

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, December 5, 2006
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Robert Liberty, Rex Burkholder

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, DECEMBER 7, 2006/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the December 7, 2006 Metro Council agenda.

2. COLUMBIA CROSSING

Councilor Burkholder said the Columbia River Crossing Project Team was approaching a decision on the Columbia River Crossing on February 27th. He introduced the team that was there to talk about the issue. They included Adam Davis, Jay Lyman, Kris Strickler (WSDOT), John Osbourne (ODOT), Tom Markgraf, Mark Turpel and Ross Roberts. Mr. Davis provided an overview of the public opinion and the concerns raised by Metro. There were a total of seven related handouts (a copy of each is included in the meeting record).

Mr. Strickler talked about the focus group discussions; two focus groups were surveyed on the Oregon side and two on the Washington side. The goal of the research was to develop questions for the survey, to talk with people and assess the support for the project. Councilor Liberty asked about the results and costs of the focus group. Mr. Markgraf asked if the public thought something needed to be done. The focus groups were to provide them with an idea of the range of issues.

Councilor Hosticka asked what commerce meant. Mr. Osbourne responded to his concerns and question. Issues were raised about tolling, emergency preparedness, impact on low-income individuals. Groups were impressed with the two states working together to solve the problem. Councilor Burkholder indicated that the survey was part of the decision process. He called for questions. Councilor Hosticka asked whose project was this, who did we think of as the affected audience and who had ownership? He also commented on interstate commerce. Councilor Burkholder said the I-5 partnership study looked at the implications on both a local and national level, the economic impact on Puget Sound. There was a strong case to be made for the benefits to both states. Councilor Hosticka asked how they got a voice in the discussion.

Councilor Liberty talked about traffic impacts. Councilor Burkholder said Washington was supportive of light rail and felt the river crossing was important. Oregon was less strong in its support.

Mr. Strickler thanked Richard Brandman, Ross Roberts and other Metro staff for moving towards a solution. The question was should the existing bridge stay or not. Other issues that were raised had to do with the environmental impact statement. Mr. Roberts commented on the cost benefits analysis.

Mr. Lyman said they would discuss alternatives after February or do further analysis. There was a broad range of recommendations having to do with number of lanes, traffic safety and operations. The range of alternatives included ferries, subway, etc. Some options would be eliminated based on cost. Councilor Liberty asked if the cost benefit was part of the analysis. Mr. Lyman talked about towing, park and rides, and Transit Demand Management program. A tolling recommendation would go forward. They were working closely with the Bi-State Committee on this issue. Mr. Lyman indicated that they were accepting all agencies comments including discussions on freight movement, redevelopment of the waterfronts and redevelopment of Hayden Island. He felt the time was right for all three projects to come together.

Councilor Hosticka talked about a rendition of a bridge, which included a tunnel. Had this been considered? Mr. Lyman said that a tunnel had been considered and dropped because of the traffic patterns across the river. He explained further the issues surrounding a tunnel. They then discussed the bridge parameters including span, height, rail, ramps, and river channel issues.

Mr. Lyman talked about land use changes impacting the problem. He then continued with his PowerPoint presentation (a copy is included in the meeting record) and talked about the 2002 MetroScope Results including the analysis of the I-5 Corridor, the impacts regardless of transportation actions including development, increases in Clark County population and jobs, industrial areas. Councilor Liberty asked clarifying questions about job growth in Clark County and increases in congestion. Mr. Lyman responded to his questions. He then continued with his presentation and addressed what would happen if they failed to invest in the I-5 corridor. He noted positive impacts if they do invest. With transit and highway investments in the I-5 corridor, employment growth would be attracted to the center of the region, more jobs would be attracted to the region, new job opportunities would be created for residents near the I-5 corridor and transit investments would support mixed-use and compact housing around stations.

Councilor Liberty talked about transit investments and how decisions were made. Mr. Lyman continued by talking about project priorities, community values expressed through extensive outreach and Task Force adoption of the vision and values statement as well as evaluation criteria. Councilor Liberty questioned what was used evaluation framework was used to narrow range of alternatives and suggested that there may be evaluation criteria that was not used. Mr. Lyman reviewed the evaluation framework. He talked about the financial limitations and noted that the Columbia Crossing was the largest project that the region had ever tackled. They needed to be innovating including considering tolling. Councilor Liberty asked if there would be tolling on both bridges. Mr. Lyman responded that they would make a determination in January. He then talked about the draft financial plan, which would be presented to the public.

Mr. Lyman reviewed the alternatives that demonstrated fundamental choices including: no action, replacement bridge and bus rapid transit with complementary express bus or replacement bridge and light rail transit with complementary express bus. Councilors added their comments about choices. They also discussed safety issues and capacity on I-5. Mr. Lyman talked about the river crossing concepts for consideration: replacement bridge downstream, replacement bridge upstream, supplemental downstream and arterial crossing, supplemental downstream. Councilors discussed proposals and made some suggestions about alternatives.

Councilor Burkholder asked the Council President for time on a work session agenda before February 27th to talk about trade off, financial implications, public input. There had been no endorsements and he noted more information was coming.

