

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

June 29, 2000

Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Ed Washington, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Rod Monroe

Councilors Absent: Jon Kvistad

Presiding Officer Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:00 p.m. and noted that Councilor Monroe would be late to the meeting as he was on other Metro business.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Mike Burton, Executive Officer, summarized the activities of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process since 1995. He noted the sheet, Public Involvement Timeline (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). He also noted that the RTP was under funded. He urged proceeding with the planned timelines.

4. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park reviewed the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting held last night. The Committee had been updated on the RTP and discussed the 4(d) Rule. They would continue to work on Goal 5 issues.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration of minutes of the June 22, 2000 Regular Council Meeting.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of June 22, 2000 Regular Council meeting.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilors Monroe and Kvistad absent.

7. ORDINANCES –FIRST READING/PUBLIC HEARING

7.1 Ordinance No. 00-869, For the Purpose of Adopting the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan; Amending Ordinance No. 96-647C, Ordinance No. 97-715B.

Presiding Officer Bragdon assigned Ordinance No. 00-869 to Transportation. He reviewed the public hearing process and said the public comment period would close as of 5 p.m. today.

Tom Kloster, Transportation Department, Transportation Program Supervisor, provided a power point presentation of the RTP. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Councilor McLain asked staff to reiterate how many times the local jurisdictions have reviewed the maps for the RTP.

Mr. Kloster responded there had been extensive local review leading up to the Framework Plan adoption in December 1997. The two iterations since were a cooperative process. The comments were approximately 5 percent of the lines on the map where there was some discussion between Metro and the local jurisdictions. Typically the discussions involved how designations would match up between adjacent jurisdictions. He said that was the best time for Metro to step in and suggest an appropriate designation for a street.

Councilor McLain asked how often they were obligated to look at the RTP.

Mr. Kloster said that it should be reviewed every 3-5 years.

Councilor McLain asked if funds became available could the RTP be amended between reviews.

Mr. Kloster responded yes, the plan as written required amendments to change the project list. Critical changes that were adopted by a local plan required an immediate amendment. Other changes would wait the next review.

Councilor McLain summarized that this was a living document. She asked what the importance was of having a finished product, an action.

Mr. Kloster responded that the RTP guided the funding allocations. When the plan was updated the out years were massaged. Those projects would not be built for a long time, but were a guide so that improvements were done in a consistent manner, rather than piecemeal. The key thing, which Metro did not have in the past, was a really updated RTP that reflected the 2040 Plan. Metro had a current plan that described the most critical projects for decisions on how to allocate federal funds.

Councilor Atherton noted a letter from the Westside Economic Alliance. Their key point was that the region usually came up short in identification and commitment to funding strategies. The RTP had lots of options rather than a clear direction.

Mr. Kloster responded that the purpose of the plan was not to identify specific funding for the next 20 years, it was to identify the improvements and raise the money that were needed. If no population increase had been forecasted for 20 years the funding situation would have been totally different and there would not be a funding crisis. His interpretation of the RTP was to set the table for how to go out and raise the money, typically done in shorter 3-5 year increments.

Councilor Atherton asked if Metro drew lines on maps and then went looking for money to do the work, or drew the lines depending on how projects were to be paid for. He felt the alliance was suggesting a different approach and asked if that was a key question.

Mr. Kloster said he would make a case that Metro viewed its level of service policy as an appropriate response to the land use plan. There were places where Metro did not want to set a high standard for motor vehicle mobility during peak periods, e.g. downtown Portland. He felt that was a responsible policy and was a change. If Metro had continued its 1995 policy there would be a lot more projects. In a way this RTP represented a scaling down of the system. It had been painful for local planners to deal with this change. The reasons were dealt with in the alternatives analysis. He felt that the RTP represented a different philosophy in terms of how the plan was sized and how big the dreams were for raising money.

Councilor Atherton said he heard Mr. Kloster saying that the key way of paying for this plan was by lowering the level of service standards.

Mr. Kloster said he would argue that this level of service policy reflected what was on the ground today. It had been pretended in the past that the traffic on the Banfield could be smoothed out at rush hour. While pricing on the facilities could smooth out the traffic peaks, planners were facing the music; in some cases it was not only impossible but also inappropriate. Metro had reviewed travel time benefits traveling from Beaverton to Portland at rush hour in different level of service scenarios. Only a couple of minutes were gained. The perceived time was not as bad as it was made out to be. One problem was that it had been set up for a long time on a grading system with 'F' as a failing grade. Yet 'F' was a little better than what was seen on the Banfield during the rush hour. In the balance between livability and mobility in places like downtown Portland he was saying it worked, it seemed to be a good system.

Councilor McLain asked him to expand on why this RTP addressed an appropriate level of service as well as demanded fiscal constraints.

Mr. Kloster responded that everyone wanted to be able to travel quickly and easily, but not to pay for the improvements or have them happen on a street near their own house. For example, major street improvements in Beaverton to allow easier travel to the coast from the eastside were popular with people who did not live around those improvements or pay for them. He noted that in the RTP series of workshops Metro held a couple of years ago, the staff pressed the issue of what was acceptable in their own community. When cost, the environmental impact and ease of movement was discussed it was easier for people to come up with a compromise. When these compromises were added up it came close to Metro's level of service policy. He said the result of the JPACT (Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation), MPAC and Council workshop staff held was that it was reasonable to assume congestion for 2 hours during the rush hour at night, 1 hour in the morning and possibly another hour around lunch time. It was less trying to reduce the standard to save money, but the \$14 billion dollar plan, an impossible to raise figure, would require every freeway in the region to be 10 lanes or more, and most arterial streets to be 7 lanes. It was not only expensive, who would want to live near those improvements.

