



CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

Citizens Advisory Committee AGENDA

City Conference Building
223 S. Buxton
Troutdale, OR 97060

Wednesday, April 2, 2014
7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of New Members
3. Approval of Minutes – March 6, 2013
4. Communications from Staff
5. Election of Officers for 2014
6. Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review:
 - Task 6 – Adoption of Coordinated Population and Employment Projections
7. Adjourn

*This meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities.
A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to Craig Ward, 503-849-1483 or by email to craig.ward@troutdaleoregon.gov.*

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

223 Buxton

Troutdale, OR 97060

Wednesday, March 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Members Present: Charlie Foss, Zach Hudson, Jan White, Jon Lowell, Carl Tebbens, Nancy Nichols, Cynthia Walston and Victoria Rizzo

Members Absent: Ida Wells, Stayce Blume

Staff: Rich Faith, Community Development Director

Guests: Matt Bell, Kittelson & Associates
Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group

1. **Call to Order.** Rich Faith called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.
2. **Introduction of New Members.** Each committee member introduced themselves.
3. **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2013.** Rich explained the nomination and voting procedure at the first meeting of each year and the basic duties of the Chair and Vice-Chair, and he opened the nominations.

Nominations for Chair

Zach Hudson

Nominated by

Carl Tebbens

Seconded by

Jan White

There were no further nominations for Chair; the nominations were closed.

Zach Hudson was unanimously elected Chair for 2013.

Nominations for Vice-Chair

Carl Tebbens

Nominated by

Jan White

Seconded by

Zach Hudson

There were no further nominations for Vice-Chair; the nominations were closed.

Carl Tebbens was unanimously elected Vice-Chair for 2013.

At this point, Chair Hudson presided over the meeting.

4. **Approval of Minutes.** Carl Tebbens asked that a comment he made regarding a crosswalk be included in the minutes. **Jan White seconded Carl's amendment. The amendment was approved unanimously.** On p. 3, the following sentence was added to the fifth paragraph: *Carl suggested reviewing a painted crosswalk across Cherry Park Road and Hensley Road.*

There was no motion to approve the minutes as amended; however, the amended minutes of February 6, 2013 were unanimously approved.

5. Communications from Staff.

Rich reported that the Community Garden is up and running this year; Michael McRae has signed the Garden Manager agreement. Michael mentioned to Rich that he hopes to get a garden clean-up party together, made up of the gardeners. On the first day open to registrations last week, there were quite a number of them. Jan said the garden is shown on the front page of the Champion this month.

Last month Rich mentioned that the City Council is considering a new ordinance called the Unsafe Building Ordinance; they held a work session on it about a month ago and are now ready to conduct a public hearing and hear testimony. It will be heard at next week's Council meeting, Tuesday, March 12, 2013. If anyone here has interest, you might want to attend that meeting, he added. A copy of the draft ordinance can be obtained from the City Recorder.

Rich explained more of what the ordinance addresses, i.e., buildings that have become structurally derelict and pose a safety risk; this is an attempt to try to get these buildings cleaned up and up to code.

Carl asked what, if anything, had happened regarding the City Hall Review Committee. Rich said he did not know but he believes it is still up for discussion at the Council level. There still are some varying opinions on whether there is a need for this committee.

6. Periodic Review - Task 6

• Goal 14 - Urbanization

Rich said he thought that in conjunction with periodic review it would be appropriate for this committee to look at other sections of our Comprehensive Plan that are not required in periodic review. The goal would be to update the entire Comprehensive Plan, not just those chapters that are required as part of periodic review. There are certain plan goals or chapters that we must address with periodic review and there are others that may be appropriate but not necessarily required. He previously had brought a few different chapters with draft amendments forward for the CAC to review, and there was discussion on the narratives for those chapters as well as the goals and policies, and the CAC signed off on a number of those. The City Council, when a few of those were brought before them, said they did not see any need to address anything that is not a periodic review requirement. Even though our intentions were good, Rich said, in their minds if it is not required in periodic review then why fix it.

