

REGIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1992
5:00-6:30 P.M. ROOM 440, METRO CENTER**

AGENDA:

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF
OCTOBER 14, 1992 (MATERIALS ATTACHED)**

II. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

**III. POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT
FORECASTS PRESENTATION**

IV. METRO CHARTER BRIEFING

**V. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION
92-1712, LISTING A REASONABLE RANGE OF
REGIONAL GROWTH ALTERNATIVES.
(MATERIALS ATTACHED)**

VI. OTHER

All parking spaces are available for public use at 5:00 pm.

Please let us know if you cannot make it.

Thanks!!!

Regional Policy Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

October 14, 1992

RPAC was convened by Chairman Gardner at 5:10 p.m., Wednesday, October 14, 1992.

Members in attendance included: Committee Chairman Jim Gardner, Pauline Anderson, Jerry Arnold, Dick Benner, Sharon Cohen, Larry Cole, Jack Gallager, Darlene Hooley, Chris Foster, Gretchen Kafoury, Robert Liddell, Peggie Lynch, Susan McLain, Alice Schlenker, Bruce Thompson and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Andy Cotugno, Brent Curtis, Brian Campbell, Eric Carlsen, Dick Bolen, Phyllis Clark, Ken Gervais, Julia Patriche, John Reeves, Al Siddall, Robert Stacey, Larry Shaw, Stuart Todd, Terry Vanderkooy, Mary Weber and Mark Turpel.

I. Chairman Gardner asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the September 9th meeting. Hearing none, the minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

II. Chairman Gardner asked for communications from the public. There were none.

III. Chairman Gardner opened the discussion of the Region 2040 project. He outlined the focus of the discussion - do these regional growth concepts represent a reasonable range, or are there other concepts which should be added?

Andy Cotugno provided a brief description of each regional growth concept and indicated that he would be asking RPAC to make recommendations by their December meeting. He indicated that a draft resolution was being prepared for review of RTAC and TPAC and he would be bringing the resolution to RPAC at the November meeting. He indicated that there had been some initial meetings with the cities and counties of the region and that several suggestions made were likely to be recommended by staff. These included a different approach to Concept "A". He indicated that there would be a "base case" which would extrapolate past policies, not include implementation of Rule 12 or the RUGGO and that this would constitute a benchmark for comparing the growth concepts. Concept "A" would incorporate Rule 12 and the RUGGO and, as with all growth concepts, be made workable within the confines of concepts tenets. He noted that some had recognized the strong forces from I-5 and had suggested that there ought to be a concept which better recognizes this factor. He noted that some were concerned with concept "C", that the areas between the existing boundary and the new satellites would be subject to intense development pressure and might just "fill in".

Mayor Cole asked if it would be possible to have for the next meeting a write-up listing other options that had been suggested - an options package?

Chairman Gardner agreed that such a document would make adding or deleting easier.

Dick Benner asked how many growth concepts could be considered before the costs were too high?

Andy Cotugno stated that Clackamas County Commissioner Judie Hammerstad had, at an earlier meeting, suggested that 3 (not necessarily the three depicted) seemed to be a good number - enough to provide a lot of choice, but not too many to be confusing. Andy Cotugno stated that he agreed. He stated that he was not sure about where the cutoff was when considering costs.

Dick Benner stated that the material from Toronto included in the packet considered seven alternatives and that their materials perhaps included too many choices. He recommended keeping the number of options to a minimum as long as the choices were not too confining.

Jim Zehren stated that he was concerned with the images developed and the options suggested. He stated that there was a need to develop criteria, because which and how many criteria are used affect how many concepts or the level of complication of the work. He recommended calling Toronto and asking how they evaluated concepts and what did it cost.

Andy Cotugno stated that he thought that the number and type of criteria to be used would influence how many concepts could be evaluated.

Jim Zehren stated that it didn't have to mean that you necessarily have to limit the options, that perhaps prototypes could be used to help make the decision.

Mayor Liddell stated that having 3 options was a pretty solid way to make decisions, that 10 options were too many and that there should be a base foundation for comparison of concepts.

Councilman Thompson asked which came first, transportation or land use?

Andy Cotugno stated that transportation needed to be fit to the land uses concluded to be best.

Councilman Thompson stated that development patterns followed transportation access, so that important land use results occurred when transportation determinations were made.

Commissioner Hooley stated that she believed that the ultimate conclusion of the Region 2040 process would result in a combination of the concepts.

Andy Cotugno stated that he agreed that a mix would eventually occur.

Mayor Liddell stated that there is a psychological process that needs to be considered. He indicated that initially, the choices should be clean, that is be well-defined and distinct. Later in the process it would be appropriate to stack on mixes. He indicated that he was comfortable with 3 choices.

Andy Cotugno stated that it was appropriate to start with growth concepts with stark differences.

Chairman Gardner stated that he was comfortable with this approach, so long as any significant element is part of at least one concept and that the element could be pulled out and made part of a hybrid.

