

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 – revised 2/28/05  
**DATE:** March 3, 2005  
**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 February 17, 2005 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

3.2 **Resolution No. 05-3540**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Joann Herrigel, Wendy Fisher, Les Joel and Lori Stole to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC).

**4. RESOLUTIONS**

4.1 **Resolution No. 05-3552**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Mike Leichner, Ray Phelps, George Simmons, Paul Matthews, Matt Korot and Michelle Poyourow to the Metro Rate Review Committee. Park

4.2 **Resolution No. 05-3551**, For the purpose of Designating Council Projects and Assigning Lead Councilors and Council Liaisons. Burkholder

4.3 **Resolution No. 05-3554**, For the Purpose of Appointing Members of the Ballot Measure 37 Work Group. Hosticka/  
Liberty

**5. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

**6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

**ADJOURN**

**Television schedule for March 3, 2005 Metro Council meeting**

<p><b>Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, and Vancouver, Wash.</b>  Channel 11 -- Community Access Network  <a href="http://www.yourtv.org">www.yourtv.org</a> -- (503) 629-8534  2 p.m. Thursday, March 3 (live)</p>	<p><b>Portland</b>  Channel 30 (CityNet 30) -- Portland Community Media  <a href="http://www.pcatv.org">www.pcatv.org</a> -- (503) 288-1515  8:30 p.m. Sunday, March 6  2 p.m. Monday, March 7</p>
<p><b>Gresham</b>  Channel 30 -- MCTV  <a href="http://www.mctv.org">www.mctv.org</a> -- (503) 491-7636  2 p.m. Monday, Feb. 7</p>	<p><b>Washington County</b>  Channel 30 -- TVTV  <a href="http://www.yourtv.org">www.yourtv.org</a> -- (503) 629-8534  11 p.m. Saturday, March 5  11 p.m. Sunday, March 6  6 a.m. Tuesday, March 8  4 p.m. Wednesday, March 9</p>
<p><b>Oregon City, Gladstone</b>  Channel 28 -- Willamette Falls Television  <a href="http://www.wftvaccess.com">www.wftvaccess.com</a> -- (503) 650-0275  Call or visit website for program times.</p>	<p><b>West Linn</b>  Channel 30 -- Willamette Falls Television  <a href="http://www.wftvaccess.com">www.wftvaccess.com</a> -- (503) 650-0275  Call or visit website for program times.</p>

**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, (503) 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 e-mail, 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](http://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).

**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:** March 3, 2005  
**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 February 17, 2005 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

3.2 **Resolution No. 05-3540**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Joann Herrigel, Wendy Fisher, Les Joel and Lori Stole to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC).

**4. RESOLUTIONS**

4.1 **Resolution No. 05-3552**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Mike Leichner, Ray Phelps, George Simmons, Paul Matthews, and Michelle Poyourow to the Metro Rate Review Committee. Park

4.2 **Resolution No. 05-3551**, For the purpose of Designating Council Projects and Assigning Lead Councilors and Council Liaisons. Burkholder

**5. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

**6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

**ADJOURN**

Agenda Item Number 3.1

Consideration of Minutes of the February 17, 2005 Regular Council meeting.

Metro Council Meeting  
Thursday, March 3, 2005  
Council Chamber

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, February 17, 2005  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

### 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

### 3. METRO CENTRAL ENHANCEMENT GRANT SLATE 2005-06 AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SERVICE

Councilor Burkholder said there were two enhancement funds established for the north and northwest Portland area. He talked about the funds and introduced Leland Stapleton and Scott Rosenlund, members of the Central Enhancement Committee.

Leland Stapleton said they were on the Metro Central Enhancement Committee. He felt it would be helpful to give information about the program. He provided details on the grant program. He spoke to the criteria for awarding grant funds. Scott Rosenlund talked about the projects that they funded this year. This year the Committee found some discrepancies concerning rental fees. They were able to take these savings and make additional awards. He thanked Karen Blauer, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, and the rest of the Metro staff for their help.

