

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, August 7, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), reminded Council about their discussions regarding renewal and replacement. A previously unknown factor was the accuracy of the depreciation schedules. A physical asset inventory has since been done. Karen Feher, Capital Improvement Program Coordinator, introduced Aaron Mertz, PSU graduate student, who was working on the inventory. Mr. Mertz briefly reviewed the history of renewal and replacement, using a handout (a copy is included in the meeting record). Metro was currently in the midst of the renewal and replacement cycle. Metro made a large initial contribution that allowed for lower contributions in subsequent years. The listings focused on condition, remaining useful life, and estimated replacement cost of the assets. We were about to release an RFP for a consultant to review our information, as well to assess some of the more obscure or specialized items. Ultimately, the finance department could provide near- and long-term forecasts for renewal and replacement needs and costs. Ms. Feher distributed a sample that the database would be built upon (a copy is included in the meeting record). Future unanticipated needs would continue to be incorporated into the database.

Councilor Harrington asked about the consultant and their comparison to industry standards—what industry were they comparing to? Ms. Feher said it was facility management standards for various industries. Councilor Burkholder asked about the inflation rate—the construction inflation rate had been running much higher than the regular inflation rate. How had they accommodated for that? Ms. Feher said she could incorporate that, and separate it out by type of assets and projected inflation. All the information would be adjusted to reflect reality. Mr. Jordan said perhaps the consultant could do that. Councilor Liberty had a simple question about the structure of the valuation. It went from the level of a chair to the level of a roof; how did they choose the level of analysis? Ms. Feher said they had used an operating basis. There was a \$5,000 bottom. For example, chairs in the Council Chamber were grouped for replacement projection purposes. Even though an individual chair would not be a capital item, the replacement of an entire room of chairs would be accounted for. Things at Metro Regional Center (MRC) were just ending their useful life, since 1993 when it was opened. Mr. Jordan said the staff was trying to make judgments about how things were actually replaced over time.

Councilor Park wondered how the various functions of the capital assets were factored into the analysis. For example, the Oregon Convention Center (OCC) charged for their services. Ms. Feher said the business model for OCC was much different from MRC's. OCC competed in the marketplace. The current case was just the general fund assets. It was prompted by the general fund consolidation. Mr. Jordan said the renewal and replacement was related to the use—at the Zoo, exhibits weren't replaced piecemeal, entire exhibits were upgraded at once. The judgment was based on the business model. Ms. Feher said the funding source was also important.

Council President Bragdon said the revenue source related to whether something was an enterprise, which in turn related to the visitor experience. If people didn't like the drapes at the OCC, they might not be back; if they didn't like the drapes in his office, it wouldn't really matter. There was a different threshold depending on the visitor experience. Ms. Feher said it was based on operations—safety and code violations were forefront, then the business.

Mr. Jordan deferred the economic alliance discussion to a later time.

4. I-5/99W CONNECTOR—RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

Item 4 was moved up due to Councilor Burkholder's need to leave for another meeting.

Mark Turpel, Principal Transportation Planner, and Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, distributed two handouts (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). Councilor Hosticka said the purpose of the discussion was to give him guidance for an upcoming steering committee meeting wherein the range of alternatives would be narrowed. There needed to be a full range of alternatives that included transportation system management/transportation demand management (TSM/TDM). The specific item of discussion was the various alignments. The question before the steering committee would be which alignments to carry forward and which to eliminate. Councilor Hosticka urged elimination of "non-starter" alignments. He'd like to concentrate on the alignments while acknowledging that the full range included a no-build and TSM/TDM.

Mr. Cotugno started with the project purposes; following on from the last meeting, Council had not been satisfied with the problem statement, which framed the problem as the lack of a connector. The project had taken that input to heart and changed the purpose statement. It now had two facets: 1) through travel exiting the region; and 2) access to the local area, especially industrial lands. The through traffic issues were connected with the town centers of Tigard, Tualatin, and Sherwood, which bore the brunt of the through traffic and didn't allow them to function as town centers. The study process currently was looking at a wide range of alternatives. He listed the five items in the range of alternatives: 1) no build; 2) TSM/TDM; 3) enhance existing system alternative (EESA); 4) connector(s) inside the urban growth boundary (UGB); 5) connector(s) outside the UGB. These were all additive. As much as possible would be gotten out of the first alternatives. If an alternative outside the UGB was selected, it had to be demonstrated that that was because the options inside the UGB were impossible. The committee was leaning towards dropping the alternatives that connected at I-5 and 205, because of the major neighborhood impacts. He reviewed the staff recommendations. This was a check-in point along the way, to see if Council bought into the rationale.