Mr. Kloster noted the last plan was interim, to keep up with improvements and did not look at levels of service. He said planners who came to the Metro workshops did not want to report back to their constituents that it would be harder to get around, or that the roads would be widened from 2 lanes to 7 lanes. It was a tough issue to resolve. That was why Washington County and the cities of Cornelius, Hillsboro and Forrest Grove had their own transportation plans. Not all issues

could be solved on a regional level. Metro established a context from which the jurisdictions could work with the more detailed questions on land use and local streets.

Councilor McLain agreed and said that if a local jurisdiction chose a different strategy and could demonstrate its fiscal responsibility to fund it, Metro would put it on the plan.

Councilor Atherton asked why the level of service on Interstate 205 decreased significantly.

Mr. Kloster responded that Clackamas County had a historic problem in keeping up with urbanizing its growth system at the level of Washington County over the last 20 years, nor wasn't even close to the level of Multnomah County in the 1960s when it urbanized rapidly. That problem created a backlog. A federal freeway (I-205) made it easier to ignore the backlog because of its capacity, but that did not last long as it grew and filled up. Metro exacerbated the problem with expansions to the urban growth boundary (UGB) in Clackamas County. He noted there was a disproportionate number of housing units going into the area. Metro was also trying to add employment, because of the historic jobs/housing imbalance. I-205 fails regularly between Oregon City and I-5. He agreed that there was a lot to be done there, a lot of projects called out. Metro also laid that out as an issue on the land use side. An outstanding issue staff had noted, could not be resolved in the RTP, was how the county could get caught up a little bit and not put every trip that goes through the county on I-205.

Councilor Atherton commented that it was difficult to do

Presiding Officer Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 00-869.

Matthew Whitman, Cedar Hills Homes Association, 621 SW Morrison, Ste. 1300, Portland, said his group was a homeowners association formed in 1946. It represented more than 2,100 homes and 8,000 people within the area south of Highway 26. He felt his association could be of value in the ongoing process Metro was engaged in, along with the local planning bodies. While he knew Metro was at the tail end of the RTP process and had been unintentionally excluded from the planning process, he felt the association was a uniquely perfect community organization for the purposes of public planning. It represented every homeowner within a defined geographical area that was intimately affected by a number of specific projects within the RTP. Last month the association had met with Kim White, Transportation Department, Associate Transportation Planner, and a Washington County planner (who would implement the process). He felt it had opened up lines of communication for the ongoing planning process and future fine-tuning. There were several projects, numbers 3014, 3075, 3024, 3008, 3018 and 3021 that directly affected the Cedar Hills area. Association involvement in Metro's continuing public outreach about these projects would allow them to disseminate information to its members and funnel information to the regional and local planners.

Matt Palmer, Citizens in Favor of Community Development on Walker Road, 13270 SW Walker Rd., Beaverton, 97005, read his testimony into the record. (A copy and photographs were included in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked if the proposal widened the road without adding sidewalks.

Mr. Palmer responded that the proposal would increase Walker to 5 lanes plus sidewalks. Currently it was one lane each way, with bike paths and no sidewalks.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked what Washington County's reaction had been.

Mr. Palmer responded that his group had not visited with Washington County beyond the meeting with Ms. White and Clark Berry, Washington County Planner. They planned to do so in the coming months, but since the RTP window of opportunity was closing they began at Metro.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said he was happy Mr. Palmer had done so. He encouraged him to work with Washington County, too.

Bob Akers, President of the 40-Mile Loop Land Trust, 1038 SE 224, Gresham, commented on four projects he felt were important and wanted to get into the RTP for 2000. One he would like to get on the RTP maps with a dashed line was a trail his group proposed to build. It would go from Kelly Point Park on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, through Smith and Bybee Lakes, Pier Park, Reno Street and under the St. Johns Bridge. Then a trail would be built along the Willamette River from the St. Johns Bridge to the Steel Bridge, tying in with OMSI-Springwater Trail. They felt it was very important and would be even better than the Springwater Trail, which was hard to beat. The trail would allow people to commute from North Portland, even from Washington State, via Marine Drive.

Mr. Akers said the second important trail was the East Butte Trail that would take off from the Springwater Trail at about 158th off Foster up Kelly Creek, across some of the Metro open space property recently purchased with bond money and property bought by the City of Gresham. It would tie into the Springwater Trail east of Gresham. The third item was a trail already on the regional trails map, a section of the 40-Mile Loop in Troutdale. He said the trail from Blue Lake Park to Troutdale was recommended to be on Marine Drive to Frontage Avenue. He felt most of the Council was aware that Frontage Avenue had been a one-way street heading east for the past two years. It was completely unsafe for a recreational trail. He proposed to move the dashed lines from Blue Lake Park to Troutdale on the dyke next to the Columbia River on the north side of the old Reynolds Aluminum plant to tie in with the new development in downtown Troutdale. He said it was very important for safety, future planning and getting grants to build the trail.

Mr. Akers said the final item was a new project that he was not personally involved with, but had looked at for almost 30 years. It was a trail from the bike path at I-205 to downtown via I-84. It would tie in with the Springwater and St. Johns and Steel Bridge trails. Some people were calling it the Banfield Corridor project. He felt it would get people downtown from I-205 and it would mean a lot to the City of Portland to have decent landscaping from the Airport to downtown Portland. Each time he drove west on I-84 he wondered what out-of-town guests thought when they saw the graffiti, trees, brush, blackberry bushes and the complete lack of organization. He thought this project would mean a lot to the whole community. He requested that all four projects be put on the Regional Trails Map.

Bruce M. Pollock, 9601 NW Leahy Rd., Apt. #201, Portland, (Cedar Mill area), testified on his own behalf. He read his testimony into the record. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Mr. Pollock said he had testified many times before Tri-Met. Currently, he served on an ad-hoc committee for the Tualatin Hills Park District concerned with acquiring property and saw a lot in that area. He was using that experience but did not represent anyone at today's public hearing.

Ross Williams, 426 SE 19th Avenue, Portland, represented Citizens for Sensible Transportation. He read his testimony into the record. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this

meeting.) Mr. Williams said he was currently chair of the Transportation Reform Working Group of the Coalition for a Livable Future.

Mr. Williams made additional comments. In looking at the plan, Citizens for Sensible Transportation was very satisfied with the RTP policy document. They thought it expressed the regional vision that the 2040 Plan created. However, they were concerned about the implementation. The actual project list does not reflect those policies. The people responsible for creating the list compiled the priorities of the local jurisdictions that were responsible for various road building and other transportation projects, instead of approaching the task with a regional vision. They were local elected officials responsible to their constituents for specific services in their community, who did not get elected to provide a regional vision. Therefore, the Mayor of Beaverton was not responsible for the trails or bus service in his community, but he was very much responsible for the roads in his community and he had staff to work on that issue.

Mr. Williams said the Metro Councilors, as regionally elected officials, even though they represented different districts of the region, needed to provide a stronger voice for the region and regional vision for the plan, to have a truly regional plan. That more forceful regional stand from the Metro Council would create conflict with some of the local officials and Metro was under attack from many. But the danger to the institution and the entire regional system of government resulted from the Metro Council being too timid, not from it being too bold. He urged the Council to be bolder in asserting its authority as the regional planning agency. He asked that the plan have a regional vision, not simply a compilation of local visions or projects in its implementation. He thought the policies were very good, but the projects were pretty lousy.

Mr. Williams said, in terms of specific concerns with projects, there were simply too many that served commuters, which represented a minority of the trips in the region. There were too many projects that served people travelling from one place to another but did not serve the communities in which they were located. In fact, they damaged the quality of life of people who currently lived in those communities. The region needed more projects that improved the communities the projects were in, rather than projects that simply provided a way for people to drive through those communities. If the region focused on that it would produce a regional vision that would satisfy the 2040 Plan goals.

Lynn Peterson represented 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW Third Avenue, Suite #300, Portland. She read her testimony into the record. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this meeting.) Ms. Peterson also said Metro had a great planning document (the RTP). She was proud to have been a member of TPAC (Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee) and a member of Metro during the time in which the RTP was created. Her organization was most concerned about the implementation process.

Morgan Will, 2627 NE 12th Ave., Portland, testified and requested that the Council place the Banfield Corridor Project (a regional bicycle and transportation trail project) on the Master Plan of Regional Trails. He read his testimony into the record. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Councilor Atherton commented that Mr. Will's slide show and written remarks were outstanding communication. They supported Mr. Akers's remarks regarding how useful and lovely the Banfield Corridor could be, except for having to breathe the car exhaust.

Councilor Atherton also asked Ms. Peterson about air quality problems associated with the RTP. The federal financially constrained strategy was required to satisfy the air quality standards. He asked her to provide an explanation.

Ms. Peterson said yes, she understood that to be true. The modeling done demonstrated that Metro's federally required financially constrained strategy was just within satisfying the minimum air quality requirements. However, that same modeling procedure had not been completed on the strategic plan. It would be done in the future, possibly after RTP adoption.

Councilor Atherton said in essence, the RTP as currently presented to the Council might or might not satisfy air quality standards.

Ms. Peterson said the federally required financially constrained system satisfied the minimum requirements. However, they did not know whether the strategic system (the RTP) would meet those same requirements.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Kloster to clarify the federal air quality requirements.

Tom Kloster said the federal government required that Metro predict how much money the region's elected officials would raise during the next 20 years, and program it toward projects that would not exceed current revenue sources. There was less on the non-transit side. Metro planned to use state employees who frequently performed this type of work. The financially constrained system was much smaller (about one-third the size) than the strategic system. Therefore, the federal government required Metro to demonstrate that the system would meet air quality requirements. Generally, the fiscally constrained system would be more congested, therefore it was the least likely to meet air quality requirements, because Metro was not fixing bottlenecks, but instead adding all the growth the region expected during the next 20 years to the system. The system was also limited in terms of transit. The region could not assume a huge transit system. That was what drove the regulation. Metropolitan areas wrote off their congestion and air quality problems by citing transit projects on their plans that they never intended to build. That explained the financially constrained system. The federal government asked Metro to feature it more prominently in the RTP. That was one of the Metro Transportation Department's recommendations for TPAC tomorrow morning.

Councilor Atherton asked if Metro projected the revenue would be "x" and it was enough to build a system. Then they determined through Metro's modeling that the system would still violate air quality standards. He asked if that means the federal government can intervene and take regulatory action to ensure the air quality standards were met.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said if Metro's modeling demonstrated non-conformity it would not be acceptable. Metro would have to make further amendments and not submit the RTP for federal approval until it conformed. The federal government could not approve the RTP until Metro could demonstrate it would conform. Further Metro action would be necessary. If Metro was unable to define further transportation actions to conform, the agency would have to return to the DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) and ask for changes to other air pollution sources to meet the federal standards. He asked the Council to remember air quality resulted from a variety of sources. The DEQ would not have to make changes, but it was an option.

Councilor Monroe asked for clarification from staff regarding the procedure for how the Council could add the Banfield Corridor Project to the RTP, because part of it was located in his district. He was interested in the project and wanted to see it move forward.

Bill Barber, Transportation Department, Senior Transportation Planner, agreed it was a very interesting corridor and was on the city of Portland's bicycle master plan. It was not currently on Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department's 1992 trails plan, but the plan was being updated. The Metro Transportation and the Parks and Greenspaces staffs considered the corridor, and decided to wait until it was added to the Parks and Greenspaces Plan before adding it to the RTP. He said the Parks and Greenspaces staff could be contacted or it could be added to the preferred RTP system. There was no funding for the project, but it would be put on the map.

