

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, February 27, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:05 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 1, 2007//ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the March 1, 2007 Metro Council agenda.

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, reported on Metro's presentation to Moody's rating agency regarding the natural areas bond release. Metro has the best rating of any special district in the country.

2. 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE – PROCESS UPDATE AND RECOMMENDED DRAFT POLICY FRAMEWORK

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner, distributed two handouts (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). She updated Council on recent activity at the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC). Today was to be the last check-in with Council, with JPACT and MTAC action coming up later in the week. She wanted to focus on investment priorities. She summarized the contents of her memo, including committee recommendations, and acknowledged the outstanding issues. She talked about the differences between the various recommendations and asked Council for direction.

Councilor Newman felt it was important to move on to Phase 3. He would prefer to endorse and adopt the resolution.

Councilor Burkholder endorsed Councilor Newman's position. His preference would be to aim for JPACT and MPAC to pass their resolutions on to Council. Changes could be made later if necessary. He wanted to work toward a majority approval from the committees.

For the benefit of Councilor Harrington, Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, clarified the key discussion items. He explained how some confusion had arisen because there was not agreement or clear direction from the various committees.

Councilor Liberty asked about the use of level of service (LOS) in the document. He thought we were trying to move away from LOS. Ms. Ellis said that would still be incorporated but would be a performance measure. Level of service alone has not resulted in the outcomes we have wanted. She described it as an effort to keep LOS as a measure but not as the key piece. Council President Bragdon observed that some people were uncomfortable leaving LOS measures behind, without new measures in place.

Mr. Cotugno reviewed Discussion Item #2, the hierarchy of 2040 design types. He went over the different committee recommendations. There was some debate about regionally significant industrial areas (RSIA) versus regular industrial areas and their economic value classification. Councilor Hosticka recalled that this same issue had been debated during the Nature in Neighborhoods discussions. Mr. Cotugno said he would look back and see if he could get something out of that. Councilor Liberty thought that the way it was laid out implied that we were committing to a certain set of investments; our analysis had shown that some town centers were more economically productive than the regional centers, but the regional centers were still the focus of transportation investment. Councilor Newman wanted some way to tie investment to the community's own efforts.

Councilor Burkholder observed that the hierarchy was just one part of the decision-making process. Councilor Hosticka argued against following the market and putting our investments there (think BridgePort Village). Councilor Park had some questions about station communities. Mr. Cotugno explained some of the rationale for the rankings. He did not think any capacity would be lost.

Councilor Liberty had trouble understanding the relative weight of the factors. Mr. Cotugno said there was no intention to actually weight them. There were a lot of different factors, with different needs; this ranking was only to look at place. Council President Bragdon said this issue would come up again with the New Look, and we had to start with a framework; otherwise everything was equally important and we would have no way to target the investments. We also needed to be able to adapt it over time. Mr. Cotugno talked about the need to recognize local jurisdictional uniqueness.

Mr. Cotugno addressed item #3, jurisdictional responsibility as a tool for defining resource allocations. Councilor Liberty said each level had an impact, that the idea that one was in charge of one slice was hard to fathom. Every level shared responsibility for its effects on other levels. Mr. Cotugno agreed and observed that Metro did not own any part of the system. He mentioned some of the discussion that had taken place around this issue. Some cases might involve dual responsibility. Was there a regional interest in the state highways? Council President Bragdon said his reading of the memo was that people wanted more fragmentation, not less. Councilor Liberty agreed. Could we agree on how it fit together, and execute a common vision? Councilor Park mentioned an example of local accountability. Mr. Cotugno stated that the language was directly aimed at the regional funding discussion, including potential future funding. Councilor Liberty said it reminded him of the bond measure; was it our role to make up for jurisdictions who had gaps?

Councilor Harrington said she would like to see the balance of multiple objectives. Councilor Hosticka said, if by Council silence, the document was implicitly accepted; the pathway would commit us to a certain conclusion. Council discussed some of the various jurisdictions and what they thought their approach would be. Councilor Liberty wondered when he could address issues that weren't on the list. Councilor Burkholder suggested we view it as a draft policy framework, but it was important to move on; could we accept the draft and go back to it and refine it as the work developed? We had to have somewhere to start. Mr. Cotugno encouraged Council to share their views with the committees. He then addressed the consent items from the memo.

Councilor Liberty was interested in how these factors would influence Metro's decisions. Council and staff talked about bottlenecks and missing links. Council asked to see some definition of

bottlenecks. Councilor Burkholder was concerned about the language on additional lanes. Council was a bit nervous about some of the language; it seemed to be slipping back towards an LOS mindset. Ms. Ellis said there was language that called out the definitions. Councilor Liberty hoped that the systems work would alleviate anxieties about slipping back to the old way. Councilor Harrington was encouraged to hear the level of discomfort. She felt the jurisdictions were uncomfortable also; it was good that we were taking the leap of faith all together.

