



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPAC)

Meeting Minutes

August 26, 2015

Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sam Chase
Carlotta Collette
Denny Doyle
Andy Duyck
Maxine Fitzpatrick
Mark Gamba
Jeff Gudman
Jerry Hinton
Dick Jones
Carrie MacLaren
Keith Mays
Anne McEnery-Ogle
Marilyn McWilliams
Craig Prosser
Bob Stacey
Peter Truax, *Chair*
Jerry Willey

AFFILIATION

Metro Council
Metro Council
City of Beaverton, Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Washington County
Multnomah County Citizen
City of Milwaukie, Clackamas Co. Other Cities
City of Lake Oswego, Clackamas Co. Largest City
City of Gresham, Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Oak Lodge Water District, Clackamas Co. Special Districts
Department of Land Conservation and Development
Washington County Citizen
City of Vancouver
Tualatin Valley Water District, Washington Co. Special Districts
TriMet Board of Directors
Metro Council
City of Forest Grove, Washington Co. Other Cities
City of Hillsboro, Washington Co. Largest City

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Tim Clark, *1st Vice Chair*
Martha Schrader, *2nd Vice Chair*

AFFILIATION

City of Wood Village, Multnomah Co. Other Cities
Clackamas County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jim Bernard
Jackie Dingfelder
Jennifer Donnelly
Ed Gronke
Renate Mengelberg
Brenda Perry
Jeff Swanson

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County
City of Portland
Department of Land Conservation and Development
Clackamas County Citizen
City of Oregon City, Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
City of West Linn, Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Clark County

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Armstrong, Eric Chambers, Carol Chesarek, Colin Cooper, Radcliffe Dacanay, Chris Deffebach, Kathryn Harrington, Eric Hesse, Brian Martin, Zoe Monahan, Jonathan Schlueter, Laura Weigel

STAFF: Martha Bennett, Nick Christensen, Jeff Frkonja, Elissa Gertler, Alison Kean, Tim O'Brien, Nellie Papsdorf, Ted Reid, Nikolai Ursin, Malu Wilkinson

1. CALL TO ORDER, SELF INTRODUCTIONS, CHAIR COMMUNICATIONS

MPAC Chair Peter Truax called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and declared a quorum. All attendees introduced themselves.

Chair Truax shared information about a series of small housekeeping amendments that Metro staff was proposing to the Functional Plan. He noted that the item was for informational purposes and did not require a recommendation to the Metro Council. Chair Truax explained that the amendments address code section inconsistencies in the different Titles of the Functional Plan. The Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) discussed the proposed changes at their August 5 meeting and recommended one minor language change that was incorporated into the proposed ordinance.

Councilor Jeff Gudman thanked Chair Truax for the update. He noted that in January he had brought the committee's attention to a discrepancy in Metro's requirement for local jurisdictions to provide notice of proposed land use actions. He requested that this deadline be changed to match the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) notice requirement of 35 days. Councilor Gudman thanked Metro Planning staff for reconciling the issue and bringing the requirements into alignment.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

3. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Sam Chase notified MPAC members of the following items:

- Metro Nature in Neighborhoods Trail Grants are now available for 2015. These grants provide opportunities to plan, restore, and build regional trails that increase access to parks and natural areas for people and improve the quality of natural resources associated with regional trails in the Portland metropolitan area. This year \$500,000 is available for regional trails grants. Funding is available for projects that match the following criteria: implement the Regional Trails Plan; increase access to nature for regional trail users and boost nature as part of the regional trails system; improve the ability of all communities, including underrepresented communities, to learn about and connect with nature; and support and create partnerships in local communities to improve water quality, fish and wildlife habitat. Funding for Nature in Neighborhoods community grants has more than doubled thanks to the parks and natural areas levy that the region's voters approved in 2013.

4. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATION

There were none.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of July 8, 2015 Minutes

MOTION: Mayor Denny Doyle moved and Councilor Jeff Gudman seconded, to adopt the July 8, 2015 minutes as amended.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

Note: The July 8, 2015 minutes were amended to correct a couple of minor typographical errors.

6. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Powell-Division Transit and Development Project

Chair Truax provided an introduction for the item, noting that it was an update on the Powell-Division Transit and Development Project and intended for information and discussion. Chair Truax explained that in conjunction with the transit project, the Cities of Portland and Gresham have engaged their communities to understand the types of changes near future station areas that are desirable and feasible in the near term. This outreach work was funded through Metro's Community Planning and Development Grants program. Chair Truax then introduced Metro Investment Areas Manager Malu Wilkinson, City of Portland Planner Radcliffe Dacanay, and City of Gresham Senior Planner Brian Martin to discuss the project.

