

**RPAC/MPAC JOINT MEETING**  
**APRIL 14, 1993 - METRO CENTER**  
**Meeting Summary**

MPAC and RPAC members and alternates in attendance:

Jim Gardner, Gussie McRobert, Heather Chrisman, Richard Devlin, Rod Drake, Bud Farm, Judith Fessler, Judie Hammerstad, Gary Hansen, Bonnie Hays, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Bob Liddell, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Chuck Peterson, Arnold Polk, John Reeves, Sandra Suran, Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback, Loren Wyss and Jim Zehren

Others in attendance included: Jeff Condit, Andy Cotugno, Lisa Creel, Barbara Duncan, Chris Foster, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Pat Lee, Frank Josselson, Frank Nadal, Ben Small, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Carol Waters, Mary Weber and Terry Vanderklein

Sary  
Devr

Kooy

**RPAC Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 by Chairman Gardner.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**II. Communications from the Public - none**

**III. Discussion of Amendment of RUGGO Replacing RPAC for MPAC**

Chairman Gardner stated the purpose of the amendments were to define which of RPAC's responsibilities under RUGGO would transfer to MPAC. RPAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Council Planning Committee.

Peggy Lynch stated that, assuming MPAC members also received the materials, she would like to hear their comments.

Chairman Gardner stated that yes, both groups had received the entire packet and were invited to comment on both agendas.

Peggy Lynch stated that she was concerned that the MPAC members understand the importance of these responsibilities under RUGGO.

Chairman Gardner stated that the effect of these memos would be to eliminate RPAC.

Commissioner Hays stated for informational purposes that at the February meeting of the ~~for~~ there was a unanimous vote to request transfer of duties from RPAC to MPAC.

Chairman Gardner stated that yes, that <sup>information</sup> notice had been received.

Commissioner Kafoury motioned to recommend Council adoption of the amendments. Mayor Kidd seconded the motion.

Councilor McLain stated concern about the timing of the resolution, and that she could support the resolution if it could be passed so that by the next <sup>meeting</sup> MPAC, they could <sup>assume</sup> ~~take over~~ the RPAC <sup>responsibilities</sup> agenda.

Chairman Gardner responded that if the amendments were adopted in the most direct way, at the first May Council meeting, by the next MPAC meeting, there would be no RPAC.

Mayor McRobert stated that there was a core of experienced people and staff ~~was~~ available to bring people up to speed if needed.

Councilor Devlin stated that it must be an ordinance to amend RUGGO and would have to go for a first reading, then to Council Planning Committee, then back to Council. The first meeting it could be acted on would be the first meeting in May. He stated that the amendments made clear that local governments were to be full participants and that Metro Council <sup>also</sup> expects to fully participate.

Chairman Gardner stated that his timeline for passage of the amendments was possible, but optimistic. He stated there may still be another RPAC meeting next month.

Jim Zehren stated that as a citizen, it seemed that everyone ~~but the Council~~ was ready to move ahead with this and get to work.

Chairman Gardner stated that a motion had been moved and seconded to recommend Council adoption of the amendments in the draft that amends Goal 1 of RUGGO. The vote was unanimously passed.

Jim Zehren asked about the wording changes in the ordinance, for example "eversee participate" (bottom pg. 4) and what the intent was in the change.

Chairman Gardner responded that MPAC and RPAC have different relationships with the Metro Council. RPAC had two voting Council members, MPAC does not and MPAC requires a vote of the public to change it, while RPAC was created and changeable by Metro. These changes were meant to be consistent with the Charter's role for MPAC to be an advisory body.

Jim Zehren stated that the intent seemed to be to scale back on the advisory committee processing, which seems ironic as the Council can change what it has assigned to the committee at any time.

Councilor Devlin stated that MPAC is an integral part of the process, the Charter made it clear that the principle duty of the district is regional planning. He stated that there are councilors who want to insure that we have a cooperative effort with local government. The process will likely be the same as in the past, but councilors want it to be a constant interaction, not a check in every six months.

Peggy Lynch requested that since the motion had already been approved, RPAC and MPAC members could be notified of when the Council meetings regarding this would be.

Chairman Gardner responded that there were still opportunities for input. The ordinance would be heard at the next Council meeting, then at the Planning Committee the first Tuesday of May, and again at the next Council meeting, the second Thursday in May.

#### IV. Discussion of Evaluation Criteria

Ervin  
Chairman Gardner stated that originally a presentation by Christine Irving from the State Growth Agency including a slide show on Benchmarks had been scheduled, but was postponed until next months meeting.

John Fregonese was introduced to give an update on Region 2040 and Future Vision. He stated that in addition to the three concepts of Region 2040, a base case has been added which takes policies currently in existence and extends the effect out 50 years in the future. This is the least realistic concept, but is important in that it shows when and where problems will arise. John Fregonese stated that we are currently in the base case sketch modeling stage. A partnership is being formed with local government through TPAC and RTAC to help model the concepts, showing population growth distribution.

