



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 12, 2009

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Brian, Chair
Jody Carson
Nathalie Darcy
Dennis Doyle
Jack Hoffman
Dick Jones
Richard Kidd
Charlotte Lehan, Second Vice Chair
Robert Liberty
Rod Park
Wilda Parks
Alice Norris
Rick VanBeveren
Jerry Willey

AFFILIATION

Washington Co. Commission
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Washington Co. Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Clackamas Co. Special Districts
City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Clackamas Co. Commission
Metro Council
Metro Council
Clackamas Co. Citizen
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
TriMet Board of Directors
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington Co. Other Cities

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Sam Adams
Shane Bemis, Vice Chair
Ken Allen
Richard Burke
Pat Campbell
Amanda Fritz
Carl Hosticka
Robert Kindel
Don McCarthy
Michelle Poyourow
Judy Shiprack
Steve Stuart
Dilafruz Williams

AFFILIATION

City of Portland
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Port of Portland
Washington Co. Special Districts
City of Vancouver
City of Portland
Metro Council
City of North Plains, City in Washington Co. outside UGB
Multnomah Co. Special Districts
Multnomah Co. Citizen
Multnomah Co. Commission
Clark Co., Washington Commission
Governing Body of School Districts

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Shirley Craddick
Jennifer Donnelly
Jim Kight
Keith Mays

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development
City of Fairview, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities

STAFF: Robin McArthur, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Kathryn Harrington, Kelsey Newell, Kayla Mullis, Milena Hermansky, Sara Schooley, Andy Shaw, Randy Tucker

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Tom Brian declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm.

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Committee members and audience members introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Consideration of MPAC Minutes for July 22, 2009

Mayor Richard Kidd requested the minutes be corrected to read,

“...Forest Grove...will also host an ~~Iron Man~~ a Hula Man competition the weekend of July 25th, 2009.”

MOTION: Mayor Alice Norris moved, and Councilor Shirley Craddick seconded, to approve the MPAC minutes from July 22, 2009.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed with the amended language.

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Robert Liberty from Metro updated the committee on:

- The new Predators of the Serengeti exhibit at the Oregon zoo will commence the weekend of September 12-13, 2009.
- The council's recent passage of Ordinance No. 09-1221C, which amends the Metro code governing the reporting relationship of the MERC General Manager.
- An upcoming trip to Vancouver, B.C. to tour centers and corridors, to which he invited all committee members to join.

6. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Construction Excise Tax Administrative Rules

Mr. Andy Shaw of Metro reviewed the second draft Construction Excise Tax (CET) Administrative Rules, which incorporates comments and feedback received from MPAC and other advisory groups in recent weeks. He discussed the following:

- Grant cycles: The first grant cycle shall allocate CET collections for planning in areas inside the current Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The second cycle shall allocate collections for planning in future expansion areas, future urban reserves, and existing urban areas, with up to half of funds earmarked for future expansion and urban reserve areas.
- Screening Committee: Committee should be expertise-based rather than geographically representational (although not geographically clustered, either).
- Application: Cities and counties shall be eligible to apply for a grant. Applicants should propose project milestones and planning timelines. Payment will be contingent on meeting these milestones.
- Criteria: Applicants should give a reaction to each criterion as part of the grant proposal.

The committee discussed the Metro Chief Operation Officer's ability to terminate projects that are not achieving proposed milestones.

In the interest of full disclosure, Mayor Jack Hoffman of Lake Oswego mentioned to the committee that a partner in his law firm is involved with the CET lawsuit against Metro. He, however, is not personally or professionally involved with the lawsuit.

6.2 Mayors' Institute on City Design Report

Mayor Hoffman, Mayor Denny Doyle of Beaverton, and Mayor Jerry Willey of Hillsboro briefed the committee on the Mayor's Institute on City Design (MICD), held the week of July 15-17, 2009 in Portland, Oregon. The mayors highlighted the MICD experts' recommendations to think and plan contextually on a larger, broader scale and to focus on the long-term objective. The mayors emphasized that the event was useful and inspirational, and thanked Metro staff for its sponsorship.

