

# METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 9, 1993 - Meeting Summary

Board Members in attendance were: Gussie McRobert, Chair; Rob Drake, Judith Fessler, Charlie Hales, Judie Hammerstad, Gary Hansen, Gretchen Kafoury, Bob Liddell, Chuck Petersen, Bruce Thompson, Jean Schreiber and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance included: Richard Devlin, Susan McLain, John Anderson, Tom Armstrong, Brian Campbell, Greg Chew, Maggie Collins, Andy Cotugno, Brent Curtis, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Robert Liberty, Dean Lookingbill, Mike McKeever, Gail Ryder, Larry Shaw, Alf Siddall, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Terry Vanderkooy, Caryl Waters, Merrie Waylett and Mary Weber.

## I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 p.m. by Chair McRobert and a quorum was declared.

## II. Roll Call and Recognition

## III. Comments from Visitors on Items not on the Agenda - none

## IV. Approval of Minutes on May 26, 1993 Meeting

Motion for approval was made by Councilor Fessler, seconded by Mayor Liddell and unanimously approved.

## V. Regional Alternatives Planning Process (RAPP) Discussion

Chair McRobert introduced panelists Mike McKeever, John Anderson, Maggie Collins, Brian Campbell and Robert Liberty.

Maggie Collins stated that the Metro Area Planning Directors (MAPD) have formed a subcommittee on the RAPP. The subcommittee looked at the Region 2040 program to see if it was compatible with the RAPP. The conclusions reached by the subcommittee were:

- Metro can accomplish the items in the Charter: the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), Greenspaces planning, urban design, urban reserves, water supply planning and housing density. These are elements of a good regional comprehensive plan.
- Metro may not have the funds to accomplish all 17 elements in RAPP.
- Metro's many programs and duties may take away from the focus of the RAPP elements.
- The subcommittee recommended a steering committee to address topic areas not covered by the Region 2040 process.

- There are opportunities for mixing and matching the elements of RAPP. RAPP may be a bigger process than what Metro is prepared to take on.

Brian Campbell stated that strong connections can be made between the Region 2040 and RAPP. RAPP could be adjusted to fit better with what is happening in the region. The Future Vision Commission (FVC) covers many of the same topics. Brian Campbell stated that if the FVC could incorporate more of the RAPP elements, the result would go beyond what Metro has put forth so far.

Maggie Collins stated that if MPAC felt it was useful, they could ask the MAPD to look the process in more detail.

Robert Liberty stated that he would focus on the Regional Framework Plan. Metro has significant powers given by the legislature which are mandatory, not discretionary, including review of comprehensive plans and adoption of planning goals. The Charter expands and widens the responsibilities. Probably no other regional entity that has the authority Metro does. Robert Liberty stated that MPAC must remember why the legislature and the voters gave Metro this power, because the existing process is inadequate. Due to the timelines mandated in the Charter, we must remember that the product is not a set of plans and guidelines, but to change the pattern of development in the region.

Robert Liberty stated that the major constraints are time and money. Between 1989 and 1993 the region has grown by 100,000 people without any significant intervention on a regional level. Cost is the other constraint. Robert Liberty estimated that for the upcoming year, Metro would need \$1 million planning budget, which it does not have, to start on the Regional Framework Plan. He stated that the Charter has tight deadlines and requirements which are mandatory that include compliance review, interim compliance, acknowledgment compliance and approval of changes in local land use standards for consistency with the regional framework plan.

Robert Liberty stated that if the current pace is maintained, he predicts no change in local plan outcomes in this millenium. What is needed is a steep increase in funding, or loaned staff from local jurisdictions. He stated that time is short and something drastic will have to happen to meet the Charter deadlines.

Councilor McLain stated that the phasing of RAPP looks very similar to the Region 2040 process and Future Vision, the differences between the processes are budgeting and timeline. She asked what time does MPAC feel is needed for consensus building.

