



J. Lewis
METRO

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

Memorandum

Date: October 29, 1991
To: METRO Council, Executive, Interested Parties
From: Betsy Bergstein *B*
Regarding: Charter Committee Meetings - October 17, 1991
and October 24, 1991

[Kimi Oboshi, Committee Clerk, is distributing meeting minutes within one week of the meeting date. Since she provides a very thorough transcript, the format in my memo will be to focus on key points, reoccurring themes, identification of areas of agreement and disagreement, rather than to repeat the transcript. If this is not acceptable, please let me know.]

The Committee has used their last two meetings to discuss "regional planning powers and responsibilities" specifically the addition of (1) a Regional Plan and (2) a Future Vision Concept.

The **regional plan** is an idea which has been advanced by Frank Josselson, Jon Egge and Larry Derr. Their outline is attached and dated October 17, 1991. The October 24, 1991 outline, also attached, was advanced by Hardy Myers at the last committee meeting.

The Committee has gone through the points of these proposals in some detail. At this time, they have not reached consensus on the final product. They plan to finish this Thursday, October 31, 1991, and then have a process of "public comment" on the idea. They will probably wait to finalize the concept until later in their process.

Key points:

- o A **Regional Plan**, not a **comprehensive** plan which contains:
 - Metro Regional Goals and Objectives;
 - Metro Functional Plans;
 - Performance Standards called **benchmarks** for local plan responsibility.
- o Regional plan has 50 year time frame.
- o A longterm (100 years) future **vision** for the region on which the regional plan is based.
 - Vision establishes population level and settlement pattern for six counties.
 - Guideline for "short term planning."
 - Vision has no regulatory effect; planning mechanism.
 - Mandate to create the vision, not the vision, to be in Charter.
- o Both regional plan and vision have periodic review, the former

- o Both regional plan and vision have periodic review, the former every 2 years, the latter every 10 years.
- o Intent of Committee to identify areas of regional responsibility, local responsibility and unspecified subject areas, the latter being a process to add to the regional plan at some point in the future.
 - Allows regional government to do what it does best, local government to do what it does best and forces communication.
 - Respond to idea of what makes sense for the region; operate as an integrated organism, not as 27 separate units.
- o Adoption and Review have two major areas, (1) 30 month time limit and (2) sanctions for non-performance.
 - After much discussion on 10/17/91, Chair came back with options in the October 24, 1991 outline, section part V. section C.
 - This section is still under discussion.
 - Intent was to have consent of local government.
 - Key, reoccurring theme of a cooperative process sought.
 - Unresolved key question of what the process will be for plan to become operative.

Unresolved Issues:

- o Increase or decrease in current authority? No consensus on the Committee.
 - Cease urged to "do something with a chance of passage", can do within existing law. Have to get it done as well as approved. Successful efforts are pragmatic; build on what we have; have to relate what we do to the world out there; get realistic.
 - Hales and Josselson don't support the premise that voters won't support.
- o Cost. Assume increase cost for local governments to make their plans conform to a regional plan (also, implied increase cost for Metro to do a regional plan).
- o LCDC role. Should the regional plans or the local plans be acknowledged by LCDC? Which plan is primary in the eyes of LCDC? Will counties and cities continue to go through an acknowledgment process for their plans or will there be one acknowledgment process?
- o Regional plan elements and process. Chair characterized as "items of legitimate inquiry." Not decided, yet.
- o Time limits, sanctions and local sign-off. Want to impose a time limit (eg. 30 months) so the process avoids the lengthy time it took for comprehensive plans. Incentives/sanctions for both local and regional government to finish and approve plan. Need some sort of local government sign-off.
- o Local plan/regional plan conflicts. Assume that Metro has the authority to insure that local plans conform with the regional plan. Local plans would have to conform to the regional plan and should not interfere with attainment of another local plan. There is not Committee consensus on where the boundary is between regional and local responsibility.

- o **Definition of regional significance.** Committee must define (Phelps). Relates to proposed Metro process in evaluating local plan amendments impact on the regional plan.
- o **100 Year Vision.** No Committee consensus on concept of creating a 100 year vision or whether it could actually be done (Tobias, Shoemaker, Phelps, all questioned the concept).

Committee is scheduled to finish this work at their October 31, 1991 meeting.