

RPAC MEETING
Summary
March 10, 1993

The meeting was convened by Chairman Gardner at 5:11 p.m.

RPAC members or alternates in attendance: Chairman Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Heather Chrisman, Richard Devlin, Chris Foster, Darlene Hooley, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Robert Liddell, Susan McLain, Linda Peters, Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance: Peggy Lynch, John Kvistad, John Reeves, George Van Bergen, Brent Curtis, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Dave Nadel, Vergie Ries, Al Siddall, Mark Turpel, Mary Weber.

Chairman Gardner stated there had been questions as to why this meeting was being held. He responded that RPAC has duties which are not yet assigned to MPAC. He stated that until MPAC meets, adopts By-Laws and gets on its feet, he recommended that there be no further RPAC meetings unless there is something that requires RPAC action. The next RPAC meeting might be to comment to Council on the ordinance change that would transfer RPAC duties to MPAC. RPAC might then recommend that RPAC cease to exist, and that would be the last RPAC meeting.

I. Approval of Minutes

Mark Turpel stated there was a correction needed on page 10 on the Government Dues vote, Darlene Hooley had voted no, the vote was not unanimous.

Jim Gardner stated that on pg. 2, Peggy Lynch's comment should read:

"..the Chairman is not an ~~RPAC~~ MPAC member.."

and on pg. 4, Councilor McLain's comment should read:

"... Metro Councilors ... would be added to the membership of ~~RPAC~~ MPAC.."

and on pg. 6, Commissioner Hooley's comment should read:

"... Metro staff and ~~RPAC~~ MPAC members ..."

John Reeves stated that he was left off the attendance list in error.

Peggy Lynch stated that on pg. 1 her comment should read:

"... and their appointment to MPAC was ..."

Mayor Kidd stated that on pg. 11, the title should read:

"Mayor ~~Councilor~~ Kidd asked ..."

The minutes were unanimously adopted as corrected.

II. Communications from the Public

Peggy Lynch stated she was distressed that RPAC was suspended until MPAC gets up and running because of work needed on 2040 and Future Vision integration. The role of RPAC may not be directly rolled over to MPAC. She stated that item 26 on the Region 2040 Planning Process timeline, the development of evaluation criteria, is the most important thing to work on. She stated that Region 2040 should not be put on hold.

Councilor McLain stated that she was also concerned that there would be no other RPAC meetings. She agreed with Peggy Lynch that developing an evaluation criteria was a major responsibility. Councilor McLain stated that the question of attendance had been raised at the FOCUS group meeting and she was surprised that more of those people were not here tonight.

Jim Zehren agreed with Councilor McLain's concern and stated he was concerned that there would be no more RPAC meetings until MPAC was up and running. He stated his concern that staff have the input of the local officials in this time period.

Councilor Devlin stated that RUGGO has to come back to RPAC for a recommendation, then to the Planning Committee and then to Council. It would probably need two readings because it is an ordinance and this process would take, at best, two months. Councilor Devlin stated the earliest they might expect action would be late April, more likely early May.

Chairman Gardner stated he was thinking of the best case scenario on how quickly MPAC could get going. If MPAC did take two or three meetings to get going then he agreed RPAC would still have work to do. He stated that the attendance demonstrated that many MPAC members are not willing to continue meeting as RPAC.

Commissioner Kafoury stated that she was not willing to keep attending if there was to be more discussion on appointments, By-Laws etc. She stated that Commissioners Hales and Blumenauer agreed they are not willing to go to 2 meetings a month.

Chairman Gardner stated that he had received the same message from other people.

Peggy Lynch asked if all the MPAC members were willing to take on the duties.

Mayor Liddell stated that one month had been lost for RPAC due to last month's joint meeting. He stated that what should have happened was one hour of RPAC business and then switch over to MPAC. Mayor Liddell agreed that no one wants to attend more meetings than they already are but RPAC needs to keep working. RPAC is moving ahead full speed and MPAC just getting started. He stated that it may take two or three months for MPAC to get through their By-Laws and up to speed, so there would be a period of the two running parallel and when MPAC By-Laws and amendments are ready then we can move forward.

Councilor McLain stated that the amendments were important for Council to have before dissolving RPAC. She stated a concern mentioned in a FOCUS group minority report that if MPAC takes on all RPAC duties will MPAC duties get lost under all the RPAC duties.

Mayor Liddell stated that MPAC has no designated staff member yet and paperwork takes time to get to members.

Chairman Gardner stated that the speed in which By-Laws and paperwork is settled may determine the timeline on which RPAC becomes MPAC.

