



Clackamas
County
Coordinating
Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities, and Special Districts

C4 Metro Subcommittee Agenda

**Wednesday, February 15, 2017
7:30 AM – 9:00 AM**

Clackamas County Development Services Building
Room 120
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

- 7:30 a.m. Welcome & Introductions**
- 7:35 a.m. JPACT/MPAC Selections for cities**
- 7:55 a.m. C4 Bylaws**
- *Discussion Specific to C4 Metro Subcommittee*
- 8:20 a.m. JPACT Issues**
- *RFFA: Cleveland Street or Division Street*
- 8:40 a.m. MPAC Issues**
- *Urban Growth Management Task Force Recommendations*
- 9:00 a.m. Adjourn**

Attachments:	JPACT/MPAC Work Programs	Page 02
	JPACT/MPAC Nominations Memo	Page 04
	Letter from JPACT Chair Dirksen	Page 07
	Urban Growth Management Task Force Memo	Page 09

For additional information, contact Karen Buehrig at karenb@clackamas.us or 503-742-4683.

2017 JPACT Work Program

As of 2/7/17

*Items in italics are tentative; **bold** denotes required items*

<u>February 16, 2017</u>	<u>March 16, 2017</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • Resolution No. 17-4766, For the Purpose of Amending the 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Include TriMet's New Open Trip Planner and Low or No Emission (Low-No) Bus Program Projects (consent) – Recommendation • JPACT Finance Subcommittee Recap (10 min) • 2018 RTP Update: Building the RTP Investment Strategy – Information/Discussion (Frisbee/Ellis, Metro; 30 min) • Discussion and Determination of RFFA Project (Cleveland St. or Division St.) (Kaempff/Leybold, Metro; 30 min)- Recommendation • Resolution No. 17-4772, For the Purpose of Endorsing Regional Policy and Funding Priorities for 2017 State Transportation Legislation (Noah Siegel, Metro; 10 min) – Recommendation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • Resolution No. 17-4774, <i>For the Purpose of Amending the 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Provide Significant and Required Funding Adjustments Involving ODOT, Portland, and Metro Projects (consent) – Recommendation</i> • MPO Federal Grant Endorsement Policy – Information/Discussion (Ted Leybold, Metro; 10 min) • Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2017-2018 – Information/Discussion (Chris Myers, Metro; 15 min) • 2018 RTP Update: Vision Zero and Safety Crash Data Analysis – Information/Discussion (Lake McTighe, Metro; 20 min) • Powell-Division Transit LPA and RTP Amendment – Information/Discussion (Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara, Metro; 30 min)
<p><u>Jan. 30, 7:30-9am</u>: JPACT Finance Subcommittee</p> <p><u>Feb. 25 – Mar. 1</u>: National Association of Counties Legislative Conference, Washington, D.C.</p>	<p><u>Mar. 11-15</u>: National League of Cities Conference, Washington, D.C.</p> <p><u>Mar. 26-31</u>: Spring Break</p> <p><u>April 5-6</u>: JPACT D.C. Trip</p>

<p><u>April 20, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2017-2018 – Recommendation (Chris Myers, Metro; 10 min) • 2018 RTP: Regional Transit Vision (Jamie Snook, Metro; 20 min) • 2018 RTP Update: Building the RTP Investment Strategy – Information/Discussion (Ellis, Metro; 30 min) • 2018 RTP: Regional Freight Plan Update (Tim Collins, Metro; 20 min) 	<p><u>May 18, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • Powell-Division Transit LPA and RTP Amendment – Recommendation (Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara, Metro; 30 min) • 2018 RTP Update: Building the RTP Investment Strategy – Recommendation (Ellis, Metro; 30 min)
<p><u>June 15, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • 2018-2021 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) – Information/Discussion (Ted Leybold/Grace Cho, Metro; TBD) 	<p><u>July 20, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • 2018 RTP: Digital Mobility (Frisbee, Metro; TBD) • 2018 RTP: Resilience (Ellis, Metro; TBD) • 2018-2021 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) – Recommendation (Ted Leybold /Grace Cho, Metro; TBD)
<p><u>August 17, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) 	<p><u>September 21, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min)
<p><u>October 19, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) 	<p><u>November 16, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) • 2018 RTP: Investment Strategy Findings and Background on Regional Leadership Forum #4 (Ellis, Metro; TBD)
<p><u>December 21, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair comments TBD (5+ min) 	