3. BREAK

4. REGIONAL SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL VOUCHER PROGRAM

Councilor Liberty said the Voucher program brought two discussions before Council previously, and Council deliberated on three areas of concern. 1) Was staying within budget, 2) was regional equity: Districts 5 and 6 use two-thirds of the funds, and 3) was whether this was seen as a fundraising activity. He thanked Jan O'Dell and Jenny Stein of Metro's Solid Waste and Recycling department for their involvement and introduced two of our partners, Sylvia Bogert of Southwest Neighborhoods Incorporated, and Cathy Saunders of the City of Portland. He said that the options before Council (see meeting packet) included recognizing and accepting that there were these broader covenants and reflecting and increasing the budget amount; meeting the target budget amount with a rationing system; and options for some add-ons. The most important point was that the program did and could in the future deliver a lot more benefits in terms of diversion materials in meeting our other goals, and was important to Nature in Neighborhoods. We can recognize that the budget justified more and spend it; we can also demand some sort of performance measures making sure we're getting back that diversion; there were add-on programs that we suggested that were modestly scaled and specifically addressed the geographical distribution of program benefits.

Ms. O'Dell presented Council with a Richmond Neighborhood Clean Up spreadsheet (a copy is included in the meeting record), as an example of the gold standard of how much diversion neighborhoods could achieve. The goal of the program was more diversion of waste. Metro staff could help by providing more information and referrals, including promoting the Master Recyclers program. The regional equity aspect of how the program was being used was a bit complicated due to certain areas having access to programs in other areas and not using ours. She asked for direction on budget and writing the criteria of the program into an executive order. She asked if Metro will continue to support clean ups, in addition to enforcement activities that offer support to vulnerable populations and events that bring people together which include recycling components.

Councilor Liberty noted that most of the materials listed at the bottom of the spreadsheet were manageable through the landfill and discussed the various options.

Councilor Hosticka said we would never escape rationing, had no issue with increasing the budget, didn't want it to get too bureaucratic for the user, and as a representative of an under-represented district, it didn't bother him.

Council President Bragdon said Option 1 was a good one and explained why he supported Option 1. He suggested linking of the program to other popular public Metro events.

Council President Bragdon felt combining recycling and education in regards to hazardous waste was important, it increased agency visibility, but there were some issues with using these events as fundraisers.

Councilor Liberty said that what has been discovered is that the vouchers were actually covering the costs and the expenses to pay for the event. They were not generating surplus cash for the organization. He concurred with Council President Bragdon that it needed to be made clear that we were helping to pay for the event and not generating surplus money for Metro.

Ms. Bogert responded by saying that the Metro waivers were costly enough, and that was what it cost to dispose of it. If Metro didn't cover that cost, they would have to find another way to cover it. She clarified that the waivers covered only the expense of the event and were not used as a fundraising tool. There were other expenses that the Office of Sustainability helped reimburse, such as advertising, clean up and providing food.

President Bragdon said that he wanted to ensure that the criteria was reasonable, and protected the agency from abuse. He spoke to regional equity. As long as we are doing outreach in a geographically equitable way and publicizing it, the fact that different communities avail of it at different rates is a function of their choice and not due to something we have omitted.

Ms O'Dell said that other parts of the region have access to other funds and referred to Washington County's Clean and Green and Stop Oregon Litter and Vandalism (SOLV) activities, as well as the Oregon City Enhancement Grants. Program users indicated that not all costs were being met, and it had become necessary to begin charging for certain items, such as computer monitors and other e-waste, to help cover the cost of disposal. She said that we will continue publicizing, and to coordinate publicity surrounding hazardous waste events. One requirement that could be built into the program was the addition of signs indicating that disposal of waste collected at the event is provided by Metro.

Council President Bragdon agreed that people were often unaware of the services their government offered; the solid waste system was not often very visible, but it functioned very well and was positive for the health and safety of the region, and was taken for granted. We needed to take advantage of any opportunity we could to draw the people's attention to the program.

Council President Bragdon communicated that Councilor McLain liked Option 1 and hoped that when we looked at option 1, an evaluation performance on diversion would consider equity set-aside for Districts 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Councilor Hosticka said that he preferred Option 1. He would like more money to go into the program. He was concerned about all of the requirements and reporting, and wanted things to be as easy on the user as possible.

Councilor Liberty concurred with Councilor Hosticka's remarks. He talked about the budget process and the need to review funding for the program using critical success factors.

Ms O'Dell asked if Council supported creating an executive order to allow administrative rules and boundaries to manage the program and remove some of the language from the Metro code. Council President Bragdon agreed and said that it should be an administrative action instead of legislative action.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

Metro Council Work Session Meeting
12/05/06
Page 5

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

Prepared by,



Maggie Voss
Acting Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
 DECEMBER 5, 2006**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	120706	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, December 7, 2006	120506c-01
2	Columbia Crossing	112106	To: Metro Council From: CRC Project Team Re: Draft Memo Update: Considerations for Replacing Versus Reusing the Existing Interstate 5 Bridges	120506c-02
2	Columbia Crossing	120506	To: Metro Council From: CRC Project Team Re: PowerPoint Presentation	120506c-03
2	Columbia Crossing	120506	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Letter	120506c-04
2	Columbia Crossing	110606	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Preliminary Alternative Packages: Columbia River Crossing	120506c-05
2	Columbia Crossing	041906	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Draft Step A Component Fact Sheets: Columbia River Crossing	120506c-06
2	Columbia Crossing	031506	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Draft Components Step A Screening Report: Columbia River Crossing	120506c-07
2	Columbia Crossing	032206	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Screening and Evaluation Framework: Columbia River Crossing	120506c-08
2	Columbia Crossing	120506	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Recommend for Further Study by Transportation Task Forces	120506c-09
4	Solid Waste Disposal Voucher System	120506	To: Metro Council From: Jan O'Dell, Solid Waste Dept Re: Richmond Spring Cleanup Statistics	120506c-10