



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 26, 2011

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Matt Berkow
Steve Clark
Kathryn Harrington
Jack Hoffman
Carl Hosticka
Charlotte Lehan, Chair
Annette Mattson
Marilyn McWilliams
Doug Neeley
Loretta Smith, 2nd Vice Chair
William Wild

AFFILIATION

Multnomah County Citizen
Trimet Board of Directors
Metro Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Metro Council
Clackamas County Commission
Governing Body of School Districts
Washington County Special Districts
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Multnomah County Commission
Clackamas County Special Districts

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Shane Bemis
Jody Carson
Pat Campbell
Nathalie Darcy
Michael Demagalski
Dennis Doyle
Jim Rue
Andy Duyck
Amanda Fritz
Keith Mays
Wilda Parks
Steve Stuart
Norm Thomas
Barbara Roberts
Jerry Willey, Vice Chair

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Vancouver
Washington County Citizen
City of North Plains, representing Washington Co. outside UGB
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Washington County Commission
City of Portland Council
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Clackamas County Citizen
Clark County, Washington Commission
City of Troutdale, representing other cities in Multnomah Co.
Metro Council
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Lori DeRemer
Stanley Dirks
Ed Gronke
Marc San Soucie
Peter Truax

AFFILIATION

City of Happy Valley, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Wood Village, representing other cities in Multnomah Co.
Clackamas County Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other Cities

STAFF:

Jessica Atwater, Nick Christensen, Councilor Collette, Rita Conrad, Andy Cotugno, Councilor Craddick, Christina Deffebach, Tom Kloster, and Kelsey Newell.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

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

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

All attendees introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE MPAC MINUTES FOR AUGUST 10, 2011

MOTION: Mayor Peter Truax moved, Mr. William Wild seconded to adopt the September 28, 2011 MPAC minutes.

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

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Hosticka updated MPAC on the following points.

The Metro Council voted to expand the Urban Growth Boundary by 1,985 acres on October 20, 2011. There was one addition to the Chief Operating Officer's recommendation, an area west of Tigard known as Roy Rogers West. The piece was added to facilitate connectivity to previous UGB additions, areas 63 and 64. Councilor Hosticka clarified that Metro feels that the UGB edge is complete for at least three to four years, and will now focus on promoting policies and investments that make the most of land within the UGB. Metro's UGB decision now goes to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for approval. Some members inquired into Metro's focus within the UGB, specifically in regards to how cities outside the current UGB can request entry within the UGB in 2016. Councilor Hosticka responded that Metro is required to assess a capacity ordinance for the region in 2014, determine how to meet at least half of that housing need by 2015, and how to meet all the need by 2016. There is no requirement that any need must be met outside the boundary. Title 11 concept plans and efficiency measures should be received by the end of 2015. If a jurisdiction is outside the UGB and in Urban Reserves, that entity will have to compile a Title 11 packet.

MPAC and JPACT will meet in a joint work session to receive an update on the 'Climate Smart Communities: Scenarios' project on Friday, December 2nd from 8am to 11am at the Oregon Convention Center. After the December 2nd meeting, jurisdictions need to discuss what actions they would like to take, what actions they are able to take, and where the region would like to go with this project.

Councilor Hosticka invited Councilor Collette to update the group on the status of Metro and the Consortium's HUD grant. Councilor Collette explained that if the grant is awarded, an executive committee will be composed of governmental, nonprofit, and various other groups in the community. MPAC will have the opportunity to appoint two members to sit on this committee.

Metro will be informed within approximately 60 days as to whether or not the Consortium will receive the HUD grant. Even if the HUD grant is not awarded to Metro and the Consortium, Metro and some of the groups in the Consortium may pursue some of the projects outlined in the grant proposal.

On October 17th Metro hosted a workshop on local transportation systems plans. Metro staff provided guidance and materials on how the region can meet 2035 Regional Transportation Goals through local transportation system plans. Please see the brochure at www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp.

On November 4th there will be a presentation by Dr. Lawrence Frank that relates the impact of the built environment on health. Portland is a leader in this issue area. Dr. Frank will bring updates on the national and international levels.

Metro's 'Tours of Untimely Departure' event takes place on Halloween at Lone Fir Cemetery. The tour begins at 6pm. Tickets can be purchased online at friendsoflonefircemetery.org.

6. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 GREATER PORTLAND PULSE—DEMONSTRATION AND UPDATE

Councilor Harrington introduced the Greater Portland Pulse (GPP) project, emphasizing that MPAC must consider how to make this important tool part of social policy as this project is a tool to serve public servants. The development phase of this project is wrapping up, and is currently working on a business plan that will determine how to make GPP indicators a permanent part of the region's planning. Councilor Harrington highlighted that the GPP report available at this meeting contains important data on education, vital for creating the workforce our region needs for the future. She extended Metro's gratitude to GPP's board members, including select members of MPAC. She also announced that the City Club of Portland's will host a GPP luncheon, taking place on Friday, October 29th. She introduced the GPP team members presenting to MPAC, Dr. Sheila Martin of Portland State University's Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies, Ms. Rita Conrad, and Mr. Andy Cotugno, both of Metro.

