Estacada, distributed a handout, "City of Estacada Issues." That handout is attached and forms part of the record. He discussed the issues outlined on that handout for the members.

Councilor Park asked how the public felt about growth in Estacada.

Mayor Austin said that there were only a few so far who seemed opposed to that.

Mayor Becker asked what Estacada had looked at in terms of gas tax or opportunities to increase transportation revenues.

Mayor Austin said that they had decided on a gas tax rather than a transportation utility fee. He said that every time they got close to finalizing that tax, gas prices would increase, and it would be put onto the burner. He said that the city was hoping to get that tax passed this year. He said they were currently considering a one-cent tax or slightly more than that.

Chair Kidd asked about the density of the construction of 500 residential single houses.

Mayor Austin said that they were coming in at low densities, approximately 7500 sq. ft. lots. He said that the city was anticipating an increase in density in order to bring in more multi-family housing.

Councilor Liberty asked if the Estacada council had talked about an institutional relationship with Metro.

Mayor Austin said that they had not yet discussed it, but they were getting to the point to reach out. He said that they wanted to be less isolated but still maintain a green barrier. He said that Estacada schools had capacity to take on another 300-500 students.

Gil Kelley, City of Portland, asked what types of firms were filling in the industrial areas.

Mayor Austin described those industries. He said that many were metal related outfits.

Mayor Becker asked if Mayor Austin knew who was commuting out of the community for work.

Mayor Austin said he did not know, but it would be a good thing to survey citizens about. He said that he would like to see more of his community work close to their homes.

Mayor Linda Malone, City of Sandy, distributed a handout that focused on growth in the City of Sandy. That handout is attached and forms part of the record. She reviewed the handout for the members.

Chris Smith, Multnomah County Citizen Representative, said that both cities were located on a highway. He asked what that meant for their street grid and how it related to the highway. He asked about TriMet's service area and their transit system on the edge – how did they see the edge districts working together to help form a comprehensive network?

Mayor Malone said that Sandy had a fully up-to-date transportation master plan. She said that they hoped to someday have a truck bypass, and maybe a toll road bypass. She said that Sandy had just completed a north to south connection. She said they received money from ODOT that would fund the completion of a north to south connection out to highway 26 at Vista Loop. She said that the city was trying to provide options to the residents to avoid the highway. She said that on Friday and Sunday afternoons the residents were very aware that they live on a highway. She said that they had a bicycle and trail plan for future development.

Mayor Austin said that since Estacada was on the edge of a highway their situation was a little different. He said that there were currently other routes to get out of Estacada and thereby avoid the highway.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR MARCH 22, 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#4 Council Update	3/22/06	Councilor Robert Liberty Council Update for MPAC 3/22/06 talking points	032206-MPAC-01
#5 2035 RTP Update	3/22/06	2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update – MPAC talking points	032206-MPAC-02
#6 Neighbor City Presentations	March 2006	City of Estacada Issues	032206-MPAC-03
#6 Neighbor City Presentations	March 2006	City of Sandy Growth	032206-MPAC-04

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

April 12, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chuck Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Charlotte Lehan, Richard Kidd, Tom Potter, Chris Smith

Committee Members Absent: Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Andy Duyck, Dave Fuller, Bernie Giusto, Tom Hughes, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Diane Linn, Alice Norris, Katherine Ruthruff, Larry Sowa, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District –vacant)

Alternates Present: Larry Cooper, Ed Gronke, Laura Hudson

Also Present: Robert Austin, City of Estacada; Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Bob Clay, City of Portland; Valerie Counts, City of Hillsboro; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Shirley Craddick, City of Gresham; Sara Culp, City of Portland; Kay Durtschi, MTAC; Jon Holan, City of Forest Grove; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Doug McClain, Clackamas County; Laura Oppenheimer, Oregonian; Paul Savas, Clackamas Co. Special Districts Alternate; Andy Smith, Multnomah County Chair's Office; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons – Carl Hosticka, Council District 3, others in audience: David Bragdon, Council President; Brian Newman, Council District 2; Rod Park, Council District 6

