



**METRO**

**JOINT MEETING OF THE METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE JOINT  
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
MINUTES**

October 22, 2008

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

Oregon Convention Center, Portland Ballroom, Room 256  
777 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Portland, OR

**MPAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Bob Austin  
Jeff Cogen  
Rob Drake  
Dick Jones  
Nathalie Darcy  
Nick Fish  
Dave Fuller  
Charlotte Lehan  
Alice Norris  
Wilda Parks  
Michelle Poyourow  
Rick Van Beveren

**AFFILIATION**

Mayor, City of Estacada, representing City of Clack. Co. outside UGB  
Commissioner, Multnomah County  
Mayor, City of Beaverton, representing Wash. Co. 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
Oak Lodge Sanitary District, representing Clack. Co. Special Districts  
Citizen, Washington County  
Commissioner, City of Portland  
Mayor, City of Wood Village, representing Mult. 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  
Reedville Center, LLC, representing TriMet Board of Directors

**JPACT MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jim Bernard  
Rex Burkholder  
Rob Drake  
Kathryn Harrington  
Robert Liberty  
Lynn Peterson

**AFFILIATION**

Mayor, Milwaukie, representing Cities of Clackamas County  
Metro Councilor, District 5  
Mayor, City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County  
Metro Councilor, District 4  
Metro Councilor, District 6  
Chair, Washington County Board of Commissioners

**MPAC MEMBERS EXCUSED**

Ken Allen  
Shane Bemis  
Richard Burke  
Pat Campbell  
Andy Duyck  
Judie Hammerstad  
Tom Hughes  
Richard Kidd  
Cities Tom Potter  
Sandra Ramaker  
Martha Schrader  
Steve Stuart  
Richard Whitman

**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 Dist.  
Councilor, City of Vancouver, Washington  
Commissioner, Washington County  
Mayor, City of Lake Oswego, representing Clack. Co. Largest City  
Mayor, City of Hillsboro, representing Wash. County Largest City  
Mayor, City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other  
Mayor, City of Portland  
Rockwood Water PUD, representing Multnomah Co. Special Districts  
Commissioner, Clackamas County  
Commissioner, Clark County, Washington  
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development/Land  
Conservation and Development Commission

MPAC and JPACT Joint Meeting Record

October 22, 2008

Page 2

Vacant Governing Body of School District  
Vacant City in Washington County outside UGB

JPACT MEMBERS EXCUSED

	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Sam Adams	Commissioner, City of Portland
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Dick Pedersen	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Royce Pollard	Mayor, City of Vancouver, Washington
Roy Rogers	Commissioner, Washington County
Steve Stuart	Commissioner, Clark County, Washington
Jason Tell	Oregon Department of Transportation
Paul Thalhoffer	Mayor, City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Don Wagner	Washington Department of Transportation
Ted Wheeler	Chair, Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland

MPAC ALTERNATES

PRESENT

	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Tom Brian	Chair, Washington County Board of Commissioners
Craig Dirksen	Mayor, City of Tigard, representing Washington Co, Other Cities
Shirley Craddick	Councilor, City of Gresham, representing Mult. Co. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Largest City
Donna Jordan	Councilor, City of Lake Oswego, representing Clack. Co. Largest City
Clark Balfour	Tualatin Valley Water District, representing Wash. Co. Special Dist.

JPACT ALTERNATES

PRESENT

	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Tom Brian	Chair, Washington County Board of Commissioners
Donna Jordan	Councilor, City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
Nina DeConcini	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

METRO MPAC LIASONS PRESENT

Metro Councilor Carl Hosticka, District 3; Metro Councilor Carlotta Collette, District 2; and Metro Councilor Rod Park, District 1.

OTHER METRO COUNCILORS PRESENT

Metro Council President David Bragdon

METRO STAFF PRESENT

Dick Benner, Chris Deffebach, Pat Emmerson, Michael Jordan, Mike Hoglund, Kristen Lieber, Robin McArthur, Lake McTighe, Lisa Miles, Tim O'Brien, Sherry Oeser, Deena Platman, Kathryn Sofich, Ted Reid, Randy Tucker and Bridget Wieghart.

