Agenda

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1797

METRO

Meeting: **FUTURE VISION COMMISSION**

Date: August 30, 1993

Day: Monday

Time: 4:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

Place: Metro, Room 370

	Approximate Time
1. CALL TO ORDER	5 minutes
3. ROLL CALL	
2. PUBLIC COMMENT (*two minute limit, please*)	
4. MINUTES Approval of August 16, 1993 Minutes	
5. REGION 2040 PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION - Gervais, Group	70 minutes
6. DISSCUSSION ON PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMISSION CONTACT- Group	20 minutes
7. DISCUSSION OF WORKPLAN - Group	20 minutes
8. PUBLIC COMMENT on Items not on the Agenda	5 minutes
9. OTHER	

Other materials in packet:
- *Remarks to the Conference on Renewable Strategies*, provided by Wayne Lei
- Addendum to 8/3/93 Minutes, Planning activities graphic by Andy Cotugno
- *Future Vision Concept Statement* by Ethan Seltzer

Please R.S.V.P. to Barbara Duncan at 797-1750 by August 27th if you are unable to attend

FUTURE VISION COMMISSION
Meeting Summary, August 16, 1993

Members in attendance: Len Freiser, Chair; Lisa Barton-Mullins, Ron Correnti, Judy Davis, Mike Gates, Kim Katsion, Wayne Lei, Peggy Lynch, Peter McDonald, Susan McLain, John Magnano, Alice Schlenker, Ted Spence, Fred Stewart and Robert Textor.

Others in attendance included: Harmon Arroyo, Karen Buehrig, Andy Cotugno, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Raoul Gurrero, Greg Hendrix, Sharon Meyer, Gail Ryder and Ethan Seltzer.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call
The meeting was called to order at 4:15 by Chair Freiser and a quorum was declared.

II. Minutes of August 3, 1993
Peggy Lynch requested that the question "Is Region 2040 a product or a process?" be added to the minutes, as well as the graphic by Andy Cotugno **(enclosed)** that accompanied the discussion of the various planning programs and deadlines at the bottom of page one of the minutes.

Discussion followed on Region 2040. The Commission asked for a one hour presentation on Region 2040 by staff for the next meeting, August 30th.

III. Visitors Comments - none

IV. Introductory Remarks
Chair Freiser asked commissioners to discuss their previous experience with visioning processes. Visioning projects of Metro area cities were mentioned. Chair Freiser related comments from Rod Stevens that the Commission's work was visioning first and specifics second. Peggy Lynch suggested that the Commission think of the work as a Declaration of Independence, a framework, rather than a more detailed Constitution. Commissioners expressed that both specifics and visioning are needed.

Lisa Barton-Mullins asked where the FV process will end, the document or implementation? She stated that Gresham's three year visioning process includes the topics of land use, open space, downtown, the Rockwood district, transportation, community centers, Mt. Hood View corridor protection, Columbia River access, arts and industry and historic resources. The first year of the process emphasized maps of how the area should look, with few written reports.

Commissioners discussed how to have input from experts in various fields. It was suggested a list be kept of people and issues that would be fitting to hear from, and to schedule them as appropriate.

V. Table of Contents
Commissioners discussed their ideas on how long a document they were thinking about. Responses ranged from 1 page to 50. Discussion followed on the potential form and contents of the document. The Commission went through the Table of Contents and dicussed what information is needed on each topic and who should provide that information.

There was a discussion regarding "I. Defining the Region (Geographic Scope)". The Commission will define the geographic scope.
Comments: Should the vision go beyond the Portland Metropolitan region?
Should the Commission define the area in the beginning of the visioning

process?
To what degree should the vision concentrate on the connections to larger regions: State, West Coast, Pacific Rim?
In the context of 50 years, the "local region" will change.
There may be three areas: the visioning area of interest, the relationship to larger regions, and the jurisdictional boundary of Metro.
Change "Values and Icons" to "Values" and "Symbols" to "Icons and Symbols".

The Commission discussed the item "Is growth good or bad/Why should we grow?" listed in the Preface of the Table of Contents.

Comments: Growth, like quality of life, is subjective; a pro/con discussion may be too politically sensitive.
Change "why should we grow" to "why will we grow".
Discuss what are the changes associated with growth.
Economic impacts - growth is not viable if it means only housing without industry.

On Section II. of the Table of Contents "Where we are/Where we are headed", the Commission will seek staff input. Section III. "The Vision / Concept" and Section IV. "Text on Eight Topics" will be addressed by the Commission. A report on carrying capacity will be needed by staff.

Other comments:

-Ethan Seltzer suggested that each Commissioner take two rolls of film (35mm slides), one of their neighborhood and a second of "Icons" from the region.
-There was discussion of the Commission arranging one meeting where representatives from various jurisdictions and groups around the region could speak for two or three minutes on what they see as their community's/jurisdiction's values.
-Metro's Regional Growth Conference on October 4th (with day and evening sessions planned) may be an opportunity for the Commission to interview citizens on what they value in the region.
-Sections I and II, "Defining the Region" and "Where we are/Where we are Headed" may merge and be one section.
-A work session with maps will help the Commission list which major landscape elements should be included.
-Ken Gervais announced that the FVC library shelf was set up. Karen Buehrig distributed a bibliography of the items available, most of the items should be used at Metro, copies can be made. Items to be included in the library should be given to Karen.