Mr. Cotugno provided an historical overview of the GPP project. He reminded the group that Metro has an obligation to track its progress on various projects. He recalled that MPAC played a role in determining which indicators Metro and the region would track, specifically the economic and education indicators that are typically beyond Metro's jurisdiction. This fact led to the partnership between PSU and Metro. As fundraising could not occur for the project until there was a finished product to track indicators Metro and PSU contributed the initial funding for GPP and its business plan.

Ms. Conrad provided an overview of the GPP project. The purpose of this project is to measure results and inspire action around them. There are nine results teams—economic opportunity, education, healthy people, safe people, arts and culture, civic engagement, healthy natural environment, housing and communities, and access and mobility—with the addition of an equity panel. There are four kinds of "capita" needed for prosperity: human capital, social capital, physical capital, and natural capital. The indicators speak to Metro's progress toward the six Desired Outcomes. In addition to consideration of business plans, there are equity proceedings.

Dr. Martin gave a demonstration of the GPP website. She pointed out sections where people can endorse the project, the 'latest news' section, and a section where people can sign up for workshops. She encouraged members to both endorse the project and for members' staff to sign up to attend workshops. She continued the demonstration by showing the group how to use the indicator maps. She highlighted that for some census tract data, the margin of error can be quite high, and is visible when viewing data on the maps. The census data puts an equity lens on indicator areas. Data is generally presented for the four county region: Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas, and Clark counties. Skamania, Columbia, and Yamhill counties are included in some indicator areas.

Dr. Martin gave the group examples of how members may want to use the data. The data allows people to begin asking questions about what investments or which policies can be made in which neighborhoods or in which programs (e.g. affordable housing, transportation, loans, etc).

Dr. Martin then discussed the relationship between education and economic prosperity. She highlighted that the higher a person's education, the lower that person's unemployment rate; education offers insulation from unemployment. Examining this relationship through the lens of race and ethnicity, the insulation offered by higher education begins to disappear for non-white and non-Asian populations; this indicates an equity issue. The region needs to look at this relationship and ask 'what are we doing today to make this better tomorrow?'

Ms. Conrad explained how the GPP report uses the Pulse data online by highlighting one theme in this first reporting cycle. This report centers on the importance of human capital in sustaining economic prosperity as well as social, physical and natural capital. The region's human capital is fast becoming more diverse, especially in K-12 schools. Children of color and low income will increasingly be the region's work force and leaders of tomorrow. However, it is children of color and low income, and their families that suffer inequities across indicator categories. A critical upstream solution is making sure *all* children get a good education.

Members expressed support for this research and addressing the education inequity issue. Staff posed a set of questions for MPAC to consider: What are the criterion of whom and where the host of this project should be? And is MPAC prepared to be part of the 'ask' for the funding plan?

Group discussion highlights included:

Members expressed some concern as to the currency of the census tract data, and a mechanism for updating data. Dr. Martin explained that there is a data update schedule, but there needs to be a stable home and funding for this to occur.

Some members inquired if neighborhoods would be included in the indicator maps. Staff said that they are in the process of adding neighborhoods to the maps, and they would appreciate members' input in that process.

Some members asked if there is data available on foreclosures. The presenters answered that previously there was, as the data was available for free, but the data now has a cost and so has not been included.

Some members inquired into the education data, expressing concerns that the data is too linear. The presenters acknowledged that they shared these concerns, but that the data conforms to a

national standard. Ms. Annette Mattson clarified that the federal government has now standardized how high school graduation rates are measured. The goal is for 88% of entering freshman to graduate within four years. While a fifth year senior goal has also been added to the measurement, the GED is still not part of this measurement. The group discussed high school graduation rates within the region, and looked at these rates through the lenses of location and race and ethnicity. The national goal for education levels is 40-40-20 (40% of people obtain a Bachelor's degree, 40% obtain a post-secondary degree, and 20% have at least a high-school diploma). The region has not yet achieved this goal, which indicates a need to have stronger partnerships between all levels of education and nonprofits offering education services. Mayor Peter Truax commented on the importance of reading proficiency based on his experience as a teacher.

Members asked if there is a way to compare a new housing development to an older neighborhood in terms of education, transportation costs, etc.... Staff responded that as education may be collected on a school district basis and land costs are assessed on a parcel basis, you can only infer a relationship, there is no direct relationship.

Members inquired if there is a way to observe data on the growth within the UGB through this site, with some members interested in using this data for a UGB decision. Staff responded that GPP already has 78 categories of data, with 58 of those categories having collected data. Crafting indicators is vital for public involvement and utility. While staff is not discouraging collecting more data, they are mindful of how they present it.

Some members would like to explore how to use the data for MPAC.

6.2 OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (TPR) AND OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN (OHP) AMENDMENTS

Mr. Tom Kloster and Ms. Lainie Smith of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) presented to MPAC on upcoming amendments to the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). The two documents are linked through TPR section 0060. They emphasized that the changes to this section will be sweeping, particularly in the area of highways. The TPR is currently in parallel review by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and LCDC.

