

# MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING

January 9, 2001

Metro Council Annex

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder, Carl Hosticka

Councilors Absent:

Presiding Officer Bragdon convened the Council/Executive Officer Informal meeting at 2:02 p.m.

## 1. UPCOMING LEGISLATION

- ◆ Internal organization of committees.
- ◆ Priorities for the legislative assembly that opened in Salem 1/8/00 were discussed by Councilor Susan McLain. There has been work on updating legislative priorities and this was to look back at Metro policy that dictate Metro's position on these items. The three amendments that were coming up are tires, self-insurance and Zoo funding.
- ◆ Federal flexible funding cycle for transportation will be coming to JPACT next Thursday, January 18, was at Community Planning on 1/17/01 and will be considered at Council 1/25/01 among the Council.

## 2. TIMETABLE FOR COUNCIL COMMITTEE WORKPLAN DEVELOPMENT

- ◆ **Presiding Officer Bragdon** discussed having at least two committee meetings between now and Council to consider committee workplans. Samples of prior work plans were given.
- ◆ **Councilor McLain** said that the samples were given because they were basics of items that needed to be covered this year and whether it was a high or low priority with time or money. The other issue was when it was going to happen in the year so all of the projects do not come up at one time.

## 3. STRATEGY FOR OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- ◆ **Presiding Officer Bragdon** said the first line of reporting will be from Mr. Doug Riggs, PacWest to Mr. Jeff Stone on behalf of the Council and Mr. Bruce Warner on behalf of the Executive Office and Mr. Dan Cooper. They will then report immediately to Presiding Officer Bragdon and/or Councilor McLain. If things need to go to Council, they can be fast-tracked or Councilors can be canvassed.
- ◆ **Councilor McLain** said that the legislative committee has worked on updating legislative priorities. The handouts included the draft 2001 legislative priorities list and the general principles. That draft was created to look back at Metro policy with decisions that dictate Metro's position. Councilor McLain said she would be happy to sponsor the recycling of tires and the Zoo funding amendment but she wanted to hear more about the self-insurance amendment. She understood the self-insurance amendment to mean that they would ask the legislature to reduce the number of staff need for self-insurance enrollment.
- ◆ **Mr. Stone** would be the representative on the legislative team. He said that legislation would be brought forward in general because things moved quickly in Salem. He asked that the Councilors look at the amendments carefully before they were brought to Council.
- ◆ **Mr. Riggs** said that he hoped this year would be a six-month session instead of a seven-month process. He presumed that Salem will focus on funding for education and the rest of the budget. He handed out committee memberships, chair, and committee meeting times. The central goal was to make sure that the goals in Salem were accomplished, PacWest would provide all of the information that would be helpful to the Council to make good

decisions. There would be weekly conference calls between PacWest and the legislative team.

- ◆ **Councilor McLain** brought forward the Oregon Zoo handout on funding for tourism. (A copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting.)
- ◆ **Executive Officer Burton** said Nancy Goss-Duran would be helping the legislative team.
- ◆ **Presiding Officer Bragdon** announced there would be a Salem update on every Informal agenda.
- ◆ **Mr. Burton** discussed SB 87 brought forward last session by a group called Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC). This bill was to try and fix a mandatory land amount for 20-year industrial and retail/commercial land supply. He said this is about to surface again which might bring out concerns from Legal Counsel, City of Portland citizens.
- ◆ **Mr. Cooper** said that he called Mr.Chandler who was working on a proposal that was very similar to the minority report that would seek to have either Land Conservation and Development Department (LCDC) or the Oregon Department of Economic Development look at the performance of cities with population over 25,000 as to how well they were doing with land supply for industrial purposes. Mr. Cooper said that Metro would probably wait and see what the bill actually was before they reacted to it. He said that it was clearly not the old SB 87.
- ◆ **Councilor Atherton** said that Metro could cut a deal to drop the 20-year land supply on housing and focus on 20-year supply for commercial/industrial.