Malu Wilkinson explained that the update was an opportunity to share the collaborative work staff have been working on over the past couple of years. Councilor Bob Stacey, a member of the Powell-Division Transit and Development Project's steering committee, added that the project was one of Metro's best examples of successful public engagement as part of a corridor study.

Ms. Wilkinson began by giving a brief overview of Metro's investment areas. She noted that Metro's approach to planning in investment areas such as the Powell-Division corridor has been focused on using planning, partnerships, and implementation iteratively to bring together the region's corridor planning and land use implementation. This allows the region to better leverage investments in a targeted area.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Ms. Wilkinson shared a few examples of investment strategies and how resources had been leveraged to support the project. She explained how Metro's Regional Transit Options, Community Planning and Development Grants, and Nature in Neighborhood Grants had all played a role in the project, and worked in conjunction with private, public, and non-profit partners.
- The approach to the project has been focused on place and particularly looking at transit and development needs in the region.
- In terms of transit, the corridor connects the downtowns of the two largest cities in the region, the City of Portland and City of Gresham. The corridor already has significant ridership with 18,000 riders a day between the two main bus lines and has been identified as a top priority in the Eastside Service Enhancement Plan. Because of the significance of this route, it is a good choice for improvement.

- In terms of development, the corridor is important for a number of reasons. The corridor connects a number of economically-significant regional and town centers, and also acts as a main education corridor for the region, with Portland State University, Portland Community College, and a number of high schools included on the route.
- Community-driven decision-making has been vital to the project's success. Ms. Wilkinson noted that the community members make up more than half of the project's steering committee. Metro staff have also been engaging with the community in a number of different ways, including holding briefings with local committees, neighborhoods associations, business organizations, and advocacy organizations, as well as hosting online surveys, community forums, and discussions across the corridor.
- Ms. Wilkinson reviewed the draft Transit Action Plan, noting that the steering committee and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT) had both recommended it be moved forward in June. The recommendations provided the direction staff needed to move towards implementing the plan.
- Ms. Wilkinson then shared a proposed timeline for the project for the next two years.
- She explained that the development component of the project has been just as important as the transit component. Because of this, it has been critical that Metro work in collaboration with the Cities of Portland and Gresham in order to make sure their work aligns with the cities' development and land use work. Local partners have provided land use planning that has identified needs, opportunities, and constraints for future station and stop locations along the route.
- Ms. Wilkinson introduced City of Portland Planner Radcliffe Dacanay to discuss the draft Portland Action Plan. Mr. Dacanay noted that the plan was intended to compliment the Powell-Division Transit Action Plan by addressing issues outside of typical transit plans, such as community development, affordable housing, and more. The purpose of the Portland Action Plan is to support residential and community stability, so that current residents and businesses benefit from the transit project; to illustrate design and development concepts for opportunity areas; and to provide a roadmap for City work in the Powell-Division corridor. Mr. Dacanay then gave an overview of the Plan and the major themes and principles it included, and shared some proposed designs.
- Commissioner Andy Duyck acknowledged that there was still work to be done but asked if the project would require the closure of any automobile lanes. Ms. Wilkinson responded that staff was still working on the design but the overall aim was to maintain the area's current capacity. She added that wholesale closure of lanes on Powell Boulevard was not part of staff's present designs.
- Ms. Wilkinson introduced City of Gresham Senior Planner Brian Martin to discuss the draft Gresham Action Plan. Mr. Martin explained that similar to the Portland Action Plan, the Gresham Action Plan addresses how the transit project could best serve the city's residents. Mr. Martin noted that many residents were excited to share the desired changes they would like to see in the city's station areas and their feedback informed the themes the plan focuses on, including new job opportunities, better connections, and keeping housing affordable. Mr. Martin then gave an overview of the Plan and the major themes and principles it included, as well as the work that went into its development.
- Ms. Wilkinson finished the presentation by sharing the following discussion questions:
 - Are there any concerns about the Powell-Division Transit Action Plan?
 - Are there any concerns or comments about the Portland and Gresham Action Plans?
 - Any topics that you would like to be explored at a later date?
 - Any feedback on the approach for engaging the community or steering committee membership?

- Any lessons learned that could be applied to future collaborative efforts?

Member discussion included:

Councilor Gudman asked if there was anything that could be done to accelerate the process and begin construction in 2016. Ms. Wilkinson noted that accelerating the process would be difficult due to certain federal timelines. She added that the project was moving quickly and would ideally be at least partially ready to use within five years.

