

## **MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING**

Wednesday, March 21, 2007

Dryland Room, Howard Terpenning Recreation Complex

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 2:00 p.m.

Council President Bragdon said they were going to see where they were on the road map that had been adopted in February 2007 on the three major decisions.

Robin McArthur, Planning Department, said the agenda had changed in terms of order. They would be discussing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) first. The reserves strategy would be second. The investment strategy would be third. She reviewed the desired outcomes for each of those components. Council President Bragdon said they had included in the budget unappropriated funds for the department to be determined based on Council discussions. It would take an ordinance to direct the funds. Ms. McArthur said that was why they were seeking direction today so they could develop the work program budget.

Council President Bragdon suggested having Kim Ellis, Planning Department, get through the whole presentation first and then ask clarifying questions. Ms. Ellis noted an updating chart mapping out phase 3 of the RTP process so that Council had an idea of all of the different pieces were part of phase 3. She would be focusing on asking for direction on the proposed project solicitation process. The Council accepted the policy framework on March 15<sup>th</sup>. The next phase of that was then taking the policy framework and translating it into a solicitation process to be able to solicit a pool of candidate projects for the RTP based on the updated policy framework. What she would lay out was the process and procedures on how they were envisioning this to work. Also she would lay out some draft screening criteria that would be used to evaluate projects that were brought in. They were trying to model this effort after the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) process in a simplified fashion. Part of this was developing a solicitation packet and the project submittals would be locally developed through the County Coordinating Committees. They were proposing that these committees host workshops that bring together the counties and cities to work together to develop these project submittals. Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) members would serve as the main liaisons and leads for that work. They would also assign Metro staff to provide technical support as they went through the solicitation period.

Councilor Park asked for clarification on how deep they were following the MTIP model. Ms. Ellis said this would become clearer as she presented the information and then if there were questions, she would entertain those questions. Councilor Newman asked about Council's process to nominate projects. He suggested flagging this point. Ms. Ellis talked about the RTP projects. They were also laying out that the projects and programs must be located within the primary or secondary land uses. They were proposing establishing a target for local government to aim for. They would bring forward up to 100% level and then another 200% level. Councilor Hosticka asked if this process was a no vote or were these projects that were already being worked on. He wanted to know if they were starting from zero or from something else. Ms. Ellis said they were asking local governments to look at the current plans that were out there and then through the lens of the new policy framework and the update RTP goals to re-look at the projects and resubmit

them for inclusion in the RTP. As part of the policy framework discussion the question came up about projects being grandfathered in that were in the current plan. They wanted to reexamine all of these projects within the context of the new policy framework. Councilor Hosticka asked what was a primary or secondary land use? Ms. Ellis responded that those were the 2040 land use categories. The primary land uses were the central city, the industrial areas and the intermodal facilities. Secondary areas were the town centers, station communities, corridors and employment areas. Inner and outer neighborhoods were in the third category. Councilor Hosticka said the Sunrise and I-5/99W Connector would qualify based on industrial areas? Ms. Ellis said industrial area provided access connections. Ms. McArthur said they would not just be grandfathered in but would have to make the case based on the criteria. Ms. Ellis said they were also asking that the submittals be a minimum of \$1 million. For the RTP they wanted to have a minimum threshold but similar projects could be bundled together. She provided examples. They were also identifying projects that were greater than \$25 million and asking that the local governments look at how they could break up projects into discrete phases so that there could be a right of way preservation element. In terms of staging a project what were the more immediate priorities. Overall what this process was trying to do was have the local government process identifying what were there top priorities for inclusion within the RTP considering how well they met the new goals in the policy framework. They were also saying that the projects needed to meet Metro's requirements for public involvement.

In terms of the workshops for the Coordinating Committees, what Metro would provide was a database that Metro developed as part of the background research such as base year and future year modeling. They had also completed an inventory of the bike and pedestrian networks. They would be looking at having the workshops focus on community building type of projects and the regionability type projects consistent with the policy framework. The draft policy framework was serving as a safe harbor for trying to identify where there were gaps in the system. The goal was to develop a complete system. They were utilizing the complete system as the highest priority and the deficiencies would be a secondary priority but also important. Councilors asked clarifying questions about the process. Councilor Liberty said at some level every project addressed a deficiency. He provided an example of Hwy 217. Ms. Ellis talked about the need for connectivity. What the solution was was not yet resolved. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, provided more information about scoring of projects. Ms. Ellis said they were building on the cost estimate methodology to have a more consistent approach for how project cost estimates were developed with significantly increased construction costs. They had shown through the MTIP process that projects were not well estimated. They were trying to get a better handle on this so that they can truly know what the overall costs of some of these projects will be.

Councilor Harrington summarized the parameters for local workshops and of the multiple RTP goals this applied only to those two goals that were enumerated in the second bullet item. Ms. Ellis said the overall RTP goals were about community building and regional mobility as a whole. There were nine goals included as part of the policy framework. Some were more focused on community building and others were focused on the regional mobility. Ms. McArthur said one way to describe this was that the goals and the criteria roll up to promote community building and regional mobility. Ms. Ellis said the goals they had laid out were a recommended set of investment program areas that were around those two emphases. They were not necessarily the goal in themselves but the nexus for what your investments were trying to do. The community building was an important component but also the regional mobility both for access to jobs as well as investment within the region.

Councilor Park said when one of these entities took an action, what was it? Ms. Ellis said the action in the solicitation process was that they were asking these entities to provide Metro with project information to self score their project. Councilor Park asked what did we expect them to do, was it by resolution? Ms. Ellis responded that the projects were in an adopted plan currently or they would pass a resolution of their policy forwarding the projects to the RTP. Ms. Ellis said they would take the projects through a screening filter. She would describe the criteria for this filter. They were having the entities develop them; they could see how well they were matching up with the goals in the policy framework.

Ms. Ellis talked about the steps they were asking jurisdictions to go through. One set of workshops was at the coordinating committee level. They were asking the City of Portland and the Port of Portland to work together to develop their list. They would then review the background information provided by Metro as well as the currently adopted plans in the region. They would also ask them to develop updated cost estimates for all of these projects. They would ask them to work together at a coordinating committee level to bring forward their nomination for submittal but the May 25, 2007 deadline.

