



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Jennifer
Memorandum

Date: September 10, 1991
To: Metro Council, Executive, Distribution List
From: Betsy Bergstein *JB*
Regarding: Summary - Charter Committee Meeting September, 5, 1991

In its third consecutive "background" meeting, the Metro Charter Committee heard from a variety of speakers including Port Director, Mike Thorne, former Multnomah County Commission Chairman and Portland Housing Authority Director, Don Clark, Portland State University School of Urban Studies Chairman, Nohad Toulon, 1000 Friends attorney, Keith Bartholomew and Bill Moshofsky and Dale Johnson representing Oregonians in Action. All members were present with the exception of Ned Look, Senator Ron Cease and Mary Tobias.

The next Committee meeting is Thursday September 12, 5:30 at Tri-Met, conference room C & D, third floor. Their agenda includes Tom Walsh, Tri-Met, John Phias, Portland Chamber, De Vanderbeek, Hillsboro Chamber, Joan Pasco, Gresham Chamber, Steve Peterson, OEDD, Metro Managers, Homebuilders and a briefing on RUGGOS.

On Saturday, September 14, the Committee will have a retreat at Clackamas Community College, Community Center, Room 127, 19600 S. Molalla Ave., Oregon City starting at 9:00 a.m. and probably lasting until 2:00 p.m. This is an open meeting as are all Committee meetings.

Highlights of the September 5 meeting are as follows:

Mike Thorne, Port Director. Mr. Thorne gave an overview of Port operations characterizing Portland as the "market center of the State."

The Port provides market access --- a transportation system to get products to markets; connects the international marketplace, crucial to economic health of state.

Feels it is under funded and asked "how do we perform private sector activities but are essentially funded as a government body?"

\$12 billion in import/export activity go through Port facilities;
Sell land, lease waterfront property, support core transportation

activities;

50% of the gross export products of the U.S. to the Pacific Rim go through their airports;

2400 - 2500 employees;

Definitely impacted by BM #5;

Most crucial:

Articulating mission and service;

Deepening channel to accommodate ships of the future -- draw 42 feet of water (present is 40 feet).

Port is essential to state's future health.

How much land does the Port have? (Myers)

10,000 acres, 3200 at airport

Do you have a long term plan?

No integrated master plan or strategic plan.

Do you interact with Metro? (Regenstreif)

No, have not in the past. Believes it is important for public to understand what each unit of regional government --- Metro, Tri-Met, Port --- does.

Do we need an agency which can require regional coordination (Hales)?

Did not respond.

Keith Bartholemew, 1000 Friends.

Strong supporter of Metro.

Challenges of growth; transportation increasing 8 times faster than population (DEQ).

JPACT-RPAC - requires consensus of local governments; shift from local based system to regional based system.

Metro needs more bold approach; release Metro from bonds of local governments.

Timidity and fragmented authority will not do the job.

Metro should have more "shalls" in their documents than "shoulds" or "mays." (RUGGOs)

Growth management powers? (Myers)

Land-use and transportation integration;

Comprehensive planning;

Sign-offs to major developments to assure fit with goals and objectives.

Approval authority for regional projects.

Authority to make changes to comprehensive plans.

"Concurrency" idea as in Florida where developer must provide a certain level of public service with development.

Why Metro instead of LCDC?

Buck needs to stop in region.

Should Metro have a larger role in planning, pollution control,

accommodating projected 500,000 growth, should 3 counties be expanded to 5? (Egge)

A cap on growth would drive up the cost of housing. The question of the air shed accommodating growth is set by the Feds. Property tax structure needs to be rearranged; economic activity centers in RUGGOS. Currently have "have" and "have not" jurisdictions; have nots need to get some of the take. Regional tax base system, like Minneapolis/St. Paul.

Don Clark.

Doesn't represent an institution; has a "bias on everything."
Consolidate housing program in region? (Hales)

Yes, major reform with fewer local governments; less cumbersome. Metro needs greater reform; get rid of all the local governments and have one combined city/county government plus Metro, Tri-Met and the Port.

Increased public accountability.

Internal organization? (Myers)

Value in separation of powers;

A policy body that focuses on values, represents community values, oversees and audits programs, allocates resources, has public hearings, presents a forum.

Some districts should be at-large; good for the whole; prevents log rolling.

Executive runs programs, delivers services, administers agency, manages managers.

Executive should be separate from the chair of the legislative function.

Executive should be accountable for results; highly visible; should be elected.

Public should have right to vote out of office.

Separate but equal is a check that the public interest is served.

Metro should have broad based taxing instruments and programs; diversified.

Don't limit government by the charter. The people will provide the best valve and checks and balances. Recent flap over Multnomah County business license tax proposal best recent example.