RTP Regional Leadership Forums:

- **April 2016:** RTP Regional Leadership Forum #1 (Exploring Big Ideas for Our Transportation Future)

- **September 2016:** RTP Regional Leadership Forum #2 (Building the Future We Want)
- **December 2016:** RTP Regional Leadership Forum #3 (Connecting Our Priorities to Our Vision)
- **December 2017:** RTP Regional Leadership Forum #4 (Drafting Our Shared Plan for the Region)
- **June 2018:** RTP Regional Leadership Forum #5 (Finalizing Our Shared Plan for the Region)

Parking Lot:

- Southwest Corridor Plan
- Land use & transportation connections
- Prioritization of projects/programs
- Westside Freight Study/ITS improvements & funding
- All Roads Safety Program (ODOT)
- Air Quality program status update
- Washington County Transportation Futures Study (TBD)

2017 MPAC Work Program

As of 01/18/17

*Items in italics are tentative; **bold** denotes required items*

<p><u>Wednesday, January 25, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPAC Roles and Responsibilities (Alison Kean, Metro; 10 min) • MPAC's Role in 2017 (Mark Gamba, Chair; 50 min) <p>2017 Metro Legislative Agenda (Andy Shaw, Metro; 15 min)</p>	<p><u>Wednesday, February 8, 2017</u></p>
<p><u>Wednesday, February 22, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>2018 RTP Update: Building the RTP Investment Strategy – Information/Discussion (Ellis, Metro; 45 min)</i> • <i>2018 RTP Update: Vision Zero and Safety Crash Data Analysis – Information/Discussion (Lake McTighe, Metro; 30 min)</i> 	<p><u>Wednesday, March 8, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Powell-Division Transit Locally-Preferred Alternative (LPA) and RTP Amendment – Information/Discussion (TBD, Metro; 40 min)</i> • <i>Urban Growth Management: Summary of Proposed Work Program – Information/Discussion (Ted Reid, Metro; 45 min)</i>
<p><u>Wednesday, March 22, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>2018 RTP: Regional Transit Vision – Information/Discussion (Jamie Snook, Metro; TBD)</i> • <i>2018 RTP: Regional Freight Plan Update – Information/Discussion (Tim Collins, Metro; TBD)</i> 	<p><u>Wednesday, April 12, 2017</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>2018 RTP Update: Building the RTP Investment Strategy – Recommendation (Ellis, Metro; 60 min)</i>
<p><u>Wednesday, April 26, 2017</u></p>	<p><u>Wednesday, May 10, 2017</u></p> <p><i>Powell-Division Transit LPA and RTP Amendment – Recommendation (TBD, Metro; 40 min)</i></p>
<p><u>Wednesday, May 24, 2017</u></p>	<p><u>Wednesday, June 14, 2017</u></p>

<u>Wednesday, June 28, 2017</u>	<u>Wednesday, July 12, 2017</u>
<u>Wednesday, July 26, 2017</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018 RTP: Digital Mobility (Ellis, Metro; TBD) • 2018 RTP: Resilience (Ellis, Metro; TBD) 	<u>Wednesday, August 9, 2017</u>

Upcoming events:

- December 2017: RTP Regional Leadership Forum #4 (Drafting Our Shared Plan for the Region)
- June 2018: RTP Regional Leadership Forum #5 (Finalizing Our Shared Plan for the Region)

Parking Lot:

- Presentation on health & land use featuring local projects from around the region
- Greater Portland, Inc. update
- “Unsettling Profiles” presentation by Coalition of Communities of Color
- Washington County Transportation Futures Study in January or February 2017
- Missing middle housing walking tour with Eli Spevak
- System development charges (SDCs)
- City of Portland inclusionary housing
- November 2017: 2018 RTP, Analysis Findings and Background on Regional Leadership Forum #4

Fellow JPACT members—

As you will recall, at our January 19th meeting, JPACT discussed and approved a slate of projects for Regional Flexible Funds. However, we decided to delay approval of the project submitted by the City of Gresham in response to requests from members to review more information about the project in advance of a decision. **We will be discussing and voting on which Gresham project to approve for funding at our February 16 meeting and this email is intended to provide background information in advance of that decision in response to the request from JPACT.**

The City of Gresham submitted two projects for RFFA funding—the Complete Division Street and the Complete Cleveland Street projects. After considering both projects, TPAC’s recommendation included funding for the City of Gresham’s Complete Cleveland Street Project. But TPAC indicated that JPACT, as part of its deliberations on the RFFA recommendations, should discuss the option of funding the Complete Division Street Project in place of the Cleveland Street project at an identical funding level.