Robert Liberty stated that to do a few things thoroughly and well is more important than trying to do it all.

Chair McRobert asked if the panel agreed that Region 2040 is up to Phase IV?

Maggie Collins stated no, in RAPP you determine if there is compelling need to go forward.

Chair McRobert asked are you saying its not wise to assume we need to do things differently?

Maggie Collins stated that we don't know what to do yet, we need to decide what problems we want to address that will make a change, as a region, with more public participation.

Ken Gervais stated that the discussion with the RAPP group has been going on for a year and a half. He stated that some of the differences between the RAPP and Region 2040 processes are:

- a. RAPP states you must define what the problem is first. We believe you don't have to say what we've been doing is a mess in order to determine a better way to do it.
- b. RAPP has 17 areas as focal points and requires you look at the whole plan with regard to each issue; the existing process coordinating land use and transportation is complicated enough.
- c. We disagree that everyone must buy in to the scope of work before we start.
- d. RAPP says make the process less political, organized through a neutral body. The Charter states the forum for regional planning is the regional government agency -- Metro.
- e. RAPP recommends clear, objective standards for measuring these elements. The political element is real in this process and the outcomes will effect individual lifestyles.

Ken Gervais stated that the not implicit criticism of the Region 2040 program in the RAPP document was a disservice to all the people around the region who have been involved.

Jim Zehren stated this was a good dialogue to have. He asked the panelists about their comment regarding Metro not having sufficient resources, was that assuming a fixed Growth Management budget?

Maggie Collins stated that many of the requirements are federal mandates such as the regional transportation plan, and RAPP is not recommending taking money away from those programs. If it was agreed that RAPP and Region 2040 processes are complementary, the RAPP steering committee would work to find money for Phases I through III.

Jim Zehren stated it would be helpful to know how far along we are in the process and budget.

Mayor Liddell stated that it seemed like two architects arguing over a set of plans.

Maggie Collins stated that was a fair characterization. RAPP would like the process to redefine regional planning, to see more neighborhood refinement and more dialogue between planners and social service agencies.

Ken Gervais stated that there are absolutes in RAPP. Who knows how to do a 50-year plan for education or public safety? We have incorporated many of the 17 elements into

the process. It would be impossible to get agreement from all parties before you start. No one has done a 50-year plan, we are learning as we go along, the process builds on itself.

Robert Liberty stated there was an assumption that there will be no implementation without consensus with government and interest groups. That would apply in a jurisdiction where there was no Charter and no ORS 268, 380 and 390. You do not have a choice to do the plan or when to do it, or what it will include.

Mike McKeever stated the RAPP document is not a critique, it was put together by planners so that a plan could be developed that would work and ensure implementation. Elements of RAPP can be used in any kind of planning.

Councilor Fessler asked can we get an extension on the deadlines?

Robert Liberty responded that the deadlines are from the Charter, and to change to the Charter requires a vote of the people.

Judith Fessler asked if the RAPP group would be available for part of the process, if not for the whole thing?

Brian Campbell stated that when the FVC is formed, there will be an opportunity to look at many of the 17 elements and integrate that into the ongoing Region 2040 program.

Chair McRobert stated we can not ask the voters for an extension, state statutes don't apply.

Brian Campbell stated that John Fregonese is a member of the MAPD, who are looking at the RAPP.

Chair McRobert stated that it was unclear how a RAPP committee would fit into MPAC.

Commissioner Kafoury stated she thought RAPP would advise MTAC, our technical group.

Councilor McLain stated RAPP is a tool, not only a process. The public has enough problem keeping all the programs and committee names straight, we don't need another name. She asked the RAPP group to watch the Future Vision process, as they are looking at all of the elements mentioned in RAPP, only the process is different.

Robert Liberty stated that Future Vision is possible if the vision is kept focused. The Regional Framework Plan is tougher, and will need interim protection and decisions. The cost of implementation is greater than the cost of doing the plan.

