

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Thursday, January 22, 2004  
Portland State University  
Urban Center Room 710

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Brian Newman, Rod Monroe, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park

Councilors Absent: Rex Burkholder (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Council Worksession at 2:10 p.m.

### 1. FUTURE VISION PROJECT

Council President Bragdon introduced the Future Vision topic. He said this was the chance to talk about the big picture. Why were we here in the first place? What did we want the region to look like in the long run.

Dick Benner, Long Range Planning Director, talked about how were we doing. Was the region becoming the place we set out to create? Based on current trends, where were we headed? Where did we stand in creating the vision laid out in the 2040 Plan? He passed out copies of the 2040 fundamentals (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He spoke to the Vision/Core Values and the 2040 Fundamental Values. Those who wrote these said they expected these values to be a guide. He noted some specific visions such as vibrant cities, culture of opportunity, etc. He talked about vision versus values (details are included in the Vision/Core Values document). He then detailed the 2040 Fundamentals. This set of statements was not in the Future Vision but more an effort to develop performance measures. He then spoke to the 2040 Growth Concept, which was an effort to convert those 2040 Fundamentals to an integrated set of concepts. He went over those concepts, which included preserving access to nature, mixed-use urban centers, etc. He spoke to how the concepts have been achieved through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) Titles, etc.

He noted that these values and visions were expressed through a map including centers, corridors, employment areas, industrial areas, etc. If there was something in the growth concept that Council wanted to accomplish, it had to be in a Functional Plan or in a concept plan or regional framework plan.

He talked about how we were doing in the Future Vision. Were we getting to Future Vision? They also needed to check against fundamentals, performance measures and other measures. He suggested remembering what the base case looked like which drove the plan. He talked about our growth versus other communities' growth. He spoke to our successes in keeping the boundary tight. He talked about increasing density but people were hardly noticing it because the density had been accommodated in centers, main streets and corridors. He noted that the Portland area had 30% less retail space and yet it generated 30% more retail sales than other areas. He felt it was a very efficient region concerning retail. He talked about retail recycling as part of the growth strategy. He noted that there was no new big boxes retail in industrial areas since adoption of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. He detailed other success such as access to nature and multi-modal transportation system. He then spoke to where things had been

disappointing such as sense of place/separation, vibrant cities – centers were growing slower than expected, economy, affordable housing, and closeness to nature.

He talked about why were we not doing better in areas of disappointing performances? Some areas hadn't been implemented yet or implementation had yielded disappointing results.

He asked what did we want to do to address some of these issues? The first question was: Do we still want to implement the vision? Was it the same vision that they wanted to carry forward that had been developed in the early 90s?

Councilor McLain said she felt Mr. Benner had identified well successes and disappointments. She spoke to things that they knew. She then spoke to the Future Vision map and noted that there were individuals that had been involved in creating this map both inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Was this the vision that we still wanted to carry out? The dialogue may not change as much as the tools and strategies as to how we get there.

Councilor Newman asked when the map was created. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, indicated that Future Vision was adopted in 1995 so that was when the map was created.

Mike Wetter, Senior Policy Advisor, asked Lydia Neill, Planning Department, to introduce the maps. Ms. Neill spoke to the maps. Mr. Wetter spoke to the two rules for this conversation; they needed to stay big picture and cover the spectrum of issues. He then began by leading the discussion concerning identified issues, or other issues raised by the context presentation. He noted seven issues that Council had brought up previously. He said Councilor Burkholder was absent but had written out some of his transportation issues.

Councilor McLain talked about core values being a good place to connect. This was where you got people excited. She suggested keeping citizen's vision on the big picture as well.

Councilor Park talked about how we were doing now. He said a lot of things in his district were going well. His biggest concern was what was happening outside of the region. The traffic studies were showing something we didn't want to happen which was people were commuting from satellite and neighboring cities. He asked, was it OK that we had 75% capture rate in job and 68% housing capture rate? Councilor McLain said the issue was do we have enough tools. She noted benefits and issues. Ms. Neill asked, were some of these issues generated by small communities? Councilor Newman said what he wanted to talk about was the UGB hell, the periodic review cycle. He wanted to talk about beyond these five-year cycle, what their constituents wanted? The challenges were beyond our boundaries. What was the cumulative effect of these five-year decisions? He wasn't sure things were going that well. He was still seeing some erosion. He said the citizens were sold a bill of goods in the 2040 Growth Concept. He gave examples of this vision. He felt we were lacking in implementation. He felt we had a lot of work to do.