So that effort was stopped except for *Goal 14 - Urbanization*, which is one that we have to address in our periodic review work program. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), the State agency that oversees state land use planning and the whole periodic review process, has informed us and other local governments in the Portland metropolitan area that if we are going through periodic review then we have to

adopt the population forecast that Metro has generated. Metro has recently done this under a different statutory requirement, and so we must now adopt the population forecast for Troutdale to be consistent with the Metro area local governments' population numbers that are being used for planning purposes.

Metro adopted the population forecasts last Fall and allocated them amongst each of the cities. To satisfy the requirement in our periodic review work program we are required to adopt these into our comprehensive plan. Rich called attention to the document he provided with new text highlighted in gray; that text is the only part he is asking this committee to review and approve if they are comfortable moving this forward to the Planning Commission where they will conduct a public hearing to move them forward with their recommendation for Council action. Everything else technically has already passed the CAC's approval. (Only the text highlighted in gray is different from what the committee reviewed in November 2011.)

There were questions and discussion about the 20-year population forecast, as well as about the undesignated 186 acres immediately south of the city and urban reserves.

Jan White moved, with a second by Carl Tebbens, to approve Goal 14 as written to forward to the Planning Commission for their review. There was no discussion on the motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

7. **Transportation System Plan Update - Review of Troutdale Development Code Amendments.** Chair Hudson said the committee looked at this at their last meeting and had a good discussion about it, so it was decided to continue the discussion at this meeting. Rich asked the consultants if any follow-up was necessary based on that discussion; they said there is not.

Rich explained that this update must be addressed in order to complete the work on the Transportation System Plan (TSP), one of the requirements under periodic review that the State says we must look at and evaluate to make sure it is in compliance with all State and regional requirements. Related to that are amendments to our Troutdale Development Code (TDC) which tie in with transportation; our consultants have looked at our current TDC and evaluated it against requirements that have come out of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), a State Administrative Rule, as well as Metro's Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). These are all regulatory documents that the City must bring its code into compliance with, so the consultants have determined where we are deficient, where we have gaps in our current codes in terms of compliance with these requirements, and they have proposed changes to our code that they feel are necessary.

Since the last meeting, Rich said he made a few edits to the amendments proposed then. He said he believes the consultants are comfortable for the most part with these changes, so now it is really down to asking the committee to give it one more review to make sure they all are comfortable with the proposal with the knowledge that these will go through the adoption process. It is a lengthy process but these are the steps we need to follow.

Darci said she and Matt Bell have worked closely with Rich to make sure these proposed changes meet Troutdale's needs as well as those of the State and Metro. On the comments received here last month, Darci said they have received comments and feedback back from both the State and Metro reviewers on how to improve the language with just a few tweaks and with relatively minor amendments which she will point out. Troutdale's code is in good shape, she said, and what we are doing is refining it and bringing it up to date. A lot of the changes for consistency have to do with multi-modal travel and some new language about utilizing Troutdale's urban areas wisely. We are also trying to update procedures so that they are consistent with State requirements, and she summarized what was discussed at the February committee meeting on these amendments/updates.

A committee member said he assumed the updates would apply to any new building or major renovations and not to existing buildings. Rich agreed and said we cannot retroactively require someone not currently in compliance to comply with new amendments. At the time anyone wants to make any future significant modification to their site or a new development, then these standards would apply.

Rich also commented on off-street parking and loading, for clarification. The issue of parking requirements for multi-family is one we have quite a history of here and he explained the current standard for the minimum parking spaces and that a development can put in more parking if they want but customarily do not because of the cost. The minimum is an important standard.

We are proposing lowering the parking ratio. He said the expectation is that those standards will even apply to duplexes and triplexes; however, he recommends that duplexes and triplexes remain at two-parking spaces per unit as opposed to lowering that based upon the number of bedrooms. He pointed out that this is a judgment call as to whether or not this will pose problems. If the committee feels the number of bedrooms is a determinant of how many vehicles the occupants of that unit will have, and how many parking spaces there ought to be, then no change may be needed.

