

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, July 24, 2007  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused), Robert Liberty (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL WORK SESSION, JULY 26, 2007//ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS**

Council President Bragdon reviewed the July 26, 2007 Metro Council budget work session agenda. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, said the emphasis would be on Council directing staff about proceeding towards the September decision on budget amendments. Performance measurement would also be a focus. The debriefing of last year's budget would be scheduled soon. Council President Bragdon said he felt it was important that the full Council be present at that discussion.

Councilor Harrington asked about item 6.3, titled "GPAC summit"; was this referring to the recent greenspaces summit? Mr. Jordan said it was. Council President Bragdon observed that Metro would not have the resources to manage all the open spaces we would be acquiring. He wanted to discuss what Metro's role would be. Also, we needed to be clear about the distinction between one-time use of funds versus ongoing commitments.

Councilor Park commented that an agency's choices about which programs and projects to manage affected its ability to later play a role in the region; he cited Multnomah County's decision to let go of parks and roads. Metro needed to make its decisions in the context of what kind of player we wanted to be; for example, our transportation planning was probably undetectable to the public. Mr. Jordan stated that Thursday's discussion would not be restricted and would be ongoing. It was intended to set the context for the budget, with the policy implications spinning off from there.

### **2. NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM TARGET AREA REFINEMENTS**

Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Bond Program Manager, and Jim Morgan, Parks Manager, presented on behalf of Jim Desmond, Parks Director. Ms. Brennan-Hunter emphasized that the focus would be on the terms of the bond measure and the science. She said Tier 1 properties would be pursued aggressively; Tier 2 properties would be more opportunistic. Council also had the option to offer matches with other partners.

#### *Westside Trail*

Within this target area, the focus was on the right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. The question was whether to pick up natural areas adjacent to the trail. Councilor Hosticka said yes. Councilor Burkholder was open to the idea but was aware of the limited resources we had available. Councilor Harrington wanted to emphasize connectivity. Council President Bragdon said we needed to focus on the end-to-end length. Acquisition of adjacent areas would more properly be in the realm of the local jurisdictions and their matching share. Metro should focus on the

regional aspects. As far as matches, Metro should be asking for local matches. This program had the opportunity to backfill or make up for what the local jurisdictions had missed out on, things they had chosen not to do to build their own parks.

Councilor Burkholder said the connectivity needed to make sense. Councilor Park asked which connection made the most intuitive sense (politics aside). Mr. Morgan said one part of it was very steep. There were a few options as far as connecting to Sauvie Island. Councilor Hosticka explicated his "yes" statement. The priority should be on completing ROW, but keep alert for opportunities.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter summarized that staff would include the natural areas directly adjacent linked to the trail, but we would want to see a local match.

#### *Cooper Mountain*

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said there had been some development and engineering underway, from the 1995 bond measure. We wanted to fill in the gaps in the watershed and habitat areas. One main questions regarded wildlife and trail corridors, which had not been included in the bond description but had come out of stakeholder feedback. There were Tier 3 objectives in the lower area, but limited funds could preclude their purchase. Staff wondered if the Tier 3 area (Area D on the map) should be retained.

Council President Bragdon felt that the Tier 3 was not practically achievable, and that there was a lack of willing sellers. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said local landowners were leaning towards wanting development in that area. Councilor Hosticka commented that it would be an ongoing discussion with the landowners.

Councilor Park wanted to ask what Metro's policy position would be in cases like Area D, which had the potential for development to occur around them; it was not Metro's intention to provide local parks for such development. Mr. Jordan agreed; we needed to have a policy that was responsible to changing situations on the ground.

Councilor Burkholder was concerned about the lower Area B on the map, to ensure that that would be a trail. Councilor Harrington received clarification from staff that the lower Area B would extend all the way to the park.

Council President Bragdon wanted to maintain the integrity of our land use function; we needed to make sure that was compatible with our willing seller program. It needed to not be seen as a quid pro quo. Mr. Jordan said we needed procedural firewalls to make sure our decisions were and were perceived as open and above board.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter summarized that they were comfortable with dropping D, with focusing on the nature park, with looking at Weir Road as the trail connection, and with connecting lower Area B to the park.

