

# METRO URBAN GROWTH READINESS TASKFORCE MEETING

SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2016 | 2:30 – 4:30 PM

## Taskforce Members in Attendance:

---

Pete Truax, Mayor (Forest Grove)  
Shane Bemis, Mayor (Gresham)  
Lori DeRemer, Mayor (Happy Valley)  
Mark Gamba, Mayor (Milwaukie)  
John Ludlow, Clackamas County Chair  
Tom Hughes, Metro Council President  
Carlotta Collette, Metro Councilor  
Carrie Maclaren, Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development  
Jason Miner, 1,000 Friends of Oregon  
Jeff Smith, Homebuilders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Tom Armstrong representing Charlie Hales, Mayor (Portland)

## **Members not represented:**

Krisanna Clark, Mayor (Sherwood)  
Doug Daoust, Mayor (Troutdale)  
Lou Ogden, Mayor (Tualatin)  
Tim Knapp, Mayor (Wilsonville)  
Andy Duyck, Washington County Chair  
Sam Chase, Metro Councilor

## **The following members submitted letters:**

Krisanna Clark, Mayor (Sherwood)  
Tim Knapp, Mayor (Wilsonville)  
Andy Duyck, Washington County Chair  
Jeff Smith, Homebuilders Association of Metropolitan Portland

## STAFF:

---

John Williams (Metro)

Ted Reid (Metro)

Andy Shaw (Metro)

Colin Deverell (Metro)

Jeanne Lawson - Facilitator (JLA Public Involvement)

Hannah Mills - Scribe (JLA Public Involvement)

---

## OVERVIEW & EXPECTATIONS OF THE GROUP

Tom Hughes, Metro Council President, welcomed the attendees and recapped what has been done since the last meeting. The charge of this group is to develop proposals that increase flexibility for Metro to consider “modest” Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansions for housing development. During the summer break staff summarized the goals agreed upon at the last meeting as follows:

- Increasing local certainty about growth
- Requiring strong proposals from cities for UGB expansion
- Advancing the region’s Climate Smart goals
- Providing greater choice and mix of housing

Tom reminded the committee that the taskforce asked Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) to examine two ideas at the June meeting and provide recommendations before they are brought back to the taskforce. The ideas were:

1. Flexibility for Metro to consider city requests for modest UGB additions
2. Exchanging lands already in the UGB that aren’t ready for development with lands are ready

Next, Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement, reviewed the agenda:

1. Summary of Concepts
2. Discussion & Recommendations
3. Meeting Summary
4. Next Steps

Jeanne explained that the conversation should focus on determining how proposed concepts will carry forward. She acknowledged that there were letters received highlighting members’ concerns and explained that those issues would be addressed as the taskforce moves through the discussion.

---

## SUMMARY OF CONCEPTS

John Williams, Metro, used a PowerPoint presentation to review the state, regional and local land use legacy. Currently, the statewide planning program aims to protect forest/ farm lands, and regional and local plans focus on improving existing communities. The 2040 Growth Concept highlights investment in

transit and walkable communities, natural areas conservation, and urban and rural reserves. This effort will also work to embody Metro's Six Desired Outcomes:

1. People live, work and play in **vibrant communities** where their everyday needs are easily accessible
2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's **sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity**
3. People have **safe and reliable transportation choices** that enhance their quality of life
4. The region is **a leader in** minimizing contributions to global warming
5. Current and future generations enjoy **clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems**
6. **The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.**

John explained that the process needs to be responsive to the needs of the community and address the issues approved by the taskforce and illustrated in the Problem Statement. The Problem Statement that the Task Force approved is as follows:

*Under current state law, the Metro Council lacks sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to city requests for modest residential UGB adjustments into urban reserves when cities demonstrate that they can govern the area and finance infrastructure and services, and when the adjustment would advance regional and local goals.*

The previous system for growth management used simple math to define complex housing needs and made expansion decisions based on soil types. The new system will require a concept plan for lands designated as urban reserve before allowing expansion, define housing needs with additional policy considerations and choose expansion areas based on outcomes.

The taskforce previously agreed on several core values, that John summarized as follows:

- Focus on growing existing urban locations and do not exceed the footprint of urban reserves through 2060.
- Keep growth management decisions in a regional context.

A series of additional considerations were determined with the direction of both the taskforce and the Metro Council:

- Balance certainty and flexibility.
- Base expansions on regional needs.
- Make considerations for city expansion requests that will reduce spillover growth in neighboring cities.
- Consider governance, finance and the market in an effort to be practical when making decisions regarding the viability and location of UGB expansions.

- In an effort to address past challenges, explore the possibility of UGB exchanges.
- It is not necessary to have annual UGB decisions.

John reviewed the current proposed concepts for urban growth management:

- Acknowledged urban reserves represent the maximum anticipated urban footprint for the region through 2020
- Metro Council will consider cities’ requests for modest residential UGB expansions into acknowledged urban reserves. Metro will maintain the existing six-year urban growth management decision cycle and also consider mid-cycle city requests for modest residential UGB expansions. Mid-cycle UGB expansions would be done through UGB exchanges or through minor amendments to the most recent Urban Growth Report to recognize housing needs that were not anticipated.
- Cities requesting UGB expansions will demonstrate that they are taking actions that will advance regional and local desired outcomes and that the expansion area will produce housing in fewer than 20 years.
- Mid-cycle UGB expansions will be limited to a region-wide total of 900 gross acres.

