

REGIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12 1993 MEETING*

5:00-6:30 P.M. Room 370

METRO REGIONAL CENTER

600 NE GRAND AVENUE

AGENDA:

I. Convene

II. Minutes

III. Adjourn

The Coliseum Transit Center and MAX Convention Center stop are two blocks from Metro Regional Center. There are 30 visitor parking spaces available for public use on the north side of the building (Irving Street) in the parking structure. Please let us know if you cannot make it. Thanks!!!

*** Joint meeting with MPAC**

Regional Policy Advisory Committee
April 14, 1993

RPAC members and alternates in attendance:

Jim Gardner-Chair, Heather Chrisman, Richard Devlin, Rob Drake, Gary Hansen, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Bob Liddell, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Gussie McRobert, Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback and Jim Zehren

Others in attendance included: Jeff Condit, Andy Cotugno, Lisa Creel, Gary Derr, Barbara Duncan, Bud Farm, Judith Fessler, Chris Foster, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Judie Hammerstad, Bonnie Hays, Pat Lee, Frank Josselson, Frank Nadal, Chuck Peterson, Arnold Polk, John Reeves, Ben Small, Sandra Suran, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Terry Vanderkooy, Carol Waters, Mary Weber and Loren Wyss

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 by Chairman Gardner.

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

II. Communications from the Public - none

III. Discussion of Amendment of RUGGO Replacing RPAC for MPAC

Chairman Gardner stated the purpose of the amendments were to define which of RPAC's responsibilities under RUGGO would transfer to MPAC. RPAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Council Planning Committee.

Peggy Lynch stated that, assuming MPAC members also received the materials, she would like to hear their comments.

Chairman Gardner stated that yes, both groups had received the entire packet and were invited to comment on both agendas.

Peggy Lynch stated that she was concerned that the MPAC members understand the importance of these responsibilities under RUGGO.

Chairman Gardner stated that the effect of these memos would be to eliminate RPAC.

Commissioner Hays stated for informational purposes that at the February meeting of the FOCUS there was a unanimous vote to request transfer of duties from RPAC to MPAC.

Chairman Gardner stated that yes, that information had been received.

Commissioner Kafoury motioned to recommend Council adoption of the amendments. Mayor

Kidd seconded the motion.

Councilor McLain stated concern about the timing of the resolution, and that she could support the resolution if it could be passed so that by the next MPAC meeting, they could assume RPAC responsibilities.

Chairman Gardner responded that if the amendments were adopted in the most direct way, at the first May Council meeting, by the next MPAC meeting, there would be no RPAC.

Mayor McRobert stated that there was a core of experienced people and staff available to bring people up to speed if needed.

Councilor Devlin stated that it must be an ordinance to amend RUGGO and would have to go for a first reading, then to Council Planning Committee, then back to Council. The first meeting it could be acted on would be the first meeting in May. He stated that the amendments made clear that local governments were to be full participants and that Metro Council also expects to fully participate.

Chairman Gardner stated that his timeline for passage of the amendments was possible, but optimistic. He stated there may still be another RPAC meeting next month.

Jim Zehren stated that as a citizen, it seemed that everyone was ready to move ahead with this and get to work.

Chairman Gardner stated that a motion had been moved and seconded to recommend Council adoption of the amendments in the draft that amends Goal 1 of RUGGO. The vote was unanimously passed.

Jim Zehren asked about the wording changes in the ordinance, for example "oversee participate" (bottom pg. 4) and what the intent was in the change.

Chairman Gardner responded that MPAC and RPAC have different relationships with the Metro Council. RPAC had two voting Council members, MPAC does not and MPAC requires a vote of the public to change it, while RPAC was created and changeable by Metro. These changes were meant to be consistent with the Charter's role for MPAC to be an advisory body.

Jim Zehren stated that the intent seemed to be to scale back on the advisory committee processing, which seems ironic as the Council can change what it has assigned to the committee at any time.

Councilor Devlin stated that MPAC is an integral part of the process, the Charter made it clear that the principle duty of the district is regional planning. He stated that there are

councilors who want to insure that we have a cooperative effort with local government. The process will likely be the same as in the past, but councilors want it to be a constant interaction, not a check in every six months.

Peggy Lynch requested that since the motion had already been approved, RPAC and MPAC members could be notified of when the Council meetings regarding this would be.

Chairman Gardner responded that there were still opportunities for input. The ordinance would be heard at the next Council meeting, then at the Planning Committee the first Tuesday of May, and again at the next Council meeting, the second Thursday in May.