What is Metro's communication problem? (Phelps)

People don't know what Metro is. Neither fish nor fowl.

One local government would make more accountable, visible and easier to understand.

Problem solving/service delivery to occur at neighborhood level; organize into catchment areas. SE Portland example, organized into neighborhood teams; established clinics.

Rena strong executive; very accountable. Doesn't want to put herself forward (same thing as Clark didn't want to do when he held public office). Rena very strong person. Should be more visible; would become a symbol of Metro.

Water districts are invisible; better to have government with more visibility.

Second choice for government reorganization? (Hennessee)

Look at work out of Future Focus which had regional focus and then try to divide special needs across region.

Nohad Toulan, Portland State University

Agreed with previous speakers.

Plan - plan - plan

Drafted UGB in 1976 (was on CRAG technical advisory committee); drew boundary in absence of a plan.

Need a planning authority; how we absorb population growth is key. Keep local government; can delineate regional planning very precisely; -Transportation planning, regional facilities planning.

Difference between a regional plan and a local plan.

Regional --- states what you want to accomplish.

Local --- says how you do it.

Disappointed Metro can't do a regional plan.

Lack of local government cooperation; passage of BM#5; increased concern about consolidation of local governments.(Egge)

Some cooperating but need more. Consolidation will not save dollars in first few years.

Cooperation as an alternative to consolidation.

Limits to how much we can accommodate from our airshed.

- 80 years ago the Portland area represented 43% of the state's population; similar today.

- How do we want 6 million located?

- Do we want 43% of state population to remain in Portland area?

- Example of London, small communities.

European cities plan with a 75 year time horizon.

By 2050 we will have rings of city-poor; city-rich.
Should be OK to relocate growth outside the valley.

Is 500,000 a well considered assumption (Josselson). Yes, may be low.
Can we accommodate and retain quality of life? Yes, think about the
next 20 years after this 20 years.

If Metro is to manage regional facilities, is there a way other than
"another layer?" (Shoemaker)

Yes, if local governments give up some control and delegate to
Metro and visa versa.

We have turned planning into regulation rather than producing a vision
everyone will buy.

Is there a conflict for Metro to do both planning and service delivery
(Egge)? (This has become a theme in these discussions.)

No, solution is public scrutiny; have become bogged down in
immediate problems.

Should zoning be transferred to Metro? Should Metro move the UGB to
accommodate exception areas? (Answer: qualified yes). Have locals
created these 5 acre lots?

Can't blame locals for 5 acre lots; 15 years ago worried about
land values inside UGB. A mistake.

Structure (Ray)? Need very strong executive; need very strong policy
board; believe in separation of powers; agreed with Don Clark.

Can we separate planning from regulation? (Larry Derr)

Just wrote paper on that for Oregon Progress Board---will send.

Key point: We have same urban pattern today as established in 1840.
Should try to change.

Bill Moshofsky, Dale Johnson, Oregonians in Action.

See attached testimony.

Supports strong Metro.

Land use planning to give direction to locals is missing.

State has no planning program.

500,000 can be accommodated; protect liveability of neighborhoods;
Identify financial resources and appropriate neighborhoods.

Metro must be given authority to develop and implement a land use

plan.

Expand UGB or limit economic growth.

First value of OIA: Quality of life: liveability. Implemented at local level. Integrity of local community.

Do an urban land use plan for entire region.

"Regional" if goes beyond boundaries of local jurisdiction.

"Implementation is the killer; everyone loves to plan."

Is your support for a strong Metro based on a receding LCDC authority? (Hales)

Support planning and direction of Metro in statue. Higher levels of regional planning required to accommodate growth; accept Metro doing it rather than state. Quoted Jefferson, pushing levels of government to lowest appropriate levels.

Planning structure in place doesn't encompass a vision for the future, where the growth is going to occur (theme); what should Metros role be (Myers)?

Only Metro can make sense of the details of the short and long term view.

Prepare now for long range - next 2 million people.

Difference with 1000 Friends is the home they come home to; definition of liveability plan begins with the neighborhood and then looks at facilities.

"If you don't know where you want to go, any road will get you there."

Flawed state policy and how goals are applied. 25 million acres as farm and forest land; out of 16 million farm, only 2 million are prime farm land; the rest is grazing and rocks.

RUGGOs? (Egge) Facility based; backwards concept of planning (Johnson).

Don't believe in UGB; creates an artificial housing shortage.

Our vision was not long term enough.

Sprawl could have been prevented by secondary lands sub division.

REGIONAL GROWTH AND METRO'S RESPONSIBILITY

Presented to the Metro Charter Committee by Oregonians In Action, September 5, 1991

The most significant void in preparing for regional growth in Oregon is the absence of land use planning and the related public facilities planning that is necessary to give direction to that growth. The Portland Region has developed Goals, Processes, Procedures and a variety of other generic concepts relating to the direction and control of growth motivated development. What has been missing, at the regional level, is any kind of land use planning that would give specific direction to the local development policies.

