

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL INFORMAL MEETING

Tuesday, May 6, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Brian Newman, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Informal Meeting at 2:06 p.m.

1. SALEM LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Doug Riggs, PacWest, reviewed legislation that was being considered at the State. He spoke to transportation issues. They were getting closer to an agreement on funding. They were making progress. He spoke to the specifics of the debates. He reviewed the Metro Regional Mid-Session Lobbying Report (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Councilor Park asked about the TriMet payroll tax and the effect on the transportation package. Mr. Riggs said this would be separated out from the transportation package. He also noted a possible significant allocation for Transportation Demand Management. He highlighted some of the bills being considered including civic penalty bill, self insurance bill, tire recycling bills, the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) bills, and other bills that Metro had weighed in on. Councilor Hosticka asked about the bus-burying bill. He spoke to amendment process and what their goal had been in working on those amendments. Councilor Hosticka asked about the land use study task force. Mr. Riggs thought this would pass. He spoke to bills they were encouraging to pass, Periodic Review, Industrial lands, etc. Councilor McLain asked about the industrial site bill. Mr. Cooper responded to her questions. The bill did not harm Metro. Councilor McLain asked about the economic development versus school development issue. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said the industrial land bill was stuck in Ways and Means and explained why. Councilor Park asked about the LCDC bill. Mr. Riggs spoke to LCDC's history. They couldn't continue to do everything. They had to come up with some measures to allow them to do less. He spoke to the structure and the activities of LCDC. Mr. Riggs said they had played a pivotal role in the electronics-recycling bill. He spoke to the two anti-Metro bills, both of which didn't pass.

2. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE

Tom Kloster, Transportation Planning Manager, talked about the required update on the RTP. The plan would expire in January 2004. It must be updated every three years and demonstrate that it was consistent with the Clean Air Act. He explained the significance of the work. He spoke to the update (a copy of which is found in the meeting record). They were attempting to keep the plan current. On page 2, the Major Tasks for the 2003-04 were identified. He spoke to friendly amendments, which would come before Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). He noted that there had been discussion to coordinate a regional funding initiative. The RTP would be a way to identify projects, which could be funded. Councilor Park asked about the five-year plan. Mr. Kloster explained what had happened in the past years. He spoke to the possibility of expanding the update. He noted the need to better plan for the projects on the table. Councilor McLain spoke to the original RTP goals and the local transportation plan

friendly amendments. Mr. Kloster said most of the amendments were not projects but rather classification or text changes. He spoke to the process for adding projects. The projects would come before the Council. If JPACT or the Council did not choose to accept the amendment, the local jurisdiction would have to amend their plan. They had reviewed the policies with the local jurisdictions before considering bringing a friendly amendment before Council. Councilor McLain asked about the 5 to 8 lanes issue. Mr. Kloster said there were a couple of six lane projects already in the RTP. Councilor Newman said he supported the technical amendments. He asked about the RTP, strategic direction and reevaluating of our relationship with Oregon Department of Transportation. Mr. Kloster said the Plan had a lot of new rules in Chapter 6. If we followed what we had on the plan, we would accomplish what we said we wanted to.

Councilor Burkholder spoke to the chances of making a major update. It would be in 2007. He thought the institutional arrangements in the RTP were good. There were a number of urban form questions that played out. Mr. Kloster spoke to the level of service issue. It was a stopgap. He spoke to congestion and when expansion would not work. Councilors talked about implementing federal guidelines and air quality issues. We needed to rethink and redefine our RTP. Councilor McLain said they had spent a lot of time on Chapter 1. We couldn't do updates or changes without some major public comment process. She talked about the need for a policy discussion. Councilor Park talked about the Powell/Foster project. Mr. Kloster talked about the congestion management issues. He suggested a policy discussion on how much mobility you could have. Councilor Burkholder said by providing land use options they had produced better travel times. He recommended that the Council review some of these issues, discuss and adopt these before 2007. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, talked about long term discussions prior to 2007 and what it would look like. Council President Bragdon asked how Mr. Jordan would start the process. Mr. Jordan thought a retreat mode this summer would be a good start. Council President Bragdon said he thought there were some ripe issues. He noted the assets of our RTP. Councilor McLain talked about the retreat mode and suggested feedback from Council on how to build those agendas. Council President Bragdon said they had talked about using the Council Informals as an additional mode for informing. Mr. Kloster said he thought the discussion on separating out policy topics worked well. Councilor Monroe talked about regional evolution. Councilor McLain suggested not starting at the project level. Council President Bragdon provided some feedback for Mr. Kloster on the background of the RTP.