Another thing Rich pointed out in the proposed amendments was the notion of giving credit for on-street parking that may be near a development. We currently do not recognize on-street parking as fulfilling the off-street parking requirement; under our code they are two completely different things. The new language shows that if there is on-street parking immediately adjacent to either an apartment complex or a commercial or industrial development, a developer could get credit for that as meeting part of the parking needs. This is a new concept so he proposed a conservative credit for on-street parking. Our current code for parallel parking on the street is 22 feet in length to maneuver in and out of an on-street parking space. To be consistent with that standard, this amendment would also require 22 feet of continuous parallel on-street parking to calculate a credit towards the requirement for off-street parking. He asked the committee to take into account adjustments for things such as driveways, fire hydrants, etc., for which credit should not be given. The intent of this provision is to comply with the TPR and Metro's RTFP.

The Long-Term Bicycle Parking Requirement and the distinction between short-term and long-term bicycle parking is new. We have had requirements in the code for providing bicycle parking since about 1996, and it seemed appropriate that we make accommodation for bicycle parking in our attempt to accommodate all modes of transportation, but we never distinguished between short- and long-term bike parking and what percentage of each we need to provide. These will add costs and make projects marginally less feasible to construct.

There was discussion and questions on short- and long-term bike parking for small businesses and those businesses who do not provide parking for their use only, and the percentages per business of short- and long-term bicycle parking. Darci said the language might be more easily understood if it were revised, and that was agreed. She said she will rethink it to clarify it. Carl asked where the percentages (5% and 3%) came from; Rich quoted from Metro's RFTP but it does not state a percentage. Carl said most developers go with the minimum, and it would be up to the City how much they wanted to enforce the minimum standard. Rich said the 5% short-term standard is based on the current standard in our code that the number of bicycle parking spaces be 5% of the number of vehicle parking spaces.

There was discussion about covered bike racks or lockable bike storage, and the difference between, say, three hours to park one's bike versus 45 minutes. Jon Lowell asked why there is nothing about handicapped parking in these code amendments. Rich said our development code already requires that handicap parking be provided in conformance with the Structural Specialty Code. No one could build a parking facility without meeting the requirements for handicapped parking.

Next, the committee discussed exceptions for "in-street loading areas." We currently do not permit delivery vehicles to park on public streets in order to supply businesses, although we know it goes on in the downtown. This amendment proposes that deliveries in the central business district zone be permitted to load and unload their wares from vehicles parked on the street. Rich acknowledged that it is unclear how this would be administered. This is specific to the downtown business district, Carl added, and Rich agreed that it would not apply anywhere else in the city.

Responding to a question from Charlie Foss, Rich explained that when this goes before the Planning Commission, staff will develop a staff report which will explain the process and will be clear on what has happened, what is happening, and what this committee's recommendation is.

Carl suggested adding lighting, signage, signalization to the various improvements as these are a big part of roadways and streets. Rich said that was a good catch and agreed they should be added to that section for clarification.

Jan White moved, with a second by Charles Foss, to accept the Troutdale Development Code amendments, as amended in discussion, and forward them to the

Planning Commission for their review. There was no discussion; the motion was approved unanimously.

- 7a. Committee Concerns and Initiatives.** Jan noted that this agenda topic was missing this week, and Carl explained to the new members that this is offered to the committee each month for them to bring forward for discussion anything that is of concern to them or issues they might want to pursue. Chair Hudson said this was a good time to bring up the current nominations for the Troutdale Citizen of the Year and Troutdale Youth of the Year; the nominations are currently open up until May 31 and that the forms are available on the West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce website.
- 8. Adjourn.** It was moved, and seconded by Jan White, to adjourn. There was no discussion and the meeting adjourned.

Zach Hudson, Chair



CITY OF TROUTDALE

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT

Periodic Review Task 6

Text Amendments to Goal 14 Urbanization including adoption of updated Population and Employment Projections

FILE NUMBER: 08-071F

MEETING DATE: April 2, 2014

STAFF CONTACT: John Morgan, Planning Consultant

APPLICANT: City of Troutdale

PROJECT NAME: Complete Periodic Review Task 6

SUMMARY: Adopt updated and revised Urbanization Policies along with updated Population and Employment Projections relating to Statewide Land Use Goal 13 (Urbanization) in fulfillment of Task 6 of the City's Periodic Review Work Program

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Draft Language for updated Goal 14 narrative and policies of the Troutdale Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Updated Population and Employment Projections

