



JOINT MPAC/JPACT MEETING
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 7, 2014
World Forestry Center, Cheatham Hall

JPACT MEMBERS PRESENT

Jack Burkman
Carlotta Collette
Shirley Craddick, Vice Chair
Craig Dirksen, Chair
Denny Doyle
Diane McKeel
Steve Novick
Paul Savas

AFFILIATION

City of Vancouver
Metro Council
Metro Council
Metro Council
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
Clackamas County

JPACT MEMBERS EXCUSED

Shane Bemis
Roy Rogers
Don Wagner
Bill Wyatt

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.
Washington County
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland

JPACT ALTERNATES PRESENT

David Nordberg
Jef Dalin
Tim Knapp
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
City of Cornelius, representing Cities of Washington County
City of Wilsonville
Oregon Department of Transportation

MPAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Ruth Adkins
Sam Chase
Tim Clark

Denny Doyle
Lise Glancy
Kathryn Harrington
Jeff Gudman

Dick Jones

AFFILIATION

PPS, Governing Body of School Districts
Metro Council
City of Wood Village, representing Multnomah Co. other cities
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Port of Portland
Metro Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Oak Lodge Water District

Anne McEnery-Ogle

Keith Mays

Marilyn McWilliams

Doug Neely

Craig Prosser

Loretta Smith

Bob Stacey

Peter Truax

Jerry Willey

City of Vancouver

Washington Co. Citizen

Tualatin Valley Water District, Washington Co. Special Districts

City of Oregon City, Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City

TriMet

Multnomah County

Metro Council

City of Forest Grove, Washington Co. Other Cities

City of Hillsboro, Washington Co. Largest City

MPAC MEMBERS EXCUSED

Maxine Fitzpatrick

Keith Mays

Charlynn Newton

Wilda Parks

Jim Rue

Steve Stuart

Kent Studebaker

Peter Truax

AFFILIATION

Multnomah Co. Citizen

Sherwood Chamber of Commerce

City of North Plains

Clackamas Co. Citizen

Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation and Development

Clark County

City of Lake Oswego

City of Forest Grove, Washington Co. Other Cities

MPAC ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jim Bernard

Jackie Dingfelder

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County

City of Portland

STAFF: Jessica Rojas, Alex Eldridge, John Williams, Joel Cvetko, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Ina Zucker, Tom Kloster, Grace Cho, Randy Tucker, Ramona Perrault, Nick Christensen, Dan Kaempff, Lake McTighe, Peggy Morell, Patty Unfred, John Mermin, Roger Alfred and Chris Myers.

FACILITATOR: Sam Imperati, Oregon Consensus.

The joint policy advisory committee meeting on the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project convened at 8:03 a.m.

1. WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Meeting Facilitator, Sam Imperati of Oregon Consensus welcomed the members and alternates of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) as well as staff and interested parties.

Mr. Imperati gave an overview of the joint committee meeting agenda and goals of the meeting:

- 1) Metro staff will share and seek input on key themes from the public comment period.
- 2) Overview steps taken, review the draft Council Ordinance, components of the adoption package and the next steps.
- 3) Staff will provide a review of each component of the draft adoption package and follow up with a facilitated straw poll on each component in providing direction to MTAC and TPAC in fine tuning a final recommendation for consideration.

Among the materials provided were color-coded voting cards (green, yellow and red) determining three levels of support to recommend a level of investment to test.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

MPAC vice Chair Truax and JPACT Chair Dirksen began by declaring a quorum for both Committees. JPACT Chair and Metro Councilor Craig Dirksen acknowledged the presence of Jerry Lidz, a commissioner with the Land Conservation and Development Commission and liaison to the Climate Smart Communities Scenario Project.

