

# 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:** July 26, 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 • June 14 & June 28, 2006	Kidd	Decision	3 min.
4	COUNCIL UPDATE	Hosticka	Update	5 min.
5	SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES	Neill/McArthur	Information	45 min.
6	TITLE 4	Benner	Information	30 min.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

MPAC: July 26 & August 9, 2006

MPAC Coordinating Committee, Room 270: August 9, 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

June 14, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

**Committee Members Present:** Chuck Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, Dave Fuller, John Hartsock, Jack Hoffman, Tom Hughes, Richard Kidd, Charlotte Lehan, Alice Norris, Wilda Parks, Chris Smith

**Committee Members Absent:** Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Bernie Giusto, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Diane Linn, Tom Potter, Larry Sowa, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District –vacant)

**Alternates Present:** Laura Hudson

**Also Present:** Mayor Robert Austin, City of Estacada; Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Bob Clay, City of Portland; Carol Chesarek, Citizen; Valerie Counts, City of Hillsboro; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Kay Durtschi, MTAC; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; LEEANNE MacColl, League of Women Voters; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; David Zagel, TriMet

**Metro Elected Officials Present:** Liaisons – Carl Hosticka, Council District 3,

**Metro Staff Present:** Kim Bardes, Miranda Bateschell, Sonny Conder, Andy Cotugno, Robin McArthur, Lydia Neill

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. Chair Kidd asked those present to introduce themselves.

### 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was none.

Due to lack of quorum at this time, the Chair skipped to agenda item No. 5.

### 5. NEW LOOK

#### 5.1 Regional Forum

Robin McArthur, Long Range Planning Director, reviewed the agenda for the Regional Forum and spoke to why elected officials should attend as well as stakeholders. She distributed the new look mailer and asked the members to take extras to pass out in their jurisdictions. She outlined the three (3) planned exercises for the forum.

### 4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Carl Hosticka said that the Panel of Economic Advisors would be meeting at the convention center on June 16, 2006 from 8:30-4:00. He reviewed the agenda for that meeting. He said that the Metro Council had recently been spending most of their time on the Metro budget and measure 37 issues.

### 3. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for May 24, 2005:

Motion:	Mayor Rob Drake, City of Beaverton, with a second from, Commissioner Andy Duyck, Washington County, moved to adopt the consent agenda with the minor revision pointed out by Chris Smith regarding the quorum and vote at the last meeting.
Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.

#### 5.2 Investing in our Communities: Tools Discussion

Lydia Neill, Principal Regional Planner, distributed an updated version of the spreadsheet that had been included in the packet and that spreadsheet is attached and forms part of the record. She reviewed the importance of the matrix and discussed how she would like the exercise to run.

The members split into two groups and discussed the tools outlined in the matrix. Afterwards a member from each group gave a summary of their discussion. Jack Hoffman gave the first report and Mayor Rob Drake gave the second report.

#### 5.3 Research Findings

Dick Bolen, Data Resource Center Manager, gave a report on research findings regarding the New Look Forecast. He said that those findings would be used as a base case on new look work and related work on the New Look effort in the fall. He reviewed the handout that had been placed at the back of the room, which is attached and forms part of the record.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes  
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR JUNE 14, 2006

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

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
<b>#5 New Look</b>	June 2006	Flyer for 2006 Regional Forum – New Look at Regional Choices	061406-MPAC-01
<b>#5 New Look</b>	6/14/06	Memorandum from Lydia Neill to MPAC re: Investing in Our Communities Exercise	061406-MPAC-02
<b>#5 New Look</b>	6/14/06	Summary of report: Creating the Base Case Forecast for the New Look, a spatial allocation of projected regional population and employment growth	061406-MPAC-03

## METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

June 28, 2006 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

**Committee Members Present:** Chuck Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Andy Duyck, Dave Fuller, John Hartsock, Richard Kidd, Wilda Parks, Chris Smith