Councilor McLain stated that people gave good reasons at the joint RPAC/JPACT August 18th meeting for a small number of concepts. She stated that it would help clarify the concepts by having overlays of the concepts basic elements.

Commissioner Hooley stated that she had met with Metro staff yesterday and that they had come to the conclusion that the labels on the concepts were very important. She indicated that what was captioned Concept "A" was really a depiction of past practices extrapolated into the future. She stated that policies had changed including the Transportation rule, the RUGGO and local policies and what was shown as Concept "A" did not reflect what was now happening.

Andy Cotugno stated that this was what he meant by the different approach to Concept "A" that he had mentioned in his opening presentation.

Commissioner Hooley stated that the Region 2040 tabloid should have some sections added. One section should describe what the project is about and the other section should explain that the project is not about promoting growth - rather - it is preparing for expected growth.

Andy Cotugno stated that he thought that we are actively promoting growth now - that is present policy. He stated that if the region is going to change this policy, then there was a need to talk about how do we pay for infrastructure.

Councilman Gallagher stated that he believed that limiting the concepts to perhaps 3 options make it accessible to people and that more options meant more chaos. He stated that he thought the simpler the better. He also stated that while transportation decisions do impact land uses, it depends on how transportation systems are designed. He stated that if the Mt. Hood Parkway is designed with no on/off ramps in areas where no development is desired, none will occur as a result of the transportation improvement.

Chairman Gardner stated that he agreed that there were design solutions which could address transportation impacts, but that if made and explained on the front end of the process, it makes a big difference in effectiveness.

Councilman Thompson stated that if the Mt. Hood Parkway was built as a freeway it will bring growth. If it is built as an expressway, it would not. He stated that the kind of road made a big difference.

Mayor Schlenker stated that this was the first time that she had heard of an I-5 growth option and that it started to develop images that were not all good. She further stated that Lake Oswego was in the process of developing a new transportation plan and that they were needing to make assumptions about growth and that the assumptions would have a great importance to their planning. She stated that the City would like to know Metro's plans and what were the basic assumptions.

Andy Cotugno stated that there would be a "base case", a variation of what was depicted as Concept "A", which would use existing adopted comprehensive land use plans of the cities and counties and the existing RTP, but would not include compliance with the Transportation Rule or the infill and redevelopment emphasis of the RUGGO's.

Mayor Cole stated that in regard to the satellite cities, what kind of cities do we have now? He asked if the region was to become one high density city and that there was substantial resistance to higher densities in existing developed area. He stated that one way to achieve higher densities was to build them first and then build the lower densities. He suggested that some of the satellite cities might be primarily higher density residential.

Councilwoman Kafoury asked if this pattern wouldn't go against efforts to work and live in the same place.

Mayor Cole stated that he had just started to consider this possible urban form and that there were many aspects to be explored, but that he thought that this type of satellite city did not preclude living nearer to housing. He stated that at the turn of the century the rail companies had constructed amusement parks and other trip generators at the ends of lines to balance trips.

Councilman Thompson stated this was like Tri-Met and the Win-Mar proposal.

Mayor Liddell asked which concept will limit or constrain growth.

IV. Chairman Gardner stated that in the interest of time, and because of Mayor Liddell's timely question, he would move to the next agenda item, which was consideration of the slow growth/no growth debate. He asked Andy Cotugno to give the committee some background on the issue.

Andy Cotugno stated that on the basis of how frequently slow growth is mentioned, he thought there was a need to be more up front about the issue. He stated that it was necessary to get several messages out including the fact that the growth forecasts were technically driven based simply on what outside forces may cause, that the forecasts were not derived from pro-growth advocates. He stated that the forecasts were not promoting growth. He stated that there were questions about the optimal size of a region and that he was not sure that this was answerable. He noted that included in the meeting packet was a paper prepared by Phyllis Clark which began to provide some information about the issue.

Andy Cotugno stated that if there is an interest in limiting growth, there were many questions that needed to be addressed including how do we try to do it, what is the cost of doing it? California tried huge fees, but look what happened a decade later.

Commissioner Hooley stated that growth is cyclical. She noted that Phyllis Clark's paper indicated that no growth schemes do not work and are not sustainable.

Andy Cotugno stated that even in Moscow during the height of the USSR, they were not able to curtail growth of the city.

Mayor Liddell stated that there are livability values to consider. If you want low crime, clean water, etc. what does it cost? People's concerns change and there are paradigm shifts. Water seems very important now.

Councilwoman Kafoury stated that at a minimum, there was a need to explain why no growth does not work. She stated that she was not sold on having no growth as a concept along with the others. She noted the letter from Jon Chandler made this same point.

Andy Cotugno stated that if you put a limited growth option up there, then it implies it is an alternative that you could pick.

Councilwoman Kafoury stated that they had struggled with the same issue at the City and that perhaps it was something to be done together.

Chairman Gardner stated that there was a long distance from the concepts shown to a slow growth concept. He stated that the consequences should be explained and that it should be explained that existing policies are positive to growth - that there is no such thing as neutral policies - that you end up with a mixed bag of policies. He stated that if you describe the effect of slow growth, it should also be explained that existing policies are pro-growth.