Council President Bragdon asked if there were other elementary schools in the district? Mr. Rosenlund said Chapman School was the only one in the district. Councilor Liberty asked about large grant proposals? Mr. Stapleton said the most they had awarded was \$60,000. They had not had those kinds of requests but were open to this kind of request. Mr. Rosenlund said they had partial funded or fully funded some of the projects depending upon the request. Councilor Liberty asked what the total budget was. Mr. Stapleton responded to his question. Councilor Burkholder presented certificates of appreciation to both Mr. Rosenlund and Mr. Stapleton for their service.

### 4. OREGON STATE MARINE BOARD'S ANNUAL AWARD FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE.

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director, said that Dan Kromer had received an Oregon State Marine Board's Award for Professional Service. This was one of the highest professional awards the Board gave. He felt the award spoke volumes about Mr. Kromer's service. This award in part was based on Mr. Kromer's work on the Chinook Boat Landing. He had also undertaken this type of work with two other smaller facilities. He noted that Mr. Kromer had served Metro for twenty years. Mr. Kromer will also be overseeing the opening of Cooper Mountain. Council President Bragdon presented a plaque to Mr. Kromer.

## 5. METRO LEADERSHIP IN RIPARIAN RESTORATION ALONG THE CLACKAMAS RIVER

Mr. Desmond introduced Curt Zonick. He talked about Metro's restoration projects and his project to control Japanese Knotweed in the Clackamas Watershed. He felt this was a model for the region and the agency.

Curt Zonick, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, presented a power point presentation on riparian restoration along the Clackamas River to eradicate Japanese Knotweed. He spoke to the partners on this project, which included The Nature Conservancy, Americorps, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB), Clackamas River Basin Council, United States Department of Agriculture and State of Oregon. He talked about the noxious weed, Japanese Knotweed. It was an aggressive vegetative weed. He shared how the weed spreads, the distribution of the weed and how it inhibited native plants from growing. Metro managed property in and outside the Metro jurisdictional boundary. He said Metro sought funding from OWEB and was awarded grants over the past several years to go after the weed. He said each of the grant years they had raised funding to pay Americorp workers to flesh out the infestation. The Americorp crew went out and mapped the weed and then began to treat it. He talked about how they got rid of the weed through stem injection. In one year they had killed about 40% of the infestation. He spoke to their outreach efforts. The Clackamas River Basin Council was prepared to take over the project this year.

Councilor Burkholder asked about the property owners that didn't want to cooperate. Was there a way to obtain public right of way to these properties? Mr. Zonick said they had refused a survey but felt they would be willing to participate in eradicating the weed infestation. Mr. Zonick said there were a dozen knotweed groups working in the area. He talked about working cooperatively with their partners and the lead that Metro had taken. Councilor Newman thanked the Americorp volunteers for their hard work. He wondered if there was a ban among the nurseries on this weed. Mr. Zonick said they were working on this. Councilor Park talked about why weeds were brought in to certain areas. He also talked about the injection methods and why it was superior. He appreciated the hard work of Americorp as well. He also noted that Multnomah County no longer supported a weed board and felt that made their work even harder.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration of minutes of the February 10, 2005 Regular Council Meetings.

6.2 **Resolution No. 05-3538, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Loretta Pickerell to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

Motion:

Councilor McLain moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the February 10, 2005 Regular Metro Council and Resolution No. 05-3538. Councilor Newman seconded the motion.

Councilor McLain spoke to Loretta Pickerell's service on SWAC.

Vote:

Councilors Burkholder, McLain, Liberty, Park, Newman, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.

**7. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING**

**7.1 Ordinance No. 05-1072**, For the Purpose of amending the FY 2004-05 budget and appropriations schedule accepting \$850,000 of Federal Funds from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for a Regional Travel Options Marketing Campaign; recognizing \$150,000 of the New Grant Funds to increase the Materials and Services Budget of the Planning Department to Hire Consultants to Develop and Implement the Marketing Campaign; transferring \$54,655 of TriMet Grant Funds from Contracted Services to Personal Services to add 1.0 FTE Regional Travel Options Program Manager (Manager 1); and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1072.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder provided an explanation of this budget amendment. These dollars had been directed to the Metro area. Metro was chosen as the group to carry out the project. The reason why there was a management position being included in the amendment was that the program was being transferred from TriMet to Metro. Councilor Newman talked about the possible cuts to the Regional Travel Options (RTO) program in 2008-09 and asked would it effect this position? Councilor Burkholder said it would effect this position unless other funds were available. Councilor Newman asked Michael Jordan about hiring limited duration positions. Mr. Jordan responded that there was no normal response. They weren't taking on any new staffing with the expectation that the position would transfer to another project. Council President Bragdon acknowledged Councilor Newman's concern. Councilor Burkholder urged support.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1072. No one came forward to testify. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, McLain, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
---