There will be an action item for MPAC to endorse a Metro letter on November 9, 2011, but members are encouraged to write letters from their own jurisdictions or themselves to highlight issues that are most important to them. These letters should give examples of how the current rules have impeded a jurisdiction's land use, transportation, or community plans and how the new rules will help this plan succeed. Councilor Harrington emphasized MPAC members should be willing to go to the hearings personally to testify.

Mr. Kloster gave a presentation on the content and timeline of the TPR and OHP amendments. There were some concerns brought to LCDC at a hearing last year that have triggered proposed amendments. Economic development opportunities come into play when jurisdictions receive development proposals that require plan amendments, and many jurisdictions have made the case for greater flexibility in waiving transportation improvements that might otherwise be required for these amendments. However, other local jurisdictions have argued against favoring certain kinds of development with what amounts to a transportation infrastructure subsidy, so there will most

likely not be consensus in our region on proposed TPR provisions to allow 'partial mitigation allowed when adding industrial or non-retail jobs.'

Ms. Smith discussed Policy 1F, which addresses highway mobility, expressed as a volume-capacity ratio. As parcels move from less intense land use to more intense land use, as in up-zoning, there are standards for highway mobility. Current proposals for changes to Policy 1F are sweeping in tone and substance. The language is moving from the word 'standard' to the word 'target.' ODOT is moving toward more flexibility in allowing for alternative transportation standards. These standards no longer have to be volume-capacity based. There are often competing transportation needs within a community, and the results of these amendments could mean more congestion on the system, with a trade-off of better pedestrian crossings or more bike facilities. It must be determined if those trade-offs are acceptable. ODOT now allows for more flexibility in the creation of traffic. The changes to the TPR specifically recognize that Metro already has alternative mobility standards, as adopted in 1999. Those standards are now 'up against the wall.' Through developing alternative standards in local areas ODOT is developing a toolbox of measures for alternative mobility to set standards for specific plans.

There was a joint meeting of MTAC and TPAC on these amendments. There is a letter on TPR that Mr. Kloster will take to TPAC on October 28, 2011, which will then go to MPAC on November 9, 2011. Councilor Harrington emphasized that now is the time for members to express their thoughts on the direction of TPR.

The OTC will hear amendments to the OHP on November 16th in Silverton, and LCDC will hear amendments to the TPR on December 8th and 9th in The Dalles. The presenters encouraged members to write letters to the OTC and LCDC in regards to these hearings on specific topics that they feel strongly about in the OTC and TPR amendments. Many items discussed at TPR meetings have been left without consensus, and this letter is another opportunity for members to express their views on these issues and others.

Group discussion highlights included:

Some members who had participated in the TPR amendment process expressed that ODOT is nervous to move TPR language from 'standards' to 'targets.' LCDC has been made aware of the lack of consensus. Some members expressed support for moving from 'standards' to 'targets,' though they feel that it is not far enough; they would like to see an even greater increase in flexibility in regards to transportation planning and up-zoning areas. They expressed concern that the changes will still prevent up-zoning in certain areas due to alternative transportation requirements. Some members asked if there is a way to make the extremely expensive traffic analyses standards more flexible, and based on principles rather than standards. Some members would like to intensify center developments with the TPR changes.

Some members also discussed the concern of effective local government in relation to new transportation developments. The impacts of these changes are extremely different from jurisdiction to jurisdiction; members encouraged each jurisdiction's transportation planners to review the amendments closely. It will most likely be several years before another opportunity to make amendments to the TPR occurs. It is important to focus on the large changes now. Now is a good time to ask questions as Salem looks to this region as a sort of laboratory as to how to address traffic issues.

Some members inquired if concurrence between the OHP and the TPR are required. Staff responded that it is not, each is a free-standing document. Despite the lack of need for concurrence, some members would like to encourage concurrence to facilitate greater cooperation to achieve results. Members expressed a need to make sure that standards are flexibly enforced and accurately measured.

Some members would like TPR to move ahead, and to include Business Oregon to create confidence in these changes. The group expressed that these concerns would be appropriate to include in the letter to the Commissions.

Mr. Kloster agreed with the group that he will include both a staff recommendation and a draft letter to the Commissions in the next MPAC packet. Members also would like some materials that focus on issues that are not currently in the letter that currently do not have consensus, but may be of importance to certain jurisdictions.

7. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Lehan adjourned the meeting at 6:59pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Atwater
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR 010/26/11:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
4.0	Flyer	10/26/11	Dr. Lawrence Frank Presentation	102611m-01
4.0	Booklet	10/26/11	Fall 2011 Metro GreenScene	102611m-02
4.0	Booklet	10/26/11	Regional Transportation Plan, Local Transportation System Plans	102611m-03
6.1	Presentation	10/26/11	Greater Portland Pulse, Moving Beyond Startup	102611m-04
6.1	Report	10/26/11	Greater Portland Pulse 'The Path to Economic Prosperity'	102611m-05
6.2	Presentation	10/26/11	Transportation Planning Rule and Oregon Highway Plan Amendments	102611m-06