Mayor Cole stated that he wanted to make clear that he did not favor slow growth, but that he thought it was important to have the discussion. He stated that any discussion should include both the positive and negative aspects.

Jim Zehren stated that one of the negatives may be that you could spend a lot of money on efforts to slow growth and have no effect. He noted that Andres Duany, when he came to speak at a previous growth conference began by saying don't even bother to try and stop growth - it doesn't work. He stated that most people were receptive to the idea of growth is going to happen, let's get on with it and manage it.

Chairman Gardner stated that many people will intellectually agree, but then they zero in on growth-positive policies and have a problem.

Mayor Liddell stated that there are many types of growth and change. He stated that there

are coming changes in average age, income, etc.

Councilman Gallagher stated that were searching for a new approach - perhaps quality growth.

Dick Benner stated that an argument could be made that all concepts shape growth and do not affect the rate of growth. He stated that one approach could be to choose a concept and then deal with the rate of growth.

Commissioner Hooley stated that a lot of thing that happen which promote growth. She cited the Port of Portland drydock. She asked whether there is anything in the concepts that promotes growth. She stated that she doubted any concept on its own promoted growth. She stated that agencies promote growth.

Mayor Cole suggested that Concept "A" could promote the most amount of growth.

Mayor Schlenker stated that jobs will make a community grow. She stated that people are moving up from California because we have jobs.

Mayor Cole stated that he was aware of many who had moved here without jobs because of the home equity that they had.

Chairman Gardner stated that some people brought their jobs with them. He indicated that sometimes it seems that the no-growthers are those just moving in.

Councilman Thompson stated that he thought it was more prudent to plan a party for 100 and get 50 than the other way around.

Andy Cotugno stated that there would be a draft resolution for RPAC's consideration at the next meeting which would provide options and some specificity.

Chairman Gardner noted that the next regular meeting date would be November 11, Veterans Day and asked if the members would care to change the date. The group consensus was to keep the meeting at the regular date and time.

Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting at 6:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Turpel.

METRO

Memorandum

Planning Department
2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
(503) 221-1646 Fax 273-5585

DATE: December 3, 1992

TO: RPAC Members

FROM: Andrew Cotugno, Planning Director

SUB: Resolution 92-1712 - Reasonable Range of Regional Growth Alternatives

Attached please find a draft copy of Resolution 92-1712, as amended and recommended by RTAC and TPAC. The draft also reflects concerns raised at the November 11, 1992 RPAC meeting concerning an earlier draft.

Also attached is a summary of the responses that have been received from various meetings, open houses and other forums for public response. We recommend that your attention be directed to the "fundamental changes" section, as these are "go"/"no go" actions which provide specific direction to the next phase of Region 2040. The other responses, "Suggested Modifications" can be accommodated within the next phase of work.

We would like to schedule a Metro Council decision on the resolution later this month and request that RPAC consider a final action on December 9.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

(revised 11/30/92)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING THE)
REGIONAL GROWTH CONCEPTS TO BE)
EVALUATED IN PHASE II OF THE)
REGION 2040 PROJECT)

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1712

Introduced by Rena Cusma,
Executive Officer

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives ~~in order to ensure the region's livability is protected as growth occurs;~~ and

WHEREAS, ~~It is necessary to consider the region has called for the development of alternative urban forms for evaluation in considering ways to implement the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives;~~ and

WHEREAS, ~~The citizens of the region approved on November 3, 1992, Measure Number 26-3, granting a Charter to Metro which made growth management a primary function;~~ and

WHEREAS, The Region 2040 project has been undertaken to guide Metro in the management of the Portland metropolitan area urban growth boundary, ~~future amendment to the~~ Regional Transportation plan and to help ensure that transportation and land use are coordinated; and

WHEREAS, The Region 2040 project is intended to address the concerns of the region about the long-term aspects of growth in the region; and

WHEREAS, The approved work program for Region 2040 Phase I calls for Metro to determine a reasonable range of alternatives for accommodating growth to be evaluated in Phase II; and

WHEREAS, The Region 2040 project has completed a telephone survey of over 400 randomly selected citizens of the region about their concerns and values about growth; and

WHEREAS, Two series of workshops with the elected and appointed officials of the cities and counties of the region have been conducted in the spring and fall of this year concerning growth in the region; and

WHEREAS, Interviews with 52 representatives of public and private agencies and organizations from throughout the region have been conducted gathering their thoughts about growth in the region; and

WHEREAS, Two series of public workshops and open houses were advertised in the newspaper of general circulation as well as community newspapers, and were held during the spring and fall of this year and gathered public values and concerns about growth in the region; and

WHEREAS, 20,000 copies of a 12-page publication were prepared and distributed this fall which provided a background on ; possible growth choices and provided the opportunity for citizens of the region to add or amend growth concepts; and

WHEREAS, RTAC and TPAC, RPAC and JPACT have reviewed, revised and recommend the evaluation of these regional growth concepts; and,

