

Regional Policy Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

December 9, 1992

RPAC was convened by Chairman Gardner at 4:35 p.m., Wednesday, December 9, 1992 in room 440, Metro Center.

Members in attendance included: Committee Chairman Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Earl Blumenauer, Dick Benner, Larry Cole, Richard Devlin, Jack Gallagher, John Godsey, Chris Foster, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Robert Liddell, Ed Lindquist, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Roy Rogers, Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Mike Gates, Doug Anderson, Andy Cotugno, Eric Carlsen, Brent Curtis, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Larry Shaw, Al Siddahl, Richard Ross, Stuart Todd, Mary Weber and Mark Turpel.

I. Meeting Summary

Chairman Gardner asked for amendments to the meeting summary of November 11, 1992. Hearing none, he asked for approval and no dissent was voiced.

II. Communications from the Public

Peggy Lynch asked to speak about regional growth.

Chairman Gardner recommended that as Resolution 92-1712 was the next item, the committee move to that item and as the issues that she was interested in were discussed that she make her comments at that time.

Chairman Gardner also introduced John Fregonese, the newly appointed Land Use Supervisor.

John Fregonese described his background including his 12 years as Director of Community Development for the City of Ashland and prior to that as Planning Director for the City of Woodburn.

III. Resolution 92-1712

Chairman Gardner asked Andy Cotugno to summarize the resolution and attachments.

Andy Cotugno described the resolution and attachment dated November 11, 1992, which included changes made at the previous RPAC meeting as well as changes made by JPACT.

Mayor Liddell asked how do you freeze Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and comprehensive plans?

Andy Cotugno stated that you could say "we're done". He indicated that growth would not totally cease, at least initially, that it would not be exactly static. He gave as an example vacant or redevelopable properties that could develop to their comprehensive plan potential, but there

would be no comprehensive plan changes or UGB changes. He further stated that there could be zone changes within the constraints of the overall local comprehensive plan, within the constraints of land use economics.

Councilman Gallagher asked if it was easier to just build a fence around the ugb. He asked about disaster damaged structures and replacement.

Andy Cotugno responded that he was not in favor of such an option, but was responding to the question.

Jim Gardner asked if anyone was in favor of this option.

Chris Foster asked if it was legal.

Richard Kidd stated he was not in favor of the idea, but allowed uses within zones would give some flexibility, might be a possibility.

Mayor Cole stated that such a policy might have been acceptable if done 10-15 years ago, but that commitments had been made.

Mayor Liddell agreed that it couldn't be done now.

Chris Utterback said that if it is not doable, you shouldn't give the public the idea that is a possibility or a choice to be made from among other concepts.

Councilor Devlin stated that nothing can be done about it now, but there were some prime agricultural lands brought into the UGB historically.

Jim Gardner asked staff about the "no governance" option, and the radial option. He asked whether the radial option was simply a different way of doing concept "C".

Mark Turpel responded that the no governance concept was proposed by members of the development community, but only as a contingency to the slow or no growth concept. He stated that they were seeking to look at the full spectrum of alternatives if the slow growth alternative were going to be considered. He further stated that radial pattern could be a different way of implementing either concept "A" or "C".

Jim Zehren mentioned Greenspaces, and that he hoped to come back to this program as RPAC talks about criteria and next phases of the project.

Andy Cotugno stated agreement with the need to integrate an greenspace element for each option, and that a statement to this effect had been added to the resolution. However, he noted that there had not been the time to play out what form this could take.

Mayor Liddell stated that natural areas and quality of life were important considerations and that this may be the first thing to address in the next phase.

Chris Utterback stated that CPO's like natural areas, but raise the issue of compensation to land owners when one property is designated as park and another as residential. She also stated that she would like to see criteria for becoming a satellite included so you don't constrain land prices. She stated that it is possible to prevent sprawl and have a safety valve (satellites), although she didn't see this in the resolution.

Andy Cotugno stated you can do it in concept C.

Chris Utterback stated that C shows specific locations.

Andy Cotugno stated that this was intended only an illustration and was the reason why staff was recommending adoption of the resolution, not adoption of the specific maps.

Jim Gardener stated that was the downside of including maps, that they sparked discussion, but could be considered to be the only way to play out a growth concept. He indicated that there were many issues relating to satellites and concept C, as there were with the other alternatives.

Councilor McLain stated that in the next phase, that every time you do a map, land owners see this as designating a park. She stated that the map may be only for illustrating a general area, not a specific property, but someone has to be brave enough to put something on the map to begin the discussion.

Richard Devlin stated that he had just come from a park meeting and that what we are trying to do is a vision, a framework plan, of which one element is open space. He stated that Region 2040 should be addressing greenspaces in all concepts.

Councilman Gallagher asked whether this included taking into consideration what cities and counties are already doing and planning.

Councilor Devlin agreed that it must include this effort.