BACKGROUND

The City has been in periodic review since the initial notification from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on May 20, 2008. Its approved periodic review work program governs the tasks that the City must complete as part of periodic review. DLCD approved the City's work program on April 15, 2010. The approved work program includes tasks related to statewide planning Goal 13, Urbanization. Specifically identified as Task 6 of the work program, the City is required to complete the following tasks:

Periodic Review Task 6 – Population Forecast and Coordination with Metro

As a final task, the city will coordinate with Metro to the extent necessary to obtain an allocation of both projected new jobs and dwelling units that are expected to be accommodated within the city limits. Once available, both twenty-year forecasts for employment and residential uses shall be "point" forecasts, that is, an absolute number as contrasted with a range forecast.

Products:

- Adopt the final Metro Population Forecast allocated to Troutdale in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Adopt new or revised Goal 14 plan policies, maps, and land use regulations as needed.

Draft Urbanization Section language is attached. This language includes a new section describing the Population forecast purpose and process.

The language also includes a new policy that declares it to be the City policy to use the Metro 2035 forecasted population and employment numbers for planning purposes.

A compilation of those projections is attached. While not included in the Metro publication of the forecast, the attached compilation of the projections includes data that helps put the projections in context, and provides valuable insight into the projected future of Troutdale. It includes these four elements:

- The population and employment forecasts
- A separate housing forecast, by type
- For comparison sake, the same projections for the adjacent cities; Gresham, Fairview, and Wood Village
- Growth and growth rate percentages over the planning period

The rate information helps point out some of the growth potential and characteristics of Troutdale. The modeling shows an average annual growth rate of 0.3%. Fairview with little land

to support growth is only 0.1% while Wood Village and Gresham both grow more than twice as fast as Troutdale at 0.7%.

The housing data shows Troutdale growing with a marginally higher growth rate for multi-family over single family. But the housing growth is very small compared with Gresham where multi-family units will be created at twice the rate as single-family homes and an overall housing unit increase of 34% compared to Troutdale's 15%.

The forecasting shows a 143% increase in employment over the planning period, which is attributed to the north side industrial lands. Fairview also has a large percentage increase while Wood Village is less and Gresham is substantially less.

It appears Troutdale will be creating the bulk of the jobs for the east-side cities and Gresham will be creating the housing.

NEEDED ACTION:

The CAC is asked to review this amendment package for the Urbanization section of the Comprehensive Plan and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission on its adoption or adoption with amendments.

The Planning Commission will review the proposals and will hold a public hearing before developing a recommendation to the City Council. The Council will also hold a public hearing and then, if approved, adopted the proposed changes by ordinance.

When making a decision on this matter the Planning Commission and Council will be using the criteria from the Development Code to guide their decision-making. Those criterion are quoted below along with brief findings for each.

Section 15.050 of the Troutdale Development Code establishes the following approval criteria for evaluating comprehensive plan amendments.

1. *For Comprehensive Plan text amendments, compliance with the Statewide Land Use goals and related Administrative Rules.*

Adoption of an updated Urbanization Chapter with updated population and employment forecasts is a required task of the City's periodic review work program. The document has been prepared in accordance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14; therefore, it logically and necessarily satisfies this approval criterion.

2. *Public need is best satisfied by this particular change.*

Public need is best satisfied by the recommended changes. The updated population and employment forecasts do not bind the City to any action, but provide a predictive framework important to making future planning actions.

3. *The change will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the community.*

Adoption of this Plan amendment provides further guidance for the City to accommodate future growth and will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the community. The Plan addresses current conditions and future needs in order to foster positive benefits for the community.

4. *In the case of Development Code amendments, the particular change does not conflict with applicable comprehensive plan goals or policies.*

The proposed Plan pertains only to the Comprehensive Plan and not to the Troutdale Development Code; therefore, this criterion does not apply.

RECOMMENDATION:

This proposed update to the Urbanization Section of the Comprehensive Plan along with the population and employment forecasts has been developed to satisfy a required task of the City's periodic review work program, and to provide a needed planning tool for the Community.

Staff recommends the Citizens Advisory Committee forward the proposed Plan amendment to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for approval.

GOAL 14 - URBANIZATION

The City of Troutdale's policy is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use and to provide urban services ultimately from Strebin Road to the Columbia River.