MPAC vice Chair Peter Truax thanked everyone present for their time and investment. Chair Truax acknowledged the work completed from the May 30th joint meeting and offered his apologies for not being present due to his auto accident. Vice Chair Truax offered opening remarks, reminded members that the final recommendations will be made in December 2014. Vice Chair overviewed the agenda with members, acknowledged that that the current task requires no formal action but is intended to identify any technical needs that the committees will need to work on by representing the priorities of the respective districts in making a recommendation.

MPAC vice Chair Truax introduced to Metro Councilor and JPACT Chair Craig Dirksen. Chair Dirksen offered opening remarks in regards to the process. Chair Dirksen reviewed significant dates on the timeline with members and offered comments on the process as validation that the draft plans are sufficient in advocating for local needs and priorities. Chair Dirksen introduced Sam Imperati as the facilitator for the joint meeting.

3. SETTING THE STAGE FOR THE DAY

Mr. Imperati overviewed the process for the day and welcomed everyone. Mr. Imperati introduced Peggy Morrell of Metro, to share input from the public engagement component.

4. WHAT WE HEARD FROM THE PUBLIC

Ms. Morrell reviewed the methods used to garner engagement, informed members that the straw poll is not binding but is used to check in and see where members are in terms of the support for the plans. Ms. Morell informed members that this will allow room for discussion of how to prioritize the remaining time and reviewed the materials with members in providing guidance in making a decision. Ms. Morrell presented the public engagement efforts sharing the feedback received from the 45 day comment period, including the Metro Council's guidelines for public engagement.

Takeaways included:

- Received two kinds of input, through phone polls and through relationship building with community based organizations that can garner feedback.
- A variety of tools were used engage the public in garnering comments from discussion/ focus groups, scientific valid phone surveys and online surveys.
- The online survey garnered over 2400 responses.
- Offered the components of the draft approach, over 90 correspondences were exchanged.
- Input received from all parts of the region but may have more work to do public engagement, particular communities that have been under represented.

- Shared the feedback on the types of investments and the support for each area, including the statistics for each area and how the questions were framed.
- Shared input received from community leaders on how a policy area would be implemented in their communities.
- Shared the Alternative Transportation Plan (ATP) features of the feedback received as safety was cited often, reducing congestions and counter comments in regards to parking.
- Referenced that 1800 responses were received from the public, towards policy makers in making a decision in regards to where the investments should be and how should the investments be considered. Ms. Morell referenced Exhibit E as a resource.

5. GETTING TO THE FINISH LINE

Mr. Imperati introduced John Williams who provided an overview of the Climate Smart Communities decisions timeline.

Mr. Williams overviewed materials in the packet, reviewed the actions that have been taken and next steps in the process. Mr. Williams reminded members that the Climate Smart Communities (CSC) strategy is grounded in the plans already adopted across the region, as a diverse shared vision. Mr. Williams shared examples of the plans in relation to the region's adopted six desired outcomes. Mr. Williams acknowledged that targets can be reached through the investments and can be exceeded if we can continue to invest. Mr. Williams explained that to members that this is a collaborative approach between business, community and leaders by looking public health and safety. Mr. Williams overviewed the benefits with members of the proposed actions.

Mr. Williams referred to the draft ordinance in the meeting packet that will be considered in December. Mr. Williams referenced exhibits A-D running through each one individually and their intent, what each piece directs staff and the results. Mr. Williams discussed the elements of the CSC strategy and what they can accomplish from transportation, to reducing green house gases (GHGs) and to securing investments for transition.

Mr. Williams discussed the amendments and where they would apply to and explained that those amendments are integrated into the entire system of planning and will not set climate change beyond other outcomes. Mr. Williams highlighted current plans that already meet the goals and identified new activities that as a region and as individuals can be taken to meet the goals.

Mr. Williams reviewed exhibit E with members including the summary of changes, the comments received that are incorporated into the summary of recommended changes and shared how the amendments would be incorporated. Mr. Williams referred to the Finding of Fact that will be available in December and reflected back to the short list of actions as the work that has come out of the work at the advisory committees and will be seeking feedback.