Mayor Liddell stated that the MPAC By-Laws will be coming back at the March 24th meeting at the Convention Center.

Councilor Devlin stated that a target date should be set for merging the two committees, perhaps not earlier than May.

Mayor Liddell stated that MPAC may have to meet more than once to get going.

Chairman Gardner stated that he hoped MPAC would keep in mind they could meet more frequently than monthly particularly at the organization stage.

Councilor McLain stated that the FOCUS group had added another layer to the process and that keeping the process understandable to local jurisdictions as well as the public was important. Councilor McLain stated this subject was on the agenda for the meeting on the 18th. She stated that people who are not able to attend that meeting should give comments on that subject to Councilor Devlin, Chairman Gardner or herself.

Chairman Gardner stated he had intended for this subject to be on the agenda tonight as a discussion item.

Jim Zehren asked if Commissioner Kafoury meant that Portland representatives would not attend any more meetings.

Commissioner Kafoury responded that she would attend if Region 2040 would be discussed, but not if it would be a meeting discussing procedures like last months joint meeting. She stated that a lot of work could be done by smaller sub-committees.

Chairman Gardner stated that until MPAC was up and running he did not feel RPAC needed to discuss those issues anymore.

Commissioner Hooley agreed that if RPAC is to meet, it should be to discuss Region 2040, not procedures and By-Laws.

III. Integration of Region 2040 and Future Vision Work Efforts

John Fregonese introduced the memo, included in the meeting packet, that was presented to the Council and though not officially approved, has been used as a working document on the integration of the 2040 and Future Vision projects. He stated that the Charter was a very powerful document and gave clear direction to Metro to develop a set of specific documents. He further stated that Region 2040 has contained elements of both a Future Vision and a Regional Framework Plan. He stated that Metro had looked at the two documents and compared them.

John Fregonese stated that the Future Vision was the end goal. Region 2040 did contain some long range elements as well as some specific short term decisions, e.g. transportation plans. John Fregonese stated that the Future Vision did not contain any mandatory compliance measures, and he felt the Charter Committees intention was to not have the Future Vision in the courts. In contrast, the Regional Framework Plan does require mandatory compliance with the land use act, it requires acknowledgement and it requires coordination with the local governments.

John Fregonese stated that the Future Vision is a 50 year outlook and is only updated every 15 years, which implies that these are the kind of values that do not change much over time. The Regional Framework Plan is how to accomplish that vision. The Future Vision has its own commission that advises the Council on its adoption. The MPAC, however, is clearly an important advisory body for the creation of the Regional Framework Plan. When you look at RUGGO, it is clear that that is the kind of role RUGGO intended for RPAC as well as advising the Council on any kind of document that was going to effect local governments.

John Fregonese stated that the Future Vision is very general in terms of topic areas. In contrast the Regional Framework Plan is specific and lists nine areas to be addressed. He stated that the Regional Framework Plan may have other responsibilities added with the advice of MPAC. Future Vision covers a large area and specifically says to look outside the Metro boundary, while the Regional Framework Plan is only implemented within Metro boundaries, though there is some mention of urban reserves and Clark County coordination.

John Fregonese stated that in trying to integrate Region 2040 into this, the thinking is that Region 2040 is a process that will develop several products. Region 2040 will produce the same products originally intended - urban growth boundary decisions, regional transportation plan decisions, but it also needs to point to long range decisions needed in Regional Framework Plan and Future Vision. This needs to be accomplished within budget constraints. This is a new planning mandate and the most must be made of existing funded programs. To do that Council gave a clear directive to integrate Future Vision with the Region 2040 process. John Fregonese stated that to do that, Region 2040 is now being thought of as a process, where it was previously thought of as a plan that would lead to one product. The process will lead to several work products, some short term products will be information to be used in the regional transportation plan and urban growth boundaries. But it also informs Future Vision, and will lead eventually to Regional Framework Plan. Of the nine topics specified, five are directly related to Region

2040.

John Fregonese pointed to the "Analysis of Concepts" section on the Planning Process timeline graph. This is the technical work of analyzing how growth can be accommodated in each of the concepts and providing criteria with which to compare them. John Fregonese stated the next section on the timeline, called "Future Vision Activities" will inform Future Vision but are also integral to Region 2040. John stated that under "Future Vision Commission" the first action item is to appoint the commission and mentioned that nomination forms are now being circulated. The next items will be to look at other vision plans that have already been done so as not to duplicate efforts and a population forecast study and a carrying capacity study. John pointed out that this portion of the process was parallel to the "Analysis of the Concepts" work and that they will both be done by the end of 1993.