VI. Public Comment

Harmon Arroyo expressed interest in the Commission meetings and the use of images and metaphor.
Raoul Gurrero suggested that the Commissioners take a walk around and look at streets and think about how the street might look 50 years from now. He stated that meetings will accomplish the technical aspects of the vision, but you should also see the area and talk to residents.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan.

Portland State University

P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751

August 30, 1993

To: Members of the Future Vision Commission

From: Ethan Seltzer

Re: Future Vision Commission Workplan

Introduction...

There are many ways to approach that task given to the Commission. Although there is probably no one "right" workplan, based on the discussions of the Commission to date the path to be chosen by the Commission should incorporate a number of key elements. First, it should be based on a dialogue among Commission members. Although the work of the Commission should be informed by invited testimony and other public events, the Commission members have been selected as a group to provide representation for a wide range of interests and communities in the metropolitan area.

Second, the product of the Commission's work should be specific enough to inform decisionmakers engaged in making major urban form decisions for the region. The Future Vision needs to be specific enough to be relevant without becoming the plans that it is intended to inform.

Third, the Commission needs to complete enough of its work early enough so that it can add its voice to the kinds of decisions coming through the Region 2040 process in the summer of 1994. Although a vision for 50 years will not live or die on any single decision or project, the far-reaching implications of the Region 2040 decisions cannot be ignored.

Finally, the final product should be based on solid factual information. However, the introduction of factual background material into the Commission's discussions should be balanced with the desire to allow the Commission to have the kind of discussion it feels is necessary. Early reliance on background data could hamper the ability of Commission members to put ideas on the table that, though perhaps deserving of rejection, also deserve to be discussed.

Future Vision: a definition and approach...

With these thoughts in mind, a review of the proposed table of contents developed by the Commission suggests an approach to your task. The proposed table of contents leads to a vision that speaks directly to three central questions. As defined by the Commission, they are:

-- What should we keep?
-- What should we change?
-- What should we add?

In essence, the table of contents defines the Future Vision as being the result of your efforts to answer these questions. In answer to the question, "What is a Future Vision?", your response, based on the proposed table of contents, is:

> A set of principles that describe what we ought to try to protect, add, or change in our region's landscape, communities, economy, edcuational systems, and culture.

School of Urban and Public Affairs Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
503/725-5170 FAX 725-5199

If this is accurate, then the Commission could achieve its objectives through the following five-part process:

1) Commission Discussion I - The Commission will begin by discussing:

-- boundaries for the work of the Commission; and

-- what, within those boundaries, ought to be kept, added, or changed in the metropolitan region. Commission members would be asked to organize their thoughts according to specific categories, including landscape, natural resources, communities, economy, education, culture, families, and linkages. Complete by end of October.

2) Invited Commenters - The Commission has indicated a desire to invite community leaders into the process at an early date. To make the most of their time, and to focus their comments on the task before the Commission, the results of the Commission's discussion will be written up and provided in advance to invited commenters. Invitees will be asked to consider the same set of questions as the Commission -- what should be kept, added, and changed -- and to comment on the results of the Commission's discussions to date. Ongoing through April.

3) Commission Discussion II - Based on what it hears, the Commission will revise the results of its first discussion and define background studies needed to provide a reality check on the product of the its discussions to date. Complete by December.

4) Testing and Revision - The background studies will be used by the Commission to test the ideas in its discussion to that point, and to help establish the relationship between and relative priority of the elements to be kept, added, and changed. Complete by May.

5) Document Editing and Public Review - Discussion with the public and decisionmakers to focus and refine the vision statement. Complete by September.

Results...

This approach will:

-- result in a product that can be incorporated in Metro Council action on the Region 2040 alternatives next summer;

-- set the stage for Commission discussion of implementation activities following development of the vision;

-- make good use of the time and experience of Commission members; and

-- keep the Commission on target for completing its entire task by January of 1995.

Parallel Activities...

At the same time that the Commission is going through this process, a number of parallel activities should take place to both add to the discussion and to anticipate Charter mandated issues. By mid-September, the Commission should consider and either embrace or reject the following kinds of projects:

a) Photo project - To help Commission members better understand their respective interests and familiarity with the region, and to expand the familiarity of all members with the region, each Commission member will be asked to take two roles of film (slides, 24 exposures per roll). The first will be of key features or defining elements in the landscape of their neighborhood, community, and/or city. The second will be of views or features that could be used to help define the geographic boundaries for the work of the Commission.

Each shot should be logged with the location and brief comments on the reasons for the shot. All photos should be taken by _____. Each Commission member will then be asked to select five from each roll for presentation to the entire Commission on _____. All slides from all rolls and accompanying logs will be reviewed by staff and interested Commissioners to identify common themes or features by _____. The common themes along with the slides included in the Commission slide show will be located on a map and provided to the Commissioners as a self-guided tour. We may also want to charter a bus to take the tour as a group in order to enable Commissioners to explain the landscape they saw through the lens to the rest of the Commission members.

b) Interviews - Commission member Bob Textor has, on occasion, proposed an interviewing process to help Commission members articulate their views of the future. The Commission should hear again from Bob and consider interest in and the role for that activity in the next few months.

c) Charter Mandated Concerns - As the Commission's discussion proceeds, and prior to January, 1995, issues identified in the Charter and specifically delegated to the Commission need to be investigated. Towards that end, three reports should be prepared:

> i) Carrying Capacity - a report outlining the conceptual basis for applying the carrying capacity concept, long-term, in a metropolitan setting, with specific attention to land, air, water, educational, and economic resources. This report should also integrate new concepts pertaining to sustainable development to respond to concerns regarding the "use, restoration, and preservation of regional land and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations."
>
> ii) Settlement Patterns - a report outlining the historical development of regional settlement patterns, their implications, and trends for the future.
>
> iii) Quality of Life - a summary of regional vision documents, opinion surveys, benchmarks, and other materials that provides a baseline for defining "a desired quality of life" in the metropolitan area. This kind of information will also emerge through discussions of the commission internally, through public contact, and through interaction with invited commenters.

d) Public Contact Plan - Staff should be directed to develop a systematic public contact plan that integrates the workplan of the Commission into Region 2040 activities and other contact opportunities in the next year. Consideration should also be given to performances and public relations devoted to the Future Vision in the form of school programs, plays, exhibits, forums, concerts, and other events. Commission members should be involved in framing that plan, and in its implementation.

e) Technical Assistance - Commission members needing additional technical information will be supported by staff. Books, reports, maps, data, and community contacts can be provided to assist Commissioners with gaining the knowledge that they feel is essential to

their full participation. In addition, a compilation of existing vision statements, particularly with respect to common themes, will be developed.

Discussion questions...

To assist with the evaluation of this outline, please consider the following questions:

-- Does the working definition of the Future Vision make sense?

-- Is the list of Commission discussion categories complete? How else should the Commissioner's come prepared to discuss what ought to be kept, added, and changed?

-- Who should the Commission hear from?

-- Is the list of parallel activities complete?

-- When and how would the Commission like to tour the metropolitan area?

Remarks to the Conference on Renewable Strategies

Center for Resource Management

Santa Fe, New Mexico

Angus Duncan

Council Member

Northwest Power Planning Council

May 15, 1993

Introduction and Background

When we talk of electricity in the Pacific Northwest we still begin with the great works of civil engineering on the Columbia and Snake River systems, the Depression-era dams of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

We are still a largely hydro-based system -- two-thirds of our energy and three-quarters of our capacity -- but the last dam of any size, Lower Granite on the Snake, was completed in 1975. In the last thirty years we have built 16 coal plants and pieces of six nuclear plants, of which only one, WPPSS #2, still fitfully operates.

Through most of the 1980's the region carried a power surplus that exceeded 3000 megawatts at times. The costs of nuclear misadventures and overbuilding in the 1970's were enormous; BPA's rate increases in the early years of the decade exceeded 450%.

In the 1990's we are romancing gas. Less than 2000 MW of current capacity is natural-gas fired today, but some 80% of planned new capacity is gas also. There is substantial industrial gas usage, and still very limited but growing direct use for residential space and hot water heating.

The 1980's have also been years of drought, which accelerated declines in Basin salmon runs. Both factors are stressing the electrical system, as river operations adjust to return flows back to the spring and summer when the fish need them, away from the winter when the needs of power users peak.

On top of this, the closure of the Trojan nuclear plant near Portland has forced the issue of capacity constraints in the Interstate 5 corridor from Seattle to Portland. Most existing -- and much of the new -- generation is found east of the Cascades, and much of it is east of the Rockies where, in both cases, access to the fast-growing loads in the west is limited by available transmission capacity.

The Power Planning Process

The historical evolution of the Northwest grid and the generation that supplied it was for decades the province of the Bonneville Power Administration and the public and private utilities and aluminum companies that comprised the market for its power. In 1980 this arrangement was dramatically changed. The Northwest Power Act of that year established the Northwest Conservation and Power Planning Council as a creature of the four States, charged with adopting an integrated resource plan for the region. The Council was accepted begrudgingly by the utility

community, which had only wanted Congressional authorization to use BPA as a financing tool for new large generation as was done for the first WPPSS projects. Congress agreed, but only on condition that the Council approve BPA's actions.

The Congress also stipulated that the region should not build conventional thermal plants until it had first acquired all the cost-effective conservation resource available, and then all the cost-effective renewable resources. In determining cost-effectiveness, the Council was to consider environmental as well as direct dollar costs; and was to quantify environmental costs wherever possible.

These rules of the road are reflected in the Council's third Power Plan, adopted in 1991. The Plan calls for meeting more than 50% of the decade's load growth with conservation, and the rest with a mix of new small hydro and gas-fired cogeneration. It also sets up an agenda for confirming three renewable resources -- wind, geothermal and solar photovoltaics -- and beginning to introduce them into the regional power pool. That agenda includes:

- o confirming the extent and quality of each of the three resources;
- o tracking the progress of technologies that harness the resources;
- o understanding how to integrate intermittent resources like wind into the existing system to capture the greatest added value;
- o building a 30 MW demonstration utility wind farm; and also a "cold weather" wind site;
- o developing three dispersed geothermal projects of at least 10 aMW@;
- o finding and developing cost-effective photovoltaic applications, mostly for electrical loads remote from the grid or where they displace long, expensive and difficult-to-maintain distribution lines.

Two years later it's clear that these goals were not ambitious enough. Instead of 30 MW of wind, we have 180 MW under negotiation. Instead of 30 aMW of geothermal, we are pushing ahead with 90 aMW.

Where we estimated that wind would cost of 5.3¢ to 8.0¢/kWh, we now project costs of 3.5¢ to 6.1¢/kWh . . . almost 2¢ lower. With the federal tax credit and the effect of a BTU tax, on a strictly cost comparison the best sites should be competitive with gas or nearly so. And there is a technical potential for 4500 aMW of wind in and near the region.