\*\*\*

**Janet Mathews and Doug Anderson**, Metro, came forward to talk about tire recycling. There was a lack of market for spare tires. The problem with the tires was the waste of good resources that were going into the ground. There had been discussions with the staff on the legislative team from the Executive Office & Council about this problem that had a direct effect on Metro. Ms. Mathews said about 30,000 tires a year came through the transfer stations. A concept was being drafted based on Alberta Canada model where there was a fee on tires that went to a dedicated fund for market development purposes. This was a state-delegated proposal. The funds would be used to pay for performance that was used to recover tires and payments would go to all applications of tire upgrade. In Alberta, they have seen the markets for scrap tires go from almost complete reliance on tire-direct fuel to almost no reliance. The Alberta plan gave a higher priority and a greater subsidy if they grind up the tires and use it into reconstituting some kind of rubber product. Burning and recovering the energy in the old tires was superior because you were recovering something that was useful and that was energy.

#### 4. M.T.I.P. PROCESS

**John Houser, Metro analyst**, gave a broad overview of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) allocation process. The MTIP project funding cycle covered a period of four federal fiscal years and the current cycle covered the period of fiscal years '00-'03. Every two years they embarked upon a new allocation program that was conducted to make adjustments to the current approved plan or to provide funding for new projects for the next two years of the cycle. During the last allocation process they had about \$75 million dollars available which there was a solicitation in requests for that money in the amount over \$300 million. These projects were then assigned to one of eleven different categories such as planning, road modernization, road reconstruction, bridge, freight, boulevard, pedestrian, bike/trail, Transit Demand Management (TDM), Transit Oriented Development (TOD). The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds can be used for any project in any of these categories while the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds were limited to pedestrian, bike/trail, TDM, TOD or

transit categories. The staff prepared a list of projects for further consideration and the price tag for all of these projects was about 150% of the amount of money that was available and now it was called the 150% list. The staff has initiated the current allocation process and has designated it the priority 2002 MTIP update. The staff estimates that they will have about 38 million dollars for this funding cycle, about 20 million in STIP funds and about 18 million in CMAQ funds. The first step in the process will combine, with Council adoption of a resolution that outlined the criteria for the submission of projects, the process in which they will be ranked and a tentative timeline for the completion of the allocation process. The Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT) must concur on the contents of this resolution. With the limited resources, the staff has recommended that Metro not use the same general solicitation process that was used in the last allocation process. The staff has recommended that the starting point of the allocation should be projects that were not funded from the old 150% list from the last allocation process. These projects have an estimated total cost of about 56 million dollars. TPAC has completed its work on the staff proposal and has recommended a proposed resolution and supportive documentation for consideration by JPACT and the Council. Issues that were discussed at TPAC were: goals for the process, a process for the substitution or addition of projects for the 150% list, freeway related projects, selection criteria and the local public input requirements. The next steps would include consideration of the resolution at the 1/15 Community Planning Committee and JPACT's consideration on Thursday morning, 1/18. Tentative Council action on the resolution was scheduled for the 25<sup>th</sup> of January. Based on the adoption of the resolution at that time, that would initiate a solicitation process which local jurisdictions would be free under the current wording of the resolution to add a limited number of projects to the list or to substitute projects. The final Council action to identify the projects that would be worked on would occur sometime in the June to July timeframe.

**Andy Cotugno, Planning Director** emphasized the process point, the JPACT mailing was Thursday, 1/11 for the meeting 1/18 so these issues were going to be public and would be noticed Tuesday, 1/16. Mr. Cotugno said that this was that category of funds that they had most discretion for allocation. This would not be considered as federal funds. In the next couple of months there would be a federal petition coming through for monies that Metro was seeking from the federal government through various preparations. That was another federal set of priorities that was relevant. MTIP money we knew was coming and we had the greatest degree of discretion. At the end of the year when the whole Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) got adopted, this piece got folded in with all of the other federal sources through the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) functions. They had to approve every federal dollar for transportation purposes in this region. All of the resurfacing projects that were tied to those types of projects, had to be in the TIP as well. Mr. Cotugno said there was also a fair amount of transit money that under federal courts, went to Tri-Met for their program of spending that money on vehicle expansion. This had to be in the TIP as well but it all gets called federal funds. The whole TIP has to be agreed upon by the Oregon Transportation Commission, which was the third approval.