**Committee Members Absent:** Ken Allen, Richard Burke, Rob Drake, Bernie Giusto, Jack Hoffman, Tom Hughes, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Charlotte Lehan, Diane Linn, Alice Norris, Tom Potter, Katherine Ruthruff, Erik Sten, Steve Stuart, (Multnomah Co. Special Districts – vacant, Governing Body of School District –vacant)

**Alternates Present:** Martha Schrader

**Also Present:** Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Al Burns, City of Portland; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Shirley Craddick, City of Gresham; Kay Durtschi, MTAC; Jon Holan, City of Forest Grove; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Doug McClain, Clackamas County; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Melody Thompson, City of Canby; Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County

**Metro Elected Officials Present:** Liaisons – Robert Liberty, Council District 6    others in audience: Rod Park, Council District 1

**Metro Staff Present:** Kim Bardes, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Paul Ehinger, Kathryn Sofich

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

Chair Richard Kidd, called the meeting to order at 5:11 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 June 14, 2006

Deferred to the next meeting due to lack of quorum.

### 4.      **COUNCIL UPDATE**

Councilor Robert Liberty said that the Metro budget had been formally approved. He reported that 19 jurisdictions had signed the intergovernmental agreement for the Construction Excise Tax. He announced that there would be a Headquarter Hotel meeting with POVA on the following day. He gave a report on the Hillsboro Get Centered! event that had taken place on Tuesday, June 27, 2006. He reviewed the Metro Council agendas for the last meeting in June and the meetings for July.

## **5. JPACT UPDATE**

Andy Cotugno, Metro Planning Director, distributed a handout titled “Regarding the Prioritization Summary of Potential ODOT Region 1 Modernization Projects.” That handout is attached and forms part of the record. He reviewed the projects outlined in the handout and explained that this was mid-point in the process.

## **6. SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEM PLANNING**

Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste & Recycling Director, reviewed a large map displayed at the front of the room that showed waste facilities locations – both Metro and private, as well as the two landfills. He then reviewed the materials included in the meeting packet, mainly focusing on the study/report submitted by the consultant hired to look into the feasibility of a fully private system, a fully public system, or the continuation of the current hybrid system. Mr. Hoglund outlined the time frame for the study and presentation of the findings to the Metro Council.

Rick Winterhalter, Waste Reduction Coordinator for Clackamas County, talked about how Clackamas County administered their solid waste program and how that intersected with the Metro run solid waste program.

Chris Smith, Multnomah County Citizen, said that as centers were developed with greater density planners should give thought to waste collection routes and practices. There was discussion about the hybrid system currently in use versus a totally private system.

Councilor Rod Park asked Mr. Hoglund to explain the flow of waste material from user to recycler or landfill. Mr. Hoglund used a large display at the back of the room to explain the process.

Councilor Park addressed issues surrounding resource management. He said that a rough estimate of contracts showed that there was 7 or 8 billion dollars. He said that was why this was such an important issue.

There was discussion about looking at the solid waste disposal system as a revenue source for planning or infrastructure costs.

Mr. Hoglund said that he would be back in August or September with a recommendation on the ownership model and to update the MPAC members.

## **7. NEW LOOK: SHAPE OF THE REGION**

Chris Deffebach, Long Range Planning Manager, gave an update on the Regional Forum.

Chair Kidd expressed his admiration for the work on the forum exercise and how well it was put together. He said he was looking forward to the presentation of the results from that exercise. There was discussion about the difficulty level of the exercise and the real world issues that had to be wrestled with. Comments centered on the need for more time to actually do the exercises versus how much time was spent on explaining the exercise.

Chair Kidd said that there would be a follow-up Regional Forum in December.

Mayor Chuck Becker, City of Gresham, asked when the forum exercise results would be available.

Ms. Deffebach said that it could be 2-3 weeks.