Our estimates of the extent of geothermal potential still await better information on the resource in the Cascade Mountains, about which little is still known. But we think the costs will be closer to 3¢/kWh than the 5.4¢/kWh we estimated in 1991.

There has been some progress in deploying photovoltaic systems as the Council envisioned, mostly in Idaho Power's service territory. Cost still relegates this technology to the important but narrow niche of remote, dispersed loads such as stock watering and end-of-line farms and residences.

The region, with Bonneville and the Council leading, has established the Regional Supply Expansion Program (RSEP) as a tool for demonstrating and commercializing new technologies, including conservation as well as renewables.

A Prognostication

Given these activities, and reasonable assumptions about maturing renewable technologies and declining cost curves, where might we be at the end of the decade? Any number of places of course, but to make a point let me suggest two possible outcomes.

	"Business-as-Usual / Present technology and cost trends	Regional commitment plus major progress on barriers
Geothermal	+ 400 aMW	+1000 aMW
Wind	+ 75 aMW*	+ 250 aMW*
Solar		
Year 2000	+ 475 aMW	+ 1250 aMW
	= 20% of load growth	= >50% of load growth

(* = 300 MW and 1000 MW of installed capacity x 25% capacity factor)

Some, especially in the utility industry, would say the first outcome is impossibly ambitious. Others will argue that the second is far too timid when considered in light of global environmental stresses. Without trying to resolve these arguments, I want to focus on the space in between. What would have to be different,

in practical terms, to reach or exceed the higher target? What are the barriers, other than pace of technology and cost of installed equipment, that condemn us to *positioning* on renewables while we are *building* combustion turbines?

Inconsistent public policy, especially at the Federal level, is certainly one constraint. Federal subsidies and other forms of support have consistently favored conventional thermal technologies, while support for renewables (and efficiency) has been tepid and erratic. This has elevated the risk profile for these technologies, investors never knowing what next year's tax and depreciation schedules will bring.

But there are other barriers, closer to home, that we need to address.

Fear of Flying: Utilities and their regulators have a very low comfort level with these technologies and the apparently erratic quality of the wind and sun that fuels them. The pace of technology change is too fast, too unpredictable. After the expensive misadventures with nuclear plants, decisionmakers are wary of uncertainty, of 'stranded investment" (when better equipment appears); they are drawn to the safe harbors of burning a fossil fuel, especially when a relatively clean one is available. (We can speculate on how, say, run-of-the-river hydro might have fared as a new technology today, without the comfort of our hydroelectric history.)

Existing regulatory practices: Practices that seemed to work well for thermal and large hydro plants can handicap renewable technologies with very different characteristics.

Utilities can only earn a return on their own investments, not on purchased power (which is expensed), so contracts are discouraged that shift the renewable fuel risk to developers who know wind and geothermal well.

Regulatory discount rates tend to favor fossil fuel technologies with lower front-end capital costs, and to disadvantage capital-intensive technologies with front-end loaded costs, principally renewable and conservation investments.

We have made some progress as a region in figuring out how to properly value risk factors like short resource lead times and small/modular resource size; but precious little in fairly valuing system diversity (of technologies and fuels) and environmental costs that are not now reflected in market prices.

Competition: There are new forces at work in the energy industry, competing for traditional utility markets and putting financial stress on traditional utilities. Natural gas is competing for residential space and water heating loads; non-

utility generators (NUG's) are competing for industrial loads; and customers themselves are reaching out to efficiency and smaller-scale supply technologies that are suddenly accessible directly rather than only through the utility. These competitors often offer newer technology, more flexible ownership and capital structures, and lower front-end rates. The utility fights back by trying to hold its rates down, a strategy that discourages investments with long payback profiles. Under these influences we would be unlikely, for example, to build the capital-intensive Columbia-Snake hydroelectric system on which we rely today for our least-expensive power.

The Environmental Disconnect: The difficulties of siting new power plants (or airports; or landfills) on environmental grounds are well known. And no one should argue for lax environmental review of wind and geothermal projects; that would only lead to bad projects and a delayed reaction that over-regulates these technologies. But there's a badly tilted playing field now. Renewables tend to be located in remote locations that often have rural and scenic qualities. They also have high site-centered impacts (visual; noise) as opposed to the less visible but often more significant emissions effects of thermal plants. The resources themselves -- wind, sun, hot water -- are usually in remote sites that require transmission facilities. also with largely visual environmental effects. A combined opposition of some environmental groups with local inhabitants is potent and discouraging to developers. The result is that today it is far easier to place a 248 MW gas-fired combustion turbine in a suburban Tacoma industrial park than to site 50 MW of wind turbines on a rural ridge in eastern Washington.

System Integration Issues: There are some issues peculiar to the Northwest power system. Most of our load growth is in the I-5 corridor west of the Cascades; most new generation, including renewables, is east of the mountains. Most good wind resource is even further away, east of the Rockies in Montana and Wyoming. New transmission, or creative expansion of the capacity on existing lines, will have to accompany significant renewables development. So will getting smarter about how the new resources interact with the existing system, since the ability of the reservoirs to store new power is increasingly limited by fish needs, flood control, recreation constraints and so on. So will better understanding of the capacity value of these new resources, and training of dispatchers to fully exploit that value.

