A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793

METRO

Agenda

MEETING:	METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING
DATE:	May 29, 2001
DAY:	Tuesday
TIME:	2:00 PM
PLACE:	Council Annex

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

I.	**UPCOMING LEGISLATION**	
II.	**AIR RIGHTS OVER METRO GARAGE**	Moss
III.	**METROSCOPE**	Cotugno
IV.	**TRANSPORTATION POLICY DISCUSSION**	
V.	**EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATION**	
VI.	**COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS**	

ADJOURN

052901.01

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program Overview

What is the Past DBE Program

- Federal law requires contractors and sub-contractors to use minority and women sub-contractors.
- Only applies to FTA funded contracts.
- In 1992, Metro adopted its first DBE program by making it a part of code 2.04.300

What It Is Not

- Minority/women/emerging small business program (M/W/ESB) applies to local (Metro) funds. Metro Code 2.04.200

Why

- Required by the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) to obtain grants.
- Compliance reported to FTA quarterly.
- Every three years we are audited for compliance.
- Regulated under CFR 49 Part 23.

1995 Adarand vs. Pena

- Supreme Court declared DBE's programs illegal
- 1999 FTA revised the DBE program under CFR 49 part 26 making it race neutral and no set-asides
- DBE decided by annual income, size, ethnicity, years in business.
- For FY 1999-2000 and 2000-01, Metro adopted the State of Oregon's DBE Program by Executive Officer.

Proposed new Metro program

Section 1: Program and policy statements
Section 2: DBE Liaison Officer and Program Coordinator
Section 3: DBE Directory - adopt State of Oregon's
Section 4: DBE Owned Banks - encourage use by contractors
Section 5: Annual and contract goals
Section 6: Good Faith Efforts
Section 7: Counting and reporting DBE participation
Section 8: Monitoring of payment to DBE's
Section 9: Compliance and enforcement
Section 10: Requirements in RFP's and contracts

Impact to Staff

- Additional work to track all DBE firms that proposed as primes or subcontractors, win or lose.
- Tracking of all payments made to DBE and non-DBE subcontractors
- Additional goal setting and monitoring
- Monitor and enforce monthly payment reports

Impact to Council

- Repeal current Metro Code section 2.04.300
- By resolution adopt new DBE program after approval by FTA - expect to take up to a year to approve.
- Approve annual DBE goals by resolution

5/29/01

052901.02 2

History in Brief of Air Rights Project

June 1997	Tom Mosian of Ankrom Mosian Architects prepared conceptual design of a 10 story, 130,000 sq.ft, and 140-room condominium on the Metro parking structure. Proposed estimate at $178 sq./ft totaling $23 million.
November 1997	Tom Stein of Hoffman Construction prepared estimates based on conceptual design: 1) $103.24 sq./ft low, 2) $123.24 sq./ft medium, and 3) $140.02 sq./ft high.
December 1997	Sylvia McFarland prepared a market study on the proposed condo project. Proposed the project was feasible if condo's sold between $165 to $200 per sq./ft.
January 1998	Van Vliet Consulting prepared a Financial Feasibility Study. Concluded the project to be feasible. Recommended mixed income (40%) low income to take advantage of tax credits. Also recommended working with PDC for financial leverage.
May 1998	Architect Gary Reddick, CEO of Sienna Architects, expressed strong interest in the project.
Summer 1998	Preliminary discussions with PDC, Housing Authority, and developers. All expressed interest in project.
October 1998	Metro Council Growth Management Committee directed staff to prepare an RFP
February 1999	Draft RFP completed. Goals of RFP 1) no risk to Metro, 2) a minimum of 100 housing units with 20% affordable for households at 80% of median income, 3) encouraged flexibility and creativity.
March 1999	Metro Council briefed.
September 1999	Sylvia McFarland and Bruce Ostly prepared a follow-up market study on the proposed project. The study concluded 1) west side close in housing sales increasing, 2) Cascadian Towers represented major competition, 3) expect to sale 4-6 units per month (40-60) during construction, and 4) recommends sales prices be between $175 to $210 per sq./ft.
June 2000	University of Oregon master's degree architectural students prepared design schemes for Metro's headquarters site.
June 2000	Metro Council briefed that project is on hold due to lack of staff resources.