John Fregonese explained that the Future Vision Commission cannot adopt the Future Vision plan until 1995. Yet there are decisions needed in 1994 that Future Vision needs to inform, for example the regional transportation plan, urban reserves. So the UGB question must be answered before Future Vision can be finished. John stated that the goal is to have Future Vision decide the big questions such as carrying capacity and how are we going to grow.

Councilor Devlin asked John Fregonese to explain the reason Future Vision cannot be implemented until 1995.

John Fregonese responded that the Charter states the Future Vision plan cannot be adopted before January 1995 or after July 1995, so that the smaller new Council would be adopting the Future Vision plan. John stated that the next section on the timeline involved some key decision points. He stated that some other decisions would have to be added to that list of decisions, including evaluation criteria. He stated that in the Fall we have to make a decision on the concepts, and where the growth would go under the four concepts. We have to start holding the concepts constant so that we can take a detailed look at what the differences are between them. We will need to look at the modeling in terms of harder to define quality of life issues as well as the technical issues.

John Fregonese pointed out the "Interim Concept Choice" to be decided in May 1994. That is the latest date at which the Council can adopt concept A, B, C or X. He stated he felt that likely a combination of the best elements of the concepts would be adopted. That will decide urban growth boundaries, urban reserves and also give direction to the Regional Transportation Plan. Then the Future Vision Commission goes on to study economic and educational resources for that concept decision. At the same time the technical analysis looks at local plans to see how far they are from the chosen concept, and how would we implement it, what tools or codes might be needed. John stated that there will be a Concept Choice document produced at the same time as the Future Vision document. He stated Council deliberation is shown lasting three months, with final adoption in the first half of 1995.

John Fregonese pointed out the "Unified Public Involvement" program that needs to include Region 2040 as part of Future Vision. The next public involvement piece is now being prepared that will explain to the public what is going on and what the activities will be.

John Fregonese stated that next month we will have a public involvement strategy and some requests for proposals that will describe technical assistance needed for evaluation. The Future Vision workplan will probably have been reviewed and adopted by Council. We will also have the sketch evaluation criteria. John stated that at the modeling level, RUGGO is being used as a goal and seeing which RUGGO goals can be evaluated easily with this model. He stated that we can measure numerical things such as vehicle miles traveled, air quality information and urban density. But other things in RUGGO are harder to measure and will wait until the fine modeling stage. The consultant contract will be evaluating those quality of life issues in the Fall. He stated that in the short term we want involvement on the evaluation criteria.

Peggy Lynch stated that she felt it was a good idea for people to read through RUGGO again.

Mayor Liddell stated he felt a workshop was necessary to get everyone up to speed, which may take a whole Saturday, but should happen in the next couple months.

Peggy Lynch asked that the RUGGO document be mailed to all MPAC members. She stated the MPAC members may also want to look at RUGGO in order to decide if this is what they expected their job would be.

Chairman Gardner stated that RUGGO could be mailed to them, though most may already have it.

Jim Zehren stated that he felt the description of the vision, on page 2 of the memo, sounded like it was about the physical place. He stated that he hoped when considering the vision we not just have pretty maps but also a vision of the harder to define things e.g., quality of life, affordability housing, and what its like to live here on a daily basis.

John Fregonese responded that it was not his intent. He stated that the first thing included was a value system. He agreed that a Future Vision probably would not contain a map, that it should not be that detailed. The values are things that do not change much over time and a detailed map would be inappropriate.

Councilor Devlin stated that he felt the Council was concerned that Region 2040 should lead to two products: Future Vision and Regional Framework plans. He stated the Council was having a problem funding the planning that is presumed to occur in the Charter, they want to be sure Future Vision isn't funded to a point of driving the budget of the agency and funding areas that will not assist in production of framework plan and divert funds from other areas.

Mayor Liddell stated that it may be a very large effort to get everyone (JPAC, TPAC, etc.)

involved in the Saturday workshop, but would be worthwhile so that down the road the different groups don't find they have been duplicating work.

Jim Zehren stated that it was not clear to him the relationship between the middle section of the chart, the Future Vision activities, and the upper portion of more technical items such as cull variations. He stated that the middle portion seemed more value oriented, while the upper portion seems more technical and numerically oriented. He stated he was concerned and hoped that we will be looking at what we care about, and that the data we need to decide what we care about then apply that data to the concepts.

John Fregonese stated that the top portion of the chart, the numerical, technical portion, would give us growth scenarios, applying projected numbers to the four concepts, showing outcomes. It is intended that RPAC/MPAC be involved in the technical portion as well as the value based decisions. John Fregonese stated that the two sections are happening simultaneously.