WHEREAS, growth choices depicted in the publication intend to show broad policy options and not to specify land use designations, transportation facilities or employment centers; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council directs staff to begin evaluation of basic growth concepts as follows:

- Concept "A" continuing with current policies ~~accommodating~~ , which ~~accommodates~~ forecasted growth to the year 2040 through ~~implementation of~~ currently adopted comprehensive plans and continued expansion of the urban growth boundary;
- Concept "B" growing inside the urban growth boundary ~~accommodating~~ , which ~~accommodates~~ forecasted growth to the year 2040 by not enlarging the present urban growth boundary and increasing development intensities focused on transit inside the current boundary; and
- Concept "C" ~~satellite~~ communities growing at the edge ~~accommodating~~ , which ~~accommodates~~ forecasted growth to the year 2040 through some increases in intensities of use inside the current urban growth boundary and by some growth occurring ~~in~~ areas of concentrated urban development outside the current urban growth boundary; and ~~Concept "D"/"E"/"F" (to be added as necessary in response to public comment).~~

2. That all of the above concepts will strive to be workable models and will endeavor to meet the intent of newly adopted policies and requirements including Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives and the State of Oregon's Transportation Rule and Urban Reserve Rule and the Clean Air Act of 1990.

3. 2. That a base case for comparison purposes will be developed to provide an examination of the implications of implementing existing plans and policies not including new provisions of the State's Transportation Rule and Urban Reserve Rule, the Regional Urban Growth

Goals and Objectives of the Federal Clean Air Act of 1990 as recently amended. That detailed base data and assumptions will be provided for timely review to all TPAC and RPAC jurisdictions.

4. 3- That Examination of each growth concept will include the full tri-county area and take into consideration its effect on growth in Clark, Columbia, Yamhill and Marion Counties surrounding communities.

5. 4. That the concepts described above in 1, constitute a reasonable range of choice for regional growth alternatives. That a study of growth pressures will be completed in two parts. The first part will identify and analyze factors, both internal and external which influence growth and which describes how the growth options respond. The second part of the study will identify possible actions which may be taken to discourage or encourage growth and the feasibility of application.

6. 5. That the concepts described above in 1, could be designed in a myriad of ways and are subject to further technical definition, but that Exhibit "A" attachment "1" outlines the minimum set examples of variations for each concept basic elements of each alternative that will be examined further. The variations described in attachment "1" shall be evaluated. However, during Phase II of the project, other variations may be developed or proposed and Exhibit "A" attachment "1" is not intended to limit the possibility of other variations being evaluated tested.

6. That all concepts will strive to be workable models and will endeavor to meet the intent of newly adopted policies and requirements including Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives and the State of Oregon's Transportation Rule and Urban Reserve Rule as well as the Federal Clean Air Act as recently amended. (see #2, above)

7. That each concept will incorporate an element related be evaluated in relationship to the Greenspaces Master Plan.

8. That for each of the regional growth concepts, Region 2040 shall develop a further level of detail which facilitates evaluation in terms of livability, economic, governmental and social costs, benefits and impacts, including the evaluation of public and private costs. That for each concept, Region 2040 shall develop a comparative analysis of public infrastructure and services. Several variations to each concept may be considered. It is Metro's intention for the process of refinement and evaluation to be as inclusive as possible to encourage participation and ultimate consensus on alternatives.

9. That the Region 2040 project shall be amended to 2045 to ensure requirements of the Metro Charter related to development of a "Future Vision" are addressed including establishment of a "Future Vision Commission."

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this ____ day of

____ 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

Possible Refinements to Designated Regional Growth Concepts

For each concept there will be developed a further definition of detail sufficient to allow evaluation of impacts on liveability and economic vitality. Numerous variations of each concept are possible. The following are a minimum set that will be developed. During the development and further definition of the variations, it may be concluded that additional variations should be added. The following list is therefore a minimum that will be pursued, but is not intended to be an exclusive list which cannot be amended as deemed appropriate.

Concept "A" Continuing with Current Policies

The basic framework for Concept "A" is existing comprehensive land use plans and current urban growth boundary policies.

1. Concept "A" will be refined to determine the location for expansion of the urban growth boundary considering the following factors: a) contiguity with the existing boundary; b) a balanced consideration of factors 3 through 7 of Goal 14 and RUGGO, including accessibility of expansion areas to the jobs of the region, the ease of providing sanitary sewers and avoidance, where possible, of rural resource lands; and c) no expansion into floodplains or the Columbia Gorge Scenic area.
2. Two variations of the highway system would include: a) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood Parkway and Western Bypass as freeway/expressway level facilities; and b) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood and the Western Bypass as arterial, non-freeway improvements.
3. The Transit assumptions will include a basic radial transit system in which: a) the east-west light rail line from Gresham to Hillsboro will exist; b) there will be north-south light rail service connecting Milwaukie, Clackamas Town Center, Vancouver and Portland International Airport; c) there will be an additional radial light rail line to the southwest quadrant of the region; and d) the light rail and bus transit service level will be that described in the existing Regional Transportation Plan. A basic level of bicycle and pedestrian improvements would be included in this option.

