



**METRO**

**METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

September 10, 2008  
5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Austin  
Jeff Cogen  
Nathalie Darcy  
Rob Drake  
Nick Fish  
Dick Jones  
Richard Kidd  
Charlotte Lehan  
Alice Norris  
Wilda Parks  
Michelle Poyourow  
Sandra Ramaker  
Martha Schrader  
Richard Whitman

AFFILIATION

Mayor, City of Estacada, representing City of Clack. Co. outside UGB  
Commissioner, Multnomah County  
Citizen, Washington County  
Mayor, City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
Commissioner, City of Portland  
Oak Lodge Water District, representing Clackamas Co. Special Districts  
Mayor, City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other Cities  
Mayor, City of Wilsonville, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities  
Mayor, City of Oregon City, representing Clack. Co. 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
North Clack. Chamber of Commerce, representing Clack. Co. Citizen  
Bicycle Transportation Alliance, representing Multnomah Co. Citizen  
Rockwood Water PUD, representing Multnomah Co. Special Districts  
Commissioner, Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development/Land  
Conservation and Development Commission

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Ken Allen  
Shane Bemis  
Richard Burke  
Pat Campbell  
Andy Duyck  
Dave Fuller  
Judie Hammerstad  
Tom Hughes  
Tom Potter  
Paul Savas  
Steve Stuart  
Rick Van Beveren  
Vacant  
Vacant

AFFILIATION

Oregon AFSCME Council 75, representing Port of Portland  
Mayor, City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
Tualatin Valley Water District, representing Wash. Co. Special Districts  
Councilor, City of Vancouver, Washington  
Commissioner, Washington County  
Mayor, City of Wood Village, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities  
Mayor, City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City  
Mayor, City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City  
Mayor, City of Portland  
Oak Lodge Sanitary District, representing Clack. Co. Special Districts  
Commissioner, Clark County, Washington  
Reedville Center, LLC, representing TriMet Board of Directors  
Governing Body of School District  
City in Washington County outside UGB

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Craig Dirksen  
Clark Balfour  
Donna Jordan  
Norm King

AFFILIATION

Mayor, City of Tigard, representing Washington Co, Other Cities  
Tualatin Valley Water District, representing Wash. Co. Special Districts  
Councilor, City of Lake Oswego, representing Clack. Co. Largest City  
Mayor, City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities

Donald McCarthy  
Shirley Craddick

Rockwood Water PUD, representing Multnomah Co. Special Districts  
Councilor, City of Gresham, representing Mult. Co. 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City

METRO LIASONS PRESENT

Rod Park, Metro Council District 1.

OTHER METRO COUNCILORS PRESENT

Kathryn Harrington, Metro Councilor, District 4.

METRO STAFF PRESENT

Dick Benner, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Kim Ellis, Robin McArthur, Sherry Oeser, Ted Reid, Scott Robinson, Andy Shaw, Randy Tucker and Malu Wilkinson.

**1. SELF-INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Alice Norris, called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. She welcomed new members Dick Jones, representing Clackamas County special districts and Donald McCarthy, representing Multnomah County special districts. Chair Norris asked those present to introduce themselves.

**2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There were none.

**3. CONSENT AGENDA**

The meeting summary for August 13, 2008:

MOTION: Judie Hammerstad, Mayor of Lake Oswego, with a second from Jeff Cogen, Multnomah County Commissioner, moved to adopt the consent agenda without revisions.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion passed unanimously.

**4. COUNCIL UPDATE**

Metro Councilor Rod Park gave an update from the Metro Council. He invited MPAC members and staff to participate in the Metro Council Bike Commute Challenge on Tuesday, Sept. 16 by biking to Metro. He highlighted the joint MPAC/JPACT/Metro Council meeting on Oct. 8, 2008, 4-7 at the Oregon Convention Center and encouraged everyone to attend. A copy of Councilor Park's complete talking points will be included in the permanent record.

**5. COMPARATIVE INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS**

Malu Wilkinson, Metro Associate Regional Planner, continued the August 13, 2008, MPAC presentation on infrastructure. She reported on what they heard from MTAC last week and introduced Todd Chase from SCS, who worked on the infrastructure analysis, and Andy Shaw, Metro Infrastructure Finance Manager. A copy of her presentation will be included with the permanent record.

The challenge is to invest strategically and improve services. She referred to the need for more information on infill.

