



Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Metro Council Work Session
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2011
Time: 1 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

**1 PM 1. ADMINISTRATIVE/ CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
 COMMUNICATIONS**

**1:15 PM 2. CREATING A CLIMATE SMART COMMUNITIES Ellis
 STRATEGY USING SCENARIOS - INFORMATION /
 DISCUSSION**

**2 PM 3. LARGE - INDUSTRIAL - SITE INVENTORY AND Williams
 REPLENISHMENT PLAN - INFORMATION / Reid
 DISCUSSION**

2:45 PM 4. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Agenda Item Number 2.0

**CREATING A CLIMATE SMART
COMMUNITIES STRATEGY USING
SCENARIOS**

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, May 3, 2011
Metro Council Chambers

METRO COUNCIL
Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: May 3, 2011 Time: 1:15 p.m. Length: 45 minutes

Presentation Title: Creating a Climate Smart Communities Strategy Using Scenarios

Service, Office, or Center: Planning and Development Department

Presenters: Kim Ellis, Project Manager (797-1617 or kim.ellis@oregonmetro.gov)

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

In 2007, the Legislature established statewide goals for greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) – calling for stopping increases in emissions by 2010; a 10 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2020 and a 75 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. The targets apply to all emission sectors, including energy production, buildings, solid waste and transportation.

In 2009, the Legislature passed House Bill 2001, directing Metro to “develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios” by January 2012 that are designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from light-duty vehicles. The legislation also mandates adoption of a preferred scenario after public review and consultation with local governments, and local government implementation through comprehensive plans and land use regulations that are consistent with the adopted regional scenario. The Climate Smart Communities Scenarios effort responds to these mandates.

On April 1, the Department of Land Conservation and Development released the draft Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Targets rule for public comment. The draft rule assumes significant advancements in vehicle fleet, technologies and fuels, but also calls for the Portland region to reduce per person carbon emissions by 20 percent below 2005 levels through other transportation and land use strategies that will be evaluated through the region’s scenario planning. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) held a public hearing on April 21, and is expected to adopt the rule and emissions reduction targets on May 19, 2011. A copy of Councilor Collette’s LCDC testimony is included in the packet for reference.

Staff presented the Discussion Draft Phase 1 Scenario Approach and Framework (dated February 23, 2011) to the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) on February 28 and March 2, respectively. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) provided further input on March 3 and March 9, respectively.

The committees supported the overall approach, recognizing more information and discussion is needed to define the combinations of land use and transportation strategies to be tested this summer, and indicators to be used to evaluate the scenarios. Several committee members also expressed concern that House Bill 2001 only mandates consideration of carbon emissions from light vehicles. MTAC also recommended building in more opportunities for collaboration with TPAC throughout the scenario planning process. An updated draft is included in the packet, and will be discussed by TPAC and MTAC on April 29 and May 4, respectively.

Next steps

A goal of this effort is to further advance 2040 implementation, local aspirations and the public and private investments needed to build great communities and meet state climate goals. Work is underway to identify opportunities for coordination with other Community Investment Strategy

efforts and the Regional Transportation Council scenario planning effort, compile a toolbox of strategies to be evaluated, gather additional input from Metro's advisory committees and develop analytic tools and methods to support the scenario analysis to be conducted this summer. The scenarios analysis is anticipated to begin in June, pending Council, JPACT and MPAC affirmation of the overall scenario evaluation approach.

While focused on reducing transportation-related carbon emissions, this effort will build data, tools, communication methods and staff capacity that can be applied in current and future Metro initiatives in support of the region's six desired outcomes and Community Investment Strategy implementation.

