



# Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**

Date/time: Wednesday September 21, 2022 | 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual video conference call meeting via Zoom

---

## **Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Carol Chesarek  
Tom Armstrong  
Colin Cooper  
Laura Terway  
Greg Dirks  
Katherine Kelly  
Jamie Stasny  
Chris Deffebach  
Neelam Dorman  
Laura Kelly  
Shelly Parini  
Gery Keck  
Cindy Detchon  
Tom Bouillion  
Tara O'Brien  
Brett Morgan  
Sara Wright  
Rachel Loftin  
Preston Korst

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Multnomah County Citizen Representative  
Largest City in the Region: Portland  
Largest City in Washington County: City of Hillsboro  
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley  
Multnomah County: Other Cities, City of Wood Village  
City of Vancouver  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Department Land Conservation and Development  
Clackamas Water Environmental Services  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
North Clackamas School District  
Portland of Portland  
TriMet  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Environ. Advocacy Org: OR Environmental Council  
Community Partners for Affordable Housing  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland

## **Alternate Members Attending**

Steve Koper  
Kevin Cook  
Sarah Paulus  
Glen Bolen  
Kelly Reid  
Manuel Contreas, Jr.  
Aaron Golub  
Brendon Haggerty  
Ryan Ames

## **Affiliate**

City of Tualatin  
Multnomah County  
Multnomah County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
Clackamas Water Environmental Services  
Portland State University  
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah Co.  
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington Co.

## **Guests Attending**

Andrea (no last name)  
Ben Bortolazzo  
Brian Martin  
Elin Michel-Midelfort  
Elizabeth (no last name)  
Jessica Pelz

## **Affiliate**

City of Beaverton  
  
Washington County

---

John O’Neil  
Julie Gustafson  
Kathleen (no last name) Washington County  
Marc Farrar  
Mary Phillips City of Gresham  
Michelle Miller  
Miranda Bateschell City of Wilsonville  
Schuyler Warren City of Tigard  
Tom McGuire City of Tigard  
One unidentified phone caller

**Metro Staff Attending**

Alex Oreschak, Clint Chiavarini, Eryn Kehe, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Roger Alfred, Ted Reid, Thaya Patton, Tim O’Brien

**Call to Order, Quorum Declaration and Introductions**

Chair Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum was declared. Zoom logistics and meeting features were reviewed for online raised hands, renaming yourself, finding attendees and participants, and chat area for messaging and sharing links.

**Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

- **Updates from committee members around the Region** (all) none
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The report noted in August, four people died in traffic crashes in in the region, all in Multnomah County. So far this year, at least 73 people have died in traffic crashes. Thirty-seven percent of the traffic deaths were pedestrians. These reports help acknowledge the severity of fatal crashes and the work yet to be done to bring about our Goal of Vision Zero. Chair Kloster noted the upcoming JPACT/Metro Council workshop on Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials that will address this issue.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** - none

**Consideration of MTAC minutes July 20, 2022 meeting**

**MOTION: To approve minutes from July 20, 2022 meeting**

Moved: Colin Cooper

Seconded: Carol Chesarek

**ACTION: Motion passed with one abstention: Neelam Dorman**

**Tigard Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) exchange** (Ted Reid & Tim O’Brien, Metro) Background and overview of the proposed land exchange was provided. The UGB exchange process, while already enabled under state law, has not been used in the Metro region. It would entail adding the River Terrace 2.0 area to the UGB and removing a comparable amount of buildable land elsewhere in the region. This approach is consistent with Metro’s focus on city readiness in its growth management decisions. It recognizes that Tigard is ready for growth while some other areas that were added to the UGB in the past have not resulted in housing and may not for decades to come. Ultimately, adding land to the UGB can only help us address our housing shortage if it develops in a thoughtful, predictable

way. Tigard has demonstrated that it is ready to develop River Terrace with a mix of middle housing types that makes efficient use of land.

The UGB exchange process is codified in Oregon Administrative Rule Chapter 660, Division 24. Specifically, OAR 660-024-0070 provides the requirements for exchanging land inside the UGB for land outside the UGB. A local government may remove land from a UGB provided it determines:

- a) The removal of land would not violate applicable statewide planning goals and rules;
- b) The UGB would provide roughly the same supply of buildable land after the exchange;
- c) Existing public facilities agreements do not provide for urban services in the area to be removed from the UGB, unless the public facilities provider agrees to removal and concurrent modification of the agreement;
- d) Removal of the land does not preclude the efficient provision of urban services to any other buildable land that remains inside the UGB; and
- e) The land removed from the UGB is planned and zoned for rural use consistent with all applicable laws.

Metro staff is following a two-step process for determining areas to consider for the UGB exchange. The first step is GIS analysis to identify preliminary exchange candidates and the second step is consultation with local jurisdictions, service districts, and other stakeholders about the planning and development status of exchange candidates to focus on those areas that have not demonstrated a path towards readiness. Areas identified for further consultation and discussion as well as areas identified as no longer under consideration were shown.