IV. Discussion of Evaluation Criteria

Chairman Gardner stated that originally a presentation by Christine Ervin from the State Growth Agency including a slide show on Benchmarks had been scheduled, but was postponed until next months meeting.

John Fregonese was introduced to give an update on Region 2040 and Future Vision. He stated that in addition to the three concepts of Region 2040, a base case has been added which takes policies currently in existence and extends the effect out 50 years in the future. This is the least realistic concept, but is important in that it shows when and where problems will arise. John Fregonese stated that we are currently in the base case sketch modeling stage. A partnership is being formed with local government through TPAC and RTAC to help model the concepts, showing population growth distribution.

John Fregonese stated that the next step is base case fine modeling, which looks at the more detailed effects of growth such as how greenspaces and transportation networks can fit in that concept. Concept Integration is the last step and a combination of the strengths of each of the concepts will likely be chosen rather than one concept. The final concept choice will be made in May 1994 by the Metro Council. Then a Regional Transportation Plan is developed and Region 2040 Phase III looks at how to achieve the chosen concept. John Fregonese stated that at the same time, the Future Vision Commission will start by looking at visions and plans that have been done in the region and looking for commonalities. Then they will look at carrying capacity and develop a desired scenario.

John Fregonese stated that population growth estimates for the region in 50 years ranged from a high estimate of 1.5 million additional people to a low of 600,000 people. He stated staff was using a middle estimate of 1.1 million. John Fregonese stated that currently the staff is doing base case modeling and finding the model's strengths and weaknesses. John stated that for the next ten Wednesdays local technical people will be meeting to do growth allocations. He also stated that there were three Request for Proposals (RFPs) being developed: 1) Develop Evaluation Criteria 2) Urban Design and 3) Growth Analysis. John Fregonese then asked Ken Gervais to present information about evaluation criteria.

Ken Gervais had five points on evaluation criteria; first that this has to be a consensus building process. Second, the process is fallible, no one has ever done a 50 year plan before and we are learning as we go. Third, that implementation is also an important part of the process, what trade offs do we use to encourage desired behavior such as transit use. Fourth that government agencies cannot determine the outcome by themselves, many other parties are making decisions that will effect the region. Finally, that "no build" is not an option.

Ken Gervais stated that evaluation criteria serve two purposes. One is as a list of characteristics, how do we describe them? There are over 250 criteria in the Benchmarks, do we apply them all? Ken Gervais stated that we are interested in MPAC's concerns and staff will be back for regular discussions.

Andy Cotugno stated that the ultimate limit on looking at evaluation criteria is the budget. Which are the important factors to spend staff time to measure. We need help from local government staff and special district staff.

Chairman Gardner stated that another limit is time and he would like to keep the discussion to 15 minutes tonight.

John Fregonese stated that what we want to discuss may not be evaluation criteria but descriptive indicators. The basic question is do the concepts meet our goals? Each descriptor is tied to a goal, for example the descriptor is housing costs and the goal is affordable housing. We start with RUGGOs, as the regional goals document. John stated that what was needed from MPAC was help defining the criteria.

Peggy Lynch asked what was the timeline for deciding the evaluation criteria.

John Fregonese responded that the evaluation criteria are to be chosen in mid-July, the RFP will be out next month to get the consultant on board. At the next MPAC meeting the approach for the RFP should be discussed and approved.

Chairman Gardner stated that the RFP would be issued in May.

Chris Utterback asked why under affordable housing, livability was not included, when that is the number one concern according to surveys, and it is getting brushed aside.

Chairman Gardner stated that livability is hard to define.

Jim Zehren asked about the plan for a Saturday workshop for all advisory committee members.

Chairman Gardner responded that it hasn't been scheduled yet.

Jim Zehren stated that it is hard to discuss this in 15 minutes, the workshop should happen before money is spent on a consultant, before the RFP is finalized.

Councilor McLain stated that the growth conference had a good small discussion group format that could be used. Perhaps we could have the workshop in early May.

Discussion followed regarding possible meeting dates.

Chairman Gardner stated that RUGGOs could be a good guide.

Jim Zehren stated that the Benchmarks presentation should also be a part of this.

Councilor McLain asked if we could do something simple without a lot of staff time? Just use the RUGGO subject divisions as Chairman Gardner suggested.

Commissioner Kafoury stated that in addition to the educational session, time needs to be set to talk about evaluation criteria. She stated that a week night time is preferred over a weekend.

Arnold Polk stated that a couple of evening meetings would allow time to digest a lot of information, and then meet again.