The analysis is not reflective of private sector costs. They also did not look at the public or private benefit side. They used available information, and in some cases, there were gaps in information. The study does not illustrate the full household cost to the buyer. Mr. Chase talked about looking at the comparative regional costs. They attempted to look at the data without interpretation, as an exploratory analysis. More information will be needed to draw specific or broad conclusions. They looked at some large projects where information was available. He discussed the comparative costs methodology, including equivalent dwelling units (EDU). Mr. Chase clarified that the study is looking at the costs per EDU and not the benefits. This allows comparison from a single family and mixed use area. The analysis found a wide variation from project to project, depending on the existing infrastructure in a given location. The average cost per EDU in the urbanizing areas was \$75,000 and \$51,000 in the urban redevelopment areas. He reviewed other factors that made the costs increase. He presented a chart comparing infrastructure costs per EDU of specific projects. He reviewed some of the specific projects included in the report, noting the local vs. community costs for each, and those that were above or below average in each category. A copy of the presentation will be provided to MPAC members following the meeting.

Andy Shaw, Metro Infrastructure Finance Manager, talked about some of the next steps for this infrastructure challenge. He referred to the upcoming joint meetings with JPACT and the Metro Council in October, November and December. The effort is to frame the choices that will need to be made over the coming year, as part of the urban and rural reserves and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) work. They want to look at how to finance infrastructure, how to achieve greater efficiencies and innovation in delivery of services and to explore demand management strategies. He noted that staff is looking for feedback from MPAC on next steps in these three areas.

Mayor Kidd asked for clarification of costs listed in the study. Mr. Chase clarified that total costs listed in Appendix 1 on page 46 of the study are total capital costs in thousands of dollars, and not costs per EDU. Appendix 1 does not include regional costs that are included on each project sheet under cost per dwelling unit. Mayor Kidd noted that Forest Grove was not included in the regional map presented at the meeting (but it is included in the report map).

A representative of Damascus commented on the report. He said he would like to encourage more of a regional, holistic, long-term approach. He felt the approach may be short-sighted and make it more difficult in the long run to outline costs. He noted the City of Damascus' need for help in realizing its dreams for community development. He said they need to look at the benefit side carefully as well.

Shirley Craddick, City of Gresham Councilor, asked about the commute miles, where the numbers came from and the assumptions associated with the commute information. Mr. Shaw explained that the commute information is based on the vehicle miles traveled from census data. Ms. Craddick was concerned that already developed urban areas would be given preference over newly brought-in suburban areas. Mr. Chase explained cost per EDU density. Ms. Wilkinson noted that challenges exist in both urban and suburban areas.

Tom Brian, Chair, Washington County Board of Commissioners, talked about all growth costing money. He asked about tipping points and how they were calculated. Mr. Chase talked about what was factored in as part of the study. He said it is different looking at it per dwelling unit vs. per project. He said they did not think about a level of analysis that looked at phasing of costs and tipping points. Chair Brian talked about the difficulty of siting schools. He said schools and parks are different than other infrastructure. Mr. Chase said that the need for schools was factored into costs for some areas, where schools would be needed. In the South Waterfront area, affordable housing costs were factored in. Each area has different needs and costs. Chair Brian noted that they need to be "beware of averages."

Bob Austin, Mayor, City of Estacada, noted that some areas were lacking data and the report shows them as zero dollars, which may be misinterpreted as being no cost.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor, talked about the 2040 Growth Plan, the lack of funding for infrastructure and the need for prioritization by elected officials. He said this study is about raw costs. He talked about the cost of retrofitting (renewal and replacement of) aging infrastructure that would have to occur, regardless of growth.

Chair Alice Norris, noted some corrections for Beavercreek. The report says that parks are not included in the Beavercreek concept plan, but they are in fact included. She encouraged others to review the data and provide corrections before the report is published.

Nick Fish, City of Portland Commissioner, noted the possible need to site a fire station in the South Waterfront and housing costs. He said that public safety and fire are part of infrastructure costs.

## **6. PERIODIC REVIEW ISSUES**

Richard Whitman, Director of DLCD, spoke about the periodic review process and requirements. The cities of Portland and Forest Grove are the first two of 32 cities that will be entering into periodic review in the next 7 years. The periodic review process will be melded with Metro's process.

### **City of Forest Grove**

Richard Kidd, Mayor of Forest Grove, spoke about the aspirations of Forest Grove. He introduced Jon Holan, Forest Grove Community Development Director, who is heading up the city's periodic review. They distributed a handout, which will be included in the permanent record. Mr. Holan noted that the city's comprehensive plan was very out of date, having been based on data from the 1970s. So they are taking the approach that they will be adopting a new comprehensive plan, as opposed to amending the existing plan. He talked about their planned methodology for doing the comprehensive plan, including use of consultants, citizen involvement, use of existing boards and committees, web-based tools, town hall meetings and a broad-based perspective. He referred to the importance of the community vision statement and other issues of concern. The City of Forest Grove has its own light and power operation, so that is a unique consideration for their city. He said that the current city charter discourages redevelopment and urban renewal, but the city is looking at changing that for the future to encourage redevelopment, especially in conjunction with using MetroScope. They city has completed its work program and has submitted it to the state DLCD for approval. They look forward to providing their information and projections to Metro to coordinate with Metro's planning work. Their projections may be lower than Metro's, and may be cause for looking at some alternative scenarios. He referred to the state's recommendation that the CCI function as a policy body. He talked about flexibility from DLCD for the city to adopt interim decisions via resolutions.