Per Metro Council direction, it is staff's intention to provide several possible UGB exchange options for Council consideration. However, it is also necessary to narrow existing options down somewhat to facilitate Council discussions. Staff will present narrowed options in a Chief Operating Officer (COO) recommendation this October and will seek MPAC's endorsement of that recommendation. To get to that COO recommendation, staff is seeking MTAC's advice on considerations that can narrow the exchange options presented in this memo. Suggested considerations are as follows:

#### Planning and infrastructure status

Understanding the planning, infrastructure provision, and development status of candidate areas has been the focus of consultations with local jurisdiction and service district staff this summer. If additional information comes forward, it could be used to remove from consideration areas that may be more ready for development than initially understood or to reinforce our understanding that some areas do not appear ready for development for some time to come.

#### Time in UGB

All the UGB exchange candidate areas that staff recommends for further discussion have been inside the UGB for at least 20 years. Most of these areas were added to the UGB in 2002, but some date back to 1983 and 1979, when the region's UGB was originally adopted. Staff suggests discussing whether areas that have been in the UGB longer, yet remain undeveloped, deserve additional consideration as exchange candidates.

### Parcellation

Some exchange candidate areas consist of large parcels, while others consist of smaller parcels with rural residential development. Existing low-density development may make some areas difficult to urbanize efficiently in the future and, by that measure, may make sense for UGB exchange. On the other hand, it is likely that such areas have property owners that have diverse views on whether they would like their properties considered for exchange.

### Property owner wishes

The Metro Council has the authority to manage the region's urban growth boundary and, while it values the desires of property owners, it is not bound by them and must maintain a regional perspective. On some occasions, the Council's regional perspective has led it to expand the UGB in locations where property owners did not want their properties included in the UGB (while others did). Similarly, in this proposed exchange, there will be a mix of viewpoints among property owners whose properties are being considered for removal from the UGB. While it is important to understand the general sentiment of property owners, staff does not recommend only considering areas with property owners that wish to have their land removed from the UGB as doing so would likely result in a piecemeal outcome.

### Number of exchange areas

The quickest way to narrow options down would be to focus on larger contiguous areas. On the other hand, focusing on such areas may deemphasize other considerations that are equally or more important.

### In the UGB for a unique purpose

Some areas were added to the UGB to address a very specific need such as to provide large industrial sites that could be served by specialized infrastructure. Discussions of such areas may be best handled in a more deliberate manner with an updated understanding of whether those unique needs still exist. For instance, such areas may deserve additional discussion as part of the 2024 Urban Growth Report.

### Jurisdiction's position

As with property owners, some jurisdictions may be open to having lands removed from the UGB in their jurisdiction (as with counties) or in their vicinity (as with cities that have not yet annexed areas). While the approval of local jurisdictions or service districts is not required, their interests are worth considering.

### Comments from the committee:

- Colin Cooper noted an update in Hillsboro, Jackson East area previously reported that was in the process of having their comprehensive plan designated for industrial land. This has continued to its conclusion with no appeals filed. Property owners have agreed with this parcellation. Referring to OAR 660-024-0070, the element of land removed from UGB as planned with all applicable laws, it was asked how Metro staff was looking at this regarding future development providing taxes through urbanization. Ted Reid affirmed the sections in Hillsboro in the land exchange in some areas where urbanization is being considered. It was

noted that part of the process identifies unincorporated areas within a mile of the UGB. Areas on the map shown are options that still have rural zoning.

- Carol Chesarek noted the memo did not describe the different areas under consideration with size of land removal. It was asked to expand on the pros and cons of trade out areas divided into 2 or 3 different areas in regard to different jurisdictions that could make this complicated in terms of logistical work and potential legal issues. Mr. Reid noted there are a number of options on the map shown where the full 350 buildable land acres were not possible for dividing. Limited areas where one identified area might be handled this way was noted in the former Damascus area because of the larger size area.
- Chris Deffebach noted that for those unfamiliar with the process with UGB, in Washington County per Metro requirements land in the UGB is protected for future development with applicable rules. Some areas zoned for future development may also be planned with future infrastructure such as sewer or electrical lines.
- Kevin Cook asked for clarification on rural and urban reserves. Mr. Reid noted Metro's goal is to put any areas removed from the Urban Growth Boundary into urban reserve areas because we need to look at these areas first when extending the urban development areas. Metro's legal staff are sorting out the steps and process with this now.
- Steve Koper noted these considerations make good sense and appreciated the work done by staff.
- Katherine Kelly agreed that the considerations were well thought out. It was noted it appeared from the slides part of the exchange areas extended into Washington state. Mr. Reid assured the areas are all located in the state of Oregon, with the software program sometimes extending circles wider in slides.
- Shelly Parini asked if the meeting later today with the Clackamas County Board would be the same. Mr. Reid noted some of Metro staff from Government Affairs and planning would be attending with more context around the process rather than the technical aspect.