Mr. Imperati provided members with details of the polling exercise and what it means as non binding, but will provide guidance in letting technical committees know that members want the technical committees to focus on and explore in the next coming weeks.

Members asked clarifying questions on the straw vote process, Mr. Imperati clarified what each result does and does not mean.

Member comments included:

- Dave Nordberg of DEQ offered his comments as sitting in for Nina DeConcini and that he is not principle staff and will not be voting.

Councilor Sam Chase asked questions in regards to receiving nonvoting input at the current meeting.

Mr. Williams confirmed that participation from everyone is desired.

- Members offered comments in regards to the poll and expressed concern for the tool box, offered comments from MAPC on the tool box.
- Members offered comments in regards to the job market.
- Dick Jones offered comments of concern and sited transportation needs, and concerns he has raised at MPAC in relation to funding, expressed that he would like to see a better road map.
- Keith Mays offered comments on the tool box for refinement and breaking it up.
- Members offered comments to all the exhibits all referenced his county and their needs for transit, as he sees counties as the safety net in providing infrastructure.
- Susie Lahsene offered comments and sited the port and its approach to environmental stewardship and thinks the regional framework amendments are not needed and offered where it can improve.
- Members shared what they are in support of and where they are divergent, expressed the reservations from Clackamas County and the tool kits ability to provide for diverse communities as they move forward.
- Members offered comments and concerns, wants to know what Metro defines as the region and shared his concerns on fixing what exists.
- Members expressed concerns from their county and shared insight how the plans work or conflict with local jurisdictions
- Vice Chair Truax offered his concerns, citing the summary of recommended changes, expressed concerns of unintended consequences and offered suggestions on how to improve.
- Lise Glancy from the Port of Portland expressed her support and concerns in funding levels and agreed with those from MPAC on concerns of the tool box used as a resolution than less as an ordinance.
- Members offered comments in regards to the urban growth boundary (UGB) reserves and the future. Expressed concern that it conflicts with the statistics cited in the staff report and the development plans as they occur.

6. COMPONENTS OF THE DRAFT CLIMATE SMART COMMUNITES STRATEGY

Mr. Imperati thanked members for the feedback and to staff who presented their work. Mr. Imperati referred to straw poll and the topic of the draft toolbox. Mr. Imperati explained the process in making the recommendations to the technical staff.

Mr. Williams began the prioritization with the tool box, sharing background of the process. Kim Ellis of Metro and Metro attorney Roger Alfred also shared comments on the process, referred members to the changes made in the recommended changes list. Mr. Alfred to shared details of the state rules in addressing concerns of the tool box, how it should be adopted and what is required and how the documents were prepared for the joint meeting.

Ms. Ellis referred to exhibit E and clarified when it would be adopted. Mr. Imperati opened requested discussion from members to get a sense of the support and concerns in the room.

Comments and questions included:

- Members offered comments about the tool box, offered wording suggestions that would bring confidence that the tool box is not a mandate.
- Members offered feedback received on the tool box, expressed concern of not being able to wordsmith at the current meeting, recognizes that there are jurisdictions may have different needs as the tool box cannot address highway concerns. Members shared comments on the Metro's emphasis on transit and not on highway expansion.

- Ruth Adkins offered her green perspective and feedback on the toolbox, shared what stands strong to her in offering support for the toolbox as being flexible in moving forward.
- Members offered comments of where improvements can be made in regards to job creation and meeting the CSC objectives.

John Williams responded to member comment and explained that that the incentive notion has been incorporated in the proposed changes.

- Susie Lahsene offered her concerns over a clarification over the adopted the plans in meeting or exceeding the goal and expressed her concern for tools.
- Members commented on the summary of recommended changes and asked that the cities be allowed to work with staff to vet wording and requested a track changes version from this day forward.

Mr. Williams responded that after this meeting that there can be a single set available before making a recommended before council.

- Members asked questions in regards to asking legislature for more time.

Mr. Williams confirmed that the deadline is the end of the calendar year.

