

# **MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING**

May 29, 2001

Metro Council Annex

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

Councilors Absent: None.

Presiding Officer Bragdon convened the meeting.

## **I. Upcoming Legislation**

- The MPAC Parks Subcommittee work, the Zehren report
- The second reading of the reapportionment ordinance. There was a brief discussion describing the status of the ordinance, the new map, and the amendment process.
- The Recycling Bill passed the House
- RTA language was expected
- There was a planned Zoo Parking Lot hearing scheduled later in the week
- HB 2142 - the car title fee legislation was scheduled for action
- Submission to federal government of a new DBE program needed to receive FTA grant funds, separate from the MWESB program. The handout distributed is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting.

## **II. Air Rights Over Metro Garage**

Mike Burton, Executive Officer, presented background information regarding exploration of the air rights over the Metro garage. The handout distributed is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. Because of continued interest, Mr. Moss explained the cost, the market study results, the feasibility study results, and architectural schemes. It could serve as a resource site for Metro. Mr. Whitmore commented that the strength of the market has not yet been determined. The success of the Cascadian construction project will be closely monitored. Although Metro does not currently have the resources, it would attempt to qualify the possibilities of TOD funding. Preliminary work could continue while the climate for such a project continues to be monitored. He reviewed potential lender inquiries. This will be a difficult idea to make realized. There was discussion regarding the risks and market conditions.

## **III. Metroscope**

Andy Cotugno, Planning Department, presented an outline of the assumptions in the first four case studies that the Council had approved. The assumptions labeled E (to hold the UGB) and F (Subregional ) were discussed at length. The handouts distributed are attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. In the handout, the item identified as Case D is really Case E, and the item identified as Case E is really Case D. The use of lines, some corresponding with the county lines on the map, rather than identification of areas, caused much discussion. The Periodic Review Program states the need to make decisions on a subregional basis, then followed by policy making on a subregional basis, and then action to adopt amendments on a subregional basis. The hard lines on the map suggest artificial boundaries. Suggestions were made that the map be based on separate colors on a subregional basis, or employment center basis, or possibly have no map at all, but regional descriptions.

#### **IV. Transportation Policy Discussion**

Not discussed for lack of time. Councilor Monroe asked that the MTIP Process needed direction.

#### **V. Executive Officer Communication**

None.

#### **VI. Councilor Communications**

Councilor McLain briefly commented on the train system in Japan.

Presiding Officer adjourned the meeting.