Mr. Reid concluded the presentation noting further comments could be sent to him directly. Next steps include considerations presented at MPAC Sept. 28, working toward the Metro COO recommendation this fall and Council decision early 2023.

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Pricing Policy Development** (Alex Oreschak, Metro) Mr. Oreschak provided background information on the Regional Congestion Pricing Study initiated in summer of 2019, and resulted in a Metro Council resolution to accept the findings and recommendations in the final report, and directed staff to incorporate the findings and recommendations from the study in the 2023 RTP update and use them to inform the 2023 RTP update.

Mr. Oreschak noted the new introduction sections:

- Types of pricing, what jurisdictions might implement
- Why is pricing important?
- Benefits to freight and businesses
- Revenue reinvestment
- Constitutional restrictions
- Other state and regional pricing work

- Federal pricing programs
- Regional Congestion Pricing Study summary

Revised draft RTP pricing policies (the first 6 policies) were reviewed. These included:

**Policy 1 Mobility:** Improve reliability and efficiency of the transportation network, reduce VMT per capita, and increase transportation options through congestion management, investments in transit, bike, and pedestrian improvements, and transportation demand management programs.

**Policy 2 Equity:** Center equity and affordability into pricing programs and projects from the outset.

**Policy 3 Safety:** Address traffic safety and the safety of users of all modes, both on the priced system and in areas affected by diversion.

**Policy 4 Diversion:** Minimize diversion impacts created by pricing programs and projects prior to implementation and throughout the life of the pricing program or project.

**Policy 5 Climate:** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travelled per capita while increasing access to low-carbon travel options.

**Policy 6 Technology and User Experience:**

Coordinate technologies and pricing programs and projects to make pricing a low-barrier, seamless experience for everyone who uses the transportation system and to reduce administrative burdens.

Continuing work on RTP policies includes policy background/context and connection to the RCPS and the action items, clarification on how policies and actions relate to RTP goals and objectives, how different pricing projects can be regionally coordinated, and continue coordination with OHP amendment. Staff will update policies and incorporate into RTP chapter updates with the chapter updates planned to be released in late winter or early spring.

Comments from the committee:

- Glen Bolen noted not a lot in the policies regarding tolling revenue with operations and maintenance. This is still being developed. It was noted many obstacles are tied together between policies and objectives to achieve goals, which include increasing capita, increasing options, reducing congestion and raising revenue.

It was noted that a segment in Policy 12 was stricken out “before adding capacity beyond the planned system”. The logical connections with the OHP amendment are looking at tolling before adding capacity. Land use planners typically use the transportation rule in the system to justify land use changes. ODOT will require capacity during the lifetime of the plan and will need land use plans fully developed. DLCD, ODOT and Metro are working together on this issue.

- Sara Wright appreciated the work done. It was noted goals to prioritize and process work moving forward. The reconciliation with ODOT on OHP amendment will be critical and looked forward to these updates reported on.
- Chris Deffebach noted pricing and the goal to raise revenue not mentioned in the policies. With tolling, parking charges and user fees among revenue discussions currently, was there a reason pricing was left out? Mr. Oreschak noted lack of results to use in updating the policy,

and the timing of RTP goals, as well as noting the study was started without work on revenues as part of the study findings. More on this is working its way through the process.

- Tara O'Brien agreed on the previous comments that are significant issues to continue work on, reconciling pricing assumptions to revenue and RTP policies. It was noted there are many goals we want to see in the policy implementations and how they align with tolling projects underway now. Are these too challenging to be implemented because of the many issues we are hoping these policies support? Interest was shared with ongoing discussions.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:19 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting September 21, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	9/21/2022	9/21/2022 MTAC Meeting Agenda	092122M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	9/8/2022	MTAC Work Program as of 9/8/2022	092122M-02
3	Memo	8/25/2022	TO: MTAC members and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: July 2022 Report - Traffic Deaths in the three counties	092122M-03
4	Slide	9/1/2022	August traffic death report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	092122M-04
5	Minutes	7/20/2022	Draft minutes from July 21, 2022 MTAC meeting	092122M-05
6	Memo	9/14/2022	TO: MTAC members and interested parties From: Ted Reid and Tim O'Brien, Metro Principal Regional Planners RE: River Terrace 2.0 UGB exchange: preliminary UGB exchange options	092122M-06
7	Memo	9/14/2022	TO: MTAC members and interested parties From: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Brief –Pricing Policy Development	092122M-07
8	Attachment 1	August 2022	Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Draft Pricing Policy, Policy Actions, Definitions, Background & Context	092122M-08
9	Attachment 2	August 2022	Feedback from July 2022 TPAC Meeting	092122M-09
10	Attachment 3	August 2022	JPACT & Council Workshop #2 (July 28, 2022) Summary	092122M-10
11	Presentation	9/21/2022	Tigard UGB Exchange Metro Technical Advisory Committee	092122M-11
12	Presentation	9/21/2022	RTP Pricing Policy Development	092122M-12