Concept "B" Growing Inside the Urban Growth Boundary

A basic assumption of Concept "B" is that the current urban growth boundary would not be expanded.

1. Concept "B" will include accommodating the forecast growth for population and employment to the year 2040 inside the current urban growth boundary by a more intensive use of land

focused on transit. LUTRAQ and the Livable City projects would provide more specific local models for how land use intensification could occur in this concept focused on high capacity transit line intersections and transit "Main Streets."

2. Transit would be assumed to: a) have the most extensive transit level of service of any concept; b) consist of a radial high capacity transit system with an east-west component from Forest Grove to Gresham and north-south lines which connect areas north of Vancouver, Washington, Portland International Airport, Clackamas Town Center, Milwaukie and Oregon City; c) include an additional radial light rail line to the southwest quadrant of the region; d) include a circumferential high capacity transit system on the southern end of the region; and e) have a level of transit service consistent with that described in Tri-Met's proposed Strategic Plan. The highest level of bicycle and pedestrian improvements would be reflected in this option.
3. ~~The Highway system would: a) continue with the radial system currently in use, with expansions as necessary; b) include the arterial alternatives for the Western Bypass, Sunrise Corridor or Mt. Hood Parkway.~~ Two variations of the highway system would include: a) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood Parkway and Western Bypass as freeway/expressway level facilities; and b) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood and the Western Bypass as arterial, non-freeway improvements.

Concept "C" Communities Growing at the Edge

A basic assumption of Concept "C" is that the current urban growth boundary would not be expanded in a contiguous manner. Rather, three satellite centers would be added as places to accommodate growth. An initial definition of satellite centers includes centers sized to accommodate 40-60,000 people, with alternative locations considered primarily on flatter, non-rural resource lands.

1. Approximately two-thirds of the forecast growth would be accommodated within the current urban growth boundary and the balance in satellite centers outside the current urban growth boundary as guided by forecasts of demand.
2. High capacity transit would be assumed to include both radial and circumferential lines, with service including: a) east-west from Forest Grove to Gresham, north-south from areas north of Vancouver Washington, to Portland International Airport, Clackamas Town Center, Milwaukie and Oregon City; b) a southern circumferential line; and c) an additional radial light rail line to the southwest quadrant of the region. Satellite centers would be provided high capacity transit service. The level of transit service would be less than that recommended in the Tri-Met proposed Strategic Plan, but higher than the current Regional Transportation Plan. A moderate level of bicycle and pedestrian improvements would be included in this concept.

3. Two variations of the highway system would include: a) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood Parkway and Western Bypass as freeway/expressway level facilities; and b) the Sunrise Corridor, Mt. Hood and the Western Bypass as arterial, non-freeway improvements.

Base Case

This base case will reflect past practices. Recently adopted but not yet implemented policies such as the Transportation Rule, Clean Air Act or the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives will not be included. The light rail system will be limited to an east-west line from Gresham to Hillsboro with a modest level of transit service. Highway investment in transportation expansion will continue to lag behind growth. The base case will also assume that underbuilding, or development at less than the maximum densities allowed by existing comprehensive plans, will occur consistent with historical experience. In addition, the base case will assume that infill and redevelopment will continue to occur at existing rates.

~~Attachment "2"~~

~~Options for Addressing Slow or No Growth Concerns~~

~~There are three options¹ to choose how to address the Slow or No Growth Concerns. They are:~~

- ~~1. Include as a growth concept "D", a slow growth option.~~
- ~~2. Complete a study of growth pressures, describing the benefits and costs of growth, no growth and negative growth; identifying present actions that encourage growth and possible actions which could discourage growth; and evaluating urban form options in terms of their adaptability to different growth rates. Analysis of the top 4 or 5 forces that affect growth and would be affected by a change in growth policies should be emphasized.~~
- ~~3. Develop a policy process which provides a method of making policy choices including a range of concepts from encouraging growth to no growth to negative growth.~~

MT/srb
s:\pd\markt\reso92.two

~~¹ All options should include consideration of the economic and environmental quality of life issues that would be affected by a slow growth approach.~~

METRO

Planning and Development
2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
(503) 221-1646

Memorandum

DATE: December 2, 1992
TO: RPAC, JPACT
FROM: Andrew Cotugno
RE: Region 2040 Public Involvement Findings

Attached you will find a summary list of comments from the public regarding the draft growth concepts. Metro has sought the opinions of citizens, elected officials, local government staff, special interest and neighborhood groups, and stakeholders in the region about the range of growth concepts. Each group was asked; "Is this the right range of concepts to be considering or have we missed one? and, "Would you modify the concepts in any way?".

The following summary reflects responses we received from:

- sixteen briefings for special interest groups;
- thirty local government meetings;
- sixteen neighborhood coalition meetings;
- three open houses (Clackamas, Multnomah & Washington Counties);
- cable TV call-in program; and
- various other public written comments.