Mr. Wetter summarized that they needed to take into account the values of communities outside the boundary. Councilor Newman said he wanted to know where did we want to grow and where do we not want to grow? He talked about the details of inside the region.

Council President Bragdon said they were talking about implementation, going from theory to implementation. He said there was a question about Measure 5. A lot of this was really about investment, both private and public. Having more of a focus on investment was where the action was. He then spoke to tools such as regulation. Regulation didn't insure that good things happened. Some of the measures weren't quantitative. He gave examples of this such as Bethany

versus Laurelhurst. The action that Council took was relative to the results that happened in the world. Even if the Metro Council were to adopt a functional plan for parks, that alone would not enable local governments to increase spending if they don't have the resources.

Councilor Hosticka said he was concerned about irreversible actions such as not creating parks. Councilor Monroe talked about studying transportation and what they knew. He talked about the attempt to try and build a transit network with very limited resources. He spoke to air quality conformity and the assumption that they would continue to build a transit network. We had to figure out a way to keep building this network. We couldn't give up and quit doing what we were doing.

Councilor McLain added that the reason that the core values were so important was that this was where you got the energy to go forward. When you go back to the core values, people got excited about doing the hard work again. You needed to find the vehicle to get that excitement back. She gave an example of the urban reserves. She said the Transit Orient Development (TOD) program was an example of another success story. We needed to show results such as the 8000 parks acres. Mr. Wetter asked if there was a need to reassess the core values? Councilor Hosticka said he didn't think people's values had changed but their willingness to pay the cost to implement the values had changed. Councilor Monroe said he felt public opinion was leaning toward Metro. He talked about light rail and the lack of initial support. Public opinion was moving in our direction but we must continue to have successes.

Councilor Park said the satellite cities had economic issues. The things that they were trying to accomplish would occur but at a lesser degree. He said all of the costs were not being identified. Councilor Hosticka suggested discussing the question of satellite cities. He suggested linking these with transportation infrastructure. We needed to create the tools to address these issues. He suggested Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) or some mechanism for a conversation to interface with satellite cities. He also thought that land prices were too cheap outside the UGB. The only way they could make land prices higher was to keep a tight boundary.

Councilor McLain said how we treat our boundary and how the satellite cities treat their boundary needed to connect. The cities had to relate to Metro's policies. Inside and outside the UGB policies affected each entity. She spoke to the need for coordination.

Councilor Newman talked about an alignment of interest, separation of communities, and transportation infrastructure. He felt it was all about what was going on in the north Willamette Valley and how the neighboring cities were growing. Councilor McLain said we had to continue a strategy of eliminating the them and us. She suggested a worksession on what had succeeded before we were trying a big effort. What could we do that would be successful? They needed to do this at the front end. Council President Bragdon said he felt that you needed to get other institutions to think beyond their own turf. Councilor McLain said one example was the green corridors. This was what the neighboring cities cared about. This was an area of commonality. She suggested figuring out some themes such as green corridors. Council President Bragdon said violating an agreement was easier to do than to violate a mutually shared value. You must appeal to something larger. Councilor McLain suggested coordination was key to the neighboring cities.

Mr. Jordan talked about the notion of neighboring cities. The easiest part of this was agreeing about the values. He said Sandy was trying hard to do 2040. He felt it would be easy to find common value. It wasn't what, it was how. Fiscal capacity was a big issue. The piece that was hard for Metro was having this be someone else's idea. It must be everyone idea that this was important to do. If it was not, then we had to regroup. You also needed to think about what a

neighboring city was. The definition may have changed over time. He felt the Council was headed in the right direction. Talking about how to get there was the issue.

Councilor Hosticka said there was also still separation within the UGB as well, such as, Sherwood. Were they conceptually different? Councilor McLain reiterated Mr. Jordan's comment; it must be everybody's idea. You had to get together in a cooperative collaborative fashion. She noted the early implementation of the Functional Plan as an example of this process and success.

