

Regional Policy Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

November 11, 1992

RPAC was convened by Chairman Gardner at 5:08 p.m., Wednesday, November 11, 1992 in room 440, Metro Center.

Members in attendance included: Committee Chairman Jim Gardner, Pauline Anderson, Earl Blumenauer, Jerry Arnold, Larry Cole, John Godsey, Darlene Hooley, Chris Foster, Gretchen Kafoury, Robert Liddell, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Gussie McRobert, Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Andy Cotugno, Brent Curtis, Doug Anderson, Ken Gervais, Larry Shaw, Al Siddahl, Mary Weber and Mark Turpel.

I. Meeting Summary

Chairman Gardner asked for amendments to the meeting summary of October 14, 1992. The following changes were recommended: 1) Page 1, second paragraph, (Members in attendance) "... Peggy Lynch..."; 2) page 4, paragraph 5 (Mayor Cole's statement) - the end of the first sentence should read "...preclude living nearer to housing jobs."; 3) page 5, paragraph 3 (Andy Cotugno's statement) "...they were not able to ~~curtain~~ curtail growth..."; 4) page 6, first full paragraph (Councilman Gallagher's statement) "...stated that ~~were we're~~ searching...". With these amendments, the meeting summary was unanimously approved.

II. Communications from the Public

Peggy Lynch asked to speak to the issue of slow growth that was a topic of discussion at the last RPAC meeting. (see also copy of letter dated November 17, 1992 from Peggy Lynch). She stated that a slow growth policy option could be included as a concept "D", but that doing so was not responsible, because the public and decision-makers alike would assume that it was achievable. She stated that she did believe that a response was due to those that raised concerns about the rate of growth and that the approach outlined in point number 2 of attachment 2 to the resolution was a responsible and responsive method.

Chairman Gardner thanked Ms. Lynch for her comments and noted that this issue would be addressed further in the meeting under item IV. He asked that the order of agenda items be adjusted to provide for setup time for agenda item III and moved to agenda item IV.

IV. Metro Charter Briefing

Larry Shaw, Metro Senior Legal Counsel, distributed a memo (attached) which outlined some of the Charter provisions as they relate to growth management.

Andy Cotugno stated that he saw the Region 2040 product as being the same as the future vision, in that they both provided a direction for guiding more specific items. He elaborated that functional plans as provided for in the existing enabling legislation for Metro were similar to the elements of the framework plan of the charter. He stated that one piece that had not been figured out was the timing for completing products. He indicated that the plan had been to

complete Region 2040 by the end of calendar year 1993. He stated that there was a state mandate for completion of a Regional Transportation Plan update in 1995 and an Urban Reserve deadline in 1994. He stated that he was apprehensive about slowing down existing work efforts and felt that the substance of existing projects was compatible with the intent of the charter. He also stated that another concern was the Future Vision Commission and that it was important to start it as soon as possible.

Chairman Gardner stated that the memo from legal counsel was a first, brief look at charter provisions and there were lots of little details that needed to be looked at. He gave as an example the relationship of RPAC, as provided for in the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, to the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). He asked whether there was a reason to have both and what was the best way to deal with the issue. He stated that people often commented that Metro makes too much demand on local government representatives' time.

Mayor McRobert asked why there would be two committees (an MPAC and an RPAC).

Chairman Gardner stated that there was a real difference in functions. He stated that RPAC was set up by RPAC (or its predecessor, UGMPAC) and that there is a difference between an advisory group, like MPAC and a decision-making group like RPAC. He asked whether products could be developed with an MPAC, or whether finished products should be brought to MPAC for comment and response. He stated that these and other questions needed to be discussed by RPAC at future meetings. He indicated that in the interest of time, he would move to the next agenda item, but that important discussion of the issues was needed in the future.

III. Population and Employment Projections

Doug Anderson, Metro Senior Economist, provided a presentation of overhead projections concerning population and employment projections (a copy of the materials are available from Metro). Doug indicated that over the next 50 years, if there were no in-migration and no out-migration, negative population growth would occur by the end of the period, assuming current birth and death rates. He indicated that net in-migration, as a result, was a very important variable in projecting future growth of the region. He also indicated that his work had indicated that historically, there was a strong and relatively constant relationship between local migration rates and national migration rates. Doug showed in-migration rates for west coast cities, with our region among those with the lowest rates.