Councilor Burkholder reiterated that all of these jurisdictions knew this was coming and had budgeted time to do this so it was not a big additional load on them. Councilor Harrington said the methodology of executing it was different than what they were used to. Ms. McArthur said yes, it would be much more extensive for them this time around. Councilor Harrington expressed her concerns about the amount of work the jurisdictions would have to undertake. Ms. Ellis said one of the things they were trying to be clear about was what were the different roles and responsibilities. The county would need to complete an application or provide Metro with information about how the coordinating committee self scored projects of the high, medium and low criteria Metro had defined. Through that process each project then would have a score that was a qualitative score of how well it matched with the RTP goals. When Metro received the materials from the local governments Metro would then review them and compile a master list of the entire projects and programs region wide. Metro's projects would also need to go through the same process.

Metro was proposing to have cost targets. The rationale for this was to start having the prioritization begin through the communities as opposed to how the RTP had been done in the past. They wanted the priorities to come from the local jurisdictions and assess how well they matched up to the RTP goals. There was still a lot of policy discussion on what that financially constrained forecast was and how big the system might be. In the interim, they were proposing that they use the fact face report which assessed what revenues they anticipated being available on the planned period as an interim target. For part of the region of non-locally generated revenue, the amount of money that would be a target would be based on the 2035 population forecast. In addition to this, any locally generated revenue that was identified in that financial analysis. Councilor Hosticka asked for clarification on what Ms. Ellis had just summarized. Ms. Ellis clarified that they were allocating money to the jurisdictions based on their population. This was how the MTIP allocation process happened. In the very beginning in the solicitation packet that was put out by Metro there was a target that was established for each coordinating committee. This was modeled after the MTIP process. Each jurisdiction had up to a certain dollar amount of projects that the jurisdictions would bring forward. Councilor Newman asked if this was purely on a per capita basis. He said the capital needs by each area would be very different. It seemed that it would make more sense to have some kind of blended allocation where it was not just based on population. If the capital needs were dramatically different by our own admission, there needed to be some kind of recognition of this. Councilor Hosticka asked what was so

regional about this regional plan. Was it just a compilation of local plan in which everyone looked at how much money they get based upon their population. He felt this process was qualitatively different than MTIP when you were doing a regional plan for 35 years versus when you were distributing a relatively small amount of money to meet a general goal of air quality. He was concerned that jurisdictions were going to be allocated based on their population. Ms. Ellis said this was not indicating how the projects would get determined but it was the first step. This was trying to have the jurisdictions identify their top priorities so that we know locally what their top priorities were. Councilor Hosticka asked, when did we get regional about this, such as, the I-5 99 connector? It went through two counties and three cities. It was serving an area much extended beyond those entire entities dependent upon how it was designed. Whose project was it if it was not a regional project and then to whom would he say that this project had to fit into their allocation. Councilor Burkholder suggested putting those issues in a "to be dealt" with parking lot list. He felt that some of the answers would come forward during the rest of the presentation.

Ms. Ellis clarified that this was a starting point for discussion that Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) would be having between April and June of 2007. Then, they would also be looking at alternatives for trying to fund the gap between what was in that financially constrained forecast and that broader set of needs that the region knew were out there. Those would be another set of policy questions that the Council will be reviewing during the summer and fall 2007. She noted that there were 10 to 12 categories of modally based. What this was proposing was that for purpose of organizing how the projects and programs were within the RTP, they were emphasizing different areas of the policy framework. These were potential program areas in terms of how Metro organized the projects that came in. She provided some examples such as regional bridges and regional trails. She then reviewed the scoring criteria. She noted the important distinction between the qualitative scoring criteria that was being used to look at the nominations that come forward and also the performance measures work that was yet to be completed. They expected to continue working on this component. She talked about the draft policy framework and the potential performance measures. There was not a policy discussion about which would be the ones that were the most important. The screening criteria would be used to match the candidate investments with how well they were meeting the RTP goals. They were trying to focus in on the essence of the goals that were in that framework. The performance measures that they would be working to refine would be more quantitative based and would be used to measure the performance of the overall system scenarios that they would be doing in August and September 2007. The performance measures could help serve as a basis for developing more details, project level evaluations, similar to the MTIP. The screening criteria were not trying to evaluate projects on an individual basis the way the MTIP currently did. It would be difficult for them to do this with the RTP so they were trying to do this evaluation with a different screen.

Ms. Ellis reviewed the nine goals. She said the emphasis of Goal 1 was urban form. For each of the goals they had tried to identify a high, medium and low score consistent with the policy framework of what the emphasis was. Within the objective of Goal 1 the highest priority was on the primary land uses themselves. In this construct, a project or program that was serving two or more primary land uses would be the highest priority for investment. The medium score was one that would serve one land use. The lower score would be a project or program that was serving secondary land use. Goal 2 was, Sustaining the Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity. This goal was trying to identify the importance of providing or improving access to the labor market as well as the market areas of the centers and industrial areas in terms of supporting job creation and retention as well as leveraging other developments. The majority of these goals focused on system completion standpoint, such as completing a gap in the system that was improving access

to these areas within a primary land use area of the highest priority, a system deficiency of primary land use and then, at the third level it would be a secondary land use area (addressing a system gap or deficiency). Goal 3's emphasis was on expanding travel choices to reduce driving in the region but also to improve access toward environmental justice target areas that were identified as part of the background research. Following the same notion, the idea was to focus on completing a part of the system. This was all elements of the system including bike, pedestrian or transit connection to help improve access to or within these primary areas. It was also recognizing that within that particular goal, demand management and system management were also priorities for investment to be included in that element. The project that would receive a high score had the same system completion and deficiency on the primary and secondary land use area. Councilor Harrington asked for clarification on environmental justice, did this element only had value with primary land uses and not with secondary land uses. Councilor Burkholder said if it was a target area it raised them up in value. If they were primary land use and environmental justice areas it raised them up to high. If they were primary land use or environmental just areas, it would be considered secondary. Ms. Ellis said this particular goal focused on transportation access. She provided further details about this goal.

Goal 4 was the reliable movement of people and goods. This particular goal emphasized those regional mobility corridors. Different strategies were used to address system efficiency and inner connection of modes and reliability of those systems. Goal 5 was the safety and security goal. This was also putting the highest emphasis on those regional mobility corridors and adjusting reoccurring safety issues in them. In the congestion management report a significant portion of the congestion was related to incidents. This was trying to address this issue. This also was important on the arterial streets within those regional mobility corridors and other aspects of the system. Goal 6 had two components, human health and environment. She explained that this was where the highest score would be for projects that were reducing vehicle emissions and vehicle noise and providing an opportunity for physical activity. She explained the different scoring for this goal. The objectives on the natural system focused on barriers to fish and wildlife passage. The highest priority in this area would be removing total blockage of passage. She again explained scoring. Councilor Hosticka asked if there was a possibility of having a negative score. He said such proposal would disrupt environment or degrade human health. Ms. Ellis said they didn't build this in. Councilor Liberty said that would apply to the environmental justice component.