Councilor Park suggested having it be neighboring cities idea.

Mr. Wetter asked about balancing nature areas and agriculture. Had they covered this? Ms. Neill asked where they go, where do they grow? Councilor Hosticka said we have done all of the expansion we can do so expansion will be occurring in those neighboring communities. Mr. Cooper said there were three alternatives, up, out or centers. Councilor McLain said when you re-look at the tools and strategies, you will get a group that says we need to expand. Mr. Jordan said this notion of rural reserves and separation leads the discussion. There was growth pressure on small communities. This was why this was an interactive discussion. The small communities will at some point need to grow. Councilor Park said the model to hold the UGB was there. Mary Weber, Planning Department, said in a satellite city, holding the boundary didn't function well. Councilor Park talked about the Metroscope. Councilor McLain suggested having neighboring cities come show Metro their growth plans and talk about mutual implications. Councilor Monroe talked about Goal 5 and its implications and impacts. It magnified the issue of density versus expansion.

Councilor Park asked if there was an agreement that this conceptually was bigger than Metro. Council all agreed. They needed to figure out a strategy for involvement of these communities. Mr. Wetter said Metro's job was moving from regulatory to investment. Councilor Hosticka said it was between regulatory and investment. He thought the problem was that the full cost of development was not reflected in the market. As long as that was the case you were going to get a lot of distortions. How did we get money in order to invest when we had these distortions? This was a big problem. How will we get the money to invest? Through a tax that subsidizes growth?

Councilor McLain said we might have differing degrees of investment. She spoke to Metro's role. Ms. Neill said Councilor Hosticka was talking about a paradigm shift. This might change people's thinking. Councilor Hosticka said it was whom you talked to. Councilor Park asked how he would classify farmland. Mr. Wetter talked about Councilor Burkholder's question about single person automobile not lasting. Was it time to take this into account? Councilor Newman said they were already taking this into account. He thought it was more the question of investment. People liked the projects but didn't want to pay for the projects. Councilor Monroe said we needed a national campaign so that federal funding for transit was equal to other types of transportation funding. Councilor McLain said there was still debate about the number of lanes. Did we go there? She suggested a meeting with Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) to strategize. Mr. Wetter asked if there was need for a shift on this issue. Council President Bragdon said the money needed to follow the policy. Was government going to continue to subsidize? Council President Bragdon added legislative agenda under the issues bin.

Mike Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, talked about where we go from here. What follow up should be taken in response to today's discussion? What were the next steps? He suggested that the staff and Mr. Cotugno had thought through some of the logistical issues. He wanted to have the conversation with staff and bring their ideas back. He suggested having a meeting on the

“HOW”. How, in a sense of the posture that Metro would take. He suggesting having staff take a look, review what staff had looked at and then have Council talk about their role and their philosophy of how to approach this as Metro. Councilor McLain suggested, when staff had their conversation, see how staff would project showing that Metro was an integral part. Councilor Newman asked about the Willamette Valley planning project. Mr. Jordan said he said there were some reports he could bring to Council.

**2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

**3. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

There were none.

**4. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

There were none.

**5. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 22,**  
**2004**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda Detail	1/22/04	To: Metro Council From: Mike Wetter, Senior Policy Advisor Re: "Big Look"	012204c-01
1	Discussion questions	1/22/04	To: Metro Council From: Mike Wetter, Senior Policy Advisor Re: "Big Look" Discussion Questions	012204c-02
1	Values, concepts and fundamentals	1/22/04	To: Metro Council From: Dick Benner, Long Range Planning Director Re: Vision/Core Values, 2040 Growth Concept summaries	012204c-03
1	2040 Fundamental Values	1/22/04	To: Metro Council From: Dick Benner, Long Range Planning Director Re: 2040 Fundamental Values	012204c-04
1	Memo	1/22/04	To: Mike Wetter and Metro Council From: Councilor Burkholder Re: Agenda and Questions for "Big Look"	012204c-05
1	Map	1995	To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Planning Department Re: Future Vision Map, the Geographic Context	012204c-06