



METRO

Meeting: **FUTURE VISION COMMISSION**

Date: **October 31, 1994**

Day: **Monday**

Time: **4:00 p.m. - (?) 6:30 p.m.**

Place: **Metro, Room 370**

Approximate
Time

1. CALL TO ORDER

15 minutes

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. OTHER BUSINESS

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 17

6. WORKSESSION IN SMALL GROUPS TO FINALIZE COMMENTS ON
THE REGION 2040 RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

135 minutes

Enclosures:

Memo for Mike Houck (Testimony on the Recommended Alternative)

Upcoming meetings:

November 7

November 10 (presentation to Metro Council)

Questions? Call 797-1562.

FUTURE VISION COMMISSION

Meeting Summary, October 17, 1994

Members in attendance: Len Freiser, Chair; Judy Davis, Wayne Lei, Robert Liberty, Peggy Lynch, Peter McDonald, Susan McLain, John Magnanao, Ted Spence, Rod Stevens, Bob Textor and Marilyn Wall.

Others in attendance included: David Ausherman, Glen Bolen, Bill Bullick, Tom Coffee, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Sherry Oeser, Ethan Seltzer and Larry Shaw.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 by Chair Freiser.

II. Public Comment -

Bill Bullick, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Arts Commission spoke to the Commission and distributed a memo from the Commission on the Draft Vision document.

Members expressed thanks to Mr. Bullick

III. Minutes

The minutes of August 8, 29 and September 12, 1994 were accepted as submitted. The notes from August 15 and 22 were accepted into the record.

IV. Other

Ethan Seltzer stated that he will be gathering their comments and looking at areas of agreement. The second task is to define the "flavor" of the draft. These will be gathered together and distributed as a new draft in the next week. The next few weeks should be spent in concentrating on organizing the testimony on Region 2040 to the Metro Council on November 10th.

Members discussed the schedule for the next few meetings. Members viewed the revised FVC maps by David Ausherman and discussed possible variations and items to be mapped.

V. Recommended Alternative Discussion

John Fregonese stated that he wanted to have an interactive discussion with the Commissioners highlighting areas where the Vision draft and the Recommended Alternative agree and disagree. He stated that the Recommended Alternative (RA) is the best of all the concepts and noted a new, corrected air quality calculation just released. The VMT reduction under the RA is 11%, not 5%, making it the best of all the concepts except Concept B.

John Fregonese stated that the RA is the best for parks, open space, community centers and pedestrian environments. One of the main elements is towns built around community centers, this directly mirrors the FV.

Bob Textor spoke about the large amount of industrial land on the Columbia, is it too much?. Discussion continued on Columbia Slough water quality, the amount and location of industrial land.

Rod Stevens stated that the RA is not politically adventurous, it should mix industrial with commercial. He stated concern with having Regional Centers at the end of the light rail line.

John Fregonese stated that Gresham is a great center at the end of the LRT.

There was discussion of Tannesbourne and Hillsboro, edge city-type growth, areas of jobs growth, Damascus, Happy Valley and Stafford areas.

Robert Liberty outlined his comments on the RA.:

Clark County industrial land is not shown, not enough detail north of the Columbia

Lots of industrial land, is it in the right area?

Good news about the 11% VMT reduction, but 20% is the state goal (Concept B was 18%)

There is a ghetto in N, inner NE, that needs to be acknowledged

There are lower income areas from roughly Gresham to Oregon City.

There are too many centers to be viable.

Discussion continued on industrial land (separation or mixing of uses), inter-suburban traffic, and accessibility of the "inner-city" areas in relation to business development.

John Fregonese stated that on the VMT issue, additional TDM programs will be implemented to reach the other 9% VMT reduction. The reduction in Concept B was due, in large part, to double the congestion.

John Magnano spoke about industrial land on the Columbia that was "given away" and the imbalance of a primarily bedroom-community, and the growth of minimum wage jobs in the service sector in bedroom communities.

John Fregonese outlined some areas of non-consensus between the FV and on the growth concept:

EFU (exclusive farm use) land

the UGB in Washington County, Hillsboro area

the St. Mary's property

the Stafford area

John Fregonese stated that the Future Vision is a visionary document likely to capture the imagination of the region. He offered the following critiques of the Vision:

- the transportation section is not visionary, the pedestrian environment should be measured by the physical connections in the environment, not pedestrian environmental factors which are really a computer modelling tool.

