

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

May 14, 1998

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer) Ruth McFarland, Susan McLain, Ed Washington, Lisa Naito

Councilors Absent: Patricia McCaig, Don Morissette (both excused)

Presiding Officer Kvistad convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:16 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Art Lewellan, 3205 SE 8th Portland OR continued his dialogue on the LOTI design focusing on the set of compromises that he had included in his LOTI design. He suggested instead of taking the light rail into Milwaukie, bringing the streetcar into Milwaukie allowing for the station to be closer at hand. He reviewed additional advantages to bringing the streetcar into Milwaukie.

Councilor McFarland asked Mr. Lewellan about his design.

Mr. Lewellan explained his design again.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Washington presented a letter to the Executive Officer from the mayor and delegation of Japan visitors. He noted that he had received a gift to present to the Council as well.

Mike Burton updated members of the council concerning what has been going on with the Endangered Species Act. He read his update into the record (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). He noted what types of species were listed and who was the responsible federal agency, why National Marine Fisheries Service listed a species, what was required when a species was listed, and the exceptions to the requirement. He then reviewed Metro's role including charter preamble as well as the mission statements of growth management services and regional parks and greenspaces departments. Metro had at least 3 important roles including identifying Metro activities that potentially impacted Steelhead, ensuring regional coordination, and communication. He suggested the next steps that should be taken.

Councilor McLain asked a question about the Regional Water Consortium and whether there would be a briefing on the Act.

Mr. Burton said he would be happy to review the Act with this group.

Councilor McLain added that she had seen the work plan.

Mr. Burton responded by noting the briefing packet that the council had received.

Councilor Naito wondered if there was any indication about the State of Oregon and how they were involved in this process.

Mr. Burton responded that they were and explained further their involvement.

Councilor Naito asked about the City of Portland's process noting that it was a good one.

Mr. Burton concurred and explained what the city was doing. He added that he had been asked to come to the Portland Chamber tomorrow to speak to Metro's proposed contribution to the schools.

Councilor McFarland asked if the schools had planned for Metro to give moneys to the other school districts in the region. She felt that it was presumptuous to write Metro's contribution into the Portland School District. She expressed her concern.

Councilor Naito said, having just reviewed the budget, the point made was there was no additional funds in the general fund. She suggested meeting with the Oregonian and reviewing Metro's proposed budget.

Mr. Burton said he had contacted the Oregonian to question where they had received this information and they indicated that it was from the school district's budget itself.

Councilor McFarland said she thought Mr. Burton was right. There was a disconnect with the Oregonian and the Portland School District.

Councilor McLain appreciated Mr. Burton clarifying Metro's responsibilities.

4. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. MPAC COMMUNICATION

Councilor McLain said she and Councilor Naito had met with MPAC last night. They would be starting their meeting at 4:30 p.m. on May 28th and invited the council to attend as soon as possible recognizing the formal meeting started at 5:30 p.m.. She also reviewed some of the progress which has been made on Title 3.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration meeting minutes of the May 7, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of May 7, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

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

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 98-749**, Amending the FY 1997-98 MERC Operating Fund budget and appropriations schedule for the purpose of transferring appropriations to increase Operating Expenses, Debt Service and Capital Outlay, and declaring an emergency.

Presiding Officer Kvistad assigned Ordinance No. 98-749 to the Finance Committee.

7.2 **Ordinance No. 98-740**, Amending the FY 1997-98 Budget and Appropriations Schedule by transferring \$45,469 from Capital Outlay to Debt Service in the General Revenue Bond Fund for the purpose of correcting a technical error, and declaring an emergency.

Presiding Officer Kvistad assigned Ordinance No. 98-740 to the Finance Committee.

7.3 **Ordinance No. 98-751**, Amending the FY 1997-98 Budget and Appropriations Schedule in the Support Service Fund and in the Building Management Fund for various funding purposes and declaring an emergency.

Presiding Officer Kvistad assigned Ordinance No. 98-751 to the Finance Committee.

8. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

8.1 **Ordinance No. 98-742**, Amending the FY 1997-98 Budget and Appropriations Schedule by Transferring \$150,000 from Contingency to Capital Outlay in the Solid Waste Revenue Fund to Provide for Initial Expenditures Associated with the Replacement of Compaction Systems at Metro South Station, and declaring an emergency.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 98-742.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** reviewed that this ordinance provided funds for the purchase of compactions systems at Metro South Station. She indicated that these systems were necessary when one was in the business of garbage.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 98-742. No one came forward. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9. RESOLUTIONS

9.1 **Resolution No. 98-2642**, Amending Canemah Refinement Section of the Willamette River Greenway Target Area Refinement Plan.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2642.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** spoke of Resolution No. 98-2642 indicating that this parcel would provide a link between Metro open spaces and Oregon City park land. The owner was a willing seller and the land owner to the east was also supportive. This purchase came under the 1990 bond measure to purchase open spaces for the public for the future. Canemah Bluff was one section of Metro's key areas for protection. She urged the council's support of this resolution.

Presiding Officer Kvistad noted that the Canemah Bluff's property was the property that many of the Metro employees helped clean up.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.2 **Resolution No. 98-2631**, Accepting a Nominee to the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2631.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said there were a few openings on MCCI. Dale Chambers from Forest Grove had agreed to participate in MCCI. Government Affairs Committee had reviewed his application and forward the resolution to council with a do pass recommendation.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.3 **Resolution No. 98-2645**, Approving 1998 Bylaws Amendments for the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2645.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** reviewed that this measure was a house keeping measure amending the bylaws of MCCI. The Council was responsible for approving and voting on the bylaw changes. She noted that one of the changes was to place MCCI on a fiscal year which coordinated better with other Metro operations. She urged the council's support of the resolution.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.4 **Resolution No. 98-2651**, Adding the Second Largest Cities of Clackamas and Washington County to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2651.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said that this resolution would make MPAC larger by two members. There were 22 members currently, this resolution would take membership up to 24. The two new members would represent the second largest cities of Clackamas and Washington counties. She felt that their membership on the Advisory Committee would be extremely important. She noted that at this time the second largest city in Clackamas county was Oregon City and Hillsboro in Washington county. These cities were not named in the resolution because the cities may change with changes in the population.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.5 **Resolution No. 98-2636**, Confirming the Selection of First Chairperson and Vice-Chair for the Natural Hazards Technical Advisory Committee, and Appointing a Home Builder delegate to the Committee.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2636.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** said these appointments were reviewed in the Growth Management Committee and they recommended unanimous adoption of this resolution. This resolution would confirm the first chair and vice chair of the Natural Hazards Technical Advisory Committee, both terms would end in May 1999. Ed Trompke was named as chair and Scott Porter as vice chair. It also confirmed John Godsey to serve the remainder of the term as home builder delegate to the committee, his term would also end in May 1999. She urged the council's support.

