

**Metro Policy Advisory Committee**  
**Joint Meeting with Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation**  
**October 28, 1993 - Meeting Summary**

Members present: Rob Mitchell, Acting Chair; Richard Benner, Rose Besserman, Kathy Christy, Richard Devlin, Rob Drake, Bud Farm, Judith Fessler, Jim Gardner, Charlie Hales, Judie Hammerstad, Gary Hansen, Bonnie Hays, Gretchen Kafoury, Susan McLain, Terry Moore, Chuck Petersen, John Reeves, Alice Schlenker, Sandra Suran, Bruce Thompson and Jim Zehren.

JPACT Members present: George Van Bergen, Chair; Shirley Huffman, Jon Kvistad, Ed Lindquist, Craig Lominicki, John Magnano and Les White.

Others in attendance included: G. B. Arrington, David Ausherman, Andrea Ball, Richard Brandman, Karen Buehrig, Andy Cotugno, Brent Curtis, Judy Davis, Barbara Duncan, John Fregonese, Len Fresier, Ken Gervais, Craig Greenleaf, Karen Haines, Dean Lookingbill, Robin McArthur-Phillips, Gail Ryder, Sherry Oeser, Ethan Seltzer, Bob Sokol, Ted Spence, Robert Textor, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Terry Vanderkooy, Tom Vanderzanden and Merrie Waylett.

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. by JPACT Chair Van Bergen.

**I. Introductions and Welcome**

**II. Planning in Washington**

Andy Cotugno stated that coordination of land use and transportation efforts on both sides of the river is needed more and more, so the purpose of tonight's meeting is to help all parties understand the growth management efforts of both states and how they effect each other.

Craig Greenleaf, Planning Director for Clark County gave a briefing of Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA is different from the Oregon land use laws in that it is only in effect in the fast growing areas of the state. Its purpose is to define and create urban growth areas which are similar to Oregon's urban growth boundary. The goals of the GMA are to:

- encourage development in urban areas
- reduce sprawl of low density development
- encourage efficient multi-modal transportation
- encourage affordable housing
- encourage economic development
- secure private property laws
- ensure timely, fair issuance of development permits
- retain and conserve open space, parks and wildlife habitat
- increase access to natural areas and parks
- protect the environment
- ensure citizen participation in the process
- ensure public facilities are available in a timely matter with development (concurrency)

Craig Greenleaf stated that in April 1993, the Clark County Commission adopted a framework plan that provides a 50 year vision for Clark County, tries to identify and reach consensus on urban and rural land uses and where they ought to be occurring, and provides a framework for the current 20 year planning effort. Clark County and Vancouver have experienced a lot of growth in recent years. Between 1960 and 1990, the population grew by 150,000 people. There has been extensive residential development in unincorporated areas of Clark County. The County will likely process 130 - 140 subdivisions this year and more than 1600 land use permits. Thirty percent of area residents work in Oregon. Some issues Clark County planners are

trying to address are a better balance of industry, increasing densities along transit corridors and in Vancouver, keeping neighborhoods desirable and livable, and the possibility of a transfer of development rights program.

Karen Haines, with the City of Vancouver stated that in Vancouver there has been considerable public involvement. The aim is to complete a single comprehensive plan that would encompass both the City of Vancouver and unincorporated Clark County lands. A Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) identified issues and elements to be included in the comprehensive plan. They have produced a policy document with an action agenda and they developed some land use options from which they have identified a preferred alternative. An assumption they have been working under is that the area will grow by 125,000 people in the next 20 years, 70,000 of those in the Vancouver urban area. The CAC has recommended option B which will provide significantly higher densities in the urban downtown area, 20 - 25 units per acre, the Vancouver Mall area would range from 15 - 20 units per acre and 10 - 12 units in the WSU campus area and 15 - 18 units per acre along primary transit corridors. This option has a 60/40 single family-multi family split, compared with the current 70/30 split. Karen Haines stated that other issues to keep in mind include:

- Concurrency laws
- Washington's Trip Reduction Law (similar to Oregon's Goal 12 but focused on employers of 100 people or more).
- The maintenance and enhancement of Greenspaces.
- The GMA allows impact fees to be levied on transportation, parks, fire services and schools.