6.3 Making the Greatest Place Performance Targets

Mr. John Williams of Metro updated the committee on the framework and performance targets recommended for monitoring the region's progress toward achieving the Six Desired Outcomes. The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) considered the framework on July 31 and August 5, 2009, respectively. TPAC and MTAC discussed the following:

- Clarification over jurisdiction: What is the role of Metro and local governments?
- Targets should be linked directly to the Desired Outcomes.
- Need for consistency among performance targets.
- Concerns over data collection.

Mr. Williams then asked the committee for their own recommendations. The following items were discussed:

- Adding more targets: recycling and waste management; youth; food challenge.
- Structure of the targets: for example, some are spatially created, others not.
- How will the Regional Performance Targets be related to the Six Desired Outcomes?
- Issues related to the measurement of targets:
 - Poverty indicators should be consistent with those discussed by the Metro Council.
 - Reliability of target measurement techniques: for example, using high school free lunches as a measure of poverty may be misleading.
 - Present conditions must be measured in order to form a baseline against which future progress can be compared.

6.4 Regional Transportation Plan Adoption Package

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro updated the committee on the schedule for Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adoption package. The RTP adoption package will be subject to a 30-day public comment period starting September 15, 2009 and ending October 15, 2009, and will include a series six of open houses and public hearings. MPAC will be asked to take action on the RTP at their November 18, 2009 meeting. MPAC, along with JPACT and the Metro Council, will consider adoption of a final ordinance in spring 2009.

6.5 Making the Greatest Place Small Group Discussions on Urban and Rural Reserves

Mr. Brent Curtis of Washington County, Mr. Doug McClain of Clackamas County, and Mr. Chuck Beasley of Multnomah County updated the committee on urban and rural reserves activities in their regions.

The committee then divided into two groups; one to discuss urban reserves and another to discuss rural reserves.

6.6 Small Group Reports

Mayor Richard Kidd of Forest Grove reported the results of the small group discussion on urban reserves. Please see Attachment A to the minutes for a full report of these comments.

Councilor Shirley Craddick of Gresham reported the results of the small group discussion on urban reserves. Please see Attachment A to the minutes for a full report of these comments.

7. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Tom Brian adjourned the meeting at 7:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Milena B. Hermansky
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR AUGUST 12, 2009:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
6.1	Handout	07/08/09	Administrative Rules-Metro Code Chapter 7.04	081209m-01
6.1	Chart		CET Administrative Rules Comments	081209m-02
6.1	PowerPoint	08/13/09	<i>Construction Excise Tax Administrative Rules Draft #2</i> Presented by Mr. Andy Shaw	081209m-03
6.3	Memo	08/12/09	MPAC and TPAC Comments on Performance Targets for Making the Greatest Place	081209m-04
6.4	Memo	08/12/09	To: Metro Council, MPAC, JPACT and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager Re: 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update – Project List Summary	081209m-04
6.5	Publication	07/10/09	Coordinated Reserves Work Program, Overview – Draft	081209m-05
6.5	Handout/Maps	08/03/09	Staff Recommendations and Staff Report for Washington County Urban and Rural Reserves	081209m-06
6.5	PowerPoint	08/13/09	Recommended Urban and Rural Reserves – Washington County	081209m-07
6.5	Handout/Maps	08/05/09	Urban and Rural Reserve CAC and Staff Recommendations – Multnomah County	081209m-08
6.5	PowerPoint	08/13/09	Recommended Urban and Rural Reserves – Multnomah County	081209m-09

Topic: urban reserves

Group questions:

- How can urban reserve designations best support continued implementation of the 2040 growth concept?
- What urban reserve designations will complement and enhance centers, corridors and employment areas and how will the new areas be served with infrastructure considering limited local and regional funds?
- How will development patterns at the edge of the urban growth boundary change in the next 40-50 years in response to large scale economic and demographic trends?
- What level of land use, governance, and infrastructure planning should be completed in urban reserve areas after designation?

