

Council Retreat May 26, 2004

Attendees: Dick Benner, David Bragdon, Rex Burkholder, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Michael Jordan, Kate Marx, Susan McLain, Rod Monroe, Lydia Neill, Brian Newman, Rod Park, Bill Stringer, Randy Tucker, Mike Wetter and consultants

Minutes taken by Kim Bardes.

Mike Wetter introduced the consultants, reviewed the “scope” of what the Councilors want to do and the reasons for doing the “Big Look.”

Agenda item #3: Mike Wetter asked the councilors to discuss what the “Big Look” meant to them.

Rex Burkholder: Metro is a unique government and can contribute to improving the quality of life and living within the community.

Susan McLain: Wants to see Metro attain the vision that the Council identifies and be leaders in the region.

Rod Monroe: Wants to ensure that Metro continues to project 30-50 years into the future along with the short term planning. He said Metro should make the region a good place for people to live now and for our grandchildren.

David Bragdon: Wants to see the “Big Look” process become a tool/exercise for good change and prevention of degradation in the quality of life for the region.

Rod Park: Wants to see Metro do the best job in the nation of serving urban as well as agricultural communities in the region.

Agenda item #4, #5 and #6: Mike Wetter asked the councilors to discuss their goals, and any concerns that they may have about the “Big Look” process, and the issues that they would like to see addressed. He made lists pertaining to Data, Problems, Solutions, and Concerns.

Susan McLain:

- Improved communication between Metro and cities
- Scope both inside the boundary and outside the boundary for
 - Communication
 - Cooperation
 - Work load
 - Action/reaction
- List goals and include opportunities for leadership (Goals list)
- Find ways to help people understand trade-offs of planning

- Metro/Council should revisit vision and revision
- Cautioned that neighboring cities did not necessarily want to absorb growth from City of Portland, but did want to have “healthy centers”

Brian Newman:

- Focus on support planning for new urban areas (Issues list)
- Coordinate process planning with state (Goal list)
- Need to revision off of strong base that is already in place
- Look at growth concept in relation to neighboring cities

Rex Burkholder:

- Consider all three types of boundaries (UGB, Jurisdictional, MPO)
- Be open to governance structure for Metro and other governments (Port, TriMet, etc.)
- Educate public on long-range potentials and trends so that they can see what can be done to achieve communities with equity, economy, and sustainability factors
- Provide a base of understanding on issues so that people understand the choices that they face
- Make sure that not only citizens understand trade-offs of planning, but that Metro staff and Councilors also understand those trade-offs
- Metro would have to work with jurisdictions to create regional vision of future growth
- Each time they add land – does the 2040 vision still get met in terms of redevelopment?
- Why do normal market demands seem to be at odds with what is actually taking place in the community? Has expanding the UGB been hurting that effort? Why doesn't the market supply for the obvious demand? What does it take to make that happen?

David Bragdon:

- Change growth patterns and resulting trajectory of growth from 50's to present (Goals list)
- Create organization to deliver product
- Define culture/character of agency via Metro's institutional powers
- Cultivate region through management, training, talent
- Include issues such as social equity, economic development
- Expand outside institutional parameters
- Outreach through “Let's Talk” type efforts

Rod Monroe:

- Include schools
- Find better ways to utilize existing housing and stock, not continue pushing housing into regional sprawl

Rod Park:

- Find way for people of the region to communicate what they like on a process or plan for the future and not just what they don't like
- ODOT could take lead on travel patterns in region and Metro would partner with them on this type of work

Mike Jordan:

- Revision with a mix of new vision for future endeavors
- It has been proven that growth cannot be contained within one boundary, so they needed to keep in mind that a new growth concept was emerging and would affect any projections or future processes
- They need to determine what leadership role they will have as a council in the region (might not be what they expect)

Andy Cotugno:

- All issues come back to middle: find redevelopment possibilities, question if they are creating pockets of wealth and pockets of poverty
- What influence on gentrification, poverty and centers does Metro wield, want to wield, could possibly wield?
- The big issues and discussions need to take place for the middle, not just the edges of the region

Conclusions:

- Assess how Metro is doing inside the boundary
- How successful has the 2040 vision been thus far?
- What tools do we need to achieve the 2040 vision?
- Do we need to use what we have to better effect?
- Reassess progress
- What is the Council as a whole interested in doing for the region in the future?

Agenda item #7, and #9: Priorities were identified through discussion and a “dot” vote. Main points and priorities from discussion:

- Subregional
- Urban and rural planning where and when they have a future
- Relationships between cities, counties, partners: they are extremely important to the process
- “Big Look” inside
- Transportation finance and equity among jurisdictions
- Urban reserves with hard boundaries

- Make better use of centers and create new centers
- Invest in centers and redevelopment
- Government structure control/guidance of how cities, counties and jurisdictions invest funds in order to change growth patterns and contain sprawl
- Living for less money, energy and time
- Education and engagement of community
- End expansion

Agenda item #10: How do we free the agency from the ongoing process of periodic review long enough to work on the “Big Look?”

Discussion centered on whether the LCDC has the authority to grant a two-year extension on periodic review. The next capacity analysis was due in 2007. If a capacity analysis was done for 2007 as soon as possible and an extension was granted, would they be able to work productively on the “Big Look?” The Council members agreed that the first step was to have a discussion with LCDC and then from that determine what they would need as resources to accomplish the capacity analysis and then start work on the “Big Look.” They agreed that they would also need to ascertain what the process would be for planning the “Big Look” work.

Agenda item #11: Mike Wetter listed out Data, Problems, Solutions and Concerns on flip charts and listed those items accordingly.

Data

- Not enough staff resources to do both the UGB and Big Look
- The periodic review process is due sooner than 5 years because the clock has already started
- LCDC has already expressed interest in talking with Metro.

Problems/Concerns

- Politically can’t get out of the 2007 deadline for periodic review
- Without the subregional process, growth can spill over to those jurisdictions that do not want it
- The existing system may, if it continues along the current course, destroy itself
- Politically cannot add housing now
- Need to immediately engage the LCDC commission and determine what their particular issues are/would be
- Need to figure out a way to engage citizens in the Big Look vision rather than just focus on analysis and expansion
- Can Metro get funding from the state?
- Perhaps Metro should focus on a long term timeline that would encompass bigger expansion, instead of smaller expansions more frequently
- How would citizens react (vs. MPAC) to getting notice just a few months after closing this round?

- Regional players would need to be on board with Metro to make the “Big Look” work
- Would not be able to use subregional as an option outside the hierarchy
- Need to have Council/LCDC discussion about all of these factors
- Many are just learning how to make good use of existing land within the UGB
- Need to address the question of why grow at all?

Solutions

- Address housing now (20 year land supply – 2709)
- Change law to either get the clock restarted, or change the cycle length
- They need to put in for an extension from LCDC immediately, do the capacity assessment by December 2007, or even start the analysis right now
- Get the state to pay for both as they are done simultaneously
- Approach LCDC as the first step
- Plan for future growth within UGB