

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, February 6, 2007  
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Kathryn Harrington, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Rex Burkholder, Brian Newman, Robert Liberty

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:04 p.m.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, FEBRUARY 8, 2007/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Council President Bragdon reviewed the February 8, 2007 Metro Council agenda. The headquarters hotel lottery funds item has been pulled.

Councilor Newman distributed a handout on the Title 4 item (a copy is included in the meeting record). The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) recommended that we adopt the Council President's proposal as amended. Dick Benner, Metro Attorney, described the amendments. The first two were not considered controversial. The third amendment was intended to address a situation in which there was a preexisting use that Title 4 would not allow on a tract of land designated industrial. Some were concerned that the proposed language would allow a simple change, even though only a small portion of the property was actually developed with the use. Mr. Benner's suggested changes added some requirements about assessed value ratios, to allow Council to correct mistakes.

Councilor Liberty agreed that the reworked language was an improvement. He was still concerned about the language under C 1-3. He felt it was saying it could be done on a policy basis, as long as job capacity was not diminished. He preferred to go with a mistake approach rather than a policy approach. Mr. Benner thought C and H addressed similar problems. The criteria needed to be considered collectively.

Councilor Hosticka thought that D could authorize pre-existing uses. Was there a way to authorize pre-existing uses without changing the zoning? Mr. Benner said that had already been done in Title 4. It would help property owners who had perhaps been mistakenly included in industrial land. Councilor Harrington asked if the language under C4 would be the same as H. Mr. Benner agreed to make the change. Councilor Newman said they had tried to respond to MPAC and tighten things up. Councilor Liberty thought overall it was good, although he didn't yet know how he would vote. He had no problems with the current changes. Council President Bragdon was fine with packaging the amendments.

Councilor Park asked what feedback had been received from large lot property owners. Mr. Benner said there had not been a full Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting on the proposals. Councilor Park asked about community feedback. Mr. Benner was not aware of any. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said people did not want Council to go too far in removing industrial land protections.

Councilor Hosticka wondered if the new Kaiser hospital in Hillsboro would be affected in any way. Councilor Newman said it only applied to pre-existing, before March 2004. Mr. Benner observed that the second set of Title 4 revisions dealt specifically with hospitals, and Council adopted a version of Title 4 saying no hospitals in industrial areas. Mr. Cooper recalled that the Kaiser proposal was outside the industrial area.

Council President Bragdon asked about the Measure 37 resolution. Did that have any implications for this Thursday? Mr. Benner said there was a package of claims for Thursday; they were all recommended to be dismissed since they were all outside the urban growth boundary.

## **2. QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT**

Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer, distributed the 2006-2007 second quarterly report (a copy is included in the meeting record). Each report had a theme. Today's was a capital project status update. He pointed out some revenue and expenditure information. Some were related to the bond measure. Zoo revenues were very good. The Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) was projected to come in a bit under, but that might be an accounting problem. Interest earnings were generally up. Councilor Liberty asked why program revenues were at 40% instead of 44%. Mr. Stringer thought that was not significant; there were a number of planning grants that just hadn't come in yet.

Karen Feher, Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Coordinator, talked about the capital budget summary and some of the changes that had been needed. Councilor Liberty noted that the golf learning center costs had increased about fourfold. Jeff Tucker, Finance Manager, said those were estimated costs. Market studies would bring the numbers into better focus. Councilor Park said some of the design incorporated use of the golf course to enhance water quality. Mr. Tucker added that part of that cost was a clubhouse, for which private funding might be found. Ms. Feher said the Zoo had changed a few projects; the lighting project was successful and would be expanded. The lion exhibit was in a big fundraising effort. Changes to the primate structure were in the works.

Councilor Hosticka asked about Cooper Mountain. He did not remember approving a final project. Mr. Tucker said the figure represented what was in the master plan. Council had directed staff to come back to review the budgets for all three proposals. This was to be done within the next few months, before the budget was adopted. The consultant had been unable to fulfill the contract language, and the contract was awarded to the next bidder. Councilor Park asked if anything had been learned through that process. Mr. Tucker said it would be considered. He would pass it on to the project manager.

Ms. Feher talked about some solid waste projects; these were often hard to schedule and took a long time. Ms. Feher said renewal and replacement was being very well funded, at long last. Next year's CIP would be much different. An asset assessment was proposed.

## **3. 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE: PROCESS UPDATE AND DRAFT RTP POLICY FRAMEWORK (VERSION 2.0)**

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner, distributed two documents (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). Version 2.0 responded to about 85% of the comments. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, clarified that the comments would be broken into major issues for discussion, and then consent items would be separated out from discussion items.

Councilor Liberty liked the way the comments had been compiled. Councilor Burkholder identified a key question as coming to agreement that the basic concept was sound. The systems approach has proved to be a strength.

Tom Kloster, Planning Manager, said they had been to MPAC. Councilor Liberty's take was that people were engaged. Councilor Harrington thought people were still trying to figure it out. There was still a lot of skepticism.

Mr. Kloster stated that the Freight Task Force wanted to make sure that additional commuters be viewed in their effects on freight movement. Councilor Hosticka raised some questions about freight capacity and how to address possible diminished arterial capacity. Mr. Kloster said that we needed to look at accommodating the freight aspect of the entire corridor.

