

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.