

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, June 17, 2003  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Susan McLain (excused)

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

### 1. SALEM LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said the legislature was still in session. The Senate was not moving forward with legislation. They were still working on the civil enforcement bill. He talked about the sub-regional bill and the language concerning Metro. It also included the extension from five to seven years for periodic review. City of Portland and 1000 Friends were both concerned about the bill. Councilor Monroe asked if Metro had an official position. Council President Bragdon said this bill was consistent with other positions Metro had taken previously. Councilor Hosticka asked if this was a mandate. Mr. Cooper clarified the language in the bill. The transportation bill had now gone through the Revenue Committee and was on to the full House. There was still no movement on the TriMet payroll tax. There had been discussion that if the Transportation bill went to the Senate, the TriMet payroll tax might be rolled into that bill.

### 2. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JUNE 19, 2003.

Council President Bragdon reviewed the Council agenda for June 19, 2003.

### 3. REGIONAL ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP BRIEFING

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, introduced the Regional Economic Partnership. He felt it was an important step. It was a coordinating body. They were dependent on other organizations to carry out their recommendations. There was marketing of the region objectives, which included both public and private sector. They had asked Metro to be a full member. They had been staffing for the Metro Policy Economic Task Force. He spoke to the longer-term action, development of a regional policy. He talked about key target areas that were outlined in the work program. He noted page 3 of the work program, which addressed work clusters (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Council President Bragdon suggested spending some time talking about governance, how did we engage with this group and what was the governance structure of the partnership itself. He didn't think there had been much policy direction. Membership was now taking on a different character. He said that during the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) process, the partners suddenly had an opinion on the process. Councilor Hosticka spoke to the membership. Mr. Cooper talked about the voting rights of the partnership. The membership belonged to Metro and not to the individual. Mr. Cotugno said the issue still remained, was the position being taking coming from the governing bodies of these organization or from the individual? Council President Bragdon asked what was appropriate for the partnership to take action on?

Mr. Cooper noted that there was an executive committee to the partnership. Mr. Cotugno said any decision-making remained with the membership. Councilor Monroe asked about the dues. Mr. Cotugno said we were in the \$5000 membership category. Councilor Newman talked about the representation on the partnership. He noted Jack Hoffman's concerns about not being invited to be involved. Mr. Cotugno said they would be soliciting governing bodies for membership. Lydia Neill, Planning Department, said there was a concern that it should be a regional focus and a broader perspective. Councilor Park asked about other memberships that Metro was involved in similar to this organization. He asked about their role as an elected official. He spoke to the purpose and participation. Council President Bragdon said we were part of the Regional Water Consortium. Mr. Cooper said this partnership was not subject to public meeting laws because there were private sector individuals as well. Council President Bragdon said he was concerned that a public official was not able to attend the meeting but that the partnership was funded by public dollars.

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, said it was a non-profit organization. This region needed a group to develop an economic strategy for the region. The policy group had asked this group to develop such a strategy. He thought the question was, did Metro want to be at the table? Councilor Burkholder said his major issue was, was the question being involved in economic development versus knowing about the economy to understand the impact of the Council's action? Mr. Jordan said the members had been involved in the discussion concerning economic development. The policy group had asked to take the next step concerning economic policy. This was the challenge. Council President Bragdon noted that this was an umbrella group dealing with a multi-disciplinary perspective. Councilor Newman asked, who would be our representative? Council President Bragdon responded that it would be Andy Cotugno and Lydia Neill. Mr. Cotugno said there was a need for higher level of policy representation. Who were they accountable back to? Councilor Burkholder said the question arose that there needed to be a broader responsibility. Councilor Newman said he felt comfortable with the three that represented Metro. Councilor Park asked about the end product. He asked how Mr. Cotugno would vote, what position would he take. Council President Bragdon said in terms of delegation of authority, Mr. Cotugno still came back and reported to the Council. Mr. Jordan said that Councilor Park presented a good point about how we use their recommendations. He said there as an opportunity and a danger. The opportunity for Metro was greater than a danger. If you looked at the long-term aspects, there was a whole section on regional collaboration. Ms. Neill said she thought the same conflicts would occur with other jurisdictions. Mr. Cotugno said was it in our long-term interest for the partnership to be successful because Metro benefits in the long term. Mr. Cooper clarified the membership requirements.