Council President Bragdon asked if all the remaining alternatives connected to the Wilsonville interchange area. Mr. Cotugno said, yes, they would connect just north of the interchange, and would include parallel ramps to merge onto I-5 without having to go off I-5 and back on. Councilor Liberty asked, as the staff recommendations moved forward, how would they be allowed to combine elements? Mr. Cotugno stated that the analysis allowed for the conclusion of the process to mix and match to arrive at the overall preferred solution, not just to pick one single alternative. Councilor Liberty said he liked the fact they were touching back. The purpose needs statement had been broadened somewhat to acknowledge different movements serving different needs. He was glad to see a combined TDM/TSM. He was concerned about some things that couldn't be fixed. The purpose statement was still focused on transportation as a means, as opposed to land use (job access, patterns of growth, etc.). If we had that, we'd have a much

clearer idea on serving the different transportation movements. Without a common list of factors between projects, it was impossible to compare them. Projects with significant neighborhood impacts had been eliminated as too expensive, but the other projects were also extremely expensive. The chart comparing connector corridor performance did not help him understand impacts on wider regional movement. Given the amount of area that had freight activity, could we examine the project benefits for freight movement? He hoped Council would hear comments on the valuation factors that might determine the outcome; what would we use to evaluate the alternatives? Mr. Cotugno replied that the project would be taking up evaluation criteria next; that information could be shared formally or informally according to Council preference.

Councilor Hosticka thought it was a good step to get some of the options off the table. Admittedly, many of the reasons for eliminating them were the community impacts. He didn't assume the solution would be a new interchange, although it seemed likely. He had urged the committee to think of design elements; if you tried to get to 205 from this connector, that there be other ways besides I-5 and chopping down all the trees and widening the right of way. Metro had supported the separation of Wilsonville and Tualatin; some of the designs would eliminate that visual separation. Councilor Park was curious to see the work on the north and south Sherwood options and the results of that analysis and impacts. Was there an emphasis on mode alternatives? Mr. Cotugno said yes, it was compatible with the larger regional transportation plan (RTP).

Council President Bragdon thought the adopted purpose statement was much improved, but it still mentioned two objectives that were trade-offs; 1) intrastate travel—people going to Newberg, the casinos, and the coast; and 2) the local arterial access and circulation. He was not interested in spending a lot of money to make it easier for people to commute to Newberg; he was very interested in improving the local circulation and access to town centers and industrial areas. In reading the worksheet and the quotations from the 2000-2004 RTP, that needed to be more consistent with the modern purpose. The old RTP talked about moving traffic away from the centers, but we might actually want to increase activity in the centers. Some of the wording was inconsistent with our current aspirations. Mr. Cotugno said the RTP was intended to deal with traffic movements on all levels. It remained to be seen how it would be paid for. Council President Bragdon wanted to see what type of induced demand this would create. Mr. Cotugno added that, amongst the alternatives, it called for the connector alternatives to be either a freeway fully limited or partially limited access facility. The first would be slower, with better local access. Tolling would be part of the analysis as well.

Councilor Harrington realized none of this was easy or uncontroversial. On the initial staff recommendation, some of the options were eliminated; she knew they would all have very high costs, but that would be acceptable if there were corresponding benefits. She was comfortable with the approach at this point.

Councilor Burkholder said it was a package that was being proposed, and the financing also needed to be a package that would enhance the existing system. Everything had yet to be actually built. We couldn't just build the corridor and not the other elements. If Measure 49 didn't pass this fall and Measure 37 claims were to stand, western Washington county had a lot of acreage; if we did anything that provided better access into the urban area from the countryside, without dealing with the claims, it would be a landslide of problems. There had to be some kind of management technique—tolling, high occupancy lanes would be even more important if Measure 37 were retained. Also, how did we pay for something like this? We had lots of other things that were much more critical to build, that we weren't doing, to focus on things that were nice to build but couldn't get funded.