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:14 p.m. Chair Kidd asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for March 8 & 22, 2006 and MTAC Appointments:

Deferred to next meeting due to lack of quorum.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Carl Hosticka said that LCDC had approved the industrial lands Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) decision. He announced that the Housing Task Force report would not be given to Council on April 13th as reported. It would be deferred one week due to an emergency in Councilor Liberty's family. He said that the speaker series on Economic Development was continuing and announced that Carol Coletta, President/CEO of CEOs for Cities, host/producer of a public radio show, Smart City, would be the next speaker in that series, presenting on Thursday, April 13, 2006 at 7:00 at Liberty Northwest.

5. JPACT UPDATE

Andy Cotugno, Metro Planning Director, distributed the agenda for Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), which was due to meet the next morning. He reviewed that agenda for the members. That agenda is attached and forms part of the record. There was discussion about the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Mr. Cotugno said that they would need to take action on the '100% list' by July. He said that the process had changed slightly. He explained the typical pattern versus the new pattern. He said that the basic change was that Metro and JPACT would get a chance to look at the range of projects under consideration by the state earlier in the process.

6. MAYORS'/CHAIRS' IV: LEADERSHIP FORUM

Councilor Brian Newman distributed information regarding the Regional Mayors' and Chairs' Forum. That information is attached and forms part of the record. Councilor Newman reviewed that handout.

7. DEBRIEF ON NEIGHBOR CITIES PRESENTATIONS FROM MARCH 22, 2006

Chris Deffebach, Metro Long Range Planning Manager, distributed a handout that summarized the presentations by Estacada and Sandy at the previous meeting. That handout is attached and forms part of the record. She reviewed that handout for the members.

Councilor John Hartsock, Clackamas County Special Districts, said that they would need to include information on how (and if) growth creates traffic impacts in surrounding communities.

8. NEW LOOK: SHAPE OF THE REGION

Councilor Hosticka distributed an issue sheet for the members. That sheet is attached and forms part of the record. He said that they would be looking more at what decisions would be made by whom – regarding the shape of the region, and what kind of information was needed, and who would participate. He invited the members to comment on the list of identified issues that he had just handed out. He said that they were essentially working the process backwards this time. He said that decisions would be made by entities and maybe they should start the process by asking up front what those decisions would be and whom those entities would be. He reviewed each item on the list for the members. He said that he would add "bi-state," "population allocations," and "neighboring cities" as items to the list. He announced that there would be a June Regional Forum to discuss these items and the proposed process, and he encouraged MPAC members to attend.

Mayor Rob Drake, City of Beaverton, said that some of the committees dealing with these issues should take longer than 5-6 meetings to make decisions and explore possibilities. He said many folks on committees had full-time jobs and many other obligations so they were not always able to attend short run committees and give real input.

Chair Kidd said that to do that would require sub-committee formation and work.

Councilor Jack Hoffman, City of Lake Oswego, asked if there was going to be focus on issues inside the UGB.

Councilors Hosticka and Newman said yes. Councilor Newman explained that there were three tracks for the New Look effort: 1) the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, which focuses on transportation

issues, 2) investing in communities – looking at centers, corridors, and focusing inside the UGB, and 3) looking outside the boundary – where would we decide to grow and not to grow? He said that each track would be kept separately but that they were all inter-related. He said that there would be two forums regarding this effort – the June 23, 2006 Regional Forum and another forum in early December.

Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen Representative, asked how Metro planned to make sure the public was engaged.