#### **4. MTIP 100% LIST UPDATE**

Ted Leybold, Planning Department, and Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, updated the Council on where we were at and where we were going with Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Mr. Leybold talked about Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) actions. He spoke to the recommendations made by the Metro staff and Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPACT). He noted the amendments that had occurred at JPACT (a copy of the approved projects is included in the meeting record). He noted Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had offered \$2 million in funds. There were also some brief amendments to our approval process. He noted language introduced for the Sunnyside Road project. Councilor Park noted the St. Johns piece. Mr. Cotugno talked about funding the full project. Mr. Cotugno talked about the draft and changes in the staff report. Councilor Newman asked about language in the Frequent Bus corridor. He then asked about money for South Corridor. Councilor Park thanked Councilor Burkholder's for his efforts. Councilor Monroe talked about the Sunnyside

Road issue. He noted ODOT's comment about the Sunnyside project. Councilor Park noted Bruce Warner's contributions to the process. Councilor Burkholder thanked Councilor Park's for his efforts. The work that we did with ODOT will make the difference. We wanted to position ourselves so we would have a good list of projects. Mr. Leybold thanked the Council for their guidance. He also thanked staff for their efforts. He spoke to the next steps of evaluating the process. He talked about the next steps, looking at the projects programmed in 2004-05 and the air quality analysis. All of the projects that were included in this go around were in our financially constrained list. There would be a public process once the analysis was complete. Mr. Cotugno noted specific conditions for the funds. Councilor Park talked about the public hearing at Council and how critical that was. Councilor Burkholder talked about the Partners for Smart Growth. He felt this would make a great workshop. Councilor Newman asked about allocation from the federal government. Mr. Cotugno explained the process for the money.

## **5. GOAL 5 UPDATE**

Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, and Mr. Cotugno, spoke to the key update areas on Goal 5. Ms. Deffebach said the Economic Advisory Committee met and approved the economic methodology. She spoke to the time schedule for Economic Social Energy and Environmental (ESEE) analysis. Councilor Burkholder asked about the economic value. Ms. Deffebach responded to his question. She updated the Council about the range of options that would be taken out to the public. She spoke to the Social Advisory Committee. She then gave an overview of the program options (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Councilor Hosticka underscored regulatory and non-regulatory concerns and activities. He gave examples of acquisition. These would be issues that would come up and Council must consider. Councilor Park asked for clarification on regulatory versus non-regulatory. What were we requiring of individuals and of local governments. Mr. Cooper responded that Goal 5 was a land use program. Metro's requirements had to be comprehensive planning or land use regulations. He further explained specifics of the land use toolbox. Councilor Hosticka talked about Goal 5 versus Fish and Wildlife projection program. Councilor Park asked about Goal 5 authority. Mr. Cooper said action would be by ordinance with concurrence from Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). Mr. Cotugno spoke to incentive that could be adopted. Ms. Deffebach said the options would vary by outcome. She talked about the resource lands and differing functions of the lands, not all lands may warrant the same protection. Councilor Newman asked if the Council adopted the inventory. Ms. Deffebach said the Council had adopted the inventory but this was classifying the lands more specifically. Development status would also vary because some lands were already developed. She noted a map, which showed the wildlife and riparian areas. Councilor Park asked for clarification on resource lands and development status. Ms. Deffebach said they were prepared to share that information. Councilor Burkholder asked about the break points. Ms. Deffebach said it was three, four and five functions for the riparian areas. Mr. Cotugno said there were five functions in the riparian areas and the differing classes. Paul Ketcham, Planning Department, talked about the classes in the riparian areas. Ms. Deffebach spoke to their strategies. She then gave an overview of Goal 5 requirements (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). She noted where discussion would occur, definition of limit. She asked for regulatory direction for maximum and minimum program option. Councilor Hosticka said as they discussed this further it would be important to consider land. He gave an example. Ms. Deffebach said they were on schedule to bring public options to Council on August 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Cotugno said they would be back mid-July to bring additional information before the August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. Councilor Park talked about charts 4 and 5. He felt it would make a difference to include the new Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) information. Councilor Burkholder said he needed more information on how you set up a process for defining public need. Mr. Cotugno said the same kind of issues needed to be considered for economic value. Mr. Jordan said trying to define what a need was. It was a