Merrie Waylett stated that tomorrow the Council will consider a tax study that was mandated by the Charter. Although there is agreement there is a problem with funding, we are on the way to resolving that.

Commissioner Hansen stated he was concerned about timelines, planning moves slowly and the start up time is tremendous. The last thing we can afford is to take any action that will slow implementation.

Chair McRobert stated some of these processes, like education, can move ahead they don't have to be coordinated through Metro.

Councilor Fessler stated MPAC is in the process of getting on track, and should continue for three or four months.

Ken Gervais mentioned Commissioner Kafoury's comment about sending this through MTAC.

Maggie Collins suggested sending it through the MAPD.

Commissioner Hales stated that the value of RAPP was that it took a different approach to some of the same issues. We need to keep elements of the RAPP as we proceed.

Chair McRobert asked are you comfortable waiting three or four months, and stated she was not.

Commissioner Hales stated no, but maybe we revisit it in a few months. He stated Metro should not be threatened by what was done here, it is a contributor, not a competitor.

Chair McRobert stated that visioning is not MPAC's business, now that there is a FVC.

Mayor Liddell stated that RPAC was a unique group that went outside for funding, we need all the help and regional support we can get. He stated MPAC should send RAPP through MAPD.

Councilor Devlin had an update that the tax issue will be heard by Council in two weeks, not tomorrow.

Chair McRobert asked for consensus to send this to the MAPD. John Fregonese is a member of that group. Chair McRobert asked if other MPAC members would like to sit in.

Members agreed to send the RAPP to the MAPD for input. Mayor Liddell and Councilor Fessler volunteered to attend.

Jim Zehren stated that we shouldn't forget the goal, that we need to change the pattern of development in the region. We need to plan for 50 years as well as plan for some immediate things we know we need to do now.

Councilor McLain had to leave for a Council meeting and had a comment on the FVC, and stated that they had strived for balance in the membership of the Commission. She invited MPAC members to attend the Future Vision meetings.

Commissioner Hammerstad stated that the fastest growing county in the state had only one delegate.

Councilor McLain stated two positions are still open that will allow balance.

## **VI. Planning Budget**

John Fregonese stated that planning that makes a difference is not just plans, but implementation. The Regional Framework Plan needs to be effectively implemented and needs a planning program and budget to work with local governments on implementation. John Fregonese stated he disagreed with Robert Liberty about the measures for mandatory cooperation; consensus is essential. Planning needs to be implemented in a flexible manner, adapting to changes.

John Fregonese stated that you need to try ideas and have demonstration projects so people will be willing to try something that worked elsewhere. You need to work in a timely manner, make some decisions each year, not wait four years until the whole plan is complete. John Fregonese stated he was optimistic that this can be completed within the timelines and the budget. We are building on good work that has already been done; RUGGO, the UGB and the Regional Transportation Plan. John Fregonese stated that the budget is adequate to do Region 2040 this next year. What is lacking is more short-range planning (within five years), the immediate need planning mentioned by Jim Zehren. We need demonstration projects to try new ideas. John Fregonese stated implementation is also needed and is where we are the weakest.

John Fregonese stated that he is concerned that the visioning and long-range planning will continue without the implementation. He stated that about half of the budget programs relate to Future Vision and the Regional Framework Plan. Region 2040 contains the following elements:

- Provides the technical background for Future Vision.
- The public involvement for Future Vision comes from Region 2040.
- Region 2040 provides the basis for the urban growth boundary, urban reserves, regional transportation plan, housing density and urban design.

John Fregonese stated that when the Region 2040 decision is made in July 1995, it will be a step toward the Regional Framework Plan. In 1994-95 we can finish adoption of the Future Vision, the regional transportation plan and urban reserves. In addition, the UGB policy could be done by July 1995. The first components of urban design and housing density could be adopted in July 1995. In 1996, we can do Clark County coordination, parks and open space. John Fregonese stated that by July 1996, we could adopt most of the Regional Framework Plan. In 2000, Metro will update these plans.