3. MTIP/STIP - COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS ON 2004-07 TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said the next three agenda items were linked. This meeting was intended to have a policy discussion on the thrust of the program. There were still some choices to be made as to the theme. This provided a forum to have Council discussion before JPACT had their discussion. They were trying to elevate this discussion above projects. He spoke to timing, discussing options, this week. They then could provide this input to Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC). He noted May 20th discussion on MTIP 100% list. He added that there would be a public hearing on June 5, 2003.

Ted Leybold, Planning Department, said this discussion was intended to elevate the theme. He reviewed the framework. They had laid out three options (a copy of the Strategies for Transportation Priorities 2004-07 memo was included in the meeting record). He reviewed what those options were. Councilor Hosticka spoke to honoring prior commitments. He asked about the policy discussion concerning Goal 5 issues. Mr. Leybold said this was proposed language that Council could consider for adoption. Mr. Cotugno said some of the copies did not have draft stamped on them. Mr. Leybold continued by talking about Option A, the land use objectives of

the program and concentrating investments on the Tier 1 projects. He spoke to competing projects. He then talked about Option B, which would focus more on modal emphasis and 2040-land use performance. Option C took in to consideration the Transportation Investment Task Force. It would use MTIP funding to get projects ready so State and Federal projects could move forward.

He asked Council to discuss which direction they would like to take. Councilor Park said there would be a transportation package out of Salem. He said it would be interesting to see how JPACT responded to Option C. Councilor Newman said he liked Option C best, Option B next and Option A the least. He noted the Metro Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects and the urban centers TOD (on Option B). He said A, B and C all have TOD money. Should Option B include urban centers TOD? Mr. Cotugno explained why it did. He suggested some sort of hybrid between Options C and B. Councilor Newman talked about the program and said that some constituents wanted to make sure there were some mixed-use projects. Councilor McLain supported Option B and explained why. She felt that Option A and C were too broad. They would have problems if we went away from the criteria. She hoped that all options had the same criteria. Mr. Cotugno said all of the projects were in the RTP. They had put a stronger 2040 emphasis. All of the projects were better than they had seen in the past. He spoke to the limits of Option B because it only focused on regional centers. Option C was designed around getting engineering going. Councilor Burkholder said he looked at a vision of scarcity and abundance. How do you make the biggest impact, with Option A. Option B would do more smaller projects in more places. Option C took faith in the future, this was a strategy to get more resources and to meet those needs. All options met the goals and objectives. Councilor Park emphasized which option gave you light rail from Milwaukie to down town, Option C. Council President Bragdon said all three of these options have good content. The way the intake part of this was shaped helped. Councilor McLain said she supported Option B because it gave all of the tools. She thought some of the tools had been set-aside in Option A and C. Councilor Monroe reminded that these decisions couldn't be made in a vacuum. He felt the partnerships were changing. If they were serious about going to a vote in 2004, they had to do Option C. His philosophical preference was to support Option A and B, but in order to broaden our scope, it was critical that Option C play a role in the final outcome. The preliminary engineering made sense.

Council President Bragdon asked what they needed. Mr. Cotugno said they were looking for feedback on those options now. Councilor Hosticka said his preference was Option B and explained the need for balance in planning and conceptualizing with doing some improvements to the system. Councilor Hosticka said C was a good theory but he didn't want to bet all of his money on that option. Councilor Monroe said we must do Option C. Councilor Newman said he was leaning toward Option C to get ready for the ballot. Councilor McLain said Option B was consistent with policy. She felt that that they could meld Options B and C. Councilor Burkholder said he supported Option C. If we failed in Fall 2004, we had other projects. Other jurisdictions had done Preliminary Engineering. These could be included in the ballot. Councilor Park spoke to all options. He supported Option C but we needed to stretch as much as we could. Option C gave them more options. Council President Bragdon said he liked Option A, he thought Option C was a bit speculative. Mr. Cotugno cautioned allocation of projects in 2007. He spoke to adapting the direction based upon what happened. Mr. Jordan said he felt Council had given direction but ultimately he heard Council requesting blending. He spoke to the projects that had been picked for political salability. Councilor Burkholder said they needed to be prepared for whatever the State did. Mr. Cotugno added that there was a lot of attention to the specific projects in the area of the big six projects. There was also a general category of community-based projects. The Task Force recognized the value of the smaller projects. Council President Bragdon said the region had made a commitment to certain projects. Mr. Cotugno talked about the MPO funding and the