Councilor Burkholder asked Council if these goals were laid out correctly. He asked Council to comment on the goals. Councilor Newman said one question or concern was on the environmental measure (such as culverts). If the project had not been designed yet and it was a line on a map, how would this get scored? Ms. Ellis said if the project flagged it, there was a regional culvert inventory that had been done in the late 90s. It ranked all of the culverts in the region that corresponded to transportation systems. What they wanted to do was flag where those locations were and identify if there was an opportunity for transportation improvement that actually addressed this issue. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said with fish the design standards would require fish passage today, wildlife was something else. If they wanted to make the promise to allow for wildlife passage, they would be ranked on that basis. Councilor Newman said his other concern was that secondary land use was automatically scored as low rather than medium. If you follow the hierarchy that had always been followed, the secondary land use types like town centers and station communities would be in the medium but really the way it was designed now primary land use types dominate the first two high and medium scoring. He felt there would be a lot of push back on this. He would argue that town centers should be part of the medium scoring. Mr. Cotugno said, for example, if a town center was the only town center in a

town like Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) recommended. Ms. McArthur asked Council if they agreed with Councilor Newman's suggestion. Councilor Burkholder said this related to three of the seven areas. The question he had was did they want to weight these, they were equal right now. He thought the compact urban form and trying to promote region 2040 meant that they wanted to promote investment in our centers. Having three of the seven goals focused on primary and secondary, in a sense this was a weighting toward that direction. He said what this was doing was pushing their investment to the centers. Councilor Newman clarified his remarks and explained his general concerns. Council President Bragdon said he felt this was directly linked to what the definition of "serve" was. He thought, just because some facility ran next to a jurisdiction, didn't equate to serving it. There had to be some evaluation of the impact in terms of a good outcome. He provided some examples.

Councilor Liberty suggested starting the RTP systems analysis first. He was concerned that the way they were headed was that they were reinforcing certain patterns, which was to talk about projects before we have a system analysis. He suggested thinking about it separately from some of the land use questions they were talking about. He felt they were going to have a big political blowout which would either bust the criteria or all of the criteria could be meant for all of the projects. He hoped that Council was going to go back and try to get the region to begin stepping back from the current list of projects and start thinking about the system, doing an analysis of then jointly and then jointly coming together around some projects and ideas. He would also broaden those who could suggest ideas. He didn't know why it would have to be governments. He would encourage things that were inter-jurisdictional, interdepartmental, that involved other interests in proposing something. He would start with the joint learning of our system and how it might operate and use that as an intellectual foundation for proposing projects.

Councilor Park said his concern was when jurisdictions turned their projects in; Metro would then score the project based on this criteria and then tell the jurisdiction yes or no on the project. He agreed with Councilors Liberty and Hosticka, where was the regional piece first. You needed to look at the regional backbone that they were trying to create first and how the RTP's supported that regional piece. He was not sure where he was at on the per capita amount. He also had a question about serving, such as, a street that went by a development but didn't really serve to enhance the development.

Council President Bragdon talked about what he really liked about the first two phases of this and what he saw was an abrupt departure in a very different direction. That piece troubled him. Up until this point they had been talking about being regional and strategic and thinking in terms of systems. It seemed now they had taken a very abrupt turn toward the parochial. He questioned whether MTIP was the right template for this. He felt MTIP did not have a cohesive vision. This was supposed to be about a cohesive system. He didn't see MTIP as the right template for this process. He felt county governments were anti urban institutions. This was Metro's major tool to build 2040. He said he had concerns in terms of systems. One was the freight system. The freight system had regional impacts beyond jurisdictions sponsorship with the exception of the Port of Portland. The Port itself was interested in its facilities as opposed to the network on which freight moves which was owned by a variety of jurisdictions. He thought an approach that was overly jurisdictional shortchanges freight. He saw on the list the Port of Portland and the city of Portland. The whole region depended on the Portland Airport and the marine terminals. These were important to commerce in the region. Lumping these two entities together doesn't do the airport justice in terms of the movement of freight. Another example would be bridges. The vulcanized nature of the bridge ownership regime doesn't reflect the regional importance of these facilities. He felt the bridges were a system that needed to be looked at beyond jurisdictions. A

third area that didn't get captured was that the functioning of a system was going to be dependent upon hundreds or thousands of little projects and programs. Again, there may or may not be jurisdictional advocates for some of these good projects. There were also bad projects that have strong jurisdictional advocates. He needed to see a way in which these three areas were considered. Ms. Ellis said they would seek advice from the Freight Task Force to support and be an information base for the county and city coordinating committees to bring into their planning work to nominate projects. Councilor Harrington also expressed her concern about freight movement advocacy. Ms. Ellis said they were trying to tap into the structures that were already in place. Ms. McArthur talked about using the county and city coordinating committees and who were on these committees, such as Mayor Hughes, who was also in the Freight Task Force and should be promoting freight. Councilor Burkholder acknowledged that the issue was not just freight. Ms. McArthur questioned, shouldn't the counties and cities be responsible for thinking about freight movement? She suggested putting the onus on the counties to be more multi-model. Councilor Harrington suggested ground rules for these coordinating committees such as considering not just road projects but other modalities of transportation. Councilor Liberty said it reinforced the idea that counties were basic organizing units for a regional system. He felt this was a problem. There was no advocacy for system management or operations. For example, no one knows what an investment in sidewalks might do around the region. They were currently treated as an add-on.

Council President Bragdon said he thought any organization, including Metro, was inherently incapable of being objective when it came to things that it owned. At the end of the day entities were going to take care of the things that they owned. He said in an ideal world, they could say the money ought to be spent in the most effective way to aid people's commute back and forth. At the end of the day, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was going to look to fix its own facility. Councilor Harrington said she had listened to the proposal for high, medium and low for each of the goals. She needed to hear more dialogue about how the information on the goal pages was used to define the high, medium and low. Ms. Ellis said they looked at, within the context of the goal statement and then the objective for each goal, what was the primary emphasis of that goal. They tried to capture several different elements. A good example was to sustained economic and prosperity was trying to get to job access, the market area access. Then they would apply what the priorities for that investment in that area because there were objectives within each goal that emphasized one type of access or investment over others. In the transportation choices goal, system and demand management were a priority for investment as well as expanding transportation choices as the outcome that they were trying to achieve. They were trying to meld them together as opposed to having a high, medium and low for each objective. They were trying to simplify because for each goal they had three to six objectives that you were evaluating your project against.

