



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 11, 2012

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jody Carson, 2nd Vice Chair
Dennis Doyle
Andy Duyck
Maxine Fitzpatrick
Bob Grover
Kathryn Harrington
Jack Hoffman
Carl Hosticka
Annette Mattson
Keith Mays
Marilyn McWilliams
Doug Neeley
Wilda Parks
Barbara Roberts
Loretta Smith, Vice Chair
Norm Thomas
Bill Turlay
William Wild
Jerry Willey, Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Sam Adams
Shane Bemis
Steve Clark
Michael Demagalski
Amanda Fritz
Charlotte Lehan
Jim Rue
Steve Stuart

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Karylenn Echols

STAFF:

Jessica Atwater, Nick Christensen, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Kim Ellis, Alison Kean-Campbell, Nuin-Tara Key, Tom Kloster, Robin McArthur, Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Ted Reid, Sherry Oeser, Nikolai Ursin, and John Williams.

AFFILIATION

City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Washington County Commission
Multnomah County Citizen
Washington County Citizen
Metro Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Metro Council
Governing Body of School Districts
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Washington County Special Districts
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Clackamas County Citizen
Metro Council
Multnomah County Commission
City of Troutdale, representing other cities in Multnomah Co.
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County Special Districts
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City

AFFILIATION

City of Portland Council
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
TriMet Board of Directors
City of North Plains, representing Washington Co. outside UGB
City of Portland Council
Clackamas County Commission
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Clark County, Washington Commission

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Jerry Willey declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m.

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

All attendees introduced themselves. New members, Ms. Maxine Fitzpatrick and Mr. Bob Grover gave a more detailed introduction of themselves.

Mayor Willey encouraged MPAC members to review the MPAC tentative agendas, and note planned times for tours.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Hosticka updated the group on the following items:

- There will be a public hearing on the revised Land Use Final Order (LUFO) on the Columbia River Crossing (CRC). The Land Use Board of Appeals and the Supreme Court found error with the fact that Metro cannot approve the project beyond the Urban Growth Boundary. The public hearing and Council vote to address this issue will take place on April 12, 2012.
- Metro Chief Operating Officer, Martha Bennett, will present the 2012-2013 fiscal year budget on April 19, 2012. There will be a public hearing on April 26, 2012, at which the Metro Council is scheduled to vote to transmit the budget to the Multnomah County Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC). On June 14, 2012 the Council will consider any amendments to the budget; final adoption is scheduled for June 21, 2012. **NOTE: The submission of Metro's budget to Multnomah County TSCC will actually take place on May 3, 2012.**
- Metro recently purchased two new natural areas in the Western Washington County Area; the Killin Wetlands and Wapato Lake Natural Area.
- Packy's 50th birthday celebration is this Saturday, April 14th. Please join Metro in the celebration. There will be free birthday cake; Packy will receive his birthday cake at 2pm.
- Metro is honored to host Circ du Solei at the Expo Center. The show will run until May 20, 2012. Please consider taking the Max if you attend.
- In lieu of the April 25th MPAC meeting, Metro has invited Dr. Michael Freedman, an internationally renowned urban designer, to speak at Metro on April 19th. Please consider attending, he will be speaking on remaking strip commercial corridors and transforming business parks in the context of community design and urban innovation for a knowledge economy.

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

- **The February 22, 2012 MPAC Minutes**
- **2012 MTAC Membership Nominations**

MOTION: Mayor Pete Truax moved, Ms. Marilyn McWilliams seconded to adopt the February 22, 2012 minutes with corrections. Chair Willey postponed the 2012 MTAC Membership Nomination until May 9, 2012.

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

6.0 INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING/AFFORDABLE LIVING

Mr. Ted Reid of Metro introduced Metro's affordable housing inventory project. He explained that Metro would like to consider affordable housing as Metro works on related projects. The Metro code requires that Metro complete an affordable housing inventory, though Metro is not currently developing any new policies surrounding affordable housing. Affordable housing policies are implemented by external agencies.

Mr. Reid introduced partners in the affordable housing project, Mr. Steve Rudman of Home Forward, Mr. Val Valfre of Washington County, and Mr. Trell Anderson Clackamas County. These three representatives from the affordable housing community discussed what agencies are doing to address affordable housing in the Metro region, and the challenges faced.