### **City of Portland**

Nick Fish, City of Portland Commissioner, introduced Gil Kelley, City of Portland Planning Director, and Hannah Kuhn. Mr. Kelley raised two framing points regarding periodic review. He noted that it feels awful, but that it is a huge opportunity. He wants to focus on those opportunities. He also noted that he is here as part of the region, working actively together with Metro and other jurisdictions, looking at what are our big-picture choices. He reflected on the uniqueness of our regional cooperative work, along with our enormous challenges for change.

He spoke about 3-4 game changers: escalating infrastructure cost, growing awareness of climate change and the need to take the lead in embracing those constraints (otherwise we may end up like Detroit); and the growing diversity of our region. These are issues Portland is considering as part of its periodic review process. He noted that the 1980 comprehensive plan did not anticipate the growth of east Portland, the Pearl, and South Waterfront. It did talk about centers and corridors to some degree. He said it is a good thing for all jurisdictions to be taking stock for the future, regardless of the periodic review requirements. He wants to know about more than just what is required for the state periodic review: affordable living, community health.

Portland is in its first scoping phase. In future phases they will be testing hypothesis. He noted 5 major concepts:

1. Portland is a collection of 22 neighborhoods
2. Build on the centers of excellence ringing the downtown, to foster collaboration among them, for economic benefit for the city (educational, industrial, design, artistic, etc.)
3. Affordable living strategies, with multigenerational communities
4. Functional green infrastructure and living
5. Public rights of way as our public "front yards," in which to have community life occur

They will enter a third phase in 2010 to refine those ideas.

They are also being asked by Mayor Tom Potter to incorporate to take a level of civic discourse and public involvement to a new level. Mayor-elect Sam Adams is asking them to use the process to develop a strategic plan.

He noted the "happy alignment" in which Portland, Metro and the state are updating their plans for growth. This is an opportunity to make choices collectively. He noted the need to make information available for making those choices. In the past the MetroScope model did not include costs for infrastructure at the edge. He said lots of technical work is needed to get the information out there.

Secondly, he said that we are not communicating sequencing of decisions well enough. He suggested that they may benefit from guidance from Richard Whitman and DLCD.

Thirdly, he said they want flexibility with the allocations at the beginning of the process. He said they need some ranges, rather than a single number, to deal with. He talked about coordination with the urban and rural reserves and RTP work. This is the opportunity to look at things holistically.

He talked about determining the buildable land supply. He said they have concerns about brownfields (300 in Portland) and environmental zones. He talked about the P-zone (no-touch) and C-zone (more flexible) environmental zones.

He also mentioned the desire to get some relief from the recently adopted PPR. They fear it will function as a barrier to achieving some of their density aspirations.

Richard Whitman, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, responded to the two cities' comments. He said he wants to hear about what in the process is not working for the local cities. The Oregon Transportation Commission is aware of some of the problems with the application of this rule, and feels they can work within it.

There being no further business, Mayor Norris adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Linnea Nelson  
Executive Coordinator  
Office of the Chief Operating Officer

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

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

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
<b>#4 Council Update</b>	9-10-08	Speaking points from Rod Park, Metro Councilor	091008-MPAC-01
<b>#4 Council Update</b>	N/A	Flyer: Metro Council Commute Challenge	091008-MPAC-02
<b>#4 Council Update</b>	N/A	Flyer: The Future is Here: Is Business As Usual Good Enough?	091008-MPAC-03
<b>#5 Comparative Infrastructure Costs</b>	9/10/2008	“Regional Infrastructure: Comparative Costs” PowerPoint presentation provided by Malu Wilkinson	091008-MPAC-04
<b>#6 Periodic Review Issues</b>	9/10/2008	Handout on <i>Forest Grove Periodic Review</i> distributed by Richard Kidd	091008-MPAC-05
	N/A	Handout for the Regional Choices Engagement: Framing Our Choices – Fall 2008	091008-MPAC-06
	N/A	Flyer: Troy Russ – Rebalancing Roadways to Build Sustainable Communities	091008-MPAC-07
	9/5/2008	Updated 2008 MPAC Tentative Agendas	091008-MPAC-08
	9/3/2008	Updated 2008 JPACT Work Program	091008-MPAC-09