Our task is to decide what changes, if any, need to be made to the draft Resolution 92-1712 and its Exhibit "A" to address the comments received from the public about additions to the range of growth concepts. The attached comments listed in the category, **Fundamental Changes**, requires review and decisions on the part of the technical and policy committees of Metro and the resulting recommendations must be integrated into Resolution 92-1712 for adoption by Metro Council.

A summary of public comments relating to suggested modifications of the range of alternatives is also attached for your information. The suggested modifications can be addressed within the existing language of the draft Resolution 92-1712 and staff recommends their inclusion in Phase II as part of the concept refinement process. No action need be taken regarding the suggested modifications.

Public Comments on Region 2040 Draft Growth Concepts

11/30/92

The public comments on the regional growth concepts submitted during the Region 2040 Phase I planning process are summarized below. These comments represent the responses to the question asked; "Is this the right range of concepts to be considering or have we missed one?". Other comments offered, including likes and dislikes, or speculation as to the effectiveness of a specific concept are not included, as they will be part of the evaluation work to be completed in Phase II.

The comments that specifically address additions to the draft growth concepts are listed below for your review and consideration.

Fundamental Changes

Additional Urban Form Concepts

This category refers to the urban forms suggested by the public that are in addition to concepts A, B, and C that were presented in the tabloid. The suggested urban forms are:

Slow Growth Principle

- include a slow growth concept that accommodates less than the forecasted population growth
- promote growth in communities outside of our metropolitan area as a way to accommodate some the region's growth
- use a statewide approach - our metropolitan area has achieved its optimum size - state needs to encourage growth elsewhere

No Governance Principle

- reduce or eliminate government intervention

Radial Pattern

- use a spoke pattern of transportation improvements to serve small cities with access to green spaces between and around the communities

Contract UGB

- reduce the size of the existing UGB and concentration growth along rail lines inside

other

- use high speed rail as the guiding principle
- use greenspaces as the organizing principle for the regional form

Suggested Modifications

11/30/92

The public comments on the regional growth concepts submitted during the Region 2040 Phase I planning process are summarized below. These comments represent the responses to the question asked; "Would you modify the concepts in any way?". Other comments offered, including likes and dislikes, or speculation as to the effectiveness of a specific concept are not included, as they will be part of the evaluation work to be completed in Phase II.

The comments that are specific modifications to the draft urban form concepts are listed below for your information.

Suggested Modifications to Concept A

- Amend the first resolve to describe Concept "A" as "a continuation of current trends, as modified by the Transportation Rule and RUGGO and which accommodates forecasted growth to the year 2040 primarily through implementation of currently adopted local and regional policies..."; .
- allocate higher densities to new urban land concentrated at the edges of UGB
- urbanized area between Forest Grove and Hillsboro
- third bridge across the Columbia
- expand UGB only to the south (not east or west)
- use existing transportation corridors to the south I-205/Stafford Rd. to accommodate growth
- future expansion of the UGB should be considered in areas with large parcel patterns so that they can be master planned with high densities
- water transit
- connect Western Bypass to I-5 and create a beltline
- decentralized transit
- hybrid between A & B
- urbanize underdeveloped agricultural land between Hillsboro and Beaverton before moving the UGB

- LRT from Clackamas Town Center to Oregon City
- I205 LRT
- need additional transit if only two LRTs are built
- Hillsboro should be an employment center
- Gresham should be an employment center

Suggested Modifications to *Concept B*

- Amend Concept "B", so that it is clear whether or not the Barbur LRT is included as part of the southern "circumferential high capacity transit system...".
- water transit
- hybrid between B & C
- LRT along Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy and TV Highway to Hillsboro
- LRT to Northwest Portland
- LRT along I-5 through N/NE Portland
- LRT on Foster/Powell to I-205
- nodal centers as an option for accommodating higher densities
- co-housing
- Hillsboro should be an employment center
- Gresham should be an employment center

Suggested Modifications to *Concept C*

- Amend the attachment, so that it is clear that neo traditional development is a part of at least one variation of all concepts.
- move jobs out of Portland CBD to smaller communities
- make satellite communities conform to watershed boundaries
- future expansion of the UGB should be considered in areas with large parcel patterns so

that they can be master planned with high densities .

- higher densities at the edge of the UGB around highway improvements
- water transit
- larger satellite communities
- decentralized transit
- North Plains as a satellite community
- greater distance between UGB and the satellite communities
- a satellite community east of I205/Powell the Johnson Creek area
- north/south transit in east Washington County
- edge cities should be special development areas, for example retirement communities
- Hillsboro should be an employment center
- Gresham should be an employment center

A BILL FOR AN ACT

DRAFT

Relating to land use; amending ORS 197.015 and 197.251.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 197.015 is amended to read:

197.015. Definitions for ORS chapters 196 and 197. As used in ORS chapters 196 and 197, unless the context requires otherwise:

(1) "Acknowledgment" means a commission order that certifies that a comprehensive plan and land use regulations, land use regulation or plan or regulation amendment complies with the goals or certifies that Metro land use planning goals and objectives, Metro regional framework plan, amendments to Metro goals and objectives or amendments to the Metro regional framework plan comply with the statewide planning goals.

