

Metro Scenario Rulemaking Advisory Committee
Meeting #3
April 23, 2012

Members in attendance:

Nancy Cardwell	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Jerry Lidz	Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)
Brian Dunn	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Angus Duncan	Oregon Global Warming Commission (OGWC)
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Tom Kloster	Metro
Karen Beuhrig	Clackamas County
Ramsay Weit	The Community Housing Fund
Andy Back	Washington County
Tom Armstrong	Portland
Cindy Tatham	Beaverton (Alternate)
Mary Kyle McCurdy	1000 Friends of Oregon
Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association
Mark Gamba	Citizen
Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland
Alwin Turiel	Hillsboro
Katherine Kelly	Gresham

Members absent:

Don Mazziotti	Beaverton
Denny Egner	Lake Oswego
Heidi Guenin	Upstream Public Health
Andrea Riner	

DLCD Staff: Bob Cortright, Bill Holmstrom

Others in Attendance:

Kim Ellis, Metro Staff
Dick Benner, Metro Staff
Ray Jackson, Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments

Meeting called to order by chair Jerry Lidz at 1:06pm.

Introductions & Agenda Review

Chair Lidz opened the meeting at 1:02pm.

Bob Cortright reviewed the process to date, including a brief overview of the legislation that requires the Commission to initiate this rulemaking. As much as possible, we are attempting to fit this rule and process into existing processes at Metro.

Review and Discuss: Revised Rule Outline

Cortright moved into discussion of the draft rule outline. As the final RAC meeting is planned for next month, it is important to identify and focus on areas of concern or that need further refinement. Cortright went through the draft rule section by section, noting changes from the previous version.

Under **Definitions**, there was discussion of how the language applies to local land use plans, and whether the scenario planning definition is too restrictive or detailed. There was concern about the phrase “a planned pattern of development,” or that the definition could instead refer to section (3) of the draft rule. There was some discussion about the selection of a scenario, and if it would be considered a land use action. Some discussion about how the scenario planning will fit in with the existing framework plan. The RAC had some more discussion about the level of specificity in parts of the rules; there was some concern that the draft rules were too specific in parts.

The RAC moved on to discussion of the **Cooperative Selection of a Preferred Scenario**. Cortright gave a summary of the changes in the draft rule. Discussion of the evaluation criteria that Metro must develop: should the list of criteria be required, or should Metro have more flexibility in developing criteria? The RAC held some discussion about removing the list of potential goals or outcomes altogether. There was a general feeling among the committee to keep the rule as general as possible rather than being prescriptive.

Cortright summarized the new draft rule language describing the preferred land use and transportation scenario. The committee discussed the performance measures and targets in section (3)(e). Some members wondered how the performance measures relate to the evaluation criteria. There was some discussion about adding a criterion about Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The RAC did not come to a consensus.

Cortright moved on to summarizing Section (4) under Cooperative Selection.

The Committee moved on to discussing **Adoption of Regional Plans to Implement the Preferred Scenario**. There was some concern again about how prescriptive the draft rule text is, particularly under section (4)(5). There was concern about crafting minimum standards for local jurisdictions where the details of the preferred scenario are not yet available.

Cortright reviewed the **Commission Review of Regional Plans**, which has gone largely unchanged in the draft.

The Committee moved on to review of **Adoption of Local Plans to Implement the Preferred Scenario**. It was clarified that Metro will set the implementation standards for local governments, and LCDC will review Metro's progress in implementing the preferred scenario on a region-wide basis. There was some discussion of how to make sure changes are front-loaded in the process appropriately.

The Committee moved on to review of the **Monitoring** and **Update** portions of the draft rule. The draft rule now includes a provision for Metro to request an extension of up to 2 years to prepare an updated scenario in order to coordinate with other planning processes.

The Committee went into a **break** from 3:00pm to 3:12pm.

Chair Lidz summarized the earlier discussion by noting there was general agreement among the committee to keep the rule straightforward and free of over detailed prescriptive measures in several locations.

Chair Lidz had each member of the RAC state if they had read the **Draft Statement of Need and Fiscal Impact, Housing Cost Impact Statement**, and give a quick summary of their thoughts about the rule discussion. There was a lot of concern about making too many assumptions in both the draft impact statements and rule without knowing enough about the outcomes of the planning processes.

Chair Lidz left the meeting at 3:34pm during the members' discussion.

Bob Cortright thanked the committee and asked for further comments to be sent to him. The next meeting will be held on Monday, May 21. The next meeting is planned to be the final RAC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54pm.