Councilor McLain stated that the intent was to have Future Vision folded in so as not to be redundant, and so that work already done would be used. The chart shows that the processes are parallel, where they had been independent but are now integral. She stated that it looked like at the beginning B was coming before A.

John Fregonese responded that the chart is used for scheduling purposes and that they need to do better describing the relationships between these projects.

Jim Zehren stated that we should not underestimate the time it might take to get everyone to get consensus on the regional values, and one Saturday might just get us started.

John Fregonese stated that it was important to remember that we are not starting from scratch, we have RUGGOs, that they are the foundation we start from. Also other work that has been done can be helpful.

Commissioner Hooley stated that she felt it would be helpful to have that workshop, to get everyone brought up to the same point. Also helpful would be a description of what the Future Vision Commission will do and what Region 2040 will do for comparison.

Chairman Gardner stated that a Future Vision workplan is going to be complete in a few weeks.

Linda Peters stated that the Future Vision Commission will be working on a farther out future. The values and work that was hammered out before will be used in this next generation of decisions.

Peggy Lynch asked where are we on the evaluation criteria?

Chairman Gardner stated that it was helpful to look at how things line up vertically on the

timeline.

John Fregonese stated that there are two types of evaluation, one will give us a quick look at how different variations match up with our goals. He stated that the initial task was to evaluate based on the numbers that the computers give us, looking at vehicle miles traveled, what it does not evaluate is the quality of life. There will be an in house document called "Sketch Evaluation Criteria" done in April that can be used to compare the concepts. He stated that there will be a consultant contract, for about \$100,000, to help us develop more refined evaluation criteria and to measure the consequences of different and to do a systematic evaluation of qualitative criteria. John Fregonese stated that the Regional Framework Plan will be available for review in April. The consultants will provide the numbers and the qualitative information. In December we should have, for each concept, a good idea of what it would look like, how it would feel to live there, and how much it costs. The question then will be "what do we want to do now?".

Peggy Lynch asked how does someone tell us or do the consultants tell us how to judge the non-numerical qualities. She stated that to her that is what evaluation criteria are.

John Fregonese agreed and responded that we would have consultants to help us with that. He stated that you have evaluate based on your goals and we will use RUGGOs. Some goals may need to be added but RUGGO is the starting point.

Councilor McLain stated that either at the proposed Saturday workshop or at the next RPAC we need to review what the RUGGO goals are, have them on one page, and then look at the "hard" numbers and the "soft" numbers. She stated that rather than have the consultant do evaluation in isolation, we need to review the goals before it goes to the consultant.

Jim Zehren asked when the workshop could be scheduled and added that it couldn't happen too soon. He stated that he wished Dick Benner were present because he has been working on a livable communities package for the state.

Chairman Gardner stated that yes, there is a presentation planned in the near future.

Jim Zehren stated it would be helpful if the RUGGO discussion could happen at the same time as the livable communities presentation.

Mayor Liddell stated that we need a dimensional document to be able to view it all together, and have enough facilitator that the information will get across.

Councilor Devlin stated that it is better to have a workshop format rather than a decision making format, to avoid a meeting like last month, and invite all the new members of MPAC so everyone is up to speed at once.

Peggy Lynch stated that she thought MPAC members were to be attending tonight to listen.

John Reeves stated that yes, that is why he attended tonight.

Chairman Gardner stated that the MPAC By-Laws subcommittee had made a decision that MPAC should meet separately.

Peggy Lynch stated that they were invited to sit and listen, not sit at the table, to avoid what happened last time.

Chairman Gardner stated he interpreted the proposed workshop would be more of an MPAC workshop, because those members may be less familiar with the RUGGO and other documents and existing regional policies.

Mayor Liddell stated he was thinking it would be all of the groups, JPAC, RPAC etc. so that everyone can let John Fregonese know what their thinking is. It will be hard to orchestrate but is very necessary.

Chairman Gardner stated that among all those people, the new MPAC members probably need it the most.

Peggy Lynch announced that she had a copy of the draft bill that may be going to the legislature to add school in high growth areas to the land use planning process and anyone interested may contact her.

Chairman Gardner announced that nominations and applications are being actively sought for the Future Vision Committee, the deadline for both is April 2nd. Gail Ryder at Metro is the contact. He stated that in April they will sift through the applications and start interviewing in hopes of getting the commission appointed by the first Council meeting in May. Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

MT:bd
S:\PD\RPACMIN