



METRO

Meeting: **FUTURE VISION COMMISSION**

Date: November 21, 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. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of October 24, 31

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

5. OTHER BUSINESS

6. WORKSESSION

135 minutes

- FINALIZE COMMENTS TO THE METRO COUNCIL ON THE REGION 2040 RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE FOR PRESENTATION ON NOVEMBER 28
- ASSIGNMENTS ON CONTACTING NEW COUNCIL

Enclosures:

Calendar for the next few months

Memo from Seltzer

Charge to the Writer from Freiser/McLain

State Agency letter and Chandler response

Revised "Testimony to the Council"

Questions? Call 797-1562.

FUTURE VISION COMMISSION

Meeting Summary, October 24, 1994

Members in attendance: Len Freiser, Chair; Wayne Lei, Robert Liberty, Peggy Lynch, Peter McDonald, Susan McLain, John Magnano, Ted Spence, Rod Stevens.

Others in attendance included: David Ausherman, Glen Bolen, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais and Ethan Seltzer.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 p.m. by Chair Freiser.

II. Public Comment -

Peggy Lynch announced a Metro candidates forum this evening downtown. She brought a draft Washington County Planning Director's comments on the Recommended Alternative.

Robert Liberty announced that 1000 Friends will soon have a draft map of Washington County showing where houses are built on farm and forest land.

Ethan Seltzer and Peggy Lynch spoke about the Willamette Valley Futures Conference held October 21 in Corvallis. Ethan, Peggy, Alice, Ken, Mike and Robert Liberty attended.

Members discussed the letter from Polk County Commissioner Blanchard who had written with concern that Region 2040 and the Future Vision were planning their futures without their involvement. Ken Gervais sent a response explaining the non-regulatory aspect of the Future Vision's 9 county focus. Members requested that letters be sent to other county officials and Councils of Governments explaining what the FV is and isn't.

Chair Freiser suggested that in regard to Mike Houck's memo on writers, he and Susan McLain would meet to talk about what the writer would do. Others are welcome to participate as well.

III. Recommended Alternative Discussion

Ethan Seltzer stated that the points "left over" from the last discussion with John Fregonese were:

- new communities, how can they be developed
- should we expect more travel by walk/bike modes
- interim controls until the alternative is implemented.

Members discussed how to best approach the FVC commenting on Region 2040. Should we apply the Vision to the Recommended Alternative or vice versa?

Ethan Seltzer took discussion notes on flip charts, members voiced areas of concern about the RA. Members worked on identifying three topic areas: agreement, omissions or needed amendments, and conflicts between the FV and the RA.

[PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DISCUSSION NOTES]

After working on agreements, conflicts and omissions of the RA members had a discussion of how these items should be addressed, at what level of specificity will the comments be most effective/useful.

Issues discussed included the Stafford Basin area, Tannesborne and interim controls.

With no further business, Chair Freiser adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

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

FUTURE VISION COMMISSION

Meeting Summary, October 31, 1994

Members in attendance: Len Freiser, Chair; Mike Gates, Mike Houck, Robert Liberty, Peggy Lynch, Peter McDonald, Susan McLain, Ted Spence, Fred Stewart and Marilyn Wall.

Others in attendance included: David Ausherman, Glen Bolen, Barbara Duncan, Ken Gervais, Marty Peets, Ethan Seltzer and Zachary Seurike.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m. by Chair Freiser.

II. Public Comment -

Chair Freiser stated that he and Susan McLain had developed a one page "charge to the writer".

Peggy Lynch announced that Metro executive candidate Bonnie Hays had expressed interest in attending today but had a conflict.

Peggy Lynch stated that she had attended a Beaverton Committee for Citizen Involvement on the Oct. 26th, she gave testimony on the Future Vision and Region 2040.

III. Minutes

The minutes of October 17, 1994 were accepted as submitted.

IV. Work Session

Ethan Seltzer distributed a new draft dated October 30th and explained how the document had changed from the last version. He thanked all those who submitted edits and comments and asked for Commissioners to review this latest draft and forward comments to him.

