

Regional Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
July 8, 1992

RPAC was convened by Chairman Gardner at 5:15 p.m., Wednesday, July 8, 1992.

Members in attendance included: Chairman Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Dick Benner, Councilman Earl Blumenauer, Chris Foster, Councilman John Godsey, Commissioner Judie Hammerstad, Mayor Robert Liddell, Councilor Leslie Like, Mayor Craig Lomnicki, Peggy Lynch, Councilor Susan McLain, Mayor Gussie McRobert, Councilman Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Eric Carlson, Phyllis Clark, Jeff Condit, Andy Cotugno, Brent Curtis, Ethan Seltzer, Al Siddahl, Larry Shaw, Mark Turpel and Mary Weber.

Agenda item I, Approval of Minutes, was ratified unanimously by the members present.

Chairman Gardner asked for citizen communications. Hearing none, he moved to agenda item III, Planning Projects Report.

Mark Turpel outlined the Region 2040 process referring to the chart in the packet. He indicated that three background documents were being prepared to provide a basis for the alternatives. The documents to be produced included a report summarizing public involvement, a report on existing physical conditions of the region and a demographic and economic report.

Jerry Arnold asked about the regional growth alternatives and whether they would include maps.

Mark Turpel described two types of images that would be used to portray the concepts. He stated that "building blocks," which will include photographs of various types of residential densities and examples of commercial and industrial uses, would be included. In addition, generalized maps of the region would be included to illustrate distinct growth concepts.

Jim Zehren stated that it sounded as though the process would propose three alternatives and a consensus would be sought about whether these were the right three alternatives. He asked whether there doesn't have to be some evaluation to get to three? He stated that he thought there was a need to come up with a list of things the region cares about and to consider how alternatives affect those things.

Mark Turpel responded that evaluation of alternatives would occur in Phase II of the project, but that evaluation was very costly and that to the extent that the region could narrow alternatives based on values, a cost effective result could be achieved consistent with the concerns and values of the region.

Jim Zehren stated that he was uneasy and concerned about getting to issues. He also indicated that he felt much work had been done by the state for the *Oregon Benchmarks* and that this work could be used to evaluate Region 2040 alternatives.

Jim Godsey stated that it appeared that there would be the opportunity to make choices along the way.

Dick Benner stated that it was important for the proposals to be distinct and different from each other so that people will easily see the consequences of the alternatives and their likes and dislikes.

Mark Turpel indicated that although three alternatives were going to be illustrated, the process would be encouraging comment - including the possibility of additional alternatives. He stated that the public involvement document could include a blank column which interested persons could use to construct and describe another alternative that they might recommend.

Dick Benner stated that the State Agency Council on Growth in the Portland Metropolitan Region (SAC) had conducted a study on the costs of growth. He indicated that the SAC concluded that costing out growth impacts was very tough to do, making the choice of cost variables very important. He suggested that when the evaluation phase was reached, that these choices be made and then to forge ahead. He suggested that Metro staff should get copies of the SAC documents.

Jim Zehren asked what was the State's interest in the region's growth, and whether there was coordination with Metro efforts?

Dick Benner responded that the State Agency Council was pursuing a definition of the state's role in the region.

Robert Liddell indicated that whatever plans were, care should be taken to ensure that implementation did not happen like the cartoon of a swing on tree. What people describe and how a description is carried out can be two different things.

Chairman Gardner stated that on August 18, there would be a work session scheduled in lieu of the regular RPAC meeting. He indicated that at the meeting RPAC, JPACT, RTAC and TPAC members would be given a preview of Region 2040 growth alternatives and that further information would be made available prior to the meeting. He indicated that the meeting would be held at 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Earl Blumenauer asked if the meeting could start earlier, perhaps at 7:30 a.m.

After discussion by members, Chairman Gardner concluded that a 7:30 a.m. starting time might be accommodated and he directed staff to investigate the feasibility.

Mary Weber gave a presentation on the Infill and Redevelopment project. She stated that a methodology had been established and that infill would be considered separately from redevelopment. She indicated that Phyllis Clark was completing interviews of developers and lenders about their thoughts about infill. She referred to Regional Land Information (RLIS) maps and the database on which they were based. She stated that an RLIS database of vacant lands was the universe of parcels considered and that floodplains, wetlands, steep slopes were taken out of the inventory. She stated that redevelopment lands would be added in and that a draft product was expected by the in of July. She stated that the product would be further refined and made a part of the growth allocation workshops.