Mayor Melody Thompson, City of Canby, gave a presentation on the City of Canby. Mayor Thompson's notes are attached and form part of the record.

There being no further business, Chair Kidd adjourned the meeting at 6:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kim Bardes  
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR JUNE 28, 2006

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

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
<b>#5 JPACT</b>	6/26/06	Prioritization Summary of Potential ODOT Region 1 Modernization Projects 2008-11 STIP	062806-MPAC-01
<b>#7 New Look</b>	6/27/06	Notes from Mayor Melody Thompson regarding the City of Canby for her "Neighboring Cities" presentation	062806-MPAC-02
<b>Misc.</b>	6/28/06	Letter from City of Gresham, Mayor Chuck Becker, to Mayor Kidd and MPAC re: Metro New Look Project- Investing in Our Communities	062806-MPAC-03
<b>Misc.</b>	6/28/06	MPAC Tentative 2006 Agenda Items	062806-MPAC-04
;			

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 Northeast Grand Avenue | Portland, Oregon 97232-2736  
(tel) 503-797-1700 | (fax) 503-797-1797



METRO

**Date:** July 18, 2006

**TO:** MPAC

**FROM:** Lydia Neill, Principal Regional Planner

**RE:** MPAC Workshop Topics

## **Background**

A number of discussions have taken place leading up to the June Regional Forum to determine which strategies will be most useful in stimulating development in centers and corridors. These discussions will help determine the breadth of the Tool Kit for Investing in Our Communities over the next several months. As a follow up to these discussions a workshop-like series is being developed to share information and stimulate additional discussion. Metro staff will prepare basic information and schedule local experts to provide short presentations on different aspects of the topic. A set of questions will be posed to stimulate discussion by MPAC. The intent is to elicit sharing of information regarding successful programs and determining if different approaches are warranted. Additional topics may emerge as the series progresses. The summer/fall topic areas are:

- **Systems Development Charges-** reimbursement and strategies to use them as an incentive
- **Vertical Housing Tax Credit Program-** how jurisdictions are using the program, pros/cons, opportunity?
- **Urban Renewal and Tax Increment Financing-** successful examples of these tools, types of projects, trials and tribulations
- **Good Design and Use of Design Review-** where can we find good infill development? Examples of successful design review programs

## **Action**

No action is required. The sequence of information presented is for information only.

**Attachment:** Notes from MPAC Matrix Discussion 6.14.06

## MPAC Matrix Discussion Notes

### 6.14.06

The MPAC Chair divided the committee into two groups to allow more small group discussions to occur. The groups were asked to discuss and add to ideas that were contained in the Investing in Our Communities Tools Matrix.

MPAC discussion group 1:

Participants focused on **Urban Renewal** for a significant amount of time as many of the jurisdictions have used this tool and find it extremely successful:

- Development results have been good, but politics have created challenges and have not always been positive
- In Oregon City, experienced a 600% appreciation in property value, and recognized this really is the one tool they have to spur total revitalization in areas. The Council initiated the program
- Can be combined with Enterprise Zones to increase jobs
- In Gresham, this secured a \$5 million industrial plant
- Charters vary: in some jurisdictions councils initiate urban renewal areas/plans and in some the public has to vote for urban renewal programs
- Urban Renewal is extremely popular in Wilsonville, which includes specific capital projects in the urban renewal plan for the school and fire districts in order to prevent opposition from these groups, which gain a benefit despite the loss in tax revenue
- Citizen advisory committees can also help to gain support
- Can be used innovatively

### Acquire Fiscal Resources

- Metro could really help, especially with urban renewal, by allowing local jurisdictions access to Metro's resources such as the DRC and the Economic Modeling
- Urban renewal programs should remain local
- **Small jurisdictions could use help with all of these tools;** for other jurisdictions, they are using many of these and do not need assistance from Metro
- Cross-jurisdictional corridors would be a good instance to have Metro use LIDs; otherwise, it seems to be a local program
- LIDs & SDCs: Metro could help by comparing Oregon's program with other more progressive state programs
- Revolving Loan Fund: very good function for Metro
- Metro could help by debunking myths about each of these programs: it presents information from a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to resolve issues
- Support at the legislative level (e.g. Urban Renewal program renewal)
- Promote success stories (Hawthorne, Belmont, Hillsboro)

