

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, March 16, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused), Susan McLain (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 1:05 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 18, 2004.

Council President Bragdon reviewed the upcoming agenda. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said he had been asked by the Finance Department to remind Council about the proposed, proposed budget. Until the Council received the budget on April 1, 2004, Council couldn't formally deliberate on the budget.

2. SOUTH CORRIDOR DOWNTOWN PROCESS

Richard Brandman, Dave Unsworth, and Ross Roberts, Planning Department, said they had been here about six weeks ago to update the Council on the South Corridor Downtown Process. Council President Bragdon asked when construction would begin. Mr. Brandman said they were undertaking the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) shortly. Councilor Burkholder asked if they needed the EIS for full funding. Mr. Brandman said yes and gave an overview of other important dates, which included approval of the final design. He spoke to the Conceptual Design Report (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). The work that was underway was not just to determine how to put light rail on the mall but to make the mall pedestrian, bus and retail friendly. He spoke to the goals of the downtown area. They had briefed Council about different kinds of platforms. They were now down to two options, platforms on the right or left. The left side would keep things as they were today. The change was adding light rail. He then addressed the benefits of going on the right side. It allowed a continuous auto lane for the mall. Mr. Brandman then spoke to the finance plan. Councilor Burkholder asked about the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) monies and was that the existing commitment we had made? Mr. Brandman said yes. Council President Bragdon asked about "the other" category. Mr. Brandman said this was the funding gap. They were still seeking funding for this gap. The Steering Committee was looking at costs for possible downsizes and cost savings opportunities. He noted the Lentz issues concerning bringing their community closer together. Councilor Monroe asked about the costs for the right versus left side platform. Mr. Brandman responded that the right platform was more expensive. Councilor Burkholder asked about Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOTs) contribution. He suggested going back to ODOT and asking for more money. Council President Bragdon asked who made that decision? Mr. Brandman said the Commission made that decision. Councilor Burkholder asked how they approached the Commission about the additional funding from ODOT. Mr. Brandman said the project management group would make a recommendation on how to close the gap. He detailed the process from there. Councilor Burkholder suggested not going through the ODOT system. Mr. Brandman said it was appropriate for ODOT to be a major contributor.

Dave Unsworth, Planning Department, said staff had been trying to come up with a solution to meet all of the criteria for the downtown mall. He showed a video of the left versus the right side platform options. Mr. Roberts said the number of pedestrians that were shown in the video were to show peak hour use. Councilor Burkholder asked about the number of buses. He wondered under both scenarios how many buses would be being used. Mr. Unsworth responded that on the right side, there would be more buses available, there would be fewer with the left side platform. The committee had looked at the possibility of a circulatory light rail in the downtown area to accommodate the reduction in buses. They were trying to make sure that the most popular buses stayed on the mall. TriMet would also be looking at more hybrid buses so there was less noise and pollution. Mr. Unsworth talked about the possibility of moving stations. Moving some stations made a lot of sense and he suggested not being anchored to our current stations. He talked about the citizen advisory group, the business community and transit riders supporting the right hand platform option. Councilor Burkholder asked about function with the regional system, what were the positives and negatives of left versus right options? Mr. Unsworth said there might not be good retail development until they reduced the number of buses on the mall. There were some things that TriMet could fix today. By adding light rail, there was the possibility of taking some of the buses off the mall and concentrating buses on 10th and 11th. With both options, some buses would have to come off the mall. Mr. Roberts summarized the pros and cons. Left was cheaper, greater bus capacity, did not allow through auto lane, was not favored by downtown community and kept stations where they were today. The left side allowed transit to create a place in downtown, giving a series of landmarks. The Citizens Advisory Committee had endorsed the right side option. He detailed the membership of the committee. He spoke to the transit effects of the right side. The buses would travel more quickly with either right or left system. The clarity of the right side option supported a sense of place. Councilor Hosticka asked about safety issues with the right side option. What were the conflicts? Mr. Brandman said TriMet's answer was that with the right side option, people would know transit was on the right side. Councilor Hosticka gave an example of a safety issue. Mr. Roberts said those same safety issues exist today. It was not a big leap in terms of change.