Presiding Officer Kvistad added that John Godsey was a Hillsboro City Councilor.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.6 **Resolution No. 98-2633**, Authorizing the Executive Officer to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement Establishing the South/North Land Use Final Order (LUFO) Steering Committee.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2633.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** said that in 1996 the Oregon legislature adopted HB 3478 defining the procedure for siting the South North Light Rail and establishing a process to be used to adopt a land use final order (LUFO). LUFO defined the light rail route, stations, park and ride lots and other related facilities. Metro was required to enter into an intergovernmental agreement with Tri-Met, ODOT, Clackamas and Multnomah County and the cities of Portland and Milwaukie. The IGA established a South North Steering Committee and directed that the charge of the committee was to adopt a recommended LUFO to be forwarded to the Tri-Met Board of Directors. The IGA also noted that, subsequent to the adoption of the LUFO, the partners would work in good faith to execute a second IGA that would implement the requirements of other sections of HB 3478. Metro would be a voting member on the LUFO Steering Committee, a subcommittee of the South North Steering Committee. He urged adoption.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if this committee actually made the alignment decision? According to the way he was interpreting this, it was different than what he understood in the Transportation Planning Committee.

Leon Skiles responded that the actual decision makers for the project were the Metro Council both for the locally preferred strategy and for the land use final order. The preferred strategy identified the project they would like to build, the land use final order established the land use findings criteria so that the project could be permitted under Oregon land use law. The purpose of the two Steering Committees were, one which adopted a recommendation for the locally preferred strategy and the second, the Land Use Final Order Steering Committee recommended a land use final order. The land use final order recommendations went to the TriMet Board who submitted an application to the Metro Council. The steering committees were not the deciding bodies but rather recommending bodies.

Councilor Naito read a portion of the resolution and then asked if the steering committee was forwarding the recommendation to TriMet and then TriMet forward that recommendation to the Council?

Mr. Skiles said this was correct. They would also forward the recommendation from the Steering Committee to the Metro Council at the time the application that TriMet submitted was forward to the Council. The Council would have knowledge if there was any difference in the Steering Committee's recommendation and the TriMet Board's application.

Councilor Naito said what troubled her was that what was forwarded to Council was approval of the order rather than a decision that the Metro Council might wish to make. It seemed to imply a process where the Council was only okaying what had happened rather than making an actual decision.

Councilor Washington said he would think in that situation the Council and JPACT still made the final decision. If something was sent that the Council disagreed with then it would be sent back to them until there was agreement. He asked Mr. Skiles for clarification.

Mr. Skiles said yes, the Council had to come into an agreement with TriMet on the land use final order. The dialogue would hopefully occur through today's council work session, through the process of the steering committee adoption both of the preferred strategy and the land use final order. It would not just be TriMet unilaterally applying, TriMet would be part of that discussion as well.

Councilor Washington asked if this procedure had been followed with both east side and west side light rail.

Mr. Skiles said the same procedure was followed for the west side and the Hillsboro project except that in that instance the state law had TriMet being the decider of the land use final order because the project was in preliminary engineering at the time. It had already had a DEIS completed by Metro, prior to the requirements for a land use final order.

Councilor Naito wondered, if in paragraph A, there would be difficulty with substituting language, instead of saying for approval of land use final order, saying for the decision of the land use final order. Also clarifying in subsection B, where it referred to Metro, including language that it would come back to the Metro Council. She asked legal counsel for clarification.

Mr. Dan Cooper, Legal Counsel, said one of the reasons this resolution was written this way was that the statutory provision setting up the authority for Metro to do the land use final order and put it on the fast track for an appeal that would go quickly rather than the normal LUBA process, set TriMet up as being the applicant just as if it were any other private developer. The Council would be making the land use decision on the developer's application. The Council had the authority to approve the application, make the land use decision, or deny it. The Council did not have the ability to change their project. TriMet was the project applicant. This was why this structure was carefully drawn to fit the specific provisions of the statute that was adopted by the legislature on the land use process.

Councilor Naito said she had been looking at it wrong all along in the sense that it would come to Council for any decision. It would go to TriMet for a decision and then they would forward their recommendation to the Metro Council for approval. The Council's only option at that point would be to accept or reject it.

Mr. Cooper said the Council could accept it, reject it or send it back to TriMet with the Council's conditions. If TriMet accepted the conditions they would then bring it back to Council. TriMet did have the option to do the 'no build' decision. If the land use decision that the Council made was not one that would work for TriMet, as a project manager, they got to go back to the drawing board and come back to the Council.

Councilor Naito said this was fine and seemed to be the way the resolution was written. This was not how she had understood it before, it was possible she had misunderstood the process.

Mr. Cooper said part of the nuance of this was that there were two parallel decisions going on here, one was the land use decision which was purely one of state law which got all of the land use planning pieces taken care of with one appeal so that the project could go forward with certainty. The second decision was the locally preferred strategy which was part of the federal process. He suggested Mr. Skiles and Mr. Brandman might wish to further clarify.

Presiding Officer Kvistad added that Metro did have the siting decision as the funding agent through JPACT. They would actually make the determination of the actual siting. This process would be similar to one where a local jurisdiction asked for a change in urban growth boundary or land use planning, you must have an entity that made the land use request under state law. TriMet would be the entity making the land use request under state law for the alignment so that it had one point of appeal.

Councilor Naito said she understood this piece but she thought it went contrary to what Mr. Cooper had just said.

Mr. Cooper responded that he did not think so. TriMet was the applicant for the land use portion. 99% of the issues got resolved in the locally preferred strategy which was also coming to the Council for final decision. The land use application had to conform to those decisions. The planning was for all of these decisions to happen fairly closely together as one package. The Council had more discretion on their vote on the locally preferred strategy than they did on the land use final order.

Councilor Naito acknowledged that she understood.

