



**METRO**

**Agenda**

MEETING: MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE WORK SESSION  
DATE: June 16, 2009  
DAY: Tuesday  
TIME: 2-5 p.m.  
PLACE: Metro Regional Center, Room 501

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Objectives:

- Council direction on strategies to achieve desired outcomes for the Chief Operating Officer recommendation
- Council direction on regional reserve designation considerations
- Shared understanding of timelines/milestones for 2009 - 2011 decisions
- Updates on Metro investment activities

- I. Making the Greatest Place: Strategies to Achieve Desired Regional Outcomes (60 minutes) (Robin McArthur, Jim Middaugh, Stephan Lashbrook) (memo attached)
- II. Looking 40 to 50 Years: Urban and Rural Reserves (45 min) (Councilor Harrington, John Williams)
- Regional designation considerations
  - Milestone timeline revision (memo attached)

Break (10 min)

- III. Inside the Existing Urban Growth Boundary: Urban Growth Report (60 min) (Councilor Hosticka, Stephan Lashbrook, Malu Wilkinson)
- Urban Growth Report/capacity decision timeline 2009-2011 (memo attached)
  - Discussion of comments and refinements to preliminary residential Urban Growth Report
- IV. Other
- Centers and corridors designation process (memo attached)
  - Mayor's Institute of City Design (handout at meeting)



## Metro | Memo

Date: June 9, 2009  
To: Metro Councilors  
From: Jim Middaugh and Stephan Lashbrook  
Subject: Policy recommendations and engagement strategy for Making the Greatest Place

---

At the Council work session June 16, we'll engage the Council in a discussion of recommendations to achieve the desired outcomes of the Making the Greatest Place initiative. The draft recommendations are examples that could be included in the integrated COO recommendation in September. We'll also present a draft timeline of engagement activities and tools for June through December 2009. Communications and planning staff from all programs associated with the Making the Greatest Place effort are collaborating to develop an integrated, strategic engagement plan and are currently identifying a work plan and budget needs.

The following direction is needed from Council:

- Clarify level of detail of COO recommendation to be released in September. Are we asserting a strong Metro position or is this a broad direction on which we're seeking input and agreement? (This will determine the direction and strategy for Metro's engagement with stakeholders and community members.)
- Approve general engagement approach of targeting local governments and key stakeholders, rather than an intensive public involvement campaign.

**Background on draft engagement strategy:** The goal of an integrated public engagement strategy is to succinctly explain the range and implications of the decisions to be made in 2009 and 2010, illustrate the policy trade-offs and choices, prove why stakeholders should care about the policy decisions and desired outcomes of the Making the Greatest Place initiative (MGP), and provide accessible opportunities for participation in the process.

This effort will strategically target audiences - primarily local governments and key stakeholders who are mostly likely to be affected by, want to weigh in on, or are required to implement regional decisions. Metro will adhere to public involvement principles and go beyond by building on our partnership with local governments and communities, plus using the web, an extensive earned media campaign, public events and a public comment period to reach general audiences.

In addition to traditional public outreach tools, communication and planning staff will be adding more visual, interactive new media tools to demonstrate the decisions, choices and tradeoffs the region faces and how those connect to values consistently upheld by residents of the region. Using examples from local communities will create stories that are compelling, meaningful and easily understood.

Councilors and senior staff members will be engaged directly with local elected officials, interest and advocacy group representatives, and local government staff to build support for the Council's desired policy goals and outcomes.



**Date:** June 2, 2009  
**To:** Metro Council  
**From:** John Williams  
**Re:** Reserves milestone timeline revision and next steps

---

### ***Summary***

A revision to the milestone dates for phases 3 – 5 of the Urban and Rural Reserves work program has been approved by the Core 4. The revision allows more time for creation and review of technical products while still reaching agreement on reserves by the end of 2009. The changes are:

- **Phase 3 (milestone = preliminary urban and rural reserve areas recommended):** Move milestone date from July to October 2009
- **Phase 4 (milestone = reserve areas recommended via intergovernmental agreements):** Move milestone date from September to December 2009
- **Phase 5 (milestone = Metro designates urban reserves; counties designate rural reserves):** Move milestone date from December 2009 to May 2010

The Council has previously approved the Reserves milestones timeline via resolution and an update to this resolution will be brought to the Council based on the new timeline.