- NMTC: takes too much time and sun setting – seemed to have little interest; however, more information and a connection to the CDEs with money might be useful

### **Focus Capital Investment**

- If Metro managed tools such as 11 & 16, it would remove individual control, which might be appropriate for these tools, and which could be very political
- Land surplus could be beneficial for Metro to handle, but how would each jurisdiction be guaranteed to get what they put into the trust?
- Tax-base sharing: each jurisdiction is not getting a balance of housing and jobs leaving them with an imbalance of tax revenues. This is a very controversial issue that should be discussed at a future meeting.
- *Coordinate state incentives*: they are not always looking at land use and transit decisions/patterns when implementing programs and encouraging developments
- Local *sales tax* would provide significant revenue
- SDCs: discuss and analyze different programs that have graduated fee systems based on development type and location as well as those programs that apply these funds to additional services needed for growth management. Metro could provide a matrix with options and provide current numbers to see where the holes are (Wilsonville, and other cities outside of Oregon have such programs).

### **Cultivate innovative development**

- Technical committee of development officials could produce this type of information
- Developers would love a collaborative approach in the region
- Gresham: this can be very beneficial; there is already a risk for innovative development and jurisdictions can assist in making sure developers can finish in time. Flexibility is important and phasing centers development is integral: the first development may not reach the FAR, but it gets something there and moves the center in the right direction
- Host charrettes and provide pictures of successes and design examples for the region to get similar projects going.

### **Adapt Policy**

- Height issue should be handled carefully: clarify this to the public and how it would occur
- Height limits and zoning in centers could be prohibiting what the market would develop
- Stories can be more flexible than specific height limits
- Development needs are different now and the codes should be adapted to accommodate this (Gresham's experience with the change in retail demands led to an increase in height maximums)
- Model codes from Metro could help and should include reminders of exemplary examples in the region; pair this with designs
- GMELS got retailers excited, similar discussions could create additional connections.

### **Tools to discuss at further meetings**

- Tax-base sharing
- Land Trusts
- Interpreting building codes to allow more mixed-use development
- Sales Tax
- SDCs (graduated)
- Parking strategies and tools
- Density and Height
- Urban Renewal
- Legislative Agenda
- Model Codes

MPAC Discussion Group #2 focused on the second half of the tools matrix beginning with “adapting policies”.

### **Adapting Policies**

#### **Building Heights**

- Density is a problem that is part of the public’s perception and design of projects
- Million \$ question: Does density make sense everywhere?
- Would density work in Hillsboro Regional Center?
- What about Lake Oswego? – Not likely, citizens have been very resistant
- Design standards need to be specific to individual jurisdictions
- Might be interesting to know where we have height limits now that prevent developers from reaching zoned capacity?
- A variance process can help address height restrictions
- Parking – reductions in number of spaces can go too far, creates other problems
- Lenders create a floor for parking standards
- \*Metro = give advice, have staff help determine what information is being generated from several parking studies that are underway

#### **GMELS**

- Market does not always lead with vision – it operates according to today’s demand
- Planning is important
- Lots of growth in home business which move into start-up spaces (Organic)
- Larger share of employment – opportunity for centers, looking to provide employment in centers flexibility could be helpful

#### **Cultivate Innovative Development**

- Share resources throughout the region
- Building Department – need to coordinate between jurisdictions, share expertise, knowledge

- Fire does this already, they don't try to reinvent the wheel and they seem to be collaborative not competitive. Hillsboro is trying to foster this kind of relationship so they have the Fire Marshall housed in Building Department
- Develop pool of expertise throughout the region
- \*\* Don't just start with legislature\*\*

### **Place Making**

- Damascus could benefit from a master design to create a place
- Hillsboro – looking for development, downtown is a challenge
- Must be driven by local interests
- Can't replicate around the region- they are all different
- Help cities through a 'charrette' process
- Hillsboro – did for the Civic Center "Work Shop" and may want to do for downtown.

