

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
DATE: June 22, 2004
DAY: Tuesday
TIME: 1:00 PM
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

- | | | | |
|---------|----|---|--------------------|
| 1:00 PM | 1. | DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING, JUNE 24, 2004 | |
| 1:15 PM | 2. | ADOPTING THE 1-205/PORTLAND MALL FUNDING
PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR MTIP COMMITMENT | Brandman |
| 1:30 PM | 3. | PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TPAC BYLAWS
TO CLARIFY SUBCOMMITTEE ROLES | Kloster |
| 1:45 PM | 4. | COOPER MOUNTAIN MASTER PLANNING
ACTIVITIES | Kent |
| 2:15 PM | 5. | TRANSFER STATION SERVICE AREA | Hoglund/
Brower |
| 3:00 PM | 6. | CITIZEN COMMUNICATION | |
| 3:10 PM | 7. | CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION | |
| 3:20 PM | 8. | COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION | |

ADJOURN

ADOPTING THE I-205/PORTLAND MALL FUNDING PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR MTIP COMMITMENT

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, June 22, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 22, 2004 Time: 1:00 pm Length: ??
Presentation Title: I-205/Portland Mall Light Rail Funding Plan
Department: Planning
Presenters: Richard Brandman

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

This presentation is a precursor to Metro Council consideration of a resolution to adopt the funding plan for the I-205 Portland Mall Light Rail Project. The plan is required in order to obtain a favorable Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts funding request. All New Starts submittals are due to FTA August 20, 2004. The plan is also a key part of the Finance Chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The local funding partners include Metro, TriMet, Clackamas County, ODOT and Portland. Local share will cover 40% of project costs, with FTA section 5309 New Starts funding making up the remaining 60%.

In previous actions, the Metro Council allocated MTIP funding for projects in the South/North Transit Corridor. the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 03-3290 For the Purpose of Endorsing a Multi-Year Commitment of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Funds for a Regional Funding Plan that added \$50.0 million over the period of FY2006-2015 to the multi-year commitment of STP funds; making a total allocation of MTIP funds of \$117.5 million available for a regional funding plan consisting of the Interstate MAX, South Corridor, Commuter Rail, and North Macadam projects The most recent action was

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

The requested action is Council approval of the finance plan resolution following endorsement from TPAC and JPACT. The Council can approve, approve with changes or not approve he resolution.

Funding Source	\$Millions
Federal Sec. 5309 Funds	\$296.2 (3)
MTIP (TriMet bonds)	\$48.50
TriMet General Fund	\$25.33
Clackamas County	\$35.33
ODOT (4)	\$23.00
City of Portland (2)	\$65.33
Total Project Revenues (1)	\$493.70

Note 1: Does not include contributions for Preliminary Engineering

Note 2: Includes \$2 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 3: Includes \$3 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 4: Does not include the value of contributed ROW.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes __No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes __No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____

Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING A) RESOLUTION NO.
SUPPLEMENTAL MULTI-YEAR FUNDING)
COMMITMENT OF METROPOLITAN) Introduced by Councilor ____
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM)
FUNDS FOR THE I-205/MALL LRT PROJECT AND)
ENDORSING A REFINED REGIONAL FUNDING)
PLAN)

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 96-2442 For the Purpose of Endorsing a Regional Position on Reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) that established a multi-year commitment of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds totaling \$55 million over the period of FY 1999-2009 for the South/North LRT Project; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 99-2804A For the Purpose of Endorsing the Interstate Max LRT Project and South Corridor Financing Strategy and Amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program that added \$12.5 million to the multi-year commitment of STP funds; making a total allocation of MTIP funds of \$67.5 million available for the "North LRT/South Corridor Financing Strategy;" and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 03-3290 For the Purpose of Endorsing a Multi-Year Commitment of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Funds for a Regional Funding Plan that added \$50.0 million over the period of FY2006-2015 to the multi-year commitment of STP funds; making a total allocation of MTIP funds of \$117.5 million available for a regional funding plan consisting of the Interstate MAX, South Corridor, Commuter Rail, and North Macadam projects; and

WHEREAS, the regional funding plan requires that the multi-year commitment of STP funds be allocated to TriMet which, through a combination of (a) direct use of federal grants of STP funds and (b) direct or indirect borrowing against the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds, is authorized to provide (a) up to \$55 million of net proceeds (net of borrowing cost) to the Interstate MAX project (only \$40 million of which is required by the Interstate MAX project), (b) \$10 million of net proceeds to the Commuter Rail project, (c) \$10 million of net proceeds to the North Macadam project, subject to the City of Portland committing its share of local match to the South Corridor project, and (d) apply the remaining funds to the South Corridor project; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 03-3303 For the Purpose of Amending the Locally Preferred Strategy for the South/North Corridor Project to Define a Two-Phased Major Investment Strategy for the South Corridor that, as a result of the South Corridor SDEIS published on December 20, 2002 and related hearings, (a) established the I-205 LRT project as the Locally Preferred Alternative for Phase 1 of the South Corridor Project and Milwaukie LRT as Phase 2 of the South Corridor Project, (b) proposed the incorporation of a Mall alignment into the Phase 1 South Corridor Project, and (c) established a conceptual finance plan for the South Corridor Project; and

WHEREAS, on January 8, 2004, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 04-3403, For the Purpose of Finalizing the Decision to add the Portland Mall Alignment to the Locally Preferred Alternative for Phase I of the South Corridor Light Rail Project, that amends the South Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative by extending Light Rail Transit from the Steel Bridge to Union Station and then on 5th and 6th avenues along the Portland Transit Mall to the Portland State University Terminus at SW Jackson Street, and