(2) "Board" means the Land Use Board of Appeals or any member thereof.

(3) "Commission" means the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

(4) "Committee" means the Joint Legislative Committee on Land Use.

(5) "Comprehensive plan" means a generalized, coordinated land use map and policy statement of the governing body of a local government that interrelates all functional and natural systems and activities relating to the use of lands, including but not limited to sewer and water systems, transportation systems, educational facilities, recreational facilities, and natural resources and air and water quality management programs. "Comprehensive" means all-inclusive, both in terms of the geographic area covered and functional and natural activities and systems occurring in the area covered by the plan. "General nature" means a summary of policies and proposals in broad categories and does not necessarily indicate specific locations of any area, activity or use. A plan is "coordinated" when the needs of all levels of governments, semipublic and private agencies and the citizens of Oregon have been considered and accommodated as much as possible. "Land" includes water, both surface and subsurface, and the air.

(6) "Department" means the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

(7) "Director" means the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

(8) "Goals" means the mandatory statewide planning standards adopted by the commission pursuant to ORS chapters 196 and 197.

(9) "Guidelines" means suggested approaches designed to aid cities and counties in preparation, adoption and implementation of comprehensive plans in compliance with goals and to aid state agencies and special districts in the preparation, adoption and implementation of plans, programs and regulations in compliance with goals. Guidelines shall be advisory and shall not limit state agencies, cities, counties and special districts to a single approach.

(10) "Land use decision":

(a) Includes:

(A) A final decision or determination made by a local government or special district that concerns the adoption, amendment or application of:

- (i) The goals;
- (ii) A comprehensive plan provision;
- (iii) A land use regulation; or
- (iv) A new land use regulation; or

(B) A final decision or determination of a state agency other than the commission with respect to which the agency is required to apply the goals; and

(b) Does not include a decision of a local government:

(A) Which is made under land use standards which do not require interpretation or the exercise of policy or legal judgment;

(B) Which approves or denies a building permit issued under clear and objective land use standards;

(C) Which is a limited land use decision; or

(D) Which determines final engineering design, construction, operation, maintenance, repair or preservation of a transportation facility which is otherwise authorized by and consistent with the comprehensive plan and land use regulations.

(11) "Land use regulation" means any local government zoning ordinance, land division ordinance adopted under ORS 92.044 or 92.046 or similar general ordinance establishing standards for implementing a comprehensive plan.

(12) "Limited land use decision" is a final decision or determination made by a local government pertaining to a site within an urban growth boundary which concerns:

(a) The approval or denial of a subdivision or partition, as described in ORS chapter 92.

(b) The approval or denial of an application based on discretionary standards designed to regulate the physical characteristics of a use permitted outright, including but not limited to site review and design review.

(13) "Local government" means any city, county or metropolitan service district formed under ORS chapter 268 or an association of local governments performing land use planning functions under ORS 197.190.

(14) "Metro goals and objectives" means the land use goals and objectives that a metropolitan service district is required to adopt under ORS 268.380(1). The goals and objectives do not constitute a comprehensive plan.

(15) "Metro regional framework plan" means the regional framework plan required by the 1992 Metro Charter or its separate components. Neither the regional framework plan nor its individual components constitute a comprehensive plan.

(14)(16) "New land use regulation" means a land use regulation other than an amendment to an acknowledged land use regulation adopted by a local government that already has a comprehensive plan and land regulations acknowledged under ORS 197.251.

(15)(17) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, governmental subdivision or agency or public or private organization of any kind. The Land Conservation and Development Commission or its designee is considered a person for purposes of appeal under ORS chapter 197.

~~(16)~~(18) "Special district" means any unit of local government, other than a city, county, metropolitan service district formed under ORS chapter 268 or an association of local governments performing land use planning functions under ORS 197.190 authorized and regulated by statute and includes but is not limited to: Water control districts, domestic water associations and water cooperatives, irrigation districts, port districts, regional air quality control authorities, fire districts, school districts, hospital districts, mass transit districts and sanitary districts.

~~(17)~~(19) "Voluntary association of local governments" means a regional planning agency in this state officially designated by the Governor pursuant to the federal Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 as a regional clearinghouse.

~~(18)~~(20) "Wetlands" means those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration that are sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

SECTION 2. ORS 197.251 is amended to read:

197.251. Compliance acknowledgment; commission review; rules; limited acknowledgment; compliance schedule. (1) Upon the request of a local government, the commission shall by order grant, deny or continue acknowledgment of compliance of comprehensive plans and land use regulations with the goals, or, upon request of Metro, by order grant, deny or continue acknowledgment of Metro goals and objectives or Metro regional framework plan for compliance with the goals. A commission order granting, denying or continuing acknowledgment shall be entered within 90 days of the date of the request by the local government unless the commission finds that due to extenuating circumstances a period of time greater than 90 days is required.