Councilman Godsey stated that he did not have a good feeling for what is going on in Oregon in terms of the characteristics of those migrating.

Doug responded that auto license surrenders provided a snapshot of the characteristics of those coming to the state, but there did not appear to be a good way to determine the characteristics of those leaving the state, so that the characteristics of net in-migrants was difficult to assess.

Councilor McLain asked if school statistics were useful.

Doug indicated that school statistics were used in an indirect way. He stated that much data was derived from the State's Population Center housed at PSU and that these data were used in the materials presented.

Doug presented a possible range of birth and death rates based upon historical ranges of the region. Based upon these ranges and in-migration assumptions, several growth trends were shown, with a range of 2.015 and 2.360 million people in the year 2040 for the 4 county area. These trend projections were completed within a range of common historical rates of births and deaths in the region. In addition, Doug showed growth projections if the region had growth patterns such as those in Europe (low birthrates) and Florida (high elderly in-migration). In addition, he showed a growth projection if conditions were similar to Seattle dynamics. In this range, population could be within 2.54 to 3.4 million in the 50 projection period. The highest of these would be an extreme of the highest possible growth factors (in-migration, birthrates) sustained for the entire time period.

Commissioner Hooley asked why there was such a difference in the population projections of a "Seattle" scenario over other scenarios.

Doug responded that it was directly related to fertility rates.

Mayor Cole stated that a summary of the major points and conclusions would be very useful.

Doug indicated that such a report was being written.

Jim Zehren stated that the 3 trend scenarios for Portland seemed perhaps too constrained. He stated that although they were within the most common rates of birth, death and in-migration rates, many American cities had undergone much more rapid change - for example, Phoenix - than their historical rates would have predicted. He stated that using extreme rates did seem to be a "clinker", but that they might be used to bracket the possibilities of growth for the region.

Doug indicated that although the "Trend" band of projections was constrained to historical rates, the others were not and that bracketing could be obtained if all projections were included.

Mayor Liddell asked if there was any comparable region with an urban growth boundary. He stated that an UGB must make a difference in growth rates. He stated that Seattle was a sprawl city and wondered what a region with a more limited boundary had experienced. He also stated that in talking to commercial real estate brokers, there seemed to be a limited supply of land and he pondered how this might influence growth rates.

Doug stated that few regions currently had ugb's, but that in the state of Washington, the fast growing counties were developing them and that other fast-growing parts of the country were expressing interest. He indicated that if everyone had a ugb, there would be an even basis for comparison, which would provide a more useful measure of what a ugb might mean for growth.

Chairman Gardner stated that he appreciated gaining a better understanding of some of the growth dynamics and that additional briefings and question periods would be useful. He stated that in the interest of time, he would move to the next agenda item.

V. Review and Discussion of Resolution 92-1712.

Chairman Gardner asked Andy Cotugno to review the draft resolution.

Andy Cotugno reviewed the draft resolution, indicating that a full discussion of the resolution was in order, that revisions to the resolution were expected to be made at RTAC and TPAC meetings and that these would come back to RPAC at the December meeting. He also indicated that it was recommended that the resolution be completed by the Metro Council in December.

Mayor Liddell stated that Metro could not implement the extreme version of concept "C" - more distant satellites - as these areas were well outside Metro's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Hooley stated that although this was technically correct, the counties did have substantial abilities and that through the counties and RUGGO, this variation might be achieved.

Mayor McRobert stated that some communities are concerned that the project could result in Metro, or some entity forcing them to accept growth - or planning the growth for them.

Mayor Liddell stated that the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Act recently adopted would mean a lot of change anyway and that the greater Portland area has always had a large impact on the rest of the state.

Mayor Cole stated that the issue was not how do we plan for others, rather, what amount of cooperation is possible.

Chairman Gardner agreed that it was presumptive of the region to be planning for other areas, but that some type of cooperation was imperative.

Andy Cotugno stated that some had suggested that there be a concept "D" added to the other concepts for evaluation. This concept, over the 50 year period, would hold the ugb and provide for distant satellites for that growth which could not be accommodated by existing 20 year comprehensive plans. Alternatively, he indicated that language could be added which would identify the potential impacts of the region's plans on the full extent of the three counties as well as Clark County.