Councilor Washington urged the Council's support and noted that there would be opportunity to discuss this at the work session.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.7 **Resolution No. 98-2644**, Approving an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Cornelius for Management of Property in the Gales Creek Target Area.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2644.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** noted the Gales Creek property on the map. The Regional Facilities Committee consider this resolution and voted unanimously in favor of it. Ms. Nancy Chase told the committee that Metro had purchased a .22 acre parcel in the Gales Creek Target Area. This property was adjacent to a .76 acre track owned by the City of Cornelius. The City would like to develop the parcel for access to the Tualatin River and call it Steamboat Park. The City had contributed approximately 10% of the purchase price of the property and was committed to assuming management responsibility for it. This IGA clarified the management responsibilities, in keeping with many other pieces of land that Metro had purchased. She felt that it was spectacular that this parcel could be part of the park.

Councilor McLain added her congratulation to staff for working out a good intergovernmental agreement. She thought this was an exciting partnership. She noted that the Tualatin River Keepers were considering a canoe trip that would start at this site. The Steamboat Park name came from a historical perspective. There used to be steamboats on the river and this had been one of the final stops.

Councilor Washington asked for clarification about the Tualatin River and Gales Creek.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.8 **Resolution No. 98-2643**, Amending the Tualatin River Access Points Target Area Refinement Plan and Authorizing the Executive Officer to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Tualatin to Manage Property.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2643.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** said Metro had some access points in the target area refinement plan. This resolution executed an IGA with the city of Tualatin to manage property. The Council was authorizing the Executive Officer to amend the Tualatin River access points so that Metro would be in agreement with local people, connecting trails and access points.

Presiding Officer Kvistad reviewed the map indicating where these access points could be found. Metro had worked with the City of Tualatin to purchase some green and open space along the river adjacent to this parcel. This agreement helped to construct and build a greenway.

Councilor McFarland said the city of Tualatin agreed to contribute to the purchase price of the 8 and half acre property and requested Metro's help. The intergovernmental agreement would ask the City of Tualatin to maintain the property, Metro would have not oversight responsibility in that way.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing.

Paul Hennon, Tualatin Parks and Recreation Director, said the resolution lead to the acquisition of 8 1/2 acres of property that would expand an already 20 acre park, Browns Ferry Park along the Tualatin River. It would add about 1400 linear feet of high quality land within the Tualatin River Greenway. The city viewed it as a valuable addition to the region's open space program. It provided an opportunity for the public to immediately get on property that the Metro Greenspaces program was involved with. There was a parking lot, prairie, wooded nature area, and a boat dock with a canoe and kayak rental concession on the Browns Ferry Park right now. This parcel would be east of that area and be included within the Park. The Tualatin City Council recently approved a resolution authorizing the acquisition of the property, partnering with Metro, expending the last portion of their local share funds and entering into the IGA to manage the property whereby the City took this responsibility on. The city had willing sellers for the property, the Millers. The City of Tualatin urged adoption of this resolution.

Councilor Washington asked for clarification on where the parcel was on the map.

Councilor Naito said she thought the canoe experience sounded fun, Councilor Washington's question had helped clarify where the parcel was located. She asked if canoes could be rented now.

Mr. Hennon responded yes and gave directions to the park.

Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Councilor McFarland closed by saying that both of these resolutions dealt with the Tualatin River. She urged the council's support.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.9 **Resolution No. 98-2641**, Confirming the Nominations of Sylvia Milne and Brian Scott to the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2641.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** reviewed the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee's responsibilities. This resolution confirmed the nominations of two individuals; Sylvia Milne, a community involvement coordinator for Oak Lodge Neighborhood Park Advisory Board and Brian Scott, a Rose City Neighborhood Association member who had extensive experience in financial management and marketing. She urged approval of the confirmation.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the Metro Council and convened the Contract Review Board.

10. CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

10.1 **Resolution No. 98-2624**, Extending a Three-Year Contract to a Five-Year Contract for Soft-Drink Dispenser Machines, Maintenance of Same, and Syrups.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2624.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** said that the Regional Facilities Committee had spent quite a bit of time on this resolution. This resolution involved the contract for soft drink syrup at the Zoo. She noted that this resolution was important to look at because Metro was trying to balance the need to be business like and flexible but also as a government, we wanted to make sure that our contracts where ever possible were put out to bid and there was a competitive bidding process. This legislation was a hybrid between those two goals. Metro had budgeted \$25,000 for FY 1997-98 and another \$25,000 for FY 1998-99 for soft drink syrup. The Zoo currently had a contract which ended in February 1999 with Portland Bottling. In September 1998, the new Oregon Exhibit would open at the Zoo which would include a new food service and catering facility. There was need of new equipment and construction to put soft drinks dispensers in these new facilities. This resolution provided an extension of the three year contract to a five year contract ending in February 2001. There would be an overall cost savings with this contract because correct cabinetry, plumbing and electrical systems, which would be needed, could be put in. Portland Bottling was the lowest bid and substantially less than the other two bids. This made good financial sense for Metro, they had been very careful that the existing vendor was the cheapest and had provided excellent service at the Zoo. She urged the council's support.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the Contract Review Board and reconvened the Metro Council.

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

12. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor McFarland said the committee, that was constituted by MERC to study the Civic Stadium and what should be done with the facility, finished its work and they presented their recommendations to the MERC Commission. Those recommendations were accepted by the Commission. Financial issues were not dealt with in total, however, the total of what was recommended was \$45 million. These recommendations would be coming to Metro Council and

the Portland City Council. She assured the council that she did not commit Metro to any amount of money. Metro might find themselves the organization that would issue the bond for the voters to vote on but other than that she did not see that Metro had any way of contributing moneys. She had followed the council's recommendations. This would bring the facility up to a point where a decision could be made to go with either soccer or baseball. Thus far, those interested in soccer, had contacted Councilor McFarland more often than those interested in baseball. She noted that the committee that made these recommendations was a committee of very high powered people. She added that this recommendation would come before the Council at a future date.

13. SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL WORK SESSION

Councilor Washington said this work session would include a thorough overview of the South North Light Rail alignment and length alternatives.