Mr. Steve Rudman, Home Forward (Formerly the Housing Authority of Portland)

The housing needs of the region outstrip the resources our region has. The region is experiencing one of the tightest rental markets in a long time; this is due in large part to a loss of income. Housing authorities are created by states, but the funding is provided by the federal government, and funding is decreasing. There are 4 housing authorities in the region, and they work together. Public housing and Section 8 (affordable housing vouchers) are the only type of affordable housing based on income. The federal subsidy based upon income operates on the premise that families should be spending 30% of income on rent. One can be rent burdened in affordable housing, but less so than if no assistance was provided, allowing households to save more money to spend on healthcare, food, and transportation. About 4500 of the units in Metro's inventory are public affordable housing, 1500 Section 8 affordable housing are not included in the inventory. There are about 15,000 Section 8 vouchers total. The last time the Section 8 waiting list was opened up in Multnomah County was 2006; thousands of families applied. While resources are scarce, the need is great. Affordable housing is an important issue to consider when thinking about the livability of the region.

Mr. Val Valfre, Housing Authority of Washington County

Mr. Valfre thanked the group for inviting them to speak, and said that the Metro affordable housing inventory will be a useful tool. In Washington County last year, 6,000 people joined the affordable housing wait list, and then the County had to close the waiting list. Forty-five percent of families in Washington County are rent burdened. Many families are forced to travel far outside the city to find housing they can afford, which adds transportation costs to their budget, jeopardizing the family's budget for food. Washington County is experiencing a large increase in population; many of these residents are elderly, and live on fixed incomes. These people will especially need access affordable housing. Washington County is learning to work across jurisdictions with other affordable housing authorities and nonprofit organizations, and together have provided over 200 new affordable housing units. These new units are going to house specific populations, veterans, the chronically

homeless, people with special needs, and people who make 30% less than the median income. Again, federal resources are declining while the need for affordable housing is increasing. The rate of foreclosures is also increasing the need for affordable housing. There are not enough housing councilors to meet the demands of the increased foreclosure rate. There are a lot of private home owners who are opting-out of the affordable housing rental contracts.

Mr. Trell Anderson, Housing Authority of Clackamas County

The housing authorities have taken the position that affordable housing should be considered as key infrastructure when developing community plans. Although that puts demand on already strained budgets, there are extremely few resources for housing authorities and nonprofits in affordable housing to maintain existing housing or create new housing. There are a number of tools available to policy makers to support affordable housing, though they are not always popular:

1. Tax abatement programs
2. Urban Renewal
3. Land use planning
4. Credit enhancements

Please contact your housing authority or affordable housing nonprofit to talk about how you can find opportunities or partner to include affordable housing in future projects. There are many opportunities for partnership in affordable housing, everybody must come together to support residents in the region.

Group Discussion Included

The group discussed the difference between regulated and unregulated housing is. Regulated affordable housing is that which is subsidized by the government and not provided by the private market; regulated affordable housing is included in Metro's inventory. Sites often have more than one unit, and can have unregulated and regulated units. In order to be in the inventory it must have at least one regulated unit. It was confirmed that housing authorities do work with Habitat for Humanity, that this housing is considered regulated, and it is included in Metro's inventory.

Commissioner Smith shared that tax abatement programs for affordable housing had not been a good tool for Multnomah County. The speakers shared that Clackamas County does not have tax abatement programs, though Washington County does. Washington County partners with Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue and Tigard-Tualatin school district. It has been a positive program in Washington County. Generally, layering the different sources and tools to fund affordable housing programs enables more complete funding of affordable housing.

Councilor Roberts inquired into the new City of Portland housing development geared to address the to the growing situation in which returning veterans find themselves without a home, and with special needs. Mr. Rudman responded that there are special voucher programs for very low income veterans, and homeless veterans, and that this program enjoys a lot of support from all sides. Mr. Valfre confirmed that Washington and Clackamas Counties also have this program; he noted that there is a need to focus on women veterans. Mr. Anderson also noted that there is no statewide coordinated program for veterans; housing authorities and providers are left to approach it ad hoc. The infrastructure to do it is there, but no one has made it a priority at this point.

Members inquired if community land trusts included in the inventory, and if it is known what the region's shortfalls are. Within the Metro affordable housing inventory, Metro intended to include

owner occupied properties through data from community development agencies that will show up in inventory. Creating the inventory, where the affordable housing is, can happen very quickly. Opportunity mapping tools have been developed in Washington and Clackamas County to facilitate a discussion about access in communities with affordable housing. There is a map for each indicator (e.g. schools, transit, etc...), and with the overlay of all the factors you can identify which areas have the greatest opportunities for people with low income. There is discussion of doing regional opportunity maps.

Members of the group asked the group to consider what MPAC's role in affordable housing should be. It is a matter of regional concern, as addressed in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 7. They asked that the group consider if there is a regional problem, or if they think there will be in the future, and what on what scale the solutions may be. One of Metro and MPAC's roles is promoting transit near housing. The affordable housing issue seems almost cyclical, often surfacing between Urban Growth Boundary cycles. Some members expressed that while there has been some regional mapping done, there is a need to address the location and needs of the areas where it exists and which areas may need it.