Councilor Harrington said you can't have something that was unwieldy but she hoped that they hadn't lost too much of the value, particularly with regard to goals 2 and 4. Then, related to a comment that Councilor Newman raised, she didn't see how developed areas versus emerging development fit into the equation at all. She was having difficulty with this piece. Ms. Ellis said they would be asking for people to assign that area. For their analysis, they could sort out projects that were serving those different areas. The intent of having the table was to identify and recognize that different parts of the region were at different stages of development. It wasn't intended to use this as a policy basis for investing more in one area versus another but that it was to recognize that there were differences and depending upon where a place was in terms of the stage of development that there were different things that they should be focusing on in terms of building an urban transportation system to support 2040. Councilor Harrington appreciated the

time that was being spent on this hard phase of the project. They were going to be dealing with so many partners and stakeholders that they needed to have them go through this process with Metro in a positive exchange fashion. She was concerned that they would question how this was different compared to methodologies that they had used in the past. She didn't have that prior experience to share how it was different. They needed to get to the point where they were dealing with specific projects and trying to apply a system holistic view and then get down to projects and what it really meant with things on the ground. She was looking for some reinforcement on the leap of faith. She didn't want to have a situation where they went through all of this work and the result was still the same. They needed to do some major selling of the methodology. Another concern she had was, was a sense for how this would feel familiar to some folks and for some it will feel very foreign and others it will feel very threatening. She suggested that where there was further descriptive information, they might want to anticipate where people were coming from. She felt it was still a bit confusing in terms of who does what where, such as, the Technical Advisory Committees and Metro. Where do the different players do the work and where does it come together.

Councilor Hosticka echoed some of what other councilors had said as far as the regional nature of what they were doing. He said they had gone through all of this to set up a regional system yet they were setting up a process for projects to compete with each other. This didn't make sense to him. It may make sense if Metro generated a list of potential projects and then go to the scenarios to see what the basic scenarios were for a regional system. Then, you could look at the projects as to how they contribute to scenario. Were projects more compatible with certain scenarios? He was concerned that they might get projects that they didn't want. He suggested we needed more system in the system analysis and more region in the regional analysis. Eventually they had to come down to picking projects based upon how they contribute to a preferred scenario.

Councilor Burkholder said this was not finished but this was a good framework. They should look at refining the framework for two reasons. One, was that the role of the RTP was to provide direction for the region. The system that they were creating was a sum of its parts. Especially with the ideal model that had been developed in terms of the network of arterials, collectors, etc. It was clear that those were implemented on a localized level. The idea was that when the RTP was completed all of these components would work together. He felt this approach was a radical departure just because it was not an open ended system where right now it was an open ended system. He thought as far as the model went in terms of looking at what was a regional direction and what was a regional model, that work had been done already and therefore on that level there was no need to go through a scenario because they have a scenario for a dense network that included transit, alternate modes, access, etc. What he saw, in terms of the goals and rankings, was how do you actually implement that and make it happen. The way he saw this was through the weighting issue he had talked about earlier in the discussion. There were four of the criteria that focused on network completion which were the system gaps. The gap was in Metro's model. There were three goals where the 2040 hierarchy of lands was the highest ranking piece. He was not saying this was all that we should be doing but he was saying if you looked at those two components they were critical to completing a regional vision. Both of those components got a lot more points because it showed up multiple times. He said the MTIP was a very directive process where the only products you can get on the list to be log rolled where projects that met the regional goals and objectives that were set through the criteria. He felt it was a good model. There were some refinements that needed to be done. They were trying to get that regional system and the land use piece implemented, those things should receive a lot of points. The projects that would come forward would be the ones that reached those regional goals.



Councilor Newman said he wanted to make sure that at the end of this day, they came to some resolution as they had a very short timeline. He was concerned about the project solicitation process. He was trying to brainstorm about this, was it possible to get away from the county process that was outlined in this proposal. There had to be a project solicitation process and local governments would play a large role. They had a project list at the local level. He suggested work groups on system topics like freight rather than having people come to a county sponsored event and go through a county process, why didn't Metro convene it. He suggested doing it on topics and avoiding geographic areas. He wondered how difficult this suggestion might be to implement. He suggested that the process be convened by Metro and was focused on system categories. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said they were trying to take advantage of the staff resource at the local government level. They were the ones that were going to have to own and operate the system. To the extent that we could shape what they were bringing to Metro, they needed them to want to do the projects that Metro developed. He thought it was a matter of them embracing an approach to come up with a system. They needed to leverage the capacity. Metro didn't have the capacity in staff to do that extensive of a process. Ms. McArthur asked was there a way that they give system category targets to those coordinating committees as and ask them to come back with their priorities for freight and bike/ped. She suggested letting the coordinating committees know that they were expecting a multi-model submission.

Councilor Harrington added, she thought they had to say more than we were expecting a multi-model system. She suggested using maps. Ms. Ellis said they would be providing maps to the coordinating committees. There were resources Metro could provide, but the local jurisdictions had the local expertise. They were not just trying to leverage staff resources but to build trust with the local jurisdictions. Metro wanted them to take ownership over implementation.

Councilor Liberty said he was concerned about a political blowup because we hadn't established the trust or a common understanding. He suggested involving the local governments through involving them in the development of the scenarios and to make them work thematically and inter-jurisdictionally such as multiple governments working on freight or transit theme. He suggested that the experience of working together might break down some of the silos, to develop some understanding of the system and to create a new menu of projects. He talked about the linkage between communities. He thought using scenarios to education people and build trust before we get to a project level was the route he recommended. Otherwise we were reinforcing ownership around projects instead of around a system. He talked about bringing other people in as well to build community. He was also skeptical about criteria yielding the outcome unless we change the thinking and there was an education process. Then they would do this jointly.

Councilor Harrington said in order for you to go through scenario analysis, it seemed that there was a dependency on input data. You were using the project solicitation process to provide you with that data. She didn't know how they could go through a scenario process and get the work done between now and the end of March.