Michael Morrissey, Senior Council Analyst, reviewed the materials for the work session; issues describing the South North options found in the DEIS, further summarized into a briefing document dated March 20th and a pamphlet which included the discrete items that the Council would be reviewing and giving guidance on at this work session. The pamphlet outlined a blue print of the 11 discussion choices that the Council would be reviewing including length alternatives, 9 alignment choices from the Clackamas Regional Center through Hayden Island in Vancouver as well as a maintenance facility choice. There was one page for each of the choices in the packet which attempted to discuss in summary fashion the overview of each of those choices and sub-choices. Each of the pages also referred back to the DEIS.

Councilor Washington noted the public comment notebooks, the small briefing book and the DEIS. The purpose of today's work session was to receive Council input on major alignment issues on the South North Light Rail project prior to Councilor Washington's participation in the South North Light Rail Steering Committee on June 5th. The corridor had been studied for more than five years. The full corridor went from Clackamas Town Center to Vancouver at a cost of \$2.3 billion, 21 miles long, and could take as much as 15 years to construct. For this reason the light rail would have to be built in segments. Throughout his years participating in this process he had concluded that the full project was the right project, it had by far the highest ridership and the most benefits. It also had the most potential for enhancing neighborhoods throughout the corridor as well as a bi-state area. He asked for the Council's input at the end of the work session to understand if the Council shared his opinion. The staff would take Council through the major alignment issues one by one before the Council came back to the larger issue of what length the project should be. There would be no vote at Council today but the final vote would be before Council on July 23, 1998. This work session allowed Council to have early input into the decision making process and allowed Councilor Washington to understand any issues or concerns the Council might have. The formal process would start next week with a recommendation from the project managers group which would be followed by recommendations from the Citizen Advisory Committee, the Downtown Oversight Committee and the Steering Committee. All the partner jurisdictions would take action in June before this came back to the Council in July for final decision and conclusion. The purpose of today's session was to hear from the Council and to make sure the Council understood the alignments, the phases, and what the MOS stood for. He urged each Councilor to get out and see the project by walking it. It made a lot more sense. He had asked staff to put together a tour for any councilors who were interested in a tour.

Richard Brandman, Assistant Transportation Director, said they would go through the segments one by one highlighting the key issues which they had learned through the process of working with the community. He noted the 2 volume public comment book which they had processed. At

the beginning of the book there was a summary of the major public comments for each segment. He spoke of a letter dated March 21st to the governors of the states of Oregon and Washington as well as a number of other officials including Councilor Washington from the South North Expert Review panel, the panel that had analyzed all of the data that had been used to complete the draft Environmental Impact Statement as well as to define the issues that were at hand for each segment. He noted several sentences in the letter to support evidence of the thoroughness of the job. "At our final meeting, one of our members observed no other place does this as thoroughly and comprehensively as Portland.....Clearly the level of work performed in this region documented in the DEIS and ancillary reports represents an unusually thorough level of analysis to support the identification of the locally preferred alternative. The public involvement effort has been outstanding not only in its scope but particularly in the range of efforts to engage a broad cross section of people and communities in the project." This letter was from the independent group of experts across the United State that helped participate in this process.

Mr. Brandman continued by reviewed the packet of information the Council had before them at this meeting. (A copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting.) The first page of the packet showed what were the issues at hand, some were larger issues than others, some were issues that they had not spent much time addressing with the Council because they were somewhat technical in nature as opposed to policy in nature. He started with page 3 which reviewed the Clackamas Regional Center segment. He added that Mr. Leon Skiles would note on the map what Mr. Brandman was describing verbally. The two options for the Clackamas Regional Center were north and south of the Clackamas Town Center with terminus options ending either at the Town Center or further to the east with the north of I-205 segment or further to the south and east with the south of the Clackamas Town Center option. The real issue here was how much more would it cost. Either option going beyond the town center would have some benefit associated with it, but that benefit came at a cost. The cost to go east of the freeway with the north option was \$85 to \$100 million and with the south option was almost \$50 million. The community was desiring to have a project that seemed to not only be the basic project but which best met community needs. There may not be money to go that far in this round of the work. Looking at the two options that just stopped at the Town Center itself, the one on the north side was about \$3 million less than the south side option. It was also closer to the apartments which were just north of the Town Center. This option was strongly supported by the management of the Town Center. They had commented through the public comment period that they had a strong preference for the north side option. They planned to grow the Town Center to the north and would try and meet that station by physically extending the Town Center to meet the light rail station. They also had extensive plans to turn Monterey Avenue into a main street and have the light rail be incorporated into that main street.

Councilor Naito asked if the Clackamas Promenade owners were the same as the owners of the Clackamas Town Center?

Mr. Brandman responded, no, the Town Center was owned by the Illinois Teachers Pension Fund, he was unsure who owned the Promenade. The owners of the Town Center came to the Steering Committee. There was a new management team for the Town Center in the last month. The team was a management company from Chicago who had tremendous interest in turning the Town Center into the Regional Center that Metro had talked about through the 2040 process. They brought plans for high rise office buildings that would be going onto the site of the Town Center and other amenities which would start to create a Regional Center. They were also very supportive of the Town Center north option. Their concern about the south option was that it was the main auto access into the Town Center off of I-205. The anchor tenants which were Meier and Frank and Sears had a line of sight from the roadway to their buildings and they had very intense,

strong feelings that that line of sight needed to be uninterrupted. There would be a structure on the south side of the facility which would interrupt that line of sight.

Councilor Naito said the thing that troubled her was that there were numerous stores in the Promenade as well as restaurants. On the north side, it was some walking distance from these retailers and restaurants. While servicing one part of the Town Center you were leaving a whole area totally underserved. She did not think people would walk through the mall to the Promenade from the light rail on the north side.

Mr. Brandman said there was a trade off. The trade off in this situation was the significant number of apartments to the north. If the alignment were on the south side, it would make the accessibility to those apartment dwellers much less. This was a trade off.

Councilor McLain questioned which of the two alignments could be continued on to Oregon City.

Mr. Brandman stated that there were numerous ways to get to Oregon City and the project was being taken that direction. Another study was to be conducted soon in order to find the most reasonable way to get to Oregon Center. He explained that both the McLoughlin Boulevard and the I-205 corridors would be studied. From the Town Center, either of those two options would work.

Mr. Skiles outlined on the map how each alignment option would continue to Oregon City.

Councilor Washington pointed out that all the information needed by Metro Council after today's work session was contained in the briefing documents including design options and terminus options. He called for further questions.