#### *Fanno Creek*

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said this was another area from 1995; the primary focus would be on completing the connection from Cook Park to Woodard Park, focusing on water quality and habitat.

The focus of Area B would be trail linkages. She pointed out Ash Creek, which had been identified by a stakeholder. It was not as high a priority; this area had a lot of small parcels, there was some public feedback on the importance of the creek.

Councilor Burkholder wondered if linkages would be the best investment. Ms. Brennan-Hunter thought so. In response to Councilor Harrington, Mr. Jordan emphasized that easements would be a very viable option.

#### *Forest Park Connections*

Ms. Brennan-Hunter described this as a well-known target area. The focus would be on closing the gap in the upper part of the park and protecting headwaters. It was important to note that some of the areas might not fall neatly into Tiers 1-3. Councilor Harrington asked about the relationship of Area C to Tier 2 objectives. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said that had been dropped as not feasible. Councilor Harrington observed that that would leave Area D, with the Tier 3 objective, as a focus. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said that Area D would rise up in the rankings if it were considered in connection with the Westside Trail. Councilor Harrington wondered how the areas would be prioritized, with multiple Area B's being pitted against Area D. Would we pursue Area D before Area B? Ms. Brennan-Hunter said staff was seeking that direction from Council. Area D could be upgraded to Tier 2. Councilor Burkholder hoped there would be lots of interest and offers of easements. Councilor Park asked about connections from Area A to the rest of the park. Mr. Morgan said the Forest Park Plan ultimately wanted to see more intense use in the south and more habitat in the north. He was optimistic that the planning process would recognize the realities and provide some connections.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter confirmed that Council supported staff direction.

#### *Rock Creek Headwaters and Greenway*

Mr. Morgan said this was a combination of new and old target areas. He talked about the history of purchases and efforts in the area and pointed out the different areas and the Tiers. Councilor Hosticka felt Area C should be in Tier 1. The original lines on North Bethany anticipated that Abernathy Creek was a natural edge; if we could reinforce that by our acquisitions, we should do it. That same reasoning could apply to Area B, but Area C was more important. Councilor Harrington asked if Century Boulevard had been mentioned. Mr. Morgan said he had no had any conversations about it. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said nothing had been discussed in detail. Councilor Harrington wanted this to stay on the radar. Had Cleanwater Services expressed an interest? Mr. Morgan said they had expressed interest in the overall priorities.

Councilor Park had some questions about making sure the process was consistent, even after the current Council was gone. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said we would have the oversight committee as a resource; they had expressed interest in monitoring a lot of the issues that had come up.

Councilor Burkholder liked Councilor Hosticka's suggestion to upgrade Area C to Tier 1. Council President Bragdon said it made sense to him also. It was an urban form issue as distinct from a purely scientific one, but it was still a valid policy basis. Council and staff discussed the use of easements and strategies to achieve the objectives. This area was fragmented. Councilor Burkholder proposed that lower Area A be Tier 2. Council agreed. Mr. Morgan said a lot of it would be driven by the funding constraints. Property would be expensive. He felt comfortable with the direction.

In summary, Council confirmed for Ms. Brennan-Hunter that the level of information in the packets was correct.

Councilor Park said, choice of three creeks, McTighe/McKay, Council, Dairy, how to choose one over the other. If it's in the heart of an agricultural area, then to go into that area, we were assuming that other protections weren't available. He wanted to make the point, some of the other areas, within the urban area, as far as policy choices, emphasis to go to a certain area over others, why C versus A, lower A, somewhere we needed to have some more discussion about that, how much did we let, difficult to separate out, we were separating out future urban form vs. science, protection. The areas we were targeting may not best optimize all the goals.

Mary Anne Cassin, Parks Planning and Development Manager, previewed a new map that would provide more context and more information about how the target areas were related, and that would start to get at the urban form and the relationships. Mr. Jordan said this was bringing up the issue of two policy processes that touched on each other at points. Some of the corridors fell right into the middle of three different sets of criteria. Those balancing tests would only become sharper over the coming year.

