

A G E N D A

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



METRO

MEETING: METRO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DATE: February 4, 2009
DAY: Wednesday
TIME: 10:00 a.m. to noon*
PLACE: Room 370A&B

| TIME | AGENDA ITEM | ACTION REQUESTED | PRESENTER(S) |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 10:00 a.m. | CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS | | Ross Roberts |
| 1. 30 min. | Local Aspirations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our Place in the World• State of the Centers Report• HCT Workshops• Update on Local Aspirations Process | Informational/ Discussion | Chris Deffebach/ Karen Withrow |
| 2. 30 min. | Proposed Legislation on Boundary Changes in the Metro Area | Informational/ Discussion | Dick Benner |
| 12:00 noon | ADJOURN | | |

****PLEASE NOTE, MTAC NOW MEETS FROM 10:00 A.M. TO 12 NOON***

Next regularly scheduled meeting (MTAC meets the 1st & 3rd Wednesday of the month): February 18, 2008

For further information or to get on this mailing list, contact Paulette Copperstone @ paulette.copperstone@oregonmetro.gov or 503-797-1562

Metro's TDD Number – 503-797-1804

Need more information about Metro? Go to www.oregonmetro.gov



Date: January 30, 2009
To: MTAC members and alternates
From: Chris Deffebach
Re: Making the Greatest Place Products for Feb 4 MTAC meeting

I am pleased to share two documents for your review prior to the MTAC meeting on Feb. 4th on the Making the Greatest Place effort. We are mailing these documents to MTAC members and alternates under separate cover. Hard copies will be available at the meeting. We look forward to hearing about their usefulness, what you find interesting or surprising in the current conditions in our centers and suggestions on how this approach can help describe local aspirations within the regional context.

One document is the latest edition of “Our Place in the World”, which sets our region’s current efforts in a framework of larger sustainable regional planning and development. A draft copy of this booklet was distributed during the joint JPACT and MPAC “Framing Choices” meeting this fall. Designed to be accessible to a broad range of regional stakeholders, “Our Place in the World” describes the challenges and choices that lay before us in the context of our history and our place, outlines the aspirations we have set forth as a region for future growth and development, and identifies the key strategies that will help us to realize our goals.

While the first document focuses on the broader regional context, the second document, the “State of the Centers” report, focuses on our progress in developing the region’s centers. This first edition of the report profiles each of the Regional and Town Centers in the 2040 Growth Concept and is intended to describe current conditions in our centers as well as help develop aspirations for the future. The document includes the Activity Spectrum and Typologies that you reviewed last fall as benchmarks for comparison and as a tool to help assist in achieving the aspirations.

The “State of the Centers” report includes data on existing population, employment, income, urban living infrastructure businesses, parks, transit and street network for each center. Already, we have heard many suggestions for additional data that could be conveyed in this format as tools to help understand and plan for our communities. We remain open to additional suggestions for expansion or improvement in later editions.

I would like to recognize the significant efforts of Lisa Miles and Janice Larson, who led the production of the Our Place in the World booklet and the efforts of Leila Aman, Brian Harper, Clint Chiavarini, Matt Craigie, Mark Bosworth and members of the Communications staff for the “State of the Centers” report.

January 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: MTAC
FROM: Dick Benner
SUBJECT: Boundary Changes

The Metro Council authorized introduction of proposed legislation with two changes to Metro’s statute (ORS chapter 268): (1) when Metro adds territory to the UGB, it automatically becomes part of the Metro district; and (2) Metro’s authority over boundary changes shifts from “old” urban reserves (1996) to any new urban reserves designated through the new reserves process. Please give us your thoughts about these two changes.

BACKGROUND

Amendment 1

As you know, Metro is a service district. It has a district boundary, same as water, sewer and other service districts. Changes to the Metro service district boundary are made according to ORS chapter 198, using the same procedures used by other service districts. As you also know, Metro has responsibility for the region’s urban growth boundary (UGB). Changes to the UGB are made according to Goal 14 and various statutes. The two boundaries are not tied to one another; the procedures are not related to one another. As a consequence, urbanization of new territory is more complicated and less efficient. It is one of many problems with the overall process of converting rural land to urban use to accommodate population and employment growth.

When Metro added 18,600 acres to the UGB in 2002, we learned that some 4,600 acres within the newly-expanded UGB lies outside the Metro district boundary.¹ Because this land lies outside the district boundary, it is not subject to Metro’s functional plans. That means the land is not subject to the provisions of Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, intended to protect the status quo on land added to the UGB until the responsible city or county adopts new comprehensive plan provisions and land use regulations to allow urbanization over time. Also, because the land lies outside the district boundary, people who own the property cannot vote in Metro elections, even though Council decisions greatly affect their properties.

The proposed legislation would not address these 4,600 acres already inside the UGB. Metro would add these lands to its district boundary over time, using the procedures in ORS chapter 198 and the Metro Code. The legislation would be prospective only. The effect of the legislation would be that any new land added to the UGB would automatically become part of the district, at the time of the UGB expansion ordinance.

Amendment 2

At the time the Legislature abolished the region’s Local Government Boundary Commission (1997), the same legislation passed the Boundary Commission’s responsibility over boundary changes² to the Metro Council. At that time, the region had legally effective urban reserves, adopted by the Council in 1996. The 1997 legislation reduced the geographic coverage of the boundary change authority of the old

¹ There was already some land inside the UGB, but outside the district, before the UGB expansion.

² “Boundary change” includes formation of districts, incorporation of cities and changes to the boundaries of both.

Boundary Commission from all territory in the three counties to just the Metro district and the urban reserves. It included the reserves out of concern for the efficient urbanization of the reserves when they came into the UGB.

LUBA and the Court of Appeals declared Metro's urban reserves invalid several years later. But the invalidation of the reserves did not affect Metro's authority over boundary changes in the territory that had been urban reserves at the time of the 1997 legislation.³ The proposed legislation would revise this provision in Metro's statute⁴ to apply to urban reserves (if any) designated by Metro through agreement with the three counties under the new Senate Bill 1011 process, now underway.

³ *Clackamas River Water v. Clackamas County and Metro*, 52 Or LUBA 710 (2006).

⁴ ORS 268.347.