

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, June 6, 2006
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Carl Hosticka (Deputy Council President), Rod Park, Robert Liberty, Rex Burkholder, Brian Newman

Councilors Absent: David Bragdon (excused), Susan McLain (excused)

Deputy Council President Hosticka convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

1. **DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JUNE 8, 2006/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Deputy Council President Hosticka reviewed the June 8, 2006 Metro Council agenda.

2. **MERC COMMISSION PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TOOL**

Jeff Miller, Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) General Manager, said the Commission had decided to use a self-evaluation form to see how they were performing and how staff felt about the work they were doing. Councilor Liberty asked if there were concerns about Commissioner participation or lack thereof. Mr. Miller replied it was more of an effort to make the expectations of the position clear. Councilor Liberty asked what the expectations of Commissioners were. Mr. Miller said he wanted them to bring their expertise to bear on MERC policy. He felt the Commissioners needed to participate in the meet and greets and to “make the ask.” Customers liked to see the Commissioners (and Councilors) at these events.

Councilor Newman had heard about some problems with the new business software. Mr. Miller thought the software was fine, but there were some small implementation issues. He clarified that MERC was not changing the reporting structure, which would require Council approval, but just using a new tool.

3. **2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION UPDATE**

Kim Ellis, Planning, said the latest version of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) resolution and attached work program incorporated direction given by the Council as well as comments received from the many stakeholders she had contacted. This was the last scheduled work session prior to final approval by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) June 8. She explained what Council approval of the resolution would entail and pointed out the questions that staff had for Council. Councilor Burkholder said that this process had been ongoing and cumulative. They were trying to tie the RTP work into Metro’s other planning efforts.

Ms. Ellis talked about some of the work she and other staff had done to integrate the planning and work programs, particularly the integration of the RTP update into the broader New Look planning process and integration of the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Plan effort into the RTP update. She asked for Council feedback on the overall approach on technical analysis and policy development. Councilor Newman had some questions about identifying the public

priorities and desired outcomes, and the process that would be followed. Ms. Ellis explained what they had planned, including the work that would be expected from the consultant. Robin McArthur, Regional Planning Director, listed some of the possible desired outcomes. It was much broader than just transportation issues and included evaluation measures. The outcomes would be prioritized.

Councilor Liberty was concerned that Council had fully approved the scope of the work, to minimize surprises for the consultant. He reiterated his desire to keep the brainstorming broad-minded, to examine the RTP update in the context of Metro's portfolio of responsibilities, to consider equity issues, and to be able to consider the tradeoffs. Ms. Ellis felt that the process was flexible enough to incorporate these points. Councilor Burkholder said Council should have the idea hopper open wide.

Councilor Liberty wanted to know if one of the outcomes would be a comprehensive view of an integrated transportation system. Ms. Ellis was hopeful this would happen. Councilor Burkholder felt that the best possible outcome would be a vision of a community.

On the question of Council support for the targeted approach, Councilor Park had some questions about how the stakeholder groups would be selected and how their feedback would be evaluated. He wanted to avoid having certain groups developing a resistance to projects in their region. Ms. Ellis explained the stakeholder workshops were intended to include a broad representation of interests, both geographically and topically. Councilor Park would like to see feedback coming from a level between regional and local. Councilor Newman thought it was good for people to hear about issues from other parts of the region.

Brian Scott, MIG, talked about the variety of forums that they had planned, to elicit the widest variety of responses. Councilor Liberty had some questions about the educational portion. He would appreciate having research on transportation behavior and to disseminate this information during the outreach. Mr. Scott referred to the outreach toolkit that would be used. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, agreed that some modeling might be effective in educating people as to the outcomes of various transportation changes.

Chris Smith, Metropolitan Advisory Committee (MPAC) member, wondered what electronic participation tools would be used. Councilor Burkholder explained why the use of an Internet-based forum posed problems for Metro, since as a government agency we would be unable to censor any potentially objectionable—even libelous or obscene—comments.

Richard Benner, Metro Attorney, confirmed for Deputy Council President Hosticka that Council had the ability to censor public testimony during meetings if the testifiers became unruly or offensive. Ms. Ellis described some of the electronic tools that would be available for public participation. Councilor Newman offered his comments on the amount of time required to maintain a successful blog and whether other methods would be more effective for the type of input needed.