Chairman Gardner agreed and added that the region should look at acquisition of open spaces from willing sellers.

Mayor Liddell mentioned the problem of schools in West Linn. He didn't see education in the criteria. He stated that the 12-20 acres needed for a school site is not a small parcel. The number of people multiplied by the school needs equals a lot of land.

Andy Cotugno responded that we do take the need for school land into regional figures, but the calculations were not done in the sense of a specific site for a specific school.

Jerry Arnold stated that Beaverton schools need space for 1,200 more children than they have capacity.

Dick Benner stated that the need for school sites can differ depending on how they are built. If they are single story, have lots of parking they use more land. If they are built with several stories, perhaps with other uses included and have more reliance on transit, less land is needed per student.

Councilor Devlin stated that no one is setting aside school sited even though they know the need is there.

Mayor Liddell stated in the Tanner Basin, they did set aside land but schools had different ideas- massive Southern California style 1 story expansive schools.

Chairman Gardner asked if they can afford it.

Councilor McLain stated as an example the Winkle School, which is 2 story and has preserved adjacent wetlands and has houses as neighbors on the other side of the fence.

Roy Rogers asked what density are we trying to achieve? Is the satellite concept the right approach? If all renters are in high rise what kinds of differences from today will we see.

Andy Cotugno stated that we don't have the concepts worked out in sufficient detail to provide the numbers, but that the point of the concepts is to explore possibilities. One definition of tolerable is another person's definition of terrible.

Jim Zehren asked whether the growth concepts would consider the 4 county area.

Andy Cotugno stated that there was no 4 county plan contemplated. He suggested that a cooperative effort be included for those areas outside the Metro boundary but within the 3 county area and to provide information about the possible impacts of development in the metro area to Clark County.

Jim Zehren asked about whether the rate of growth would be considered and how this might affect how growth was accommodated.

Chairman Gardner noted that the resolution was describing a range of reasonable growth concepts, not choosing specific options, a task not to occur for 6-8 months.

Councilor McLain asked how the concepts would respond to fast growth in one area of the region.

Andy Cotugno responded that there should be language that included a future task that would analyze how to respond to whatever conditions face the region - slow growth, fast growth - the

consequences of each and that these all dealt with the rate of growth issue.

Councilman Gallagher asked whether added growth should be defined in terms of what the community can afford to support? He asked how do you put a handle on it without affecting local communities?

Andy Cotugno responded that this issue was brought up by the public, and that some of the public stated that they did not like to see more development outside the urban growth boundary and did not want to see more development over and above what existing plans allowed. He stated that he did not recommend a separate no growth option, but it was a issue that required a legitimate response, including what the consequences of such actions would be.

Councilman Gallagher stated that if you follow the U.S. Constitution, there was the right to travel and other rights which would make no growth perspective not viable.

Andy Cotugno stated that he agreed, but that an issue was raised, does the RPAC recommend inclusion of a slow or no growth option as a concept "D"?

Councilman Gallagher stated that when the issue was the ability of the public to pay costs, the discussion was on firm ground, but that other aspects of the issue were disturbing.

Councilor Devlin stated that at a meeting when the advisory committee was known as UGMPAC and the RUGGO were being discussed, the merits of concurrency versus consistency were debated. He stated that growth does not occur unless there is an ability to pay and that perhaps the concurrency issue should be explored further.

Chris Utterback proposed that for resolve #8, the second line, that the words "livability and density" should be added.

Commissioner Rogers stated that the word "growth" needed to be better defined.

Andy Cotugno stated that "added population and employment" could be used to clarify what was meant by growth.

Commissioner Rogers stated that the qualities of households and families were changing and that there were not as many traditional families as a percentage of all households as their had been in earlier decades and these types of qualitative changes make a difference. He asked whether you can move an urban growth boundary based on different family structure.

Andy Cotugno stated that if the RPAC wanted a no growth option, they needed to define how they wanted to approach it.

Mayor Cole asked whether resolve #4 of the resolution was only concerned with the 4 counties regarding urban growth or whether it would include other issues.

Andy Cotugno stated that he did not believe that the resources were available and that there were jurisdictional problems.

Mayor Cole asked whether this indicated indifference about what happened outside the region.

Chairman Gardner stated that it was not a matter of indifference, only a recognition of limitations.

Councilor McLain stated that she hoped that the language would be written to express the idea that the region would identify the impact and that they could do their own analysis. That way, the region wouldn't get into doing an air quality analysis, for example, for them.

Mayor Cole stated that he would like to see the word "growth" struck.

Andy Cotugno recommended that a tighter definition, including the word growth, remain.

It was then moved by Councilwoman Kafoury and seconded by Jerry Arnold to revise the resolution by adding the word "rate" to growth in the 5th resolve, add the word "density" after the word livability in resolve #8, add "and regional framework plan" to resolve #9.