Councilor Hosticka appreciated the continuing comments on the land use implications. He appreciated the guidance going forward and agreed to return with the criteria. As far as the funding, that would be really tough. Councilor Liberty said, on the criteria and the evaluation, he hoped we could look from project to project at the performance, taxes, operation costs, it would be nice if we had a standard metric so we could pick up any study and compare them. He felt we would mostly be off-putting the traffic onto another corridor.

Mr. Cotugno noted that Council would later be discussing the Tonkin Wetlands refinement area, which was smack dab in the middle of the corridor area. Any of these corridors would criss-cross that wetlands. That was of serious concern and the project would have to be sensitive to that. Councilor Harrington wondered what the last Metro project with such a big environmental impact had been, perhaps the Nyberg interchange? Technology was changing, were there some new methods and mitigation techniques that we could learn about?

2. LAKE OSWEGO TO PORTLAND TRANSIT AND TRAIL ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Ross Roberts and Richard Brandman, Transit Program Directors, distributed numerous handouts for discussion (a copy of each is included in the meeting record).

Councilor Burkholder said that, similar to the eastside streetcar project, where conditions had been adopted, we should be talking about concerns of the Council as conditions going forward. This was a chance to catch up with the other groups. Mr. Brandman said he wanted to do four things: 1) share new information on right of way (ROW) value and how it would apply to a financing plan; 2) summarize the public hearing and open houses; 3) share findings from the project management group and recommendations from the the Lake Oswego Project Advisory Committee (LOPAC); and 4) talk about public involvement.

Mr. Roberts referred to an excerpt from the draft finance plan. It inflated the cost of the project from 2007 dollars, putting the ROW value into perspective. The cost in 2007 dollars would be about double when finally done, and including interim finance costs. The local funding gap would be \$23.1 million if the ROW contribution were about \$89.2 million. Council President Bragdon observed that ROW appraisal was tricky. What was the standard? Did the feds have one? Mr. Brandman said that TriMet had a ROW appraisal team, who appraised for all their projects, including purchases for rail. They used "over the fence" analysis, which looked at the value of the properties adjacent to the ROW owned by the railroads. Council President Bragdon asked if there were independent appraisers that could be used. Mr. Brandman said sometimes they were brought in when disagreements arose. Council President Bragdon asked, other than the ROW, what was the local contribution to the \$23.1 million? Mr. Brandman said that Lake Oswego and Portland were talking about urban renewal. There was a lot of support for the project, especially regarding the development potential. Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) were also an option. Councilor Liberty was interested in standardized comparisons on projects, cost per person, and the benefit to motorists of having a streetcar or bus rapid transit (BRT). Also, it was confusing to keep making adjustments for inflation; more consistency would be good.

Mr. Brandman introduced Karen Withrow, Associate Public Relations Coordinator, to talk about the hearing and the comment period. Ms. Withrow said there were 21 testifiers at the public hearing, mostly supporting streetcar. She cited the specifics of citizen support for streetcar. Several folks in favor of streetcar had specific suggestions for route stops; several expressed a

preference for Macadam over the Willamette shoreline. No one spoke in favor of BRT as an option. Some supported neither BRT nor streetcar; one supported an HOV toll lane, and one favored connecting to the Milwaukie commuter rail project. Overall, there was a lot of support. The open house and the hearing had garnered similar comments. Mr. Roberts added that the two open houses together attracted over 200 people. The vast majority filled out comment cards. Overall, staff felt it was a terrific turnout and very successful.