Cheap Gas: It would be churlish to complain about the price of gas being too low, but it is appropriate to measure the long-term effects of a regional rush to gas combustion turbines. Gas that is low-cost, available on relatively long-term contracts, easy to use in readily-sited, short-lead time combustion turbines, is pretty seductive. Right now it is crowding not only renewables but energy efficiency investments and even gas-fired cogeneration (which is often more efficient but more complicated to develop). Renewables have to be closer than shouting distance to gas on price and reliability in order to benefit from risk-management considerations (risk of fuel escalation; of new environmental regulation; etc.). If they are -- and some are, in good sites -- utilities and regulators have to give full weight to system diversity values. The choice shouldn't be gas *or* renewables, which now it is to the disadvantage of the latter, but building a balanced resource portfolio of gas *and* renewables.

There's a lot of detail to be managed here, and the devil's in the details as we know, but there also needs to be something to pull all those particles together, to impose a coherence and a correspondence on them; something which, for want of a less elevated term, we call a vision.

I believe most people in the Northwest would subscribe to a sustainable energy future that relies on efficiency and renewable resources. While they would not do so at all costs, neither would they want such a future to be frustrated by a pinched and foreshortened view of costs and benefits. Cost-effectiveness and reliability are prior conditions, to be construed rigorously but broadly, in a way that reflects the long-term environmental and societal values that a short-term market can miss.

We are tantalizingly close to realizing such a vision today. Geothermal and wind costs and reliability values are nearly competitive with conventional thermal generation: yes, even with gas. Wind and solar costs are still sloping downward as the technologies mature. So are costs of efficiency technologies such as HVAC control systems, lighting, motors, glazing, etc.

Utilities are "positioning" (their term) themselves to exploit these technologies, but are unwilling still to take the risks of substantial commitment. At the same time, their purchases of gas combustion turbines could smother the baby in the crib.

We're close to the top of the hill, with a lot of baggage that could keep us from

clearing the top and accelerating down the other side.

Utilities and regulators will have to be persuaded that the vision is a plausible investment scenario, and to agree on a risk/reward formula that properly values prudent, long-term risk-taking.

We need capital and ownership structures that better distribute risk, by mixing utility strengths with those of technology companies and third-party financing entities.

We need utilities and consortiums that adopt a portfolio approach to new technologies, just as a bank loan officer will have a loan portfolio with higher and lower risk instruments. He knows if all of his loans pay off, if none of them goes south on him, he's probably being too conservative. Equally, if utilities only bet on sure things they're not getting the returns they should.

Siting authorities and environmental interests need to approach siting decisions in the larger context of regional and global environmental consequences, not just those associated with the site. Both need to understand the opportunity cost of failing to untie the knot of local impact. Both need to become familiar with the particular qualities of renewable projects, and not treat them for siting purposes as odd-shaped thermal plants.

What else? Federal intervention at the margin, setting equipment standards and favorable depreciation schedules. Sharing the costs of demonstrating near-ready technologies, and sustaining RD&D support for advancing those further away. Volume purchases of small-scale technologies such as photovoltaic cells and fuel cells.

Most of the heavy lifting, however, is ours; regionally, and utility by utility, State by State, interest group by interest group. None of it is easy, but on the other hand it's a pretty short "have-to-do" list. And a pretty narrow gap to close. Some better tools, such as those I've touched on, a few successes, and a commitment to go forward with our feet firmly on the ground but our eyes on the horizon, can carry us to a future we've deliberately chosen, one we will not regret.

M E M O R A N D U M

METRO

To: Future Vision Commission

From: Ken Gervais 797-1736

Date: August 20, 1993

Re: Future Vision Concept Statement

ACTION REQUESTED: Review

PSU is now ready to go to work. Please review Ethan Seltzer's memo of July 6, 1993 attached.

We are all anxious to see that assistance from the Institutue of Portland Metropolitan Studies fits in with your objectives and the outline which you have been preparing.

INSTITUTE OF PORTLAND METROPOLITAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

FUTURE VISION CONCEPT STATEMENT
JULY 6, 1993

I. Future Vision Mission

By charter, the Future Vision is:

> "a conceptual statement that indicates population levels and settlement patterns that the region can accommodate within the carrying capacity of the land, water and air resources of the region, and its educational and economic resources, and that achieves a desired quality of life. The Future Vision is a long-term, visionary outlook for at least a 50-year period."

The charter goes on to state that the matters to be addressed by the Future Vision include but are not limited to:

> "1) use, restoration and preservation of regional land and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations, 2) how and where to accommodate population growth for the region while maintaining a desired quality of life for its residents, and 3) how to develop new communities and additions to the existing urban areas in well-planned ways."

The charter specifically states that the Future Vision is not a "regulatory document," and that it is the intent of the charter that the Future Vision "have no effect that would allow court or agency review of it." The only specific effect of the Future Vision noted by the charter is that the Regional Framework Plan shall "describe its relationship to the Future Vision."

Taken together, these sections of the charter suggest that the Future Vision should be a compelling statement of principles regarding the stewardship of the region's landscape and communities. Although the Future Vision is not intended to be a plan, especially a "land use plan" as called for by the Oregon Statewide Land Use Goals, it should be specific enough so that its application to any specific geographic location is easy to understand. The Future Vision should be a useful tool for stewardship, a "users guide" to the metropolitan area.

The Future Vision must clearly identify those features and relationships in our landscape that are central to our sense of place and should never change. It should also identify the forces of change acting on the region and identify those that are positive, those that are potentially negative, and those that could be either positive or negative depending on the circumstances.