Some members questioned why Metro's affordable housing goals are voluntary when there is such a critical need, and expressed a desire for MPAC to look at something that has teeth, that goes beyond voluntary programs. They would like to consider how the region can consider this inventory. Investing in affordable housing is critical.

Mayor Willey recalled the MPAC Affordable Housing Subcommittee chaired by former Metro Councilor Robert Liberty, reminding the group that the conclusion of that group was to embrace a regional perspective. He asked the group to consider how MPAC can incentivize jurisdictions to take affordable housing on as a priority, without creating a mandate. Some members proposed creating another affordable housing MPAC work group that would work with Mr. Reid and then report back to the MPAC.

6.2 CLIMATE SMART COMMUNITIES SCENARIOS: SHAPING REGIONAL AND LOCAL CHOICES

Ms. Kim Ellis came to MPAC both to report on the latest updates on Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project (CSC), and also to ask for MPAC's support for the direction of Phase 2. When Ms. Ellis was last at MPAC, the findings report was being prepared to be transmitted to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). The report has been transmitted to ODOT, and CSC is moving in to Phase 2.

This next phase is about shaping local and regional choices. In the next year, CSC will be working with local jurisdictions, Metro's advisory committees, the technical work group, and other stakeholders to identify what local jurisdictions are planning for their communities, and how that links up with CSC and other regional programs, how to adjust the assumptions of the strategies that form the scenarios, and measurement of the six outcomes established in the framework, approved by MPAC and JPACT in June of 2011. The milestone for December 2012 is to reach regional agreement on 3 approaches to test further. These would be tested in winter 2013, so more refined alternatives can be considered in 2013 and 2014.

There will be two different tracks to achieve the December milestone. The first track focuses on understanding the building blocks of the scenarios, and the second focuses on developing a scorecard to evaluate the outcomes of the scenarios tested in 2013. The project is also proposing to look at the results of the Phase 1 scenarios at the district level and isolate the individual effectiveness of different strategies. Local governments can also identify new aspirations for their community to integrate into the discussion and shape the policy choices our region considers. For example, the SW Corridor will be having workshops this summer that will influence CSC in the SW Corridor plan area. Staff also proposes to develop case studies to document community ambitions in different parts of the region and illustrate the policies needed to achieve community ambitions. Recommendations from the Statewide Transportation Strategy will also be considered in this phase; the draft STS is anticipated to be released for public review in May. All of this work will lead to development of a range of scenario options to be considered and evaluated in 2013. It is proposed that the final preferred scenario will be selected at the end of 2014.

Ms. Ellis gave a presentation to update the group on CSC's recent progress.

In the local briefings that have occurred, Metro staff have identified some key challenges:

- Balancing community ambitions and regional approach
- Complexity remains a hurdle
- Economic realities dampening ambitions
- Broadening engagement to shape choices
- Building trust, partnerships and commitment

The project is intent on building an engagement strategy that focuses on both local elected officials and stakeholders. Building trust is most important. Metro is working hard to work with everyone to answer questions and address concerns. Phase 1 focused on understanding the region's choices, and Phase 2 focuses on shaping those choices. Specifically, Phase 2 will:

- Identify range of options for applying strategies
- Create a score card to evaluate options
- Define 2-3 scenario options to evaluate in detail

Next steps include:

- **Jan. – May:** Share findings with local elected officials and stakeholders
- **April – May:** Request JPACT, MPAC and Council support for Phase 2 activities
- **May:** Develop more detailed schedule of policy discussions and engagement activities
- **June:** MPAC, JPACT and Council kick-off policy options discussion

CSC will also be back to MPAC in December 2012 after the Scenarios decision milestone to make sure everyone is on the same page and comfortable to move forward.

CSC will present this approach to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation tomorrow, and the Metro Council in early May.

Over the next month, with MPAC's support, CSC staff will develop a more detailed policy discussion schedule for MPAC and a regional engagement schedule.

Ms. Ellis asked the group to consider:

- What are your community's ambitions and how can this work help you be successful?

- Will this approach provide you with the information needed to direct staff on scenario options to test?
- What additional information do you need?
- Do you support the overall approach?

Group Discussion Included

The group asked the Metro Council liaisons what they have learned from regional engagement. Councilor Harrington shared that she's learned understanding which choices may be underway or feel right for each local jurisdiction is very important. The approach of understanding, reviewing, and proceeding through the local level is vital, and has been reinforced at local engagements. Councilor Hosticka shared that he appreciated that Ms. Ellis outlined challenges early on; jurisdictions are trying to figure out what this information means to them. He would like to see more discussion on what jurisdictions want to do and is feasible to do. Councilor Harrington mentioned presenting a more refined breakdown, he would like communities to see this, and then discuss what actions are really appropriate for their communities. Members responded positively, saying they too would like to dialogue between their jurisdictions and Metro on what communities would like to achieve through this project. Some members said they would like to help staff narrow down the number of possible Scenarios, and that they are ready to bring energy to Phase 2.