Councilor Park asked about the issue of trains weaving back and forth and what was the issue with deterioration of the rail and trains? Mr. Brandman responded to his question, that the weave was very slight and there would be little deterioration beyond the norm. He then finished up talking about costs. The left side was less costly to fund but there was a greater funding issue. Council President Bragdon asked when they would come back to Council. Mr. Roberts talked about the upcoming schedule. Metro Council would consider the option on May 6th. Councilor Burkholder recommended holding the line on stops. Council President Bragdon said the land use final order limited the stops. Councilor Hosticka asked about headway. Mr. Unsworth detailed the headway near Lloyd Center. The areas of concern were at Rose Quarter and Gateway. Mr. Brandman said with the introduction of light rail on 5th and 6th it would allow new trains. It freed a lot of space. The real issue was with the Steel Bridge.

4. NEW AREA PLANNING – CONTINUATION

Ray Valone, Planning Department, said there were a few items that he wanted to respond to. They had been going over the concept chart. He had added Area 37. He had contacted them about planning for that area. West Linn had responded that they had no intention to plan for that area. Richard Benner, Planning Department, said if Council specified two years and the city did not complete the concept planning, then Metro could take action. If the city refused to do the planning, Metro could do the planning. Councilor Monroe asked how they could collect the funding. Mr. Benner said there was nothing in the Code currently. Councilor Burkholder asked what they did if the two-year deadline went by and the city had not planned. Mr. Valone said

there was question on getting funding for value added. There was an assessment about funding. The third issue was on interim protection measures and did they last? There was a lag between planning and zoning being done and annexation. Annexation must take place. Councilor Park said, in Gresham when planning took place, they concentrated on the new area. The older areas were not necessarily addressed. He spoke to some interface issues that may not have been addressed. Mr. Valone said much of this was the interface with the financing. Councilor Park said he didn't think there was a mechanism to address these issues.

Mr. Valone talked about Bull Mountain, Tigard, Cooper Mountain and 209th in West County. These locations had particular challenges. The existing cities were one to two miles away. Tigard wanted to deal with the Bull Mountain area. Cooper Mountain was a distance from Beaverton. It resulted in residents not being able to urbanize. There may be real frustrations from the property owners. Councilor Hosticka reminded that this was supposed to be a 20-year land supply. Councilor Monroe spoke to one of the problems under rural designation, if the area continued to develop under 5 to 10 acre plots, by the time it was annexed; you had lost a lot of that area. Mr. Benner said the Code required two years unless a special condition existed. Council had left it at two years for most areas. It was something Council needed to give more attention to in the next round. Councilor Burkholder said one of the obstacles was that we were looking for cities to take on annexation rather than counties. He would like to see some recommendations. Mr. Valone said there was a twenty-year land supply with additional expectations. He then spoke to the Bonnie Slope area. He had had a meeting with Multnomah County about this area. They had started meetings. He noted a letter from Diana Godwin bringing forward some of these issues. There were a lot of players in this that weren't ready to come to the table. They had some property owners that wanted to get the planning done and may be willing to pony up money. Ms. Godwin had suggested Metro convening a meeting with the entities. Mr. Valone suggested an alternative, meeting with the county first. At the agency level we would get these issues on the table with Multnomah County. They had Intergovernmental Agreements with surrounding cities for planning. Councilor Monroe asked to be kept informed on how those meetings proceeded. Councilor Hosticka talked about industrial lands and adding areas that were contiguous. Mr. Valone said Bethany they had included in the two-year process. In Bethany a planning process had not started yet. Beaverton was waiting for all of the appeals to play out. He then spoke to the Wilsonville open house on industrial lands. There were about 500 people that attended that workshop. He talked about what was going on in this area including transit, trail, industrial and Goal 5 issues. There was a convergence of many issues going on. He said, Mark Turpel, Planning Department, was the lead for the corridor study. Staff was still working out the logistics of how to make sense of it. Councilor Burkholder said this was a great argument to go to the legislature and asked them for relief from 2709. Metro was unable to carry it out in an orderly fashion. Councilor Hosticka said there was some order to it. There was a solution in sight. He was meeting with the mayors to discuss these issues. Councilor Burkholder said there was too much happening. Councilor Hosticka said if they don't start drawing the lines soon, we would have a real problem.