### **3. BREAK**

### **4. 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE**

Councilor Burkholder said today's update would basically be a check-in. The finance discussion would be delayed due to the absence of Councilor Newman and Andy Cotugno, Planning Director. The key piece was to look at the performance evaluation monitoring framework. The idea was to take the suggestions from the Chapter 1 policy framework that Council, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) had accepted. This would be the framework for investments and measurements. The first RTP would be the federal constrained one, with a low investment. The final "real" RTP would be the state one, to be adopted in June. A working group had been convened. We wanted to get out in front and make sure the correct measurements and outcomes were being evaluated.

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner, distributed a copy of the PowerPoint presentation (a copy is included in the meeting record). She wanted to know what Council thought was most important to evaluate in the system, including the investments, and also what things should be monitored over time. As far as the project timeline, we were in Phase 3. She reviewed the aspirations, how to get there, and outlined the principles of guiding the performance measures. The draft policy framework from March had 50 different potential performance measures. That was unwieldy. She hoped they could identify the key set of measures to help articulate the story. She showed the RTP performance management system schematic. We did not have all the data we needed, so we wanted to monitor whether we were getting the right data. It would be tied to the measurement of Metro Council goals and objectives. They wanted the terminology to be compatible. It would also very much relate to the future performance-based urban growth boundary (UGB) measurements. Ms. Ellis talked about next steps. She had formed a Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) work group. She summarized "what we've heard so far," identifying support and concerns.

Councilor Burkholder asked her to talk about the difference between monitoring and modeling. Ms. Ellis said system reliability was a good example of that. Transportation staff had been working with computer models; some showed that system unreliability was moving more and

more out of peak periods. We had some good information on system reliability, but that was hard to do looking to the future, we would like to move forward in that direction. She mentioned that we did not have a good way to measure the trip not taken. The measures should tie back to the individual's experience of the system. She showed the RTP parking lot of issues that would need more discussion before the state portion of the RTP was adopted. They didn't have to be discussed today but should stay on the radar.

Council comment on the final plan would be this December. The current plan would expire March 5, 2008. Once the federal piece was approved, the state component piece would start, including additional rounds of analysis.

Council President Bragdon thought that the percentage of personal, household budgets that was spent on transportation would be a good measure. Councilor Burkholder thought there was a way to measure that indirectly, using existing data.

Councilor Harrington asked about the indicator on access to jobs/markets. Ms. Ellis said, under the viable travel options, there was a percentage of homes and jobs. The travel time contours had shown how accessibility might be changing within a 20-minute travel shed. Councilor Hosticka suggested that we measure the percentage of people who lived within a travel time contour, with the number of people, the percentage of the population, and travel times. He'd like to see that for all the contours. Councilor Harrington asked about equity and environmental justice—was travel service limited to a single choice? What about having multiple options? What percentage had access to more than one bus route or MAX line? One transit access was necessary but not sufficient. She also thought a measurement of the number of miles of sidewalk that were missing in corridors would be a good measure. Ms. Ellis agreed and said that could be a measure of "system completion."

Councilor Park said that the reason we measured density was that it showed the activity level we could expect. But some groups focused on density as the issue rather than the activity level. Were we making a value judgment about driving? We didn't want to give anybody an easy hammer to hit us with.

Mr. Jordan commented on the structure of the measurement system; we would need a subset of the measures that could be easily communicated to the general public, telling a story about how we were doing. Based on the goals and values in Chapter 1, there could be measurements that articulated the tangible outcomes that affected people as it pertained to the transportation system. He personally was not bothered by a lot of driving if the cars didn't emit a lot of exhaust. The pocketbook issue mentioned by Council President Bragdon was a good example. Councilor Hosticka suggested something like time lost in traffic; he didn't know what standard measures were used. And what about time lost to construction?

Councilor Harrington asked if we were missing land use input on this issue. Ms. Ellis replied that the various land use committees were reviewing it as well. Councilor Harrington asked if the statement about data not being too time-consuming or difficult to report was actually what we wanted. We didn't want to make it too easy. Mr. Jordan said, in performance measures of any kind, there was a balance between what was practical and what was very expensive to measure. Councilor Harrington agreed but emphasized that we didn't want to not do a measurement just because it seemed too difficult. Ms. Ellis added that this would be a discovery process; we may have follow-on work program activities to get the data. Also, there would be data available from other agencies.