Mayor Cole stated that if those jurisdictions outside the immediate region are not invited to participate, then there still is a problem even if we only evaluate impacts.

Jerry Arnold stated that the timing for coordination with Clark County was fortuitous, as they are completing work to comply with their state's Growth Management Act.

Mayor McRobert stated that she would like to see attachment 1 to the resolution treat highways in concept "B" the same as it does now in concept "A". That is, there should be an explicit highway option to "B" as there is in "A". In addition, she stated that she did not believe that the Mt. Hood Parkway would have the growth impacts that a freeway could, as access was planned to be very different.

Andy Cotugno stated that he agreed that there should be a consistent approach to how freeways were handled in all concepts - that the highway language in "A" should be included in "B" and "C" (and any other concepts if added).

Jim Zehren asked what was meant by "freeway". He stated that a lack of access could be similar to or very different from a freeway.

Andy Cotugno stated that at the level of detail of the resolution and attachment that the usage of the term could be broad, but that at some later date, further definition might be appropriate.

Chris Utterback stated that there should be a concept "E", as she was concerned that concept "C" implied bedroom communities, not fully functioning urban areas with employment, shopping schools and all of the elements that make for a total community. She further stated that the concept should allow for development of neotraditional communities. She stated that the telephone survey completed early in the project noted that there was a strong interest on the part of the public for a "rural feeling" and that this desire should be heeded. In addition, she stated that all of the concepts to date ignored the rivers as a part of the transportation system.

Andy Cotugno stated that none of the concepts precluded the use of neotraditional methods.

Chris Utterback stated that the project time frame was 50 years and that there should be more than three concepts that are explored with that type of period.

Andy Cotugno stated that when the resolution is adopted, one option from the second attachment dealing with potential approaches to the no or slow growth issue, would be incorporated in the resolution and the rest of the options would be deleted. He suggested that the second option would be the best approach.

Councilor McLain stated that she supported this type of approach.

Mayor McRobert stated that state law prohibited no growth.

Andy Cotugno responded that this was true and that he did not suggest that this approach be taken. He also stated that in the past the region has decided what it wanted and then gone after it, even if it took a change in state law.

Jim Zehren stated that he had a concern with the amount of staff time it could take to provide sufficient materials to come to a conclusion about slow or no growth. He indicated that it could

take so much time that other tasks would be affected.

Councilman Blumenauer stated that the closer people get to growth the crankier they get. He stated that some have voiced the concern that by projecting a population, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. He stated that it is true that actions can be taken to slow the rate of growth and that someone would need to analyze this issue in order to get community consensus. He stated interest in a study which showed the costs and consequences of such a policy.

Mayor Liddell stated that in West Linn there are three new councilors who are very concerned with growth. He stated that some type of forum on growth would be useful, because a legislative session was almost before us and the region may be forced to deal with the issue.

Mayor Cole stated that there is substantial pressure for slowing growth. He stated that it would either be addressed now or it will have to be addressed later.

Peggy Lynch stated that there is a need for facts and figures about growth - what it does it do to us, etc. She stated that information about growth was very different from having a separate slow growth option which would be unfair and unrealistic. She stated that school overcrowding and finance was a big issue related to the growth rate and that it should be addressed. She stated that the business community did not expect or want slow growth and the consequences of such an action should be carefully considered.

Councilman Blumenauer stated that he believed that people will take things into their own hands if something is not done about it. He stated that if slow or no growth is not looked at, some will feel that the project is a sham.

Jim Zehren asked if there was an estimate of the resources necessary to conduct a no or slow growth study.

Andy stated that he did not have such figures available, although a detailed study could be substantial. He indicated that there could be a concept "D" which could be a proxy for slow growth by holding the ugb in place, not changing existing comprehensive plans and looking at the consequences of such actions.

The meeting having exceeded its regular adjourning time, Councilor McLain, acting for Chairman Gardner, entertained adjournment. In light of the need to try and take action on the resolution at the December RPAC meeting, she asked whether the committee would prefer starting earlier or continuing later. The majority of the committee agreed to an early start at 4:30 pm instead of 5:00 pm.

Councilor McLain adjourned the committee at 6:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Turpel.

H:\rpac11.min