A summary of upcoming policy discussions and milestones is provided for reference:

- **May 11 - MPAC** discussion on scenarios evaluation framework.
- **May 12 - JPACT** discussion on scenarios evaluation framework.
- **June 7 - Council** affirmation of scenarios evaluation framework, if desired.
- **June 8 - MPAC** affirmation of scenarios evaluation framework.
- **June 9 - JPACT** - affirmation of scenarios evaluation framework.
- **June - Sept.** – Scenarios development and evaluation with technical committees.
- **Fall** - Report back to **Council, MPAC and JPACT** on scenarios evaluation findings and recommendations.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

- Move forward with Climate Smart Communities Scenarios approach as presented by staff, with staff continuing to work with designated Council liaisons - Councilors Collette, Hosticka and Craddick.
- Identify areas for refinement or discussion by Council at a future work session. Staff will schedule regular briefings at future work sessions if desired by Council.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Staff will present an update of the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios activities and a refined evaluation framework that reflects input from Metro's technical and policy committees. Staff is seeking Council support for the overall framework, draft indicators and strategies to be tested in regional-level scenarios this summer. With Council support, staff will finalize the framework with Metro's advisory committees and Council liaisons, and begin the analysis in June.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Does Council **support the overall framework, including the draft indicators** as presented by staff?
2. What **additional information** does Council need to prepare for upcoming policy advisory committee discussions or to support staff moving forward with the evaluation?
3. **How would Council like to stay informed** of the evaluation process this summer?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes **X**No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes __No

- **Attachment 1:** Testimony of Metro Councilor Carlotta Collette Before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (April 21, 2011)
- **Attachment 2:** Draft Phase 1 Scenario Evaluation Framework (April 21, 2011)



**Testimony of Metro Councilor Carlotta Collette
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
on behalf of the Metro Council
Before the Land Conservation and Development Commission
April 21, 2011**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets Rules. **With this letter, I am conveying the Metro Council's support for the proposed rules and 20 percent target for the Portland metropolitan area,** with the understanding that the region will pursue the target with a collaborative process that builds on our ongoing efforts to preserve farm and forest land, create jobs, build healthy communities and provide equitable access to jobs and affordable housing and transportation choices.

I'm proud of the leadership the Commission and the Legislature have shown in establishing the process that led to these proposed rules and Metro's scenario planning effort. It is in this context that I want to encourage the Commission to continue to provide statewide leadership on several aspects of the climate issue with the following comments.

We need a more clearly defined explanation of the target, using real world examples of what it might mean from an individual perspective and community perspective. Translating the rules into an average number of vehicle miles of travel per capita per day and clarifying the assumptions around the fuel efficiency expected of the vehicle fleet will help the community understand what it might take to reach the target. The rule provides an estimate of the region's share of emissions expected to be reduced with land use and transportation strategies, but does not include an estimate of the emissions reductions expected from vehicle technology improvements and cleaner fuels. Without both pieces of information and real world examples of what it might mean, it is difficult to simply explain what the target means for our region.

The draft rule undervalues the effectiveness of land use strategies in reducing emissions. As we develop more healthy communities, where walking, biking and public transit are accessible to meet daily household needs, we also reduce dependence on automobiles. This leads to reduced purchasing of vehicles, and corresponding reduction in emissions related to vehicle manufacturing. The draft rule ignores these embedded emissions from the transportation system. If the fleet and technology assumptions do not come to fruition as quickly as expected, these land use changes may be even more important to reaching our emission reduction goals.

We need to continue to work together to ensure federal and state cooperation in meeting these goals. We need the state to continue to work with our region and our federal delegation and state representatives to ensure federal and state policies help us realize the draft rule's technology assumptions. These assumptions are very aggressive and will require state and federal actions to implement incentives and regulations to be realized. This also means fighting any legislation that would have the effect of undermining environmental protections, reducing public transit funding or slowing the adoption of cleaner fuels and more efficient vehicles.

We need the state to acknowledge that all sectors of our economy contribute to the climate problem, and all need to be part of the solution. This rule only addresses a small part of the overall climate change issue – the emissions from cars, small trucks and SUVs. The state hasn't set targets for emissions from industry, freight and consumer goods consumption. We need targets and efforts to reduce emissions in those sectors as well.

But for now, we recognize the focus is on reducing emissions from cars, small trucks and SUVs. **We have started our search for a regional solution that will build on our existing efforts, local plans and the region's adopted desired outcomes.** The strategies we've used to implement the 2040 Growth Concept to make the metropolitan area a great place to live are among the same tools we'll need to meet the state targets.