WHEREAS, further engineering, cost estimating and financial planning for the I-205/Mall LRT project has determined the need for supplemental local revenues, and a refined financial plan has been recommended that requires additional funding commitments by TriMet, Clackamas County, ODOT, City of Portland, and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and Metro action committing additional MTIP funds and refining the regional funding plan is required to (a) meet Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria for advancing the I-205/Mall LRT project into Final Design, (b) implement the regional projects endorsed by the above-referenced actions by JPACT and Metro, and (c) ensure the efficient use of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds in TriMet's borrowing program; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby:

1. Endorses the *Refined Regional Funding Plan for the South Corridor, Commuter Rail, and North Macadam Projects* shown in Exhibit A.
2. Amends the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to reflect the supplemental commitment of regional federal formula funds described in the *Refined Regional Funding Plan for the South Corridor, Commuter Rail, and North Macadam Projects*.
3. Endorses the attached *Regional Funding Plan Intergovernmental Agreement* between TriMet and Metro, and authorizes the Council President to execute the agreement.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council on this ____ day of July, 2004.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Exhibit A
**Regional Funding Plan for the South Corridor, Commuter Rail,
and North Macadam Projects**

1. Multi-Year Commitment of MTIP Funds to Regional Funding Plan

- 1.1 Metro hereby supplements the multi-year commitment of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds set forth in Resolution No. 03-3290, and amends the MTIP, as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Multi-Year Commitment of MTIP Funds under Resolution No. 03-3290</u>	<u>MTIP Funds Applied to Interstate MAX Project</u>	<u>Supplemental Multi-Year Commitment of MTIP Funds to Refined Regional Funding Plan</u>	<u>Total Multi-Year Commitment of MTIP Funds to I-205/Mall LRT, Commuter Rail, No. Macadam Projects</u>
FY '99	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '00	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '01	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '02	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '03	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '04	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '05	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
FY '06	\$8,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$ -	\$4,000,000
FY '07	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$8,000,000
FY '08	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '09	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '10	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '11	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '12	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '13	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '14	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
FY '15	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$1,300,000	\$9,300,000
Total	\$117,500,000	\$41,500,000	\$10,400,000	\$86,400,000

As used in this Regional Funding Plan, the term MTIP funds includes Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, or any successor federal funding program allocated to metropolitan regions.

- 1.2 TriMet will prepare and implement a financing program to use, through direct federal grants to projects, and/or a borrowing strategy, the MTIP funds committed in Section 1.1 to provide the following amounts, net of borrowing costs, to the following projects:

Project	Millions
I-205/Mall LRT Project	\$48.5
Commuter Rail Project	\$10.0
North Macadam Project	\$10.0

This Regional Funding Plan anticipates that TriMet may pledge all or a portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds as security for one or borrowing(s). TriMet may employ the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to provide the amounts shown for projects in any manner that facilitates its funding and borrowing program TriMet may pledge any portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to any borrowing or borrowings it deems necessary or desirable to achieve the purpose of this Regional Funding Plan.

- 1.3 TriMet will enter binding agreements with FTA and local governments committing TriMet to provide the amounts shown in Section 1.2 to the respective projects. To provide such amounts, TriMet will enter loan agreements relying on receipt of the annual amounts shown in Section 1.1 to help repay such obligations. Accordingly, the annual amounts shown in Section 1.1 are fully committed to TriMet; subject only to authorization and appropriation of MTIP funds.
- 1.4 TriMet will provide to the I-205/Mall LRT, Commuter Rail, and North Macadam Projects the amounts shown in Section 1.2, above, regardless of the borrowing costs incurred in implementing this regional funding plan. TriMet will neither be provided additional MTIP funds nor be required to reimburse MTIP funds in the event borrowing costs differ from those assumed in preparing this plan. In the event that interest rates do not permit MTIP-backed bonds to provide the full \$68.5 million anticipated in Section 1.2 from the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds, TriMet will employ general fund borrowing to provide the difference to the applicable project(s).
- 1.5 A mix corresponding to the needs of TriMet's financing program of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds will be used to fulfill the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds. Representatives of Metro and TriMet will cooperatively determine the appropriate mix of CMAQ and STP funds to be used to fulfill the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds.

2. I-205/Mall LRT Project

- 2.1 The finance plan for Final Design and construction of the I-205/Mall LRT Project is currently anticipated to be as follows:

Funding Source	\$Millions
Federal Sec. 5309 Funds	\$296.2 (3)
MTIP (TriMet bonds)	\$48.50
TriMet General Fund	\$25.33
Clackamas County	\$35.33
ODOT (4)	\$23.00
City of Portland (2)	\$65.33
Total Project Revenues (1)	\$493.70

Note 1: Does not include contributions for Preliminary Engineering

Note 2: Includes \$2 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 3: Includes \$3 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 4: Does not include the value of contributed ROW.

This finance plan is preliminary, and subject to change due to Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, Full Funding Grant Agreement negotiations with FTA, and other future adjustments. The funding plan is based on an assumed schedule for receiving Section 5309 and local funds. The finance plan contemplates interim borrowing costs resulting from the unavailability of federal funds when required by the construction schedule. In the event federal funds are appropriated to the project at a slower rate than assumed or local funds are not received when scheduled, interim borrowing costs and the total project cost may be higher than anticipated in the finance plan. Any such cost increase will be counter-balanced by either additional local funding contributions or cost reductions from project scope reductions.