Ed Gronke expressed his appreciation for the extensive work that had been done to engage communities throughout the planning process. He asked if the bus rapid transit system would be a dedicated right of way and where that might be located. He also inquired about how pedestrian crossings would be managed. Ms. Wilkinson stated that although the design of such components was incomplete, staff intended to preserve auto capacity and was working to design safe crossings for pedestrians.

6.2 2015 Urban Growth Management Decision: Chief Operating Officer Recommendation

Chair Truax introduced the item, explaining that it related to the upcoming urban growth management (UGM) decision. He stated that the group would be discussing the Metro Chief Operating Officer (COO) Martha Bennett's recommendation and noted that although MPAC has discussed the UGM decision for a couple of years, the item marked the first discussion of the COO's recommendation released in late July. Chair Truax emphasized that MPAC was not providing the Metro Council with a recommendation that night, but would be making its formal recommendation at the next meeting on September 9.

Metro Chief Operating Officer Martha Bennett gave an overview of the presentation in three parts. Project Manager Ted Reid would first explain the process leading up to the decision, Ms. Bennett would discuss the substance of the recommendation, and lastly Mr. Reid would review the recommendation process. Ms. Bennett explained that the goal of the discussion was to better inform the committee about the basis for the recommendation. Following the presentation MPAC would have an opportunity to discuss and debate the recommendations.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- The process leading up to the decision: There are three phases to the urban growth management process: technical engagement, the Urban Growth Report, and the urban growth management decision.
 - Phase one focused on technical engagement and included convening a number of technical working groups to discuss the region's urban growth needs. These groups and panels involved a broad representation of individuals and institutions that helped staff develop how to come up with an inventory of buildable land, how to conduct the forecast, and how to describe the land use needs of different industries.
 - Phase two, the draft 2014 Urban Growth Report (UGR), was released in July 2014 and approved by the Metro Council in December 2014. Mr. Reid shared a timeline of MPAC and Metro Council discussions that occurred leading up to the draft's approval.
 - Phase three, the urban growth management decision process, began in February 2015. Mr. Reid shared a timeline of significant events that had affected the decision process, such as MPAC's additional topic discussions.

- The substance of the recommendation:
 - Three main factors in the urban growth decision: economic conditions (the lack of middle income jobs and the projection of more than 60 percent of new residents earning less than \$50,000 annually as the economic reality of the region), legal and political factors (particularly related to the status of the urban reserves decision in Multnomah and Clackamas Counties and the fact that many areas positioned for future urban growth are not currently available for expansion), and the success of regional and local policies (evidence from around the region that local investments are working, yielding the type of development the region has been planning for since the mid-1990s).
 - The first recommendation is to decide not to expand the urban growth boundary. The other six are needed to make the first work; they are in response to the previously mentioned legal, economic, and development factors.
 - The recommendation to not expand the UGB was made for two reasons. One, at the midpoint of the employment and population forecasts, the region has a sufficient land supply according to the UGR. Two, due to the legal reserves issue, even if there was a deficit of land, the region does not have the acknowledged urban reserves land with complete concept planning needed to expand.
 - Feedback over the last year has been concerned about how the data may have affected the Urban Growth Report. Because the report was developed following a serious recession and finished in the middle of an economic boom, there are questions about the effects of its timing. Rather than waiting six more years, the second recommendation suggests it may be best to begin the next round of the process in 2017 to resolve these issues.
 - The third recommendation is to seek acknowledgement of reserves and resolve the legal factors affecting the UGM decision.
 - The fourth recommendation is meant to respond to feedback about the overall UGR process. It involves exploring the process to provide additional certainty to the region, counties, cities, and stakeholders. This discussion should not take place until the reserves litigation is resolved, but should occur before the next Urban Growth Report.
 - The last three recommendations are in response to the economic conditions and regional policies. They address the public policy and program issues raised by the draft Urban Growth Report.
- The next steps in the recommendation process:
 - The August 26 meeting marked the first opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the committee.
 - On September 9, MPAC will be asked for a formal recommendation.
 - On September 15, the Metro Council will be asked to identify a point in the range forecast from which to plan in order to finish the UGR.
 - Public hearings will be held and the process will conclude on November 19 when the Metro Council considers the final version of the Urban Growth Report.

Chair Truax then asked the committee to split into three small groups, with the audience members acting as a fourth, to discuss the recommendation. He provided the groups with some initial questions to begin the discussion and asked that they report their thoughts after to the committee.