Andy Cotugno asked if Clark County's urban growth boundary's are a constraint to growth?

Craig Greenleaf stated that the existing boundary did not have the implementation tools to support it. There is lots of infill needed within the boundary. The legislation that will be adopted in July of 1994 will strengthen the boundary.

John Magnano stated that Vancouver and Clark County planning agencies are now moving progressively towards growth management, and light rail which may not have been true in the past.

Richard Benner asked why option B had been chosen over option A.

Karen Haines stated that option B emphasizes more population in the urban area and within the transportation corridors.

Commissioner Hales asked, given the similarities in language and efforts of growth management and legislation in both Clark County and the Portland Metropolitan area, and that the Charter requires to the extent possible that Clark County be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), how far should the RTP go to address Clark County?

Andy Cotugno stated that we have to ask ourselves that question. The Metro area must adopt a Regional Framework Plan which has to address eight subjects, one of which is coordination with Clark County. There is cross representation on both Oregon and Washington's advisory committees, is that enough, do we need a bi-state compact or an intergovernmental agreement?

Councilor Devlin stated that agreement on some factors that effect quality of life would be valuable.

There was discussion on concurrency rules, how much teeth do they have, how can they be effectively implemented? Do concurrency rules without strong growth boundaries push growth out beyond the urban area where its easier to develop?

Councilor Gardner stated that in the past, Oregon's land use laws may have encouraged new development

to go to Clark County, now with the GMA it may be time for a regional non-competition agreement.

Jim Zehren asked how Clark County had evaluated its growth options.

Craig Greenleaf responded that it cannot be decided by technical and numerical comparison, but will ultimately be up to an elected body's best decision.

Karen Haines stated that there was not a weighted list of items, but a continuum of criteria that the CAC developed along with goals from other regional policies.

Les White stated there is a need to be aware that a lot of activity does not necessarily mean economic prosperity, a growing bedroom community without an industrial base can lead to a bankrupt community. Rezone requests from industrial to small residential lots are increasing, which can lead to air quality and transportation problems.

### **III. Planning in Oregon**

Andy Cotugno stated that next year, decisions will be made through a similar process as tonight.

John Fregonese gave a slide show presentation on past growth trends and predictions and an update on where the Region 2040 process is today. Concept B will be modeled first. Key events on the Region 2040 timeline are:

- Concept Analysis Report - February '94
- Presentation of growth concepts to local governments - February and March '94
- Preferred alternative development - March - May '94
- Local government recommendations - April '94
- MPAC, Future Vision and JPACT comment - May '94
- Final Council concept choice - July '94

Andy Cotugno stated that in the next few months trade offs between the concepts will need to be illustrated. If single family residential is reduced from 60 percent to 49 percent, is that reasonable, does it make sense? If we expand the UGB, where and how much? How can we reach the required reduction in VMTs?

Sandra Suran asked how other factors, such as new trends in telecommuting, can be factored into the modeling? A discussion on telecommuting followed.

Commissioner Hammerstad asked about infrastructure costs, will cost be part of the concept choice?

John Fregonese responded that cost information will be part of the February concept analysis report.

There was discussion on how to increase public participation and how to educate citizens on this choice. Other topics discussed included how to factor business, particularly small business, into the concepts, as they seem to be concentrating on housing, how can Metro enforce whatever concept is chosen, and is the demand for future housing being taken into account, such as retirement housing.

Andy Cotugno stated that we are currently looking at what pieces of the concepts might be sewn together into a Concept "X" (preferred alternative).

Commissioner Hales stated that MPAC should be taken through the RTP process, he asked if there should be another joint meeting in December or January, support for this idea was expressed.

Andy Cotugno stated that ODOT is in the process of cutting \$126 million from their six year program of \$300 million. The question has been raised should there be deeper cuts in order to allow for more alternative

mode projects. The same information can be brought to MPAC as well as JPACT in advance of the recommendation.

John Fregonese stated that they have been thinking about how to bring land use and transportation issues together, they are so interrelated, a change in either plan greatly affects the other.

Commissioner Hales stated that you can't do transportation planning based strictly on accident reports and traffic flows and expect the land use to follow.

Andy Cotugno stated that he will talk with the Chairs of both MPAC and JPACT about possibly meeting jointly again in January.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Duncan.