Councilor Naito discussed the cost factors and that either alignment would probably end south or north of the Town Center right now even if there were plans to extend the line later on. She pointed out that the cost to go the complete way would be much more costly by several million dollars. She stressed the importance of including Clackamas Promenade as well as Clackamas Town Center. She asked whether service to Sunnyside Medical Center would be feasible under these circumstances.

Mr. Brandman stated that this could be accomplished if the Monarch Hotel Park and Ride was not served, crossing over at I-205 (he noted two possible cross overs). The problem with this was cost. It was more cost effective to serve Kaiser with one cross over than another.

Councilor Naito indicated that in a previous briefing she understood that there were a lot of people who worked and went to that medical facility.

Councilor Washington stated he had been involved in a briefing which revealed that the facilities managers at Kaiser Sunnyside discussed the fact that the light rail would take out some of their property. They would lose some of their buildings and this was of great concern for them.

Councilor McFarland asked if the alignment showed routing to Kaiser.

Mr. Brandman indicated that Kaiser was very supportive of light rail to the Clackamas Regional Center but they had a concern about Sunnyside Road auto access. Their north Portland facility was much more conducive to transit populations.

Councilor Naito stated that the culture in that area, automobile-dependency would continue unabated. She did feel that they should be sensitive to costs factors and property owners needs but wasn't the whole idea of light rail to change the auto culture.

Councilor Washington reiterated that Kaiser had testified against bringing light rail to the Kaiser Sunnyside medical facility.

Councilor McLain stated that this decision had to be not just ridership but opportunity because of the expense of the project and the fact that it would be built in phases as well as the fact that Metro would have to come back and perform retrofit to get it carried to its full length. She stressed the short-term and long-term opportunities. She said Mr. Brandman had indicated some advantages to the north side Clackamas Town Center alignment, there seemed to be some master planning concepts and ideas. What was the difference in opportunities for TODs or for stationary planning to actually bring the kind of development or intensity that they would need for that kind of ridership. She asked what advantages Mr. Brandman saw north over south versus south over north of Clackamas Town Center.

Mr. Brandman stated that the way the planning activities were being designed by the owners of the property, they were moving very strongly towards the Main Street on Monterey and growing the Town Center to the north to meet that Main Street opportunity. For a suburban developer to be as progressive as they were with respect to trying to implement the 2040 process, that was a good faith effort on their part. They would have difficulty trying to replicate that same kind of Main Street on Sunnyside Road because this entity was a major, wide, auto-oriented arterial, the nature of which would be very difficult to change. The light rail, running through that alignment, would not be able to be at the street level. It would have to be elevated because of the grades that were presently there. He thought that was why the owners of the property had such strong feelings about utilizing the north alignment rather than the south.

Councilor McFarland reacted to Councilor Naito's statement in that people who were sick and trying to get to the hospital used cars for the most part. A certain level of access by automobile was vital for the way the hospital functioned.

Councilor Naito stated that transportation and health care were of great importance to the senior citizens, access by light rail, for that population, would be particularly helpful.

Mr. Brandman then discussed the Railroad Avenue / Highway 244 segment. The key issue in this segment was displacements. The Railroad Avenue alignments would necessitate a rather large number of residential displacements because of the nature of the existing railroad tracks, the street and the ability to introduce light rail to that street environment. The alignment called "through traffic" had 97 residential impacts whereas the local access had 26 residential impacts, so those figures were reversed. Definitions of terms: "through traffic" meant leave Railroad Avenue alone and introduce light rail next to the street which would require the taking of the first row of houses next to the street. That was the chief reason that there was such a large number of residential displacement.

Mr. Skiles showed on the map the two options.

Mr. Brandman continued with comments regarding Railroad Avenue indicating that in an effort to minimize displacements they had looked at making Railroad Avenue being made into a skinny street and have only local access, meaning that there would be barriers on Railroad Avenue in different locations, which would cul-de-sac the street so that citizens could get to their homes but not use Railroad Avenue as the main through street. This plan saved much housing displacement and brought that number down to 26. Unfortunately it had no public support for changing the nature of the street to that kind of characteristic. There was public support for the Highway 224 option. The impacts were far less. It brought resident displacements down to 14 and it also was strongly supported by the industrial area at the Freeman Way station. Several thousand employees of a number of businesses including Omark were in that area. A large number of comments were received in support of the Hwy. 224 alignment as well as the station at Freeman Way.

Another issue that had arisen was whether or not there would be a park and ride lot and station at the Milwaukie Marketplace. There had been a significant amount of public comment about the undesirability of having a park and ride at the marketplace. Comments had suggested not changing the characteristics of the neighborhood by turning it into a park and ride neighborhood.

There were opportunities, Mr. Brandman stated, to not have that park and ride lot and for the first segment to terminate at the Linwood Harmony area as opposed to the marketplace. They had looked at the request of the City of Milwaukie and had looked at the situation more critically. There was a potential that a first alignment segment could terminate at Linwood Road which would alleviate the need to have a marketplace station park and ride lot as part of the first project.

Councilor McLain asked if the Milwaukie Marketplace was the old Safeway that had closed.

Mr. Brandman explained that the old Safeway was in the next segment which was right in the downtown area.

Councilor McLain asked that Mr. Brandman repeat his previous testimony for her. She also requested clarification on the map.

Mr. Brandman explained that it was at the crossing of Linwood and Harmony Streets.

Councilor Naito asked if the light rail went to the Linwood/Harmony cross section, would there be a stop at the marketplace at all or was the park and ride the reason for a stop at the cross section.

Mr. Brandman stated that the Mayor and City Council of Milwaukie were having a town hall meeting on May 27, 1998 where they would solicit more community input on that question. He urged allowance that Milwaukie have more time in their process before Metro Council came to any conclusion.

Councilor Washington said that of all of the segments this was probably the most sensitive one, that was why they were trying to ensure as much input as possible from the citizens.

Mr. Brandman then stated that the Milwaukie Regional Center Segment was somewhat easier because there was no choice on the alignment. The other issue in this segment would be location of a park and ride. There was need for a park and ride lot in this vicinity as well as a possible maintenance facility.

Mr. Skiles explained the park and ride as well as maintenance facility issues indicating the two potential sites.

Mr. Brandman said that McLoughlin Boulevard had one of the lower key issues associated with it. McLoughlin Boulevard itself was another area where there was just one alignment choice that was narrowed some time ago. The good news for McLoughlin Boulevard was that the alignment would be between the trees and the railroad tracks so the trees would be preserved. Light rail would have no impact on those trees.