Mayor Mark Gamba acted as representative for his group and went over some of its key remarks. Comments and suggestions included:

- Members raised concerns about affordability and stagnant income growth and how the region will address these issues. Related comments included the following:
 - We should plan for influx of baby-boomers.
 - We should explore how system development charges (SDCs) affect home prices and whether they could be adjusted to account for infill versus greenfield development.
 - We should devise policies that help bring incomes up instead of only focusing on bringing housing costs down.
 - The new housing being developed is not affordable. It will not matter how much the boundary is expanded if residents cannot afford to live in the region.
 - Members expressed skepticism that urban expansion helps create affordable housing due to the cost of infrastructure.
- Members also had questions about the reserves process and how the next UGM cycle could be hindered if the process is not settled.
- Within this UGM decision, several members expressed the desire for the Metro Council to commit to revisiting the boundary in three years and improving upon the overall UGM process. Ideas included:
 - Encourage sub-regional expansion through changes in state law
 - Advocate for continual adjustments rather than every six years
 - Ground testing projections in the City of Portland on development
 - Discounting Damascus projections

Ted Reid acted as representative for another group and went over some of its key remarks. Some of the comments and suggestions included:

- One of the group's focuses was on urban and rural reserves. Several members noted that the urban and rural reserves need to be acknowledged for the process to move forward. Until then, discussing the Urban Growth Report and the UGM decision is not productive. The region needs to keep pressure on Clackamas County to get the reserves acknowledged.
 - Some questions included: What if litigation on urban and rural reserves continues indefinitely? Should we ask the legislature to affirm the map as is?
- Members shared concerns about housing affordability and the best ways to address the issue. Expansions will not solve the problem. What else is the region, collectively, going to do about it?
 - There will be a backlog of housing needs as millennials belatedly form households.
- Members explored the potential for expansions of modest size when part of a city's plan and how the region could respond to those interests.
- Members noted that there are ongoing infrastructure needs that the region will face with or without a UGB expansion. Expectations for concept planning for smaller expansions should be lowered.
- What might the evolution of our region's growth management process look like?

Craig Prosser acted as representative for the third group and went over some of its key remarks. Some of the comments and suggestions included:

- Members expressed concerns about the accuracy of the Urban Growth Report and frustration that these concerns had not been addressed by the Metro Council.
 - The housing predictions were mentioned as one problematic area, with the projected housing figures in the City of Portland shared as one example.

- Members discussed the issue of the reserves in Clackamas County and Multnomah County and how those issues may or may not be resolved within the next three years.
- Some members recommended not expanding the UGB and reviewing the situation within the next three years, though there were concerns that future Metro Councils would not be bound to updating the report within that timeframe. This lack of assurances was noted as a critical component of the UGM decision.

The audience group shared last and gave an overview of their discussion. Their recommendations included: explore the complexities of the reserves scenarios and how the different outcomes may affect the region, consider housing and infrastructure implications of further development, and avoid focusing solely on land use and transportation. Housing and education were also noted as important considerations.

Member discussion included:

Mayor Jerry Willey noted that he felt the discussion was fruitful and that there seemed to be consistency in terms of areas of concern. He explained that he would like to see increased certainty in the form of a commitment from the Metro Councilors that the process would be improved in the future before accepting the current draft of the Urban Growth Report.

Councilor Chase recommended that regional stakeholders consider recommendation four and how to evolve the UGM process to provide additional certainty to the region, counties, cities, and stakeholders. In addition to the concerns and comments that will be raised at the September 9 meeting, he asked that members consider strategies that could be applied to improve the process and make it more effective long-term.

Chair Truax noted that the content of the night’s discussions would be circulated to MPAC before the final recommendation. Communications from the Homebuilders Association and the Metropolitan Mayors Consortium would also be shared.

Councilor Stacey stressed the importance, regardless of the results of the UGM decision, of a regional economic development plan that could address the region’s growing problems of affordable housing and the lack of middle income jobs.

Marilyn McWilliams acknowledged the extensive work necessary to expand the urban growth boundary. She explained that it requires not only UGB expansion, but additional pipes in the ground, new water treatments, services expansions and more. She shared her own experience working in the Tualatin Valley Water District and provided examples of the costs of more growth.

Commissioner Jim Bernard noted that there are areas just outside of the urban growth boundary that are unable to be developed. He expressed interest in adjusting the region’s land use codes to allow such existing structures to house people. He noted that there are old homes on the periphery that will be torn down because no one can currently work on them and stressed that this was a lost opportunity for the region.

Chair Truax thanked the committee members for participating in the discussion.

7. ADJOURN

MPAC Chair Truax adjourned the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nellie Papsdorf". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Nellie Papsdorf
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF AUGUST 26, 2015

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
4.0	Letter	08/26/15	A Bike and Pedestrian Pathway Named the Willamette Shore Line	082615m-01
6.1	PowerPoint	08/26/15	Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Update	082615m-02
6.2	PowerPoint	N/A	2015 Urban Growth Management Decision	082615m-03