Mr. Valone talked about the Damascus area. He talked about the memorandum of understanding to recognize the citizen group in Damascus. There was a lot of direct involvement by that community. The intent was to plan this whole area. One of the problems had been the county planning for the Rock Creek area ahead of time for an industrial area. The area had an industrial designation. The county was trying to get it permit ready by the end of this year. One of the issues was land use planning and the Sunrise Corridor planning. The County was working to begin the Sunrise Corridor planning. What happened now was how this effected the possible urbanization. On the governance issue, a variety of groups had met. They were still working on a draft but the process had not been completed. Another issue would be the Boring area relationship to the

Damascus area. He spoke to the separation issues as well as Boring's desire to be part of the planning. City of Sandy had also expressed concern about separation issues. Councilor Park talked about the Green Corridor issue. He spoke to prior agreements and state law. Mr. Valone said the County responded to City of Sandy that we must study like areas. Councilor Monroe asked about the status of the incorporation move in Damascus. Mr. Valone explained where they were in the process. Councilor Monroe asked if there was a proposed boundary of the new Damascus? Mr. Valone said they had drawn a tentative map, which was quite extensive. Councilor Monroe asked about how they could include land that was not in the Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Benner commented that that was a good question. Mr. Valone talked about possible strategies. Councilor Monroe talked about the split between Damascus and Boring. Mr. Valone said one suggestion had been to designate Boring as a village. That would maintain their identity.

3. PLEASANT VALLEY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Jonathan Harker, Gresham Senior Planner, talked about what they had done in the last year and a half to implement concept planning. He provided a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He summarized the concept planning and then talked more about some of the issues that had occurred as they began planning. In 2003, Gresham had gotten a State Transportation and Growth Management grant to implement the concept plan. The City of Gresham had gotten no money to plan this area. He felt this was an issue for many entities. He talked about the public involvement process for the concept plan. They had also developed a series of strategies. They did rough cost estimates. Mr. Harker said much of the expenses were transportation. He highlighted some of the concept plan, the notion of green streets, diversity, town center, street system, schools, infrastructure, small neighborhood centers, and employment centers. The participating jurisdictions adopted a resolution accepting the committee's recommendation. He spoke to implementation of the concept plan. He noted who had been involved. He highlighted some of the elements of the concept plan, 1) with multiple jurisdictions how do you realize that concept in terms of zoning code with two jurisdictions doing the same plan. The notion was to have a third entity, a planning district. The environmental area would have its own district.

Another issue was rural zoning and ESA analysis. He said the approach they took started with rural zoning but when you look at development consequences, you looked at doing the concepts of doing urban development. He said 30% of the land was devoted to natural resources. He talked about the regulation challenges. Mr. Valone said the plan was to bridge all of the crossings of the tributaries. Mr. Harker talked about tax lots and how you bring people together with a multitude of parcels. They would need to master plan to address issues such as infrastructure. Mr. Valone added that during the concept planning process they got buy in to turn off the tax lots. Council President Bragdon asked if they would be willing to do this at the time of development. Portland had been exploring the notion of development corporations with shares assigned. No city had any specific method. Councilor Monroe said in Pleasant Valley they had worked out jurisdictional issues. Mr. Valone said yes, at least in Multnomah County. Mr. Harker continued to talk about the implementation of public facilities such as sanitary, parks and open spaces, storm water, transportation, and water systems. He talked about the challenges of dealing with system development charges, balance and fairness. He then spoke to annexation considerations and the financial constraints. The cities were looking at the cost issues and timing. One of the struggles was how do they make these things fiscally work out. He noted that Gresham and Portland were still cooperating. They were going to renew the IGA. He suggested figuring out governance issues early in the process. They did not have buy in from Clackamas County. Councilor Hosticka asked what the law said about incorporation across county lines. He noted other cities that crossed