### **Parking**

- Economics drives whether structured parking can be built or not

### **Corridors – change in mixed-uses to allow residential development**

- Is this really a problem? There did not seem to be consensus that this was a problem that needed to be fixed. Most people thought they already permitted residential
- If you do push this development pattern - does it siphon off activity from Main Street/Centers?
- \*Metro – report on what is out there, report on studies that have been completed

### **Large Format/Users: Hospitals and Big Box**

- Where would/should they locate?
- Hospital – do they belong in centers? Is a large format appropriate?
- Large Format Retailers – do they detract from Main Street/Centers and can they be done to not detract?
- \*Metro – Investigate and Report

### **Small Scale Commercial in Residential Neighborhoods**

- Problem is driving to get services
- Is it a market or is zoning problem? Seems to be consensus that zoning is already in place to permit neighborhood commercial uses.
- Hillsboro – struggled with Witch Hazel development – decided to try provide the opportunity for it to develop

### **Education and Information**

- Metro may be able to be helpful in disseminating information
- Home Builders Assoc. may be the best vehicle for some types of information and educational opportunities
- Infill – design is a huge issue in getting communities to embrace a compact urban form

- Hillsboro/Gresham are both trying to develop design review as a tool- they could benefit from understanding what other communities have done. Metro could convene a discussion on design review (also with HBA), set-up a meeting to share information among jurisdictions
- Lake Oswego has residential design review – if go beyond a certain FAR then it kicks in, has to have a clear objective!
- Provide density bonuses if a developer opts to do design review?
- Architects – include them in the discussion of design review standards/practices
- Skinny House Plans – can we distribute and/or adopt region-wide? How successful has this been used in Portland?

# 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



METRO

**DATE:** July 18, 2006  
**TO:** MPAC  
**FROM:** Lydia Neill, Principal Regional Planner  
Miranda Bateschell, Assistant Regional Planner  
**RE:** July 26<sup>th</sup> agenda item: SDC discussion

## **State Statute for System Development Charges: ORS 223.297 to 223.314**

"The purpose for the imposition of SDCs by local governments is to provide equitable funding for orderly growth and development in Oregon's communities and to establish that the charges may be used only for capital improvements."

Currently, a capital improvement is defined as facilities or assets used for water supply, treatment, and distribution; waste water collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal; drainage and flood control; transportation; or parks and recreation. It does not include costs of the operation or routine maintenance. It can be gathered as an improvement or reimbursement fee, or a combination thereof, "at the time of increased usage of a capital improvement or issuance of a development permit, building permit or connection to the capital improvement."

## **The uses of SDCs in and out of Oregon**

SDCs provide the most common source of funds for capital improvements in Oregon. However, levying fees is limited to the extension of infrastructure to new developments. Some jurisdictions provide SDC waivers for certain types of development projects such as affordable housing. Jurisdictions can also create graduated SDC schedules basing the fee on the location and type of the development. This accounts for the fact that smaller units at higher densities cost less to service, as do units located centrally where infrastructure is already in place. Furthermore, other states and Canada also levy SDCs to fund infrastructure facilities as well as other services needed to manage growth such as libraries, fire and police facilities, shelters, and emergency medical care.

## **Questions for discussion**

- How closely do SDCs cover the actual cost of infrastructure?
- Are discounts used for different construction types or incorporation of specific design elements into projects?
- Is there an interest in graduated SDCs that are linked to the impact of the project on public facilities in order to promote compact development and efficient land use?
- Would graduated SDCs be politically feasible in your local jurisdiction?
- Levying SDCs for additional services such as schools or police would require a legislative change; is that necessary; is there support for this?
- Likewise, is there a desire to expand SDCs to fund operation and maintenance?

