



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 10, 2011

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sam Adams
Matt Berkow
Pat Campbell
Jody Carson
Steve Clark
Nathalie Darcy
Andy Duyck
Amanda Fritz
Kathryn Harrington
Jack Hoffman
Carl Hosticka
Charlotte Lehan, Chair
Keith Mays
Marilyn McWilliams
Doug Neeley
Barbara Roberts
Loretta Smith, 2nd Vice Chair
Wilda Parks
Norm Thomas
William Wild
Jerry Willey, Vice Chair

AFFILIATION

City of Portland
Multnomah County Citizen
City of Vancouver
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas County Other Cities
TriMet Board of Directors
Washington County Citizen
Washington County Commission
City of Portland
Metro Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Metro Council
Clackamas County Commission
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Tualatin Valley Water District, representing Wash. Co. Special Districts
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Metro Council
Multnomah County Commission
Clackamas County Citizen
City of Troutdale, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities
Oak Lodge Sanitation Dist., representing Clackamas Co. Special Districts
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jennifer Donnelly
Josh Fuhrer
Jim Rue
Marc San Soucie

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Ken Allen
Shane Bemis
Michael Demagalski
Denny Doyle
Annette Mattson
Steve Stuart

AFFILIATION

Port of Portland
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of North Plains, representing Washington Co. outside UGB
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Governing Body of School Districts
Clark County, Washington Commission

STAFF: Jessica Atwater, Dick Benner, Andy Cotugno, Mary Hull-Caballero, Kelsey Newell, Tim O'Brien, Ken Ray, Randy Tucker, Nikolai Ursin, John Williams

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

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

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Committee members and audience introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Barbara Roberts updated the committee on the following Metro item:

- The final four candidates for COO recruitment have been selected and interviewed. President Tom Hughes is expected to make a decision in September.

Councilor Carl Hosticka updated the committee on the following items:

- Resolution No. 11-4278 for the purpose of creating and appointing members of the SW Corridor Plan Steering Committee passed. Councilors Hosticka and Roberts will chair the committee. The committee's goal is to build communities within the corridor by identifying how land use and transportation work together.
- Columbia River Crossing Land Use Final Order will take place as part of the Metro Council meeting on August 11, 2011. The Council may separate the LUFO action into two separate portions: approving the LUFO and delaying the signature on the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- Consideration of the July 13, 2011 MPAC Minutes.
- MTAC member nomination.

Councilor San Soucie requested an amendment to the July 13, 2011 minutes section 6.1 discussion of South Cooper Mountain; the word 'retail' is to be changed to 'residential development.'

MOTION: Councilor Jody Carson moved, and Mr. Steve Clark seconded, to approve the consent agenda as amended.

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

6. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Observations/Comments from Lents Town Center Tour

Members who participated in the tour debriefed the group on their activities and what they learned in Lents. Discussion highlights included:

- Importance of seeing the consequences of policy.

- Learning about the history of Lents, Zenger’s International Farmers’ Market, affordable housing in the neighborhood, PDC’s investments in businesses in the neighborhood, and how the flood plain significantly affects development there.
- Positive attitude towards Lents efforts to keep the original community in the neighborhood.
- Observation that the highway affects the neighborhood in a negative way.

Members agreed that it was a positive experience to observe “forgotten spaces” within the community, and expressed their desire to arrange future tours of similar areas.

6.2 Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Application (HUD)

Metro staff persons, Mr. Andrew Cotugno and Ms. Christina Deffebach, discussed the background to the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Application (HUD). Core points included:

- Metro, in partnership with a large regional coalition, applied last year and was denied due to inadequate work program specificity. While the focus on housing affordability and equity is the same as last year, there will be greater linkages to jobs.
- Last year \$150 million was available to applicants, however this year only \$100 million is available. Metro has not yet established how much money to apply for; the grant is capped at \$5 million plus 20% local-match. Grant money would not be available for spending until May of 2012.
- The grant program is structured into two categories to recognize differences in organizations' preparedness to develop and implement plans for sustainably developed communities; Metro is seeking a category 2 grant to refine and implement the plan we have.
- All grants are awarded to a consortium. Metro is currently consolidating a consortium.
- Grant pre-application is due August 25th; the full application is due September 28th, 2011. Mr. Cotugno and Ms. Deffebach will return to MPAC on September 14th to seek a resolution supporting Metro's HUD application.