Commissioner Kafoury suggested April 28th from 5-7 p.m.

Chairman Gardner stated that it was agreed to meet on April 28th as a start.

Andy Cotugno stated that MPAC could schedule meetings for the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month for the next two months and then cancel if necessary.

John Fregonese stated that the first meeting of the month could be a formal meeting, with the second meeting being a work session.

A consensus was reached that the second and fourth Wednesdays would be reserved. Peggy Lynch stated that she approved of using RUGGO as a base for the process. She stated that members should take note of the fast timeline for the RFP.

Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan
A:IMPAK

WORK SESSION NOTES

April 28, 1993

MPAC and RPAC Members in attendance: Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Richard Devlin, Rob Drake, Judith Fessler, Charlie Hales, Darlene Hooley, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Robert Liddell, Peggy Lynch, Rob Mitchell, Linda Peters, Chuck Petersen, Arnold Polk, Alice Schlenker, Loren Wyss and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Richard Bolen, Greg Chew, Andy Cotugno, Lisa Creel, Steve Dotterrer, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Vergie Ries, Alf Siddall, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel and Mary Weber.

The meeting was called to order by RPAC Chairman Gardner at 5:15.

I. Background Presentation

John Fregonese stated that Metro is the only elected regional government in the United States, divided into 13 districts, which each elect a Councilor. An Executive Officer is elected from the region as a whole. He stated the flow of power is from the public to the Executive Officer and under the Executive Officer are the executive staff and the functional areas of Metro: the Zoo, Solid Waste, Public Affairs, Finance and Management Information, Regional Facilities and Regional Parks and Greenspaces. Under the Council is the Council staff. Jointly serving the Council and the Executive Officer are the Metro Exposition Recreation Commission, the General Counsel and the Office of Government Relations. John Fregonese stated that Metro's budget is approximately \$200 million, \$83 million of which is from enterprise revenues. The excise tax is \$4.6 million.

John Fregonese gave a brief history of the organizations in the area that dealt with regional issues in the past and lead to CRAG (Columbia Region Association of Governments) being formed in 1966 and the Metropolitan Service District in 1980. John Fregonese stated Metro manages the Urban Growth Boundary, develops the Regional Transportation Plan, manages the solid waste of the region and developed the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), and the Greenspaces Master Plan.

John Fregonese stated that the Charter, passed by voters in November 1992 was a home rule Charter, making Metro controlled by local voters. The Charter also created MPAC, set Growth Management as Metro's primary function, required the Regional Framework Plan and the Future Vision Commission. John Fregonese stated that the Regional Framework Plan contains the following elements: the Urban Growth Boundary, Regional Transportation Plan, urban reserves, housing density, urban design, parks and open spaces, water planning, coordination with Clark County and other items of regional concern.

John Fregonese stated that Region 2040 was begun before the Charter passed and contains

many of the same elements required by Future Vision and Regional Framework Plan; regional transportation, land use - especially as it relates to transportation, Greenspaces, air and water quality, economic development and the transition from urban to rural land.

John Fregonese stated that Region 2040's most basic question is to grow up or grow out? Region 2040 has three phases: Phase I - defining concepts, Phase II - concept selection, and Phase III - implementation. The final step will be the Regional Framework Plan which is required by the end of 1997.

John Fregonese stated that in forecasting population, migration is the major variable but has averaged 60,000 people per five year period in recent decades. Of all the migration in the United States each year, 6/10ths of a percent come to the Portland Metro region. The middle projection we are using is 1.1 million new residents in the area in the next 50 years.

John Fregonese stated that now we are doing sketch modeling, to see where the growth would occur in the three different concepts as well as modeling a base case of the existing policies. We are meeting with technical people from around the region and from groups such as 1000 Friends and the Home Builders Association. John Fregonese stated that we need to gather information on livability and sense of place as well as easier to obtain numerical information about the region under each concept. What we want to know from MPAC is what are the important factors for you and your jurisdiction that would help you to chose one concept over another.

Commissioner Hales asked would the choice really be one concept or a combination?

John Fregonese stated yes, he believed it would be a combination and perhaps differ regionally.

Ken Gervais stated that the staff was not presuming a combination of the concepts, but was clarifying each concept.

Mayor Liddell asked if it would be more of a statement than a specific chosen concept.

John Fregonese stated that the decisions are harder than choosing one concept, more likely a combination of long range policies and short term specifics.

Mayor Drake stated that based on the concept presentations in Phase I, he believed the public feels that only one concept must be chosen: A, B or C. We need to show that a combination might be chosen.