Members reviewed the discussion of the 10/24 meeting and how to best approach and focus the FVC's comments to the Council on the Recommended Alternative (RA).

Ken Gervais stated that what may be most useful is to propose specific amendments to the RA rather than general comments.

Members discussed what exactly the Council would be adopting and the consequences of that.

Robert Liberty expressed concern, he has heard rumors of an attempt to derail Region 2040. We need to urge the council to move forward.

**At 4:30 p.m. the Commission broke into two small groups for a session on 1) Omissions and 2) Needed amendments to the Recommended Alternative.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan.

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?

Portland State University

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

MEMORANDUM

November 16, 1994

To: Members of the Future Vision Commission

From: Ethan Seltzer

Re: Tasks Ahead

At our meeting on November 14 two primary tasks for the next few months were identified:

1) Review and Completion of the October 30 Draft of the Future Vision - The Commission needs to make one last pass through the draft Future Vision prior to passing it off to a writer. There are three primary areas that you should focus your attention on:

- Are the values and vision statements clear and evocative?
- Are the proposed action steps appropriately specific? Do they avoid a level of generality that cannot be acted on? Are there others that ought to be added, recognizing the limitations of Metro's role in many cases?
- Is the implementation section adequately framed, recognizing that this is an area that the new Council will need to put its stamp on?

Please note that the objective of this review is to move the document on to a writer. Therefore, please frame your comments with the thought in mind that your common task is to bring closure to the drafting. Although there is certainly time and room to bring in new issues or actions, recognize that the draft has gone through seven drafts already and consequently should not call for a long list of edits.

Susan and Len have drawn up a draft of a "writer's charge" and a copy is enclosed with this memo. Both the October 30 draft and the charge to the writer will be discussed at the December 5 meeting of the Commission. If you need a copy of the October 30 draft, please contact Barbara Duncan at 797-1562. Please feel free to contact me should you have any comments or questions about this.

2) Ambassadors to the New Council - It's time to start working with the new Council to develop a coordinated strategy for bringing your product to them after the first of the year. There are several options for the delivery of the Future Vision to the Council. You could simply send it off after January first. You could hold hearing, make changes, and develop a broader constituency for the Vision prior to sending it off. Or you could work with the new Council to cooperatively develop a process for taking the Future Vision to the public and moving it forward for adoption. Identifying the path from here on out involves a number of steps:

- The first step is to begin to acquaint the new Council with your charge and work. Towards that end, Commission members will be asked at the November 21 meeting to "adopt a Council member". With Susan already on the Commission, there are six other members in need of six Commission members willing to contact them one-on-one. We will try to set up these informal meetings in December.

Ambassadors will be asked to provide their respective Council member with a draft of the Future Vision and all attachments, and to discuss the product and upcoming adoption process. The objective is to try to understand how the Commission can serve the new Council as it carries out its Charter responsibilities.

- The second step will be to review the results of the initial meetings on January 9, and to plan for a more intensive dinner meeting with the new Council on January 23.**
- Finally, we will hold an extended meeting with the new Council over dinner on the 23rd of January (keep your fingers crossed) to outline the delivery and adoption process between then and July 1, 1995.**

Please come on November 21 with your ideas for any revisions to the charge for the Ambassadors and your preferences, if any, for meeting with Council members.

Thanks!

ES:ae

CALENDAR FOR THE FUTURE VISION COMMISSION

1994

- Nov 21 2040 revisit, assignments to contact the Council
- Nov 28 no FVC meeting, Members will testify at Metro Council hearing (4:00 p.m. - may be held at the Convention Center)
- Dec 5 review and revise document, report on Council progress
- Dec 12 review "final" draft - send to the writer, report on Council progress
- Dec 19** Meet if necessary

HOLIDAYS!

1995

- Jan 9 Delivery strategy to Council
- Jan 11 Retreat?
- Jan 16 no meeting - Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day
- Jan 23 Dinner meeting with New Council (?)