We look forward to continued work with the Commission and the Oregon Transportation Commission in developing the Statewide Transportation Strategy. It is important for the Statewide Transportation Strategy to provide timely policy direction on some of the tools that will help our region meet our target – such as interstate and intercity travel, high speed rail, commuting between rural and urban areas of the state and congestion pricing. This will be critical to support the other metropolitan areas in their work as well.

The draft rules ignore the problem of rural-to-urban commuting that puts urban traffic on rural roads, hampering farm operations and promoting long, automobile dependent trips. The draft rules only address travel within metropolitan planning organization boundaries, ignoring traffic in the larger travelsheds that surround and penetrate those boundaries. This commuting not only generates more congestion and emissions in our region, it also has the unintended consequence of adding traffic and urban land uses in agricultural areas. This is a challenge that all six MPOs in Oregon are struggling with in part due to the geographic scope of our respective planning responsibilities. In the Portland metropolitan area, our travelshed extends far beyond our urban growth boundary as you can see on the map attached to my testimony, and includes Clark County in SW Washington.

We need more research on the potential impacts of climate change on rural economies and solutions that rural parts of the state can help implement. So far, the climate discussion focuses on urban impacts and solutions but there are also real economic impacts that could be felt by rural parts of the state that need to be understood (e.g., crop and food production impacts). These areas also need to be part of the solution given that 50 percent of the state's light vehicle carbon emissions come from rural parts of the state. We are all in this together and we all have a role to play at the state, regional and local levels.

We need flexibility and a holistic approach. Page 11 of the draft rule lists a number of factors that should be considered when the Commission reviews the targets in 2015 and beyond. These factors should also be considered during the 2012 rulemaking required by Oregon Laws 2009, chapter 865, section 37(8) and it is critical to continue bringing all the MPOs and other partners to the state table for this dialogue. It is also important for the 2012 rulemaking on preferred scenario selection and implementation to provide flexibility for each region's preferred strategy to reflect local values and approaches, and not just focus achieving the target.

Thank you for providing me with an opportunity to comment. On behalf of the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, I look forward to our continued collaboration with the Commission and your staff as we move forward.

DRAFT Phase 1 Scenario Evaluation Framework

This framework is proposed to guide the development and evaluation of the Phase 1 scenarios in 2011 and reflects input received to date from Metro’s policy and technical advisory committees and the Metro Council. The primary objective of the Phase 1 scenarios analysis is to determine the carbon emissions reduction potential of different combinations of strategies and their ability to achieve state carbon emissions reduction targets for cars, small trucks and sport utility vehicles (SUVs).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

- **Focus on outcomes and co-benefits:** The strategies that are needed to reduce carbon emissions can help save individuals, local governments and the private sector money, grow local businesses and create jobs and build healthy, livable communities. The multiple benefits should be emphasized and central to the evaluation and communication of the results.
- **Build on existing efforts and aspirations:** Start with local plans and 2010 regional actions¹ that include strategies to realize the region’s six desired outcomes.
- **Show cause and effect:** Provide sufficient clarity to discern cause and effect relationships between strategies tested and realization of regional outcomes.
- **Be bold, yet plausible:** Explore a range of futures that may be difficult to achieve but are possible.
- **Make relevant, understandable and tangible:** Organize information so decision-makers and stakeholders can understand the choices, consequences (intended and unintended) and tradeoffs.
- **Meet state climate goals:** Demonstrate what is required to meet state carbon emissions reduction targets for cars, small trucks and SUVs, recognizing reductions that from other emissions sources must also be addressed in a comprehensive manner.



The region’s six desired outcomes – adopted by the Metro Council on December 16, 2010.