TRANSITIONS

The City has signed an Urban Planning Area Agreement (UP AA) with Multnomah County. The City has agreed to provide certain services and coordination of planning for areas north and south of Troutdale which are presently outside the City limits but within the Urban Growth Boundary. The agreement has been in effect since 1979.

CITY BOUNDARIES

The City recognizes the existence of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), established by the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) in 1979, and now administered by the Metropolitan Service District (METRO).

The City also recognizes that the UGB does not include lands south of the present City limits where the City has planned for extension of services. The "Strebin Road Study Area - A Comprehensive Plan Supplement" is a report on this area submitted to CRAG in 1979. The Public Facilities Plan also discusses service provision outside the City limits.

To the north of the present City limits, Troutdale intends to eventually annex to the Columbia River within the UP AA and the UGB.

The City recognizes that METRO has established standards and criteria for reviewing requests for amendment to the UGB.

Oregon Land Use Law (ORS 195.025; 195.036) requires Metro to coordinate its regional population forecasts with local governments inside the UGB for use in updating their comprehensive plans, land use regulations, and related policies. Over a two-year period from October 2010 to October 2012, Metro went through a highly technical analysis process to produce twenty-year population and employment forecasts for the entire Portland metropolitan area based upon expected land supply and demand. Using land use and transportation modeling to match demand with supply, the forecast was then distributed between each of the local jurisdictions in the region. Troutdale's official population forecast for the Year 2035 is 17,038 people and its employment forecast is 10,011 jobs.

The Metro Council adopted the regional forecasts in November 2012. The Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission requires every local jurisdiction within the Metro region at the time of periodic review to adopt the final Metro forecast. This ensures consistency by the local jurisdiction when applying population and employment forecasts in subsequent planning work.

POLICIES

1. Provide for orderly and efficient use of the land.
2. Annex those areas within the City's planning area when services are requested.
3. Coordinate land use actions within the Troutdale planning area with Multnomah County.
4. Encourage economy in residential lot sizes, infill development, and extension of the commercial/industrial tax base.
5. Extend city-provided services outside the corporate limits of the City of Troutdale to contiguous or neighboring territory as the City Council shall, from time to time, determine to serve.
6. For planning purposes, the City shall use Metro's forecasted 2035 population and employment numbers.

**City of Troutdale
Population and Employment Projections**

Population Projections - Troutdale and adjacent cities

City	2010 Actual	2035 Projected	Change	Annual % Rate	Total % Rate
Troutdale	15,962	17,038	1,076	0.3%	7%
Wood Village	3,878	4,645	767	0.7%	20%
Fairview	8,920	9,196	276	0.1%	3%
Gresham	105,594	127,124	21,530	0.7%	20%

Household Projections - Troutdale and adjacent cities

City	2010 Actual			2035 Projected			2010-2035 Change					
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Total	Single Family	%	Multi-Family	%	Total	%
Troutdale	3,981	1,806	5,787	4,506	2,126	6,632	525	13%	320	18%	845	15%
Wood Village	458	1,081	1,539	488	1,121	1,609	30	7%	40	4%	70	5%
Fairview	1,677	1,954	3,631	1,927	2,076	4,003	250	15%	122	6%	372	10%
Gresham	19,781	18,243	38,024	25,394	25,656	51,051	5,613	28%	7,413	41%	13,027	34%

Employment Projections - Troutdale and adjacent cities

City	2010 Actual				2035 Projection				2010-2035 Change							
	Retail	Service	Other	Total	Retail	Service	Other	Total	Retail	%	Service	%	Other	%	Total	%
Troutdale	1,272	493	2,361	4,126	2,039	2,357	5,615	100	767	60%	1,864	378%	3,254	138%	5,885	143%
Wood Village	1,261	242	531	2,034	1,783	1,158	1,489	4,430	552	44%	916	379%	958	180%	2,396	118%
Fairview	236	497	1,878	2,611	558	3,293	3,724	7,575	322	136%	2,796	563%	1,846	98%	4,964	190%
Gresham	7,353	8,871	16,408	32,632	12,334	20,154	26,079	58,567	4,981	68%	11,283	127%	9,671	59%	25,935	79%