Bruce Thompson inquired whether staff was asking builders what it would take to get them to do infill and redevelopment.

Mary Weber answered that staff was looking for obstacles to infill and redevelopment and that some suggestions had been offered.

Dick Benner asked how the project fit with Metro's overall Growth Management program.

Ethan Seltzer stated that it was critical to the growth allocation process, as it would allow Metro to consider the capacity of the region to accommodate growth on infill and redevelopment parcels - something it had not been able to do in the past.

John Godsey asked whether the availability of sites was to be considered.

Mary Weber stated that it may be possible to survey property owners, but that this was not a part of the work program at this time.

Ethan Seltzer stated that the land supply within the urban growth boundary is sized to meet the forecast need for the next 20 years and that immediate availability may not be a good measure for what may be for sale or development over the next 20 years.

Robert Liddell asked whether the need for school land was considered, as they require large land sites.

Ethan Seltzer stated that a factor was provided in the calculations to account for public and nonprofit uses as well as private uses.

Jim Zehren stated that on page 3, paragraph 6, there was a reference to residential, commercial and industrial properties, but no mention of public uses.

Ethan Seltzer stated that 40 percent of the total buildable land supply was subtracted out to account for public and nonprofit uses.

Jim Zehren stated that if a growth alternative calls for more density, more public open space may be needed.

Chris Utterback stated that there was a tendency to overlook parks and that in some cases there were not enough parks now.

Ethan Seltzer stated that land for parks will never be less expensive than it currently is.

Chairman Gardner moved to agenda item IV, the DLCD Urban Growth Management Project.

Ethan Seltzer reported that RTAC had met to create recommendations regarding the state's Growth Management Project. He stated that RTAC had concluded that some of the work elements should be done immediately, while others were less time-critical. He stated that RPAC committee comments were sought and that authorization for approval was requested.

Robert Liddell asked what format would the recommendations come to RPAC for action.

Chairman Gardner stated that the present format would be used given the tight timing.

Susan McLain asked about the timeline for action.

Ethan Seltzer stated that the immediately following Friday it would be forwarded to DLCD, assuming approval. He indicated that it would come before the Commission in July for a presentation and that in August the Commission would hold a work session. He indicated that a decision in October or November was likely.

Judie Hammerstad stated that paragraph #2 is extremely well-taken. She stated that what may work well in one area may not be appropriate for another and that she appreciated the language.

Gussie McRobert asked whether it was really possible to do what was implied in paragraph 2.

Chris Utterback stated that flexibility was important or the region will cease to grow.

Jim Zehren stated that the middle of the last paragraph was confusing.

Ethan Seltzer stated that the Public Investment Areas (PIA) included two concepts. One is the concept of a PIA boundary and the second is minimum service levels within the boundaries.

Gussie McRobert asked what does #4 mean and how does it apply in our region.

Ethan Seltzer stated that specific places may need new arrangements, other areas may not.

Robert Liddell asked who would be lead.

Ethan Seltzer stated that in most cases it would be a city or county, but that in some cases, it could be a special service district which provided a critical service such as water or sewer.

Chairman Gardner stated that he had participated for some time on a subcommittee and up to January of this year, there had been two alternatives, including one that recognized that our metropolitan area was different from other areas of the state.

Dick Benner stated that in some areas of the state, special districts could be the best lead.

Robert Liddell asked whether federal and state forest lands were included.

Dick Benner stated that there were few federal forest holdings within urban growth boundaries.

Gussie McRobert stated that there was a humble pie lesson - that not everyone can be pleased and that regulations should not be too hard on local jurisdictions.

Chairman Gardner stated that he took the comments to mean that there was a need to slightly modify the last paragraph and to soften the tone a bit.

Gussie McRobert suggested adding a sentence recognizing difficulty of this task.

Chairman Gardner, hearing no opposition, directed staff to revise the letter as discussed and to send the letter to DLCD.

Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Turpel.