Eric Carlsen stated, as a former school band member, more reality was needed in the discussion. Schools have no money, if they could bank land, they would do it. Financing is key.

Councilman Kidd stated Forest Grove schools owns 3 sites, ready for construction as need occurs.

Peggy Lynch stated DLCD gave City of Beaverton a grant for coordinating comprehensive plans and urban growth with school issues. She stated that there was a final meeting December 16 and that a report will be coming out.

Andy Cotugno stated that in the resolution for Concept B top of page 2 of the attachment, the word "intersection" should be deleted. Commissioner Kafoury, as maker of the motion accepted this as a friendly amendment, as did Jerry Arnold, who seconded the motion. With this and the other 3 amendments noted earlier, the RPAC unanimously recommended adoption of the resolution.

IV. Implementation of MPAC

A memo was distributed from Larry Shaw dated December 9. (see attached)

Jim Gardner asked if RPAC and MPAC were similar enough to eliminate RPAC.

Larry Shaw responded that the Charter role for the MPAC was to provide "...advice and consent". He stated that the RUGGO gives RPAC a whole list of specific duties.

Councilman Gallagher asked if the MPAC make up could be changed.

Larry Shaw responded that MPAC and Metro Council could jointly agree to change the composition.

Jim Zehren asked if the charter functions like a constitution, could changes be made to MPAC so that it functions similarly to RPAC.

Larry Shaw stated that "advice and consent" is undefined to date.

Dick Benner stated that MPAC was mandated to be formed on January 1. If all representatives appointed to MPAC agrees to a membership change, it seemed like this could be accomplished and RPAC dissolved.

Councilman Kidd stated that this approach seemed to be most logical, otherwise there would be two meetings with most of the same people. He stated that he was ready to make a motion to that effect. RPAC for State Agency Council on.

It was noted that the State Agency Council was represented on RPAC but not on MPAC.

Councilman Kidd stated that should MPAC membership be increased to 21 members, this would remain a workable number.

Chris stated that one Metro Councilor may be appropriate, but asked why two Metro councilors.

Councilor McLain stated that originally UGMPAC had three councilors, when the UGMPAC voted for RPAC membership, it ended up with two Metro Council members and the Metro Council reluctantly approved this make-up. She stated that there is a heavy burden of coordination if there is one member, but with two there is more geographic balance and no surprises. She said that the vote was not important, representation is. She state that if a Metro councilor is in the back row not participating, this would not be very workable.

Chairman Gardner stated the value of two-since Metro is regional. He cited as an example himself and Councilor McLain. He lives in the central city and Councilor McLain is in Forest Grove.

Chris Utterback asked how they were looking at representation.

Councilman Thompson stated it was premature to talk about MPAC changes. He stated that he understood that the charter committee was intentional in leaving off the Metro Council.

Chairman Gardner stated that MPAC must make decisions.

Councilor Devlin stated that there was a change in the way citizen members of MPAC would

be selected compared with RPAC. That RPAC citizen representatives were selected by other RPAC members from county. MPAC citizens are appointed by Metro Executive with Metro Council approval. He stated that there was no mention in RUGGO of the Future Vision, the Framework Plan, MPAC, etc. He stated that there was no desire to pass off responsibility but..

Jerry Arnold stated that Metro's Executive Officer could appoint all citizens from one county.

Roy Rogers stated the only reason we're here is consultation. He stated that they had concerns with MPAC and that these issues needed to be nailed down.

Councilor McLain stated that Metro would not be calling MPAC meetings without further discussion with local governments. She stated that she hoped that RPAC members could see the worth of ongoing consultation and that it worked both ways. She stated that she did not want to lose RPAC as a consultative body until these issues were resolved.

Commissioner Rogers stated that it was important to trust, but verify.

Mayor Cole stated that in reviewing the chart contained in the memo distributed that Lake Oswego was missing. He also asked whether this would be the last RPAC meeting, or whether there would be two meetings - an MPAC meeting and an RPAC meeting.

Andy Cotugno acknowledged that there was an error in the chart and that there should be 17 members on the list for RPAC.

Chairman Gardner stated that they could be the same meeting, but that for now he was planning on continuing with RPAC and that it would meet next on January 13.

Mayor Cole asked if it would be a joint meeting.

Chairman Gardner stated that he was not sure of the timing and whether MPAC would be fully formed by the 13th.

Commissioner Lindquist stated that if MPAC appointments were similar to RPAC appointments, this could be a signal.

Andy Cotugno stated that it may be sufficient if there are 10 out of the total 18 appointed, that this would be sufficient for a quorum and to begin discussion.

Chairman Gardner stated that he would like to see more discussion of RPAC and MPAC at the next RPAC meeting.

Chairman Gardner adjourned the committee at 6:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Turpel. H:\rpac12.min