**1. WELCOME**

MPAC Chair Alice Norris, called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. This is the first of three joint meetings with MPAC and JPACT. She reviewed the speakers and topics discussed at the October 8, 2008 regional forum, "Is Business as Usual Good Enough?" DVDs of that meeting are available via Metro staff.

JPACT Chair and Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder explained why we are taking a different course than what was begun two years ago. That original course would have ended up on the rocks, so the group

made a choice to pursue a different course and recalibrate the “what” and “how we do it.” He reviewed the main topics to be covered at the three joint MPAC/JPACT meetings. The JPACT retreat last week looked at the short term funding strategies, and the agreement to work together as we go to the state and federal legislatures.

## **2. PURPOSE AND CONTEXT**

Michael Jordan, Metro Chief Operating Officer, asked the JPACT and MPAC members to self-organize into fuller tables, to facilitate good discussion. He indicated that we are not making decisions tonight. Rather the point is to provide input on the scenarios. The scenarios are not meant to be anywhere near how they will finally end up. Hybrid scenarios will be developed and brought back in early 2009. Metro is required to prepare an Urban Growth Report. Tonight’s discussion is about your community, your aspirations, through your own community’s perspective, and not that of the region as a whole.

## **3. INTERACTIVE POLLING EXERCISE**

## **4. LAND USE AND INVESTMENT SCENARIO RESULTS**

## **5. DISCUSSION AND PREFERENCE POLLING OF DESIRED ELEMENTS OF AN INTEGRATED MIX OF LAND USE, TRANSPORTATION AND INVESTMENT STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT THE REGIONAL VISION**

Andy Cotugno, Metro Policy Advisor, introduced the scenarios discussion using a Powerpoint presentation (a copy will be included in the permanent record). We are trying to isolate the cause and effect of a single land use action and get your reactions to what the results of that action are. At the next meeting, the land use items will be held constant and the transportation choices will vary. In the spring, they will look at a narrow range of choices, and make decisions by the end of 2009. Metro has made some course decisions, and now over time, they want to tailor it to the local communities.

We are trying to center growth in centers and corridors. Every center is unique. He introduced the activity spectrum developed to look at the elements of centers. He referred to the centers placards on display in the room.

In May, the committees compiled some broad categories of what makes a successful region. Now we want to specifically define those. He talked about the various categories of land use and displayed the 2040 Growth Concept map. He noted the trends and challenges that make up a rapidly changing landscape. We will need to be able to adapt as we go along. He talked about what a scenario can tell us, and how many demographic choices are mimicked in the model. He outlined five basic scenarios. He reviewed the assumptions of the reference scenario, including the population range forecast. In all scenarios the population is held stable. He referred to the public investments of the reference scenario. The model assumes programs in place now will continue to provide incentives now and into the future. The model also assumes urban growth boundary (UGB) expansion. He reviewed the state law requirement for providing growth capacity by making decisions about expanding the UGB every five years. In the model, they built in about a 10-year lag between when land is brought into the UGB and when it will actually be available for development.

He reviewed where growth would go under the reference scenario. Neighbor cities anticipated growth includes Clark County and Vancouver, Washington. The reference scenario shows about one third unused capacity in centers and corridors.

Michael Jordan introduced Ed Warnock, the consultant conducting the polling. The polling will be tallied based on respondents' roles, so they are asked to indicate if they are an MPAC or JPACT member or not. A copy of the questions presented in the PowerPoint presentation will be included in the permanent record.

Andy Cotugno introduced the second scenario: Tight UGB scenario. He reviewed the assumptions and findings of this scenario. The assumption about infrastructure refers to how much time it takes to provide the infrastructure needed to begin development. Those assumptions are not based on historical data.