**Attachment: Local SDC schedules** (provided by City of Gresham)

**SDC Comparison  
for Single Family Residential**

	<b>New City of Gresham</b>			<b>West Linn</b>	<b>Wilsonville</b>	<b>Beaverton</b>	<b>Hillsboro</b>	<b>Troutdale</b>	<b>Portland</b>
	<b>Existing City</b>	<b>Pleasant Valley</b>	<b>Springwater</b>						
<b>Parks</b>	\$ 3,185	\$ 6,603	\$ 7,299	\$ 8,029	\$ 2,394	\$ 2,981	\$ 2,276	\$ 3,600	\$ 2,961
<b>Transportation</b>	\$ 2,662	\$ 4,674	\$ 6,416	\$ 4,897	\$ 3,010	\$ 2,850	\$ 2,850	\$ 604	\$ 1,776
<b>Stormwater</b>	\$ 777	\$ 2,193	\$ 5,709	\$ 455	\$ 471	\$ 852	\$ 500	\$ 852	\$ 559
<b>Wastewater</b>	\$ 4,770	\$ 4,770	\$ 4,770	\$ 4,652	\$ 1,680	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,400	\$ 4,426	\$ 2,830
<b>Water</b>	\$ 3,917	\$ 3,917	\$ 3,917	\$ 8,849	\$ 6,363	\$ 2,976	\$ 3,377	\$ 1,148	\$ 2,399
<b>Total:</b>	\$ 15,311	\$ 22,157	\$ 28,111	\$ 26,882	\$ 13,918	\$ 12,259	\$ 11,403	\$ 10,630	\$ 10,525

July 21, 2006

## MEMORANDUM

TO: MPAC  
FROM: Dick Benner  
SUBJ: Amendments to Title 4 "Employment and Industrial Areas Map"

Over the past several months, Metro has learned of half a dozen or more proposals under consideration by local governments to amend their comprehensive plans from industrial plan designations to other designations. Planners from these jurisdictions have asked Metro how Title 4 applies to these proposed plan amendments. Upon learning that the amendments might involve amendments to Metro's Title 4 Employment and Industrial Areas Map, local planners asked about the process and criteria for changes to that map.

The Metro Code prescribes no specific process for amendments to the Title 4 map. Because the Council adopted the map by ordinance, amendments to the map must also be made by ordinance unless the Council establishes some other way to amend it. The code also prescribes no specific criteria for amendments to the map. Thus, the general policies of the Regional Framework Plan would guide map amendment decisions.

The Metro Planning Department brought this situation to the Council at a work session in June and posed the question: Should Metro prescribe a specific process and criteria for amendments to the Title 4 Employment and Industrial Areas Map?

At the work session, the Council decided that all people interested in a proposal to amend the map, including the Council itself as likely decision-maker, would benefit from a defined process and set of criteria or factors to guide consideration of changes to the map. The Planning Department has presented the following questions to MTAC. The Metro Council seeks advice from MPAC on these and other questions that may arise as the Council considers how to make amendments to the Title 4 map.

### Process:

- Should there be a single process for all proposed amendments, or should there be a faster, less involved process for amendments of smaller significance?
- Should the Council be involved in all proposed amendments, or should it save its time for the more significant map amendments?
- Should the proposed amendments be considered by Metro at any time, or should there be an annual "window" to allow Metro to weigh cumulative impacts of a number of proposed amendments?

### Criteria/Factors:

- Which policies of the Regional Framework Plan should be converted to criteria or factors?
- Should the purposes of Title 4 be applied as criteria or factors?
- What other interests should be reflected in a set of criteria or factors applicable to a proposed Title 4 map amendment?