Councilor Hosticka said they were just beginning the process, but that a lot of work would go into outreach and public engagement.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 6:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR APRIL 12, 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#5 JPACT Update	April 13, 2006	Agenda for April 13, 2006 JPACT meeting	041206-MPAC-01
#6 Mayors' & Chairs'	April 2006	Save the date: Regional Mayors' and Chairs' Forum	041206-MPAC-02
#7 Debrief on Neighbor Cities	April 2006	Summary sheet of presentations by Estacada and Sandy Mayors at MPAC on March 22, 2006	041206-MPAC-03
#8 New Look: Shape of the Region	April 12, 2006	New Look: Shape of the Region – the New Look, April 12, 2006	041206-MPAC-04
Misc.	April 2006	Brochure: VisionPDX Community Visioning	041206-MPAC-05s

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

May 10, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chuck Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Dave Fuller, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Richard Kidd, Charlotte Lehan, Alice Norris, Chris Smith

Committee Members Absent: Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, Bernie Giusto, Tom Hughes, Diane Linn, Wilda Parks, Tom Potter, Katherine Ruthruff, Larry Smith, Larry Sowa, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District – vacant)

Alternates Present: Larry Cooper, Lane Shetterly

Also Present: Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Al Burns, City of Portland; Carol Chesarek, Citizen; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Steve Durrant, ASLA/MTAC; Kay Durtschi, MTAC; Meg Fernekees, DLCD; Jon Holan, City of Forest Grove; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Greg Miller, AGC; Laura Oppenheimer, Oregonian; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Paul Savas, Clackamas Co. Special Districts Alternate; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons – Robert Liberty, Council District 6, others in audience: David Bragdon, Council President

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Miranda Bateschell, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Pat Emmerson, Robin McArthur, Lydia Neill, Tim O'Brien, Ken Ray, Gerry Uba, Ray Valone, Reed Wagner

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m. Chair Kidd asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Deferred to the next meeting due to lack of quorum.

5. CONSTRUCTION EXCISE TAX

Ray Valone, Principal Regional Planner, gave the members an update on the two meetings for collection and distribution of the excise tax. He said that collection would start on July 1, 2006. He said that they were hoping to start distribution of funds as early as September this year. He talked about the need for intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) to make this happen and said that those were being worked on currently. He said that the next step would be to set up a process and that jurisdictions would need to provide numbers for Metro so that Metro could double-check those numbers to see if they were still valid.

Councilor Jack Hoffman, City of Lake Oswego, asked if there had been any negative feedback.

Reed Wagner, Council Policy Coordinator, said that there had not been much and that it was now a matter of working out the details.

Chair Kidd asked about the progress of the draft IGA.

Mr. Valone said that the draft IGA had been sent to the jurisdictions. He said he understood that some might take longer to finalize than others and that some would have to be approved by local councils, which could also extend the process.

Chair Kidd asked if on July 1st the fee would be collected based on the payment of a building permit or the submittal of a project.

Mr. Wagner said that the Construction Excise Tax (CET) group had agreed to do it with the payment date and not the application date. He said that they felt it would make it easier to process collection for them. He said that there were two jurisdictions that would need exceptions. He said that they would know a lot more on this on Friday of this week.

Chair Kidd said that if a person had a large project that was starting now there was no way that the project would get to the point of paying the fee before July 1st.

Mr. Wagner said that if a permit was paid for by July 1 then it would not be subject to the fee. If, however, payment was received on July 1st or thereafter then the fee must be paid. He said that most members of the CET group had said that would be easier for them to deal with from a process point-of-view.

Councilor John Hartsock, City of Damascus, said that once someone had applied for a plan check then new fees could not be added. He said he thought that only the fees that were in place when the person applied would be charged.

Mr. Wagner said the CET group wanted to try to align the implementation of the fee in the same manner that the state would add a fee. He said that those type of questions would be addressed on Friday when some CET group members met to work on the language of the IGAs.

Councilor Hartsock said that for some jurisdictions the budget pass through process of the collected tax would present problems.

Chair Kidd said that in the draft IGA there would be a statement that would allow jurisdictions to keep up to 5% of the fee to cover the cost of processing the tax.