052901.03 3

M E M O R A N D U M

METRO

Date: May 25, 2001

To: Rod Park
Chair, Community Planning Committee

From: Andy Cotugno
Director, Planning Department

Regarding: ***Council Informal: MetroScope Case Study Descriptions and Assumptions***

Council Direction

1) Review the descriptions for "Baseline", "I-5 Trade Corridor", "2040 Centers" and the "New Community in Damascus" case studies to ensure consistency with direction provided to staff from Metro Council.

2) Provide direction to staff on the development of additional case studies to research the concepts of "Holding the UGB" and "Sub-regional Jobs/housing balance" issues. Continue the discussion of defining what the term sub-regional means to the region.

Common Assumptions

MetroScope is an interactive tool that requires direction and assumptions from policy makers to function properly and provide relevant information on the impacts of policy choices. Staff has identified several case studies that explore a range of policy choices associated with refinement of the 2040 growth management strategies. Specific model inputs are discussed under the individual case studies. The basic policy assumptions included in the case studies are:

- Utilize projects identified in the Priority RTP
- Assume the use of Title 3 for environmentally constrained lands
- Assume a five-year time lag for lands added to the UGB[1]

Damascus and 2040 Centers Case Studies

Based on the last discussion with the Community Planning Committee on refining the basic parameters for each of these studies a revised version of the model inputs have been prepared by staff. The changes indicated by the committee for the 2040 Centers and the Damascus Case studies are shown in *italics*.

---

[1] Staff is currently researching the validity of using a generalized five-year lag for servicing areas added to the UGB. The results of this research will be utilized in testing of a recommended alternative following completion of the case study analysis.

Descriptions of Case Study options A thru F

Case A: Base Case – the base case study option analyzes the impacts to transportation (e.g., congestion), land use (e.g., growth allocation), and regional growth (e.g., housing and land prices) by following existing State Law and Metro Code. Analysis of the base case should determine the effectiveness of existing policies in achieving 2040 goals and objectives.

Case B: I-5 Trade Corridor Study – the I-5 trade corridor study examines the transportation and land use effects of adding additional highway and transit capacity across the Columbia River. Analysis of the I-5 corridor should determine the benefits/costs/trade-offs of different transportation improvements and the affect on growth in Clark County versus Metro's capture rate.

Case C: Enhanced 2040 Centers – this case study tests the possibility of encouraging development in the region by focusing employment and housing (mixed-use) in the 2040 designated mixed-use centers scattered throughout the region. This case explores how much additional population and employment can be reasonably accommodated in these designated centers versus UGB expansion. This examination includes an assessment of the amount of public intervention (e.g., subsidies, taxes, infrastructure, and other economic incentives) that may be needed to turn market forces in the direction of mixed-use urban centers.

Case D: Hold the UGB – a case is made to explore the impacts of a no expansion of the current UGB. This was requested and included in the study on behalf of DLCD. This case study examines the economic implications and opportunities associated with accommodating the 2002-2022 forecast of population and employment inside the existing UGB. It provides a means of evaluating what it takes to accommodate the expected growth in the existing UGB and whether it results in shifting growth to neighboring areas.

Case E: Damascus Community Development – this new community case study is expected to answer questions about whether creating a full-service community in Clackamas County is an effective and efficient urban form and does not conflict with current 2040 goals. This case explores the possible reality of accommodating the entire region's employment and population needs in this one subregion.

Case F: Subregional Jobs/Housing Balance – unlike previous case studies, the subregional jobs/housing balance case is based on the notion that if subregions are in "balance" then the region will function more efficiently. This option will test making decisions on where to emphasize changes in zoning and/or UGB expansion based upon this criteria to determine whether 2040 goals can be more effectively met.

Case G: Market Study – To test an approach that attempts to satisfy market demand through zoning changes and/or UGB expansions in the areas that the market demands. The basis will be determined through examining land prices for jobs and housing.