Councilor Liberty said that also worked the other way, too much freight might compromise a center's ability to operate as a center. Mr. Kloster said there was a growing awareness that not all freight was the same. They had also talked about demand management and system management for freight. It was a shock to some people to realize that we were no longer going to be able to "build our way out." Mr. Kloster reported on the results of the technical committee meetings. Most of these issues had already been touched on.

Councilor Harrington thought MPAC was waiting until their staff gave them a clear signal that they understood it, they had internalized it, and they knew what it meant for them. Mr. Kloster said, at this point, we couldn't be definitive. Councilor Liberty said, the scenario modeling didn't have to be so open-ended. Some people still just wanted to widen the freeways. A model of a system was emerging. For those who needed to be shown, let them be involved in the scenario development, so they could see how it would work at the technical level.

Ms. Ellis talked about what was different in draft 2.0. The overall presentation was better integrated. The executive summary had been expanded. Highlighted changes included identifying key refinements, relating congestion to quality of life, economic competitiveness, expanded street concept, emphasis on a reliable and accessible transportation system, addition of a freight concept and bicycle concept, prioritization of land use and investments, freight reliability, safety improvements, and system and demand management.

Councilor Liberty said he did not see anything about equity issues or environmental justice. Also, that was a built-in assumption, which he did not share, that few problems with freight mobility was essential to assuring economic competitiveness. Also the performance measures were not aligned with land use. We needed to say, "If we build this, we get this." Mr. Kloster said, they were trying to link the system design thinkers and the outcome policy thinkers. They were trying to track the measures back to the goal statements. Ms. Ellis said, in terms of performance measures, that was part of what they were proposing, to get the goals and objectives and overall supporting language somewhat set, and then EcoNorthwest, the consultant, would put together the evaluation framework to do the analysis based on the goals and objectives.

Councilor Park asked, did we think freight mobility was an important part of the economy? Council President Bragdon thought that was a legitimate question, that could not be addressed today, but directed staff to find time to do that. Ms. Ellis talked about upcoming meetings and decision points.

Councilor Hosticka commented that the public debate was getting away from us. We needed a process to get it back under control, at least as far as it was reflected in the press. Having a work session just amongst ourselves would not get the bigger engagement. Council President Bragdon agreed that we needed to get out of the Council Chambers and into the streets.

Councilor Harrington asked about the items in the worksheet; what kind of case studies were being considered? Mr. Kloster described some elements that would go into the case studies, such as existing development and geographic barriers. Council and staff talked about the need for really getting concrete and specific.

Councilor Newman asked who was working on responses to things like today's negative Tribune editorial? Councilor Hosticka again stated that the public debate was running ahead of us. What was our plan for legislative action, if we lost the public debate? Councilor Harrington added that the local jurisdiction's staff still didn't understand the RTP direction.

Jon Coney, Public Relations Coordinator, joined the session to say that the Tribune editorial would be responded to. They took a whack at us, which was frustrating because much of what the editorial talked about was already being addressed. All the Councilors were being scheduled to do outreach. Councilor Liberty argued that the Legislature was more important than the editorial. Councilor Hosticka observed that there was no movement in Salem towards more funding. Councilor Park wondered if there was an aversion to talking about new money. Maybe it should be made more explicit. Councilor Newman said that going to the Legislature would force a discussion about a regional measure; we should anticipate that and shape the environment to lead in that direction. Council discussed the best ways to target the policy, the projects, and the influx or lack of money. Mr. Kloster said, most people who were venting loudly had not read version 2.0 in detail. A better summary would help. There was a lot of misinformation.

Council President Bragdon summarized that Council was committed to the direction on the RTP, and we were going to be realistic about money, we were not going to assume any new money. We needed to tell our story and make some clear decisions. Councilor Liberty wanted the people who were invested in the old way to develop an alternative and put a price tag on it. Council President Bragdon said, the point was, instead of just taking the criticism, we ought to address the facts of what people said they wanted, and demonstrate the logical results.

#### **4. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION**

Councilor Newman distributed two documents on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). Council discussed Thursday's public hearing and other upcoming steps. They talked about how to address the comments that might be expected on certain projects.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:46 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
 FEBRUARY 6, 2007**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc. Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
1	Agenda	2/8/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, February 8, 2007	020607c-01
1	Agenda	1/24/07	To: Metro Council From: Brian Newman Re: MPAC Recommendation (with revision to Recommendation 3)	020607c-02
2	Quarterly financial report	2/6/07	To: Metro Council From: Bill Stringer Re: Fiscal Year 2006-07, Quarterly Report, Second Quarter	020607c-03
3	RTP	2/2/07	To: RTP Interested Parties From: Tom Kloster and Kim Ellis Re: Regional Transportation Plan Policy Framework – Working Draft 2.0	020607c-04
3	RTP	undated	To: Metro Council From: Kim Ellis Re: Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 – Working Draft 1.0, Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations	020607c-05
4	Council communications	2/2/07	To: JPACT and Interested Parties From: Ted Leybold Re: Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – TPAC Recommended Final Cut List	020607c-06
4	Council communications	undated	To: Metro Council From: Ted Leybold Re: Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List	020607c-07