Finally, the Future Vision should suggest strategies for stewarding those important landscape features and relationships most vulnerable to those forces of change. The Future Vision must be developed and portrayed in a manner that is useful to groups or individuals charged with or otherwise making choices affecting urban form and structure.

II. Key Objectives

The Future Vision, as described by the charter, should explain or describe the region in several key categories:

a) Landscape - specific direction to address issues pertaining to settlement patterns, carrying capacity of the land, and the location of growth all suggest that the Future Vision should first, develop an understanding of the landscape, how we've come to inhabit it, and where our current patterns of use seem to be taking us. In this instance, the term "landscape" is taken to mean the intersection of the natural environment and the built environment as mediated by the culture of our communities. When speaking of landscape, the Future Vision should focus on the underlying relationships in the region uniting natural systems and local communities.

b) Carrying Capacity - specific mention is made of the concept of carrying capacity and the limits to growth inherent in the landscape, airsheds, and watersheds of the region. Carrying capacity, though often referred to as an absolute concept, is, like the term "efficiency," a relative concept. For example, the carrying capacity of our metropolitan land area to accommodate new households depends, at least in part, on the density we build at. The carrying capacity of our metropolitan area food supply was probably exceeded long ago, and now depends on imports from around the world.

If by carrying capacity we mean access to resources needed to sustain life, we can go far past the point where quality of life has been reduced to a cinder before we reach that biological point of no return. The Future Vision must identify the decision points for the region at different levels of population and density, and with respect to the use of technology for meeting community needs while stewarding critical landscape features.

c) Intergenerational Equity - The charter speaks to the needs of present and future inhabitants. This suggests that the Future Vision needs to specifically address the responsibilities of this generation to the ones to follow. One way to address this is to identify the characteristics of quality of life we currently enjoy, and to propose strategies for maintaining them in a mutually supportive and

sustainable manner. For example, we are fortunate to currently inhabit a landscape that embodies three important qualities:

- Possibility: residents of this region can expect rewarding and chance encounters with the natural environment and with each other in their communities. At any time, it's possible to see hawks and herons flying overhead, to hear geese and coyotes making their calls in the night, to smell the freshness of an ocean breeze or the changing of the seasons, even though we are living in the fastest growing, most densely populated part of the state. In many parts of the region, it's also possible to meet friends, family members, and neighbors in the course of shopping, work, or simply taking a stroll at lunch or in the evening.

- Abundance: in northwestern Oregon the challenge is not getting things to grow but cutting them back fast enough. Salmon and steelhead can be caught in the Willamette River in downtown Portland and in area streams. Each season brings a fresh harvest of fruit and vegetables from local producers. In short, we live in an abundant landscape that enriches the lives of its inhabitants. Historically, this abundance in our landscape has also meant economic opportunity for a large segment of our population. Today, with an economy of quite different characteristics evolving in the state, we are faced with the challenge of finding new and sustainable links between our economy, employment for our people, and the stewardship of our landscape.

- Access: it is relatively easy to move between city and country, mountains and coast. There are a variety of housing opportunities in virtually every community. Jobs are critically needed in our largest and smallest communities, though the same patterns of movement to employment are observed here as in other metropolitan areas. Citizen participation in planning and governance is both a tradition and, in some cases, the law. Relative to other large metropolitan areas, this is one where government remains relatively close to the people.

The Future Vision should identify how these, and undoubtedly other characteristics of our region operate today, how they are inter-related, and what needs to be done to sustain them as our legacy to those who will follow and be faced with their own needs and choices.

d) Growth and Change - The region will grow and change. Even without growth, the region will change, but by all accounts our long-term outlook should be one that anticipates more people and more activity in the future. The Future Vision must reflect an understanding of the sources of growth, the sources of

change, and the actions and interactions required to ensure that positive aspects of growth and change will be evident in our quality of life in the years ahead. More specifically, the Future Vision should anticipate the affects of different rates of change and population growth, and our ability to cope with the consequences of those different rates.

e) Geography - The Future Vision needs to be developed with respect to a territory descriptive of the forces at play and the resources affected. To some degree, this is an area extending the length of I-5 from Medford to Olympia, and from the coast to the high desert. To start, the Future Vision should employ a base map portraying the area from the crest of the Coast Range to the crest of the Cascades, and from Polk County to Castle Rock along I-5.

f) A "Conceptual Statement" - The Future Vision is not intended to be a comprehensive plan in the legalistic sense that we know in Oregon. It should operate at a scale appropriate to the geographic scope of the effort and its time horizon. Hence, questions of zoning or of specific densities may not be usefully addressed by this effort, and might better be delegated to subsequent Regional Framework Plan activities. It may be more helpful to think of the Future Vision as analogous to the Statewide Planning Goals rather than to a local comprehensive plan or the Urban Growth Boundary. Nonetheless, the Future Vision must be specific enough so that its application to the landscape can be mapped. In this respect, the Future Vision is akin to the older, traditional examples of "comprehensive planning," with the products taking the form of tools for decision making and conceptual or thematic maps.

With these categories in mind, the Future Vision should explain in a highly accessible manner how the region "works," what we like about it, and how our actions, as households, communities, and jurisdictions, should be guided to enhance the qualities underlying our quality of life. In essence, the Future Vision should be an engaging description of what every citizen should know about living in this region. Hence, the Future Vision should emerge as the pre-eminent statement of what this region means as a place, and how that knowledge can be used to sustain and inspire the people who come to live here.