Ed Warnock continued with the next set of polling questions. Infrastructure refers to the infrastructure needed to get building permits. Participants responded with electronic votes and the results were displayed.

Several members commented about spending in existing neighborhoods, and why they had voted for increasing infrastructure spending in existing neighborhoods. They talked about upzoning, partitioning lots, five-acre lots, etc.

Mr. Cotugno introduced the third scenario: Corridor amenity investment scenario. They picked out 15 corridors around the region to look at, and ways to make them more attractive. He reviewed the assumptions and findings for this scenario.

The fourth scenario is the center amenity investment scenario, looking at how effective investments in amenities are in regional centers for attracting more new households to centers.

Mr. Warnock continued with the next set of polling questions and participants responded with electronic votes. He then displayed the voting results. Participants discussed investment in centers for five minutes at each table.

Members reported from several tables on their discussions.

Mr. Cotugno introduced the first combined scenario, Center amenity investments plus tight UGB, and then reported the findings.

Mr. Warnock presented the next question, participants voted and results were displayed.

Mr. Jordan asked members to discuss two things: 1.) If you believe that investment in centers and corridors is important, where is the money to fund it? 2.) If the UGB is expanded, what is the spill-over effect to neighboring communities? Members discussed these questions for five minutes.

Members reported from several tables on their discussions. They raised the question about whether it was a bad thing for growth to go to neighboring communities. Members and visitors discussed the significance of growth in centers and the percentage of changes. Mr. Jordan said that in the next meeting about transportation scenarios, members will see a greater difference between the various assumptions.

Mr. Cotugno explained about the work that is proceeding on employment land. Results will be provided in the future as the work proceeds.

Mr. Cotugno referred participants to page 12 of the discussion guide, which looks at how the scenarios would compare by the year 2035. He noted that page 17 of the guide does not contain the right data. He

asked people to tear out page 17 and told members the correct information would be provided at another meeting.

Mr. Jordan invited members to comment on the process and Mr. Cotugno's question about how we know if we're doing any good or not, and what measures we should use.

One visitor commented that density is the answer to infrastructure needs. He noted that housing is expensive in areas of density. Tom Brian commented on the cost of public infrastructure, which did not include parks, schools, etc. Why can't we not create urban forms, even in expansion areas, and do it economically?

Gil Kelley, City of Portland Planning Director, responded to the housing affordability of units in the Pearl. He said density does not equal higher housing costs. He said it takes more work, but they can be made more affordable.

## 6. HIGHLIGHTS AND NEXT STEPS

Mr. Jordan thanked Metro staff for their preparation work and MPAC and JPACT members for their participation. He noted that in the past, JPACT and MPAC did not work so closely together. Mr. Jordan said that we are so far down the road now on the issues we are considering, compared to six years ago when facing the biggest UGB decision ever.

Mr. Warnock responded to a request to vote on whether the meeting was useful or not. Participants were encouraged to provide additional comments on the yellow cards, since the meeting did not allow time for all discussion.

There being no further business, Michael Jordan adjourned the meeting at 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Linnea Nelson  
Executive Coordinator  
Office of the Chief Operating Officer

## ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR OCTOBER 22, 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>
#4 Land use and Investment Scenario Results	10-22-2008	Powerpoint presentation by Andy Cotugno entitled Making the Greatest Place, "Cause & Effect" scenarios: preliminary results and implications	102208-MPAC-01
#4 Land use and Investment Scenario Results	October 2008	Metro Draft Discussion Guide, Choices: Land Use and Investment Scenarios	102208-MPAC-02

MPAC and JPACT Joint Meeting Record

October 22, 2008

Page 6

---

#4 Land use and Investment Scenario Results	Booklet: Our Place in the World; Global Challenges, Regional Strategies, Homegrown Solutions	102208-MPAC-03
#5 Discussion and Preference Polling	Powerpoint presentation by Ed Warnock, consultant: Preference Polling questions	102208-MPAC-04
#5 Discussion and Preference Polling	Feedback form: Your Input Counts	102208-MPAC-05

---