The real issue was the station at Bybee, there was a number of pedestrians from the Eastmoreland and Sellwood neighborhoods who wished to access the trains at that station as well as buses that were crossing Bybee. The question became how do you get the people at the overpass level down to the station, which was below the overpass. One option would be to construct a new pedestrian overcrossing that would allow crossing on a pedestrian bridge and construct stairs from that bridge to the station. The second option would require a complete reconstruction of the overpass which would cost \$11 million in additional funds. This would allow buses to actually pull out on the overpass without stopping traffic. This was one of the issues where the overpass for pedestrians was sufficient to accomplish the objective of getting residents who were walking to the trains down to the tracks. There was also some desire to build the overpass for buses. The City of Portland and ODOT were talking about ways this could be accomplished through means other than South North Light Rail project costs. The cheaper option worked but the more expensive option worked better. There may be an opportunity to have someone else pay for that more expensive option.

The next issue had been focused on by a lot of the community and it related to crossing the Willamette River. Both alignments would be successful but had different characteristics. The east side alignment would serve neighborhoods in east Portland. Much testimony had been provided from the neighborhoods involved. The light rail would also serve businesses in the vicinity of the station around LaFayette Street. Fred Meyer corporate headquarters was within walking distance of that station as well as a number of other businesses. OMSI would provide a unique regional attraction to the light rail system. There was wide spread community support for that alignment. The other option skirted the edge of Southeast Portland neighborhoods along the river, crossed Ross Island and continued through the north Macadam industrial area which was being renamed, although the announcement of this was still forthcoming. This was a major redevelopment opportunity for the City of Portland. Approximately 110 acres of unutilized land would be transformed into a new river district. It was viewed as a mixed-use neighborhood and place to work. OHSU had announced the plans for a new women's clinic which would go into this area. Public testimony had been heavily weighted on this issue. On the north Macadam option the property owners nor the group responsible for planning the future of that district could agree to support the alignment. A potential opportunity existed to introduce a street car from PSU through Riverplace that would follow that alignment and potentially terminate if a Caruthers crossing were constructed.

Councilor Naito announced that this portion of the package had great interest for her in that she often shopped in the central east side of the river which was an area that had a great deal of potential. It was not even far from Metro. Regarding the Caruthers alignment, she stated that OMSI was an important feature to be considered. Tourism was an important feature for the Metro Council to consider in this area. Portland's east side had been often overlooked in many of its infrastructure developments and she stated her belief that there was so much redevelopment and infill occurring in the east side of Portland that it was now time to put some development dollars into that whole redevelopment issue. The neighborhoods felt strongly about the Caruthers

alignment. Finally, according to Councilor Naito, there were some environmental impacts and, in view of this, she continued that the Audobon Society supported this alignment.

Councilor McLain questioned Mr. Brandman regarding the trolley on the west side and if it had the support of the property owners as well as the people of that area.

Mr. Brandman said yes it did.

Councilor McLain said that they had shown good ridership for the Caruthers crossing.

Mr. Brandman replied that the Caruthers alignment had higher ridership than the Ross Island alignment.

Councilor McLain continued by questioning the redevelopment and infill opportunities in those neighborhoods.

Mr. Brandman stated that on both alignments there was a fair number of redevelop opportunities in those neighborhoods. Mr. Brandman stated that in each neighborhood affected, numerous development opportunities existed.

In that there were no more questions of Mr. Brandman began the next segment at the request of Councilor Washington.

Mr. Brandman reviewed the mall alignment options. He said the downtown issue was the phasing of the alignment through the downtown. When Ballot Measure 32 was defeated and they had to go through that cost cutting process, they ended up adding to the next alignment options what was called the half mall alignment option which would turn at Morrison and Yamhill and follow the existing Max alignment. They had also continued to carry a full mall alignment from the south end of downtown to the train station, then across the Steel Bridge. Near the train station there were two options that had been under consideration, one which was pretty close to the train station called the Irving Street option and the other which was about two blocks to the south on Glisan Street. Through the EIS they had discovered that the full mall alignment would actually serve 11000 additional trips per day than the half mall alignment. If they did the half mall option, 11000 trips to destinations in that area where the light rail wouldn't be served would create significant inconvenienced. The riders would have to get off and transfer to buses or walk. You would lose a lot of the advantage of having direct service. With respect to development opportunities, the stations areas in that north mall section had a fair number of underdeveloped blocks downtown south of Morrison/Yamhill along the existing transit corridor. This was where the strength of the office corridor was, north was where it was weakest. There was a large number of development opportunities, 77 acres of developable land with the full mall versus 56 acres with the half mall. This all came with a cost, the cost was \$115 million more to do the full mall alignment.

Lastly, concerning the issue of Glisan and Irving, the question was could you introduce light rail into the north area of the mall and have a really good intermodal connection with Union Station, at the same time not significantly adding to the travel time or inconvenience of riders coming in from north Portland and eventually Clark County. The answer to the question was yes, you could have the best of both worlds, you could get closest to the train station with the Irving Street alignment. The actual engineering alignment had been modified as they had gone through this process to make it a little less circuitous and avoid some historic building impacts and have a similar travel time to the Glisan Street option. It would run behind some buildings along an

existing rail corridor and could run at a higher speed than in the street which it would do on Glisan Street. The riders would not be inconvenienced from the north and you would have a tremendous advantage of an intermodal connection. There was a lot of testimony during the public comment process to build the full mall now, it was necessary for the health of the downtown and the mall would not have to be ripped up twice which was a major disruption to downtown.

The last issue was whether or not to have a station on Harrison Street. In their analysis this station could be added, it was not one which was assumed as a given. The issues there were would a station in that vicinity help accommodate the thousands of residents and employees that were in close proximity to that station. The down side on the Harrison Street station was that it was only 200 to 300 feet from the station that would be at PSU's urban plaza. Normally you would not have light rail station that close in proximity to each other. The Downtown Oversight Committee would be considering this issue at their meeting. The South North Steering Committee would be listening closely to their input.

Councilor McLain asked if it helped at all with the Riverplace?