III. The Future Vision Commission

The role for the Future Vision Commission can be regarded as embodying important elements of synthesis and translation. Neither this generation nor any other starts with a blank slate. Our challenge is to make choices and take actions which meet our needs while not sacrificing the options available to future generations to meet their own. However, just as we are creating the context within which choices will be made

in the future, we are making our choices in a context created by the choices made since prehistory and the last glacial advance.

Therefore, the Future Vision Commission will be called on to present a unified view of our context for action. This is a task of synthesis, drawing on the cultural, political, economic, and natural history of the region. In addition, this task needs to include the values and objectives of present-day communities, and the expectations and policies that describe the future currently being sought. Through this task of synthesis, the Future Vision Commission will be able to describe how we currently define that elusive term "quality of life," and how that definition is related to and shaped by the natural and cultural qualities of our region.

The second and perhaps most central task is one of translation. With the charge for the Future Vision in mind, and a thorough knowledge of the working of our region provided by the synthesis activities, the Commission needs to translate its new-found understanding into tools for stewardship. This begins with the identification of what ought to be stewarded, how it might be affected by growth and change, and what strategies should be employed to do the job. The work of the Commission should also result in the development of a system for monitoring the cumulative affects of future growth and change on our landscape and communities.

IV. The Future Vision and Region 2040

To some degree, both Region 2040 and the Future Vision are systematic efforts to refine and improve RUGGO. Whereas Region 2040 is directed at refining RUGGO with respect to the RTP, UGB, and other land use decisions, Future Vision is in the enviable position of not having to be cast in the same planning and regulatory framework as Region 2040 or the Regional Framework Plan.

The Future Vision, by charter, is encouraged to look beyond the limitations of jurisdiction, time, and legal structure to the underlying dynamics that create and sustain identity and quality of life. Hence, the Future Vision should be fundamentally be concerned with relationships and linkages. The Future Vision is not so much about the urban design principles underlying a mixed use urban center, but the relationships between employment and housing, wheels and walkers.

The Future Vision should be specific about relationships between city and country, urban core and suburb, metropolitan region and the state, economy and the environment, and built and natural, among others. Whereas Region 2040 will develop a concept of urban form to be used for guiding land use decisions, the Future Vision should articulate the relationships that underlie quality of life in a manner that can be used to evaluate and shape land use decisions.

The Future Vision Commission will have access to the extensive citizen participation activities of Region 2040 to develop information on current visions and values as part of its synthesis activities. The Commission will also have access to all technical and background materials prepared for the Region 2040 project.

In addition to providing comment during the Region 2040 process, the Future Vision Commission should use the Region 2040 process to test its own products. Region 2040 provides an excellent vehicle for determining whether the products likely to come from the Commission's work are specific enough to be effective. Applying the Future Vision to Region 2040 will give the Commission a true "field test" of its work.

V. Suggested Future Vision Tasks

The following tasks can be developed in anticipation of Commission needs and prior to completing the detailed work plan:

1) Commission Organization: the Future Vision Commission will be appointed by early June. At the first meeting of the Commission, members should be briefed on the origin of the Future Vision project, expectations of those involved in its creation, and the relationship of the Future Vision to other Metro and charter-mandated planning projects. The Commissioners should also take time to simply get to know each other. Most important, Commission members should have the opportunity to share their objectives for serving on the Commission, and the "breakthroughs" that they would like to see in the region as the result of having a Future Vision.

2) Scoping the Process: the Future Vision is expected to be a living document, with the first iteration of the vision leading to others over time. The work plan should be developed accordingly. Fortunately, their are people and organizations in the community with experience in community goal setting and "visioning." To develop a scope of work leading to a final product, the Oregon Visions Committee members, resource people drawn from the faculties of PSU and U of O, and other key "process" experts could be involved in a one-day scoping session, the product of which would be a process white paper for the Commission. Background materials for the day would include:

a) the Oregon Visioning Model prepared by the Visions Committee of the Oregon chapter of the American Planning Association, along with the work over the past few years of the Metropolitan Area Planning Directors on regional planning issues and processes;

b) a research paper summarizing work by John Friedmann and Clyde Weaver, Michael Hough, Ian McHarg, Kevin Lynch, Ann Spirn, Richard

Forman, and Dan Kemmis along with materials describing the work of the Watershed Regeneration Trust in Toronto, the Regional Plan Association in New York, and the Greenbelt Alliance in the San Francisco Bay area; and

c) materials drawn from local efforts including Region 2040, RAPP, Knowing Home, CRAG, Portland's Changing Landscape, and planning histories by Carl Abbott and others.

3) Basic Background Reports: Six reports, focused on this notion of linkages or relationships, should be produced to augment the materials already produced for Region 2040 and other visioning efforts. Collectively, these reports could be titled "The Interactive Landscape," or something like that:

i) Landscape Ecology Report: An analysis of the region's ecosystems and landscape ecology should be prepared in a visually stimulating and useful format. This report should include information about critical natural systems and their current status, as well as about elements of the region's landscape associated with sense of place and community identity. The report should include an assessment of carrying capacities for air, land, and water in the metropolitan area, and factors likely to affect gross carrying capacities in the future.

ii) Trends: An assessment of emerging trends, from local to international levels, that will provide an essential part of the context for the growth and change of the metropolitan area well into the next century. Cultural, economic, technological, and institutional trends will be evaluated for their ability to critically affect the ecology, quality of life, settlement patterns, and patterns of activity throughout the region.