See below for more information about the two projects. You can also find the project applications on the Metro website at this link, <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/regional-flexible-funding-transportation-projects/proposed-projects>.

Complete Division Street – This project will fill part of the only remaining stretch of Southeast Division Street that does not have any sidewalks by adding bicycle facilities, sidewalks, utility obstruction relocation and ADA compliant intersection improvements between Birdsdale Avenue and Wallula Avenue. Division Street is a regionally significant five-lane major arterial and critical transit route, hosting the region’s busiest bus line (Line 4) with nearly 10,000 riders per day, and an auto traffic count of over 23,000 vehicles per day. Division Street is one of the region’s deadliest high crash corridors and there is no known alternative funding for this stretch of the sidewalks at this time.

During the discussion at our last meeting, JPACT members noted the importance of the Division Street improvements to increasing safety for pedestrians, augmenting the \$100 million contribution of Federal Small Starts grant to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, and ensuring complete pedestrian facilities throughout the planned BRT route. In addition, before our January JPACT meeting, a group of community organizations submitted a letter of support for the Division Street project, citing concerns about safety and the importance of using this project to support Division BRT.

Complete Cleveland Street - This project will bring Cleveland Avenue, a minor arterial in Gresham’s center, to urban standards by constructing continuous bike lanes, sidewalks, curbs and gutters between SE Stark Street and NE Burnside Road. This is the second and final phase of this project. The average auto daily trips along Cleveland Ave are between 4,000 and 7,000 daily and there is no transit service.

The East Multnomah County Transportation Committee voiced unanimous support for this project, citing its importance in providing a more direct and safer multimodal link between Gresham’s Regional Center and the Gresham Vista Business Park.

If you would like more information on these projects, please contact Dan Kaempff at 503-797-7559, Daniel.kaempff@oregonmetro.gov.

I appreciate your careful consideration and leadership as we work to maximize our limited transportation dollars to create meaningful outcomes for our region.

Regards,

Craig

Memo



Date: January 25, 2017
To: Metro Technical Advisory Committee
From: Ted Reid, Principal Regional Planner
Subject: Urban Growth Readiness Task Force recommendations: Metro code amendments

NOTE – This is an updated version of the memo that was included in MTAC’s December 7, 2016 meeting packet that reflects MTAC’s discussion. MTAC discussion notes are in the margins. Proposed code language deletions are shown as ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are shown as underline.

Background on the Urban Growth Readiness Task Force

As part of its 2015 urban growth management decision, the Metro Council expressed its intent to work with its partners to explore possible improvements to the region’s urban growth management processes. Specifically, the Metro Council seeks more flexibility to respond to city proposals for modest residential urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions into acknowledged and concept-planned urban reserves. Council President Hughes has convened an Urban Growth Readiness Task Force that has met four times since May to develop recommendations to achieve that flexibility.

Overview of concepts recommended by the Task Force

The Task Force found consensus¹ around three concepts to implement in the nearer term. The Task Force recommends making a fourth concept (UGB exchanges) a longer-term discussion item. The three recommended concepts are generally described as follows:

1. Clarify expectations for cities proposing modest residential UGB expansions
The Task Force has recommended that cities that propose residential UGB expansions should make the case that they are implementing best practices for providing needed housing in their existing urban areas as well as in the proposed expansion area. The Task Force has recommended that staff continue to work with MTAC to achieve a balance between certainty and flexibility in proposed Metro code amendments.
2. Seek greater flexibility for determining regional housing needs
The Task Force has recommended pursuing changes to state law and Metro code to allow for a mid-cycle growth management decision process that would be capped at a total of 1,000 gross acres of expansion per mid-cycle decision. The Task Force also recommended that mid-cycle decisions be

¹The Task Force agreed that “consensus” meant they could all live with the recommendations even if they may individually prefer something different.

made three years after the completion of a decision under the standard six-year cycle (one mid-cycle decision per six-year cycle).

Seek greater flexibility when choosing among urban reserves for UGB expansion

The Task Force has recommended that the Council have the flexibility to choose among the urban reserves being proposed for expansion by cities rather than being required to assess all urban reserves. This would require changes to state law and Metro’s code. The Task Force further recommends that this flexibility be limited to mid-cycle decisions.