### ***Rationale***

The Core 4 discussed several factors supporting the timeline revision, including:

- **Allowing more time for outreach and feedback:** Three months have been added to Phase 3, allowing more time for advisory committees, the regional Reserves Steering Committee, cities, and interested parties to receive technical materials, discuss these with their stakeholders, provide feedback and engage in discussions with one another prior to providing comment/recommendations to the Core 4. The Core 4 governing bodies will also have more time to discuss the same materials and provide direction to their representatives.
- **Synchronizing with the Making The Greatest Place process:** The reserves process is focused on suitability of lands outside the existing urban growth boundary for future rural and urban uses. At the same time, MPAC, JPACT, the Metro Council and interested parties are discussing regional and local investment and policy decisions that will lead to better understanding of the future capacity of the existing Metro urban growth boundary. This direction will be embodied in the Draft Urban Growth Report and Regional Transportation Plan documents scheduled for release in September. The revised reserves timeline allows this direction to be more directly integrated into the Phase 3 reserves recommendation.
- **Recognizing realities of adoption timelines:** The formal adoption of land use actions by Metro and the counties in Phase 5 will require public notice, discussion and/or hearings by County Planning Commissions, MTAC and MPAC, and public hearings of each governing body. These steps will take several months. Furthermore, Washington County may only adopt such

ordinances from March through October due to a charter limitation. Thus, Phase 5 cannot take place until March 2010.

- **Aiming for agreement in 2009:** The revised timeline honors the commitment of stakeholders and others investing time in the reserves process by producing agreement among the Core 4 jurisdictions in 2009 (via the adoption of intergovernmental agreements).
- **Designating reserves prior to 2010 growth management decisions:** The reserves timeline was designed to have urban and rural reserves adopted prior to mandated growth management decisions in 2010. The revised schedule of Phase 5 adoption actions supports this goal.

#### ***Next steps in evaluation process***

Metro and the counties, in partnership with cities and other interested parties, will focus further evaluation efforts on the candidate areas approved by the Core 4. As previously discussed, work on the remaining areas will include:

- **For rural reserves:** refinement of baseline agriculture, forestry and natural landscape features mapping and analysis of how candidate areas meet all of the rural reserve factors established under administrative rules.
- **For urban reserves:** use of more detailed development constraints mapping, infrastructure availability information and 2040 design type building blocks to arrive at an understanding of the potential design and capacity of urban reserve areas. All eight urban reserve factors will be utilized to evaluate these designs and produce a narrative analysis of their suitability for urban reserve designation. This work will include discussion of the positive and negative effects urbanization of the candidate areas could have on existing communities and rural areas.

#### ***Important dates***

- **May – July 2009:** Metro and counties, in partnership with cities and other stakeholders, conduct further evaluation of the suitability of rural and urban candidate areas.
- **August 2009:** County advisory committees make recommendations to county commissions on rural reserve areas and urban reserve areas.
- **September 2009:** Draft Urban Growth Report and Regional Transportation Plan available. Individual county reserve area recommendations presented to Regional Steering Committee.
- **October 2009:** Regional Steering Committee recommendation to Core 4 on preliminary rural reserve areas and urban reserve areas (PHASE 3 MILESTONE).
- **October – November 2009:** Public outreach on preliminary reserve area recommendations.
- **November 2009:** Core 4 decision on preliminary reserve areas.
- **December 2009:** Reserve areas recommended via intergovernmental agreements (PHASE 4 MILESTONE).
- **March – April 2010:** Public hearings on land use ordinances and functional plan amendments to designate urban and rural reserves.
- **May 2010:** Metro designates urban reserves; counties designate rural reserves (PHASE 5 MILESTONE).



## Metro | Memo

**Date:** June 3, 2009  
**To:** Metro Council  
**From:** Malu Wilkinson, UGR Project Manager  
**Re:** UGR/Capacity decision timeline and status report

Metro's preliminary residential and employment urban growth reports have been available for technical review for about two months. At this point in time I wanted to provide the Council with a description of the decision timeline and an update on the review process.

### UGR/Capacity decision timeline

March/April 2009:	Release preliminary residential and employment UGR for technical review
September 2009:	<i>COO Recommendation:</i> Release DRAFT residential and employment UGR for public review (includes narrowed demand range based on risk analysis and effectiveness of investments)
December 2009:	Metro Council accepts the UGR as the basis for developing actions to address any gap between capacity of the UGB under existing policies and 20-year population and employment needs: final technical assessment of "solid" and "dotted" capacity and 20-year demand range and narrowed demand range, direction on what it might take to close the gap
July 2010:	Release draft analysis that identifies where within the demand range the region will plan for and the actions (efficiency measures and/or UGB expansions) to address any capacity gap for residential and employment demand
November 2010:	Metro Council adopts "capacity ordinance" that describes committed local and regional actions to address <u>at least 50%</u> of any capacity gap (through efficiency measures and/or UGB expansions) for identified point in residential and employment demand and submits to LCDC
December 2011:	Final state deadline to accommodate 20-year demand, if not met in 2010