**7.2 Ordinance No. 05-1073**, For the Purpose of Amending the FY 2004-05 Budget and Appropriations Schedule recognizing \$48,820 in Grant Funds and Private Contributions for Specific Projects in the Zoo Operating Fund; adding \$48,820 to Revenue and Operating Expenses in the Zoo Operating Fund; and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion:	Councilor Newman moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1073.
Seconded:	Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion

Councilor Newman said this amendment recognizing grant funds. They received money to help further mentoring of teenagers to run the Family Farm. These dollars would help increase the amount of hours that our Zoo employees could mentor teenagers. He explained where the grant funds came from. The second program that was being funded was to assist in the breeding program for native Pigmy Rabbits. This was a threaten species and the funds would help with the breeding program. The third program was to help with the veterinarian hospital at the Zoo. Councilor McLain said it sounded like a good project. She asked about the Pigmy Rabbits project. Councilor Newman said the baby rabbits were taken back to Washington State. Council President Bragdon congratulated the Zoo on their efforts.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1073. No one came forward to testify. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, McLain, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
---

## 8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 **Resolution No. 05-3544**, For the Purpose of Endorsing an Updated 2005 Regional position on reauthorization of Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21).

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 05-3544.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder explained the endorsement for transportation funding. He also spoke to Resolution No. 05-3548. One was a one-year appropriation and the other was a six-year reauthorization of funds. There were no major changes. There were several new policies that they were getting comments on but in general this was similar to what had been requested for approval the last time. Councilor McLain talked about the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and asked the Councilors that served on Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) about the update. Councilor Burkholder said the RTP update would be consider this fall. Councilor McLain asked if this was consistent with the RTP? Councilor Burkholder said yes they were. All of these policies were open to further discussion.

Councilor Liberty said he would vote against the resolution. He explained that he supported many of the projects but opposed one project, Sunrise Corridor Project, which he felt, was fundamentally flawed. He explained his rationale for opposing the project. He believed we needed more transportation projects in the Clackamas County area. He was also not comfortable with the RTP projects. He felt they ought to do planning in terms of centers. He asked, were these the best investments? Third, too much transportation planning was done by a small group of experts. He felt they needed a new more transparent process. He felt they needed a fundamental change in the RTP. There had been a lot of progress in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Councilor Park said he would be supporting this resolution. They were not talking about the RTP but federal reauthorization. He suggested that they need to be looking as this as a regional government even if we disagreed with a certain project. He talked about the MTIP list and certain projects that we might not support. The policy that the Council and JPACT had adopted continued to move towards a centers focus. Council President Bragdon said he would be voting yes with some reservations. He felt it would be important to involve the city of Damascus in the Sunrise Corridor project. He agreed this whole process continued to improve. Councilor Hosticka asked about Exhibit B. Councilor Burkholder said this was what a House committee had put out. Councilor Burkholder spoke to the usefulness of this unified regional approach to the region. They were presenting a united front when they went back to Washington DC.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, Newman, McLain, and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 aye, the motion passed with Councilor Liberty voting no.
--



**8.2 Resolution No. 05-3548, For the Purpose of Approving Portland Regional Federal Transportation Priorities for Federal Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriations.**