(2) In accordance with rules of the commission, the director shall prepare a report for the commission stating whether the comprehensive plan and land use regulations or Metro goals and objectives or Metro regional framework plan for which acknowledgment is sought are in compliance with the goals. The rules of the commission shall:

(a) Provide a reasonable opportunity for persons to prepare and to submit to the director written comments and objections to the acknowledgment request; and

(b) Authorize the director to investigate and in the report to resolve issues raised in the comments and objections or by the director's own review of the comprehensive plan and land use regulations, Metro goals and objectives or Metro regional framework plan.

(3) Upon completion of the report and before the commission meeting at which the director's report is to be considered, the director shall afford the local government and persons who submitted written comments or objections a reasonable opportunity to file written exceptions to the report.

(4) The commission's review of the acknowledgment request shall be confined to the record of proceedings before the local government, any comments, objections and exceptions filed under subsections (2) and (3) of this section and the report of the director. Upon its consideration of an acknowledgment request, the commission may entertain oral argument from the director and from persons who filed written comments, objections or exceptions.

However, the commission shall not allow additional evidence or testimony that could have been presented to the local government or to the director but was not.

(5) A commission order granting, denying or continuing acknowledgment shall include a clear statement of findings which sets forth the basis for the approval, denial or continuance of acknowledgment. The findings shall:

(a) Identify the goals ~~with which the comprehensive plan and land use regulations comply and those with which they do not comply~~ applicable to the comprehensive plan, land use regulations, Metro goals and objectives or Metro regional framework plan; and

(b) Include a clear statement of findings in support of the determinations of compliance and noncompliance.

(6) A commission order granting acknowledgment shall be limited to an identifiable geographic area described in the order if:

(a) Only the identified geographic area is the subject of the acknowledgment request; or

(b) Specific geographic areas do not comply with the applicable goals, and the goal requirements are not technical or minor in nature.

~~(7) The commission may issue a limited acknowledgment order only in the circumstances identified in subsection (6) of this section and all plans and regulations shall be acknowledged in their entirety no later than July 1, 1984, as required by ORS 197.757 (1).~~

~~(8) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (7) of this section and of subsection (1) of section 12, chapter 827, Oregon Laws 1983, the commission may issue or continue a limited acknowledgment order for a coastal area or for the area within an urban growth boundary and outside the city limits after July 1, 1984.~~

~~(9)(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (7) of this section, (The commission may issue a limited acknowledgment order when a previously issued acknowledgment order is reversed or remanded by the Court of Appeals or the Oregon Supreme Court. Such a limited acknowledgment order may deny or continue acknowledgment of the that part of the comprehensive plan, or land use regulations, Metro goals or objectives or Metro regional framework plan that the court found not in compliance or inconsistent with the goals and grant acknowledgment of all other parts of the comprehensive plan and land use regulations previously issued acknowledgment order.~~

~~(10)(8) A limited acknowledgment order shall be considered an acknowledgment for all purposes and shall be a final order for purposes of judicial review with respect to the acknowledged geographic area. A limited order may be adopted in conjunction with a continuance or denial order.~~

~~(11)(9) The director shall notify the Real Estate Agency, the local government and all persons who filed comments or objections with the director of any grant, denial or continuance of acknowledgment.~~

~~(12)(10) The commission may grant a planning extension, which shall be a grant of additional time for a local government to comply with the goals in accordance with a compliance schedule. A compliance schedule shall be a listing of the tasks which the local government must complete in order to bring its comprehensive plan, land use regulations, land use decisions and limited land use decisions into initial compliance with the goals, including a generalized time schedule showing when the tasks are estimated to be completed~~

and when a comprehensive plan or land use regulations which comply with the goals are estimated to be adopted. In developing a compliance schedule, the commission shall consider the population, geographic area, resources and capabilities of the city or county.

(13)(II) As used in this section:

(a) "Continuance" means a commission order that:

(A) Certifies that all or part of Metro goals and objectives, Metro regional framework plan, a comprehensive plan, land use regulations or both a comprehensive plan and land use regulations do not comply with one or more goals;

(B) Specifies amendments or other action that must be completed within a specified time period for acknowledgment to occur; and

(C) Is a final order for purposes of judicial review of the Metro goals and objectives, Metro regional framework plan, comprehensive plan, land use regulations or both the comprehensive plan and land use regulations as to the part parts of the plan, regulations or both the plan and regulations that are found consistent or in compliance with the goals.

(b) "Denial" means a commission order that:

(A) Certifies that Metro goals and objectives, Metro regional framework plan, a comprehensive plan, land use regulations or both a comprehensive plan and land use regulations do not comply with one or more goals;

(B) Specifies amendments or other action that must be completed for acknowledgment to occur; and

(C) Is used when the amendments or other changes required in the Metro goals and objectives, Metro regional framework plan, comprehensive plan, land use regulations or both the comprehensive plan and land use regulations affect many goals and are likely to take a substantial period of time to complete.

LS/dr

1503