### Moving from the preliminary to the draft UGR

The draft UGR that is released for public review in September will differ from the preliminary UGR in the following ways:

- Incorporate technical and methodological changes recommended through the review process
- Include recently revised local zoning and investment strategies that increase zoned capacity (adding to the solid and the dotted tranches) and/or increase the utilization of existing zoned capacity (move dotted tranches to solid) recognized through the local aspirations efforts
- Identify local and regional actions that support the solid tranches
- Set the stage for 2010 by describing any gap between midline of demand range and top of solid tranches, as well as potential actions to be taken in 2010 to increase development potential of zoned capacity (shift dotted capacity to solid)

### **Status of review process**

Staff is currently working with MTAC and the Employment Coordination and Advisory Committee to identify technical adjustments to methodology and assumptions in the residential and employment analyses. We have also been working directly with stakeholders from the business community to test some of the new approaches used in the employment analysis and to ground truth assumptions such as employees per square foot and the footprint of different building types in the market subareas.

### **Example of comments**

- Beaverton School District does not agree with the methodological approach towards schools – they foresee land needs of their own and do not foresee future coordination between school districts with capacity.
- Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District has submitted a recommendation that more land be reserved for parks in the future than the current approach calls for.
- Members of CREEC have commented that the assumptions for employees per square foot by building type and market subarea appear reasonable, but some of the specific FARs are not currently supported by parking policies and market dynamics. They have expressed concern regarding the upper limit of 90% refill for non-industrial employment as not being likely over the 20 year period.

One of the goals of releasing a “preliminary” version of the urban growth report was to ensure sufficient time to review the methodology prior to making growth management decisions. Staff has scheduled two special MTAC work sessions to ensure time for a full discussion on technical elements: June 17<sup>th</sup> for residential, and June 24<sup>th</sup> for employment. MPAC will also have an opportunity to discuss MTAC’s recommended technical changes to the methodology. Staff will continue to update the Council as we move through this review process.

### **MPAC Employment Subcommittee**

The preliminary employment analysis does not address unique format or land configuration needs of specific types of employment. Metro staff is currently working to develop a methodology to better understand the demand for such needs, but effective strategies to meet such demand in a way that supports the 2040 vision can be supported by a concerted regional effort. An MPAC subcommittee has been formed to identify approaches to meet these unique needs, including looking at options such as:

- Pursuing land assembly and brownfield redevelopment inside the current UGB;
- Targeting infrastructure investments to make land inside the UGB shovel-ready, and identifying approaches to protect the public’s investment;
- Bringing parcels into the UGB but protecting them for niche industrial uses; and
- Identifying employment urban reserves and creating a fast-track process to bring parcels into the UGB when needed.

### **Local and regional actions that “count”**

The preliminary UGR analysis shows, for residential and employment, that the UGB has existing zoned capacity to accommodate the low and high end of the 20-year demand forecast. This conclusion would end Metro’s analysis and complete our responsibility under statewide Goal 14 and ORS 197.296 were it not for the application of “market feasibility” in our approach. Goal 14 requires Metro to take reasonable measures to use the zoned capacity prior to expanding the UGB.

The state statutes require that the measures Metro relies on to use existing zoned capacity more efficiently must “...demonstrably increase the likelihood that residential development will occur at densities sufficient to accommodate housing needs for the next 20 years without an expansion of the urban growth boundary.” The main focus of the Making the Greatest Place initiative is to ensure that local and regional actions work

together to support and enhance vibrant places (centers, corridors, employment and industrial areas) and implement the 2040 regional vision. An important component of that strategy is to increase the current and future utilization of existing zoned capacity in our region.

In making a case for increased market utilization of zoning, Metro must answer two main questions:

1. Will the proposed investments “...demonstrably increase the likelihood...” that more of our existing zoned capacity will be used?
2. What level of proof is sufficient that funding will be available to support investments?

#### *Will investments increase capacity?*

Metro can provide an analysis of recent experience (2002 to present) with measures, including investments, taken since we last conducted an urban growth report to demonstrate success in making more efficient use of residential land. Recent experience includes a rising refill rate, smaller single family lot size in Washington County, and other measures documented in the preliminary residential urban growth report. We can also rely on MetroScope analysis to show that investments in specific locations result in an increased utilization of zoned capacity.