Ms. Deffebach discussed the components of the grant:

- Creation of a system or process for awarding subsequent grants to community-based organizations once HUD grant is acquired.
- Opportunity mapping is being done to identify what facilities and services are needed where Metro’s goal is to make these maps available to the public and decision makers.
- Addressing what the community can do to better address housing needs. MPAC has discussed this before with an interest in having an MPAC subcommittee; housing issues link to other issues, they are not stand alone.
- Identifying areas that need investment that could serve as a demonstration project.

Members asked if HUD comments on Metro's grant proposal from last year are available. Mr. Cotugno answered that HUD refused to provide the comments in writing but we have notes from a verbal debrief.

Some members inquired into the scope of HUD programming, specifically if it can incorporate and support existing affordable housing plans. Staff clarified that HUD programming should support existing planning, and that meetings can be arranged between Metro staff and jurisdictions to discuss this issue.

Members strongly supported approaching affordable housing as an issue linked to access to transportation, health, education, and employment.

6.3 2011 Growth Management Decision – Industrial lands

Mr. John Williams of Metro recapped the industrial component of the growth management decision before MPAC and the COO's recommendation for an addition of 310 acres for large-site industrial use in North Hillsboro. MPAC will make a recommendation on residential expansion recommendation at the September 14th meeting, and will conclude its work at the September 28, 2011 MPAC meeting.

Councilor Hosticka reviewed Mr. Tim O'Brien's memo summarizing the Metro Council's recent discussion and direction on this topic, distributed at the meeting. The Council is scheduled to make a final decision on UGB additions on October 20, 2011. In early September Metro's Chief Operating Officer (COO) will prepare a draft ordinance based on the lower third of the center of the forecast range, 15,400 dwelling units, as per the Metro Council's request. The Council has received requests for consideration for 7 areas not currently considered in the COO's current report. Due to the state requirement that all areas of consideration must be submitted to LCDC 45 days prior to a final land use decision, all areas of consideration must be submitted by August 22nd. Areas that have not been studied within the COO report need to be submitted to the Council with a city sponsor and 4 Councilors support by August 18th.

The first hearing of the growth management ordinance is scheduled for October 6th, the final for October 20th. Measure 26:29 dictates that Metro must notify all residents within 1 mile of a UGB expansion area at least 20 days prior to any decision regarding the movement of the UGB, which is September 29, 2011. By this date, considering public comment and MPAC discussions, the Council intends to winnow the list of areas studied to a smaller list. If new areas are introduced after September 29th, the entire process will be delayed until November.

Apart from the UGB Growth Management decision, Councilor Hosticka related that LCDC intends to hold a public hearing on Metro's December 2010 Capacity Ordinance. The hearing will determine the validity of Metro's methodology for determining a forecast range to identify UGB areas. LCDC will also be considering urban and rural reserves on August 18-19. LCDC is not inviting anyone for private meetings to discuss these issues.

Mr. Ken Ray of Metro informed the Committee that Opt-In UGB Expansion Survey Results as well as the Hillsboro open house results will be available to Council by the end of the week.

Councilor Hosticka addressed concerns regarding the forecast range; he established that despite the slow economy the range Metro has used to forecast population needs will not need to be recalculated.

Mr. Williams presented on large lot industrial expansion. The COO's recommendation this year is similar to last year's recommendation. Currently, the COO recommends considering 310 acres in N. Hillsboro. There are other places that have been suggested by Metro studies and governments if the Council decided to adopt a higher range.

City of Forest Grove representatives Mr. Michael Sykes, City Manager, and Mr. John Holan, Community Development Director, presented their case for adding an additional 115 acres to the UGB expansion in NW Forest Grove for industrial purposes. Forest Grove is trying to diversify its economy, but possess no industrial sites large enough to accommodate companies' needs. An expansion of 115 acres of industrial land in Forest Grove would help to increase equity in the region by giving Forest Grove a more equal

opportunity. Forest Grove representatives informed the committee that Forest Grove has excellent long-term planning to support expansion. Currently Forest Grove is trying to create vibrant communities, and this expansion would help by creating jobs to meet employment needs. The representatives stated that Forest Grove is unique as an economic base because they have their own source of power, which is significantly cheaper than PGE.