**Concept Plan Prior to Expansion**

Approach	Action needed
Urban reserves represent maximum anticipated urban footprint through 2060	Seek acknowledgement of urban and rural reserves in Clackamas and Multnomah
Require concept plan for urban reserves before UGB expansion	Framework already in place
Specify topics to address in urban reserve concept plans	Framework already in place

Ted Reid, Metro, continued the presentation on concepts explaining that much of the framework is currently in place. Metro’s code already requires that cities complete a concept plan for an urban reserve before they can be included in the UGB. Code also specifies what the concept plan should address, including:

- Housing variety and affordability
- General locations of public facilities
- Walkability and transit-supportive development
- Agreements with service providers

- Infrastructure finance
- Ecosystem and habitat protection

**Define Housing Needs with Additional Policy Considerations**

Approach	Action needed
Use range forecast to acknowledge uncertainty and provide flexibility	Framework already in place
Consider how specific expansions requested by cities might reduce spillover growth into neighboring cities	Change decision-making process within existing legal authority

The team has looked for other ways to address some of the policy concerns raised by the taskforce regarding commute distances and greenhouse gas emissions. The regional economy extends beyond the UGB, beyond the three counties, and beyond Oregon’s borders. About one in five of the workers that reside in neighboring cities like Newberg, Battle Ground and Sandy work in the City of Portland, and many work in Hillsboro, Beaverton, Tualatin and Tigard. About one in five of the workers residing in neighboring cities commute more than 25 miles each way. In future growth management decisions, there could be a pursuit of policy direction from the Metro Council on whether there is a need to add a specific urban reserve area to reduce spillover growth into neighboring cities. The project team is making the suggestion that this deliberation be centered on specific requests from cities, not an abstract debate about regional growth.

**Choosing Expansion Areas Based on Outcomes**

Approach	Action needed
Be responsive to city requests for UGB expansions	Change state law to allow minor mid-cycle revisions to recent analysis
Facilitate UGB exchanges to ensure a functional land supply	Remove acreage limit in Metro code. Change state law to allow areas removed from UGB to be credited
Remain focused on existing urban areas	Change Metro code to require cities requesting UGB expansions to use best practices in urban areas
Recognize the importance of local governance & finance	Change state law and Metro code to allow flexibility when choosing among urban reserves for UGB expansion

Decisions need to be responsive to city requests and Metro should have the ability to make decisions more frequently. The creation of mid-cycle revisions is intended to address this, and UGB exchanges will help ensure functional land supply. The goal is to remain focused on existing urban areas.

John reviewed the next steps with the taskforce explaining that, pending the Task Force’s direction, the region will need to work together to make changes to state law and Metro code.

---

## DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Jeanne opened the floor up for discussion, asking the taskforce to consider the proposed concepts and provide input:

- Who gets the credit when lands are exchanged? Will exchanges be agreed upon by all bodies impacted?
  - There will be general agreement between all parties including local jurisdictions.
  - Credit will be accrued into the regional need calculation and used to address those needs.
- There should be a discussion of definitions, specifically:
  - What determines land as “**non-performing?**”
  - How was the **900 gross acres** determined?
  - What does “**holistic**” mean?
  - What is “modest” regarding “**modest mid-cycle revisions?**”
- What makes land “non-performing?” How is that determined?
  - Metro has legal authority to perform exchanges, but there will be a conversation to make those decisions. However, the details of how to shape those decisions have not yet been established.

- There is a worry that land exchanges would be imposed by Metro Council, the language needs to express that exchanges would be initiated by the local jurisdictions.
- Areas in the region risk being disregarded due to lack of development. Consider making efforts to integrate lands that are developable, but have not had the resources or finances to do so.
- Regarding the word “swap,” there needs to be an assurance that it is performed as a “mutual trade.”
  - The decision to use the word “swap” was made with the assumption that there would be extensive conversations that would address impacts to local jurisdictions, climate concerns, growth pattern, etc.
- There was concern that limiting mid-cycle region-wide expansions to 900 gross acres would not address the requirements of development, such as right-of-way or parking, and therefore restrict the housing expected.
  - That number was determined to ensure urban reserves last for at least 50 years and by reviewing actual expansion interest from cities. Currently, there are no UGB requests that exceed 300 acres. There are no restrictions for the six-year UGB expansions; this is a proposal to allow mid-cycle flexibility, not large mid-cycle expansions.
  - The objective of allowing these mid-cycle expansions was to clear the path for areas that have the infrastructure to support new development.
- There was uncertainty about whether it was necessary to delve into the details prior to bringing this to the legislature rather than focusing on flexibility. However, others on the taskforce felt that it was important to evolve these understandings in order to ensure it passes through the legislature and avoids issues with the public in the future.

---

## MEETING SUMMARY

Many members of the taskforce felt it would be beneficial to meet again. Jeanne reminded the committee that the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) will be a part of processing and finalizing the concepts and asked the committee whether they were comfortable with giving the MTAC direction in order to complete the task. Members of the taskforce expressed a desire to meet again to discuss finalization. Members accepted the timeframe and made a tentative plan to meet before Thanksgiving, understanding that there is a deadline for developing legislation for the 2017 session.

---

## NEXT STEPS

Jeanne noted the schedule and asked staff members if they were comfortable with the feedback. She thanked the taskforce for their input and closed the meeting.