Councilor Hosticka asked Councilor Burkholder if he already had a scenario and they would be different models of how the system would function dependent upon what was emphasized. He asked for clarification. Councilor Burkholder said the way he saw the scenario piece was how you phase choice. He provided an example of the finance scenario, given the limited dollars you had and given the model you were trying to build, what were the pieces that you did first. What can you afford and what impact did it have if you move resources from one place to another. He said they already had the 2040 concept and a strong transit vision. They were starting out with a certain position, the question was, what do they do next was the question. Councilor Harrington

asked, was Councilor Burkholder saying that they could do this first from the data they already had? Councilor Burkholder said the question was how do you phase things, how do you build things with the constrained revenue stream that was available. This went back to the big project issue. The project was in the RTP but they still had to phasing it. Councilor Hosticka added that they needed to have some way of getting things on the list that were not jurisdictionally based the way they were now. The chief arterial in the area that he represented was Highway 99W. It started in center city, came out Barbur Blvd and ended in Sherwood. Who owned it? If you left it to the various jurisdictions, you might not get that holistic analysis regarding that project. Another example was TV Highway. He thought it was important to get a more holistic view rather than asking each jurisdiction. Councilor Park appreciated Councilor Hosticka's comment. How do you hang the system out there first and then let jurisdictions say what pieces they were going to move forward. Ms. Ellis said that Deena Platman would be working with the Freight Task Force to identify needs in the region. She said JPACT, MPAC and the Council would be looking at the results to indicate what was missing. Then they would have to figure out how to reconcile or address where some of the things that didn't come out should be included.

Council President Bragdon suggested a draft direction to staff. He said there were reservations about a strictly project-jurisdictionally based approach. He noted Councilor Liberty suggested going back to the scenario phase. He didn't hear everyone suggesting this. He was hearing some say that the jurisdictional approach needed to be modified to require more systems type thinking. There also needed to be some mechanism so that the orphans that were really good things but didn't have sponsors such as freight needed to have strong advocates. He suggested asking staff to tweak this before going out. Councilor Liberty suggested looking at the RTP systems scenarios analysis and investment recommendations, the question was what the input into them was. The point was that if you assemble the scenarios out of projects. The point was to not have them county based or off the shelf but that you bring in a different group of people around the table. You still have themes such as operations, freight or transit, and you would have this group work collectively with broader thinking and participation. This would then allow an output of refinement. He felt the input should be more informed and more inclusive not based on the same projects and participants and that they have themes to illustrate that different approaches yield different results. This was how you make a decision about what investment to make. He felt this would break down silos and barriers.

Councilor Newman asked if this was consistent with the directions they were already going in. Mr. Cotugno said the pool of projects that they ended up with in the regional system scenarios box at a fiscally constrained funding level which was itself a policy determination, how aggressive do you want to be, and an illustrative funding level was also how aggressive you want to be, those two pools of projects that they ended up with weren't the same old suspects. It was a richer basis for coming up with those two pools of projects. The refinement phase would look at how you mix and match and what you get out of it. This could be used to be much more of a short term targeted direction.

Councilor Liberty talked about themes with a different kind of emphasis about the nature of the investment. Mr. Cotugno suggested that the themes such as freight and transit be in the mix, it was not just the same characters producing the same projects. Council President Bragdon suggested that what Councilor Liberty was suggesting was partly a communication tool. Themes were about illustrative communications. Councilor Liberty said it would be both. He provided some examples of his thinking. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), said they would get more project input than they could ever swallow. He was hopeful that they were going to steer them toward all of the model layers of the fully built system. You would then run them through

the financial scenarios and try to develop a list that met those criteria closely. You would do RTP finance scenarios which lean one way or another with the constraints that they knew they would have. Mr. Cotugno said that was the intent. You use the project solicitation and the scoring to come up with one financially constrained overall RTP and then go into the financial scenarios which would figure out what were the short term things you were going for and what was the best bang for the buck that you get out of the short term things you were going for.

Ms. McArthur said that she believed that they had devised project selection criteria that will build a multi-model system and comprehensive system that would address those goals. So that solicitation brings those projects in, then it was a matter of whether you could afford a little bit of system completion or a lot of system completion. Councilor Liberty asked which ones you were going to model. It seemed that using the themes allowed them to learn, engage and involve new people in the breakdown in some of the traditional geographic areas. Councilor Newman said this was his concern about the scenarios that Councilor Liberty was outlining. Ultimately what they were going to do, based on a constrained financial reality, was a mix of different kinds of projects. There was not going to be an RTP that was highway heavy. The reality was it was going to be a mix. Councilor Liberty said you start with the assumption that there will be a blend but the different mixes may surprise you on how they perform. We use different scenarios in developing 2040 because the highlighted policy choices and they had very different consequences on the ground and for the air quality and settlement pattern. If they hadn't done that, they would have said that they were going to grow out and grow up. They didn't end up with that. They ended up something really emphasized one theme with some modifications. He thought going through the process would enlighten them and may change the investment mix.

Councilor Burkholder said he wanted to be able to leave the meeting being OK with the project solicitation process based on these criteria and whether there were any modifications so that they could continue. Second, the other issue was the scenario piece, the timing and their ability to carry it out. We needed to get going with the project selection and their ranking for whatever type of scenario they do. Council President Bragdon said they needed to determine if staff could go ahead with modifications as described by the Council. Councilor Hosticka said he was not in favor of going ahead and asking people to nominate projects and score them in a process in which they think they are competing with each other to get their project funded. To the extent that this works in that direction, he was not in favor of it. He thought it could be modified to be something he would be in favor of which was to have them called project suggestions and have someone else besides the jurisdictions involved or in addition to the jurisdictions involved in project suggestion. He thought going along the direction described would set Metro in a path that he didn't want to go down personally. Councilor Harrington said she wanted to see the approach that was used successfully in achieving this system wide objective. She said going down the path of these scenarios takes the path off the eye of that ball. On the timeline, the general timelines was tight. She suggested making this the only topic at MPAC when they next met. There was more material needed for MPAC with the objective of that meeting being that they walk out of that room with a high degree of comfort. Council felt a high degree of ownership for this project and MPAC didn't and wouldn't necessarily have that high degree of ownership so she wanted to see that we were successful in that effort. They needed to figure out how they were going to present to MPAC.

Councilor Park talked about scoring. He asked if they could use MPAC or Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) to help do the scoring on the outcome. He wondered if that put a different spin on this or a different kind of peer review. Councilor Newman said he would not put these advisory committees in charge of scoring but having a policy discussion about what projects

supported the land use vision. Ms. Ellis said there were examples of other MPO boards determining what projects moved forward. Council President Bragdon suggested going ahead with Phase 3 with revisions. Ms. McArthur said it was clear that what staff was recommending were financial scenarios. She believed this was different from what Council was recommending. She said they were suggesting scenarios rather than themes. She wanted clarification on what to go forward with. Mr. Jordan reminded the Council that they will not move the region to a completely different place through this process alone. The Council will be able to move them a little ways. They will be able to shift the direction on the compass to some degree away from the local parochialism to a more regional systemic approach but Council won't be able to move them all the way there. The staff was trying to help Council figure out how to move them as far as possible. He felt the modifications that had been suggested will help move them along.