John Fregonese stated that for Region 2040 Phase II, Metro General Fund pays 41 percent. The rest is mostly state and federal one time grants. Of the total Planning Fund, Metro is only paying one-third. On page two of the handout is an estimated budget for the planning program, which is \$1 million to \$1.5 million more than are currently

identified. John Fregonese stated that in the short-term, he would like to see short-range demonstration projects. In the long-term, we need to develop a planning program that not only writes documents but implements them.

Mayor Liddell asked if 30 percent of the FY 1993-94 budget was from Metro, what will that percentage be in 1998-99?

John Fregonese stated he assumed we would continue to get grants and pursue them, but assumes grants will be less than half.

Councilor Fessler asked if earthquake hazards and water items belong elsewhere in the budget?

John Fregonese responded that earthquakes relate to land use, that a lot is federally funded. A water plan is mandated by the Charter.

Chair McRobert stated yes, earthquake is a growth management issue, as far as where not to build housing due to fault lines, etc.

Jim Zehren asked does 30 percent of the budget come from Metro, and 70 percent in non-Metro money?

John Fregonese stated yes, some is local government dues, and the rest is state and federal money.

Jim Zehren asked if John Fregonese felt we were underfunded on the short-term, demonstration type projects.

John Fregonese stated yes, ideally we should add to that. Funding for short-range will supplement the long-range.

Chair McRobert asked if that information had been given to the tax advisory group?

John Fregonese stated they haven't formed yet, but it will.

Chair McRobert asked if the request for input from the MAPD could include dollar amounts.

## **VII. By Laws Revisions**

Chuck Petersen moved for approval of the revisions in the May 25, 1993, memo by Larry Shaw.

The motion was seconded by Judie Hammerstad.

Chair McRobert stated an amendment is needed regarding the voting status of MPAC members on the citizen advisory committees, a vote was taken at the last meeting that they should be non-voting positions.

Chuck Petersen stated he would amend his motion to include the amendment.

Jim Zehren stated that the other change which had been discussed at the last meeting was not included in line three of item "c":

"The full membership of MPAC ... shall approve ...."

The statement should read:

"MPAC shall approve ....."

Chuck Petersen amended his motion to include the above change.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### **VIII. Clark County Participation**

Andy Cotugno stated he and Chair McRobert had met with John Magnano regarding Clark County participation on MPAC. He stated action could be taken on his memo at next month's MPAC meeting. He stated the need to coordinate activities between the two jurisdictions is clear, and the proposal is to move forward in that direction. He asked for comments from the committee.

Dean Lookingbill stated that he had served as Transportation Director for the regional transportation council which served the Metropolitan Planning Organization. There had been bi-state membership in JPACT and other organizations. He stated they were excited to be involved.

Chair McRobert stated there was discussion last meeting about the voting status of the Clark County representatives. In the future, we may have voting positions on each side.

#### **IX. Discussion of MTAC**

Councilor Fessler stated that MTAC appears to have replaced RTAC, will the membership remain the same?

Chair McRobert stated that MPAC needed to make a decision on that. She did not have a roster of RTAC.

John Fregonese stated that RTAC was a subcommittee of RPAC, so MTAC will need to be a subcommittee of MPAC. RTAC consisted of a staff representative from each jurisdiction represented on RPAC as well as a representative from the Homebuilders Association, 1000 Friends of Oregon and the Port of Portland.

Chair McRobert stated that everyone on MPAC would have staff representation on MTAC.

Ken Gervais stated yes, except for the citizen representatives. Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement will appoint MTAC representatives for those position.



John Fregonese stated that RTAC recommended to MPAC that four positions be added to represent water, sewer, energy and schools.

Commissioner Kafoury moved for approval.

Bruce Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

John Fregonese stated MPAC members will need to appoint their representatives and then approve the utility and school delegates.