WHAT WE HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH:

- Determine what combinations of land use and transportation strategies are required to meet the state carbon emissions reduction targets for light vehicles.
- Show potential impacts and benefits through a comprehensive array of measures that link back to the six desired outcomes.
- Demonstrate how well the strategies support local plans and the region’s desired outcomes.
- Identify the potential challenges, opportunities and tradeoffs associated with different strategies and implications for the region and state.
- Report findings and make recommendations to the 2012 Legislature and future project phases.

OUTCOMES TO BE EVALUATED:

While the primary objective of the scenarios analysis is to understand the carbon emissions reduction potential of different combinations of strategies and their ability to achieve state targets for cars, small trucks and SUVs, the evaluation of the smaller set of scenarios will also consider:

- **Outcomes and co-benefits** – Benefits and impacts across environmental, economic, and equity goals from a business, individual/household and regional perspective will be evaluated to better understand the choices and tradeoffs.
- **Effectiveness** – Carbon emissions reduction potential will be evaluated.
- **Cost** – The costs and cost effectiveness (per ton of emissions reduced) will be evaluated.
- **Implementation opportunities and challenges** – The feasibility of implementing different strategies and the timeframe required will be assessed to inform next steps and recommendations for Phase 2 of the process.

Table 1. Indicators to Be Evaluated in Phase 1 (draft)

Business	Individuals and Households	Region
Vehicle and truck delay	Distance driven per day	Carbon emissions
Truck travel costs	Travel costs by income group	Air quality emissions
Healthcare costs	People living in areas with good mix of homes, jobs and services by income group	Energy consumption
OTHERS?	Physical activity	Water consumption
	Fuel consumption	Land consumption
	OTHERS?	Walking, biking and transit mode share
		Infrastructure costs (capital and operations)
		Investment revenues generated
		OTHERS?

Table 1 identifies the outcomes-based indicators that will be used to evaluate the Phase 1 scenarios. The indicators represent the range of outcomes that can be evaluated using the metropolitan-scale GreenSTEP² model. The indicators will continue to be refined in Phase 2 of the process as the evaluation effort transitions to the Envision Tomorrow³ scenario planning tool, which will provide spatial analysis capabilities allowing for a more robust analysis of economic development, accessibility, public health and environmental justice indicators.

¹ In 2010, the Metro Council adopted the Community Investment Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan, and designated urban and rural reserves. These actions provide the policy foundation for better integrating land use decisions with transportation investments to achieve the region’s six desired outcomes and state climate goals.

² Greenhouse Gas State Transportation Emissions Planning (GreenSTEP) is a non-spatial model used to estimate transportation sector emissions with sensitivity to mixed-use, vehicle fleet mix, transportation cost, fuels and other factors which are used to calculate household VMT and corresponding greenhouse gas emissions. Inputs within the statewide model will be tailored where more current local/regional information is available to create a metropolitan GreenSTEP model for Phase 1.

³ Envision Tomorrow is a spatial GIS-based scenario planning tool that estimates the effect of changes to land use and transportation using a combination of land use, environmental and transportation data and 2040-based land use typologies. The inputs will be tailored where more current local/regional information is available for more refined scenario analysis in Phase 2.

Table 2 provides a framework for testing a variety of regional-level strategies during the summer of 2011 with the goal of determining what combination of strategies are needed to reduce carbon emissions. **The table is for discussion and research purposes only, and does not represent a Metro Council, JPACT or MPAC endorsed policy proposal.**

- Each category includes a set of carbon reduction strategies that the metropolitan GreenSTEP model is able to test, including transportation, land use, fleet and technology strategies. The strategies are assumed to be implemented with consideration of environmental justice and equity concerns; there may be some strategies that by their very nature could pose challenges.
- A total of 36 scenarios will be created in Phase 1, reflecting different implementation levels for each strategy. Level 1 represents the Reference Case, reflecting current adopted plans and policies.

The top performing combinations of strategies will be evaluated in more detail, using the indicators listed in Table 2. Additional sensitivity analysis may be conducted after the initial set of scenarios are evaluated as time and resources allow.