Councilor Hosticka asked about the item on climate change. Was there further significance to this issue throughout the rest of the document? How did the figures mentioned in the climate change data relate to our decisions and policies? Ms. Ellis pointed out some examples within the resolution and exhibit. Councilor Park pointed out some issues on tree canopies and freight movement. Ms. Ellis said there was a lot of work being done regarding freight. Councilor Park clarified that he was concerned for local freight movement, not just on the big corridors.

Ms. Ellis reviewed the history of the different versions of the drafts. She and Mr. Cotugno discussed their meetings with the committees, and their processes, and input points along the way. Council discussed the versions and what the committees had been working from. Ms. Ellis described their efforts to stick to the timeline.

Councilor Burkholder said he was more concerned about the consent items; the discussion items were already called out. He personally would prefer to remove the consent item about additional lane assumptions and make it a discussion item. Mr. Cotugno suggested that Councilor Burkholder bring that up during JPACT.

Councilor Liberty had a question about the purpose of the RTP goals and measurable objectives. We ought to add language about developing projects, not just screening them. On the performance measure, he felt the metric was a bit vague. Mr. Cotugno said that was intentional to get into it and see how they would work. He wanted to be clear on whether they were placeholders. Mr. Cotugno thought there was a lot there already; putting specific targets in would make it off the charts. Ms. Ellis added that we did not have the information to say what the target was. Councilor Liberty would like that impression incorporated into the text.

Councilor Harrington pointed out a question about investment priorities. She wanted to confirm that up in phase 3 we had better delineation of this, and that it went back to the actual resolution. Were we committed to being open to changes in the table? Ms. Ellis thought there was language addressing that already.

3. BREAK

4. UPDATE ON BROWNFIELDS CRITERIA PRIORITIZATION

Miranda Bateschell, Assistant Regional Planner, distributed a list of recommendations (a copy is included in the meeting record). She summarized recommendations from the task force and defined targeted communities. She described factors that would define a compelling site.

Councilor Newman clarified that the quarter-mile factor referred to frequent bus, not just any bus. Ms. Bateschell agreed. She talked about the type of information that would be collected. There were 186 sites. She was not sure of the total acreage; most of the sites were fairly small, such as old auto shop stores and gas stations. The grant only covered petroleum, not hazardous waste.

Council President Bragdon recommended some indication of market demand as a factor for prioritization. Ms. Bateschell said the task force did want to look at that; it was harder to do in this phase of the study. It might be used when the list was narrowed. Council President Bragdon thought proximity to other commercial potential was important. She agreed and mentioned some resources that she could use.

Councilor Harrington wondered how the data would be gathered. Council President Bragdon thought maybe building permits or something. He assumed that the purpose was to have the sites redeveloped. Market demand would be one indicator.

Council President Bragdon asked for and received thumbs up.

Councilor Harrington would like to see information on next steps included in the Council discussions, especially in regards to committees such as MPAC. She'd like to know more about how the information was being shared with the committees and jurisdictions. Council President Bragdon thought that would be a good thing to report on to MPAC, for example. It could go under Council updates.

Miranda gave some more information on the target areas. She said the task force was really great, they had had a good discussion, and they finished early. Next steps would be to do the research and get the site information identified before the next task force meeting. A lot would depend on the results of approaching the property owners. She said there were more liability protections for property owners than in the past.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Hosticka distributed a handout on urban and rural reserves (a copy is included in the meeting record). They would need a work session. Councilor Park suggested there was no incentive for farmers. Councilor Harrington wondered if any areas could be redesignated as urban reserves? Council talked about the hierarchy and the relationship to urban reserves. They debated political strategy and talked about the agreements that would be needed.

Councilor Harrington mentioned her request for process improvements at MPAC.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
FEBRUARY 27, 2007**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	3/1/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, March 1, 2007	022707c-01
2	RTP	2/27/07	To: Bill Wyatt From: David Bragdon, Rex Burkholder, Rod Park, Brian Newman	022707c-02
2	RTP	2/27/07	To: JPACT and MPAC From: Kim Ellis Re: Consideration of RTP Discussion Items and Consent Items	022707c-03
4	Brownfields	2/27/07	To: Metro Council From: Miranda Bateschell Re: Metro's Brownfields Recycling Program	022707c-04
5	Communications	2/23/07	To: Metro Council From: Carl Hosticka Re: Urban and Rural Reserves—LC 3289, Briefing Points	022707c-05