iii) Values, and Visions: A synthesis of locally adopted visions, value surveys, and portrayals of the future in the form of plans, scenarios, and other materials. The product will be a report outlining the values and beliefs held in common by the people of the region, and the ways in which those values have emerged in the form of plans and policies guiding growth and development.

iv) History of Settlement: A report outlining the historic settlement dynamics of the region, and the actions taken through investment, policy/planning, and/or the application of new technologies to create or affect change. This report could be presented in the form of an atlas, showing maps of settlement at different periods accompanied by photos, charts, and other background information describing the dynamics of the time. The purpose of this report is to show the unique and common

regional characteristics operating to affect settlement at different points in time, and how relationships with our history do and should shape our future.

v) Education and the Economy: A report outlining the economy of the region and the trends for its important sectors in time and location. Specific attention will be paid to the role of education in the growth of the economy, particularly with respect to attracting and retaining family wage employment. Other topics will include the identification of regional characteristics that have influenced the nature and extent of economic growth, and the likely operation of those characteristics in the future. The product should speak specifically to the relationships between the economy and the region as a unique place, the economy and the natural environment, and the economy and the people of the region and state.

vi) Carrying Capacity: A report outlining the carrying capacity concept, and providing several scenarios for its application to the metropolitan area through the Future Vision. The Commission will need to decide how it wants to define carrying capacity for a range of resources, and how it will apply those definitions to the development of the Future Vision. This is a task identified in the charter, and this report should provide the conceptual underpinnings for the discussions of the Commission.

These three activities will help to frame the work of the Commission as Commissioners get to know each other and their task. the development of the final work plan for this project should include, among other things, specific attention to the following:

a) Citizen Involvement: Due to budget constraints the Commission will need to consider ways to meet its citizen involvement needs through other planning projects, particularly Region 2040, and the work of other jurisdictions and agencies. The Commission may want to consider inviting community based organizations, cultural groups, local jurisdictions, and environmental and business groups to provide testimony on specific topics or questions during the course of Commission meetings. All meetings of the Commission will be open to the public, and could include the opportunity for public comment as a standing part of the agenda.

b) Future Vision Drafting and Testing: Using the basic background reports, products from other planning projects, and citizen involvement activities, the Commission should draft a vision statement and set of principles to be used to evaluate planning efforts. The vision statement and principles should be

presented in the form of pictures, charts, and annotated maps explaining the likely use of the landscape over time should the vision statement be acted on. To test the draft vision statement and principles, the Commission should use them to comment on the urban form choices presented by Region 2040 and their inclusion in the public involvement process leading to the conclusion of Region 2040 will provide additional public review. The use of the Future Vision for this purpose should be evaluated and the results of the evaluation should be used along with public comment in the Region 2040 process to modify and revise the draft.

c) Public Hearings: The Commission should hold public hearings on the draft vision statement and principles prior to revision and submission to the Metro Council for adoption in January, 1995.

ATTACHMENT A

Terms and Conditions

1) The Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies ("the Institute") shall:

a) Provide coordination and technical assistance for the Future Vision Commission. The Institute shall provide the time of Ethan Seltzer for this purpose up to a maximum of 8 hours per week. At a minimum, this shall include assistance with the development and implementation of the Future Vision work plan, definition of and contracting for technical reports identified as needed by the commission and according to the work plan, drafting and editing of reports and commission findings, attendance at all meetings of the commission, direct consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the commission, coordination of Metro staff and Portland State University subcontractors, and periodic reports to the Metro Council. The Institute will bill Metro monthly at a rate of $50 per hour plus 15% for overhead.

b) Develop technical reports and memoranda. The Institute shall seek subcontractors among the faculty of Portland State University or other institutions of higher education to provide background reports on the carrying capacity concept, work plan, landscape ecology of the region, history of settlement, values and visions, and the economy and educational resources of the region. Additional topics may be identified as the project proceeds. Individual report budgets and scope of work shall be developed in consultation with Metro staff. Metro shall have the right to reject a proposed subcontractor and/or scope of work, and ask either for a revised scope or to contract directly with another vendor. If the reports desired by the commission require more than a total of $52,000 to produce, Metro shall be responsible for identifying the additional required resources.

2) Metro shall:

a) Commit a minimum of $75,000 to this contract according to the terms and conditions of this attachment.

b) Provide an Associate Regional Planner at 1.0 FTE to support the activities of the commission. The Associate Regional Planner will be supervised directly by the Land Use Supervisor, in consultation with the Institute.

c) Provide all logistical support for the commission including but not limited to arranging for the time and place of all meetings, recording or otherwise documenting the proceedings of all commission meetings,

taking and disseminating minutes of all commission meetings, producing and disseminating meeting agendas and related materials, maintaining a mailing list for the Future Vision project, arranging for graphics and data support for the commission, and other tasks related to the day-to-day operation of the commission as identified by the Chair and Vice-chair or by Metro staff in consultation with the Institute.

d) Make appropriate staff members available to ensure the smooth and efficient coordination of all other Metro planning and policymaking projects with the Future Vision project.

e) Keep the Metro Council informed of the routine progress of the Future Vision project.

f) Provide resources to ensure adequate citizen participation in the Future Vision project through the activities of the 2040 planning project and/or other Metro planning projects.

3) This agreement shall be in effect for one year. To ensure continuity, Metro shall grant the Institute a right of first refusal for the renewal of the contract for a second year, or through the adoption of the Future Vision by the Metro Council, whichever comes first.

4) This agreement can be terminated at any time with the agreement of both parties.

9/ FVC

Ethans revised timeline