Table 2. Climate Smart Communities Scenarios (DRAFT)

	2035 Implementation Levels			Strategies to be Tested (indicated in bold)
	Level 1 (Reference)	Level 2	Level 3	
COMMUNITY DESIGN	Current	Double	Triple	Households in mixed-use areas and neighborhoods ⁴ (percent)
	Current rate	½-current rate	No expansion	Urban growth boundary (expansion relative to population growth)
	Current	Triple		Bicycle and pedestrian travel (mode share)
	2035 RTP Financially Constrained (FC) System			Road capacity (lane mile growth relative to population growth)
	2035 RTP FC	Double	Triple	Bus and rail transit service hours (percent)
PRICING ⁵	Current	Triple	100%	Workers paying parking fees (percent)
	Current			Non-work trips parking parking fees (percent)
	Current	<i>TBD</i>	<i>TBD</i>	Average daily parking fee for work and non-work trips
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Pay-as-you drive insurance
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Fuel and emissions fees ⁶
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Vehicle travel fees ⁷
MARKETING & INCENTIVES	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Households participating in individualized marking programs (percent)
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Workers participating in employer-based demand management programs ⁸ (percent)
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Households participating in carsharing (percent)
	Current	<i>TBD</i>		Households participating in ecodriving (percent)
MANAGE -MENT	Level 1/2 from State Agency Technical Report			System management strategies such as traffic signal timing, incident management (percent of delay addressed)
FLEET	To be held constant at Level 3 as defined in State Agency Technical Report and assumed in the Metropolitan GHG Reduction Targets Rule			Auto/truck vehicle proportions and fleet turnover rate /ages, as defined in State Agency Technical Report and assumed in the Metropolitan GHG Reduction Targets Rule
TECHNOLOGY	To be held constant at Level 3 as defined in State Agency Technical Report and assumed in the Metropolitan GHG Reduction Targets Rule			Fuel economy, carbon intensity of fuels , as defined in State Agency Technical Report and assumed in the Metropolitan GHG Reduction Targets Rule
	Level 3 from State Agency Technical Report		Level 4 from State Agency Report	Electric vehicles and plug-in hybrids market shares

The results of the analysis will be summarized and brought forward for discussion by the region’s decision-makers and community and business leaders in Fall 2011. The regional discussion will shape the findings and recommendations forwarded to the 2012 Legislature and the next phase of the process.

⁴ Existing zoning and forecasted population and employment held constant across all scenarios.

⁵ Reflected as the cost per mile to drive. Fuel price will held constant across all scenarios, reflecting market trends.

⁶ Carbon fee, gas tax, or other instruments could be used.

⁷ Vehicle miles traveled fee or other instruments could be used.

⁸ Examples include transit fare reduction, carpool matching and other carpool programs, and compressed work week.

Agenda Item Number 3.0

**LARGE – INDUSTRIAL – SITE
INVENTORY AND REPLENISHMENT
PLAN**

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, May 3, 2011
Metro Council Chambers

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: May 3, 2011 Time: _____ Length: 45 minutes

Presentation Title: Large-site-industrial inventory and replenishment plan

Service, Office, or Center: Planning and Development

Presenters (include phone number/extension and alternative contact information):
Ted Reid 1768; John Williams 1635

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Staff is seeking comment on a proposed approach for inventorying large industrial sites as a first step in the development of a replenishment plan. Staff will also describe a proposed timeline for bringing anticipated policy questions to the Council.

The development of a large-industrial-site inventory and replenishment plan are part of the Industrial and Employment Areas work program (attached for reference). This component of the work program has its origins in discussions that informed the Council's adoption of the 2009 urban growth report. In addition to Council policy conversations, those discussions engaged business focus groups, the MPAC Employment Subcommittee and MPAC itself, MTAC, and a variety of stakeholders. MPAC and the Council requested that Metro staff develop a proposal for a system that would maintain an inventory of large sites for industrial uses and identify actions to replenish the inventory as sites get developed. MPAC also indicated that the site inventory should be organized in tiers to identify any obstacles to development readiness of sites.