- Members asked clarifying questions as to why the TSP's are not included in the tool box.

Mr. Imperati reiterated that these are non-binding nature and offered comments received that the tool box should be mandatory and opened it up for discussion.

Councilor Harrington offered comments in regards to the MPAC meeting schedule, and asked questions about the JPACT work plan and Metro council meeting plans in this process.

Councilor Harrington asked Mr. Alfred if there is opportunity to make changes to the ordinance so there is more clarity and to reduce confusion.

Mr. Alfred responded that yes but it needs to be done soon.

- Members asked clarifying questions about the public posting of the ordinance in regards to the modification process.

Mr. Imperati requested members share their straw poll votes to gain a sense of the room in addressing any concerns.

Mr. Williams reviewed the Regional framework plan and directed member's attention to the language and then to the changes in exhibit B page 9. Mr. Williams reiterated consistent themes around specificity and details and referred members to specific comments in the summary of changes, requested that members take a moment to read the revised language.

- Members asked clarifying questions on the language change.
- Members offered comments from their staff review on the coordination of materials and the ability to be prepared and requested to remove bullet items in efforts to be less restrictive.

Mr. Williams responded that is worthy of discussion.

- Members commented on the bullets being kept and of those deleted, expressed concern for language in the name of flexibility and avoiding unintended consequences.

Chair Dirksen responded with his concerns of where it would be not prescriptive so it can be interpreted in different ways based on different jurisdictions different needs

Mr. Williams responded that the track changes version will help clarify confusion.

Councilor Stacey asked questions in regard to legality and the regional framework plan, asked for a clarification of the wording and how it could be implemented.

Mr. Alfred offered details of what the regional framework plan is, how it directs and what is required.

- Members commented on the revision and in regards to how GHGs can be addressed beyond transportation.

Mr. Imperati asked for a show of cards to determine where members are at on the vote and reiterated what he has heard from members.

- Members discussed what the needs are in the final language.

Mr. Imperati referred to the draft Climate Smart Strategy and requested that those in opposition share their concerns.

- Members commented on their career experience in air quality and shared expertise. Members expressed concern of the congestion impact on GHGs and expressed adding lanes on highways to reduce congestion and as economic benefit.
- Members commented on reducing congestion by adding lanes, offered the short term versus long term solution options in the decision process.
- Members commented to where the rating of strategies came from.

Councilor Stacey offered comments on pricing the road system after filling up the segments in the Regional Transportation Plan. Councilor Stacey offered the reasoning for this document in accessing the funding.

- Members offered comments on safety concerns.
- Rian Windsheimer commented that he agrees with Councilor Stacey that the RTP achieves the target and that there is consensus that it efficient and expressed a desire to focus on achieving this goal first.
- Members reiterated that this is a climate smart strategy but there are economic benefits that are underestimated.

Mr. Imperati opened the discussion towards the performance monitoring approach and asked for those with concerns to share their thoughts.

- Members requested an air quality approach and asked for measuring the changes in congestion and looking at the cost and benefits to be included.
- Members commented on the monitoring and the metrics used and expressed that it does not get to the issue of building jobs in undeveloped UGB areas and how we relate living options to that. Members requested a different metric.

Mr. Imperati moved the list of proposed actions and encouraged to have staff from technical committees to bring forth any issues.

- Members offered comments in looking at congestion pricing to show case benefits.

7. WORKING TOGETHER- WHAT'S NEXT?

MPAC vice Chair Truax and JPACT Chair Dirksen offered closing remarks and thanked members for their time. Chairs ensured members that staff will incorporate their comments and make all materials available in a timely manner.

Mr. Imperati encouraged members to fill out evaluations on the day's joint meeting process.

8. ADJOURN

Vice Chair Truax and Chair Dirksen adjourned the meeting at 10:59 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Rojas, Council Policy Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF NOV.7, 2014

DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
Handout	11/6/14	CSC Public Comment Snapshot Factsheet	