- 2.2 The commitment of MTIP funds to the I-205/Mall LRT Project is subject to funding commitments by the other state, regional and local contributors, as contemplated in the finance plan, as it may be amended from time to time.
- 2.3 FTA procedures require that Final Design be between 60 and 100 percent complete prior to commencing Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) negotiations. The finance plan anticipates that about \$35 million of Final Design and related engineering and administration costs will be incurred prior to executing a FFGA, and that such cost will be paid with proceeds from MTIP-backed bonds and/or MTIP grant funds. MTIP will not be repaid or reimbursed for such expenditures, should the project not proceed to construction.
- 2.4 In the event that the City cannot commit sufficient funds to construct a mall segment, the \$10 million (net of borrowing costs) allocated to the North Macadam Project in Section 1.2 will be reallocated to the I-205/Mall LRT Project. In the event that even with the addition of this \$10 million there remains insufficient funding to construct a mall segment, a FFGA for a minimum operable segment between Gateway and the Clackamas Regional Center will be sought, and the finance plan adjusted accordingly.
- 2.5 The proposed ODOT \$3M supplemental commitment to the project, raising ODOT's contribution from \$20 million to \$23 million, presumes that the region will assist ODOT in seeking replacement federal funds for the I-205 auxiliary lane project.

3. Commuter Rail Project

- 3.1 \$10 million, net of debt service, will be provided to the Commuter Rail Project in accordance with the finance plan set forth in the *Definitive Agreement* between Washington County and TriMet, as may be amended by the FFGA. The County will provide a sufficient amount of County funds and state lottery bond proceeds to achieve a 50 percent local share of total capital costs for the Commuter Rail Project.
- 3.2 The portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds required to provide \$10 million (net of borrowing cost) to the Commuter Rail project is currently fully committed to TriMet, and is currently being spent to pay the costs of Final Design for the Commuter Rail project. MTIP will not be repaid or reimbursed for such expenditures, should the Commuter Rail project not proceed to construction.

4. North Macadam Project

- 4.1 The *South Waterfront Central District Project Development Agreement* among the Portland Development Commission, Oregon Health & Science University, and several private entities sets forth a \$102.9 million program of public transportation, infrastructure, greenway, housing, research facility, neighborhood, and parks improvements; and a finance plan to accomplish this program. A key element of the improvement program is the extension of the Portland Streetcar between SW Moody and SW Gibbs; which is currently estimated to cost \$15.8 million. The finance plan for this project consists of \$5.8 million in tax increment and LID funds, and \$10 million provided by TriMet as a result of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds shown in Section 1.1. As part of managing the overall program budget, the TriMet funds may be made available to other projects in the improvement program, provided the recipient project is an eligible project under TriMet statutes.
- 4.2 The obligation to provide to TriMet the portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds required to provide \$10 million (net of borrowing cost) to North Macadam improvements is subject only to the City of Portland's binding commitment of \$60 million (assuming the mall to PSU option) to pay a share of the capital costs of the I-205/Mall LRT Project. Subject to such a binding commitment, TriMet will borrow funds relying on this portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds and, in FY2006, provide to PDC \$10 million to design and build North Macadam improvements. Such funds will be provided to PDC independent of whether the I-205/Mall LRT Project advances to Final Design or construction. In the event the City is unable to provide such a binding commitment, the \$10 million will be reallocated to the I-205/Mall LRT Project.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TPAC BYLAWS TO CLARIFY SUBCOMMITTEE ROLES

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, June 22, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 22, 2004 **Time:** 1:30 PM **Length:** 15 Minutes

Presentation Title: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee Bylaws

Department : Planning

Presenters: Tom Kloster, Andy Cotugno

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) is established by the Council to monitor and provide advice on transportation planning issues to ensure adequate consideration of regional values such as land use, the economy, the environment and other factors in the development of transportation plans and projects. The committee is chaired by the Planning Director, Andy Cotugno, and meets on the last Friday of each month to consider an extensive agenda of topical issues that fall under this directive. The committee makes formal recommendations to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) on action items.

Because of the broad range of issues facing TPAC at any given time, the committee has relied on two standing subcommittees to focus on key issues that cannot be fully addressed by the full committee. These committees include:

- Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Subcommittee
- Regional Travel Options (RTO) Subcommittee

More recently, two other committees have emerged as informal subcommittees to TPAC, including:

- TransPort – an ODOT committee that oversees the development and operation of intelligent transportation systems in the region (which include traffic monitoring cameras, for example).
- Regional Freight Committee – a Metro committee convened to address topical freight issues.

Each of these committees has unique composition, though most consist of technical staff from public agencies. The RTO Subcommittee is the exception, with private sector and citizen representatives that mirror the composition of TPAC, itself. Each meet at least monthly, and are open to any TPAC member who chooses to attend. However, only the MTIP Subcommittee and RTO Subcommittee report on their proceedings, since they are formal subcommittees of TPAC.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

Not applicable.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The main purpose for amending the TPAC bylaws is to recognize the Freight and TransPort bodies as subcommittees of TPAC, thus formalizing meeting notice and reporting requirements. This will not only enhance the ability of TPAC to interact with these groups, but also the ability for citizens to attend and observe the deliberations of these new committees.

There are also a number of minor "housekeeping" amendments to the bylaws that reflect changes in Metro's structure and terminology that evolved over the past several years.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Staff is requesting that the Council approve Resolution 04-3469, updating the TPAC bylaws, and formalizing the role of four separate subcommittees of TPAC, as described above.

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION ☒ Yes ☐ No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED ☐ Yes ☒ No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION (Please initial as appropriate indicating that the material for presentation has been reviewed and is ready for consideration by the Council).

Department Director/Head Approval _____
Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

Kirk for Acetugno 4/16/04

Agenda Item Number 4.0

COOPER MOUNTAIN MASTER PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, June 22, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 22, 2004 Time: 1:00PM Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Update on the Cooper Mountain Master Planning Process

Department: Regional Parks and Greenspaces

Presenters: Jim Desmond, Heather Nelson Kent, Lora Price, Ron Klein

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

In January 2004 Metro began preparing a master plan for a natural area park at Cooper Mountain. The plan will recommend what types of recreational activities and public amenities will be featured in the park as well as provide a guide for managing the natural resources associated with this site.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The planning process reached an important milestone in May when staff presented three design concept alternatives to the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and at a Public Open House. Staff is seeking the Metro Council's input on the draft goals and objectives and the three proposed design alternatives prior to recommending a draft Preferred Alternative to the PAC at their July 14, 2004 meeting. The draft Preferred Alternative will undergo additional study and analysis prior to being presented to the public for review and comment this fall.

