

Metro Policy Advisory Committee

Joint meeting with JPACT, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
July 28, 1993 - Meeting Summary

Members present: Gussie McRobert, Chair; Bill Bloom, Heather Chrisman, Richard Devlin, Bud Farm, Judith Fessler, Jim Gardner, Judie Hammerstad, Bonnie Hays, Darlene Hooley, Susan McLain, Rob Mitchell, Terry Moore, Bruce Thompson, Chuck Petersen, Arnold Polk, Jean Schreiber, Sandra Suran and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance included: Tom Armstrong, David Ausherman, Bill Bloom, Andy Cotugno, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Ed Lindquist, Sherry Oeser, Gail Ryder, Al Siddall, Dan Small, Stuart Todd and Mark Turpel.

The meeting was called to order at 5:05p.m. by Chair McRobert and a quorum was declared.

I. Introductions

II. Visitors Comments on Items not on the Agenda - None

III. Approval of Minutes of July 14, 1993

Commissioner Hammerstad had a correction on page 2, 4th paragraph:

"...recommendation is leaning towards ~~no~~ growth no build at the Wilsonville site..."

Jim Zehren stated that the By Laws did not contain (on page 4, Article IV, section c, Line 7) the added wording "... majority of the advisory committee membership..."

Motion: Arnold Polk moved for approval of the minutes, Councilor Fessler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Jim Zehren asked if on page 2 of the minutes, under "Regional Design Images", is Concept X the same as the Base case?

John Fregonese stated no, it should read:

".. Concept A, B, C or X-(the base case)."

IV. Region 2040 Alternatives

John Fregonese stated that by working with the region's technical staffs in the Users Group, we have established a good base case which shows build out under current policies. 1.1 million people will be coming into the region, a little more than 50 percent can be accommodated within the existing Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in Washington and Oregon. The base case assumes no redevelopment that would increase densities, and a 20 year rolling land supply. We have looked at two options for the base case, one with new freeways (Westside Bypass, Mt. Hood Parkway and Sunrise Corridor) and one without. John Fregonese stated that the current state policy is that when the UGB is expanded, exception lands are brought in first, exception lands being those unsuitable for farming and may have a lot of development on it already, so we have to bring in three acres to get one acre that's urbanizable. 225 thousand acres were added to the UGB in the base case.

John Fregonese went over the material in the agenda packet that identifies which indicators will be measured by Metro staff and which by the consultant. He stated that for some hard to quantify values such as security and human services, we will rely heavily on local jurisdictions sharing information. The first information from the modeling will be on land consumption, air quality and transit.

Concept B

Mark Turpel stated that Concept B will leave the UGB in place for 50 years. It is transit-intensive and includes a circumferential rail service as well as radial. Rail lines are drawn from Forest Grove to Gresham, from north of Clark County thru downtown Portland to Oregon City, Oregon City to the airport on I-205. Also a line out Barbur Blvd. to Sherwood, and from Beaverton along 217 thru Lake Oswego to Milwaukie. There is high quality bus service on both the west and east side and "Main Streets" are developed along bus service lines. This concept provides additional Greenspaces in areas that will have increased densities.

John Fregonese stated that a concept needs to be detailed in order to be modeled which is why some very specific details are included in the concept. The level of detail will give us a more accurate idea of the results of the concepts, not just picking pretty pictures.

Councilor McLain stated that water providers also need details in order to give their input.

Councilor Devlin asked when the concepts would be available on maps for distribution.

John Fregonese responded by the end of August. In Concept B, 550,000 new households will need to be accommodated, 133,000 of those go to Clark County. The existing comp plans accommodate 233,000 of the 550,000. That leaves 163,000 households will need to be allocated on the Oregon side without moving the UGB. Ways to accomplish this include the addition of "granny flats" or in-law units to 5% of the regions households, which takes care of 20,000. Also if the density of the existing vacant lands was increased by 15%, that would accommodate 35,000, which leaves 115,000 units to be accomplished by redevelopment, so about 20% of the households needed would be met through redevelopment. How do we get 2,000 units a year to be redeveloped? John Fregonese stated that what is important to remember is that 95% of the region will not change, only 5% of the acreage will have increases in density, excluding the granny flats which are region wide.

Sandra Suran asked how accurate have the projections of past trends been?

John Fregonese responded that the projections are based on birth and death rates, and migration and then the projections are checked against other agencies' projections. That gave us a population projection from which we estimate an employment projection. The allocations of growth was from a model that looked at vacant land and transportation.

Councilor Devlin asked what factor was used for the development density?

John Fregonese stated that a 10% underbuild factor was used.

Jim Zehren stated that to achieve the densities needed, how you build it greatly affects its acceptance. How do we achieve this regional goal without doing the micro-planning?

John Fregonese stated that we come up with a prescriptive solution that can be used as an example and copied by jurisdictions if they chose, or come up with their own programs that meet the same goals, but flexibility for the local governments is important. The Regional Design Images Project will show how these densities might look.