Mr. Wagner clarified that a jurisdiction could keep up to 5% of the collected funds for processing unless they found that they could process the permit fees for less.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Robert Liberty gave an update on Metro Council activity. He said that there had been budget amendments introduced formally to Council at the meeting the previous Thursday. He reviewed those amendments for the members and informed them that the Council planned to formally adopt the Metro budget in June. He said that at the Council meeting the following day the Council would be awarding grants associated with solid waste. He said that there was interest and discussion about a recent court case

pertaining to prevailing wage standards and government funded projects. He talked briefly about that case and how in that circumstance the judge had said it was not subject to prevailing wage. He talked about a new councilor project on regional medical facilities and a scoping exercise to determine and address the nature of Metro Council's possible role on that subject. He mentioned the Mayors/Chairs forum on May 19th and the New Look Regional Symposium scheduled for June 23rd. He said that the first meeting of the panel of Economic Advisors had taken place. He said that the Council had received the final report from Housing Choice Task Force. He said that the Council had directed staff to proceed on that matter.

6. NEW LOOK AT REGIONAL CHOICES

Robin McArthur, Regional Planning Director, distributed a New Look spreadsheet and New Look at Regional Choices Schedule. Those documents are attached and form part of the record. She reviewed both of those documents and discussed the anticipated outcomes.

Councilor Hoffman asked about the Regional Forum.

Ms. McArthur said that there were two forums planned: one for June 23rd and one in December.

Lydia Neill, Principal Regional Planner, distributed a handout, "Investing in Our Communities," and reviewed that handout for the members. That document is attached and forms part of the record.

Councilor Hoffman referred to a League of Oregon Cities, Local Focus, April issue article "From the Director." That article is attached and forms part of the record.

Tim O'Brien, Senior Regional Planner, reviewed the material included in the meeting packet.

There was discussion about what "great communities" meant. Mayor Alice Norris, City of Oregon City, said that they were essentially talking about creating new communities. There was discussion about land supply and when to bring in more land, the urban growth report, and criteria for making those decisions.

Kim Ellis, Senior Transportation Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation. Copies of the slides from that presentation are attached and form part of the record.

Councilor Liberty said that there wasn't a single person present who had said they thought that the project list for JPACT would lead the process to the desired outcome of the 2040 vision/map. He thought that was a striking observation.

Chair Kidd said that the land planning group and the transportation-planning group had to get together to look at how the 2040 vision could be achieved with the dollars available. There was discussion on doing the planning in both areas in a different manner than had been done in the past to get better results. There was discussion about looking at the dollars available and then looking at the best use of those dollars to achieve the 2040 vision.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said that the current plan expired in March of 2008. If Metro did not have a federally approved plan to replace it, the federal dollars that go into construction stop. He said that they were under a real deadline to have that plan updated. There was discussion about the timeline.

7. MAY 19TH MAYORS/CHAIRS LEADERSHIP FORUM

Chair Kidd provided details on the Mayors/Chairs forum agenda for the members. He then gave a brief recap of his trip to Chicago and the Chicago National Forum on Regionalism. He said that he wanted to have the consultant from San Jose come to Portland and Metro to do the same exercise as they experienced at the Chicago Forum.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR MAY 10, 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#5 Construction Excise Tax	April 2006	League of Oregon Cities, Local Focus, From the Director article referenced by Jack Hoffman	051006-MPAC-01
#6 New Look	May 2006/ongoing	A New Look at Regional Choices, Updating the Metro region's long-range plan spreadsheet	051006-MPAC-02
#6 New Look	May 2006	New Look at Regional Choices Schedule	051006-MPAC-03
#6 New Look	4/20/06	Investing in Our Communities, Outcomes for 2006	051006-MPAC-04
#6 New Look	5/10/06	Shape of the Region Goals for 2006	051006-MPAC-05
#6 New Look	5/3/06	2035 Regional Transportation Plan, A New Look at Transportation, Updating the Metro region's long-range transportation plan	051006-MPAC-06
#6 New Look	5/10/06	Letter and work program and public participation plan from Councilor Rex Burkholder re: Regional Transportation Plan to Regional Partners	051006-MPAC-07
#6 New Look	5/9/06	Metro's New Look at Transportation spreadsheet	051006-MPAC-08
#6 New Look	May 2006	Copies of slides from the Regional Transportation Plan PowerPoint presentation	051006-MPAC-09

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



DATE: May 4, 2006
TO: Metro Policy Advisory Committee
FROM: Andy Cotugno, MTAC Chair
RE: **METRO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOMINEES FOR CONSIDERATION**

This is to inform you that we have received notification of four nominees to fill vacancies/seats on MTAC.