Councilor Liberty asked if there had been much discussion about the tradeoffs between trail costs and the trail option component. We had to have something running on the ROW to maintain the ROW. Ms. Withrow said it was accurate, but generally the folks who supported the trail also supported the streetcar; they were trying to fit them both in. Mr. Roberts said it wasn't possible to run the historic trolley and the trail; physically, there just wasn't room. Councilor Liberty asked about queue jumping and lanes; what had happened with that analysis? Mr. Roberts said they hadn't gone back and re-estimated the cost of the BRT, but they had flagged the initial assessment of queue jump lanes of 200 feet. The lanes would actually have to be longer than that to bypass the projected 2025 congestion. The capital cost would double for BRT to create the longer queue jump lanes. Street impacts would also be very great.

Councilor Park asked how the figures on the local funding gap had been arrived at. Mr. Roberts walked through the math. Mr. Brandman pointed out the recommendations from the project management group (PMG) and LOPAC. Each had worked independently. Basically, they agreed that the streetcar should be advanced for further study to a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). Neither group had recommended BRT, primarily due to the queue jump lane issues. They had recommended advancement of the enhanced bus option. Of the three alignment options, Willamette Shoreline and Macadam were recommended to proceed. Macadam had more public support, but the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had not been overwhelmingly favorable. For the terminus options, the groups advised proceeding with both the Albertson's and Safeway options and against the Trolley option. Although they recognized the costs and difficulties involved, the groups recommended that studying the trail options go forward. They were interested in design, phasing it in, tweaking the alignment, and thinking differently about how a trail could be provided to lower the cost. There was a question of whether Metro was the right agency to advance the trail project. Lastly, there were legal issues regarding using the ROW for a trail. If not combined with a transit project, use of the ROW for a trail might not be possible.

Councilor Harrington asked what the 18 minutes in travel time savings was being compared to. Mr. Brandman responded that it would be 18 minutes faster than the bus would be in the year 2025. Councilor Harrington said, in that analysis, did they take into account the streetcar stopping at every single stop, or some average? Mr. Brandman replied that it included acceleration and decelerations, and it assumed an average dwell time and all the stations. Councilor Harrington asked if there was any current express bus service there. Mr. Roberts said there was not.

Councilor Liberty brought up the concept of having two tracks in the opposite direction on Macadam, but restricting use to one track during rush hours, so the train was not going against the flow. In other words, could it be designed so that the northbound train would operate only against the flow in the low-traffic direction? Would that address ODOT's concerns? Mr. Brandman did not think it was practical, operationally. For example, the trains had to come back, they couldn't be just run in one direction. Certainly it could be discussed. Council President Bragdon asked if the DEIS would be done in-house. Mr. Brandman replied that Metro would normally be the sponsor through the DEIS. The FTA has said that the project would require a DEIS. Analyzing staff workload and timing with other projects would require further discussion.

Councilor Burkholder had two concerns. First, was the development potential in Lake Oswego significant enough to justify a large financial expenditure? Second, no one was talking about creating safe bicycle and pedestrian connections except Metro. ODOT had ignored it for years. Did Council have other concerns along those lines? It was a big local investment as well as a big request from the feds. Council President Bragdon shared the interest in the redevelopment. It would generate ridership. Also, the ROW contribution made it a relatively small local contribution, which made the project attractive. When leveraging limited federal dollars, there were only so many things we could ask for. Even though the leverage was better, however, it might not be the best overall project. It related back to the larger rail plan for the whole area. Other projects may be just as worthy, even if they couldn't contribute the ROW. He'd like to see both options go forward, but it didn't make much sense to have the streetcar in traffic, and wouldn't it also defeat some of the leverage?

Councilor Park echoed the concern about not having completed the transit study for the region. Transit dollars were limited. What exactly was it that we would be buying? How far did we go in this direction before expectations got out ahead of us? Mr. Brandman said this project came out of the 2004 system plan update. When it was purchased in 1988, the idea was to preserve it for a transit purposes and determine when the timing was right. Several years ago, the Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) decided to try to determine if the time was right. Regarding how we implemented projects, the region was putting a lot of energy into the project—the EIS would be several million dollars—that could definitely support the expectations. The question for Council was, in their judgment, was the time now right to proceed? As far as limited operating dollars, Mr. Roberts observed that, given the way streetcar already existed in the corridor, TriMet might actually see a reduction in traffic over the no-build, since streetcar was cheaper to operate, at least for the Shoreline option.