difficult issue, did it have to be addressed by the Metro Council or should local governments define this. Councilor Park said we established need around our centers. Mr. Jordan explained what local jurisdictions would have to do in making their decisions about specific parcels. Councilor Newman asked about when they would consider administering the program. Was that part of the evaluation? Ms. Deffebach said it was part of the consideration. Mr. Cotugno explained further that it mattered how you implemented the program. Ms. Deffebach talked about the public involvement activities and the calendar (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Now was the time to begin thinking about outreach. Karen Withrow, Public Affairs Department, spoke to partnering within and outside of Metro. Was this acceptable to the Council? Council said, go forth and begin the partnering. Mr. Cotugno said the leveraging with other departments was essential. He spoke to the natural gardening workshops and well these tied in. Ms. Deffebach said they would be back in two weeks.

## **5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION**

Ralph Nagel, 15440 Kemmer Rd., Beaverton, OR 97007, said he lived by Cooper Mountain. He said on Cooper Mountain Metro owned a greenspace. He lived next door. There was a lot of restoration on Cooper Mountain. His problem was that he didn't understand what a greenspace was but he questioned whether Metro should be turning the area into a parking lot for the Street of Dreams. He said the issue was that they wanted to put a parking lot on a greenspace. He asked why Metro would do this. The signs said no motorized vehicles on the property. He gave some statistics on what money had been spent thus far on the greenspace. He assumed that the Council didn't know about this decision. He asked what the goal was for that area. He said putting a parking lot in paradise was stupid. Councilor Monroe asked who authorized it? Mr. Nagel said he thought it was probably illegal. Mr. Jordan said he would be looking into this right away. Councilor Hosticka said he wanted to read more closely the draft agreement. He felt parking the cars would have a long-term effect. There needed to be restoration requirements. Mr. Nagel said he was appealing to their common sense.

## **6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 17, 2003**

| Item | Topic                 | Doc Date | Document Description   | Doc. Number |
|------|-----------------------|----------|--|-------------|
| 2    | Agenda                | 6/19/03  | Metro Council Agenda for June 19, 2003 meeting   | 061703c-01  |
| 3    | Final Draft Report    | 6/10/03  | To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Planning Department Re: Metropolitan Economic Policy Task Force prepared by New Economy Observatory, Portland State University  | 061703c-02  |
| 3    | Attachment            | 6/10/03  | To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Planning Department Re: Attachment A to Regional Partners Six-Month Work Plan toward Creating a Vital and Sustainable Regional Economy "A Framework for Creating Shared Economic Priorities for the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Area, Presented by Regional Economic Development Partners | 061703c-03  |
| 3    | Bylaws                | No date  | TO: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Planning Department Re: Association of Regional Economic Development Partners, Inc Bylaws   | 061703c-04  |
| 4    | JPACT Recommendations | 6/12/03  | To: Metro Council From: Ted Leybold, Planning Department Re: JPACT Recommendation on Transportation Priorities for 2004-07 (MTIP)  | 061703c-05  |
| 5    | Update                | 6/17/03  | To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan (Goal 5)   | 061703c-06  |
| 5    | Draft Outreach Plan   | 6/17/03  | To: Metro Council From: Karen Withrow Re: Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan Draft Public Outreach Plan (Goal 5)  | 061703c-007 |
| 6    | Memo                  | 6/17/03  | To: Michael Jordan, COO From: Heather Nelson Kent, Parks Department Re: Street of Dreams Parking on Cooper Mountain  | 061703c-08  |