Councilor Hosticka said his feeling was that you push as hard as you can and you see how far they move. You don't prejudge how far you can move them and only push that much. Councilor Park asked why they had to have them organized around county entities the way these were outlined. Ms. Ellis said part of it was that it would force them to coordinate amongst their projects. There would be a lot of coordination that went on between them. Councilor Newman said before they provided their list of projects, it would be helpful to have them have a conversation about what together collectively they were trying to accomplish. Councilor Burkholder reminded that these were public servants and Council had to trust them to a point. We were asking them to change how they do things. He felt it was Council's job to lead. We can't order them to do something. We have authority to give them a direction and then lead them. They do have a model they were working off of, 2040. They were using 2040 to move them further along. They were going to make choices based on what money was available. Councilor Newman asked if the coordinating committee meetings were staff level not policy makers. Mr. Jordan said yes. Their work often rose to the policy level but 99% of the work was done by staff.

Councilor Liberty felt that they had gotten the criteria information two hours ago and were now being asked to make a decision. He did not think this was fair. Second, he wouldn't go ahead at this point for several reasons, 1) he thought jurisdiction based focus projects created a problem and he wanted to change the pattern. What it would take for him to be comfortable would be that he wanted a different group of people including people from land use and from different aspects of the system using a different process to develop the projects. They should do it at a regional level at the outset not from a county or city level. It should be public, open with lots of participation. The second concern he had was that he thought the criteria were so open ended that if you took a different dozen people and had them score the projects, the projects would be scored dramatically differently, which meant that they ought to do scoring along with other people to see how people think about the criteria. He felt they were asking for a lot of surprise outcomes from interpretations of the scoring. The approach should be more regional with no divisions based on county or city wide. Once the criteria were tested, criteria should be integrated into the scenarios.

Council President Bragdon summarized what he had heard. One, people had reservations but thought those concerns could be mitigated and they were supportive of staff going ahead in the solicitation phase using all of the methods to bring systemic thinking and minimize parochialism. Second, two Councilors had said they were not even comfortable with this. He asked Councilors if they were supportive of allowing staff to move into phase 3 mitigated with the items that had been talked about during this session. Councilor Hosticka said he was 45 degrees in supportive of this if there was modification in the solicitation. Councilor Liberty agreed with Councilor Hosticka. Councilor Newman said Metro doesn't have the capacity to do anything different. Council President Bragdon said it was accurate to say to staff they could move into Phase 3 with

modifications. Councilors concurred recognizing the Councilors Liberty and Hosticka have serious reservations.

Council President Bragdon focused the discussion on the Urban and Rural Reserves. They had talked about a major investment fund which they weren't going to get to today, performance UGB which they would talk about in April and the third item was the urban and rural reserves. The Urban and Rural Reserves was the most immediate because it did involve State legislation. They had talked previously about how Metro engaged on this issue. They had talked about what had worked for Metro in the past and what hasn't. They had talked about using outside help to get people on their side early on. The staff had gone back and tried to apply some of those rules to this particular task.

Mike Wetter, Assistant to the Council President, reviewed a chart which focused on a pattern of what they were getting success with these days. They had applied that pattern to this project. He said the first green arrow was the problem definition stage. It was the stage at which they identify a potential solution, the policy outcome that they were after, and the stage at which they as a Council give some direction about what they wanted out of the solution. Council puts side boards and or make suggestions. It depended upon the degree of influence or authority Council had over this particular project how much they could constrain the problem definition. They had seen a whole range of suggestions from the Regional Legislative agenda to the Bond Measure where Council was specific about the acreage. He explained further the scope of work which was where Council was able to give direction to the project. That scope of work was handed off to some kind of group that Council convened or was involved in convening. That group was then given this project to work on. The question there was who needed to be in the room in order for the policy proposal to have legitimacy. That group then worked with some influence or direction that the Council had given it to create a policy proposal of some sort, such as the bond measure. At that point Council would go into advocacy which was the process of the Metro Council working with this convening group to go out and advocate for the proposal, to educate, to inform, to build support for it. That was done strategically with targeting what messages we needed to get to whom. It was done by a group of folks who have been chosen very carefully at that convening stage so they had the advocates they needed when they got to the advocacy stage. It was not just Metro Councilors out there, but folks with the Council. Then, you get to the point of a policy outcome which was the enactment of the policy. This was a model that had a lot of flexibility that was built into it. He thought that there were some key questions that Council needed to be thinking about at each stage and some strategies. What they were finding was that it could apply pretty readily to a wide range of projects having to do with getting to a regional policy outcome. This was not about trying to influence local decision making. This was really when they were trying to get to a fairly significant regional policy. It was a hybrid of consultative and collaborative approach that they thought was adaptable. They had worked the problem of the Urban and Rural Reserves, using this model and they thought it worked. They were presenting that application today and wanted to know what Council thought. Council President Bragdon added that it was significantly different than the way they would have done it under the old paradigm which would be analysis and then a COO recommendation. This was a different way of doing things. Mr. Wetter said it was not the way they approach the project of Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC). In this instance, they defined the problem up front with staff and Council, consulting with other groups. Then, a group was not convened until they were clear where they were going with it. What was it that they wanted out of it? These were more defined engagements with defined scope of work. It was not an open ended group.

Council President Bragdon suggested getting into the substance of this topic. Tim O'Brien, Planning Department, said they were showing the three major steps that staff had laid out 1) rule making, 2) study areas, and 3) reserve designation. These were the three main steps contingent upon legislation passing and putting this into rule making. He noted that on the chart, the rule making and study area components would be working together at the same time, one could not follow the other. They had to be done simultaneously. He noted some key points in each phase. They would be seeking direction for Council soon about the rule making such as rule making to identify key urban and rural reserves. Another key point would be the written agreement that was part of the legislation package. This would be occurring in spring 2007. The next key point would be the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) would convene the working group for rule making. They would be the conveners of who would be involved with the rule making. When they made their presentation to LCDC in January, one of the reasons they liked the idea was Metro also said they would be very involved with this process. Councilor Hosticka noted that the person who asked for rule making was Brent Curtis. Councilors commented on the process.

