

Regional Policy Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting of May 13, 1992

Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Susan McLain, Chris Utterback, Gussie McRobert, Gretchen Kafoury, Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Dick Benner, Pauline Anderson, Jim Zehren, Richard Kidd, Darlene Hooley, Bob Liddell, Roy Rogers, Earl Blumenauer, Fred Neal, Peggy Lynch, Ed Marcotte, Chris Foster

Others Present:

Ethan Seltzer, Andy Cotugno, Mark Turpel, Terry Moore, Gail Ryder, Robin McArthur-Phillips, Rob Kappa

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 pm.

I. Jerry Arnold moved and Gretchen Kafoury seconded that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved. The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted. Jim Gardner asked if there were any citizens in the audience wishing to speak. No one came forward.

II. Ethan Seltzer provided an update on the Regional Growth Conference and Region 2040 Study projects, including the telephone survey, stakeholder interviews, local jurisdiction "kits", and public workshops. Jerry Arnold asked whether the Conference was worth the effort. Ethan Seltzer replied that it was the only event of its kind that brought together the regional growth management "stakeholders". Jim Gardner noted that next year the conference would occur at the time that the Region 2040 alternatives would be entering the Phase II analysis, providing good material for the workshops.

III. Ethan Seltzer then introduced Terry Moore, leader for the consultant team working on the Region 2040 Study. Terry described the kit being used with local governments, and the ways in which the results would be used later on. He then showed the Region 2040 slide show, following which he asked RPAC members to review the material on growth themes handed out at the meeting. Terry then asked RPAC to discuss which themes should be given the highest priority, or most attention, and why (what follows is a compilation of comments made during the discussion):

--economic development and diversification of the economy is key. Commercial development and industrial parks must be located near transportation and labor.

--Theme 5 makes sense. We should use the primary corridors and make the most of the huge public investment in LRT.

--Theme 14 should get some attention because the balance of jobs and housing is important.

--I don't like themes 1, 2, 5, and 7. 1 is too narrow. 2 needs to be balanced. Emphasizing high density corridors (5) isn't popular. 7 raises the question of which cities and where. Theme 8 looks pretty good.

--Themes 12, 13, and 14 are related and should be looked at as a package.

--Theme 5 shouldn't mean only high density corridors. There needs to be balance, with high density corridors part of an overall package. There should be balanced growth but better regional function, and linkages to themes 12, 13, and 14.

--I like theme 10 since it implies a walkable, bikeable place.

--If you don't have theme 11, it won't work. Also, there needs to be a theme 15 that deals explicitly with sense of place or community as the basis for future urban form. Everyone needs a place to fit in.

--With theme 11 should come consideration of air quality and the affect of Washington on Oregon. Also 9 crosses the river.

--Theme 1 is important. We need to see more than 3% in Portland. 1 and 5 are related. I don't like 5 because it's wasteful of land, energy, and air quality.

--How can we do this using the existing UGB? Clackamas County faces a future as a bedroom community if the UGB stays the same and no land for jobs is added.

Terry Moore remarked that it's hard to get 600,000 inside the UGB, and all too easy for most people to put the density "somewhere else". He stated that he heard a need to do all of themes 9 through 14, that themes 1 and 5 work for some, what about theme 6?

--Many techniques will need to be used. The UGB won't last for 50 years. If we don't want to be LA then we must expect satellite cities to be part of the mix.

--I don't like 1, 2, and 3. Also 4 is a problem. Theme 5 should be looked at for the activity center concept, and for looking at activity centers as cities in some cases. Theme 7 should be incorporated in the mix. Themes 12, 13, and 14 need to work together. Theme 11 must always be considered. 9 and 10 are opposites. There needs to be a mix.

--All themes can't be emphasized or 2040 won't work. Emphasize 1 and 5. If Portland fails, then the region fails. Investment in LRT demands focusing development in corridors. Theme 9 means that the air quality will be too poor to support industrial growth.

Terry Moore mentioned that as he begins to prepare for the development of alternatives, he sees aspects of themes 9 through 14 emerging as evaluative criteria. Jim Zehren noted that

he should also look at the benchmarks.

Terry then asked RPAC to discuss the characteristics of the region that are most important to quality of life.

--The distinct character of areas, communities, and districts which leads to sense of place.

--We can't expand the UGB to Salem. We should avoid becoming a western version of megalopolis. We will not accomplish much if we don't stick to our guns regarding density. Design is key.

--Nature gives us the pattern within which our cities should be built. Parks and schools need better coordination with the planning program, and all elements of what makes a center need to be considered together.

--View corridors are critical.

--Low heights of buildings. I don't like tall buildings. We must have open space, diversity in housing types, and setbacks from amenities.

--We must have open space. As density increases and plans near build-out, there must be psychic relief.

--Pedestrian friendly. Neighborhoods and districts need to be places you can really walk.

--People need to know they have real choices. Human scale means that people don't get lost. We must keep that scale everywhere because it adds to sense of place.

--Sense of community. But benchmarks for this are hard to find. Access to stores, gathering places, and transit by foot can serve as indicators for community.

--Access to parks.

--Neotraditional neighborhoods are important because people are afraid of being swallowed up.

--I am pleased to hear shared values for community, but no one seems to like theme number 6. How can it be fixed?

--Only focusing inside the UGB is too limiting.

--Excise the term "new towns".

Terry then asked if each person could let him know in 1 minute the 1 thing they want him to hear before we get into the development of alternatives.

--Communities need to understand the need for balance and priorities in a world of limited resources.

--Change will happen and things will be different.

--There is a tremendous shared sense of values, values are converging and we need to capture these views. The terminology "sucks". "Density", "neotraditional", etc. are all bad. We need win-win terms based on shared values.

--Pictures are needed to get past words. We need real examples to show how it can happen, because we need to change local plans.

--Cultural differences and styles mean that we must avoid cookie-cutter solutions and application of the themes to the region. We need to mesh differences and support multiple lifestyles. We can't leave folks out.

--There are different values and standards, and they must be defined at the start. Playing the growth game at the conference was useful because it was enlightening to see just how tough the task really is.

--I wince when I hear "up to 500,000". It might be more or less, so our planning must consider ranges. We need to communicate an accurate sense of the trade-offs. We need to use pictures to do this, and if the trade-off is not apparent locally, then the macro-level appreciation of the trade-off will be tough to communicate. We must communicate the implications of choosing the status quo.

Terry Moore then distributed the surveys to the RPAC members and asked that they return them as soon as possible.

Peggy Lynch mentioned that it will be necessary to figure out how to do a 20 minute presentation for citizens.

IV. Ethan Seltzer reported on the LCDC Urban Growth Management Project and noted that RPAC needs to look at the recommendations at its next meeting.

V. Chris Utterback asked if RPAC would look at the charter. Jim Gardner replied that it wasn't really an RPAC issue. Susan McLain mentioned that there would be public meetings on the charter later on.

Fred Neal asked if there could be a State Agency Council report to RPAC. Dick Benner replied that we could set it up anytime.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 pm.