Councilor Burkholder said that, regarding bike and pedestrian access, “network completion” would be a challenge. Also, we needed to think about second order measures where we could take data and translate it into meaningful results for the public. Regional access should be defined as “high quality” access. Regarding targets, there were some out there we could start with, and we could find more over time. Council President Bragdon said that part of the link was in the storytelling, to find useful technical information that could also be woven into a narrative.

Councilor Hosticka said that, when we talked about reliability, it was usually only in regards to freight. He wondered if that could be broadened to include personal experiences. People made travel decisions based on travel-time predictions, and they got upset when travel took longer than they predicted. People wanted predictability as much or more than lower travel times. Mr. Jordan said that freight reliability might be an indicator from which we could obtain secondary information. A real difficulty lay in measuring those impacts over time. The Council often agreed on what to do but disagreed about how to do it. The timeline showed programmatic issues but did not include strategy. Ms. Ellis said we needed to get down to the next level, prioritizing investments; the biggest strategy of the whole plan was getting to 2040.

Councilor Burkholder said that we had bought some time to do two modeling phases. The model for the constrained RTP would show it to be a failure. We would then have opportunities to test some concepts both in management and potential investments, to propose innovations. Council President Bragdon observed that many of the measures would be outside Metro’s control.

Councilor Park thought we needed some kind of check-in mechanism, to evaluate whether everyone was buying into the assumed expectations. Different parts of the region were going to measure success differently. Ms. Ellis said she would be obtaining additional comments and talking about it with the work group, which had representatives from different parts of the region. It would be ongoing. Mr. Jordan added that this issue was going to filter through the discussion of the broader strategic planning discussion; his goal was to try to figure out a different way to understand the notion of compliance. The RTP was not necessarily a part of the functional plan; our notion of compliance, with these different policy structures would have to change completely; the current the notion of compliance reporting was based on sections of code so arcane we couldn’t figure them out. We needed to ask, what were we trying to accomplish? How did it affect the community? Local jurisdictions were more likely to feel good about and report on compliance on things they felt were relevant to their citizens, but we weren’t there yet.

Councilor Burkholder referred to the memo on JPACT bylaws (a copy is included in the meeting record). During the last RTP, the federal highway administration said that our region had changed from a population of half cities and half counties, to one of 70% cities. That was why we needed to examine the JPACT membership, and to look at how the smaller transit agencies were being represented. All the special transit districts were in Clackamas County. JPACT had dropped one member seat from the State of Washington. Two cities were added in each county. The City of Portland would have two votes. It was modeled closer to MPAC. He said the changes were fairly noncontroversial. There was some talk about reducing the number of Metro seats to two, but that did not happen. The original bylaws did not say that the Metro seats had to be elected officials; that had been clarified as well as the overall process. He talked about upcoming steps. The changes would have to be out for a 30-day comment period. Councilor Park asked if Washington County and Clackamas County were gaining votes. Councilor Burkholder said there was a feeling that Portland should have more weight; they had decided against proportional voting.

Council President Bragdon said it was good to have more city representation, but observed that JPACT had always been balkanized. Councilor Park said that Councilor Newman had been concerned about adding cities and keeping our regional programs. As people saw more of the pieces, they'd want more of the pie. Councilor Burkholder thought the RTP process could build a foundation for partners coming together, working together, and agreeing on things.

Tom Kloster, Transportation Manager, added that language had been included to distinguish between the UGB and the Metro boundary. The Metro boundary could someday become larger than the UGB.

## **5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS**

Councilor Burkholder thanked people for their notes and concern on the loss of his father and stepmother. The memorial service in Bend this weekend was open to everyone.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
JULY 24, 2007**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc. Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
1	Agenda	7/26/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, July 26, 2007	072407c-01
4	RTP Update	undated	To: Metro Council From: Kim Ellis Re: A New Look at Transportation	072407c-02
4	RTP Update	7/19/07	To: Metro Council From: Kim Ellis Re: JPACT Bylaws Update Proposal	072407c-03