



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 23, 2009
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Brian, Chair
Sam Adams
Pat Campbell
Jody Carson
Nathalie Darcy
Dennis Doyle
Amanda Fritz
Jack Hoffman
Carl Hosticka
Dick Jones
Richard Kidd
Robert Liberty
Rod Park
Wilda Parks
Rick VanBeveren
Mike Weatherby
Richard Whitman

AFFILIATION

Washington Co. Commission
City of Portland
City of Vancouver
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Washington Co. Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Portland
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Metro Council
Clackamas Co. Special Districts
City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Metro Council
Metro Council
Clackamas Co. Citizen
TriMet Board of Directors
City of Fairview, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Ken Allen
Shane Bemis, Vice Chair
Richard Burke
Charlotte Lehan, Second Vice Chair
Robert Kindel
Don McCarthy
Michelle Poyourow
Alice Norris
Judy Shiprack
Steve Stuart
Jerry Willey
Dilafruz Williams

AFFILIATION

Port of Portland
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Washington Co. Special Districts
Clackamas Co. Commission
City of North Plains, City in Washington Co. outside UGB
Multnomah Co. Special Districts
Multnomah Co. Citizen
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Multnomah Co. Commission
Clark Co., Washington Commission
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Governing Body of School Districts

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Bob Austin
Shirley Craddick
Doug Neely
Matt Berkow
Aron Carleson

AFFILIATION

Clackamas Co. Commission
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Multnomah Co. Citizen
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington Co. Largest City

STAFF: Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Kathryn Harrington, Milena Hermansky, Michael Jordan, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Ken Ray, Andy Shaw, Randy Tucker, Patty Unfred, Malu Wilkinson, John Williams.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Tom Brian declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

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 September 9, 2009

MOTION: Mayor Richard Kidd moved, and Mr. Dick Jones seconded, to approve the MPAC minutes from September 9, 2009.

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

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Robert Liberty of Metro announced to the committee that the Metro Council recently had a briefing on House Bill (HB) 2001, the transportation package passed by the 2009 Oregon legislature. HB 2001 requires Metro to develop a scenario for reducing greenhouse gasses through the integration of land use and transportation. Councilor Liberty recommended that committee members have their staff review that part of HB 2001.

6. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Summary of Making the Greatest Place (MGP) Chief Operation Officer (COO) Recommendation

Metro COO Michael Jordan updated the committee on the COO recommendation for MGP, which was released September 15, 2009, and summarized key points regarding the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Urban Growth Report (UGR) Performance Measures, Investments, and Urban and Rural Reserves (URR). Mr. Jordan then referred to a map of the region to provide a more detailed description of his recommendation for Urban and Rural Reserves.

Mr. Andy Cotugno of Metro briefed members on the tentative MPAC schedule. MPAC is scheduled to discuss feedback on issues related the UGR and RTP on October 14, 2009. An all-day retreat will occur October 23, 2009 to discuss feedback on issues related to Reserves and to further refine any outstanding issues related to the UGR and RTP. Meetings in November and December will be action-oriented, with a number of resolutions coming before the committee.

Mr. Cotugno also requested that members sign up for at least one formal hearing on MGP and the RTP during the 30-day public comment period, which ends October 15, 2009.

Doug Zenn then facilitated a discussion with the committee to identify issues for discussion at the next two MPAC meetings (See Attachment A).

- Mr. John Williams of Metro indicated to the committee where key documents regarding performance measurement can be found in the COO report. The resolution will adopt a framework for performance indicators; specific targets will be discussed over next year into 2010. See Attachment A for a list of issues identified by committee members for further discussion
- Mr. Andy Shaw of Metro highlighted where key documents on investment strategies may be found in the recommendation. He explained that the investments recommendation is different from other items in that there is no specific decision or recommendation that the committee is facing this fall. Rather, it's a program of work that Metro recommends members pursue over the next year. See Attachment A for a list of issues identified by committee members for further discussion
- Ms. Malu Wilkinson of Metro highlighted the location of key documents related to the UGR in the recommendation. She advised members that not all appendices are in the binder version of the document; additional materials can be found on the CD-ROM. She also discussed the gap between supply and demand as it relates to the UGR. See Attachment A for a list of issues identified by committee members for further discussion.
- Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro indicated to the committee where key documents related to the RTP can be found in the recommendation. A final RTP will be produced next spring and will come before the committee for adoption by ordinance in June 2010. Committee members are scheduled to accept by resolution the 2035 RTP at their November 19th meeting. See Attachment A for a list of issues identified by committee members for further discussion.
- Mr. John Williams informed the committee on where key documents related to URR can be found in the recommendation. The document contains a discussion of scale and includes a detailed map. See Attachment A for a list of issues identified by committee members for further discussion

Mr. Richard Whitman of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development provided a presentation on the potential risks and consequences of designating too much or too

little land as urban and rural reserves and briefed members on Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) that pertain to URR.

7. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Tom Brian adjourned the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 23, 2009:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
	Document	9/23/2009	Revised MPAC agenda for 9.23.09 meeting	092309j-01
	Document	9/9/2009	Updated MPAC minutes for 9.09.09 meeting	092309j-02
6.1	Map	9/23/2009	Urban and Rural Reserves Recommendation	092309j-03
	Chart	9/22/2009	<i>MGP Fall 2009 Advisory Committee Schedule</i>	092309j-04
6.1	Document	9/23/2009	<i>MGP – Issues for further discussion by MPAC</i>	092309j-05
6.1	PowerPoint	9/24/2009	<i>Urban and Rural Reserves: How much land? Risks and Consequences</i>	092309j-06

Making the Greatest Place – Issues for further discussion by MPAC

Performance Measures – October 14th MPAC meeting

- Agreement to indicators
- Agreement to process for setting targets for each indicator
- Intervals for assessing targets
- What happens when above or below the plan?
- Include enforcement in the discussion
- Discuss agricultural performance measures - the health of urban agriculture
- Are the performance measures measured a regional or less than the regional level? Discuss specific geographic areas for performance measures
- Need to define local government actions in response to progress or lack of progress on performance measures.
- Coordinate with performance measures begin developed by DLCD.
- Discuss the increase of commuters from outside the region.
- Should we have housing and employment targets for specific centers?
- Need a measure on whether we are pushing too much growth to neighbor cities.

Investment Strategy – January, 2010

- How are local investments embedded in the regional investment strategy
- Definition of the cost/benefit analysis and discuss how to measure the return on investments.
- Address the timeline for the investment strategy decision points – e.g. RTP, UGR, etc. between 2009 – 10.
- Discuss the role of investment on the size of the urban reserves needed.
- Financing: sources of revenue versus location of investments.
- Audit of finance performance. Compare performance against previous plans. How have we done?
- The “doability” of our revenue assumptions. Consequence of not implementing the RTP revenue sources.

Urban Growth Report – October 14th MPAC meeting

- Housing gap between demand and supply
- Employment gap between demand and supply
- Large Lot industrial gap between demand and supply
- Equity: Housing for whom? Affordable housing
- Discuss where the housing and employment capacity lies in Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties (vacant land and refill)
- Discuss the affects of growth in satellite cities and its relation to the capacity gap
- What happened to large lot industrial tracts brought into the UGB in 2002/2004?
- Does Metro have the legal authority to limit UGB expansions to large lot industrial?

- Does metro have the legal authority to direct local government to assemble lots to meet large lot need?
- What policies and investments need to be implemented in the cities to increase capacity? When/timeframe?
- What happens if growth slows?

Regional Transportation Plan – October 23rd MPAC retreat

- Corridor Refinement Plan priorities
- RTP Performance Targets
- Alternative Mobility Standards for state facilities in the Metro region. The discussion should include how to ensure the Oregon Transportation Commission approves the region's request for alternative mobility standards to support local governments efforts to fully realize planned capacity in 2040 centers and corridors..

Urban and Rural Reserves – October 23rd MPAC retreat

- Scale of Urban and Rural Reserves
- Risks of "overdesignating" and "underdesignating" urban and rural reserves
- Discussion of undesignated areas
- Requirements for bringing Urban Reserves into the UGB.
- To what extent and under what conditions should natural areas that cannot develop be included in urban reserves?
- Can rural reserves distinguish between designations for agriculture versus natural resource?
- Discuss at what time the region would revisit/reconsider or update the urban reserves decision.
- How can urban and rural reserves be used as buffers between urban areas and large scale agriculture?
- Overlay the reserves map with the region's employment needs. How does this compare? Does it sufficiently meet region's needs, including specific types of lands.
- Urban reserves: Consider short-term versus long-term timeframes. Can we delineate which lands might be utilized first to provide more certainty?
- Distinction on rural reserves – agriculture for food versus agriculture for other agricultural needs
- Capacity estimates for urban reserves.
- Consequences of behavioral changes due to reserve designation and credibility of those potential behavioral changes. E.g. won't lease land to farmers in urban reserves; increases in land lease costs in urban reserves.
To what extent should land not under threat of urbanization be included in rural reserves?
Can we develop a regionally consistent approach to understanding what lands are under threat of urbanization?