John Fregonese stated that the next step is base case fine modeling, which looks at the more detailed effects of growth such as how greenspaces and transportation networks can fit in that concept. Concept Integration is the last step and a combination of the strengths of each of the concepts will likely be chosen rather than one concept. The final concept choice will be made in May 1994 by the Metro Council. Then a Regional Transportation Plan is developed and Region 2040 Phase III looks at how to achieve the chosen concept. John Fregonese stated that at the same time, the Future Vision Commission will start by looking at visions and plans that have been done in the region and looking for commonalities. Then they will look at carrying capacity and develop a desired scenario.

John Fregonese stated that population growth estimates for the region in 50 years ranged from a high estimate of 1.5 million additional people to a low of 600,000 people. ~~We are using a middle estimate of 1.1 million.~~ <sup>He stated that this was</sup> John Fregonese stated that currently the staff is doing base case modeling and finding where the model is ~~weak.~~ <sup>strengths & weaknesses</sup> John stated that for the next ten Wednesdays local technical people will be meeting to do growth allocations. There are three Request for Proposals (RFPs): 1) Develop Evaluation Criteria 2) Urban Design and 3) Growth Analysis.

being developed

He also stated that there were

J. Lu Fregonese then asked Ken Gervais to present information about evaluation criteria. Ken Gervais had five points on evaluation criteria; first that this has to be a consensus building process. Second, the process is fallible, no one has ever done a 50 year plan before and we are learning as we go. Third, that implementation is also an important part of the process, what trade-offs do we use to encourage desired behavior such as transit use. Fourth, that government agencies cannot determine the outcome by themselves, many other parties are making decisions that will effect the region. Finally, that "no build" is not an option.

Ken Gervais stated that evaluation criteria serve us in two ways. One is as a list of characteristics, how do we describe them? There are over 250 criteria in the Benchmarks, do we apply them all? Ken Gervais stated that we are interested in what MPAC can help with and staff will be back for regular updates.

Andy Cotugno stated that the ultimate limit on looking at evaluation criteria is the budget. Which are the important factors to spend staff time to measure. We need help from local government staff and special district staff.

Chairman Gardner stated that another limit is time and he would like to keep discussion to 15 minutes tonight.

John Fregonese stated that what we want to discuss may not be evaluation criteria but descriptive indicators. The basic question is do the concepts meet our goals? Each descriptor is tied to a goal, for example the descriptor is housing costs and the goal is affordable housing. We start with RUGGOS, as the regional goals document. John stated that what was needed from MPAC was help defining the criteria.

Peggy Lynch asked what was the timeline for deciding the evaluation criteria.

John Fregonese responded that the evaluation criteria are to be chosen in mid-July, the RFP will be out next month to get the consultant on board. At the next MPAC meeting the approach for the RFP should be discussed and approved.

Chairman Gardner stated that the RFP would be issued in May.

Chris Utterback asked why under affordable housing, livability was not included, when that is the number one concern according to surveys, and it is getting brushed aside.

Chairman Gardner stated that livability is hard to define.

Jim Zehren asked about the plan for a Saturday workshop for all advisory committee members.

Chairman Gardner responded that it hasn't been scheduled yet.

Jim Zehren stated that it is hard to discuss this in 15 minutes, the workshop should happen before money is spent on a consultant, before the RFP is finalized.

Councilor McLain stated that the growth conference had a good small discussion group format that could be used. Perhaps we could have the workshop in early May.

Discussion followed regarding possible meeting dates.

Chairman Gardner stated that RUGGOs could be a good guide.

Jim Zehren stated that the Benchmarks presentation should also be a part of this.

Councilor McLain asked if we could do something simple without a lot of staff time? Just use the RUGGO subject divisions as Chairman Gardner suggested.

Commissioner Kafoury stated that in addition to the educational session, time needs to be set to talk about evaluation criteria. She stated that a week night time is preferred over a weekend.

Arnold Polk stated that a couple of evening meetings would allow time to digest a lot of information, and then meet again.

Commissioner Kafoury suggested April 28th from 5-7 p.m.

Chairman Gardner stated that it was agreed to meet on April 28th as a start.

Andy Cotugno stated that MPAC <sup>could</sup> ~~should~~ schedule meetings ~~every two weeks for now, probably through the end of June~~ <sup>for the first</sup> and then cancel if necessary. *second and fourth Wednesday*

John Fregonese stated that the first meeting of the month could be a formal meeting, with the second meeting being a work session.

→ A ~~consensus~~ <sup>consensus</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> reached that the ~~second and fourth~~ <sup>second and fourth</sup> ~~Wednesday~~ <sup>Wednesday</sup> meetings of the month for the next two months would be reserved. *would be reserved.*

Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.