Councilor Devlin asked about sharing information with Clark County.

John Fregonese responded that Clark County has been invited to these sessions and

information is being shared.

Andy Cotugno stated he had been invited to the Clark County Commissioners Board Meeting to discuss their applying for membership to MPAC.

Mayor Liddell asked if Yamhill and Columbia Counties be invited also?

John Fregonese stated that those areas were included in the computer model work.

Rob Mitchell stated this item should be discussed under "Other" at the end of the agenda.

Linda Peters asked if the models are using data of the past five years. Can we use a model that is not tied to lifestyle patterns we are trying to change?

Ken Gervais stated that the model is not tied to the past five years. The SAM (Spatial Allocation Model) is basically an accounting system showing where people will go.

II. Discussion of Descriptive Indicators

Ken Gervais stated that we could easily come up with a thousand descriptive indicators, but due to time and budget constraints, we need to make a list of the most important factors. He asked for examples of factors that would be most important to your constituents.

Commissioner Hales stated vehicle miles traveled and housing density.

Jim Zehren stated commute time and how people will get to work.

Commissioner Kafoury stated greenness.

Councilor Fessler stated lateral movement, the widening of roads.

Loren Wyss stated costs and allocation of those costs.

Councilor Devlin stated that we should explain why we are making these decisions now.

Councilor Kidd stated the UGB would be an issue.

Mayor Liddell stated economics and the cost of development.

Linda Peters stated acceptable ways to densify, urban design and how the neighborhoods can have a role in the way the neighborhood develops.

Ken Gervais agreed and stated that much of the new development occurring is auto-dependant.

Jerry Arnold stated water quality and air quality.

Chuck Petersen stated water quality, wastewater treatment and fire fighting capabilities.

Jim Zehren stated community, being able to tell the difference between one area and another, greenspaces in between communities.

Ken Gervais stated we need to think of rural land as serving its highest purpose, not just waiting to be developed.

Commissioner Hooley stated the dream of land ownership, not everyone wants to live in urban high density.

Councilor McLain stated equity in cost and amenities between communities.

Councilor Gardner stated lifestyle changes and the cost of lifestyle preferences.

Mayor Liddell stated changes in technology, including tele-commuting, need rewards for businesses who contribute to lessened traffic.

Councilor Devlin stated equity in designating a limited number of mixed use activity centers.

Ken Gervais stated that we will need to explain that no growth is not an option.

Mayor Schlenker stated that we should designate vacant land for purchasing, because people cannot live in high density without open space.

Loren Wyss stated that compromises are made due to economics.

Councilor Devlin stated that costs are incremental, costs can be high up front with the investment in infrastructure.

Arnold Polk stated it will be difficult to approach these questions as both an individual and a representative.

Mayor Liddell stated it is difficult to make a statement for the whole region.

Councilor Fessler stated that with a 50 year plan, we may need to readjust at 20 years.

Ken Gervais agreed, 2015 is a target date that we can be more specific about than 2040.

Councilor Gardner stated that Future Vision is required to be revisited at least every 15 years.

Mayor Schlenker asked for clarification on timelines.

John Fregonese responded that May of 1994 is when a choice is made and implementation will begin in May of 1995.

Linda Peters stated that tele-commuting could be done from neighborhood office centers.

Mayor Schlenker stated that it is already happening in Lake Oswego.

John Fregonese stated that members will receive a survey asking them to rank descriptive indicators by importance.

Ken Gervais stated that although a Request for Proposal is going out does not mean MPAC has had its last chance for input.

Peggy Lynch asked if after May 1994, we begin implementing the decisions made?

Councilor McLain stated that the Future Vision plan and the Charter map out much of the time line, and that the process is evolving.

Mayor Schlenker stated that Lake Oswego wants to involve citizens in the process on a local level.

Ken Gervais stated that a brochure will be coming out soon that updates Region 2040, and then a base case document that shows the effect of current policies being carried through to the future. This is being worked on by the technical group.

III. Other Items

Commissioner Hales suggested a resolution be passed by MPAC to recommend that Council place a high priority on the planning department budget.

Councilor Devlin stated that he wanted people to understand the cost of funding these programs. He stated that most of the programs were funded but may be under funded. For example, Future Vision now has one FTE, funding for materials and supplies will depend on corporate sponsorship. Councilor Devlin stated that if we could get an additional \$40,000, the Future Vision might be in better status than it is now. We would like to get people at the next budget committee meeting May 6th to speak in support of full funding.