Some members commented that through a Regional Mayors Meeting, some members gained a better understanding for the scenarios structure, and agreed that the more scenario options and flexibility in meeting the state goals available, the better.

One member expressed doubt for the science supporting global warming and the conclusion that it will lead to significant challenges to the region, and subsequently has doubt for the need for the CSC project. Councilor Harrington reminded the group that it is important to remember is that we all want healthy, vibrant communities. The region has moved passed discussing climate science, and is mandated by the state to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The region has been successful in reaching the 2010 GHG reductions milestone, and has another one to reach before 2020; this program will help the region achieve this mandate and strengthen our communities. There is a clearly defined program, and Metro asks MPAC for its partnership in moving forward with this program.

Some members expressed that while their staff is very comfortable answering their questions on CSC, there some concern as to what recourse of action is available if the region decides on a scenario that it cannot afford.

Some members expressed strong support for the district analysis approach.

Some members had mixed feelings about the CSC proposal; though they were encouraged by the fact that level 1 approaches, current policies, go a long way toward achieving the target reductions in GHG emissions.

Some members were glad to hear that local plans have been folded into the project.

Mayor Mays stated that level 2 approaches are not feasible for Sherwood in terms of roads and community design.

Mayor Hoffman shared that Lake Oswego is supportive of the CSC project approach, and that it is part of their comprehensive plan. Staff responded that comprehensive plans are being taken into account in CSC, and that jurisdictions' staff should work with Metro staff to coordinate these efforts.

Some members asked what would occur if the region came up with a plan that got close, but not all the way, to the target emissions reduction, either due to funding or willingness. Staff responded that that would call for a conversation with the legislature, but that it is very important to work as hard as possible to meet the state mandate of 1.2 CO₂e per capita. In this vein, some members noted that transit is only one source of GHG emissions reductions.

Members were encouraged by the fact that CSC gathering information from jurisdictions, as this process may be costly and rigorous.

There was general support to move forward, recognizing there remain many questions and concerns to be discussed and addressed as the process begins to narrow the range of policy options to be considered.

6.3 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN (METRO CODE CHAPTER 3.08)

Mr. John Mermin informed the group about upcoming amendments to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan was updated in December 2010 to streamline its compliance procedures. These amendments will synchronize the UGMFP and RTFP compliance procedures for extensions and exceptions, as well add a provision for exemptions. The Chief Operating Officer (COO) will be responsible for approving extensions, exceptions and exemptions. These decisions will still be appealable; this will expedite the process.

Staff described the input received from MTAC and TPAC thus far. At the last MTAC meeting, ODOT asked to be included on the list of agencies receiving notification after the COO receives an application for exemption, exception or extension. At the last TPAC meeting, TriMet suggested that exemptions should last for a specific duration of time. Staff has incorporated both suggestions into the draft legislation.

Staff will return to MPAC with the final legislation at the May 9th meeting, asking for a recommendation to the Metro Council for adoption at their May 17th meeting.

Group Discussion Included

Some members inquired how the determination of the expiration date for an exemption would be made. Staff responded that the COO would recommend an expiration date that aligns with the adoption of the next scheduled RTP update.

6.4 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REVIEW PROCESS PROPOSAL

Ms. Robin McArthur of Metro shared the materials provided by Ms. Patty Unfred of Metro describing the updates and revisions as to how Metro will be engaging the public. This item will come before the Metro Council in the near future. Members were asked to please provide feedback to Metro, specifically Ms. McArthur, in the next couple of weeks.


7.0 MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Willey adjourned the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Atwater
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR 04/11/12:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
NA	Agenda	04/10/12	Revised 4/11/12 MPAC Agenda	041112m-01
5.0	Minutes	NA	Revised 2/22/12 MPAC Minutes	041112m-02
5.0	Memo	04/09/12	MTAC Nominations	041112m-03
6.1	Memo	04/10/12	2011 Inventory of Regulated Affordable Housing Errata Sheet	041112m-04
6.1	Handout	NA	Citizen Testimony, Tom Cusack	041112m-05
6.2	Memo	04/05/12	Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Phase 2 - Supplemental Material	041112m-06
6.2	PPT	04/11/12	Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Phase 2 Approach	041112m-07
6.2	Handout	04/11/12	Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Local Government Engagement	041112m-08
6.3	Handout	04/11/12	2012 Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project - At-a-Glance Engagement Calendar	041112m-09