METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

September 8, 2004 – 5:00 p.m. Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Charles Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, Dave Fuller, John Hartsock, Tom Hughes, Richard Kidd, Deanna Mueller-Crispin, Lisa Naito, Doug Neeley, Wilda Parks, Ted Wheeler

Alternates Present: Larry Cooper, Jack Hoffman, Laura Hudson, Charlotte Lehan

Also Present: Ron Bunch, City of Gresham; Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Stephan Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic Alliance; David Zagel, TriMet

Metro Elected Officials Present:

Metro Staff Present: Kim Bardes, Dick Benner, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Paul Garrahan

INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor Charles Becker, MPAC Chair, called the meeting to order 5:10 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summaries for July 14 & 28, 2004.

| Motion: | Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton, with a second from Nathalie Darcy, Citizen for |
|---------|---|
| | Washington County, moved to adopt the consent agendas without revision. |
| | |
| Vote: | The motion passed with one abstention from Deanna Mueller-Crispin. |

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

As there were no councilors present, this was deferred to the next meeting.

6. GOAL 5: TUALATIN BASIN APPROACH/REGIONAL PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Chris Deffebach gave a brief presentation to the MPAC members.

Rob Drake asked if she intended to map backyards and exempt them by definition.

MPAC Meeting Record September 8, 2004 Page 2

Chris Deffebach said that they still intended to map backyards and exempt them through the program itself, because if there were a major land-use decision action on a property it would still be subject to the regulatory elements of the program. The program was not about run-of-the-mill activities for people's yards.

Doug Neeley said that the benefit of mapping backyards was that if Metro wanted to attain conservation easements or something else of that nature, then the cities would have that capability. They might want to opt into a Goal 5 effort, so including those residences in the mapping was a good idea.

Rob Drake said that he still had concern about having those backyards included because of how it would/could be enforced or not enforced in the future. He said that people felt confusion and concern over including it even though it might not be strictly enforced now. The worry was related to future enforcement, when the regulation was still on the books, but the people at MPAC or Metro had changed and possibly their policies or politics might change. What would protect the citizens from future restrictions?

Doug Neeley said that Metro might want to include a page in the document to clarify this issue.

Chris Deffebach reviewed the second resolution, she handed out a list of members for the Implementation Work Group Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program, which is attached and forms part of the record. She said that they would have an updated map on the Fish and Wildlife Inventory at the next meeting for their review.

Chair Becker asked how the group of people for the Work Group was selected.

Andy Cotugno said that the members of the work group were selected based upon their experience in doing the actual permitting on an actual development project, either on the application side, or the approval side. They were chosen specifically for their expertise. They were not, however, the ultimate approving body. MPAC and MTAC would be the approval bodies from a jurisdictional point-of-view, and the Goal 5 TAC group would provide input from the various natural resource agencies, and WRPAC would represent the utilities agencies' views. All these bodies would be working on the process, giving input, and then MPAC and MTAC would work on it and forward their conclusions to Metro Council.

Jack Hoffman asked if he and the interested members of MPAC could be added to the email list for the Work Group.

Chris Deffebach said she would have Paulette Copperstone add them (all of MPAC) to the distribution list

Brent Curtis reviewed the Tualatin Basin portion of this topic.

Rob Drake thanked Brent Curtis and all the people who worked on the Tualatin Basin Approach.

Richard Kidd added his appreciation for the professional contributions of those who participated in the Tualatin Basin Approach work.

7. PERFORMANCE MEASURE REVIEW

Gerry Uba gave a PowerPoint presentation and passed out copies of the slides for the members to follow along. Slides of the handout, Preview of the Draft 2004 Performance Measures Report: Selected Sections, are attached and form part of the record.

Rob Drake asked if it would be helpful to chart the overall numbers and jobs for the region.

Gerry Uba said they would try to do that.

Doug Neeley asked if the increase in the mixed-use consumed land, if it was due primarily to zoning, would have some affect in reducing some of the other uses.

Gerry Uba said it was primarily a shift from industrial to commercial. He said that it would be more informational to keep track of the shifts in zoning, but they were not yet able to do that.

Andy Cotugno said that the table showed how much land was consumed according to the zoning. There was definitely a drop in residential with an increase in mixed-use residential/commercial. He said that there was a drop in commercial with an increase in both mixed-use commercial and mixed-use industrial/commercial, so both the mixed-use components were up and the two single use, commercial and residential, were down.