Councilor Gardner stated that he had sent a memo to the budget committee stating that Growth Management was not adequately funded. He stated that Future Vision, some of the Regional Framework Plan, general transit area planning and a regional transportation planning program are all funded internally through the excise tax. Councilor Gardner stated he would

be asking for an increase of \$200,000 - \$250,000 for the Growth Management budget, which will mean raising the excise tax a couple of tenths of a percent.

Commissioner Hales asked if due to the importance of the issue, could we authorize the MPAC Chair to speak to the Council on May 6th?

Mayor Liddell stated it shouldn't be advocating an amount, but advocating adequate funding.

Councilor Devlin stated that some cuts may need to be suggested to the Budget Committee.

Councilor Gardner stated that it is not appropriate to get into that detail.

Commissioner Hooley asked if they were looking at raising local government dues.

Councilor McLain stated that dues are only voluntary now.

Councilor Gardner stated that JPACT has pledged to make up for any shortfall in voluntary dues.

Commissioner Hales moved that we authorize the Chair or Vice Chair to appear in support of a budget that would allow Metro to aggressively pursue the planning mandates in the Charter and perhaps improve on the time line.

Seconded by Mayor Liddell. Unanimously passed.

Commissioner Kafoury asked if it was assumed that the parallel technical committee, RTAC, would continue meeting and would that be included in the resolution that will disband RPAC?

Mayor Liddell stated that the technical committee was not specifically addressed in the By-Laws, but MPAC has the option to appoint and will do that.

Vice Chair Mitchell asked could we have an agreement of interest from the committee regarding an invitation to Clark County to participate in MPAC?

Agreement was generally acknowledged by members.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan.

MPAC428

Metro Policy Advisory Committee

May 12, 1993 Meeting*

5:00-6:30 pm - Room 370
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.

Agenda

5:00 - 5:10

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Recognition
4. Visitors Comments on Items not on the Agenda
5. Consent Agenda
 - MPAC minutes

5:10 - 5:25

6. Old Business
 - 2040 Descriptive Indicators Questionnaire (materials attached)

5:25 - 6:15

7. New Business
 - Christine Ervin, Livable Communities (25 min., materials attached)
 - George Crandall, Regional Alternatives Planning Process (RAPP) (25 min.)

6:15 - 6:30

8. Committee Business
 - Procedures and by-law changes (materials attached)
9. Other
 - Information item, Clark County participation

The Coliseum Transit Center and MAX Convention Center stop are two blocks from Metro Regional Center. There are 30 visitor parking spaces available for public use on the north side (Irving Street) parking structure. Please let us know if you cannot attend the meeting. Thanks!!

* Joint meeting with RPAC

Metro Policy Advisory Committee

April 14, 1993

MPAC members and alternates in attendance:

Gussie McRobert-Chair, Heather Chrisman, Rod Drake, Bud Farm, Judith Fessler, Judie Hammerstad, Gary Hansen, Bonnie Hays, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Bob Liddell, Chuck Peterson, Arnold Polk, John Reeves, Sandra Suran, Bruce Thompson, Loren Wyss and Jim Zehren

Others in attendance included: Jeff Condit, Andy Cotugno, Lisa Creel, Gary Derr, Richard Devlin, Barbara Duncan, Chris Foster, John Fregonese, Jim Gardner, Ken Gervais, Frank Josselson, Pat Lee, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Frank Nadal, Ben Small, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Chris Utterback, Terry Vanderkooy, Carol Waters and Mary Weber

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson McRobert at 6:19 p.m.

Introductions

Andy Cotugno introduced himself and the Metro staff:

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director	797-1763
John Fregonese, Regional Planning Supervisor	797-1738
Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner	797-1734
Mary Weber, Senior Regional Planner	797-1735
Lisa Creel, Assoc. Public Affairs Specialist	797-1507
Ken Gervais, Senior Management Analyst	797-1736
Barbara Duncan, Minutes Secretary	797-1750

Andy Cotugno stated that John Fregonese would be the main staff contact for MPAC, and if he is unavailable, Mark Turpel or Mary Weber. Also Larry Shaw from the Office of the General Counsel will often attend the MPAC meetings.

I. Approval of Minutes of March 10th

Corrections: Bud Farm and John Reeves should have been listed in attendance.

Councilor Gardner asked about the MPAC By-Laws which state that the Council liaison positions will represent each county, Jim Gardner stated that he did not recall such representation being discussed, but that it might be a goal, not always achievable and perhaps should not be in the By-Laws.