MTAC advice sought

For now, staff seeks MTAC’s assistance in developing code language to address Concept One (Clarify expectations for cities proposing residential UGB expansions). Concepts Two and Three require changes to state law. Staff anticipates returning to MTAC at a later date to discuss how to synchronize Metro code with any amendments to state law. Staff expects that all proposed amendments to Metro code that implement the three concepts will be considered by the Metro Council – with MTAC and MPAC’s advice – during the fall of 2017.

Title 11 (Planning for New Urban Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional plan provides guidance for cities developing concept plans for urban reserves. MTAC has previously indicated that existing Title 11 requirements are adequate for providing guidance regarding these concept plans. Consequently the primary focus of MTAC’s work to address Concept One will be to clarify expectations that speak to citywide actions (not just in the proposed UGB expansion area). These expectations would be included in amendments to Title 14 (Urban Growth Boundaries) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and would apply to all city proposals for residential UGB expansions.

MTAC has previously discussed possible Metro code amendments to address Concept One. In those discussions, MTAC members and Metro staff preliminarily identified actions and conditions – listed below – that cities should demonstrate when requesting residential UGB expansions. Those suggestions echo the themes expressed by the Metro Council and the Task Force.

MTAC members also expressed a desire for the Task Force to clarify whether code amendments should emphasize certainty or flexibility with several MTAC members expressing the view that more specificity (certainty) was needed. The Task Force has subsequently responded that code amendments should strive for a balance. Staff seeks MTAC’s advice on how best to achieve the Task Force’s request for a balance of certainty and flexibility in these requirements. To achieve more balance, staff believes that MTAC should focus its effort on proposing ways to lend greater specificity to these requirements, particularly items C, D, E and F (staff’s sense is that it is more evident how a city would address items A and B):

- (A) The city has an ~~acknowledged~~ housing needs analysis ~~that is consistent with under~~ Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing), that ~~was completed in the last six years, and that~~ is coordinated with Metro’s most recent forecast; and
- (B) ~~The city is in compliance with the state’s Metropolitan Housing Rule regarding densities and the mix of housing; and~~

Comment [TR1]: MTAC felt that items A and B should also be discussed, as reflected below.

Comment [TR2]: MTAC suggested dropping the word “acknowledged” to recognize that cities typically only seek state acknowledgement of a housing needs analysis if they were updating their comprehensive plan.

Comment [TR3]: MTAC suggested the six-year requirement to ensure that analyses are reasonably up to date, but to also recognize that conducting these analyses requires resources, so the requirement shouldn’t be overly stringent. MTAC landed on six years as a reasonable timeframe that is consistent with Metro’s requirement to conduct a new urban growth report analysis at least every six years. This helps to ensure that city analyses are consistent with recent Metro forecasts.

Comment [TR4]: MTAC suggested that this clause is unnecessary. If a city has a current and complete housing needs analysis, it will show that the city is in compliance with the Metropolitan Housing Rule.

- (C) The housing planned for the expansion area would be likely to be built in fewer than 20 years. Cities shall demonstrate this through completion of a concept plan that is consistent with Title 11 of Chapter 3.07 of the Metro Code and by providing a letter of intent signed by the property owners of at least 75% of the land area proposed for the UGB expansion. The letter of intent shall, at a minimum, indicate support for the expansion and concept plan. To show additional property owner support, the letter may also, for example, indicate a willingness to assemble properties or to allow access for infrastructure provision; and
- (D) The city is making progress towards the actions described in section 3.07.620²; and
- (E) The city has implemented best practices for increasing the supply and diversity of affordable housing such as regulatory approaches, public investments, incentives, partnerships, and streamlining of permitting processes; and
- (F) The city has taken actions in its existing jurisdiction as well as in the proposed expansion area that will advance Metro's six desired outcomes set forth in Chapter One of the Regional Framework Plan; and
- (G) The UGB expansion would provide housing of a type, tenure, and price that is likely to reduce spillover growth into neighboring cities outside the Metro UGB.

Comment [TR5]: MTAC suggested using a percentage, but did not specify one. 75% is an initial staff suggestion for further discussion.

Comment [TR6]: MTAC did not get around to proposing language for this section. This is an initial suggestion from staff.

Comment [TR7]: MTAC did not get around to discussing D through G at its December 7, 2016 meeting

² Title 6 is attached to this memo for reference.