

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

July 14, 2004 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Charles Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Dave Fuller, Gene Grant, John Hartsock, Tom Hughes, Richard Kidd, Lisa Naito, Doug Neeley, Wilda Parks, Larry Smith, Ted Wheeler

Alternates Present: Larry Cooper,

Also Present: Beverly Bookin, CCA/CREEC; Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Cindy Catto, AGC; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Kay Durtchi, MTAC; Meg Fernekees, DLCD; Ed Gallagher, City of Gresham; Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver; Jerry Johnson, Johnson Fardner LLC; Stephen Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego; Irene Marvich, League of Women Voters; Laura Pryor, Judge – Gilliam County; Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic Alliance; Lainie Smith, ODOT; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present: Liaisons –David Bragdon, Council President; Susan McLain, Council District 4

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Sherry Oeser, Mary Weber

INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor Charles Becker, MPAC Chair, called the meeting to order 5:05 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Becker asked the members if, as there weren't a lot of agenda items on the docket, they would be interested in canceling the July 28th and August 28th meetings or would they rather cancel the two meetings in August? The committee agreed that they would hear the GMEL presentation on July 28th and cancel the two August meetings.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Dave Fuller gave an overview of a meeting that was held in Wood Village about Goal 5 and a man who clear-cut his property. The meeting was held because citizens were concerned about Goal 5 and what it meant for their community and properties.

Council President Bragdon said that they would have to address rumors head on and let the public know that there were a lot more outreach and public involvement opportunities to come, and that this process was a very long process, and it was a project that had already been on the table for two years.

Richard Kidd said that Forest Grove had a policy that citizens had to get a permit to cut a tree. However, the system was set up so that the permit was free, but a person from the city would go out to look at the tree and try to convince the citizen not to cut it down.

Dave Fuller said that there was wide interest and high attendance at the Wood Village meeting.

Gene Grant said that there were developers in his area trying to buy up land and clear some of it for development. He said that the only way to get people to stop clear cutting was to convince them that their rights were protected and also to address the taking rights issue.

Lisa Naito agreed with Gene Grant. She suggested that they put out some sort of assurance to the public. She admitted that if someone wanted to clear-cut their property then no amount of public outreach or education would necessarily stop them.

Dave Fuller said that when people clear cut lots they actually lessened the value of their property.

Lisa Naito said that sharing that type of information/education with the public might help.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for June 9, 2004.

Motion:	Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton, with a second from Richard Kidd, Mayor of Forest Grove, moved to adopt the consent agenda without revision.
Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Council President David Bragdon said that there wasn't much to report as things had quieted since the UGB decision had been made. He introduced Wilda Parks and Ted Wheeler as the new citizen representatives for Clackamas County and Multnomah County respectively. He said they would be hearing about the Beaverton Town Regional Center work shortly, and he told them about a Centers tour of Beaverton and Hillsboro, and he also said that there was another one coming up for Gresham.

6. BEAVERTON REGIONAL CENTER

Jerry Johnson gave a presentation on the Beaverton Regional Center project. Those slides are attached and form part of the record.

Tom Hughes said that the presentation touched on issues that Hillsboro had experienced. If they were to find funding, it would need to go into parking structures. They would also need to project how that would affect the rents of the area. He suggested that maybe as a group they could brainstorm on the parking structure hurdle and find ways to work with that and still achieve their goals.

Jerry Johnson said that parking was the biggest issue they had as a region when planning for center growth. It was especially difficult for the smaller communities. Once the parking issue was addressed then most of the problems for center growth would have been addressed. It was a large funding issue, and it was difficult for smaller cities to pick up the tab.

John Hartsock asked if the cost per square foot on structure parking was less than or greater than the adjacent dirt cost?

Jerry Johnson said that price ran about \$15,000 or \$20,000 per space. The current rule of thumb was \$35 or more for structured parking. Development looked at the residual. Rents were covering construction costs and what was left over was what they could afford to pay for parking. That was your land value, so if you changed your rent structure or sale price, your residual would turn around quickly and the land value would go from \$10 to \$35 very quickly. At the \$35 point, it would then make sense for them to build the structured parking.

Gene Grant said that parking for offices was not the be all or end all – he said that you could not put up parking structures and expect to fill commercial office space. The high-rise office buildings were located on the freeway interchanges.

Jerry Johnson said that there were areas that were stronger as a location for a structure for office buildings. He said that primary locations would have a lot of capacity, but secondary locations may take some time to build up. He said that Beaverton was centrally located but those businesses on the periphery would have a harder time developing the rent curve enough to get the funding to build a parking structure.

Gene Grant said that if they had money in Damascus or Happy Valley and tried to attract high-rise developers out there, they would not see any real action. He said that Mr. Johnson had indicated that low-income housing, senior housing, and condominium housing worked well for development of parking structures. He said that in most cases those catered to senior or young adult. The ones that you wouldn't attract to that type of housing were families with children. He said that was a segment that they would not be able to budge.