Mr. Brandman responded, not really. They had considered a station that would have helped serve Riverplace near Harbor Drive. The problem was that Harrison Street was at a grade that was much higher than Riverplace itself. In the consideration of the Oversight Committee they concluded that station attempted to do two things, neither of them very well, it attempted to serve Riverplace but it was away from Riverplace and if you were trying to serve that area with the office buildings and apartments, the Harrison Station served it better. The Committee had taken the Riverplace option off the table at this time and planned to concentrate on whether they should have a Harrison Street Station or not.

Mr. Brandman reviewed the Elliott segment, one which had generated a lot of interest. The issues included starting in the south, the station that said TC (transit center) was a station that was right in the vicinity of the existing light rail station in front of the Trail Blazer arena. Another issue was how to move to the north from that station, either on the west side of the freeway right next to the arena or on the right side of the freeway a bit further away from the arena which would give you an opportunity to have station at Broadway and Weidler east of I-5. If you stayed west of I-5 you could have a station on the west side of the vicinity.

Councilor Washington said this was one of the hardest segments to visualize. He explained how each of the alignments would appear.

Mr. Skiles showed these options on the map.

Mr. Brandman continued explaining the east side alignment. The way the alignments were analyzed in the EIS was having a station east of the freeway at Broadway Weidler, hugging the freeway and having another station right in front of Emmanuel Hospital on Kerby Street. For the west of the freeway alignment they would come up Flynn Avenue taking a left turn on Russell Street near the Ronald McDonald House and have a station to the south of the hospital which would actually be closer to the Elliott neighborhood. Both of these segments generated a lot of interest. The public comments included: starting in the south, the Portland Trailblazers commented strongly that the alignment west of the freeway, closer to their facility, was problematic for them because of the proximity of the tracks to the exit of the arena itself. They thought that having thousands of people streaming out of their building, usually all at one time,

would present a clear danger to pedestrians that were leaving the facility to get to parking or transit.

Councilor Washington concurred with the dangers.

Mr. Brandman continued that the other issue for the Blazers was that they had a garage just to the north of the Rose Garden with the exit of the garage being adjacent to where the tracks would be on the west side. There would be auto and light rail conflicts at this point. The Lloyd District Transportation Management Association, a group of business and community activities, took a strong position in favor of the station east of I-5 because Broadway and Weidler Streets were thriving streets and there was a lot of great activity happening to the east on those streets. Lastly, the Elliott Neighborhood felt strongly about the station on the east side of the freeway. It was closer walking proximity to the neighborhood itself.

Moving to the north the issue became who got better service from these two alignments? The hospital got good service but there was not much redevelopment opportunity there. On the Russell Station there was quite good redevelopment opportunity. Emmanuel Hospital owned four vacant blocks next to that station, housing or businesses could be put on those blocks. The Elliott Neighborhood felt very strongly that, for the residents that wanted to access the light rail, the Russell Station served them far better than Kerby. He commended Councilor Washington for the time he spent in this neighborhood, calming what was getting to be a very exciting situation. His presence helped bring this recommendation to a positive conclusion.

Councilor Naito asked if it was possible to take the east side alignment up and then catch that station?

Mr. Brandman said it was and that was what a lot of people had recommended, mix and match the stations.

Councilor McLain summarized that what had been supported was east I-5 Russell combination.

Mr. Brandman concurred and added that the other issue on this alignment was at Broadway Weidler. He said today's condition was that it was a mess. If you tried to drive through there at almost any time of the day it was a mess. Introducing light rail into that mix backed up more of the surface streets, Broadway and Weidler, and would make it far more difficult to go east and west on those streets. It would also have a very significant implications for ODOT for cars that were trying to exit the freeway at that Broadway-Weidler ramp. The analysis showed that this would leave cars sitting not just on the off ramp but sitting on the freeway trying to get to the off ramp, to Broadway and Weidler streets. ODOT had sent strong comment to Metro as well as the City of Portland indicating if the light rail were on the east side, they wanted the light rail to be grade separated from Broadway Weidler which was part of the DEIS analysis process because they knew about this concern from the past studies that had been completed.

Councilor Washington said you could do the east side and then go up Williams Avenue to Russell and then turn left toward Emmanuel Hospital. In the Elliott Neighborhood you picked up people all the way from MLK Blvd. back. His understanding was if we did this alignment, there would be something that went up over Broadway. He asked for clarification. He understood that there would be a grading so one would travel up over Broadway so as not to interfere with the flow of traffic. Councilor Washington asked about the Broadway Weidler project.

Mr. Brandman responded that ODOT had a project that was on the books as the I-5 Greeley north Banfield project which was a very big ODOT project that had never been funded and may never get off the ground. Discussion between ODOT, the City of Portland and Metro had occurred to look at ways to reduce the scope of that massive freeway project to try and integrate the light rail into that project and avoid some housing displacements that would be required and possibly end up with a project that ODOT could afford.

Councilor McLain said we had stations at the Convention Center. She wondered if they felt that going away from the Rose Quarter as a destination was a smart thing to do? How different was the Rose Quarter congestion versus the Convention Center. She asked how real was the congestion problem?

Mr. Brandman said with either the east or west alignment of the light rail, there would be a station right at the front door of the arena. The arena was well served with either alignment.

Councilor Washington said the Rose Quarter Convention Center area would really be enhanced. He then asked to move to the North Portland segment of the alignment.

Mr. Brandman said that this section of the corridor was again one of those where there was intense public interest. The issues were building light rail along the I-5 corridor a lot less expensively than one could build along Interstate Avenue. There was also a strong feeling on the part of some elected official from the City of Portland as well as the neighborhoods, not withstanding the cost difference, that the opportunities along Interstate Avenue could really help redevelop and revitalize that community with stations along Interstate Avenue. There was actually a study commissioned by the Portland Development Commission that Metro participated in. That study concluded that there were good station opportunities along both the I-5 and Interstate Avenue corridors but they were in different locations. For the Interstate Avenue alignment the stations that were of most interest were a bit further to the north along Portland Boulevard and Lombard Street and especially Kinton. There was very strong support from the Kinton Neighborhood and Business District for a station at Kinton (near the Paul Bunyon statue). The study found that the opportunities close to that station were very significant. There was a general conclusion that this was a worthy goal to try and get to that station. On the I-5 alignments at Killingsworth, they were at the neighborhood level with all of the alignments not down in the I-5 ditch. They discovered that there was a very thriving main street on Killingsworth east of the freeway. That main street was starting to trickle across to the west side of the freeway. This was one of the closest distances between the east and west side of the freeway at Killingsworth. The study found that PCC was also within a short walk of the station that would be located at I-5 and Killingsworth Avenue. There was a lot of interest by many people to try and serve that station.

