

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, September 18, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Rex Burkholder (excused), Brian Newman (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:03 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 20, 2007/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the September 20, 2007 Metro Council agenda.

Councilor Harrington had some questions about the process for the target areas resolutions. She felt there were a few loose ends. Jim Desmond, Parks Director, thought maybe the best way would be to put it in the work plan, guiding the overall administration of the program. That would provide touchpoints. Council was fine with that suggestion. Councilor Park wanted to know at what stage the work plan would be finalized. Mr. Desmond said that had taken place already. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said the 1995 work plan was a broad directive, some of which was adopted, authorizing the executive officer to purchase properties without returning to Council on an individual basis. It was a judgment call as to how much of the old refinement plan they wanted to adopt by resolution and how much would be an administrative detail.

Councilor Park didn't recall Council adopting partial work plans in the past; they generally adopted the whole thing. He wasn't clear on how much from the 1995 work plan was still applicable. Mr. Cooper said staff should pull out the entire work plan, show what was adopted, what wasn't, circulate it, and Council could decide how much formal action they wanted to take. Council liked that.

Councilor Hosticka had some questions about what was authorized and what was not authorized in the hotel resolution. Mr. Cooper said the authorization was for the developer to come back to Metro with some deliverables, then Metro staff would work with others on a financing plan. After that, Council would have to take action before the developer or staff could proceed any further. Other government action would also be needed. Councilor Hosticka wanted to make sure it was portrayed and understood that we were interested, if the financing was acceptable, but we were definitely not saying that we were going to do it. Mr. Cooper assured him that that was the case.

2. BUDGET AMENDMENT DISCUSSION

Finance staff distributed two documents (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). Margo Norton, Deputy Chief Finance Officer (CFO), wanted to confirm last week's discussions and prepare the mechanics of the amendments, then talk about the topics going forward, such as the budget calendar and Chief Operating Officer (COO) actions.

Ms. Norton stated that a mistake had been made in transferring the amendment figures from the whiteboard. One of the out-year figures had been overlooked. In fact, the total was up to \$6.2

million, not \$5.7. That included all contingencies that may or may not come to pass. She reviewed the handouts. Council did not like the phrase "Planning Department returns," it was more of an interdepartmental effort. Council President Bragdon suggested that all the notes include language that the proposals required future Council blessings.

Councilor Harrington asked how the amendments would appear on the books; would they raise any questions? Bill Stringer, CFO, thought any rating agencies would not have a problem with it.

Councilor Park asked how they would deal with the \$6.2 million. Ms. Norton said, when they adjourned on Thursday, she thought they were at \$5.7 million, but staff had missed one of the out years that brought it up to \$6.2 million. Council President Bragdon said that would have to be an amendment.

Councilor Hosticka said, in terms of the financial significance, at the start of this year, we had \$5 million in the bank, and we would have spent it all at \$6.2 million. He thought the numbers were actually pretty close; we would be earning interest and expenditures wouldn't start until later. From a political point of view, maybe people would think we were spending too much money. Councilor Liberty said part of his concern was that we keep somewhat of a cushion. Mr. Jordan said we didn't have the answers to renewal and replacement yet. Council could make changes to the budget at any time. They had a lot of control over the next three years as to how it played out. The first year's expenditures would only be \$2.7 million. Councilor Park said, he never saw anything shrink; things were always growing. He would rather hash it out now than during the regular Council meeting. Councilor Liberty said each Councilor had had their own shopping list. Could we go back and set priorities? We could still have the discussion about the interest earned, there should be a plan to get down to the earlier agreed-upon figure. Council President Bragdon asked, did they want to have the discussion now? Council agreed to take a whack at getting back down to the \$5.7 million.

Councilor Liberty supported a suggestion from Councilor Park, to give up \$250,000 for the second year of the grant program. He would like to have more information about the third-floor remodel before committing to that full amount. Also, with the proposals from Planning, we could ask for a lower figure, a baseline, then work up from there. Councilor Hosticka wanted to know how the \$500,000 figure for the Zoo challenge was arrived at. Councilor Liberty said it was half of the endowment for the operating fund. It was a match.

Council President Bragdon agreed about the third floor renovation. That did not seem as high a priority for him. Councilor Harrington wasn't comfortable dropping the whole amount. Council was using more and more of the interns; they needed a permanent home. Councilor Liberty thought the remodel should be done at the minimum level. Councilor Liberty said the combined number was \$2.3 million, that included all the components of Planning 8. The department should come back with a more detailed proposal of \$1.8 million. Only the highest priorities should have funding. Councilor Hosticka wanted the zoo on the board. It could be a 3:1 match instead of a 2:1 match. Councilor Harrington had some questions about reducing the recovery rate stabilization fund. Ms. Norton said that full funding would it would require all of the recovery rate stabilization fund. Mr. Stringer observed that the ultimate fate of the construction excise tax was an open question.

Mr. Jordan said they were setting a target. It wasn't budgeting, it wasn't appropriations; it was about setting a target they were comfortable with. Program proposals and such would continue to arrive over the years. They were setting a target for the next three years, regarding these moneys, and Council could express opinions in future checkpoints.