Councilor Monroe said he knew there currently was no funding for the project, but he wanted it on the radar screen. He was providing notice that he would continue to push the issue, but he did not want to delay adoption of the RTP.

Councilor Washington noted that this corridor project was in his district also. He asked if there had been any discussion prior to today.

Mr. Barber said not before Council but there was some discussion at the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC).

Councilor Washington asked Mr. Barber when the project could go on the radar screen.

Mr. Barber said the city of Portland considered it a long-range project (10-20 years).

Presiding Officer Bragdon noted a slide show that Mr. Will shared with some of the councilors.

Mr. Will said Mel Huie, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, Senior Regional Planner, supported the plan and suggested Mr. Will participate in today's RTP public hearing.

Councilor Atherton said bicycle trails that were separate from roadways were used much more, and were safer and cleaner. Mr. Will's proposal would accommodate a trunked facility. He mentioned Mr. Williams's comments and said despite the policy principles, Metro was not carrying out the principles with lines drawn on maps. He asked Mr. Barber how Metro could blend Mr. Will's project and other trails into a trunked system.

Mr. Barber said the idea of the trunk regional bicycle system was one piece of the puzzle. Planning in the city of Toronto was implemented approximately 20-30 years ago.

Councilor Atherton said the hub in Toronto was the trunked, off-roadway bicycle system.

Mr. Barber said it was very similar to what the Portland region was trying to accomplish. But the region needed all the elements (on-street and off-street) to make the system work.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked Councilor Monroe if his Transportation Planning Committee was a good venue to get the issue on the radar screen.

Councilor Monroe said the committee would be doing that. He also planned to discuss the issue with the Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces department to determine the most constructive way to pursue the project.

Steve Larrance, Citizens Against Irresponsible Growth (CAIG), 20660 SW Kinnaman Road, Aloha, requested that the Metro Council vote to extend for at least six months the comment

period and ultimate adoption of the RTP. He read from written testimony. (A copy was included in the permanent record of this meeting.) He concluded by asking the Councilors to put aside their personal agendas and realize the unique time and place in which they find themselves serving as elected regional officials.

Councilor Washington asked on what Mr. Larrance based his request that Councilors put aside their personal agendas.

Mr. Larrance said he did not mean his statement to be inflammatory or derogatory. He meant that there was a great need in the region right now to create capacity on the roadway system. As had been alluded to many times, it was only because people had a great deal of vision in the past that the region had capacity overbuild in the system. Because the region had used up all of that excess capacity, and was at capacity everywhere, to think that it was possible to create more capacity by lowering the level of service was not realizing what had made Portland what it is. The fact that people had foresight in the past had gone a long way towards creating the livability that draws people to the region and for which elected officials sometimes take credit. Current elected officials have to realize that it was their time to create something for the next generation. He said he was not thinking of the people in the region today, he was thinking of the long-term livability. He was general contractor, and does remodels, so he sees land use planning as a remodeling exercise. One cannot throw away opportunities, which he thinks the 2040 Growth Concept does, where it creates the thought that one needs smaller streets, that the arterial system can be thrown away, and call that connectivity when really it was the opposite of connectivity. How can one go back and remodel when buildings have been built right up against skinny streets?

Councilor Washington said he was only concerned about why Mr. Larrance's stated that the Councilors have personal agendas. He said he understood Mr. Larrance's other comments. He noted that if everyone on the Council had a personal agenda, nothing would get done in the region. Councilor Washington said Mr. Larrance had every right to say what he wants, but he asked that he be fair about it.

Mr. Larrance said he did not say the Councilors had personal agendas. He asked that they put them aside if they did.

Councilor Washington said that if Mr. Larrance put the statement in writing, he must think it exists, which was a concern.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Larrance about his comment that, "We continue to question the 'throwing away' of our existing through trip based principal arterial system by down grading those facilities as they pass through proposed 2040 city centers..." He said that was a clear policy choice in a regional strategy. He asked Mr. Cotugno or Mr. Kloster to respond to that policy option. How does the RTP address this basic question?

Mr. Cotugno said this proposed RTP reduced the function of arterioles through some regional centers and town centers in a couple of different ways. The Tualatin-Valley (TV) Highway was the one in question here. This RTP proposes that through downtown Beaverton and through downtown Hillsboro, that route be designated a "major arterial." A major arterial was still an important, traffic-oriented street, but it was one step down from a "principal arterial." A principal arterial was intended to carry statewide traffic. Other examples of principal arterioles around the region include Highway 217, Highway 99W, Highway 99E, and Highway 212 out to Sandy. Through downtown Beaverton, it was recommended that it not be viewed as that kind of long-distance regional trip maker. In order to be compatible with the area as a downtown, it ought to

be a more localized oriented trip maker. Major arterioles still carry a lot of through traffic. It was intended as an arterial function.

Mr. Cotugno said furthermore, the second way the RTP addresses this issue was with a design classification. The RTP assigns a boulevard classification to most built-up areas on various kinds of routes, such as a street classification to areas outside downtowns that still need to be multi-modal in character. The boulevard classification was very carefully designated on routes that were intended to be oriented toward the buildings much more than toward through traffic. A boulevard could be on a major arterial, a minor arterial, or a principal arterial. Either way, the designation of major, minor, or principal arterial was intended to call out the kind of through traffic it was intended to carry. The boulevard classification was intended to deal with its orientation to the surrounding buildings. In the case of TV Highway through Beaverton, the RTP does not recommend classifying it as a boulevard. Calling it a boulevard would have the most limiting kinds of traffic oriented functions. While it was going through a downtown area, the RTP recommended designating the Hall-Watson couplet, in a north-south fashion, as the boulevard treatment, and as the most pedestrian and building oriented street in the downtown Beaverton area.