Case A. Base Case – Implementing 2040, application of State Law

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:

- Capture rate – let vary but maintain the capture rate in the range of historical experience; the initial starting values for the capture rates should duplicate as close as possible the rates assumed in the UGR; subsequent five year increments should average in the last five years and this new rate should become the target
- Refill rates – provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options:

- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data:

- Priority Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in accordance with RTP schedule and RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties

- Local zoning as of January 2001
- No upzoning since local jurisdictions are already assumed to be in compliance with the Functional Plan[2]

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill Land

- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- No upzoning assumed
- Provide initial stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR; supply amounts may then change as land prices change

Vacant & Buildable Lands Analysis

- 2000 Vacant Land Inventory

Land Filter Assumptions

- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments each five years

- Use study areas defined in Alternatives Analysis, limited to exception land and EFU land that is completely surrounded.
- Expand each five years using UGR approach

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent eventual decisions of Clark County policy makers.
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

---

[2] Except rural residential (RRFU) and Farm/Forest (FF) lands that are already located within the UGB.

Case B. I-5 Trade Corridor Study – Application on of 2040 Policies and a series of interstate improvements

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:

- Capture rate – let vary as dictated by the economic forces of the model. We want to know how changes in accessibility change Clark County's employment and housing allocations.
- Refill rates – SAME AS BASE CASE: initially provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three key factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data:

- Priority RTP RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County
- Bi-state commission examining I-5 corridor issues will develop roadway, LRT, transit and bridge crossing alternatives to test

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Local zoning as of January 2001
- No upzoning since local jurisdictions are already assumed to be in compliance with 2040

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- No upzoning assumed
- Provide stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR

Vacant & Buildable Lands Analysis - SAME AS BASE CASE

- 2000 Vacant Land Inventory

Land Filter Assumption - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments each five-years - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Use study areas defined in Alternatives Analysis
- Expand each five-years using UGR approach

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent the established will of Clark county policy makers
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

Case C. Enhanced 2040 Centers

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:

- Capture rate – let vary to determine whether capture rate is affected; the initial starting values for the capture rates should duplicate as close as possible with the rates assumed in the UGR; subsequent five year increments should be averaged and in the last five years and this new rate should become the target
- Refill rates – provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options: SAME AS BASE CASE

- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data:

- Priority RTP and RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County
- Alter projects and timing to emphasize centers

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties

- Local zoning as of January 2001
- *Upzoning in centers or along corridors (no change in neighborhoods)*

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill Lands- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- Provide initial stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR; supply amounts may then change as land prices change

Vacant & Buildable Lands Analysis- SAME AS BASE CASE

- 2000 Vacant Land Inventory

Land Filter Assumptions

- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments

- Use study areas defined in Alternatives Analysis, Phase I *(exception lands and completely surrounded EFU only)*
- *Focus expansion in areas beneficial to established centers*
- Reduce expansion from Base Case based upon higher refill rates

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent the eventual decisions of Clark County policy makers
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

Center Incentives

- *Create a price differential between centers and land on the edge (either by decreasing land costs in centers or raising development costs on the edge)*
- *Focus incentives on regional centers, town centers, main streets and station communities.*

Case D. New Community in Damascus

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:

- Capture rate – let vary but maintain the capture rate in the range of historical experience; the initial starting values for the capture rates should duplicate as close as possible with rates assumed in the UGR; subsequent five year increments should average in the last five years and this new rate should become the target
- Refill rates – provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options - SAME AS BASE CASE

- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data:

- Priority RTP and RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County
- Revise schedule and projects to increase emphasis on Damascus

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties

- Local zoning as of January 2001
- No upzoning within the existing UGB since local jurisdictions are already assumed to be in compliance with the Functional Plan
- Upzone Damascus areas consistent with urbanization (based on the draft concept developed by staff)

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill Lands- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- No upzoning assumed
- Provide initial stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR; supply amounts may then change as land prices change

Vacant & Buildable Lands Analysis- SAME AS BASE CASE

- 2000 Vacant Lands

Land Filter Assumptions

- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments

- Use study areas defined in Alternatives Analysis and lands identified in Phase II of the Alternative Analysis studied for MetroScope purposes *focused solely in the Damascus area.*
- Expand each five years using UGR approach

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent the eventual decisions of Clark county policy makers.
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