county lines. The adopted amendments will go forward. Contact information will be included. Mr. Harker addressed the original estimate for capacity. Mr. Valone noted it was around 6,500 acres. Councilor Burkholder asked about school site assumptions on acreages. Mr. Valone said 20-10; it was a combined site with a park as well. Councilor Burkholder spoke to acreage issues and the need for less acreage for schools. He also expressed concern about transit and density. Kim Ellis, Planning Department, talked about bus rider ship and densification. The idea was to have transit be built early in the process.

5. PERIODIC REVIEW UPDATE

Lydia Neill, Planning Department, updated Council on where they were at in the industrial land process. They had conducted four workshops last week and one the week before. They talked to over 1500 people. There was one more workshop here on March 30th. They had hundreds of requests for documents. Most of the comments have been fairly positive. They had talked to citizens about the process as well as the objective of industrial lands. People were okay with most of the process. She noted the Wilsonville issues south of the Willamette. The Chief Operating Officer's (COO's) recommendation would be first read on April 15th. That would kick off the first phase of the public hearing process. They would also have a public comment summary report right before the release of the COO's recommendation. Once the first set of hearings were finished, they would go into the second phase and complete this process by June 24th. She also said they were looking at combining the ordinances on Title 4 and future industrial lands into one ordinance. Mr. Benner handed out a draft (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He said on Title 4, the concept that the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) subcommittee approved had drawn some fire. It was discussed briefly at the last MPAC meeting. It was being reviewed at Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and then would go back to MPAC. He spoke to issues that had been raised, size differences, medical facilities, and transportation threshold. They were going to ask MTAC and MPAC to wind up their recommendations by the end of March. Councilor Hosticka asked about his ordinance and the merits of doing the ordinance separately. Mr. Benner spoke to merits of doing it separately and together. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said they might want to have a criteria discussion. It could be treated as an amendment action. Councilor Park asked about the green corridor separation issue. Mr. Benner asked if it had to do with Sandy and Canby. Councilor Park wondered what was the proper place to have that discussion. Councilor Burkholder said Councilor Park was asking how the discussion goes forward on east side, west side, as well as the south side. Mr. Benner said in the draft analysis the agreements were mentioned. They were good agreements but may conflict with state law at some point. Councilor Park said Councilor Hosticka had a proposal and he wanted to know if we had to confirm or reaffirm the green corridor separation. Mr. Benner said the proposed policy change was a new criterion. Councilor Monroe said when they did urban reserves; they left out exception lands between Oregon City and Canby. The State threw out the decision because Metro didn't study like lands.

Councilor Burkholder asked about reaffirming financing mechanisms for urbanization. He suggested referring back to the finance piece in the draft ordinance.

6. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

There were none.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Monroe said he would be going to the Middleman industrial land workshop. Councilors talked about the results of some of the workshops on industrial lands and Goal 5. Councilor Hosticka talked about financial issues of industrial lands.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 16,
2004

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	3/18/04	Metro Council Agenda for March 18, 2004 Council meeting	031604c-01
2	Report	3/1/04	To: Metro Council From: Ross Roberts, Planning Department, Re: Portland Mall Conceptual Design Project Public Discussion Draft	031604c-02
2	Flyer	March 04	To: Metro Council From: Ross Roberts, Planning Department Re: Portland Mall Revitalization Proposed Max Stations	031604c-03
4	Project list	2/17/04	To: Metro Council From: Ray Valone, Planning Department Re: Attachment A, Version 2, New Area Planning	031604c-04
3	Power Point Presentation	3/16/04	To: Metro Council From: Jonathon Harker, Gresham Planner Re: Pleasant Valley Plan District Update	031604c-05
5	Draft Ordinance	3/16/04	To: Metro Council From: Dick Benner, Planning Department Re: Draft Ordinance No. 04-1040, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to Increase the Capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment	031604c-06