Ken Ray, Public Affairs Department, said this model acknowledged that different jurisdictional entities have different roles and different authorities with regard to the establishment of Urban and Rural Reserves. From a political standpoint, every phase of this process would require Metro engagement with the other jurisdictions to give them a sense of ownership in the process so that when it comes time to finalize some of the criteria, come up with some solid criteria in place for how urban and rural reserves were designated, we have the counties and neighboring cities on board. There would be engagement at both the staff and elected official level at all stages of the process. Councilor Newman said he had questions about this and would like to flag this for further discussion. Mr. O'Brien continued, LCDC would adopt the rules, as they were working through the rule making phase they would then have to implement the rules to see how they could start to identify those urban and rural reserve study areas. He noted that these processes would run concurrently as shown on the road map. They would need a group working through the study areas. Finally, once the first two processes were completed, the Metro Council and Counties should adopt some timeline or a formal plan. Then, there would need to be a certain amount of technical work to be done, working with the task force. They saw this task force making a recommendation to the Counties and Metro Council. This recommendation should come forward in 2009.

Council President Bragdon asked the Council if they thought this was the right approach. If so, the staff would detail a real work plan and a budget proposal. Councilor Newman said he was very enthusiastic and felt it was generally the right approach. He liked the structure that the staff had established. He wanted to make sure that they flagged and came back to, what was an informal work group and what was a task force. What was the expectation of how they operate? Second, under the study area, was it one working group for the whole region or more than one sub-group. There was no shortage of people who wanted to participate in this process. It was a localized as well as regional complex issue. Third, what was the public process? Mr. Ray talked about the direct public outreach and that it would come as they defined blobs on the map. There would be a lot of opportunity for public engagement as they defined the areas. They wanted to make sure the public's input was focused and they were as well informed as possible about the outcomes they were trying to achieve. As we begin to define the areas and why they were selected, he would envision quite a bit of direct public outreach around the region. Councilor Newman said he wanted clarification about this issue, were they having mini public events or one big event? Was it a Council with a staff presentation to go out to jurisdictions or Community Planning Organizations and Neighborhood Associations? Mr. Ray said he thought the Council

would do several meetings around the region similar to what was done with the Bond Measure. Once the Blue Ribbon Committee had created the target areas and defined why and where they were, they then had public engagement. Much of this was geographically specific. He expected they would have the same sort of discussion about the urban and rural reserves. It would be more helpful to engage the public in individual meetings. Councilor Harrington talked about the bond measure project having a lot of advocacy groups. She wasn't sure the same forum would work for this project. Mr. Ray said they also needed to engage the advocacy groups as well as the public. He expected that there was broad agreement on the need for urban and rural reserves. He felt they needed to keep them engaged in how we get there.

Councilor Newman said he knew the counties were in the brainstorming stage. They wanted to have their own parallel process and the Council needed to better understand their processes. Finally, Metro staff and Council had talked about doing some kind of testing focus groups to test the stuff that came out of the agriculture urban study. This was not on the Road Map, was that envisioned not to happen? Mr. Wetter responded when we were working at the legitimization stage, in both the study areas and the final reserve designation, there needed to be some regional perspective and probably some sub-regional perspective. Both angles needed to be worked. This might be a good place to test the blobs and then in a more final way when they were actually doing the designation. Robin McArthur, Planning Department, said they realized that they needed to ground truth this research that they had done to date. They didn't want to start rule making on this direction of this research if they hadn't tested it and figured out if the work gave them the right result. That does not necessarily mean, they involved the elected at this stage. It could be a technical exercise. Initially they thought it was a group of both policy people and electeds. They were backing away from that thinking. There were appropriate places to engage the elected officials but once they saw this construct, they were probably engaged in different places. Councilor Newman said there was a lot of interest in his district. If there was a working group and the electeds weren't part of it, then there would be a lot of frustration unless they gave them some other outlet for people to participate in. He wasn't sure what that looked like.

Councilor Hosticka said he thought they ought to have a broader public involvement than a simple working group and have it something like the focus groups because it was going to happen and they might as well get involved as soon as they can in terms of the public wanting to have some way of feeling they have a way into this process. He saw this more as ground truthing. The question he had was, where did MPAC and MTAC fit into this process? Mr. Wetter said they would expect to participate with the advisory groups throughout. He talked about drilling down into the layers. They were hoping to get approval of this general approach. They had been struggling with governance architecture for quite some time. Did this work for the Metro Council? If so, they could work through the nuts and bolts. Ms. McArthur asked clarifying questions about involving the public. Councilor Hosticka said he was talking about involving the public in the study area processes. There were parallel processes going on that they needed to link to. We needed to have a method for doing this so that everyone understood that they were working on the same thing. He also thought there needed to be some early public opportunity for people who have heard that this was going on to have a way of feeling engaged so that they don't think that come January 2008, Metro was going to adopt some blobs and their only opportunity was to show up at a hearing at Metro and provide input on the blob.

Councilor Harrington said the paradigm seemed fine. She asked was this assuming Senate Bill 1011 went smoothly? Staff responded that this was assuming that the bill passed. Councilor Harrington asked what if the bill passed but there was a lot of bruising along the way? Councilor Newman said all this process assumed a two year extension. He said if this bill did not pass, then

they could bring this forward again in early 2009. Metro didn't do anything until the end of 2009. Councilor Harrington said she was curious on the study areas and how Metro will go about defining the urban criteria and making sure that we work through that and are of a similar mind. She wasn't sure that they were of a similar mind. Council President Bragdon said he thought what Councilor Harrington was saying and would be useful for him in terms of a calendar sense; it would be good to have some dates to get on a Council calendar. He felt it was necessary to have check in points with the Council. Councilor Harrington said she was asserting that the Council may not be all on the same page with regard to the definition of urban reserve. She was looking for assurance that they would be spending some talking about urban reserve criteria. She then asked about the decision point lining up with the January 2008 policy outcomes. Ms. McArthur said it should.