Council President Bragdon thought keeping the Nature in Neighborhoods grant program going was a good idea. He'd prefer to keep the zoo at a one-to-one match. He was happy with the others, and the overall remaining amount. Councilor Hosticka said, as far as planning, there was no policy there; we were just giving a number. Councilor Harrington was not comfortable just cutting Planning 8 by \$500,000. Councilor Park would like everyone to work harder on justifying their proposals. Council directed staff to incorporate the notes into a B version, that would be read on Thursday. Councilor Hosticka was comfortable spending the entire amount.

Mr. Jordan then talked about last year's process, and Council issues and concerns. He felt it was generally positive. He was looking at the performance measurement and allocating resources going forward. He had a conceptual notion of the interface over the winter. As the future budget proposer, he'd like to engage the Council over the budget construction over time, more so than in the past, and also incorporate the performance measure project. In October the Council would adopt budget assumptions, as they had done in the past, such as rates of inflation and whatnot. Sometime in November, the staff would have the performance measurement discussion to the point that they could bring it back to Council—performance indicators that we wanted to adopt to tell us as an agency and as a region how we were doing against the high-level goals.

Mr. Jordan displayed a timeline with upcoming discussion and decision points. In October 2007, the budget assumptions would be confirmed. In November, there would be a high-level outcomes discussion, with goals and objectives and discussions with stakeholders, with the goal of moving more towards high-level reporting on our big goals. In December, it would come back to Council for another work session to confirm those outcomes and stakeholder input and make any adjustments. In January 2008, the proposals for program adjustments would be ready, and they would be confirmed in February. The draft budget would be ready in March and presented to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission in May.

Councilor Hosticka liked the schedule. If they stimulated this discussion, were the programs as defined in the program budget? When they asked about program descriptions, were those the ones in the current document? Mr. Jordan said yes. He anticipated having staff being more disciplined about their proposals and how to pay for them. The other things would still be done, such as the logic diagrams on particular programs. There was a results team around the critical success factors. They would probably have a couple of proposals. One would be a consistent set of factors across the agency, to compare programs in different departments. Could he move forward with the conceptual calendar? Council was fine with it.

3. BREAK

4. SELLWOOD BRIDGE ALTERNATIVES

Councilor Liberty reviewed a PowerPoint presentation on the Sellwood Bridge alternatives (a copy is included in the meeting record). He wanted to review the range of alternatives and update Council. He showed some pictures of the early days of the bridge. He thanked Kevin Downing for the images. The right of way under the bridge is privately owned. The structure has bridge piers going right down into it. There are condos on each side of the east side of the bridge. The bridge has suffered from being built a bit on the cheap; deferred maintenance; and earth compression on the west side.

He talked about the Sellwood Bridge project, and the players there. The federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process was being followed, as federal funds were anticipated. The original goal was to select the preferred alternative in December and start construction in 2011. The project statement again focused on the structure rather than the “needs.” He showed information on bridge counts. It was the highest volume of daily trips for a two-lane bridge in Oregon. He couldn’t find any information on bike and ped trips. About 80% of the trips began or ended in Portland, and 80% of the trips began and ended outside Portland. In other words, it was a small bridge that served a wide variety of regional trips.

Councilor Liberty showed projections for bridge use in 2030. He was not sure about a.m. and p.m. movement details. The community has been very concerned about safety issues. He showed some of the previous plans that had been envisioned for the bridge. A lot of the previous concepts were freeway-based. He showed the many alternative cross-sections under consideration. Only a few had been eliminated to date. The most grandiose was 92 feet, triple the current width. He talked about the options on the west side interchange. There were 124 total options. Some elimination of options has taken place. Signalization was on the table. It had been narrowed to a single point interchange and a couple of designs. He mentioned some of the other policy issues, such as seismic standards, congestion relief, freight traffic, and funding. Original cost estimates were \$40 to \$140 million, now they ranged from \$200 million to \$500 million.

He pointed out the 2040 regional growth concept and the bridge’s place on the map. Tacoma was a main street designation. He showed the 2040 regional growth concept definition. Main streets were supposed to include good access to transit. He showed the April 1997 south Willamette crossing study, which recommended no new bridge capacity, but to focus traffic movements on Ross Island and I-205. The first recommendation was to preserve the existing Sellwood Bridge or preserve it as a two-lane bridge with bike and ped. Other recommendations were to improve bus and transit. He showed the recommendations, which were not compatible with the discussions about Sellwood.

Councilor Harrington asked if the region would remain a district collector. Councilor Liberty said yes, it would. He talked about which New Look elements were relevant – steering growth into existing commercial areas, preserving neighborhoods, and using transportation programs to support area needs. He tied it into the Lake Oswego Portland Transit and Trail study. The issue of streetcar was not settled. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) standards said there had to be a 1500 foot separation between the bridge and other access points. Due to the location of Staff Jennings, that meant the entrance would have to be up toward Macadam. How would that fit in with the shoreline trolley? The size of trucks and turning radius would also affect the design.