Jerry Johnson said that he was right, and that there was a large part of the market that would settle outside the regional centers. That was the nature of the housing appeal for the different groups/markets.

Rob Drake thanked Metro for the grant to help their downtown. The process confirmed some things for them and they also learned some things by participating. He said that one consistent thing he had heard from constituents since light rail had been brought to Beaverton was frustration over the lack of vertical parking along light rail. The study gave them the opportunity to pull properties together. Some assistance for parking might give investors or developers more incentive to invest in those areas. The process reminded Beaverton Council of some of the opportunities that were available, and the tools that might be utilized to achieve healthier centers.

7. TUALATIN BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM

Brent Curtis gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Tualatin Basin Fish & Wildlife Program. Those slides are attached and form part of the record.

Doug Neeley asked if every jurisdiction was required to do the job.

Brent Curtis said that eventually everyone in the region would participate. If Metro made it part of their functional plan then each one of the local governments that was a member of the coordinating committee had said that they would take it to their local elected officials as ordinances to implement the program.

Each one of those governments would then make a decision about whether they would implement the program in whole or substantial part.

Doug Neeley said that during the presentation Mr. Curtis had said something about not utilizing the System Development Charge (SDC) for Goal 5 resources, and he wanted to know if that would include park SDC or would they look at it in a different way by each jurisdiction.

Brent Curtis said a park was a park and not a Goal 5 natural resource. If a park had a Goal 5 resource but was chiefly a park they could then charge SDC.

Doug Neeley said that SDC could be used for purchasing new land for parks. Therefore, could an SDC for parks, or the procurement of open spaces, be included in the program?

Brent Curtis said it would have secondary or ancillary benefits as Goal 5 resources, and that was probably legal, but if the chief reason he wanted to use a park SDC was to buy and reserve natural resources that weren't for parks, that was a dubious legal proposition.

Larry Cooper expressed concern about adding fees/taxes to the burden of taxpayers.

Brent Curtis said that they all had to continue to meet federal law. A big part of the SWM fees was to respond to clean water act requirements for the sewer system. He said it would be a good thing to take the existing fee structure and use it for Goal 5 benefits. The question, at heart, was do the constituencies, as represented by their elected officials, want to improve the environmental health of each site. He said that they had two fundamental choices: 1) try to do that on the back of developers, or 2) ask more broadly if that was a public good/benefit.

John Hartsock said the problem with that was that they were not asking the community.

Brent Curtis said that he was talking about a fee that was in place and adjusting it to apply to the exact same purpose that the people in the region had collected it for. He said that the opposite approach would be a tax.

Several people said that no matter what you called it, that was still a tax.

Brent Curtis said that the program was currently only a proposal. It still had to be evaluated by the coordinating committee. They had notified 40,000 property owners and they would be engaging in outreach, and there would be another notice to those same property owners before they were done.

Rob Drake said they had a good point but the clean water act would ultimately dictate on that issue. The constituents would eventually decide to either protect it or not. He said that he would personally rather implement something like that through a local decision. He said he was willing to support clean water. He suggested they offer a payment structure that was fair and applied some compensation.

Tom Hughes said that the other side of that was that the local jurisdictions could collect the fee throughout the region. The fee would be to improve the health of resources. The federal government would tell them that they had to do that. As they looked around for funding resources to accomplish those goals, they would know that they could not improve the quality of the resource unless there was additional money to put into it. He said that he thought the most politically saleable thing to happen

would be to raise the money to put towards the resource to restore and improve the resource. That would take care of federal mandates and any other mandates that they had to meet.

Dave Fuller said that the real issue was property rights. He said that people were feeling that there were levels of government above the local government that was forcing them to do things to their property that they would do anyway, but perhaps in a different manner. He said that his impression was that people would mitigate their own problem by getting rid of it before it happened.

Susan McLain said that they all strongly wanted to figure out how to protect property rights. Metro and the Tualatin Basin had given the public options. The people might object to the fees and how they added up, but they always seemed to want to protect the environment in the long run.

Richard Kidd said that he was on the committee that worked on the program. He said that constituents had told them that they liked the environment, and they live where they live because it was a great place to live, work, and play. He suggested that constituents would want to know what they were getting for the fee they were paying, and therefore the project lists should be supplied to the public so that people could see what their money was buying them.

Dave Fuller said that each individual property owner would want to know what he or she would get for the fee and how their property would be affected.

Richard Kidd said that each person that went to the open house would be able to see how his or her property fit into the program.

There being no further business, Chair Becker adjourned the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR JULY 14, 2004

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

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
#6 Beaverton Regional Center	July 2004	PowerPoint slides of the Beaverton Regional Center Development Strategy presentation by Jerry Johnson	071404-MPAC-01