Councilor Hosticka wanted to continue to discuss from Milwaukie over the river, but if that was off the list, he was happy to move forward with the options, but he'd like some assurance that, even if we saved money, we didn't lose capacity if we took out the buses. On Macadam vs. the Shoreline, if the condo people wanted to pay, they should have the option. If not, we ought to at least recognize that was a sort of public benefit that was being gained. There may be some private cost to that, he couldn't see spending an extra \$30 million. He was impressed with what was happening in downtown Lake Oswego; if the project would support that, so much the better. Maybe Safeway would have higher development potential.

Councilor Liberty agreed that land use development benefits should be explicitly linked. Was Lake Oswego prepared to make changes? It was important to have that conversation about leverage. As far as the trail, how did we carry that forward? It depended on if it was on the east or west bank. The Sellwood bridge project was getting a lot more expensive, but it would have better connections. He agreed about the opportunity costs. Again, we needed common metrics for the whole system. Leveraging was attractive, but only if we knew we weren't losing something. Some people seemed to be throwing in the towel on Small Starts, so maybe we would have less competition. He agreed that we would have to come back to the east bank. Without knowing about east-west connections, could we make a decision about commuter rail? Regarding Macadam, and the locals, it wasn't like running across the block in front of your house, it was right at your doorstep. They had looked at alternative right of ways in the distance; it was easy to say it was a public benefit, but it was like having it run through our lawn. Also, had a trolley bus been considered for the ROW on the shoreline? Could that be compatible with a trail? We should

be agnostic about the type of vehicles. Mr. Brandman stated that idea had not been considered during this process.

Councilor Harrington agreed with many of the comments, but it didn't have much relevance to the September 10 decision. An outline of the timeline and next steps would be helpful to her for future presentations.

3. BREAK

5. NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM TARGET AREA REFINEMENTS

Abernethy and Newell Creeks

Jim Morgan, Parks Manager, said the main features here were habitat connectivity and future trail alignment on the old rail line. They had captured a number of the sections of the trail alignment and had retained the ability to close the gaps. It was an enormous watershed. They wanted to focus on what was tangible and achievable, and to protect fish habitat and some of the other remaining unusual wildlife habitat. The stakeholder interviews and resource management agencies reported that some of the northern tributaries had higher potential for connecting the habitat quality. The Abernethy confluence was in the flood plain but was highly developed. The challenge was what could actually be achieved in connectivity and aquatic resources. Some development was moving in. He looked at some of the obstacles. He reviewed the features of each area. Staff recommended that the Tier 1 objective focus on Areas A and C. Area D, for the Tier 2 objectives, would be more opportunity driven.

Councilor Harrington noted that Area B hadn't shown up at all in the tier objectives. Why retain all four of the C-identified areas as Tier 1? If we weren't going to target anything along Abernethy Creek outside of Area A, then why even look there? It didn't seem refined enough. The report seemed to indicate all four C's. Council President Bragdon agreed; were we trying to get a foothold in each Area C? What did "large holdings" mean? Mr. Morgan said, during the last bond measure, when we first established the target areas, they were much larger, to allow some flexibility for opportunities, and knowing where the large parcels and willing sellers might be. We had to make a judgment somewhere along the line, about what the adjacent potential landowner might do. Mr. Desmond said, if we didn't look at Area B, then the Lower Area C would be a lower priority than the Area C's closer to Area A. Council President Bragdon said, maybe one of the four Area C's would be Tier 1. We didn't want to end up with five acres in each of the Area C's. He'd prefer a larger parcel in one area. Councilor Harrington asked about the 25% rule, and Mr. Morgan said that did not apply because this was a new target area.

Councilor Hosticka asked about fish passage. Mr. Morgan said they didn't have comprehensive information, but it seemed that steelhead, cutthroat, and coho were somehow making it up into some of the reaches. Councilor Liberty asked where was the UGB? Mr. Morgan pointed it out. Councilor Liberty said, regarding the survey results, there seemed to be a lot of overlap in the questions and the responses, how had that guided them? Council President Bragdon stated that it was a small sample. Mr. Morgan thought the local resource management agencies could help interpret the comments in putting their values on the ground.