#### **X. Scheduling of Future Meetings**

Commissioner Kafoury stated that she would hesitate to commit to two meetings a month.

Chair McRobert asked would it be better if it was temporary, for six months or so.

Mayor Liddell stated that it needs to be on the calendar until we get the work done and it could be changed later.

Commissioner Hales stated that he agreed with Commissioner Kafoury, two meetings a month is not a good idea. A committee can either listen to reports or it can take action. Our job is to advise the Council. There needs to be continued tension with the Council, and there is a danger of meeting too often and hearing too much.

Chair McRobert stated she wants a years worth of agenda items ahead of time and requested members to think about those items.

Commissioner Hales stated that the responsibilities under the Charter are fairly limited. We should map out some additional areas that we want to cover.

Chuck Petersen stated that his understanding about the second meetings was that it was for a short duration for orientation purposes. It should continue until that is complete.

Councilor Fessler asked if we would go ahead with the vision process.

Chair McRobert stated that now that there is a Vision Commission, visioning should be done by that committee, not MPAC.

Mayor Liddell stated MPAC should send a statement of advice to the Vision Commission.

John Fregonese stated MPAC needs to decide how it wants to be involved in Region 2040. The second meeting of the month was to be a workshop, to go over research and information. The first monthly meeting would be to take action and make decisions.

Chair McRobert stated that some of the Future Vision ends up in the Framework Plan and MPAC needs to know about.

John Fregonese stated that there are elements in Region 2040 that would come to MPAC for advice. The second meeting is for background so you could talk about one issue in depth.

Chair McRobert stated that she could see the value in that, the regular meetings are so rushed.

Councilor Fessler stated yes, if the second meeting could be "extra credit."

Ken Gervais stated that while the Charter gives MPAC certain authorities, MPAC decided to be what RPAC was. RPAC was the land use working group, MPAC needs enough time to do that. Planning doesn't get done in two hours a month.

Commissioner Hales stated that the agenda could be divided, into planning and other business.

John Fregonese stated that another option is to hold the background material until there is enough for a full informational meeting.

Chair McRobert stated that she, Councilor Gardner, Rob Mitchell, Mayor Liddell and John Fregonese are going to have an agenda setting meeting June 23, 1993, 7:00 a.m. at Metro. She invited all MPAC members to attend. Chair McRobert stated that she would like the plans for the Windmar site in Gresham to come to MPAC.

Commissioner Hansen stated that MPAC should limit the agendas as much as possible. Many groups would like to address MPAC, we don't want to hear issues that would be more appropriate for another board.

Chair McRobert agreed and stated MPAC would not continue as it has the past few months. Members had asked to hear other peoples opinions.

Commissioner Hammerstad stated there should be agenda item for updates of regional issues.

Chair McRobert responded updates can be given under "Other."

Merrie Waylett stated that on the parks merger issue, when a Memorandum of Agreement is received, it will be forwarded to MPAC. The agreement is expected by late summer.

Ken Gervais stated that Ken Greenberg has been invited to speak at the June 23, 1993, MPAC meeting. He is from Toronto, which is further along in a similar planning process.

Commissioner Hales asked if MPAC needed to address the parks transfer.

Chair McRobert stated that when the Memorandum of Understanding is written, it will be sent to MPAC.

Councilor Devlin stated he thought that would happen by July.

Jean Schreiber asked when does MPAC review something? Do we offer advice or only when we are asked by Council?

Chair McRobert responded that it depended on the issue.

John Fregonese responded RUGGO states that MPAC (RPAC) is involved in planning issues on a developmental level, not just approval of final products.

Jean Schreiber stated then we need work sessions.

Commissioner Hammerstad stated that there is confusion on the legal issues of the parks merger. If MPAC didn't ask to discuss the merger, would it have come to us?

Councilor Devlin stated that Commissioner Hansen had requested for the issue to go to MPAC.

Chair McRobert adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan

s:\pdf\69mpac