Communication and outreach tools used to develop the Master Plan to date:

- public opinion survey (summary included as Attachment A)
- expanded and enhanced Cooper Mountain web page
- feature articles and activity listings in Metro GreenScene
- two direct mailings to local residents and interested parties of the Cooper Mt. Chronicle
- guided tours and volunteer opportunities at Cooper Mountain
- targeted outreach to key stakeholder groups and technical experts in the region
- design workshop including a broad representation of local agency partners, technical experts and public land managers.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Do the draft Goals and Objectives for the Cooper Mountain Master Plan adequately address the Metro Council's vision for public use of this natural area?

Does the Council, or do individual Councilors, have strong preferences for the types of facilities and uses proposed within the three design concepts?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION ☒ Yes ☐ No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED ☐ Yes ☒ No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____

Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

Cooper Mountain Natural Area features and activities

based on 385 surveys

	very important		somewhat important		not important	
play structure for children	58	15%	108	29%	212	56%
network of walking trails	325	84%	56	14%	6	2%
loop trail with viewpoint	258	67%	104	27%	21	5%
trails for horses	144	37%	56	15%	186	48%
mountain biking	91	24%	128	33%	165	43%
parking for 15 cars and 1 bus	173	33%	112	21%	237	45%
parking for 30 cars and 2 buses	112	30%	96	26%	165	44%
wildlife viewing	237	62%	118	31%	30	8%
improve habitat	297	78%	69	18%	17	4%
bike racks	90	24%	167	45%	114	31%
restrooms	223	58%	120	31%	42	11%
place for family and friends	229	59%	117	30%	39	10%
individual picnic areas	112	29%	174	45%	97	25%
a group picnic shelter	61	16%	142	37%	179	47%
resting/viewing benches	200	52%	140	36%	45	12%
guided nature tours	62	16%	163	42%	159	41%
school field trips	117	31%	191	50%	74	19%
interpretive signs	152	40%	158	41%	73	19%

	yes	no
Small groups and gatherings?	154	223

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree
Metro's no-dogs-allowed policy	148	78	68	87

Age of respondents	
18-34	7
35-54	70
55-65	203
older than 65	92

Respondent zipcode highlights	
97007 (Aloha/Beaverton)	223
97123, 97124 (Hillsboro)	18
97005, 97006, 97008 (Beaverton)	8
97223, 97224 (Tigard)	15

Agenda Item Number 5.0

TRANSFER STATION SERVICE AREA

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, June 22, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 22, 2004 Time: Length: 45 minutes

Presentation Title: Report on the Performance of the Metro Code Provisions for Transfer Station Service Areas

Department: Solid Waste and Recycling

Presenters: Michael Hoglund and Janet Matthews (Roy Brower and Bill Metzler will be available for Q & A)

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Transfer Station Service Areas. The March 15, 2004, transfer station service area report recommends that Council consider a re-examination of the service area Code provisions. The report concludes that service areas have not accomplished Council policy objectives for transfer stations, and have not been an effective means of establishing tonnage caps for local transfer stations.

In 2001, Council established a new transfer station regulatory framework based on a "service area" concept. Service areas were established for all solid waste transfer stations, based on distance to the next closest facility. An underlying policy objective of the Code provisions for establishing transfer station service areas was the interest of the Metro Council in maintaining sufficient tonnage to ensure efficient operations at all transfer stations, including the public facilities.

The service area concept was crafted as a rationale for establishing the local transfer station tonnage caps, i.e., an alternative to the standard 50,000 tons per year caps on wet and dry waste in place at the time. The new caps were to be arrived at by (1) establishing geographic service areas, (2) calculating the amount of putrescible waste for disposal in each service area ("demand"), and (3) limiting the putrescible waste tons that could be delivered to local transfer stations to the calculated demand. In other words "demand" in each service area would equal the "cap". (However, the revised caps were set uniformly at 65,000 tons/year on wet-waste only).

Council was also interested in minimizing distances traveled by waste collection vehicles or reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). This was to be accomplished by requiring each facility to serve haulers within their geographic service area. Together, the tonnage caps and service requirements were intended to encourage haulers to deliver waste to the nearest transfer station facility.

Related Metro Solid Waste Activities affected by Service Areas. The Transfer Station Service Areas are considered or will be a factor in current and upcoming analyses related to the allocation of wet-waste in Metro regional solid waste system. These include:

- Determining the public role in the wet waste system, particularly in regard to owning and operating transfer stations (i.e., Metro South and Metro Central).
- Maintaining adequate tonnage levels at Metro South and Metro Central to be operated efficiently and economically. Do the service areas for those two facilities ensure adequate tonnage? Or, do caps on other facilities provide than assurance?
- Potential new transfer station capacity within the system. How would service areas be adjusted; and how would caps on tonnage be set? Does the Council want to defer action until after the RSWMP sorts our wet-waste system issues?

- Reviewing applications to existing caps. The Metro Code allows through Metro administrative procedures to provide five percent increases to local transfer station caps, based in part on the size of service areas. The current service areas enable some private transfer stations to utilize this provision; others may not.
- Transfer Station franchise renewals. Again, tonnage caps are reviewed concurrently with franchise renewals for local transfer stations, but the service areas are not applied and not all transfer stations are subject to caps. Local transfer station are; regional are not.
- Allocation of wet-waste tonnage to non-Waste Management facilities (10 percent).