It was originally intended that an inventory and site replenishment plan would be considered by the Metro Council as part of the December 2010 Capacity Ordinance. To that end, Metro staff convened a small group of MTAC members to sort out the details of the proposal. After meeting twice, it appeared that, while there was considerable interest in the concept, additional time and expertise were needed to refine the proposal. During the fall of 2010, the Metro Council also discussed the concept and indicated a desire to spend the time to get it right. Consequently staff did not propose, as part of the 2010 Capacity Ordinance, changes to Title 4 that would implement this concept. Instead, staff proposed and the Council adopted changes to the Framework Plan that state the Council's policies on the topic as well as changes to Title 14 (Urban Growth Boundary) that allow for expedited urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions for industrial uses. Staff would now like direction from the Council on development of the large-site inventory and replenishment concept.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

- A. Direct staff, as a first step, to work with stakeholders and local jurisdictions to develop an inventory of large sites suitable for industrial uses. The inventory would include an assessment of barriers to development readiness. Upon completion of the inventory, staff would seek Council direction on next steps for the development of a site replenishment plan.
- B. Direct staff to work concurrently on the development of the inventory and a replenishment plan.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Staff suggests that Option A (above) is the most productive approach for the development of an inventory and replenishment plan. Staff anticipates that the development of the inventory will prompt an informed discussion of the best course of action to replenish the region's supply of development-ready sites and to meet other desired outcomes. Staff believes that developing a proposal for a replenishment plan without first having a clear understanding of the inventory of sites (Option B) may lead to a system that loses track of the fundamental goal of addressing development readiness.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Does Council support staff's proposed approach to developing a large-site inventory and replenishment plan (Option A – complete the inventory first to inform the development of a replenishment plan)?
2. Are there specific policy questions that the Council would like the inventory to illuminate?

Possible policy questions for discussion at a later date:

1. How are the development readiness tiers defined (and who decides which tier a site is in)?
2. How often should the inventory and tiering be reevaluated?
3. Who should have long-term responsibility for updating the inventory?
4. How can a replenishment system be designed to leave room for policy deliberation (rather than being overly mechanical)?
5. Who sets the target number of development-ready large sites?
6. How often is the target number of development-ready sites reevaluated?
7. How do we decide when to remove a site from the inventory (what constitutes "developed")?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes __x_No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes __x_No



Industrial and Employment Areas Work Program

John Williams, Program Manager

GOAL: Prosperous, sustainable and accessible industrial and employment areas.

METRO ROLE: Identify barriers, develop and promote tools and coordinate investments to support a regional economic development strategy.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES:

- Create development-ready employment sites
- Support job growth in industrial and employment areas
- Promote equitable jobs access for all populations
- Foster energy efficient and environmentally sustainable industrial and employment areas
- Increase regional coordination of employment forecasts, data and strategies
- Coordinate regional investment strategy in support of regional economic development strategy



WORK PROGRAM ELEMENTS:

- 1:** Develop inventory and replenishment plan for regional large-lot industrial needs (*Ted Reid, lead*). This work follows up on the 2010 Metro Council decision that sites 50 acres and larger were the only regional employment land need that was not satisfied within the existing urban growth boundary (UGB) and anticipates that this will be an ongoing capacity need.¹ The project will identify large-lot opportunities (both inside and outside the UGB) and the strategies needed to make those sites development-ready. Strategies to be considered may include:
 - Identifying, assessing and cleaning up brownfield contamination
 - Consolidating fragmented ownership patterns
 - Prioritizing and developing needed infrastructure
 - Assessing and mitigating environmental constraints
 - Streamlining permitting requirementsFinally, the project will address next steps for monitoring and replenishing regional employment land supply from identified opportunity sites.
- 2:** Promote and support implementation of Metro's 2010 *Eco-Efficient Employment Toolkit* (*Miranda Bateschell, lead*). This work will identify barriers to triple-bottom line development in targeted employment areas around the region and will develop and promote tools to address these barriers. In FY 2011-2012 a major focus will be areas within the SW Corridor Plan and East Metro Connections Plan boundaries to support those major planning efforts.
- 3:** Compliance related to Metro's Industrial and Employment Areas code (Title 4) to protect industrial and employment lands for job creation (*Ted Reid, lead*).