**Mike Hoglund** said he wanted to focus on the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) agreement for a general strategy for this process. They didn't get any feedback from elected officials. The meeting was primarily about making sure of the December meeting intent of TPAC and also introducing a letter to Presiding Officer Bragdon with changes to the criteria and the public involvement process. He said that they did not want to close the door on good ideas for projects so they have allowed eligible applicants such as the City of Portland, Port of Portland, Tri-Met, and counties to each add two new projects. They would take two projects off of the 150% list and then add two. The freeway related projects could be submitted. In the past they have funded these projects related to

interchanges and TPAC has asked that they be submitted as well. He discussed main-line freeway expansion, which was related to Washington County pursuit of widening the Sunset Highway. Mr. Hogle discussed concerns with these letters having undergone local public involvement procedures so that it was not a last minute project that was submitted and had been adopted by the local government in some form.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said this was the one pot of transportation money where they had some discretion as far as use and creativity. He said, if it was to be supportive of 2040 than, this would be the best opportunity to do that.

**Councilor McLain** said that the major concern was that it made sense. The criteria point had to be on the same page with 2040. She said it was important to put on the criteria page; where the points were going (safety, cost effectiveness, general or 40% to 2040 criteria). She felt this gave a wrong or incomplete message. Councilor McLain asked, if they were allowed to add new projects to the table, why “two projects” were specified. She wanted clarification on this idea. She asked why TPAC turned it down.

**Mr. Hogle** commented that TPAC wanted as much flexibility as possible and along with the number of projects, they were concerned with the criteria. He said he also wanted to look at their projects and that were submitted in-line with the criteria that was on the table.

**Councilor McLain** said that she agreed with having a discussion about how to divide the projects on the table and how it would change the criteria.

**Mr. Cotugno** commented that the freeway issue was different from the 2040 emphasis on criteria. He stated that this was one portion that they dealt with and freeways had been portioned out of a different fund. All of the money that went to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was the money that was spent on freeways and the federal money would have to be approved through the TIP.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** suggested that any Councilor who was interested in amendments to this should work with John Houser and the Chair of JPACT to make sure that it was being done properly. It would be moved at JPACT on Thursday.

## 5. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATION

- ◆ **Executive Officer Burton** talked about policy issues.
- ◆ He then drew attention to a hearing at Multnomah County regarding signing of the proposed jail site next to Smith and Bybee Lakes.
- ◆ **Presiding Officer Bragdon** and he had gone to some meetings regarding Howell House Park and they would like to carry out the County’s proposals. They had to go back to another hearing because the issues were not resolved and people who lived there did not want anyone to come on the island.
- ◆ The purchase of Wilsonville Tract and an appraisal was still on the agenda.

## 6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

- ◆ **Councilor Park** commented on the MTIP process.
- ◆ **Presiding Officer Bragdon** said that he had met with Councilor McLain about procedures and one item was that the Chair of committees needed to sign off on the agendas no later than Tuesday afternoon for meetings of the following week. He noted that he and Councilor McLain would check in with the Councilors on a weekly basis on issues such as these and that support was being given.

- ◆ **Councilor Monroe** talked about redistricting and said he would like to work with Mr. Stone on that. He said the first part of the taskforce would be to meet with Mr. Cooper on the rules.
- ◆ **Mr. Houser** commented at the last redistricting, the Council adopted legislation outlining rules and issues that were going to be addressed. He said he hoped to have a document of this type by the end of February.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2001**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>
Priorities 2002 MTIP	December 29, 2000	Staff Report
2001 Legislative Session	December 13, 2000	Senate Committee Roster
House Assignments	January 5, 2001	Press Release
2001 House of Representatives	December 27, 2000	Roster
Proposed Zoo Funding Request	November 28, 2000	Memorandum
Pac/West Legislative Assembly Keys	N/A	Outline
Principles guiding Metro Representatives	October 18, 2000	Outline
Scrap Tire Management	December 12, 2000	Question/Answer
Work Plan Sample	2000	Chart
Amendment to Res. No. 00-2997	January 4, 2001	Memorandum
MTIP Selection overview	N/A	Overview of process