

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF REQUESTING AN)	RESOLUTION NO. 89-1106
EXTENSION FOR THE COMPLETION OF)	
METRO'S PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE)	INTRODUCED BY THE
URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY)	EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WHEREAS, on December 22, 1988, the Council of the Metropolitan Service District approved Resolution No. 88-1021, which established a process for engaging in the periodic review of Metro's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), consistent with state law; and

WHEREAS, a major task for periodic review is to rewrite and revise Metro's procedures and criteria for making amendments to the UGB; and

WHEREAS, The Council of the Metropolitan Service District did anticipate completing its periodic review of the UGB by the end of December, 1989; and

WHEREAS, concurrent with periodic review, Metro intended to also complete an Urban Growth Management Plan which would provide, among other things, a policy framework to be used as part of the procedure for considering petitions to amend the UGB; and

WHEREAS, with the passage of Resolution Number 89-1049, the Metro Council created policy and technical advisory committees for the development of the Urban Growth Management Plan and to serve as advisors during the periodic review of the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee for the Urban Growth Management Plan (UGMP) did recommend to the Policy Advisory Committee for the UGMP that it encourage Metro to seek an extension for periodic review to the end of the UGMP process so that the


rewritten and revised procedures and standards could be based on the UGMP policy framework; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Advisory Committee for the UGMP has unanimously recommended to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District that it seek an extension of periodic review, consistent with the findings of the Technical Advisory Committee for the UGMP; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

- 1) That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District does hereby endorse the process for completing the Urban Growth Management Plan developed by the Policy and Technical Advisory Committees (exhibit A, attached); and
- 2) That the Council requests the Executive Officer of the Metropolitan Service District to seek an extension for the periodic review of the Urban Growth Boundary so that the Urban Growth Management Plan, due to be completed in June of 1990, can be used as the basis for the revised and rewritten procedures and standards to be included in the Final Periodic Review Order.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 27th day of July, 1989.



Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer

ES/es
6/12/89

SUMMER	OCTOBER - NOVEMBER	DECEMBER - JANUARY	JANUARY - FEBRUARY
<p>REGIONAL GROWTH DATA BASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Literature Search o Regional Forecast o Local Comp Plans + Periodic Review Orders o State Goals o Metro Functional Plans o Existing Management System + Roles (Statutory + Existing) o Historic Development Dynamics o Begin Thematic Study of Region o Environmental Quality o Other Goal Statements 	<p>SCOPING SESSIONS:</p> <p>To identify and refine regional growth opportunities and concerns, and to identify issues relating to the existing management system. Meetings With:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CPO's + NA's - Business + Civic Groups - Metro Mayors + Managers - County Commissioners - School Districts - Planners + Agency Staff - Environmental Organizations - Others... 	<p>REGIONAL GROWTH CONFERENCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Inspiration o Present Thematic Study o Identify and Refine Regional Growth Opportunities/Concerns o Discuss Existing Management System and Roles...Strengths and Weaknesses 	<p>REGIONAL GROWTH VISION:</p> <p>To Provide Structure/Outline for UGMP. To Include Definition of Roles According to Implementation Objectives.</p>
<p>PRODUCT: First cut regional growth opportunities and concerns; description of existing management system + roles (State, Metro, County, City, Special Districts).</p>	<p>PRODUCT: Revised Growth Opportunities and Concerns to be used as basis for Conference.</p>	<p>OPINION SURVEY:</p> <p>To test results of issue identification process up through Regional Growth Conference</p>	<p>PRODUCT: A vision of the future growth of the urban region to be used as the basis for developing specific policies.</p>
<p>PAC ROLE: Review and Discuss.</p>	<p>PAC ROLE: Identify Groups, Convene Meetings, Review Meeting Format.</p>	<p>PRODUCT: Revised growth opportunities and concerns and management system analysis tested via statistically valid opinion survey.</p>	<p>PAC ROLE: Develop Vision Statements and Broad Implementation Objectives. Define Roles.</p>
<p>TAC ROLE: Data Synthesis.</p>	<p>TAC ROLE: Identify Groups, Review Format, Convene Meetings.</p>	<p>TAC ROLE: Conference planning, identification of growth opportunities and concerns, survey design review.</p>	<p>TAC ROLE: Assist in Initial Synthesis of Regional Growth Opportunities and Concerns Into Vision Statements. Summarize Findings on Existing Management System and Roles.</p>

FEBRUARY -

REGIONAL GROWTH POLICIES:

PAC Develops:

- o "Regional Concept"
- o Policies to Implement Metro's Regional Growth Vision Responsibilities
- o Any Necessary Metro Code Amendments
- o Overall UGMP Implementation, Monitoring, and Update Processes

PAC ROLE: Discuss and Develop Regional Concept, Policy Framework, Overall UGMP Implementation Principles.

TAC ROLE: Support PAC Activities Through Presentation of Initial Approach, Draft Code Language, Etc.

- JUNE

PAC RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL AND FORMAL COUNCIL ACTION

PAC ROLE: Develop Final Report and Recommendations.

TAC ROLE: Support PAC.

ONGOING

IMPLEMENTATION

- o Local Plan Consistency
- o Special Studies
- o Monitoring + Evaluation

PAC ROLE: Monitor + Review Performance; Identify Special Studies.