Chairperson McRobert stated that she had requested the three county representation, but it could be stated as a preference.

Commissioner Hammerstad stated that the reason for changing from three to two liaison positions was for equal representation from the three counties.

Chairperson McRobert stated that page 6 should read:

"She (Chairperson McRobert) Commissioner Hooley stated the meetings should be ..."

Approval of the minutes as corrected was moved by Mayor Liddell, seconded by Commissioner Hansen and passed unanimously.

II. Communications from the Public - none

III. Multnomah County Parks/Metro Greenspaces Merger

Chairperson McRobert stated that no formal proposal has come from Multnomah County and the discussion is for information only, and hoped a lot of staff time would not be spent on it.

Commissioner Hansen thanked Chairperson McRobert for the complete information included in the packet. He stated that Multnomah County has proposed passing Multnomah County's complete Parks Department and the Exposition Center to Metro. This is a self-funded package that would be transferred in whole. The rationale is that these facilities are of a regional nature. Commissioner Hansen stated that the major parks in the system fit within the Greenspace regional system. He stated that the last report from Metro, which he did not wish to comment on, showed the system would be budget neutral. Commissioner Hansen stated the hope was for the facilities to be run with a regional vision and that MERC has a higher marketing capability, and could run EXPO more efficiently.

Commissioner Hansen stated that the offer had been made and the merger has been included in the Executive Officer's budget and the Budget Committee is looking at it. He stated there was an official policy statement needed from Metro that they are willing to take on these responsibilities. Commissioner Hansen stated that it was a relatively easy decision for Multnomah County as they were shedding a responsibility, it is harder for Metro and they are taking a close look at what might happen.

Loren Wyss asked what the impact on the public might be to the public in terms of service provided and cost. Would Metro's current financial problems cause costs to rise?

Commissioner Hansen responded that there are differences in the agencies methods of budget allocation of indirect costs, and that there may be an appearance of some cost increases because of that. Commissioner Hansen stated that after Multnomah County goes through budget reform, indirect costs will be better allocated, and costs would rise under Multnomah County eventually. He stated that it is not inherently more expensive for Multnomah County to operate the facilities than for Metro to operate them. Commissioner Hansen stated that an advantage would be better utilization of Expo through MERC, and therefore more potential revenues.

Loren Wyss stated that he was concerned about the overhead of a government agency that is in need of new revenue sources, for example Tri-Met has been worried that if Metro takes over, would there be a rise in fares.

Councilor Gardner stated that Metro is looking at the cost more than anything else. The budget for the coming year included the transfer from Multnomah County, it did not assume that excise tax would be levied against any of the income from these facilities. Councilor Gardner stated that Metro does not impose the excise tax uniformly on all income sources, policies allow that certain fee generating activities not be taxed. For the upcoming year (fiscal year starting in July) no excise tax will be charged.

Councilor Fessler asked why the proposal hadn't separated out Glendoveer and the Expo Center from the parks.

Commissioner Hansen responded that they are an integral funded unit. If Glendoveer and Expo were transferred by themselves, the remaining parks would close for lack of funding.

Councilor Fessler stated that the Greenspaces measure will return. She asked about equity in park maintenance. She stated that some cities will say that they don't have large parks to maintain.

Commissioner Hansen stated that Expo and Glendoveer cover the cost of maintenance.

Councilor Gardner stated that a Greenspace bond would be for buying the land, none of it can be used for maintaining or operating the land. The plan, if the measure passed, was to maintain at a very minimal level until funding for operations could be found. The Multnomah County transfer would give Metro a track record of managing parks and lands.

Councilor Fessler stated that the maintenance of the Multnomah County parks transferred would be a separate issue from the Greenspaces measure.

Councilor Gardner agreed and stated that any local jurisdiction may chose to operate Metro Greenspace lands located in their area.

Mayor Liddell stated that the facilities in the transfer package were a mixed bag. Also, he was concerned that the quality of Glendoveer might go down under a new maintenance program.

Councilor Gardner stated that Glendoveer was maintained by a private firm who runs the facility under a long term contract, and that would not change if the facility changed hands.

Sandra Suran stated that this was an excellent opportunity. She stated that there would likely be increased efficiencies.

Councilor Devlin stated that there is a broad variety of facilities, and Council feels it must be budget neutral for Metro to do this.

Councilor Gardner stated that in the short term, the transferred facilities would pay for themselves, and if it is a bigger system in the future, the costs of managing go down because of economics of scale.

Commissioner Hays stated that she has not yet seen a proposal.