It may not be co-incidental that this same planning void exists at the state level. LCDC, with all of its goals, guidelines and administrative rules, has no planning program for growth in the state. It is of amusement that a state that brags about its superior planning programs has no planning.

Much has been made of the necessity to provide for another 500,000 people arriving in the Metro area over the next twenty years. Assumptions have been made that the population can be absorbed within the existing UGB by simply increasing existing densities and by providing more efficient transportation operations. What is missing is any consideration, at the regional level, of the allocation of the place of residency for this new population and the relationship of that allocation to the necessary public facilities.

OIA is desirous of supporting land use programs that will protect the livability of the neighborhood and the development of all of the public facilities necessary to enhance the livability of the neighborhoods. Metro must provide the identification of the appropriate public agencies to provide those facilities, including the identification of the required financial resources to maintain the facilities.

OIA believes, because of the relationship and interdependence of the municipalities in the Portland area, that Metro must be given the responsibility to develop and implement a land use plan that sets out the broad land use allocations for living, working, shopping and recreating within the urban area. This does not mean that Metro must be part of every decision on each separate property but it should be concerned with designations that impact more than one jurisdiction. OIA subscribes to the concept that the plans for the area must be driven by the concern for the livability of the home

and neighborhood.

Without exception, the quality of life that is effected by the density of development must be determined at the neighborhood and municipal level. Metro must take the responsibility to determine the desired level of residential development within each neighborhood and then base the rest of the regional planning policies on those densities. The philosophy of forcing the development of two story breeding boxes of high density housing into established neighborhoods to protect the integrity of the UGB must stop.

Metro must insert itself into the planning process to oversee the allocation of commercial and industrial designations for development to be certain that the designation of these uses is consistent with the capacity of the housing areas to support the employment and marketing demands. The certification of local plans must include an evaluation as to compatibility with regional land use plans and as to the relationship with competing and supportive developments. For example, Metro must have the authority to examine the large, undeveloped, industrial area along the Sunset Highway and evaluate those designations based on the availability and location of housing to support the employment forces. Metro must have the authority to correct imbalances by adjusting, as may be necessary, land use designations.

It is the desire of OIA that the livability within neighborhoods is the driving force in developing public facilities plans. There are two parts to this desire. First, all public facilities planning decision are to be subservient to the quality of life concerns within neighborhoods. Second, the most restrictive public facility shall control the maximum development allowed.

For example, if a school district can demonstrate a capacity to serve only 10,000 people within a planning area, then all other facilities shall be planned to serve no more than those same 10,000 people. That concept applies to all services from parks to transportation facilities. The plan would be adjusted in the future if any facility was modified to be more restrictive than originally planned. Again, for example, if the county plan was based on the capacity of Oleson Road being five lanes to serve an area and that facility was downgraded to two or three lanes, then the density of developments in the served area would have to be proportionately decreased and all other facilities accordingly downgraded.

It is acknowledged that there will be areas where the regional demands will dictate the location of facilities that may be detrimental to the residential quality of life. Highways, jails, transmission lines and other "negative" public installations are part of our society and they must be

located to meet the needs of the community at the expense of the neighborhoods. Metro is the ideal agency to co-ordinate the location and magnitude of those regional facilities.

When commitments are made to provide service facilities, they either must be built or the plan must be amended to reflect the reduced capacity. The process of plan certification must include all facility providers and those providers must demonstrate the financial and political capacity to develop the facilities. Metro must have the authority to enforce that implementation or the authority to modify the plans to compensate for the reduced capacity.

If this planning process fails to identify a capacity within the UGB to accommodate the projected growth then Metro has two options. It can either demonstrate a need for necessary expansion of the UGB or it can advise of the need to limit economic growth and make the necessary changes in land use designations to reflect the reduced need for industrial and commercial development. The latter would then provide the opportunity for other metropolitan areas to solicit the growth or for LCDC to define entirely new urban communities.

In closing, OIA urges that livability, or the quality of life, within neighborhoods must be the basis for planning in the region and that no land use decisions shall be made to jeopardize that quality. Public facilities planning, including transportation, must be subservient to the quality of life in the neighborhoods and no decision to arbitrarily increase densities to support over designed facilities can be made

Metro must be given the authority to insure, or even implement, these planning policies at the local level. Land use designations that impact the region are of interest to Metro's planning efforts and, thus, the agency must be involved in the decision making process.

OREGONIANS IN ACTION
P.O. Box 230637
Tigard, Oregon 97223
(503) 620-0258