Jim Zehren asked what PEF, Pedestrian Environmental Factor referred to.

John Fregonese responded that the PEF model shows what most models do not, which is that people walk more if there is a good pedestrian environment, which is measured by four factors:

- number of retail employers within a mile
- sidewalks
- greater number of cross streets, and
- topography and barriers

The PEF rates an area with a number from four to twelve.

Sandra Suran asked if security is considered in this rating.

John Fregonese stated that security is extremely important, but cannot be modeled at this point.

Arnold Polk asked if the PEF rating causes an assumption about the decreased use of roads and facilities in the area due to increased pedestrian use.

John Fregonese stated that yes, the model makes that assumption.

Jim Zehren asked if development outside the target area continues in existing patterns? If just outside of the mixed use, high density area is an office park, it won't work.

John Fregonese stated that the only assumption made about non-target area land is the granny flats and 15% density upgrade on vacant land.

Councilor Thompson asked how long it would take to get the light rail lines in place.

John Fregonese responded that the Concept B figures a line every ten years.

Councilor Moore asked were Main streets planned only for the east side of the region?

John Fregonese stated main streets are planned all over the region, and non-main street arterials such as McLoughlin also receive increased densities and better pedestrian environments in the model.

Councilor Devlin asked if estimates would be made of the cost of public facilities?

John Fregonese responded yes, the Descriptive Indicator Project requires the consultant to estimate those costs.

Concept A

Mark Turpel stated that Concept A is single family and auto oriented development within the goals of Rule 12. It looks at where the UGB can expand, which areas would be easiest to serve with sewer, which have accessibility and tries to avoid lands zoned for exclusive farm use. Where Greenspaces (private or public owned) exist, they are used as a boundary and to define areas and provide buffers between urbanized and farm lands. More Greenspaces show on concept A than on B now due to large expansions of Greenspace in concept A into the Boring Lava Domes area. Concept A has less transit, with a radial system of light rail to Hillsboro and Gresham, from Oregon City to Vancouver and a line to the Damascus area.

John Fregonese stated that concept A has the most privately owned greenspaces. Concept A also has the freeways (Mt. Hood, Sunset and Westside), and the effects of those will be analyzed.

Arnold Polk asked if there was a shift in the mass transit between A and B. The circumferential rail isn't in A because of the lower densities in A?

John Fregonese stated yes, A only has radial rail lines, and if the model shows very low ridership, the rail will be changed to bus lines.

Councilor Devlin stated that the map showed everything that was identified in the inventory, and there was never an intention to preserve everything in the inventory.

Councilor Fessler asked how much these concepts can be adjusted, if there are aspects we like about each concept.

John Fregonese responded that yes, the final concept choice will likely involve a combination of the best elements of the concepts.

Concept C

Mark Turpel stated that concept C proposes satellite centers outside the UGB which would accommodate one third of the growth, with the other two thirds of growth in existing vacant lands and redevelopment within the UGB. The satellites have focused on existing towns such as Scappose, Sandy and Estacada with infrastructure already in place. It is proposed that no further development occur in the rural preserve areas, but that development be applied by transfer of development rights to land within the UGB or in the satellite centers.

Councilor Devlin asked if that assumes that the privately owned "open spaces" will develop at their current zoned density.

John Fregonese stated that some areas, due to already existing development are not practical to be urbanized, you have to bring a lot of acreage in order to get some urbanizable land.

Councilor Chrisman stated that the exception areas are important, what is the timeline for the policy as these areas are filling up quickly?

John Fregonese responded that policies will be adopted by 1997. In the short range, cities will know what is going to be adopted ahead of time and can begin implementation before the policies are formally adopted.

Councilor Fessler stated that as the UGB moves, property values are effected, how does the transfer of development rights ... will property values be equal closer in to town as farther out?

John Fregonese responded yes. This scenario put a third of the growth in places like Newberg and Sandy. Sandy becomes a town of 40,000 in some scenarios. This information needs to get out to the communities. We want to do presentations to the planing commissions or city councils and hope to group presentations to several neighboring cities together.

Chair McRobert asked what if the Future Vision Commission moves in a different direction?

Councilor McLain stated that the FVC had identified all of the same factors that MPAC had, as well as some broader issues such as safety.

Sandra Suran asked if business was being involved.

John Fregonese responded yes, the economic development and corridor associations have been involved. In September and October the 2040 staff are planning a lot of public speaking to groups, if you are interested in having a presentation made to your group, please call Barbara Duncan at 797-1750.

Councilor McLain asked if the FVC could also speak to these groups.

Jim Zehren stated that the description of Concept C was not written with the same detail and quality of the other concept descriptions. He asked if a discussion was planned on the descriptive indicators.

John Fregonese responded that the material in the packet, the survey results and the listing of evaluators, was a response to that, but it can be added for discussion to the August 11th agenda.

Chair McRobert stated that Clark County representatives will begin attending next meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan