MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Wednesday, May 24, 2006 Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Carl Hosticka (Deputy Council President), Susan McLain, Rod Park,

Robert Liberty, Brian Newman

Councilors Absent: Rex Burkholder (excused), David Bragdon (excused)

Deputy Council President Hosticka convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 1:04 p.m.

Robin McArthur, Regional Planning Director, distributed a revised agenda and a sheet on MetroScope (a copy of each is included in the meeting record).

I. Emerging Trends/Issues from MetroScope

Dick Bolen, Data Resource Center Manager, and Sonny Conder, Principal Regional Planner, reviewed the work being done with MetroScope. Mr. Bolen said it was a base case. He reviewed the land supply and the year it would be available. He described some features of the model they were using, including policy inputs. Councilor McLain wondered if it was necessary to include equity, in terms of urban renewal. It should look as realistic as possible according to what people's assumptions would be. Mr. Bolen described the challenges in deciding what factors to include.

Mr. Conder talked about some of the data that they had received from local jurisdictions. His first action would be to report on the base case and to review progress from the original 2040 plan, after 10 years. He felt it was a flexible plan, not at all command-and-control. He described previous outcomes: 1) a variety of housing was available, and prices were still affordable 2) transportation stayed at a similar level of ease; also, there was a wide variety of transportation choice. Basically, our projections had been fairly accurate.

Mr. Conder said MetroScope converted policies to numbers and carried them out. He talked about what MetroScope could do, its accuracy, and future projections. Since 1980, we've consumed 2,000 gross buildable acres a year. This could be reduced in future years, by about 500-600 acres per year, if projections and assumptions remained stable. He spoke to the role of urban renewal. He described the role of infrastructure, things in the public domain, in adding value to private development, as well as the status of employment, greenspaces, agriculture, and relationships with neighboring communities. Overall, his assessment was that the metro region was doing pretty well in achieving its goals. Lots of job and housing growth has been occurring in neighboring communities, with housing growth typically outpacing employment growth.

Councilor McLain thought it was important to note the lack of information on agricultural industry and neighboring communities. Councilor Liberty had some questions about some details of the transportation projects, which staff responded to. He acknowledged the complexity of the modeling and wondered how MetroScope could handle dollars input and translate it into density. Mr. Conder talked about land pricing and some of the effects they had observed. He felt the model could accommodate a variety of inputs. Ms. McArthur described some reports that would be coming up in the near future.

II. Debrief from May 19th Collaborative Leadership Training

Ms. McArthur asked Council for their feedback on last Friday's training. Councilor Newman thought overall it was very good, although they got a bit tired toward the end. He would have preferred more integration of the topical material into the training, and to be aware of the length of time. Deputy Council President Hosticka thought the topical information could have come earlier in the session. Councilor McLain reported things she had heard, although she had not been present. She heard that people were hoping to hear about a "hot list" of five items. Also, that people thought more was needed in the section on next steps. Councilor Liberty commented it was not the best use of eight hours. Metro has been building goodwill throughout the region; we ought to have better ways than the May 19 session. Councilor Park felt it had been fairly interesting. Maybe less on the red card/black card negotiating thing. It could have been more efficient and he would have liked to see a wider variety of perspectives. But it was helpful and worth a try.

III. Review Event Brief for June 23rd Regional Forum

Ms. McArthur quickly reviewed the agenda, the objectives, intended audience, and some of the exercises that would be done. She distributed a handout (a copy is included in the meeting record). Councilor Liberty's experience was that small group discussions were usually not productive. Ms. McArthur agreed, but she said the consultant had technology that could provide feedback and consolidate the results very quickly.

Staff responded to Councilor questions about the specifics of the group exercise. Councilor McLain emphasized that integration was crucial. Ms. McArthur agreed that the questions needed some massaging. Councilor Newman wanted it to be not just about the policy choices; he would like to see a spatial exercise, using real growth projections, to get people to see the reality of the choices they were making. Deputy Council President Hosticka suggested some wording changes to emphasize that the stakeholders were being encouraged to take ownership of the process. Councilor Liberty thought the list of questions was too long.

IV. Status Report on New Look Elements (Regional Transportation Plan, Investing in Our Communities, and Shape of the Region)

In the interests of time, only the Shape of the Region portion was discussed.

Arnold Cogan, Cogan Owens Cogan, was working on the Great Communities project. He introduced the team and distributed the Great Communities work plan document (a copy is included in the meeting record). He talked about the diversity of communities that could be considered great and how his team would approach the work.

Tim Smith, SERA Architects, described the approach to the project. In the past, growth decisions were more quantitatively based. He felt there was a need for more qualitative aspects of growth. He listed the seven questions: 1) where to grow 2) how big to grow 3) how to grow 4) how to finance and fund growth in an equitable manner 5) how to govern new growth areas 6) where and how to stop contiguous growth 7) where and how to leapfrog the permanent edge to create a new town. He then reviewed the advisory panel members. He felt it was a strong panel, with lots of expertise. The advisory panel would meet twice, in Portland.

Metro Council Work Session Meeting 05/24/06 Page 3

Bob Wise, Cogan Owens Cogan, talked about the students—planners and designers—who would be doing the research. Metro's research problem was to be their course project. In addition, the advisory panel and the team itself would be available. They would focus on the urban/agricultural interface. He described the key characteristics they had identified, based on meeting with Metro staff. They would be looking at 20-30 great communities, including internationally, and asking what made these communities successful. They would draw some case results and develop standards and criteria, lessons learned, to come up with a list of that would be the point of departure for a discussion on what makes great communities. Mr. Cogan thought the research would be done within a few months.

The consultants clarified some of the terms that Council questioned. Councilor Park had some questions about evaluating citizen viewpoints on taxation, for example. Mr. Cogan thought this was outside the scope of their assigned project. Deputy Council President Hosticka would like to see Appendix A, with the list of possible communities. Councilor McLain clarified that the project was to look at other communities, see what worked and what didn't work, and bring those ideas back to our area. Councilor Liberty was concerned that issues of race, class, and income be addressed. Councilor Newman wondered about how to evaluate areas that were working but might not be aesthetically pleasing, by our terms. Deputy Council President Hosticka wanted to see information on retrofitting communities. Were there lessons to be learned about completing work that was never finished?

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Deputy Council President Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 3:03 p.m.

Prepared by,

Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

$\frac{\textbf{ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF}}{\textbf{MAY 24, 2006}}$

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	5/24/06	Revised Agenda	052406c-01
I	MetroScope	undated	To: Metro Council	052406c-02
			From: Robin McArthur	
			Re: Policy Inputs to MetroScope	
III	Regional	5/23/06	To: Metro Council	052406c-03
	Forum		From: Robin McArthur	
			Re: June New Look Regional Forum	
			Event Brief	
IV	New Look	May 2006	To: Metro Council	052406c-04
	Elements		From: Arnold Cogan	
			Re: Great Communities Work Plan	