- 1) Katie Mangle, Milwaukie Planning Director, has been nominated for appointment to the Clackamas County/Other Cities (No. 10) MTAC seat.
- 2) Mike O'Brien, Viridian Environmental Design, LLC, has been nominated as the primary member for the Landscape Architect Association (No. 30) MTAC position.
- 3) Steve Durrant, Alta Planning, has been nominated for the alternate position for the Landscape Architect Association (No. 30) MTAC position.
- 4) Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks, Inc., has been nominated for the 2nd Alternate position for the Architect Association (No. 29) MTAC position. Joseph Readdy, Mahlum Architects, and Jeff Reaves, Group Mackenzie, would remain the primary and 1st Alternate members.

Per MPAC's bylaws:

Each jurisdiction or organization named [to MTAC] shall annually notify MPAC of their nomination. MPAC may approve or reject any nomination. Revision of the membership of MTAC may occur consistent with MPAC bylaw amendment procedures...

Please consider these nominees for appointment to MTAC at your May 10, 2006 meeting.

If you have any questions or comments, don't hesitate to contact me at 503-797-1763 or cotugnoa@metro.dst.or.us

Thank you.



DATE: May 17, 2006
TO: MPAC and Interested Parties
FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: 2035 RTP Update Work Program – Recommendation to TPAC and JPACT Requested

Action Requested: *MPAC approval of Attachment 1, which identifies proposed changes to the discussion draft work program based on comments received to date and recommendations approved by MTAC on May 17.*

Background

Metro is the regional government responsible for regional land use and transportation planning under state law and the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. Last September, the Metro Council initiated an update to the regional transportation plan with approval of Resolution #05-3610A. The 2035 RTP update represents the first significant update to the plan in six years. The planning process will incorporate a new “outcomes-based” approach to more effectively respond to the growth and funding issues facing the region and prioritize transportation investments to best deliver desired outcomes.

The process will build on new information learned from the Cost of Congestion Study and New Look work program. The process will also address new federal, state and regional planning requirements, including SAFETEA-LU legislation, recent Transportation Planning Rule amendments and new policy direction from the New Look planning process. The update is anticipated to be complete by November 2007 to allow adequate time to complete air quality conformity analysis and federal consultation before the current plan expires on March 8, 2008.

Scoping Phase

The first phase of the update included a formal scoping period to develop a detailed work plan to guide the update process. In March, Metro staff and the consultant team facilitated a series of focused policy-level discussions with the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) to kick-off the scoping phase to begin building agreement on the overall approach for the RTP update prior to engaging other key stakeholders in the process.

In April and May, the discussions were expanded to include the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC), Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC), the Regional Travel Options (RTO) Subcommittee of TPAC and the Bi-State Transportation Committee. In addition, on April 20, Metro Councilors, JPACT and

other key stakeholders from the Portland metropolitan region attended a Regional Transportation Forum, building on the March policy discussions. Participants included elected officials, city and county staff, and representatives from the business, environmental, and transportation community.

Key Issues for the Work Program

Three key issues have emerged during the scoping phase discussions as most critical for the RTP update work program.

Issue 1: The work program needs to have a strong educational component throughout the process. Stakeholders have stressed the importance of providing fact-based information that is clear, visual and accessible.

Issue 2: The updated RTP needs to more realistically take into account serious fiscal constraints facing the region and be based on tangible (e.g., measurable) outcomes in the context of the broader New Look planning effort. Stakeholders relayed their clear understanding that transportation funding in the region would be under serious fiscal constraints due to a wide variety of factors including reductions in Federal contributions to local transportation funding, and a resistance to raising tax revenue at the State and Local level. They also expressed support for using desired outcomes to identify and prioritize transportation investments that are crucial to the region's economy and that most effectively integrate the land use, economic, environmental and transportation objectives embodied in the 2040 Growth Concept.