Foster/Powell project. He talked about the next priority corridor. He said Hwy 217 was funded and Foster/Powell was partially funded. Council talked about Green Streets and culvert projects. Mr. Cotugno said the solicitation that was sent indicated that they wanted to do some of these special projects. Mr. Cotugno summarized that the Council was interested in a hybrid of Option B and C. Councilor Park talked about the Stark Street project and the Yamhill project.

4. TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)

Mr. Cotugno said the TOD project was part of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) process. Phil Whitmore, Planning Department, explained the program to increase density and foster mixed-use. He spoke to how the TOD projects operate. He reviewed the power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He talked about specific TOD projects and density. He spoke to building elements, the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) joint development criteria. There were thirteen projects connected to TOD. He gave some examples of those projects. He reviewed cost penalties, projected induced ridership, and capitalized value of the fare box revenue. Mr. Cotugno gave a history of the level of funding and future decisions.

5. REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS (RTO)

Bill Barber, Planning Department, gave an overview of the Regional Travel Options Program, previously known as the Transportation Demand Management (TDM). He said this program complimented the TOD Program (a copy of the power point presentation is included in the meeting record). He gave an overview of what was included in the program. This program helped sustain the current transportation system. It complimented the transit programs. This program helped keep us within the ozone management plan. Mr. Kloster focused on some of the assets of the program. Mr. Barber spoke to the components of the program. He talked about the Travel Smart and the Lloyd District projects (the rest of the projects were detailed in written materials provided at the meeting and are found in the meeting record). This program leveraged private dollars, additional federal funds from Department of Energy and Department of Environmental Quality, state tax funding, and energy tax credits. Metro passed through the energy tax credits to the Lloyd Center TDM. He spoke to performance measures. He noted the Regional Transportation Demand Management Program evaluation report (a copy of which is found in the meeting record). This program helped in mode performance of other programs. He spoke to the future of the program, the efforts focusing on transportation, public health, and travel options for an aging population and for a younger population. This program was working and cost effective, a critical part of the Centers' strategy. Mr. Cotugno said this was also an area where there were some discretionary decisions. He talked about the travel options from a Centers' point of view. Mr. Cotugno spoke to programs that were funded through discretionary grants.

6. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

7. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

There were none.

Metro Council Informal Meeting

05/06/03

Page 5

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:54 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 6, 2003

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
2	RTP	5/6/03	To: Metro Council From: Tom Kloster Re: 2003-04 Regional Transportation Plan Update	050603ci-01
2	Transportation Priorities 2004-07	5/1/03	To: JPACT and Interested Parties From: Rod Park, JPACT Chair, Re: Transportation Priorities 2004-07, Narrowing Policy Options	050603ci-02
4	Chart of MTIP Funding	No date	To: Metro Council From: Phil Whitmore Re: TOD Program MTIP Funding	050603ci-03
5	RTO Power Point Present- ation	No date	To: Metro Council From: Bill Barber, Planning Department Re: Power Point Presentation on the Regional Travel Options Program	050603ci-04
5	RTO Information	April 2003	To: Metro Council From: Bill Barber Re: Regional Transportation Options Program details	050603ci-05
5	Evaluation Report	April 10, 2003	To: Metro Council From: Bill Barber Re: 2002 Regional Transportation Demand Management Program Evaluation Report Volume 1	050603ci-06
1	Lobbying Report	May 6, 2003	To: Metro Council From: Doug Riggs, PacWest Re: Metro Regional Services Mid-Session Lobbying Report	050603ci-07
1	Oregon Legislative Bills	2003	To: Metro Council From: Doug Riggs, PacWest Re: Copy of Bills before the Oregon Legislature 2003 Regular Session	050603ci-08
4	TOD Power Point Present- ation	No date	To: Metro Council From: Phil Whitmore, Planning Dept. Re: TOD Power Point Presentation	050603ci-09