Clackamas River Bluffs and Greenway

Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Bond Program Manager, said the two primary areas were the undeveloped floodplain for habitat and the protection opportunity on the Clackamas River bluffs.

She described the areas and the tier objectives. Councilor Hosticka asked about agricultural operations in some areas. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said they might pursue easements in such cases. Councilor Harrington asked if there were a water district here. Mr. Morgan said the Clackamas service area was primarily on the east side of the Willamette.

Lower Tualatin Headwaters

Ms. Brennan-Hunter distributed a revised work session worksheet (a copy is included in the meeting record) with the updated proposed objectives for Baker, Chicken, and Cedar Creeks. In the last week or so, they had the opportunity to do a visit, looking at what they were trying to accomplish and the strategy. The initial proposal was to keep them all as Tier 1. They now proposed that Baker and Chicken be Tier 1 and Cedar be Tier 2. The habitat quality of Baker was very high. The Cedar area could be more opportunity driven. Councilor Hosticka pointed out the potential I-5/99W connector area. Also, from our point of view as the Council, we needed to continue to look at the open spaces as urban form. He emphasized Baker Creek as being pretty well intact.

Councilor Liberty wondered if it was the same thing to say that acquisitions to Baker Creek helped the Tualatin and Willamette more because the quality was already good? Staff concurred. Councilor Liberty asked about risk and price, in terms of urban and rural land values. Was Baker Creek cheaper, or under less risk than Chicken and Cedar Creeks? Ms. Brennan-Hunter said it was, and thought we could potentially accomplish more on Baker.

Councilor Harrington thought the description of the second Tier 1 objective came across as being more about Area C versus Area D. Ms. Brennan-Hunter agreed that the language should be clarified to show that it included the drainage. Councilor Harrington said she appreciated the refinement, because she was uncomfortable with all four being Tier 1.

Tonquin Geologic Area

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said this was another 1995 bond measure area. It was difficult to work in but there had been some significant acquisitions. There was protection of unique geologic features and the trail. The Tonquin Trail master plan would start this fall. The Tier 1 objectives were split between the natural areas and the trail.

Tualatin River Greenway

Ms. Brennan-Hunter described this as a very large-scale target area with multiple objectives in Tier 1. There was some overlap with the Stafford basin area. Under the Tier 2 objectives, where opportunities presented themselves, they would look at some of the large natural features that provide the highest ratio of river frontage to acreage.

Councilor Liberty asked about the relationship between our investments and the national wildlife refuge. Would we be supplementing that? Ms. Brennan-Hunter said staff assumed that some of those might be picked up, so we would look at partnership opportunities. Mr. Desmond added that, generally, they didn't like us buying within wildlife refuge boundaries. We did make one exception last time which leveraged a lot of money. We would be pretty selective within the refuge boundaries. The feds did not have a trails agenda, and the refuge had a policy against multimodal trails. Councilor Liberty clarified that he wasn't talking about trails but about getting a big chunk on the river. Mr. Desmond stated they were trying to balance multiple objectives.

Councilor Hosticka wondered why the two sides of the river were different tiers? Mr. Desmond replied it was mostly trying to be realistic; we didn't think we could buy it all, and paddling upstream was difficult because of logs and things. It could be refined further. Councilor Hosticka said there were some areas close to the river that we'd never get. They talked about putting it all into Tier 2. Councilor Harrington appreciated the refinement on items under Tier 1 and Tier 2. She'd like to be able to do everything everywhere, but the funds just weren't there.

Gresham-Fairview Trail

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said this target area was focused on ROW to finish the trail. Stakeholder feedback was similar to the westside trail. It could include parcels and lands adjacent that provided trail access but with a local match requirement. Councilor Park was curious about Area B; was it in danger? Ric Catron, City of Gresham trail planner, talked about the adjacent PGE right of way, and the ADA crossing over Powell Boulevard. He spoke to the issues of the ROW. The boardwalks would be connecting to the east. Councilor Park asked about the sewage treatment plant. Mr. Catron said there were some homeland security concerns about the trail being too close to the sewage treatment plant. Ms. Brennan-Hunter said the open houses had brought up the issue of additional trailheads and potential trailhead at Blue Lake Park.