Issue 3: Effective coordination and collaborative partnerships will be key for the success of the RTP update. This coordination and partnering needs to occur with the local, regional, state and federal agencies and jurisdictions (including Washington State and the upper Willamette Valley), and be expanded to include the local and regional business community, environmental organizations, and other interest groups that have been traditionally under-represented. Building partnerships with agencies and jurisdictions and a broad array of business, environmental and other community-based organizations will help the outreach effort be more effective.

Next Steps

Staff and the ECONorthwest team prepared a draft work program and public participation plan that was released on May 10 for review by Metro's standing committees. The draft work program integrates with the overall New Look work program (and outreach activities) and responds to the key issues identified during the scoping phase.

A summary of proposed work program changes identified since May 10 is included in Attachment 1, including comments provided at the May 10 MPAC meeting, a joint TPAC/MTAC workshop on May 15 and a May 17 MTAC meeting. Additional refinements may be identified as the discussion draft work program continues to be reviewed by other Metro committees, Federal Highway Administration staff and the Metro Council.

Please contact me if you have questions by e-mail at ellisk@metro.dst.or.us or by phone at (503) 797-1617.

/attachment

ATTACHMENT 1

Summary of Proposed Work Program Changes

This section summarizes proposed work program changes identified since May 10, the source of the proposed change and recommendations for how to address the proposed changes. The comments and recommendations are divided into discussion items and consent items.

With MPAC approval, these recommendations will be forwarded to for consideration by TPAC on May 26, JPACT on June 8 and the Metro Council on June 15.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Comment 1: MPAC should be more of a partner with JPACT in this RTP update. (MPAC, 5/10/06)

Recommendation: Agree. MPAC plays a significant role in this update – because of the link to the New Look, but also because adoption of the RTP is also considered a land use action under state law – it represents the transportation system plan for the region. The current draft work program identifies significant opportunities to foster this partnership throughout the process on key work program elements, such as development of an outcomes-based evaluation framework, identification of desired (and measurable) outcomes, development of land use/transportation scenarios and prioritizing transportation investments to best meet desired outcomes within fiscal constraints. Opportunities to hold Joint TPAC/MTAC workshops and possibly joint JPACT/MPAC meetings will be identified as the work program is implemented.

Comment 2: The work program should clarify how differences between MPAC and JPACT recommendations will be reconciled. (MTAC, 5/17/06)

Recommendation: Agree. The current draft work program identifies technical and policy development tasks and products for which MPAC will make formal recommendations to JPACT through TPAC – this is listed under the “Responsibilities” section for each task of the work program. Examples include development of an outcomes-based evaluation framework, identification of desired (and measurable) outcomes, development of land use/transportation scenarios and prioritizing transportation investments to best meet desired outcomes within fiscal constraints. The work program has been designed to build consensus on these items as part of the process. In the event that differences occur, joint MPAC/JPACT meetings will be held to discuss and reconcile differences on these and other critical policy issues. The work program will be revised to clarify this element of the decision-making structure of the process.

Comment 3: Incorporation of local transportation system plans (TSPs) needs to be emphasized in research and outreach efforts. The work program should be expanded to include an analysis of how local transportation system plans and capital improvement plans are implementing 2040 to identify how well 2040 is being implemented locally from a transportation perspective. This information could be used to highlight conflicts with 2040 and/or between local and regional plans. (MTAC, 5/17/06)

Recommendation: Agree. The current draft work program addresses these issues. Currently, the RTP incorporates local TSPs by including locally identified projects of regional significance that are consistent with regional policies and system designations. Consequently, the 2035 Base Case analysis of land use and transportation include both the RTP and local TSPs. As we assess the effectiveness of the base case and compare it to what outcomes the region wants to accomplish, the region will need to make some tough choices about what set of transportation investments and strategies we need to make at the regional and local level.

