

Joint Metro Council Future Vision Commission Meeting
West View High School
Beaverton
May 2, 1995

Metro Councilors Present: Susan McLain

Present: Peggy Lynch, Robert Liberty, Wayne Lei, Bob Texture, Marilyn Wall, Mike Houck

Susan McLain called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Susan McLain noted the purpose of the meeting was to hear from the public with regard to the Future Vision document. She stated specific questions would be addressed as possible. She reviewed the Region 2040 newsletter.

Members present introduced themselves. Councilor McLain discussed the selection, composition and mission of the Future Vision Commission.

In response to a question from Bill Bugbee, Robert Liberty discussed the function of the Future Vision Commission. Mike Houck commented on the future of the region as function of the commission. Liberty discussed the Region 2040 Study in relation to the Future Vision document. He noted the Council would likely adopt a framework plan consistent with the Future Vision Statement. Peggy Lynch spoke to the development of the vision based on the needs of people. Ken Gervais, Metro Staff, discussed the differences between the Region 2040 Study and the Future Vision Statement. He noted the 2040 study was the technical planning portion of the mission that Future Vision established. Bob Texture used Palo Alto, California as an analogy of the mistakes that might occur in urban design without proper planning. Mike Houck stated the development of the Future Vision Commission document was a collaborative effort in terms of participation. Robert Liberty noted the document was not regulatory.

Bill Bugbee noted that at the local level decisions were being made that impacted people today. He noted the existing growth was not being dealt with in the context of the plan. He called for early implementation of the plan. He noted the objective was not to create a boundary, but to maintain livability. He called for a greater emphasis on telecommuting opportunities. He noted IBM eliminated 20 million square feet of office space due to innovations in telemarketing. He advocated methods to reduce vehicle miles traveled. He suggested government serve as a conduit between vendors and potential users of such technologies. He called for natural resource protection and cost analysis of development.

Mike Houck noted Metro was participating in a process to examine water resource needs in the area.

Cecilia Gregory supported the Future Vision Statement preceding development. She spoke to changes in the region over the past forty years. She discussed responsible natural resource protection. She noted it was difficult to plan for the use of property. She said water quality was essential to the region. She said society was being moved into two classes. She said there were limited resources for the disadvantaged and poor in the region. She spoke to the need for safe parks and recreation areas in communities.

Kelly Lundquist spoke to practical applications in planning. She noted the ideas were often good but that sometimes neighborhoods would stop the development because people don't want things like greenspaces in their backyard. She called for addressing the contradiction in these developments. Peggy Lynch called for discussions of these types of issues. Lynch noted an annual review of the plan was proposed. Mike Houck called for developing mechanisms for increasing citizen activism and education with regards to issues. Kelly Lundquist called for development of low income housing equitably distributed in the region. She questioned if the business sector would be encouraged to provide such services. Robert Liberty noted the document was not regulatory. He discussed several mixed use developments that would meet the objectives discussed.

Tom Harvey commented on implementation issues. He noted he lived near the Peterkort Property. He expressed concerns about the development of property. He favored mixed use development. He noted the housing market was

going to continue to segment the population between the poor and the wealthy. He noted middle class housing was not being developed. He said paths to the new light rail were not being constructed. He expressed concerns about the zonal editions of the newspaper. He noted the Oregonian did not report on the events of the region, but segregated them by geographic area.

Maureen Warneking expressed concerns about implementing the plan. She stated she concurred with other persons providing testimony. She said density was proposed to be increase, but that she did not want to live in a denser neighborhood. She noted land prices were increasing. She spoke to infrastructure concerns. She said some areas in the urban growth boundary were proposed for development that could not be economically developed. She expressed concerns about low income residential opportunities. She said minimum wage did not pay the rent in the area. She noted 12,000 people were homeless in Washington County and that was understandable given the price of housing. She said nothing was being done to address the housing problems in the region. She spoke to a desire to have adequate schools and parks. Roberty Liberty noted in times of increased growth, housing costs increased. In response to Liberty, Warneking stated six houses per acre was too dense and children would not have a place to play. Houck noted that options for density should be available for those interested.

Mary Vogel expressed concerns about the divergence between the vision and the current development occurring. She said parks and open spaces did not exist in the area. She said the current parks had no bio-diversity. She called for restoration of natural areas and parks to their previous condition. She spoke to the Unified Sewerage Agency (USA) planned development. She said transportation plans should be more comprehensive in terms of options. She called for trees to be included in regional transportation plans. She discussed the community land trust project as a mechanism for addressing economic housing needs. She envisioned watershed awareness in the region.

Greg Melanowski stated he lived on the edge of the urban growth boundary. He favored maintaining the existing urban growth boundary and existing the exclusive farm use land. He said he operated an organic u-pick farm. He said he dedicated five to ten percent of the land for wildlife preservation. He said his operation would provide a lot of opportunity to the urban area. He spoke to being good neighbors and encouraged a stable UGB. He stated they would commit to not developing if the tax exemption were maintained and the area was not condemned.

The group briefly discussed the development of farm lands within the urban growth boundary. Susan McLain noted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives would address some of these types of issues. She noted they would be reviewed as part of the 2040 process. A discussion occurred related to limiting growth or providing planning to sustain livability.

Susan McLain reviewed the timeline for adoption of various plans discussed and announced methods by which to communicate with Metro.

With no further citizens appearing to testify, Susan McLain adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Prepared by,


Susan Lee, CMC