She summarized that Council was comfortable with this target area and that staff would return for one more session.

6. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reported that there would be a few minor typographical corrections to the dry waste ordinance. Mr. Jordan added that the changes were non-substantive.

Councilor Harrington attended the City of Hillsboro meeting last Thursday night; they were going over their new projects. She reported on the planning taking place. There was some interesting work going on.

Councilor Harrington followed up on her request a few weeks ago for information on whether Metro had a veterans hiring preference policy. Karol Ford, Human Resources Manager, indicated that we did not have any hiring preference and offered some options. One would be to make Metro job listings accessible on information channels that vets were known to use; another would be to actually include preferences in our hiring practices. Ms. Ford was doing additional research on other local agency practices.

Councilor Harrington reported that she had been accepted into this year's Pacific Program. Mr. Jordan added that three other staff members had been accepted.

Councilor Liberty reported on the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) steering committee meeting; they focused on overall strategy. It was a productive session, and the work would be blended into the planning strategy discussion. There was an opportunity to continue to integrate land use and transportation.

Councilor Liberty reported that Mark Ellsworth, TOD steering committee chair, was also on the governor's economic development team. They had talked about the recent work session on Happy Valley and Damascus, and Councilor Liberty had shared his concerns about Metro Council having to provide the land and the frustrating process. Mr. Ellsworth had offered his help and a joint session with the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

Councilor Liberty commented on the Sellwood Bridge project. The cost estimates had ballooned; the highest project cost was now almost \$500 million, more than the Lake Oswego project.

Councilor Park reported on the headquarters hotel study. Staff were available to answer questions. Regarding the veterans' issue, he had been contacted by a disabled vet and wondered whether Metro would honor the veterans' state card for free zoo admission. He understood the financial impact on the zoo would be minimal.

Councilor Park reported on the Happy Valley process; he had been brainstorming with staff on how to do the development, and what Metro could do to streamline development to help them meet protocols and fast-track them rather than the current painstaking system.

Council President Bragdon reported that we needed to close the loop on the grant committee. He had received some names and was working with Councilor Liberty. Also, he was concerned that the planning discussions, and the work on performance-based UGB expansion and on urban reserves was getting ahead of the budget discussion. Council had indicated that they wanted the budget discussion synchronized with the planning, but the planning was running ahead. Decisions were coming up within a few weeks that would require being plugged into the budget. Mr. Jordan believed that the numbers were there, with estimates at least. We didn't have formally adopted budget amendments, but the templates would be available before Council recess.

Council President Bragdon reported that some interesting gestures had come out of the Connecting Green event.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
AUGUST 7, 2007**

| Item | Topic | Doc. Date | Document Description | Doc. Number |
|-------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | CIP | undated | To: Metro Council From: Karen Feher Re: Metro Regional Government, Renewal and Replacement Update | 080707c-01 |
| 1 | CIP | undated | To: Metro Council From: Karen Feher Re: Metro Regional Center, sample database | 080707c-02 |
| 4 | I-5/99W | 8/7/07 | To: Metro Council From: Mark Turpel Re: Proposed Range of Alternatives | 080707c-03 |
| 4 | I-5/99W | 8/7/07 | To: Metro Council From: Mark Turpel Re: Developing the Range of Alternatives | 080707c-04 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | undated | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Streetcar Option 3A: Willamette Shore ROW/Albertsons Terminus as a New Start Project | 080707c-05 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | 7/16/07 | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Public Hearing Comment Summary | 080707c-06 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | 8/7/07 | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Draft, Project Management Group Findings | 080707c-07 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | undated | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Draft, LOPAC Recommendations | 080707c-08 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | 6/27-28/07 | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Open House Comment Summary | 080707c-09 |
| 2 | LOPTTAA | 7/12/07 | To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman Re: Evaluation Summary, Public Review Draft | 080707c-10 |
| 5 | Refinement | 8/7/07 | To: Metro Council From: Jim Desmond Re: Revised Work Session Worksheet | 080707c-11 |