Case E. Hold the UGB Case Study

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:

- Capture rate – to determine if the Metro capture rate is affected; the initial starting values for the capture rates should duplicate as close as possible with rates assumed in the UGR; subsequent five year increments should average in the last five years and this new rate should become the target
- Refill rates – provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Priority RTP and RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties

- Local zoning as of January 2001
- Upzone consistent with 2040 Growth Concept

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill Lands- SAME AS BASE CASE

- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- Provide initial stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR; supply amounts may then change as land prices change

Vaçant & Buildable Lands Analysis- SAME AS BASE CASE

- 2000 Vacant Land Inventory

Land Filter Assumptions

- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments

- No additional land is included in the UGB

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent the eventual decisions of Clark County policy makers.
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

F. Subregional Case Study

Jobs/housing balance on a sub-regional basis has been raised as a concern to represent the following issues: housing prices, tax base equity, transportation imbalance, and availability of jobs and services for residents. MPAC has started this discussion and recommended that discussions about subregions should not focus on city boundaries because that is not how our region functions. People choose to live in Lake Oswego and work in the city center. Trying to change that particular situation by growing a city center job base in Lake Oswego is not the answer to this issue and by drawing the "subregional" boundary too tight might cause us to try to fix a "problem" that would not necessarily provide benefits to the region. MPAC also suggested that there might be issues of balance that need to be explored further.

Measures of subregional balance could be:
1) travel time/ distance to employment corridors to define a sub-region and
2) jobs/housing balance (i.e., a ratio) within each defined sub-region

Staff recommends that the sub-regions be designed around "concentrations" of employment. This is consistent with the RTP methodology and the discussion at MPAC on May 23, 2001.

Urban Growth Report Demand Factors:
- Capture rate – let vary to determine if the capture rate is affected; the initial starting values for the capture rates should duplicate as close as possible with the rates assumed in the UGR; subsequent five year increments should average in the last five years and this new rate should become the target
- Refill rates – provide an amount of redevelopment and infill stock (supply) equal to the historical estimates of the refill rates – let the case study determine how much of the inventory of available redevelopment and infill gets used in each five year period. Refresh the refill stock as land prices change (since land price is one of three factors in determining refill).

Environmental Resource Protection Options- SAME AS BASE CASE
- Title 3 inside UGB; pseudo-Title 3 buffer outside UGB

Transportation Data- SAME AS BASE CASE
- Priority Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and RTC Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County

Land Use Regulations – local cities and counties
- Local zoning as of January 2001
- Focus changes in zoning in sub-regions to correct jobs/housing imbalance

Supply of Redevelopment and Infill Lands
- Refresh inventory of redevelopment and infill as land price changes
- Provide initial stock of refill land equal to assumption in UGR; supply amounts may then change as land prices change

Vacant & Buildable Lands Analysis
- 2000 Vacant Land Inventory

Land Filter Assumptions
- Expert panel to meter in available supply

UGB Amendments

- Use study areas defined in Alternatives Analysis, Phase I and if needed on Phase II lands (use Phase I lands first and then go to Phase II lands if needed)
- Expand around sub-regions to correct the jobs/housing imbalance
- Expand each five years using the UGR approach

Clark County Land Use & Capacity, Neighboring City Capacity

- Add to Clark County's UGA consistent with past five years of growth.
- Use expansion areas tentatively mapped by Clark County staff for the case studies – these mapped areas do not necessarily represent the eventual decisions of Clark County policy makers
- Assume the capacity and the UGB's of neighboring cities expand every five years as needed based on the previous rate of land consumption.

Regional Forecast

- Unchanged across each case study – 2000-2025 Regional Forecast

AC/LN/srb
I:\gm\community_development\share\msindepthcase2.doc

R L I S

REGIONAL LAND INFORMATION SYSTEM

Subregions

Urban Growth Boundary

Subregions

- Clark County
- Downtown
- East
- Southeast
- Southwest
- West

DRAFT

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Miles

1"= 3.8 miles

METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503 797-1742 FAX 503 797-1909
Email: drc@metro.dst.or.us

Plot date: Apr 16, 2001; j:\larson\00341a\maps0401.apr