The Phase 2 research and analysis (particularly Tasks 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10) will inform those policy choices in the context of the broader New Look effort. Current RTP projects may be modified and new locally identified projects may be added to the RTP subject to the process described in the work program. Phase 3 of the RTP update includes a project solicitation process for projects to be forwarded to the RTP for consideration that best meet desired outcomes and New Look policy direction, and fall within the updated financially constrained revenue forecast developed during Phase 2. The system performance of projects included in an updated RTP Financially Constrained System will be conducted during Phase 3 after the project solicitation process to assess how well the updated plan meets the outcomes the region wants to accomplish.

Outreach for all of these elements will be conducted in partnership with public agencies and other key stakeholder groups with an emphasis on improving community awareness and understanding of the region's transportation needs and funding issues in the context of the broader New Look effort. A significant element of the research in Phase 2 is to identify desired outcomes and public priorities for transportation, and the public's willingness to pay for those outcomes and priorities. This will inform the outcomes and policy choices MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council recommend.

CONSENT ITEMS

Comment 4: The outreach strategies should be expanded to include a web blog for the RTP update. (MPAC, 5/10/06)

Recommendation: No change recommended. While this is an innovative approach for gathering public input, the draft public participation plan is intended to be targeted, yet representational throughout the update process. The relatively compact timeline and current staffing resources do not allow for meaningfully monitoring, compiling and reporting out more free-form input that would be provided through a web blog. The draft work program includes other web-based outreach strategies as well as focus groups, targeted workshops and other means that will be used to gather input throughout the process.

Comment 5: Revise the description of the various components of the public participation plan to clarify that Metro will conduct outreach in partnership with local governments. (Joint MTAC/TPAC Workshop, 5/15/06)

Recommendation: Agree. The public participation plan will be modified to make this clarification.

Comment 6: Expand the public participation plan to provide additional targeted workshops and to build new partnerships in the community with both the private sector and non-profits. This update should be an opportunity to meaningfully connect with groups that traditionally have not been part of previous RTP update processes, including users of the system, not just the providers. (Joint MTAC/TPAC Workshop, 5/15/06)

Recommendation: No change recommended. The draft public participation plan has been designed to be targeted, yet representational to include a broad spectrum of interests, including users of the system and groups that have been traditionally underrepresented in previous RTP updates. The draft plan includes 5 targeted workshops, 5 focus groups, 6 agency/jurisdictional outreach meetings and 5 technical workshops (called technical topic and interest area collaboration and coordination). At a broad level, the purpose of these meetings is to provide input on the technical work before and after it is completed. With the exception of the agency/jurisdictional outreach meetings – the remaining meetings will be specifically designed to include users of the system and groups that have been traditionally underrepresented. The draft participation plan fits within an estimated budget for this element of the update. In order to add more targeted workshops, or other outreach elements, a reduction in other outreach strategies will need to be identified. There is some flexibility to shift the number of targeted workshops, focus groups and technical team workshops (e.g., have 4 focus groups instead of 5 in order to add one more targeted workshop). This will be addressed as the work program is implemented to most effectively gather and use input to guide the technical work and policy development within the current estimated budget.

Comment 7: Create a sideboards document that describes the legal requirements for the RTP update that can be referenced throughout the process. (TPAC/MTAC workshop, 5/15/06)

Recommendation: Agree. A regulatory review memo has been prepared during the scoping phase that summarizes recent plans and regulatory changes with implications for the update to the Regional Transportation Plan. The memo will be modified as necessary to serve as this sidebar document, including integration of recent federal guidance on integrating the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) into system planning.

Comment 8: A base year of 2005 should be used for the background and research in Phase 2 of the update. The region changed significantly between 2000 and 2005, and if more recent information is available it should be used. (RTO Subcommittee, 5/11/06 and TPAC/MTAC Workshop, 5/15/06)

Recommendation: Agree, if more recent data is available. For modeling purposes, a base year of 2005 will be used for comparison with the 2035 Base Case during Phase 2 and RTP systems developed during Phase 3. More recent data will also be used, if readily available, for the system conditions analysis and assessment during Phase 2 (Tasks 7 – 10).