Chairperson McRobert stated she was astounded that Metro could look at the transfer without a written proposal and detailed information on all the equipment included.

Councilor Devlin stated that the proposal could have been included or left out of the budget. Eventually a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be developed.

Chairperson McRobert asked when will an MOU be written?

Councilor Devlin stated soon. He anticipates some decision by the first of the fiscal year. Councilor Devlin stated that Commissioner Hansen feels the transfer could not occur before October.

Chairperson McRobert asked if the MOU would not be developed until after the budget was passed?

Councilor Devlin responded that he understood a draft MOU has been developed by the two agencies that hasn't come to Council yet.

Chairperson McRobert asked if the meeting should go on until 7:15, members agreed.

Councilor McLain stated that the Council was looking very carefully at all aspects of the proposal. She stated that both Washington and Clackamas Counties all had varied parks departments and are looking at the proposal from different viewpoints.

Mayor Drake stated that it may be better to look at this proposal after the budget has passed, rather than rush to meet budget deadlines.

Commissioner Hansen stated that he believed there could be an MOU agreement in 24 hours if necessary, that there was not a lot in dispute. The process had been slowed down to bring the Council in on developing the MOU.

Jim Zehren stated that he remembered hearing in 1981 of the "imminent" merger of Expo with MERC. He stated that generally conference centers don't make money, can this actually be budget neutral? Jim Zehren asked how could the revenue of Expo thru MERC fund the

other pieces of the package under Greenspaces.

Councilor Gardner stated that the transferred facilities would be kept as a distinct package in the budget.

Commissioner Hammerstad mentioned the memo in the agenda packet from Mayor McRobert to Judy Wyers and the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee meeting on April 7th for discussion of the merger. She stated that she had requested that MPAC look at this issue.

Chairperson McRobert stated that she was not interested in more discussion on this without a written proposal. She has seen (in Gresham?) \$200,000 worth of work go into \$50,000 worth of results, and is concerned that there is not a formal proposal. Chairperson McRobert asked could we have an MOU by the next meeting?

Commissioner Hansen stated he was not prepared to say that, an MOU would be between the two parties.

Chairperson McRobert stated that it could be called something else. Even if MPAC is not legally required to look at it, the more input the better. She asked if members wanted to discuss this further without seeing something in writing?

Members responded no.

IV. Other: Report on Rules and Procedures

Councilor Fessler stated that she, Arnold Polk and Mayor Liddell had worked on rules and regulations, if anyone has comments on these, please bring them to the next meeting.

Chairperson McRobert stated that rules and procedures and By-Laws will be added on the agenda for next meeting.

John Fregonese asked if this was to be an amendment to the By-Laws or a separate memorandum.

Chairperson McRobert responded that it should be a separate item. She stated that RUGGOs were required reading for the next meeting. Chairperson McRobert adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan
A:IMPAK

METRO

Planning Department
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736
(503) 797-1700

Memorandum

DATE: May 5, 1993
TO: MPAC
FROM: John Fregonese, Land Use Planning Supervisor 
SUB: Descriptive Indicators Questionnaire

Descriptive Indicators is the term we are assigning to evaluation criteria in the 2040 concept evaluation process. Because there can be no fair system of "weighting" criteria (without making assumptions about people's preferences), we believe descriptive information about each concept, whether derived from the modeling or other means, will be the best system for presenting decision makers and the public with informed choices to the question of regional form.

In compiling a list of the potential descriptive indicators we have gone to our own Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and numerous other sources. These have included, Region 2040 Phase I public involvement, the Oregon Benchmarks, Regional Alternatives Planning Process (RAPP), Puget Sound Council of Governments (Vision 2020), Metropolitan Toronto - Greater Toronto Area Urban Structure Concepts Study, as well as the recent workshop with this committee to define the most important issues you think we face.

Before we release the Request for Proposals (RFP) on Descriptive Indicators, we would like to have decision makers such as yourself and the Metro Council help us cull the most important descriptive indicators. We will then work on the methodology of measuring these indicators.

Attached is a matrix questionnaire which we would like you to complete, and bring with you to the next meeting May 12. This will help us come up with a list of indicators for evaluation. You may add descriptive indicators not on the list. We ask you to respond to each question on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 showing the most importance. The primary intent is to clarify the most important issues. **This is not a final decision, we will revisit this issue when we begin our work with the consultant.**

We suggest having a work session May 26th to finish up our discussion of descriptive indicators.