Councilor Atherton asked if staff recommended Beaverton create two one-way couplets.

Mr. Cotugno said there was an existing north-south one-way couplet that can more readily be retrofitted with boulevard treatments than the east-west traffic carriers, because of the access to Highway 217. The design for the project that was just completed in Beaverton on TV Highway, was laboriously hammered out between the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Washington County, which was concerned about the traffic characteristics, and the city and the businesses along there, which were concerned about the streetscape environment. Staff was not proposing to tear out that project and make it more restrictive. That project was on the ground, and the RTP recommendations simply recognize its current state. Staff does not want to make it bigger by calling it a principal arterial, nor constrict it further by calling it a boulevard.

Councilor Atherton said this scenario was played out all over the region. He was most intimately familiar with Highway 43.

Mr. Cotugno thought Highway 43 through downtown Lake Oswego was classified a boulevard.

Councilor Atherton said that 20 years ago, Highway 43 served as a true connector, with the city off to the side. Then the City of Lake Oswego made the mistake of creating it into a boulevard, and now it was impassible and had lost its function.

Mr. Cotugno said in downtown Lake Oswego, Highway 43 had lost its function as a major through traffic carrier. The rest of the length of Highway 43 was a through traffic carrier. In downtown Lake Oswego, it was called out as a boulevard so that traffic slowed down, and there were more pedestrian crossings, because a downtown surrounded that street.

Councilor Atherton said yes, but it was the wrong place to make a downtown. It was a design choice, and the path of least resistance. He said he was not trying to debate Mr. Cotugno, he was trying to see the direction so he can understand the RTP and describe it to others. Mr. Larrance's analysis was pretty right on target, in that maybe they were not learning from the mistakes in the past. He asked if the Council was making a clear choice here, and said it seemed that they were. They were throwing away existing through capacity. That concerned him, and he wanted to hear Mr. Cotugno's analysis.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked that Councilor Atherton continue his conversation with Mr. Cotugno at a later time.

Councilor Atherton said he appreciated Mr. Larrance for asking succinctly framed questions.

Presiding Officer Bragdon noted Mr. Larrance's statement about 'dumbing down' level of service standards. He asked if Mr. Larrance understood level of service to mean strictly the volume and speed of automobiles moving through a particular point?

Mr. Larrance said that was several of the factors.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked if, in Mr. Larrance's opinion, adding crosswalks and trees was downgrading a street?

Mr. Larrance said no, downgrading was not in the classification. Adding trees does not degrade a street, but declassifying a street from a principal arterial to an arterial was downgrading. It means that there can be more cross streets, and more driveways with direct access, which will dissuade people from using the street for through trips. He noted that a principal arterial does not necessarily mean statewide significance; it can also mean regional or county significance. He noted that with Sunset Highway at capacity, even mid-day, people were again using TV Highway as the principal arterial from Forest Grove to Portland. In a time of short money, why would that classification be eliminated unless there was an alternative?

Larry Derr, 53 S.W. Yamhill Street, Portland, testified on his own behalf. Approximately six months ago he appeared before the Council to urge them to defer the tentative adoption of the RTP. His concerns included the degrading to an unacceptable level of mobility, the lack of a link to growth management planning, and the absence of a funding program. Those problems still exist in the plan before the Council today. In three minutes, there was not time to document all of them, but he shared an anecdotal piece of information concerning mobility. In yesterday's *Oregonian* newspaper, there was a quote from the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District Fire Marshall in a letter addressed to the Beaverton City Council referring to the difficulty of servicing some of the new multi-family high-density developments. The Fire Marshall said, "Many of these new developments feature so-called skinny streets – narrow drives that inhibit response and access by fire equipment. Increased density also had resulted in increased traffic congestion on public roadways, further slowing response."

Mr. Derr said the unfunded RTP was not only a problem of not being able to build the infrastructure, but more critically, this will be the first time that a regional transportation plan performs the function of a transportation system plan under the TPR (state Transportation Planning Rule). The significance was that development would be permitted and gauged under the serviceability under that plan, when everyone knows that that development will not be there, whether it was transit, streets, or anything else. The money was not there. Six months ago the Council said that Metro would come up with a funding plan in the next six months. It was not here. Today the public was told that Metro would do it in the future. He urged the Council to take heed of the letter sent from the Westside Business Coalition. He said he understands that it was human nature and natural to say, "Where were these people for the last six months, year, three years?" For the most part, some of those business organizations were not here at the table. That was the bad news. The good news was that they were now stepping forward. When a list of companies (including Fred Meyer, Nike, Portland General Electric, Tektronics, and United Parcel Service) signed a letter saying they were fearful of what they saw happening, but now want to

join in finding a solution for public financing, the Council needs to take that into account. Rather than adopt the plan today and hope to figure out how to fund it tomorrow, he urged the Council to stop, get those people on Metro's side, come up with a program, and then go forward with a plan that the community get behind.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said for the record that Chair Tom Brian, Washington County Commission, had wanted to express verbally that it was not the County's intent to send the letter at the last minute. Chair Brian wanted to assure the Council that the way the timing came together was just activated by the businesses involved.

Presiding Officer Bragdon closed the public hearing. He said Council would hold another public hearing on August 3, when it was scheduled to vote on Ordinance No. 00-869. He announced that the public comment period would close at 5:00 p.m. today.