Councilor Liberty requested feedback on his comments regarding public education. Council confirmed their interest and talked about the potential success of some various strategies. Terry Moore, ECONorthwest, agreed that this was a potential dilemma but that his scope and budget had been set and they were doing the best they could with their available resources.

Councilor Liberty again emphasized his desire to spend transportation dollars wisely. Deputy Council President Hosticka confirmed that Council had no substantive changes for staff to make before their presentation to JPACT on June 8.

Lastly, Ms. Ellis described the budgetary situation and asked for Council approval of the scope and budget for the consultants. Council acquiesced. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, described some of the details of the fiscal year compared to the timeline for the study. Councilor Liberty asked that staff update Council on any large project changes that came up.

4. NEW LOOK RESEARCH

Ms. McArthur distributed a copy of the invitation for the regional forum (a copy is included in the meeting record). She explained the decision to charge for the forum and the availability of scholarships. Mr. Smith commented that charging for public participation was possibly illegal and certainly bad policy. Ms. McArthur then reviewed the brief for the regional forum (a copy is included in the meeting record). She put the forum into the context of some of the other work that would take place. There was another regional forum planned for December 2006.

Lastly, she examined the revised exercises that were being planned, based on Council feedback about the last event (a copy is included in the meeting record). She reviewed the plan to divide the participants into five groups, based on geography. The goal was to engage the participants and get them to work collaboratively. Councilor Liberty felt cutting through districts would be good. Councilor Newman had some suggestions about the I-205 area and spreading those participants around a bit. Deputy Council President Hosticka asked Ms. McArthur to approach Councilors individually to get their input on where to draw the lines for grouping the participants.

Council had a few comments about the exercises and what would make the participation more valuable. Councilor Burkholder asked at what level dollar figures would be brought into the discussion; we did not want to set up an expectation that we would be doing projects that we couldn't afford. Mr. Scott felt they would be moving that way and would be closer along those lines in December. Mr. Moore thought that they did not want to get to a too fine level of detail at this point.

Councilor Liberty believed that interest in the outcomes would be high. It was obvious to most that funds would not be available for everything. He liked the direction the planning was going. Councilor Park appreciated the willingness to look at the financial constraints; using an example from solid waste, the cheapest thing would be just to throw everything away. But we had other concerns than cost. He would like to see a greater emphasis on the fact that without farms, we simply wouldn't eat. Farms should be more on a par with clean drinking water, rather than with aesthetics. Mr. Jordan predicted that these issues would come up during the discussions.

Councilor Newman stated that the quality of the facilitators and the size of the groups would be critically important. Ms. McArthur described how they had set things up for maximum effect. Councilor Burkholder asked how participants were being recruited. Ms. McArthur said the invitation had gone to a mailing list of 1100. Sherry Oeser, Planning, said Council was welcome to make other invitations. They all received stacks of the invitations for dissemination amongst their constituents.

5. BREAK

6. I-5/DELTA PARK PROJECT

Mark Turpel, Planning, and Kate Deane, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), introduced the project. They would be asking Metro Council, at Thursday's meeting, to recommend approval, with certain conditions. Mr. Turpel described the background of the project and some of the alternative that had been considered. It had been suggested to make the proposed additional lane a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, on I-5 south. Final results would depend on the work being done on the Columbia River crossing. Whether the additional lane would be general-purpose or HOV would not need to be decided just yet.

Councilor Newman asked for clarification on the details of how the new lane would be added, including construction timeline. Ms. Deane said that they were looking at a 2008 starting date. She described upcoming decision points that would be done in consultation with Council. Mr. Turpel said it was a high priority to make sure that mass transit would remain an option in this area. Ms. Deane clarified for Council the details of the options that had been considered. Councilor Liberty asked what congestion condition studies had been done. Ms. Deane said, during morning rush hour, in 2025, there was no gain in travel time. In the mid-day and on weekends, without this project the added congestion would be similar to morning rush hour. She provided the congestion analysis results. The project was anticipated to provide some congestion relief.

