



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 10, 2010
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Matt Berkow
Pat Campbell
Steve Clark
Nathalie Darcy
Andy Duyck
Amanda Fritz
Jack Hoffman
Patricia Holloway
Carl Hosticka
Charlotte Lehan, Vice Chair
Robert Liberty
Marilyn McWilliams
Rod Park
Wilda Parks
Alice Norris
Judy Shiprack
Mike Weatherby, Chair
Jerry Willey, Second Vice Chair

AFFILIATION

Multnomah County Citizen
City of Vancouver
TriMet Board of Directors
Washington County Citizen
Washington County Commission
City of Portland Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Clackamas County Special Districts
Metro Council
Clackamas County Commission
Metro Council
Washington County Special Districts
Metro Council
Clackamas County Citizen
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Multnomah County Commission
City of Fairview, representing Multnomah County Other Cities
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Sam Adams
Shane Bemis
Jody Carson
Dennis Doyle
Keith Mays
Charlynn Newton
Steve Stuart
Richard Whitman

AFFILIATION

City of Portland Council
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
City of North Plains, representing Washington Co. outside UGB
Clark County, Washington Commission
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Tim Knapp
Lou Ogden

AFFILIATION

City of Wilsonville, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Tualatin, representing Washington Co. Other Cities

STAFF:

Dick Benner, Alison Kean Campbell, Nick Christensen, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Brian Harper, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Ken Ray, Randy Tucker, Sheena VanLeuven, John Williams

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Mike Weatherby declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Audience and committee members introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE MPAC MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 27, 2010

MOTION: Commissioner Andy Duyck moved, and Mayor Alice Norris seconded, to approve the October 27, 2010 MPAC minutes.

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

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Liberty updated the committee on:

- At the International Awards for Livable Communities event in Chicago, the Portland metro region won top honors for strategic planning and second place overall at the International Awards for Livable Communities in Chicago, and was recognized for its shift from planning to making strategic investments;
- The Oregon MPO Consortium will host a Climate Summit on November 19, and Dr. Bill Moomaw will kick-off the event; and
- On October 29 the Land Conservation and Development Commission voted to acknowledge most of the urban and rural reserves package, approving all of the reserves as designated in Clackamas and Multnomah counties, rejecting the parcel North of Cornelius and remanding area the area North of Forest Grove back to Washington County. The Metro Council will not be considering any expansion of the urban growth boundary this year but will take actions to meet at least half of the anticipated residential need within the existing UGB.

6. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Illustrating the Role of Public Investment in Stimulating Private Development

Mr. Jerry Johnson, of Johnson Reid, reviewed the work his firm did for Metro to assess efficiency measures for the 2010 Capacity ordinance and model development trends and outcomes by looking at a series of variables such as zoning, location, access to amenities, and others.

Mr. Brian Harper of Metro discussed his research into whether investing in public amenities has a transformative impact on redevelopment capacity. He noted that to varying degrees, investments in public amenities can impact achievable rents in an area, which in turn can influence how land is redeveloped. He discussed these outcomes for the study areas of Lake Oswego, the Foster corridor, and Gresham.

Committee discussion included:

- Where investment for these amenities in local jurisdictions would come from;
- How feasible housing types for each study area were determined;
- How these results may not be as applicable to suburban areas and small cities, and the need to refine the model to account for the differences between these areas;
- Whether the research examined cost of investing in amenities relative to the cost to develop;
- Concern about the relationship between public investment in amenities and the resulting benefit to private developers;
- What local jurisdictions' experiences have been so far with investing in public amenities;
- Whether this research will be presented publicly to illustrate which investments are most cost-effective and encourage more investment;
- The need to engage other partners around the region, particularly from the business community;
- The need to consider soci-economic status and ability to pay as variables in the model;
- The relationship between high quality schools and achievable housing pricing; and
- Tradeoffs between increased density, housing size, and household amenities such as yard size.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS: COMMUNITY INVESTMENT STRATEGY

7.1 Implementing Policies- Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

John Williams of Metro gave background on the proposed changes to Title 1 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, specifically with regard to Table 1. He noted that to address the concerns about the current implementation of Title 1, Metro's COO has recommended moving toward a no net-loss policy for housing accommodation and eliminating Table 1. Mr. Williams summarized some of the concerns about the proposed changes to Title 1 including that it might unintentionally penalize jurisdictions who have done aggressive upzoning, that this approach might affect other kinds of zoning actions done by local governments, and whether the policy would be difficult to implement at a micro-level with individual property owners. Mr. Ron Papsdorf of the City of Gresham further discussed his City's concerns about the proposed changes to Title 1.

Committee discussion included:

- Concern about the timeline for downzoning and corresponding upzoning necessary to maintain no net-loss;

- Whether assessment of no net-loss could be tied to the 5-year growth management decision cycles;
- The idea of “density trading” across jurisdictions to increase flexibility in implementing the no net-loss policy;
- How the new policy would allow the Special Districts to ascertain what levels of infrastructure and service they would be required to provide in the future;
- Concern over Metro becoming an overseer of incremental changes in zoning changes;
- Concern about how local jurisdictions would get “credit” for their past actions in upzoning and changing density, and how far back to consider such actions;
- Whether there have been recent examples of large scale downzonings in the region;

MOTION: Commissioner Charlotte Lehan moved, and Ms. Nathalie Darcy seconded, to indicate to the Metro Council that the committee generally supports implementing the concept of no net-loss of residential capacity, and not returning to, or revising, Title 1, Table 1, with the following stipulations:

- That revisions be made to the language in Title 1 that respond to concerns raised by the City of Gresham;
- That the language in Title 1 be revised to clarify the intent of the regulations with regard to downzoning, specifically that these regulations are meant to apply to larger-scale downzonings, not the smaller effect of changes in development code;
- That a flexible approach be developed to give credit to jurisdictions for their recent past actions on increasing density and upzoning; and
- That there is flexibility in terms of the time between downzoning and corresponding upzoning to maintain no net-loss of capacity.

ACTION TAKEN: With 10 in favor (Berkow, Clark, Darcy, Hoffman, Holloway, Knapp, Lehan, McWilliams, Norris, Willey) and 1 opposed (Ogden), the motion passed.

The committee decided to postpone discussion of Title 6, as well as agenda item 7.2 on Title 11, until the November 17, 2010 MPAC meeting.

8. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Mike Weatherby adjourned the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR NOVEMBER 10, 2010:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
3	Handout	11/2010	OMPOC Climate Summit flyer	111010m-01
6.1	PowerPoint	11/10/2010	Assessment of Efficiency Measures	111010m-02
6.1	PowerPoint	11/10/2010	Impact of Public Amenities on Development Feasibility	111010m-03
7.2	Handout	11/10/2010	From: Homebuilders Association To: MPAC Re: Proposed Title XI changes on housing planning	111010m-04