Some members inquired into the possibility of a brownfields grant for the purpose of industrial development. Ms. Deffebach informed the group that while Metro currently has no grant applications in place, the Environmental Protection Agency is creating new grant opportunities and Metro can assist with determining which sites exist and are eligible for which grants. Mr. Williams informed the group that Metro is looking at which large industrial sites are opportunity sites (not development ready) to create a comprehensive inventory; this will not be available before this year's UGB decision.

Mr. Keith Mays thanked the group for considering his areas of responsibility, Forest Grove, Cornelius, and Tualatin. On behalf of Cornelius, he requested that the committee waits to make a recommendation to Council until after LCDC decision. Councilor Hosticka reminded the group that if MPAC waits until August 22nd to notify LCDC regarding areas considered for UGB expansion, then unstudied areas will not be eligible for consideration; Mr. Williams clarified that all industrial areas in consideration for recommendation to Council and LCDC have been studied.

Members discussed the pros and cons of recommending the 310 industrial large lot acres in N. Hillsboro.

Pros included:

- Many members agreed that 310 acres is enough to satisfy the forecast needs of the region; UGB is up for consideration every 5 years, members felt it was more appropriate to start with 310 acres and add later if necessary.
- Some members felt that currently vacant industrial large lots already within the UGB should be identified and examined prior to adding more acreage beyond UGB (see page 4 of Metro's 2009 Urban Growth Report).
- Some members felt recommending the 310 acres balances providing new opportunities and investing in existing sites and infrastructure (by focusing on work such as brownfields clean up and lot assembly).
- Industrial land does not necessarily constitute heavy industry, it can also incorporate industrial farm land.

Cons included:

- Some members felt that 310 acres is not enough to satisfy the next 20 years of growth, and that re-assessing the UGB every 5 years is not a responsible way to meet growth needs.
- Some members felt there was a lack of information regarding why certain industrial areas are not being considered. (Staff clarified that those being considered are the most immediately developable.)

Members discussed the pros and cons of recommending an additional 115 industrial large lot acres in Forest Grove.

Pros included:

- Some members felt it would be more equitable distribution of land for job creation.
- Some members felt the addition would support the Forest Grove community and Metro's Community Investment Initiative.

Cons included:

- Some members felt that the addition would be an over-extension of the UGB without necessity.
- Some members expressed concern that it was currently unknown what limits Forest Grove puts on land usage.

Mr. Williams suggested that the committee vote on large lot industrial additions to the UGB at this meeting, and wait to vote on residential additions until the September meetings. Chair Charlotte Lehan supported this idea, and members agreed to separate the Hillsboro large lot industrial proposal and Forest Grove addition into separate votes.

MOTION #1: Ms. Nathalie Darcy moved, Mayor Doug Neeley seconded, to recommend to the Metro Council the adoption of the COO's Recommendation of 310 large-lot industrial land acres to the Urban Growth Boundary in North Hillsboro.

ACTION TAKEN: With 14 in favor (Adams, Berkow, Carson, Clark, Darcy, San Soucie, Fritz, Hoffman, Lehan, McWilliams, Neeley, Parks, Smith, Wild), 2 opposed (Willey, Mays), and 1 abstention (Fuhrer) the motion passed.

MOTION #2: Mayor Keith Mays moved, and Mr. Steve Clark seconded, to recommend the addition of 115 acres to the Urban Growth Boundary in Forest Grove.

ACTION TAKEN: With 8 in favor (Mays, Clark, Parks, Neeley, Wild, McWilliams, San Soucie, Willey), 5 opposed (Carson, Fritz, Hoffman, Smith, Fuhrer), and 3 abstentions (Berkow, Lehan, Darcy) the motion failed.

Note: 16 voting members were present for the second vote, whereas 17 were present for the first. MPAC bylaws, Article IV Section b, states that "the act of a majority of those voting members present at meetings at which a quorum is present shall be the act of MPAC." Therefore the second motion failed because only 8 of 16 voting members present supported the motion.

7. **MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

8. **ADJOURN**

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Atwater
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR 08/10/11:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	Doc DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
4	Memo	08/10/11	August 4, 2011 Work Session Summary	081011m-01
6.3	Map	08/10/11	COO Recommendation-UGB Expansion Options	081011m-02
6.3	Map	08/10/11	COO Recommendation-N. Hillsboro	081011m-03
6.3	Letter	08/10/11	Large Lot Industrial Lands (City of Portland)	081011m-04
6.3	Letter	08/10/11	2011 UGB Decision (City of Forest Grove)	081011m-05
6.3	Letter	08/10/11	City of Cornelius	081011m-06