Name: _____

Jurisdiction: _____

Descriptive Indicator	How important is knowledge of this indicator to you?	How important is knowledge of this indicator to your constituents?	Should a minimum standard be established for this indicator, applicable to all concepts?
Air Quality			
Water; supply, quality, distribution			
Urban/Rural Transition; UGB, urban/rural qualities			
Greenspaces; natural areas, parks, wildlife, greenbelts			
Agriculture and Forest Land Protection			
Housing; density, affordability, choice			
Sense of Place/Community			
Urban Design			
Redevelopment/ Infill (use of developed land)			
Transportation Mobility; travel mode, travel time			
Pollution, noise			
Energy costs			
Sewers; stormwater drainage			
Solid Waste			

For each descriptive indicator, rank your response on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 indicating a higher rank, 5 indicating a lower rank (of less importance).

Descriptive Indicator	How important is knowledge of this indicator to you?	How important is knowledge of this indicator to your constituents?	Should a minimum standard be established for this indicator, applicable to all concepts?
Economic Viability; What's the \$ cost? Who pays?			
Tax Burden			
Economic Opportunity; business climate			
Public Safety			
Schools			
Social Services			
Arts Culture			
Equity Issues			
Individual Lifestyle & Property Choices			
Social Diversity			
Liberty/Freedom			

For each descriptive indicator, rank your response on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 indicating a higher rank, 5 indicating a lower rank (of less importance).



METRO

Date: May 5, 1993
 To: Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner
 From: Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel
 Regarding: MPAC PROCEDURES SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
 Our file: 7.§2.Y

Incorporating the subcommittee recommendations seems to require both a By-Law amendment and a set of procedural rules that could be in the By-Laws, but seem to be intended to be separate.

By-Law Amendments - Majority Vote of Membership Required

The By-Laws require written notice to all members and alternates at least 30 days prior to proposed action. So, this amendment could not be adopted until the MPAC meeting following this one:

Article IV, c. is amended to read as follows:

- "c. Subcommittees or advisory committees to develop recommendations for MPAC may be appointed by the Chair MPAC. ~~The Chair will consult with~~ The full membership of MPAC at a regularly scheduled meeting ~~on~~ shall determine subcommittee membership and charge. Subcommittee and advisory committee members may include MPAC members and/or alternates and outside experts. The Chair of the subcommittee shall not be the Chair of MPAC, except upon the agreement of a majority of the membership. In addition, for any subcommittee created by MPAC as advisory to MPAC, the Chair of the subcommittee shall not be an MPAC member."

MPAC Rules of Procedure

Except for the approach to subcommittees which conflicts with the currently-adopted MPAC By-Laws, most of the Procedures Subcommittee recommendations seem to be "other rules of procedure" under Article IV, e. Therefore, these have been organized together separately. Subcommittees could be treated as a "rule of procedure" if the conflicting language were not already in the adopted MPAC By-Laws. However, subcommittee authority and limitations normally would be in By-Laws.

MPAC Rules of Procedure

I. Regular Meetings:

The Chair has established that regular meetings shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 5:00 p.m. The Metro Regional Center shall be the meeting location unless otherwise indicated on the agenda packet.

II. Meeting Agendas:

A. Items may be placed on the MPAC agenda by: the MPAC Chair, other MPAC members, the Metro Council, the Metro Council Presiding Officer, the Metro Executive Officer, or the Metro Auditor.

B. The format for MPAC agendas is recommended to include the following:

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Recognition
4. Visitors Comments on Items not on the Agenda
5. Consent Agenda
6. Public Hearings
7. Resolutions
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Committee Business
11. Other

C. The Chair shall determine the order of the items on the agenda, consistent with the format in B above. If the items to be placed on the agenda or the expected length of time for presentation or discussion is too lengthy for a single meeting, the Chair may decide which items shall be placed on the next available agenda and those that are placed on future agendas.

D. Deadlines for placing items on agendas will be two weeks prior to the regularly scheduled meeting date.

E. An agenda setting subcommittee will be formed. Meetings of the committee will be conducted by the Chair, unless waived by the subcommittee members.

F. Agenda packets will be mailed to MPAC members and interested parties one week prior to the scheduled meeting.

G. The MPAC may choose to add additional items to the agenda at the meeting upon a majority vote of the membership.

III. Public Testimony Form:

Testimony before MPAC for the public record shall include the attached form.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY FORM

For testimony before the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)

(Please print or write clearly - this document will become part of the Public Record)

Name: _____

Street Address or Mailing Address: _____

City, State and Zip Code: _____

Date: _____