Councilor McLain appreciated the people who testified today, especially those with specific suggestions or additional information. Specificity helped Metro deal with amendments and items that could be changed. She knew from personal experience that Metro and local jurisdictions' staff had talked to business, local property owners and other jurisdictions. They, along with Metro must find the funding. Metro did not have the tax base and could not fund the RTP without a coalition of local, regional, state and federal entities working together. She had never seen a plan more thoroughly reviewed. She took the conversation and dedication of the people who had come today to testify very seriously. Staff would analyze all of the information and responses would come back from TPAC, JPACT the Transportation committee and the Council as a whole. This plan provided a jump-start in order to find the needed financing. There must be a plan in place in order to gather dollars. Each and every jurisdiction, including Washington County, had to update their RTP. If they came up with good suggestions Metro would not turn them away or be afraid to amend or change the plan. It was a living document that would never be completed and always updated and reviewed.

Councilor Park noted that staff had done an excellent job. He congratulated Mr. Cotugno on covering both Transportation and Growth Management. He appreciated Mr. Kloster's presentation – it was a good one. He was concerned about Washington County's request for an extension. He would gauge that against their other requests in asking Metro to go faster on the growth management side. Delay because we do not have capacity and yet at Growth Management he heard people saying go faster because they want to build something. Metro needed a clear message as to their desires.

Councilor Atherton echoed the excellent work of the staff on the RTP. He appreciated people taking the time out of their day to talk about this. As he listened to Mr. Derr and Mr. Williams, he heard his grandfather's advice: "any damn fool can learn from his mistakes". The principle was to learn from mistakes; that was the point of this exercise. That was what concerned him most. The funding issue was so overwhelming and straight forward he thought it was out on the table and would be addressed. There was a key issue of regional strategy and transportation-land use connection that Mr. Larrance phrased here that Metro was repeating the past mistakes. It would be most graphically borne out in his district, Clackamas County, where Metro followed the path of least resistance. They took old farm market roads and pretended that they really meant something. Metro allowed little developments to go up around them, expand them into major arterioles, but never followed through with clear direction. He believed the 2040 Growth Concept directed that the region had nodal centers of activity, but provided connection to the urban core. For example Sunnyside Rd. He asked if it were expanded, then should nodal centers be allowed to build up around the roadway and destroy its capacity? The same principal came up on I-205;

would the mistakes made at I-5, I-205 and Sunnyside Road be made at I-205 and Wankers Corner? He felt this issue had not been resolved. He asked for help in resolving it.

Councilor Washington said that everything that went on impacted every district in the region. Growth and transportation were tied together and were inseparable. He hoped that we did learn from past mistakes, but suggested that these mistakes were not all Metro's. Mr. Cotugno did not build Hwy. 43.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked Mr. Cotugno if that was indeed correct.

Mr. Cotugno said in 1982 Metro funded a State St. project with Interstate Transfer funds from the Mt. Hood Freeway withdrawal to build the current configuration of Hwy. 43 and for the section from Sellwood up to Bancroft. Yes, he had helped build Hwy. 43.

Councilor Washington said he appreciated everybody's interest and testimony. There were more things to be done than could be accommodated, even with a magic wand.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked where the Westside Economic Alliance was 1 ½-years ago. They were in Salem lobbying for the westside bypass. That told him something about this testimony. He felt the reference made about 'dumbing down' levels of service got it exactly opposite. This RTP smartened up the term to make it mean more than just how many cars could be moved, how fast through a particular point. It turned things in the right direction after 30-40 years of engineering that took us in the wrong direction in terms of urban and suburban form. He was supportive of the direction. Councilor Monroe made his support clear on the Banfield, that was a great example, and looked forward to working with him on tweaking some things. In terms of making that connection between land use and transportation staff was finally on the way to doing that, or we were collectively as a region. It was not easy, but hats off to staff for trying it.

Councilor Monroe wanted to include his accolades to the process and staff. He particularly supported the new type of urban transportation structures, the boulevard design structures that were being looked at. Large fast highways through dense urban communities divided them and were destructive to the communities' livability. There was a time and place when these highways need to be "downsized" in terms of their speed, but upsized as far as accessibility for pedestrians, bicyclists, shoppers, etc. this new urban design certainly was being done purposely and Metro understood that not all citizens supported it; he supported it.

Councilor McLain wanted to thank everyone. When Councilors said 'staff', they meant real people who were working hard – she appreciated everything that had been done by staff and knew it was a team approach on the RTP. This staff had been very sensitive to citizen comments and local jurisdictions. They leaned over backwards to listen and work with them. Not only did Mr. Cotugno make the connections between land use and transportation, but he also spoke before 200 people this morning where he put together that plus fish, greenspace issues and stormwater. He was very impressive.

Councilor Atherton remarked that the Highway 43 issue was so illustrative. In aerial photos from 1970 there was no commercial development along the highway. A state or regional government might have prevented the mistakes of changing a highway into a main street.

Councilor Park asked if Councilor Atherton meant that Metro should step in if it thought a local government was making a mistake.

Councilor Atherton said that was what regional government should do

Presiding Officer Bragdon noted that what he had learned from Mr. Cotugno's response was that Hwy. 43 and the Mt. Hood Freeway was that if a big highway project was killed, it could be lived on for 20 years. Now the 20 years were up and there was no money to spend.

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 **Resolution No. 00-2961**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Plan Reinstatement for the Metro 401(K) Employee Salary Savings Plan.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Resolution No. 00-2961.

Seconded: **Councilor Monroe** seconded the motion.

Councilor Washington reviewed the committee report on this resolution, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting.

Executive Officer Burton commented that when he first took office legal counsel informed him that he was responsible for the 401(K) program. He thought it did not make sense as it was the employees' program, even if it was technically and legally falls to the Executive Officer's responsibility. It had its advisory committee and does well. He expressed his appreciation for all of the time they put into it.