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

Council has a number of options to consider regarding the service area report and the related issues (as discussed above) that are influenced by the service area concept. These options include:

1. Take no immediate action. Although the service areas have been ineffective, there is no immediate and compelling need to revise Metro Code.
2. Make minor short-term adjustments to the service area provisions. This could include combining certain local transfer station service area boundaries (e.g., the Pride and WRI service areas) and/or granting cap adjustments for local transfer stations to keep caps equal.
3. Undertake a thorough, long-term examination of service area options in conjunction with: a) the public's and Metro's role in the wet-waste system, public ownership of transfer stations, and a tonnage reserve for those stations; b) developing a new approach for allocating wet-waste to private transfer stations; c) reviewing caps at all private transfer stations, whether regional or local; d) revising policy for new transfer station capacity; e) implementing host fees and community enhancement grant programs for all transfer stations. The service area concept could be included in options for examining each of the above issues. Following an analysis of trade-offs, the service area concept may stay intact, be revised, or eliminated in regard to any or all of the issues. This analysis would be done as part of or in conjunction with the update to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update.
4. Combine options two and three above. This would result in short-term fixes to issues that have little or no impact on the system; and defer larger issues to the RSWMP update and related activities.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The Solid Waste & Recycling Department suggests that Council consider a re-examination of the service area Code provisions.

In practice, the service areas have not accomplished Council policy objectives for transfer stations. Service areas have not been an effective means of establishing tonnage caps for local transfer stations, nor are they effective in maintaining sufficient tonnage to ensure efficient operations at transfer stations or reducing VMT.

In contrast, the standardized 65,000-ton cap for local transfer stations, approved by Council in 2001 and renewed in 2003, are serving some of the Council policy objectives. The caps themselves are effectively ensuring sufficient tonnage to maintain cost-effective operations at transfer stations. However, this conclusion should not be taken as a statement that flow to transfer stations is *optimal*—i.e., it may not be the efficiency-maximizing or cost-minimizing amount of tonnage. Tonnage caps also help to contain Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by maximizing flow to the nearest transfer station. Again however, market forces, particularly transportation costs, might have a similar affect.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. What option(s) and issues does the Council want to consider both in the short- and long-term?

Issue	Short Term	Long Term (e.g., RSWMP Update)
Equal cap adjustments for local transfer stations/combining service areas		
Role of public wet-waste system; public ownership of transfer station; public tonnage allocation		
Private tonnage allocations		
Review private transfer station caps and service areas		
Addressing new transfer station capacity		
Host fees/enhancement rant Programs		
Ten percent allocation of wet waste to non-Waste Management facilities		

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes **X** **No**
DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes **X** **No**

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____

Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

S:\REM\metzlerb\Service Area 2004\worksession_form.doc

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
 TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
 DATE: June 24, 2004
 DAY: Thursday
 TIME: 2:00 PM
 PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3.1 Consideration of Minutes for the June 17, 2004 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

4. ORDINANCES – FIRST READING

4.1 **Ordinance No. 04-1054**, For the Purpose of Amending Chapter 9.01 of Title IX of the Metro Code, Relating to Vacancies in Metro Elective Offices.

5. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

5.1 **Ordinance No. 04-1040B**, 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 Park

5.2 **Ordinance No. 04-1041**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro's Regional Framework Plan to Better Protect the Region's Farm and Forest Land Industries and Land Base; and Declaring an Emergency. Hosticka

5.3 **Ordinance No. 04-1038**, For the Purpose of Adding a New Chapter 10.04 "Pioneer Cemeteries" to Metro Code Title X – Regional Parks and Greenspaces providing for the Management of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries And Repealing Metro Code Section 10.02.050. Monroe

6. RESOLUTIONS

- 6.1 **Resolution No. 04-3456**, For the Purpose of Designating South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Transit District as Eligible to Receive Federal Urbanized Area Formula Program Funds and to Amend the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Reflect Distribution of Federal Funds to SMART. Park
- 6.2 **Resolution No. 04-3466**, For the Purpose of Approving Metro's Priorities for Application for Regional Flexible Transportation Funds Through the Transportation Priorities 2006-09. Park
- 6.3 **Resolution No. 04-3472**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Implementation of a 1.6 percent Cost of Living Adjustment for Metro Non-represented employees for Fiscal Year 2004-05. McLain

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Television schedule for June 24, 2004 Metro Council Meeting

Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, Vancouver, Wash. Channel 11 -- Community Access Network www.yourtvtv.org -- (503) 629-8534 Thursday, June 24 at 2 p.m. (live)	Washington County Channel 30 -- TVTV www.yourtvtv.org -- (503) 629-8534 Saturday, June 26 at 11 p.m. Sunday, June 27 at 11 p.m. Tuesday, June 29 at 6 a.m. Wednesday, June 30 at 4 p.m.
Oregon City, Gladstone Channel 28 -- Willamette Falls Television www.wftvaccess.com -- (503) 650-0275 Call or visit website for program times.	West Linn Channel 30 -- Willamette Falls Television www.wftvaccess.com -- (503) 650-0275 Call or visit website for program times.
Portland Channel 30 (CityNet 30) -- Portland Community Media www.pcatv.org -- (503) 288-1515 Sunday, June 27 at 8:30 p.m. Monday, June 28 at 2 p.m.	

PLEASE NOTE: Show times are tentative and in some cases the entire meeting may not be shown due to length. Call or check your community access station web site to confirm program times.