Background:

Clackamas County, Multnomah County, Washington County and Metro (the “Core 4”) are working together under new state statute and administrative rules to designate urban and rural reserves. Urban reserves will be designated by Metro on lands currently outside the urban growth boundary that are suitable for accommodating urban development over the next 40 to 50 years. Work in 2009 has focused on assessing the suitability of identified candidate areas in each county; these recommendations will be brought to the regional table in September. This fall the region will engage in a discussion of how reserves designations, as part of the broader Making the Greatest Place process, can serve to best implement the 2040 Growth Concept. Thus, key elements of the conversation will be how reserve designations link to and support local aspirations for existing centers, corridors and employment areas; how the region and local governments will target infrastructure funds; and how development patterns are likely to change both inside and outside the existing urban growth boundary over the next 40 to 50 years.

Group decision:

How can urban reserve designations best support continued implementation of the 2040 growth concept?

- It is important to consider the balance of jobs and housing.
- Employment opportunities should be provided in all areas of the region, large and small cities alike.
- Evaluation of new centers should be based upon existing corridors.

What urban reserve designations will complement and enhance centers, corridors and employment areas and how will the new areas be served with infrastructure considering limited local and regional funds?

- There is some concern that the cost of infrastructure will be passed along to home-buyers and burden the community.
- North Bethany has set an example by implementing a model whereby they will try to recover the full cost of infrastructure from the development process.
- Lands should be planned in sections. UGB expansion shouldn't be done in small pieces.

How will development patterns at the edge of the urban growth boundary change in the next 40-50 years in response to large scale economic and demographic trends?

- Areas along the edge of the UGB will increase in density. Citizens will want to live in self-contained communities where they can walk to meet their daily needs.
- New areas must be well-planned before they are brought into the UGB.

What level of land use, governance, and infrastructure planning should be completed in urban reserve areas after designation?

- Questions of governance, infrastructure planning, parks, medical services, schools and finance will need to be addressed in preliminary concept plans before an area is designated for UGB expansion.

Topic: rural reserves

Group questions:

- Will natural landscape features be best preserved inside or outside urbanized areas in the future?
- What form of rural reserves (for example, buffer strips or large areas) will best accomplish the intent of the reserves legislation and rules?
- How important will small-scale farming operations and local food supply be to the future of this region and how should rural reserve designations support that future?

Background (see urban reserve sheet as well):

Rural reserves will be designated by each county on lands outside the current urban growth boundary that are high value working farms and forests or have important natural features like rivers, wetlands, buttes and floodplains. These areas will be protected from urbanization for the next 40 to 50 years. Reserve designations will not change current zoning or restrict landowners' currently allowed use of their lands. They will provide greater clarity regarding the long term expected use of the land and allow both public and private landowners to make long term investments with greater assurance. The administrative rules for rural reserves require consideration of a variety of factors relating to each area's significant agriculture, forestry, and/or natural landscape features, as well as consideration of whether areas will be "potentially subject to urbanization" over the 40 to 50 year time horizon. Detailed application of these factors to the candidate areas has been a main focus of work this year. As with urban reserves, each county will be providing the region with suitability assessments and reserve designation recommendations in September. These recommendations must be combined, with urban reserve and non-reserve areas, into a long-term plan for the region.

Group decision:

Will natural landscape features be best preserved inside or outside urbanized areas in the future?

- On one hand, there are more tools and better protection in cities within the UGB. On the other hand, natural landscapes inside urban areas will always be pressured by development. Large, significant natural landscape features should stay outside urban areas; smaller features could be either inside or out.

What form of rural reserves (for example, buffer strips or large areas) will best accomplish the intent of the reserves legislation and rules?

- The form of rural reserves best suited to accomplish the intent of the legislation depends on many factors; different places each have very different circumstance.
- In general, large areas are best suited for agriculture.
- Questions of form must be addressed. For example, does buffering occur on the urban or rural side of the line?

How important will small-scale farming operations and local food supply be to the future of this region and how should rural reserve designations support that future?

- During the next 40 to 50 years, small-scale farming will continue to play an important role in the Metro region as citizens, local grocers, and restaurants make concerted efforts to support such endeavors.
- However, small-scale farming makes up only small of part of total agriculture. Oregon can consume only 10% of agricultural output; all the rest is exported.
- Rural Reserve designation encourages the clustering of smaller operations.