Lydia Neill, Growth Management Services-Senior Regional Planner, and chair of the 401(K) Committee, said her group had worked hard over the past year to be sure they had a good document to guide the plan administrator, Vanguard, in their duties disbursing funds and current with state and federal laws. She understood that Dan Cooper, General Counsel, would come before Council in the near future to discuss amendments to the Metro Code relating to the 401(K) committee and its role. She encouraged Council to formalize that role. She felt it was a good program and very important to employees.

Mr. Cotugno underscored the importance of the 401(K) Committee. Heretofore there was not a codified method of establishing the Committee and defining its role and responsibilities. Council appointed members, including him, to the Committee. He felt it had done a good job of making a good program available to people, but there was still too loose a definition of the Committee. It was decided not to institutionalize the Committee in the plan document itself because it was a sort of contract between Vanguard, the IRS and Metro. He encouraged Council to formally establish the Committee and its roles and responsibilities so that it does not go out of existence or be ignored somewhere down the line.

Councilor Washington urged an aye vote.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed.

8.2 **Resolution No. 00-2964**, For the Purpose of Confirming Matthew Rotchford, Steve Erickson and Marilyn Matteson to the Metro 401(K) Employee Savings Plan Advisory Committee.

Motion: **Councilor Atherton** moved to adopt Resolution No. 00-2964.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Councilor Atherton noted that this resolution was directly related to the previous one. There had been 3 vacancies to the 5-member Committee. Recommendation was made by the Executive Officer for these employees to sit on the Committee after application and review.

Ms. Neill noted that a 401(K) Nominating Committee reviewed the applicants and made their recommendation to the Executive Officer.

Councilor Atherton said this was employee business and had heard no complaints about any of the proposed members. He urged an aye vote.

Councilor McLain noted that the nominees were present and had sat through the entire meeting. It represented people working in the Convention Center, this building and at the Zoo. It was a very good employee driven program. She was pleased that folks were willing to take on extra duties for the benefit of all.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed.

9. CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

9.1 **Resolution No. 00-2962**, For the Purpose of Authorizing a Sole Source Agreement with the Regional Arts and Cultural Council.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Resolution No. 00-2962.

Seconded: **Councilor McLain** seconded the motion.

Councilor Washington said the resolution was a sole source contract with RACC (Regional Arts and Cultural Council). Anytime a Metro building expansion exceeded \$100,000; the agency had to pledge a minimum of 1 percent of the cost for arts. The resolution was a contract with RACC to perform the work for Metro. There were 4 payments of \$16,250 each that totaled \$65,000. The cost could reach \$81,000. There was an additional \$16,000 for Scott Moss, Administrative Service Department, Assistant Director, for services.

Scott Moss said the additional \$16,000 was to reimburse him for out-of-pocket expenses.

Councilor Washington said the process was straightforward. The RACC would administer the contract to satisfy the 1 percent requirement.

Councilor Park asked why the work was not handled internally by MERC (Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission).

Presiding Officer Bragdon said RACC would be acting as Metro's buying agent and they were familiar with the artistic community, whereas MERC knew how to manage the facilities but was not qualified to select the artwork. Metro wanted to work with skilled experts.

Mr. Moss said that was correct. He asked if the question was 'Why was RACC involved' or 'Why was the Metro Council involved in approving the contract.'

Council Park said his question was in terms of having MERC in-house and then contracting with an outside agent (RACC), instead of MERC to oversee the acquisition of artwork.

Mr. Moss said Presiding Officer Bragdon's comments answered that question.

Presiding Officer Bragdon added that RACC oversaw the acquisition of artwork when the OCC was originally constructed. The RACC provided the service for a fee to governments throughout the area. The RACC had a contact list of artists they were familiar with. The RACC was also familiar with the whole art acquisition process.

Councilor McLain said during the informal meeting and the update on the convention center development there was an internal requirement that the artwork maintain a consistent theme. There was a history with the RACC having done the work.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said "the Log" would be moved further out toward Holiday Street. The Martin Luther King statute would be moved into a more prominent location near the corner of Holiday and MLK Boulevard. The new artwork selections would maintain a consistency with what the RACC acquired before.

Councilor Washington closed the discussion and urged an aye vote.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed.

Presiding Officer Bragdon returned to discussion of Resolution No. 00-2964 and the presentation of some plaques.

Ms. Neill said two of the 401(K) committee members (Andy Cotugno and Bruce Burnett) planned to vacate the committee. They could not attend committee meetings to receive recognition for their years of service to the committee. Therefore, the committee chose to recognize them during the council meeting.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION, HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h), TO CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL CONCERNING THE LEGAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF A PUBLIC BODY WITH REGARD TO CURRENT LITIGATION.

Members Present: Larry Shaw, Office of General Counsel, Senior Assistant Counsel; members of the Council staff.

Councilor Park said he mentioned the question of new versus old Goal 14 because there seemed to be some hint from the DLCD (Department of Land Conservation and Development) Director that perhaps the applicability question may have indicated that Metro wanted to be under the old Goal 14. There seemed to be a strong indication that the new Goal 14 may not have had what Metro needed in it. Or the director may have indicated that if Metro used the old Goal 14 he would not oppose it, but he would oppose it if the agency used the new Goal 14.

Councilor Washington said Mr. Shaw commented that suddenly it appeared as if things were coming together. The issue had been sitting around for a year and a half. Based on that and the kind of information Mr. Shaw received, Councilor Washington asked him to describe the type of work load that the council could expect in September through December as a result of what was currently happening.

Mr. Shaw said the preparation and participation at LCDC (Land Conservation and Development Commission) was going to increase. The first hearing on Goal 14 before the commission was where the MPAC Coordinating Committee planned to provide some testimony from local government participants to get the Goal 14, Factor 2 issue back to the status quo immediately. Therefore, Metro had to participate in the meeting for that reason and also because that was when the work program would also be discussed. Then, every meeting they schedule would probably include a discussion of an aspect of Goal 14. That was Metro's primary land use number one issue - the urban growth boundary for the region. Because the region represented 27 jurisdictions and 45 percent of the population, Metro could provide a lot of influence on the rules that would be written and affect the region so they make sense and do not produce litigation.