Agenda items may not be considered in the exact order. For questions about the agenda, call Clerk of the Council, Chris Billington, 797-1542. Public Hearings are held on all ordinances second read and on resolutions upon request of the public. Documents for the record must be submitted to the Clerk of the Council to be considered included in the decision record. Documents can be submitted by email, fax or mail or in person to the Clerk of the Council. For additional information about testifying before the Metro Council please go to the Metro Website www.metro-region.org and click on public comment opportunities. For assistance per the American Disabilities Act (ADA), dial TDD 797-1804 or 797-1540 (Council Office)

I-205/Portland Mall Funding Plan

Project Cost	Original	Revised Proposal	Change
Project Capital Cost	\$ 499.21	\$ 493.70	\$ (5.51)
Capital Costs Reductions		\$ (10.51)	
Capital Cost Add for Mall Shelters		\$ 5.00	\$ (5.51)
Funding Source	Original	Revised Proposal	Change
Federal Sec. 5309 Funds (3)	\$ 299.51	\$ 296.20	\$ (3.31)
MTIP (TriMet bonds)	\$ 39.80	\$ 48.50	\$ 8.70
TriMet General Fund	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.33	\$ 5.33
Clackamas County	\$ 34.00	\$ 35.33	\$ 1.33
ODOT (4)	\$ 20.00	\$ 23.00	\$ 3.00
City of Portland,(incl. PSU) (2)	\$ 60.00	\$ 65.33	\$ 5.33
GAP	\$ 25.90	\$ -	\$ (25.90)
Total Project Revenues (1)	\$ 499.21	\$ 493.70	\$ (5.51)

Note 1: Does not include contributions for Preliminary Engineering

Note 2: Includes \$2 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 3: Includes \$3 million for shelter replacement on Mall.

Note 4: Does not include more than \$10 million in Project savings resulting from the purchase of ODOT ROW.

062204-03

MTIP REVENUE STREAM AFTER TAKE-DOWNS FOR SOUTH CORRIDOR, COMMUTER RAIL, NORTH MACADAM

	03	04	05	'06	'07	'08	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	TOTAL
STP	\$ 14.762	\$ 15.648	\$ 16.587	\$ 17.582	\$ 18.637	\$ 19.755	\$ 20.940	\$ 22.197	\$ 23.528	\$ 24.940	\$ 26.436	\$ 28.023	\$ 29.704	\$ 278.738
CMAQ	\$ 9.471	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.64	\$ 11.28	\$ 11.96	\$ 12.67	\$ 13.43	\$ 14.24	\$ 15.10	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.96	\$ 17.98	\$ 19.06	\$ 178.833
SUBTOTAL	\$ 24.233	\$ 25.687	\$ 27.228	\$ 28.862	\$ 30.594	\$ 32.429	\$ 34.375	\$ 36.437	\$ 38.624	\$ 40.941	\$ 43.398	\$ 46.001	\$ 48.762	\$ 457.571
INTERSTATE MAX SO. CORRIDOR, COMMUTER RAIL, NORTH MACADAM COMMITMENT	\$ (6.000)	\$ (6.000)	\$ (6.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (8.000)	\$ (98.000)
UNALLOCATED MTIP BALANCE	\$ 18.233	\$ 19.687	\$ 21.228	\$ 20.862	\$ 22.594	\$ 24.429	\$ 26.375	\$ 28.437	\$ 30.624	\$ 32.941	\$ 35.398	\$ 38.001	\$ 40.762	\$ 359.571

Assumed annual inflation of 6 percent applied to projected FY 05 appropriation
Assumes 100 percent of authorizations available for allocation to projects

**TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
(TPAC)**

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I

This Committee shall be known as the TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC).

ARTICLE II

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee coordinates and guides the regional transportation planning program in accordance with the policy of the Metro Council.

The responsibilities of TPAC with respect to transportation planning are:

- a. Review the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Prospectus for transportation planning.
- b. Monitor and provide advice concerning the transportation planning process to ensure adequate consideration of regional values such as land use, economic development, and other social, economic and environmental factors in plan development.
- c. Advise on the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in accordance with the ~~Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)~~ federal planning regulations, the ~~L.C.D.C. Oregon~~ Transportation Planning Rule, the 1992 Metro Charter and the adopted 2040 Growth Concept.
- d. Advise on the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) in accordance with ISTEA.
- e. Review projects and plans affecting regional transportation.
- f. Advise on the compliance of the regional transportation planning process with all applicable federal requirements for maintaining certification.
- g. Develop alternative transportation policies for consideration by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.
- h. Review local comprehensive plans for their transportation impacts and consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan.

- i. Recommend needs and opportunities for involving citizens in transportation matters. The responsibilities of TPAC with respect to ~~air quality~~environmental planning are:
 - a. Review and recommend project funding for controlling mobile sources of particulates, CO, HC and NOx.
 - b. Review the analysis of travel, social, economic and environmental impacts of proposed transportation control measures.
 - c. Review and provide advice ~~(critique)~~ on the proposed plans for meeting particulateenvironmental standards as they relate to mobile sources.
 - d. Review and recommend action on transportation and parking elements necessary to meet federal and state clean air requirements.

ARTICLE III MEMBERSHIP, VOTING, MEETINGS

Section 1. Membership

- a. The Committee will be made up of representatives from local jurisdictions, implementing agencies and citizens as follows:

City of Portland	1
Clackamas County	1
Multnomah County	1
Washington County	1
Clackamas County Cities	1
Multnomah County Cities	1
Washington County Cities	1
Oregon Department of Transportation	1
Washington State Department of Transportation	1
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council	1
Port of Portland	1
Tri-Met	1
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	1
Metro (non-voting)	21
Citizens	6
	21

In addition, the City of Vancouver, Clark County, C-TRAN, Federal Highway

Administration, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Washington Department of Ecology may appoint an associate member without a vote. Additional associate members without vote may serve on the Committee at the pleasure of the Committee.

b. Each member shall serve until removed by the appointing agency. Citizen members shall serve for two years and can be reappointed.

c. Alternates may be appointed to serve in the absence of the regular member.

d. Unexcused absence from regularly scheduled meetings for three (3) consecutive months shall require the Chairperson to notify the appointing agency with a request for remedial action.