Councilor Burkholder said the one concern he had was that this built up an institutional momentum. It was like they were loading the gun to do something but maybe they didn't want to shoot. In his mind, particularly urban reserves may not be something that they wanted to do. Yet if you build up expectations that something was going to happen, they may decide not to do anything. Can you do nothing if you build up momentum through such a process? Councilor Newman reminded that they had adopted the work plan. This laid out all they were going to do. Councilor Burkholder was concerned about the land that had already been brought in, in the last six years and the fact that no one was developing it. So why would Council want to be on a path that would require more infrastructure? He personally had concerns about talking about expanding the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at all. He wanted to make sure that if they come to the point where they say it doesn't make sense to do this or if the answer came out to be adding a minimal amount rather than a lot of acreage. Dick Benner, Senior Metro Attorney said there was nothing in the bill that required them to designate urban reserves. Legally, if the bill passed, there was nothing that required doing urban reserves. At the end Council could decide not to do it legally. But, the bill does say at least a 20 year supply of urban reserves. So if Council thought they wanted to have a smaller supply of urban reserves, you would have to change the bill. Councilor Burkholder said they might determine that a 20 years supply of urban reserves was zero, given the fact that we had zero absorption of the land that was brought in the last time around. That was his point; we could get to a point of spending so much institutional energy and resources on something that they felt they had to do something. Councilor Hosticka said you don't have to establish urban reserves and once you establish urban reserves, you don't have to expand the UGB. Ms. McArthur said this does not compel you to change the UGB. What it does say was when and if Metro Council was ready to expand the UGB, you do it in a thoughtful way that had already been evaluated as to balance agriculture, urban and natural resource issues. It does not compel the Council in 2009 to move the UGB.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said he thought it was important to send out all of the right signals all along the way. He thought there were two key signals that Council had said consistently, recalibrate local land use plans. How much mileage were we going to get out of existing UGB territory and if that was not good enough, you don't need to adopt urban reserves at the end of the line. If it was not good enough, it may force Metro to do an UGB expansion faster than they wanted to but you don't have to grease the skids by doing the urban reserve part in addition to being force into the UGB expansion. The second half was that the rural reserves have to be legitimate and good enough and actually have an effect. If they were not and were too small or too weak, they were not making it easier to do urban reserves if we were not following through with the protection on the rural reserves. Those were the two litmus tests at the end of the process. If those two processes don't come through, why would you want to make the urban reserves part easier? That message had to be consistent throughout this process.



Councilor Hosticka thought they ought to be doing urban reserves whether or not we expand the UGB. He thought the reason they were doing this was that they were signaling the people who were making land investment decisions about where it was likely if at all that the UGB would expand and where it was not likely that it will expand. Whether or not they expanded the UGB, there was still value in the process of having the reserves. What he didn't want to see was people making investment decisions based upon their belief that this will never urbanize and then you get into a point of urbanizing it or making investment decisions thinking that they will urbanize an area when they knew they were not. Council President Bragdon said the point for today was, were our options preserved? He said he liked the template in the sense that they knew it was going to be controversial and this got people in the box with Metro which was their objective when they started this whole thing. He agreed with a lot of what had been said. He did have reservations about focus groups. He suggested before we spend a lot of money on public involvement, he needed to have more clarity about the purpose of what these focus groups would do. He had heard several different versions, one was ground truthing which to him as a technical matter. To him that was not public involvement that was factual research. Before they gather a large group and have them tell the Council what they think about the next 50 years, this was a different matter. He was much less interested in this. He thought the public involvement got more meaningful as it was closer to an actual decision being made and when they were better informed about the options were that the Council was weighing. He was in favor of having broader public involvement where and when there was more information and more clarity on what was being framed for their consideration. He did want to see this in the work plan.

Councilor Park said the outline was good as it covered a lot of different areas. He wasn't comfortable with where we were at right now. The devil was in the details on the reserves. The question of size and location was a big part of the process. He didn't think this addressed the rural reserve issue. Council President Bragdon said he was less concerned about what future Metro Councils might do with the urban reserves but was concerned about what future County Commissions might do with the rural reserves. Mr. Benner said the legislation didn't provide answers to all of Councilor Park's questions. It could be left open in rule making to determine Metro's agreements with the counties. There was one threshold in the bill and that was if the Council chooses to do urban reserves, it had to be at least 20 years worth. If Council was assuming that there was a 20 year supply of land in the UGB, then it would be 20 years beyond that. So you would have at least a 40 year supply. You could choose to do more but you can't do less than the 20 plus the 20. If Council was trying to get a sense of how many acres that might be of all the land outside the UGB, the urban reserve that the Metro Council adopted some years ago that was overturned, had 18,600 acres and that was supposed to be a 30 year reserve. There was nothing in the legislation that indicated what that reserve would be. It was up to the Metro Council as to what they wanted the rule to say and what you wanted to say in the agreement with the counties. Second, if you identify rural reserves, under the legislation, they were protected from being urban reserves by anyone for the same period of time as the urban reserve planning period. If you get 20 year of UGB, 23 years worth of urban reserve, you have a total of 43 years, so for 43 years no one can designate rural reserve as urban reserve. If you were a farmer designated as a rural reserve, you get 43 years of security.

Councilor Liberty thought conceptually it was fine. He said the content was not only about urban and rural reserves but also included performance based UGB expansions, neighboring cities, the RTP to the extent they were talking about connections to other communities and investing in our communities. He would like something in the diagram and in their discussion some indication that those things were part of the mix. He provided examples of what he was talking about. He

felt that all of these tools needed to be integrated. He suggested that some of the things on the road map were processes, some were places and some were criteria. These were very different. It would be hard to go forward. He suggested paying a lot of attention to the LDCD process.

Council President Bragdon summarized that there was full endorsement in terms of the approach or paradigm. There was some good direction on fleshing out the work plan none of which sounded like it contradicted with other instruction. He asked staff if they had enough input from Council to go work on the plan. Councilor Newman commented on public outreach and the need for clarity on the purpose. If there wasn't going to be focus groups in each quadrant, then he needed to work with the policy makers in his area. There was positioning out there. People wanted to know what was going on. Metro needed to figure out a way to inform people of the process and participation points. He was struggling with how we do that. Council President Bragdon suggested making the public process meaningful. The last event was expensive. Councilor Newman said his concern was more reassuring the public that this was a collaborative process.

Councilor Park said they thought that what they were suggesting on the urban and rural reserve was a great idea; the question was that when they went out to the ordinary citizen, they may find out that there was both opposition and support. Somehow they needed to engage beyond the inner sanctions. Ms. McArthur said she thought there was a thirst out there for next steps. She wanted to work with Councilors to figure out how they get out there to talk about next steps before the next April meeting. Councilor Harrington asked when they were going to figure out where they might want to provide public opportunities because she was hearing from some people.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Prepared by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Billington', written in a cursive style.

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF**  
**MARCH 21, 2007**

<b>Doc. Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
3/21/07	To: Metro Council From: Kim Ellis, Planning Department Re: Power Point Presentation on "A New Look at Transportation Linking Transportation to Land Use, the economy and the environment"	032107c-01
3/21/07	To: Metro Council From: Kim Ellis, Planning Department Re: 2035 RTP Update: A New Look at Transportation Phase 3: System Development and Analysis	032107c-02
3/21/07	To: Metro Council From: Mike Wetter, Council Office Re: Urban and Rural Reserves Strategy for Development and Adoption	032107c-03
3/22/07	To: Metro Council From: Council President Bragdon Re: Recap of Wednesday March 21 <sup>st</sup> meeting issues resolved and issues pending	032107c-04