Charlotte Lehan said that the tenth slide, Change in Population Per Acre in Sample Neighborhoods 1990-2002, might be more helpful if it indicated the age of the people who live in the study neighborhoods. She said it might help if some of the information was mapped. She asked if the final document would be a book of data or would there also be some analysis provided?

Gerry Uba said that there would be mostly data, but also some analysis included.

Charlotte Lehan said that it was disturbing to note that the middle gap on performance for high school, the slide titled Quality Education Measure of Benefits and Burdens of Growth, was narrowing while the two ends were getting wider; meaning that more people were either doing better or doing worse, but not as many people were doing satisfactorily. She said the high school sample would make for a very good example of mapping the impacts.

Andy Cotugno said that there would be a Performance Measures document that would be full of facts, but mainly it would serve as a platform for broader discussion about the trends.

Charlotte Lehan wanted to know how and when that would be presented.

Andy Cotugno said that they had not laid out all the steps, but the intent of the project was to use the document for a longer-term dialogue over the course of the next year.

Tom Hughes said that the school issue was almost out of context because there was no congruity between what was measured in the districts and the Metro region. The Hillsboro School district, for example, was 50 miles north or south and a significant percentage of the population lived in the City of Hillsboro, but the majority of properties were actually outside the city. He said that the trend from the data presented by Gerry Uba looked like schools were moving out of the average category and in most cases moving into the exceptional or strong category, which seemed to be a good thing. He said that they would rather not

MPAC Meeting Record September 8, 2004 Page 4

see a strong middle class for the schools, but rather see all schools move towards the strong or exceptional categories. He also pointed out that a two-year picture was not really a trend-setting example, and it would need to be followed further in order to really determine if there was a trend.

Andy Cotugno said that when Metro staff had discussed what the indicators should be they had decided that some kind of education indicator was important because it related to the economy. There was an interest in understanding better whether or not the growth policies currently utilized had a disproportionate impact on tax bases around the region. He said that they needed to figure out if some of the places where the quality of education was declining was equal to those places where the tax base was not getting better.

Richard Kidd said that less than half the students that attended Forest Grove schools did not live in Forest Grove. He said that he thought the school data should be included in the performance measures because it said something about the economy and what was happening in the jurisdiction. Education was important to the economy, and those students that lived outside the district and their families still contributed to the local economy.

Doug Neeley referred to the issue of lot size distribution and changes over time. He wondered if the changes were due to Metro requirements for density or whether factors had changed in lot size preferences. Perhaps less large lots were available. He wondered how to separate out policy versus demographic change.

Andy Cotugno said that when they started the process back in the early 90's they found that there was no zoning outside the City of Portland that allowed lot sizes smaller than 7,500 square feet. Now there was zoning all over the place that allowed smaller lot sizes, and once it became available the market responded. This was one criterion that they wanted to track because growth policies impact the region.

Chair Becker said staff should add the cost of land and lots as an indicator.

Andy Cotugno said that the cost of land would be a good indicator to include. He said that Metro affected the assessed value going into jurisdictions, but did not affect the tax rate and the ability of the cities to tap into that tax value. The measure was intended to count the value and not the tax collected because Metro affected growth patterns but not collected tax rates. He said that the performance measures were to introduce the differences across the landscape, and mapping those differences would better showcase patterns. It was also a good place to start a sub-regional analysis in order to understand some of the distribution differences. He also said that how the population was educated was the "cause" that would "affect" the economy, and that was the relationship that they needed to stay focused on.

There being no further business, Chair Becker adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 8, 2004

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

DOCUMENT

| | DOCUMENT | | |
|-------------------------|----------|--|----------------|
| AGENDA ITEM | DATE | DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION | DOCUMENT NO. |
| #6 Goal 5: Tualatin | 9/8/04 | Implementation Work Group for the | 090804-MPAC-01 |
| Basin | | Regional Fish & Wildlife Habitat | |
| Approach/Regional | | Program – list of members for this | |
| Program Elements | | workgroup | |
| #7 Performance | 9/8/04 | Slides of the PowerPoint Presentation: | 090804-MPAC-02 |
| Measure Review | | Preview of the Draft 2004 | |
| | | Performance Measures Report: | |
| | | Selected Sections | |