Councilor Liberty asked if a time value analysis had been done; Ms. Deane said no. She talked about some of the constraints her modeling was under. One of the few assumptions she had been able to make was that mass transit would be available to Vancouver from Portland. Council and staff discussed what passage of the resolution would mean.

Councilor Burkholder appreciated that the project included some community improvement funds to help the residents who would be affected the most, and who tended to be primarily lower-income. This was due in large measure to the efforts of Ms. Deane.

7. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(e), DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO NEGOTIATE REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. Cotugno first talked about the need to discuss various items in open session versus executive session. He and Council agreed to talk about certain issues in open session before beginning the executive session.

Ray Valone, Planning, talked about compliance on the part of Gresham. Mr. Cotugno clarified the issue of the discussion, regarding Gresham's approach to density and Metro's requirements. Gresham was in compliance. Mr. Valone said that Gresham had adopted an ordinance to allow an option in a low-density residential (LDR) area; they wanted an option to develop larger lots. Gresham's analysis showed 160 net developable acres. This would make them short of their requirement. Metro has had to assume the worst case. Mr. Valone described the efforts being made by Gresham to address their responsibilities.

They then discussed the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) budget and the total amount given to Gresham (a copy is included in the meeting record). Mr. Whitmore agreed that Gresham had received more funds than other areas. A lot of this was due to the long existence of light rail in Gresham. He discussed some of the history of some of the lessons learned from some of the

investments. There were some unusual circumstances in that area. Mr. Cotugno reviewed the funds in the TOD & Centers Implementation Program, through 2009. Funds available were projected to be about \$4 million. He provided this information to help Council decide whether Gresham had received more than its "fair" share. Council discussed some of the specifics of the budget figures. They appreciated the information that staff had provided.

Deputy Council President Hosticka then opened the executive session.

Time Began: 4:26 p.m.

Time Ended: 4:37 p.m.

Members Present: Andy Cotugno, Phil Whitmore, Michael Jordan, Dan Cooper, Meganne Steele, Joel Morton, Lisa Miles

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(d), FOR THE PURPOSE OF DELIBERATING WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO CONDUCT LABOR NEGOTIATIONS.

Time Began: 4:38 p.m.

Time Ended: 4:48 p.m.

Members Present: Kevin Dull, Dan Cooper, Michael Jordan, Ruth Scott, Lisa Colling

9. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Newman discussed the results of the steering committee from the Eastside Transit Alternatives Analysis; he provided three documents (a copy of is included in the meeting record). He particularly focused on the budget controls. He was generally happy with the results of the work.

Councilor Liberty stated that he would meet with Sam Adams tomorrow regarding transportation issues. He regretted that he would be unable to attend the Sellwood Bridge policy advisory committee meeting, but he had prepared a memo.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Deputy Council President Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 4:57 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
JUNE 6, 2006**

| Item | Topic | Doc Date | Document Description | Doc. Number |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|
| 1 | Agenda | 6/8/06 | Agenda: Metro Council Regular Meeting, June 8, 2006 | 060606c-01 |
| 4 | New Look | undated | To: Metro Council From: Robin McArthur Re: New Look invitation | 060606c-02 |
| 4 | New Look | 5/23/06 | To: Metro Council From: Robin McArthur Re: June New Look Regional Forum Event Brief | 060606c-03 |
| 4 | New Look | 6/6/06 | To: Metro Council From: Robin McArthur Re: New Look Regional Forum (June 23, 2006) Draft Exercises | 060606c-04 |
| 7 | TOD & Centers | 6/6/06 | To: Metro Council From: Andy Cotugno Re: TOD & Centers Implementation Program, Revenues from Program Initiative thru FY09 | 060606c-05 |
| 9 | Council communications | 6/5/06 | To: Metro Council From: Brian Newman Re: Eastside Transit Alternatives Analysis, Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation | 060606c-06 |
| 9 | Council communications | 6/5/06 | To: Metro Council From: Brian Newman Re: Eastside Transit Project, Work Program Considerations | 060606c-07 |
| 9 | Council communications | December 2005 | To: Metro Council From: Brian Newman Re: Map, Downtown Portland to the Eastside | 060606c-08 |