¹ This work program is not intended to provide additional large-lot capacity to count towards the need identified in the 2009 urban growth report. This is a longer-term effort to provide large-lot capacity for employment.

- 4:** Coordinate employment forecasts and data distribution (*Gerry Uba, lead*).

RELATED PROJECTS/PROGRAMS:

- Integrated mobility corridors (SW Corridor/East Metro Connections Plan)
- Community Investment Initiative especially to recognize the cost to implement the actions needed to upgrade the candidate sites to development-ready status.
- Climate Smart Communities Scenarios
- Community Development and Planning Grants
- Major regional investments – Lake Oswego to Portland transit project, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail, Columbia River Crossing
- Future urban growth reports and UGB expansions
- Regional coordination for local economic opportunity analysis and comprehensive plan updates
- Housing and Equity Opportunity Mapping
- Implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan's Freight Plan
- Greenlight Greater Portland/Regional Partners economic development organization

EXTERNAL PARTNERS:

- Business Oregon
- Local jurisdictions
- Greenlight Greater Portland/Regional Partners
- Businesses, developers and private business development associations
- Workforce training organizations, equity groups
- Port of Portland
- Freight interests

COUNCIL ROLE: (*Councilors Harrington and Collette, liaisons*)

- Policy direction on overall program and elements including:
 - Whether the inventory and replenishment system triggers UGB expansions on an annual or other frequent timeline if no new sites have been made available inside the UGB
 - Potential changes to land protections and/or incentives for designated employment and industrial areas
- Political leadership in establishing investment strategies for industrial and employment areas and seeking resources for implementation
- Connecting industrial and employment investment strategies to Greenlight Greater Portland's regional economic development strategy, consistent with 2040 growth concept and desired regional outcomes
- Outreach to partners

KEY MILESTONES AND DECISIONS TIMELINE (WORK IN PROGRESS)

1. Metro Council direction on overall work program	April 2011
2. Metro Council decision on local jurisdiction requests to amend regional industrial and employment areas map	July 2011
3. Metro Council direction on large lot opportunity sites/barriers	November 2011
4. SW Corridor Plan/East Metro Connection Plan milestones TBD	TBD

NOTE: FORMAL ACTIONS ARE BOLDDED AND HIGHLIGHTED IN GRAY

EVENTS AND PRODUCTS TO ACTUALIZE KEY MILESTONES**Milestone 1 (Council direction on work program):**

- Direction from Council liaisons
- Initial discussion with Council
- Work session on inventory and replenishment program

March 2, April 11***April 19*****Milestone 2 (Title 4 status and local jurisdiction map requests):**

- Staff report
- Metro Council decision on local jurisdiction map requests

June, date TBD***July, date TBD*****Milestone 3 (Council direction on large lot opportunity sites, strategies and replenishment):**

- Base inventory of large lots
- Council initial direction on work program and replenishment concepts (based on 2009-2010 work)
- Work with local jurisdictions, private sector and others to identify opportunity sites
- Work with local jurisdictions, private sector and others to identify barriers
- Draft report to MTAC, MPAC and Council on large lots and barriers
- Final report to MTAC, MPAC, Council – seek policy direction

done***Date TBD (April/May)******May-July******August-September******October******November*****Milestone 4 (SW Corridor/East Metro Connections Plan):**

- Milestone development still underway

TBD**RESOURCES CURRENTLY ALLOCATED BY LAND USE PLANNING SECTION, FY 2011-2012**

Staff: 3.70 FTE, includes 2.70 FTE in Planning, 1.00 FTE supported in Research Center

M&S: \$15,000 for consultant expertise

Note: does not include staff in other departments

POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL WORK TASKS (NOT BUDGETED)

1. \$50,000 for additional technical assistance by consultants related to the eco-efficient toolkit in corridors and other targeted locations. Funds would provide up to five site visits and consultations with local jurisdictions.