Councilor Harrington said, in other meetings, they focused more on decision points and policy considerations. The background was interesting; what were the next points? Councilor Liberty said the alternatives would be significantly narrowed on October 1. A major issue was whether it would be a two- or four-lane bridge. His personal opinion was that cost was very important. This project operated in isolation. Regarding the bridge cross-sections, leaving aside the details, did it make sense to try to anticipate and plan now for streetcar? He felt we did not have a context for this project. Regarding the streetcar, it was not clear. Councilor Harrington asked how many lanes Tacoma was on the east side. Councilor Liberty said it was two lanes.

Council President Bragdon said he’d like to see this facility not be designed to encourage and take long-distance automobile commuting, and there needed to be recognition it was mostly for local service, to be respectful of the existing, established neighborhood, including objectives to

build commercial and retail environment along Tacoma Street. Adding capacity, as opposed to replacing the structure, would induce more traffic that would be detrimental to the neighborhood. He did not support that. Councilor Hosticka ruminated on the need for at least one bridge in the region to have a seismic safety level at phase 2. Currently, none did. Councilor Liberty agreed, but if we had \$30,000,000 to spend, would that be the bridge we would want to upgrade?

Councilor Hosticka didn't want to add capacity, except for bike/ped. He would rather see the Tillamook crossing used for transit. Councilor Harrington added, also getting more bus capacity. Councilor Liberty said he was hearing support for enhanced bike and ped. There were dramatically different ways and scales of doing it. Council discussed ways to get the most bike and ped, and which bridges to use.

Councilor Hosticka thought, for those who wanted additional lanes, that should be tied to the funding, more of a fee for service concept. That could sharpen the discussion, who would be using the extra capacity and who should pay for it? Councilor Liberty said, people tended to think that if there was another south crossing, they wouldn't have the volume of traffic. The community strongly supported two lanes over four lanes. Housing on the east and jobs on the west would automatically lead to more traffic. As far as the streetcar, perhaps an east-west lightrail at Tillamook crossing, the streetcar was slower. How did the Council feel about that issue? Councilor Hosticka asked if the streetcar would have its own lane. Councilor Liberty talked about the different options. Streetcar weights were comparable to bus and truck. The turning radius was tighter than light rail. He hasn't seen any drawings. Some of the other designs were pretty complex. The debate on rehabilitation versus replacement was ongoing.

Councilor Harrington asked how long it would take to build a new bridge. Councilor Liberty said, about two years. A bridge closure, and the impacts on local businesses, would be costly. He felt there were bike/ped options that could be achieved for only \$20 million. Councilor Park asked about cost accountability; who was paying for what? That would provide the opportunity to see how serious people were. Councilor Liberty said there had been no discussion so far.

Councilor Liberty summarized his understanding of the discussion. 1) There was agreement that the bridge ought to reflect its function, which was not to induce additional trips for more long-distance traffic but to serve as the extension into the main street. 2) Council supported light rail if it could be pursued without a lot of additional expense. There was some support for a light rail connection at the Tillamook crossing. 3) Ten feet bike/ped facilities were acceptable. 4) Council generally felt that other jurisdictions should help pay, if the improvements would benefit their residents.

Council approved carrying forward a rehab option and a lower cost option, if feasible. Councilor Liberty thought a rehab could achieve similar life expectancy to a new bridge. There were also some rehab options that were very affordable but with lower lifespan. Councilor Park wanted those things talked about. Councilor Liberty felt the projects were getting too large. The cost of getting those through the EIS had to be considered. He wanted to be able to compare projects head to head, but they were always talked about individually. He was leaning towards a lower cost project. He was comfortable that he could balance the cost and the longest possible lifespan.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park distributed proposed legislation to provide free park admission to veterans (a copy is included in the meeting record). The cost impact in terms of lost revenue should be very low. It

would also include some code cleanup. The public might really appreciate it. Council liked it. Carl liked the veterans piece, he'd like to see the code cleanup again. Councilor Harrington wondered if the facilities had to be called out by name. Mr. Jordan thought we might want to make it clear that Zoo admission or MERC events were not included.

They talked about whether Council needed to approve all fee increases. Mr. Jordan said, all fees were adopted as part of the budget, it was included in that process, it was a trigger to look at the fees annually. Council could have a broader policy discussion around fees. Council liked the idea of incorporating fees into the budget process. Councilor Harrington asked about the waiver for police officers. Council didn't understand why police officers were getting fees waived. Mr. Jordan agreed to take the comments and proceed with whipping the thing into shape.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m.

Prepared by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dove Hotz', written over a horizontal line.

Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 18, 2007**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	9/20/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, September 20, 2007	091807c-01
2	Budget	undated	To: Metro Council From: Bill Stringer Re: Packet of budget amendment materials	091807c-02
2	Budget	9/13/07	To: Metro Council From: Bill Stringer Re: Worksheet for Use of Undesignated General Fund Balance	091807c-03
4	Sellwood Bridge	9/18/07	To: Metro Council From: Robert Liberty Re: Sellwood Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement, PowerPoint	091807c-04
5	Council Communications	9/11/07	To: Metro Council From: Rod Park Re: Proposed ordinance to waive park fees for veterans	091807c-05