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

a. Representatives (and alternatives if desired) of the Counties and the City of Portland shall be appointed by the presiding executive of their jurisdiction/agency.

b. Representatives (and alternates if desired) of Cities within a County shall be appointed by means of a consensus of the Mayors of those cities. It shall be the responsibility of the representative to coordinate with the cities within his/her county.

c. Citizen representatives and their alternates will be nominated through a public application process, confirmed by the Metro Council, and appointed by the ~~Presiding Officer~~President of the Metro Council.

~~d. Metro representatives (non-voting) shall be appointed one each by the Metro Executive Officer and Council Presiding Officer.~~

Section 3. Voting Privileges

a. Each member or alternate of the Committee, except associate members, shall be entitled to one (1) vote on all issues presented at regular and special meetings at which the member or alternate is present.

b. The Chairperson shall have no vote.

Section 4. Meetings

a. Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held each month at a time and place established by the Chairperson.

b. Special meetings may be called by the Chairperson or a majority of the Committee members.

Section 5. Conduct of Meetings

a. A majority of the voting members (or designated alternates) shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The act of the majority of the members (or designated alternates) present at meetings at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Committee.

b. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

c. The Committee may establish other rules of procedure as deemed necessary for the conduct of business.

d. An opportunity will be provided at each meeting for citizen comment on agenda and non-agenda items.

ARTICLE IV OFFICERS AND DUTIES

Section 1. Officers

The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be the Metro Planning Director or designee.

Section 2. Duties

The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings he/she attends and shall be responsible for the expeditious conduct of the Committee's business.

Section 3. Administrative Support

a. Metro shall supply staff, as necessary, to record actions of the Committee and to handle Committee correspondence and public information concerning meeting times and places.

ARTICLE V SUBCOMMITTEES

~~One (1) permanent s~~Subcommittees of the Committee ~~is-are~~ established to oversee the major functional area in the transportation planning process where specific products are required. The following are designated as permanent subcommittees:

- a. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Subcommittee -- to develop and update the five-year TIP, including the Annual Element.
- b. ~~Transportation Demand Management~~Regional Transportation Options Subcommittee (TDMRTO) --to recommend measures to reduce travel demand for inclusion in the Regional Transportation PlanRTP or funding in the Transportation Improvement ProgramMTIP, and to provide oversight on implementation of the Regional Travel Options Strategic Plan.
- c. TransPort Subcommittee – to serve as the region’s intelligent transportation system (ITS) technical committee, and advise TPAC on ITS issues related to the RTP and MTIP.
- d. Regional Freight Subcommittee – to serve as the region’s freight system technical committee, and advise TPAC on freight issues related to the RTP and MTIP.

Subcommittees may be established by the Chairperson. ~~Membership composition shall be determined according to mission and need. The Chair shall consult with the full committee on membership and charge before organization of subcommittees, subject to approval of bylaws by TPAC.~~ Subcommittee members can include TPAC members, alternates and/or outside experts. All such committees shall report to the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee.

ARTICLE VI REPORTING PROCEDURES

The Committee shall make its reports and findings and recommendations to ~~the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.~~ The Committee shall develop and adopt procedures which adequately notify affected jurisdictions on matters before the Committee.

ARTICLE VII AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the Bylaws require the approval of JPACT and the Metro Council. ~~The Bylaws may be amended or repealed only by the Metro Council.~~