- the document needs to be handed over to a writer to edit and clarify. There is money in the budget to do a "tabloid" (like the current Region 2040 "You Said It" update) and mail it to our 50,000 person mailing list.

- He cautioned about the parts on "the individual", things that Metro will never be able to do.

The members discussed these items further and agreed to continue the discussion at the October 24th meeting.

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Freiser.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan.

AGREEMENT, CONFLICTS AND NEEDED ADDITIONS
Notes from 10/24/94 Future Vision Commission Discussion

Agree*

*Members agreed there were many areas of agreement, the discussion should concentrate on conflicts and omissions

Basically agree with the whole thing

Separation of places

Sense of Place

Urban Design as a tool

Focus on reinvestment in existing places

Minimal UGB expansion

Healthy downtowns

Options for lifestyle/housing choices, not economic or social segregation.

Expanded rail system

RA promotes safe communities

Economy is inseparable from the community life

Jobs/housing balance

good urban and family life

Areas of Conflict:

EFU/ Forest land

Industrial Lands

VMTs and Planning as if walking were more important than driving,
it is the primary building block
more strategic locations of centers

Arterials to nearby communities

Definitions in the Region 2040 Decision Kit are transportation oriented, not people oriented.

Areas of Concern - Needed Amendments

What is a Town Center

The role of neighborhoods?

Neighborhoods should be returned to the map. (e.x. Garden Home)

Downtown is more than an employment center (cultural role)

Bi-state and other city relationships

Regional Centers as places to live as well as work

Access to green

How will "new communities" happen who should be responsible?

Space for schools and other public facilities, enough or too much, will effect UGB expansion.

Affordable housing in RUGGO

Definitions (see conflicts)

Restoration priorities Natural systems)

Urban reinvestment priorities

1 We want a document that states our ideas clearly, straightforwardly
2 and without jargon, buzzwords, cliches, or high-minded generalizations.
3 The choice is not between a poet or a tech writer, but of someone who can
4 write uncluttered, clear prose. (A good example is that of the essayists in
5 the NEW YORKER.)

6 The language and the organization should be such as to engage the reader,
7 without any sacrifice or compromise of content.

8 The intended audience is the Metro Council and the general public.

9 There are two ways to read the document: One, use handy guide to areas of
10 concern, ie: house, job, etc. Two, read in depth. The document must incorpo-
11 rate all of the content, it must have the specific recommendations. The
12 reader can choose to approach the document in general terms by browsing and
13 using the guide, or reading it in full.

14 TO THE WRITER:

- 15 1. To start, check your understanding of the draft with what we
16 intended it to say.
- 17 2. How would you organize the content to achieve the above?

2040 GROWTH CONCEPT/FUTURE VISION COMPARISON

Gervais 10/31/94

2040 REFERENCE	AGREE/DISAGREE/ OMISSION	FUTURE VISION (10/6)	COMMENTS
Map, Decision Kit p. 19 (3,545 ac) RUGGO amend p 34 (60,000 HH and 20,000 jobs on 14,500ac)	Convert no EFU or Forest land to urban uses	line 197-199, 554-555, 562	197-199 are not absolute, does 2040 demonstrate that other options have been exhausted?
Map, Decision Kit p. 12 (9,500 vacant 4,500 redevelopment)	Too much industrial land or wrong place?	line 195-197	Not a very direct or explicit statement
Decision Kit p. 19 (correct # is 11.06 for a reduction of 10.8%) Map, technical appendix	Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) too high/need walking as a primary building block/more strategic location of centers	line 388-389, 607, P4 (637-661)	note total AWD VMT w/ commercial & external increases from 27 to 46 million miles (73%) from 1990 to 2040
Map, Decision Kit p 15 RUGGO Amend p. 35f.	Good arterials to near-by communities "Green Corridors"		This objection is a dispute about the effects of such roadways on jobs/housing mix and commuting
Decision Kit p4-8, 14-17 RUGGO Amend pp 38-41, 45-48	Definitions in Kit are transportation and land oriented instead of people and community oriented	line 75-77, 82-83	This calls attention to a significant difference in tone and emphasis, all live in neighborhoods (editorial comment on kit not concept?)