Further to the south, the opportunities along I-5 also may be considered to be a bit better because the issue was the Going Street Station at Interstate Avenue did have some redevelop opportunities around it but it was also the major arterial access route to Swan Island. There was a large number of trucks going to Swan Island. When the developers went out on a developer tour, they told Metro that while there was opportunity sites, there was not a lot of opportunity because they were not sure what they would develop there with the large volume of trucks. The other site was judged to have its problems as well. It was right next to the freeway and made it an unattractive location for the developers to try and locate new housing for example. The developers did feel there were opportunities there. Neither one of these stations were judged by the developers as their highest priority if they were going to be investing in this area.

Metro had pointed out that with the I-5 station there was an opportunity to actually build a new pedestrian overcrossing and tie back the communities that were divided by the freeway.

Further to the south, at the Edgar Kaiser Medical Facility, the station would either be at their front door or their back door. Here the issue was, if you were trying to hit a mix of stations along I-5 and Interstate Avenue and potentially also reduce the project costs by a large amount of money by mixing and matching these two alignments, the question to be considered with the community was, can you do a cross over alignment? Cross over meant crossing over from an I-5 alignment in the south to an Interstate Avenue alignment in the north and potentially hit the best of all of the stations that were being considered. The answer to that question was yes, one could cross over, there was a range of possibilities where one could cross over. He asked Mr. Skiles to describe the range.

Mr. Skiles detailed the range. In the past they had studied cross overs at Killingsworth and Portland. Generally what they found were there were higher costs the earlier the cross over was to Interstate. They also found there was more ridership with cross over alignments.

Councilor Washington called for questions.

Councilor Naito noted the redevelopment project that was planned by the Expo Center and encouraged light rail access.

Mr. Skiles also spoke of the Alberta, I-5 southbound off ramp and on ramp combination taking several homes. The ramps could also be closed and the alignment put where the ramps were and the ramps reconfigured. The travel time would increase for those coming into the neighborhood. Businesses expressed concern about this proposal. Metro was not satisfied with the option of getting rid of the ramps or the homes so they asked TriMet if there was a way to save both the ramps and the homes. TriMet had come up with a conceptual idea that could achieve this at a fairly small cost, about \$5 million.

Mr. Brandman said the last segment dealt with the alignment, extending in its third construction segment, into Vancouver and across to the Veterans Administration Hospital. They had narrowed it to one alignment, the issue was which side of Washington Street should the alignment be on, the east side or the west side of the street. There was not a lot of information but the east side of the street was about \$2 1/2 million more expensive than the west side. It brought you closer to the heart of the downtown. The west side of the street was cheaper and closer to new development opportunities in Ester Short Park. They were waiting to hear more from the City of Vancouver.

Mr. Skiles said they had heard today that the city's preference was to have the west side alignment to be closer to the new development.

Mr. Brandman reviewed the final issue, the maintenance facility. South North would add about 65 rail cars into the TriMet fleet which would need a place to be stored and maintained. The existing facilities were at Ruby Junction in Gresham and one in Hillsboro. These were not expandable so the trick was to find a site that was close to the corridor so that the trains wouldn't have a lot of deadheading time where there were no riders. Three sites had been explored, one was the Hanna Harvester site north of downtown Milwaukie, the second was just south of Ochoco Street and the third was next to the Brooklyn Yards. Where the maintenance facility was placed would be somewhat dependent upon the river crossing. With the Caruthers Crossing, the Brooklyn alignment could work easily. You could also make a Brooklyn alignment with the Ross Island crossing. It became obvious that if you could do a maintenance yard in an existing train

yard, there were tremendous advantages at putting it there rather than at Hanna Harvester which the City of Milwaukie hoped to turn into a mixed use area or north of Ochoco where there was a number of existing businesses which would have to be displaced to put in a rail yard. This issue was still evolving. Discussion with Union Pacific had occurred, there may not be an opportunity for TriMet to purchase land from them because that was a major active switching yard for trucks and trucks to rail for freight movements. They did offer TriMet possibilities because they also owned land north of Holgate Street which was on the backside of TriMet's existing bus maintenance yard. That was TriMet's center street and administrative offices as well so there was an option to move a maintenance facility into this vicinity. There was interest in exploring this option further.

Councilor Washington summarized where he saw the strongest support for the light rail alignment existed: in the Clackamas regional segments - north of the Town Center seemed to be the strong one, Hwy. 24 in east Milwaukie, the main street branch line - Milwaukie Regional Center, McLoughlin was on McLoughlin, south Willamette River crossing - Caruthers received more favorable comments, Portland was the full transit option, Elliott neighborhoods was east I-5 Russell, north Portland was the cross over options from I-5 to Interstate Avenue close to Killingsworth to serve PCC and then the maintenance station was still being debated. He had not have concerns about whether there was an east or west side alignment in Vancouver, he felt that was a Vancouver decision. He appreciated the work that staff had done, he felt they had kept him very well informed. He again offered any councilor an opportunity to go on a riding tour of the proposed alternatives.

Councilor McFarland agreed to go on the light rail tour with Councilor McLain.

14. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
051498c-01	5/14/98	Endangered Species Act Briefing before the Metro Council	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mike Burton Executive Officer	
051498c-02	5/5/98	Briefing Packet for City Council on the Steelhead Listing Under the Endangered Species Act	TO: City Council FROM: Mike Burton	

Metro Council Meeting

May 14, 1998

Page 23

051498c-03	3/21/98	Letter from the South North Transit Corridor Study Expert Review Panel's concerning the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of DEIS and results report of 11/3/97 for South North Light Rail Project	TO: Councilor Washington and other involved officials FROM: Carl Hosticka, Chair Expert Review Panel
051498c-04	5/14/98	Diagram of South North Light Rail Project Locally Preferred Strategy and Land Use Final Order Adoption Process and Schedule	TO: Metro Council FROM: Transportation Planning Department
051498c-05	5/12/98	Locally Preferred Strategy Choices for South North Light Rail	TO: Metro Council FROM: Richard Brandman and Leon Skiles of the Transportation Planning Department