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

Illustrative concept

Possible categories for regional inventory of large-site industrial land

Tier One: Development-ready within 180 days													
ID	Jurisdiction	Ownership	Acres	Sector suitability	Infrastructure	Access	Inside UGB?	Annexed to city?	Concept plan complete (if outside UGB)?	Zoning	Constraints	Other notes	Actions needed
Site 1	City A	One parcel	67	manufacturing	Serviced	rail; ½ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	environmental		none
Site 2	City C	2 parcels, 2 owners with agreement	120	manufacturing	Serviced	¼ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	none	Nearby advanced-manufacturing cluster	none
Site 3	City A	One parcel	55	warehouse / distribution	Serviceable within 180 days	¼ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	none		Transportation improvements
Tier Two: Development-ready in less than 5 years													
ID	Jurisdiction	Ownership	Acres	Sector suitability	Infrastructure	Access	Inside UGB?	Annexed to city?	Concept plan complete (if outside UGB)?	Zoning	Constraints		Actions needed
Site 4	City D	2 parcels, 2 owners	125	manufacturing	Serviced	½ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	environmental	Seismically stable	-Lot assembly -Mitigation
Site 5	City A	1 owner	53	manufacturing	Serviceable	1 mile to FWY ramp	no	no	yes	rural	environmental	Nearby high-tech cluster	-UGB expansion -Annexation -Zoning -Infrastructure provisions
Site 6	City B	3 parcels, 1 owner	52	warehouse / distribution	Upgrades needed	marine terminal; ¼ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	brownfield		-Brownfield cleanup -Infrastructure upgrades
Tier Three: Development-ready in long term													
ID	Jurisdiction	Ownership	Acres	Sector suitability	Infrastructure	Access	Inside UGB?	Annexed to city?	Concept plan complete (if outside UGB)?	Zoning	Constraints		Actions needed
Site 7	City A	10 parcels, 7 owners	110	Warehouse / distribution	Major upgrades needed	¾ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	partially developed; brownfield		-Brownfield cleanup -Infrastructure upgrades -Lot assembly
Site 8	City C	4 parcels, 3 owners	87	manufacturing	Serviced	½ mile to FWY ramp	yes	yes	NA	industrial	brownfield		-Brownfield cleanup -Lot assembly
Site 9	City B	5 parcels, 5 owners	117	manufacturing	Serviceable	1 mile to FWY ramp	no	no	no	rural	unknown		-Concept plan -UGB expansion -Annexation -Zoning -Lot assembly -Infrastructure provision

Notes:

“Serviceable” means that needed infrastructure can be provided within the timeframe indicated by the tiering

Shirley Craddick

From: Kate Marx [katemarx@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 11:20 AM
To: Shirley Craddick; Jim Middaugh; Sheena VanLeuven
Cc: 'Carol Studenmund'; 'Mark Foster'
Subject: Closed Captioning follow up

Councilor Craddick, Jim and Sheena,

Many thanks for meeting yesterday with Mark, Carol and me to discuss the requirements for adding closed captioning (CC) to Metro's line up of communications tools. I trust that you will seriously consider the multiple benefits of CC for public meetings, video postings, verbatim transcript reference, cable broadcasts, and desktop streaming of meetings and events.

Please note that Mark verbally made a formal request on behalf of the Oregon Closed Captioning Advisory Group (OCCAG) that is working to inform all Oregon governments of their obligations to incorporate CC into their ADA accessibility standards.

To clarify and formalize Metro's plans for moving forward with a budget and operating discussion about CC, we request that the Metro Council memorialize the communication benefits and the ADA requirements for CC with a resolution. Members of the OCCAG would be pleased to testify on behalf of the estimated 130,000 regional citizens who require CC to access and participate effectively in Metro business.

Carol Studenmund asked me to convey to you her willingness to work with Metro in her Cable Commission and technical expert roles to determine the hardware and software requirements for optimizing CC benefits.

Thank you again for your time and attentiveness. KM

Kate Marx
1538 NE 24th
Portland, OR
97232
503.504.0450