TAC ROLE: Assist PAC; Identify and Design Special Studies.

STAFF REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 89-1106: FOR THE PURPOSE OF REQUESTING AN EXTENSION FOR THE COMPLETION OF METRO'S PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

Date: June 12, 1989

Presented By: Carson/Lee/Seltzer

BACKGROUND

A major product of Metro's periodic review of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) will be revised and new procedures and standards for considering petitions to amend the boundary. Currently, the Metro Code contains no procedures for major amendments, and no process for periodic review and potential legislative amendments of the UGB. Furthermore, the standards that must be met by a petitioner lack clarity and specificity, and do not express any regional concerns or policy regarding Metro's management of the urban land supply.

The Urban Growth Management Plan was conceived in large part as a way to establish the underlying policy framework needed to revise and in some cases create clear and objective standards and procedures for UGB management. The Technical Advisory Committee developed a proposal for structuring the planning process that would be both participatory and exciting (see attached chart). That process would extend 6 months beyond the present completion date for Periodic Review to June of 1990.

The Technical Advisory Committee also recommended that Metro seek an extension for periodic review in order to make the periodic review and Urban Growth Management Plan processes coincide. If periodic review ends in December of 1989, as scheduled, then the products of periodic review will not benefit from the Urban Growth Management Plan process or the exposure afforded by that process. Since code revisions are one of two major periodic review tasks, it wouldn't make sense to revise the code, then develop the policy, and finally revise the code again.

In addition, periodic review is intended to be a chance to engage in an evaluation and discussion of policy issues, exactly the focus for the Urban Growth Management Plan. If the code is revised following the completion of the Urban Growth Management Plan but during periodic review, then the process remains legislative from start to finish and Metro's dialogue is with LCDC. If, on the other hand, amendments to the code are made after periodic review, then those amendments would be governed by post-acknowledgement procedures. Any "dialogue" with the state would only occur as an appeal to LUBA.

The Policy Advisory Committee modified and then adopted the process for the Plan put forth by the Technical Advisory Committee.

It discussed the recommendation to extend periodic review and unanimously moved to recommend that the Metro Council seek an extension for its periodic review of the UGB to bring it in line with the UGMP process as suggested by the Technical Advisory Committee. A letter distributed at the Policy Advisory Committee meeting on June 7, 1989, from the Regional Representative of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (attached), suggests that a request for an extension under these circumstances would be supported.

RECOMMENDATION

Extending periodic review is not to be taken lightly. Periodic review for the UGB is a relatively narrow process, and all indications are that Metro could conclude its review on time. In addition, the basic data underlying Metro's land supply findings in its draft periodic review order, and the basic structure of the proposed code revisions are unlikely to change substantially between the scheduled date for completion and the extended date.

From procedural and policy perspectives, the reasoning of the Policy and Technical Advisory Committees is sound, and should lead to the development of better policy in a legislative rather than judicial process. The Urban Growth Management Plan is not required as part of periodic review, but it will vastly improve Metro's ability to manage the region's urban land supply and Metro's ongoing management of the UGB.

The UGMP process will help to raise the visibility of urban growth issues and processes in the region, and in so doing will lead to a better and more credible product. Hence, linking periodic review to the conclusion of the UGMP process is a natural extension of the policymaking envisioned earlier by Metro when it proposed the UGMP, and should lead to a better product capable of serving the region further into the future.

Therefore, this resolution should be supported, and an extension should be sought for periodic review linked to the completion of the UGMP in June of 1990.

ES/es
6/12/89

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
COMMITTEE REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 89-1106, FOR THE PURPOSE OF REQUESTING AN
EXTENSION FOR THE COMPLETION OF METRO'S PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE
URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

Date: June 22, 1989

Presented by: Councilor Gardner

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: At the June 20, 1989 Intergovernmental Relations Committee meeting, members present -- Councilors Bauer, DeJardin, Devlin and myself -- voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 89-1106. Councilor Collier was absent.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES: Planning & Development Director Rich Carson and Regional Planning Supervisor Pat Lee presented the resolution and staff report (attached). The following points were highlighted supporting a six month extension of Periodic Review until June, 1990:

1. Completion of the Urban Growth Management Plan, which will provide a policy framework for amending Metro's procedures and criteria for making amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary, is targeted for June, 1990.
2. One of two major tasks of Metro's Periodic Review is to rewrite and revise procedures and criteria for making and assessing UGB amendments.
3. If Periodic Review ends in December 1989, as scheduled, then the Periodic Review products will not benefit from the Urban Growth Management Plan process or policy recommendations.
4. A time extension consistent with the Urban Growth Management Plan completion ensures that UGB procedures revisions to the Metro Code happen legislatively, through the Metro Council. However, if Periodic Review ends in December but Code amendments are desired later, then those amendments would be governed by "post-acknowledgement" procedures, i.e. an appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals/LUBA.

It was noted the local Land Use Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) representative, who participates on Metro's UGB Technical Advisory Committee, believes the extension request will be approved based on the above points. Both the UGB Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Advisory Committee recommended Council approval of the extension request.

DISK:NEWJPM
a:\891106.CR
6-22-89