#### *Standard for proof of funding?*

Local jurisdictions are required by Goals 11 and 12 to have plans in place for infrastructure and transportation to support their comprehensive plans – but the requirements do not include identification of funding sources. Metro can rely on city and county public facilities plans and transportation system plans, and the investments included in the Regional Transportation Plan submitted to the state, once they are adopted. We can also rely on other investments such as urban renewal and vertical housing tax credits as long as the level of investment expected in the future is consistent with recent history. The main question in 2010 is how much we can rely on *new levels* of investments and associated increases in capacity utilization to meet the 20-year demand.

Some examples of local and regional actions to focus on this year and next are described below. Actions adopted by the end of 2009 can be included in the final urban growth report, actions adopted in 2010 can be used in Metro’s demonstration of “efficiency measures” as a component of the strategy to ensure sufficient capacity to meet the 20-year demand.

#### *2009 examples*

- High Capacity Transit Plan (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)
- CET extension (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)
- East Happy Valley: new zoning (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)
- Oregon City: SDC incentives in Regional Center (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)

#### *2010 examples*

- OHSU Amber Glen: new zoning (increase capacity – solid and dotted)
- State RTP (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)
- Portland Plan (increase capacity and capacity utilization)
- Refill rate: policy choice based on local and regional investments (increase capacity utilization – dotted to solid)

Metro staff will continue to work with cities and counties to identify areas where local and regional actions can be most effective together in supporting local aspirations while moving toward the 2040 regional vision. Documentation of the local and regional actions that support regional growth management decisions will be included as part of the capacity ordinance for Metro Council action in 2010.



## Metro | Memo

To: Metro Council

From: Chris Deffebach

Subject: Centers and Corridors change designation process

Date: June 9, 2009

At the May Making the Greatest Place Work Session, Council indicated support for moving forward with consideration of changes to centers and corridors on the Growth Concept Map in response to interest by local jurisdictions. Any changes to the Growth Concept map could be considered as part of the 2010 Ordinance that addresses other framework or functional plan changes needed to support Making the Greatest Place. Council would consider changes to center and corridor designations within the larger context of the regional and local commitments to an investment strategy.

Based on the direction at the May Work Session to move forward, staff prepared a refined list of criteria for consideration of center and corridor designations. The refined list, attached, summarizes existing Regional Framework Plan policy and guidance into seven major categories for the purpose of giving local jurisdictions guidance as to what to consider in changing centers or corridors. This list does not limit Metro to considering additional policies and, in fact, the discussion in 2009 may help Metro define potential changes to center and corridor policies in 2010. It is drawn from the Growth Concept narrative in the Regional Framework Plan and policies in the Plan, in multiple locations that define the policy direction for centers and corridors. This guidance was assembled and included in the May Council packet.

Encouraging interested jurisdictions to consider center or corridor changes in 2009 can help identify the potential opportunities for increasing capacity in 2010 to meet DLCD requirements and it helps support local aspirations. Per the direction from Council at the May work session, staff plan to share this short list with MTAC and MPAC and interested local jurisdictions to begin consideration of center and corridor changes and encourage them to let Metro know of their interest.

Please contact me or Dick Benner if you have questions about this short list of centers considerations and we look forward to working with you as we work with the jurisdictions that are interested in considering changes.



### **Considerations from Regional Framework Plan Policy and Guidance for Centers Amendments**

The following considerations can be derived from the Regional Framework Plan (Growth Concept; policies; functional plans) as excerpted in the Policy and Guidance Memo to serve as factors to be weighed when changes to Centers are contemplated:

1. Can the area play the roles expected of Centers in the 2040 Growth Concept?
  - Regional Centers: "...serve large market areas outside the central city, connected to it by high-capacity transit and highways and are accessible by hundreds of thousands of people."
  - Town Center: "...local shopping and employment opportunities within a local market area and accessible to tens of thousands of people."
2. Does the area have, or have zoned capacity for, the uses and intensity of uses that will enable the area to play the roles expected of Centers: e.g., enough "rooftops" to support retail and other services for "tens of thousands" (Town Center) or "hundreds of thousands" (Regional Center)?
3. Is the area served by transit (Town Center) or high-capacity transit (Regional Center), or are there projects in the federal RTP and local TSP to establish that level of transit?
4. Does the area have, or have zoned capacity for, enough employment to be "balanced" with housing?
5. Does the area have, or have plans and funding for, a dense network of arterials and collectors (Regional Center) or a network of streets to make the Center walkable and services accessible (Town Center)?
6. Does the local government have a strategy for the Center, including the following elements?
  - Proposed investments to improve the role of the Center with funding sources identified
  - Parking management plan
7. Does the area provide, or have zoned capacity and other investment tools to provide, a mix of housing types to provide housing choices.