Councilor Washington asked if that was a new approach for LCDC. It sounded like the agency was trying to adjust the rules to cooperate with Metro's goals. He sensed continuity.

Mr. Shaw said in the past Metro was lumped in with working groups and treated like one constituency. The trip to Salem to participate in the 20-year issue was a great idea and produced great results and great message for the commission and their staff. Metro was a resource. What the agency did with Goal 2040 the commission was trying to incorporate into Goal 14 to encourage the rest of the state to grow up and not out. The region pioneered that approach. They also started to recognize a lot of the new UGB material and rules would be tested in the region. Therefore, the commission knew they should listen to Metro to gauge the success with that issue. The staff also knew that Metro was aware of the issues so they needed to pay attention to Metro and not just the commission.

Councilor Washington asked if the situation was positive.

Mr. Shaw said yes, based on a lot of hard work that was performed.

Councilor McLain said LCDC staff was as tired of the lawsuits as Metro and the misuse of resources. It became apparent that if they did not want to get involved in lawsuits, perform extra work and drain their resources they needed to cooperate with Metro and answer questions. She was delighted by LCDC's approach. She thanked Rod Park, Larry Shaw, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno and everyone else involved for their work. She recommended to the council that they provide as much feedback and comments to LCDC as possible. It was important that LCDC continue to hear from the council as a whole, because it was important to hear the council position regarding the issues.

11. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park said the council was told to be proactive and invite other agencies to use Metro's facilities. Therefore, it appeared on September 28 and 29, 2000, LCDC planned to use the Metro Chamber to perform Goal 14 work and examine Metro's issues. Therefore, it might also be important for the Metro councilors to be present as well. He suggested the council might need to reschedule a few council meetings to allow councilors to attend both meetings, or at least the most significant portions.

Councilor Washington suggested the OCC.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said the council would try to work around LCDC's meeting schedule.

Councilor Monroe said the series of roundtable opportunities, held to solicit advice regarding Metro Charter reform, had been completed. They were attended by most of the councilors. The input was remarkable. The process proceeded smoothly. Former Governor Barbara Roberts was an outstanding moderator of the last three roundtables. She planned to report to the council at the Metro Operations Committee meeting on July 5, 2000 regarding the information she received. At that time, the committee planned to open a public hearing on the resolution they planned to receive from Executive Officer Burton, who will provide an explanation of his proposal and answer questions. Then, the committee planned a second operations committee meeting two weeks later where the committee would consider any proposed amendments that may have developed during the public hearing. Finally, they planned action before the council in early August 2000.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said the roundtables were well done and very informative.

Executive Officer Burton said he would appreciate as soon as possible the opportunity to examine any amendments or other proposals so he could comment on them, if necessary. He thanked the council for the comments they provided regarding the RTP, which he said were excellent. He agreed with the councilors' comments. He also thanked the council for their participation in the process and acknowledgement of the hard work performed by the staff.

Councilor McLain commented on the roundtables. She said they were interesting. She mentioned the relationships among councilors, legal staff issues, pay issues. It was a good group. Former Governor Barbara Roberts was excellent. Beaverton, in particular, provided a very interesting mix of people.

Councilor Park said that one of the Beaverton participants hoped for more local government participation on the council.

12. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:37 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
062900c-01	None	2000 Regional Transportation Plan Power Point Presentation	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tom Kloster, TP Planner	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-02	None	2000 Regional Transportation Plan Public Involvement Timeline	TO: Metro Council FROM: Andy Cotugno, Director of TP and GM	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-03	None	Walker Road 5 Lane	TO: Metro Council	Ordinance

062900c-04	6/29/00	Expansion Project 3143 letter, map and pictures Testimony on the Regional Transportation Plan	FROM: Matt Whitman and Matt Palmer TO: Metro Council FROM: Bruce Pollock	No. 00-869 Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-05	6/28/00	Comments on the Regional Transportation Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-06	6/29/00	Testimony on the Regional Transportation Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Lynn Peterson Transportation Advocate and representing 1000 Friends	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-07	6/29/00	Testimony on Regional Transportation Plan – The Banfield Corridor	TO: Metro Council FROM: Morgan Will	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-08	6/29/00	Caig Testimony on the Regional Transportation Plan update and letter from Dept of Transportation to Jon Kvistad re: Hillsboro/Farmington UGB amendment	TO: Metro Council FROM: Steve Larrance, CAIG	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-09	6/20/00	Testimony on RTP of 1999: Projects 6030 & 6013	TO: Metro Council FROM: Pat Whiting, Chair CPO 4-M	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-10	6/29/00	Written testimony from Tom Brian and Roy Rogers, concerning request for delay in RTP	TO: Metro Council FROM: Westside Business Coalition on Transportation	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-11	6/29/00	Letter on behalf of Washington Board of County Commissioners concerning request for delay in adoption of RTP	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tom Brian, Chairman, Washington County Commission	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-12	6/28/00	Letter concerning RTP Westside Economic Alliance Comments	TO: Andy Cotugno FROM: Frank Angelo and Betty Atteberry, Westside Economic Alliance	Ordinance No. 00-869
062900c-13	6/29/00	Update of Regional Transportation Plan letter	TO: Metro Council and Mike Burton FROM: Brian Newman, President of Willamette Pedestrian Coalition	Ordinance No. 00-869

Metro Council Meeting

6/29/00

Page 20

062900c-14 6/29/00

Email and map
concerning Pedestrian
issues for SW Portland
on the RTP

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Don Baack

Ordinance
No. 00-869