062204c-05

Cooper Mountain Natural Area

Design concept summary

	Concept one	Concept two	Concept three
	Emphasizes conservation. Public use is limited to hiking trails.	Places primary access and amenities off Grabhorn Road. Provides trails for hiking and biking.	Optimizes recreation opportunities. Features trails for hiking, biking and equestrian use and an environmental education center.
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The oak woodland areas are consolidated and expanded.Most of the upper, non-native meadow remains to afford views and field habitat.Expands mixed conifer forest habitat.A small demonstration oak woodland habitat is added along the ADA trail, primarily as interpretive feature.A wet swale is additional featured habitat along the ADA trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The oak woodland areas are consolidated and expanded to for management efficiency and to improve habitat quality.The large, upper non-native meadow is maintained for habitat values and views.Expands mixed conifer forest habitat.A wet swale is planted to increase habitat diversity.Vegetated buffer using oak trees established along Southwest 190th Avenue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The existing oak woodlands and prairie areas are protected but not expanded.More of the site is managed for mixed conifer forest habitat that more closely follows natural succession patterns. This provides more cost effective natural resource management compared to expanding oak woodland habitat.More densely vegetated buffer using conifers established along Southwest 190th Avenue.A small wet swale is planted to increase habitat diversity.
Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A parking lot off Kemmer Road (entrance east of the house) accommodates approximately 25 vehicles, overflow, and a bus drop off for school groups.A restroom is located near the parking lot.Pedestrian trailheads are provided at both Stonecreek Drive and Grabhorn Road.Much of the existing service road is removed to limit public use in the southeast portion of the site, reduce stream crossings and protect wildlife habitat.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Parking is provided on Grabhorn Road for about 30 vehicles, overflow, and a bus drop off for school groups.A restroom is located near the parking lot.Pedestrian access points are provided at the northwest and northeast corners of the site along Kemmer Road and at Stonecreek Drive.Existing service road is maintained and provides maintenance and emergency vehicle access.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Two parking areas and trailheads divide the impacts of public use.Kemmer Road parking for about 30 vehicles and a bus drop off for school groups would primarily support the Education Center.Grabhorn Road parking for about 30 vehicles and a bus drop off would accommodate more general public use.Overflow parking is available at both locations.Restrooms are located at both parking lots.No horse trailer parking is proposed.Existing service road is maintained and provides maintenance and emergency vehicle access.
Trails	<p>Approximately 2.5 miles of trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Trails are for hiking only.A half-mile ADA loop trail is included.Interpretive points and distance markers are incorporated along the trails.	<p>Approximately 3.5 miles of trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Trails are for bike and hiking only.ADA trail is approximately 0.9 miles in and out; it reaches the large prairie and quarry pond but does not have a return loop.Interpretive points and distance markers are incorporated along the trails.A variety of different length loops are provided for hiking.The bike trail features one large loop and spurs to pedestrian entry points.	<p>Approximately 4.5 miles of trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A variety of combination and single-use trails.0.8-mile hiking-only ADA loop trail accessed at Kemmer Road.Interpretive points and distance markers are incorporated along the trails.Two hiking only trails continue from the ADA loop to connect with other combination trails.A hiking and biking trail on the east side of the site connects service road, Grabhorn parking lot and Stonecreek pedestrian entrance.A half-mile mountain bike only loop trail in conifer forest and field area offers more challenge and separated from other users.A 2-mile horse trail limited to the service road accommodates neighboring equestrian riders. (Could expand if more public land is acquired).
Facilities and amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The house on Kemmer Road is converted to a ranger/caretaker's residence to provide a permanent management presence on site.The garage provides maintenance storage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">An education/picnic shelter is provided in the meadow near the Grabhorn Road trailhead. The shelter accommodates a classroom of children and staff (35 people).Mowed grassy areas along Grabhorn and Kemmer roads accommodates school group activities and informal "neighborhood park" uses (play catch, toss a frisbee, etc.).A children's nature-based play area is proposed at the Grabhorn Road trailhead to augment school programs and neighborhood use.The house on Kemmer Road is converted to a ranger/caretaker's residence to provide a permanent management presence on site.The garage provides maintenance storage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The house and garage on Kemmer Road is converted to an Education Center with office, meeting/class rooms and storage. An outdoor covered deck or patio space adds capacity for school groups.A mowed grassy area along Kemmer Road west of the proposed Education Center accommodates school group activities and informal "neighborhood park" uses.A children's nature-based play area augments school programs and neighborhood use.A small terraced seating area constructed with smooth stones is located at one of the interpretive points to take advantage of views and support education programs.The ranger/caretaker's residence and maintenance storage area are accommodated off Grabhorn Road on the north parcel and close to the Grabhorn trailhead for management oversight.
Views	Broad views will be maintained from Kemmer Road and from the large native prairie.	Greatest views are afforded in this concept. Views from the large meadow, native prairie and meadow at the Grabhorn Road trailhead.	Broad views are maintained from the Education Center and the large prairie, but overall there would be less view opportunities as the mixed forest habitat matures.

PLANNING GOALS FOR COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA

- Goal 1: Protect and enhance Cooper Mountain's unique natural and scenic resources and create a place for wildlife to thrive.**
- Goal 2: Encourage community access and recreational use that is compatible with natural resource protection.**
- Goal 3: Interpret the unique natural, cultural and scenic resources of Cooper Mountain.**
- Goal 4: Utilize land management practices that will most effectively allow for protection and maintenance of oak habitat, prairie and pale larkspur communities.**
- Goal 5: Maximize operational efficiencies and protect the public's investment.**
- Goal 6: Minimize impacts to surrounding neighborhoods from site development and public use of Cooper Mountain.**
- Goal 7: Expand the Cooper Mountain Natural Area to include adjoining parcels to protect habitat, improve water quality and provide additional regional recreational opportunities.**
- Goal 8: Work with our partners to seek appropriate public and private funding for master plan implementation and ongoing management.**



METRO
Regional Parks and Greenspaces
600 NE GRAND AVE. PORTLAND, OR 97232-2736 (503) 797-1850

Transfer Station RFP
6/25/04 Update to Council

062204c-06

1. Four proposals were received on April 26th:

- **Browning Ferris Industries, Inc.**
- **Norcal Waste Systems, Inc.**
- **Oregon Resource Recovery, LLC** (Members of the LLC: Envirocon, Inc./ Calbag LLC-
Members of LLC: Calbag Metals, Inc., SSI Shredding Systems, Inc., East Co. Recycling, Inc.)
- **Waste Management of Oregon, Inc.**

All firms submitted proposals for Option #3, only WM submitted proposals for Options #1 and #2.

2. Evaluation Committee reviewed proposals, committee consisted of:

- **Dan Clark**, Wastewater Treatment Manager- BES, City of Portland
- **Craig Levie**, GM- Transportation Business Development, Port of Portland
- **Jerry Powell**, Editor and Publisher- *Resource Recycling Magazine*
- **Jim Watkins**, Mgr.- Engineering & Environmental Services, SW&R Metro
- Committee assisted by CalRecovery, Inc., RFP Project Team

3. Scores

Summary of Scores by Firm by Criterion

<u>Firms</u>		<u>BFI</u>	<u>ORR</u>	<u>NORCAL</u>	<u>WM</u>
<u>Criterion</u>	Max. Pts				
<u>1. Cost</u>	50	36.9*	50.0	10.1	0.8
<u>2. Material Recovery</u>					
Guarantee	20	13.6	18.8	15.4	18.0
Feasibility	5	4.1	1.3	2.9	2.5
<u>3. O&M</u>	25	23.5	13.3	16.7	14.3
	Total	78.1	83.4	45.1	35.5
	(100)				

*Prices were changed based on legal/contracts opinion

4. Next Steps

- Enter into negotiations with ORR
- If successful negotiation, submit contract for Metro Council review