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 05-3548.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder said this was an appropriation request list. He said each representative was allowed to allocate about \$45 million. This was a request for funding for a regional list. This was their wish list. He urged approval. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on the I-5/I-405 project. Councilor Burkholder responded to his question. Councilor Liberty asked if the Council had taken a position on this project. Councilor Burkholder said they had not taken a position on this project. Councilor Liberty said he questioned certain projects. Councilor Park said this was to request funding for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) so they could determine the best project. He was hopeful that this money could be used to further the center work that was being done. Councilor Liberty asked about the participation of Damascus in this project. Councilor Park asked Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, to respond to the question. Mr. Cotugno said this was intended to examine freeway options, parkway options etc. It was not concluded who would lead the project. Councilor Liberty asked if Damascus could be the lead? Mr. Cotugno said Damascus would be an approval body. Council President Bragdon asked about the MTIP grant and Damascus participation. MTIP funding was set aside for concept planning. The EIS process would look at alternatives. It was an open question what the design or phasing of the project would be. He added that this was a lobbying request. Any federal funds resulting from this request still had to be approved by the Council. Councilor Park commented on the concept planning of that area. He talked about the partnership between Damascus, Metro Council, Clackamas County and Oregon Department of Transportation. He was hopeful this would be a good funding exercise.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, Newman, McLain, and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 aye, the motion passed with Councilor Liberty voting no.
--

**9. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

Michael Jordon, COO, reminded Council that there was a retreat next Wednesday starting at 1:00 pm in Room 601.

**10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

Councilor Burkholder talked about a comment letter that they would like to send to John VanLandingham, Chair of Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). They were looking for a head nod from the Council. This was a major change in the rule. Council President Bragdon asked about the hospital siting in Springfield and if that had caused this proposed rule change. Mr. Cotugno explained the structure of the transportation-planning rule. Councilors asked further questions about the planning rules. Mr. Cotugno provided some history on the issue. Council President Bragdon asked if Council was supportive of this letter. They agreed. Councilor Burkholder acknowledged Tom Kloster's efforts in this area. He had done great work in this area, which was helpful to all of the urban areas around the state.

Councilor Liberty said they had convened the Measure 37 Task Force. They were interested in looking at more details of the Task Force scope of work. They would be meeting to discuss budget implications of the project.

Council President Bragdon said he met with illegal dumping personnel to discuss the program. He felt they had come to some clarification about the program. Councilor McLain said she had helped with the development of this program many years ago. It was only a two county program not a three county program. She had calls from citizens in Washington County about the clean up program. She talked about regional equity. She hoped that they could talk more to Washington County about their program. Council President Bragdon said one of the issues they addressed was regional equity. He explained changes in workdays of the inmates, which would help with cleaning up Washington County areas. He also talked about deputizing our parks rangers in Washington County and the need for changes in that area. He was hopeful to report back in a couple ways.

Councilor McLain said she and Councilor Park met about the neighboring cities issue. They would be providing a project proposal on this issue. They were trying to keep the budget low. Council President Bragdon urged involving the state agencies.

## 11. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17,  
2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
6.1	Minutes	2/10/05	Metro Council Minutes of February 10, 2005	021705c-01
8.1	Exhibit A	2/17/05	Amended version of Exhibit A to Resolution No. 05-3544	021705c-02
10	Letter	2/10/05	To: John VanLandingham, Chair LCDC From: Council President Bragdon and Councilor Burkholder, JPACT Chair Re: Comments on the proposed amendments to the transportation planning rule	021705c-03
5	Power Point Presentation	2/17/05	To: Metro Council From: Curt Zonick, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department Re: Controlling Japanese Knotweed in the Clackamas Watershed	021705c-04

**Resolution No. 05-3540, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Joann Herrigel, Wendy Fisher, Les Joel and Lori Stole to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC).**

*Consent Agenda*

Metro Council Meeting  
Thursday, March 3, 2005  
Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE ) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3540  
APPOINTMENTS OF JOANN HERRIGEL, )  
WENDY FISHER, LES JOEL AND LORI STOLE ) Introduced by David Bragdon,  
TO THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY ) Council President  
COMMITTEE (SWAC)

WHEREAS, Metro Code Chapter 2.19.130 established the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) to evaluate policy recommendations to the Metro Council regarding regional solid waste management and planning; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code Chapter 2.19.030 states that all members and alternate members of all Metro Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Council President subject to confirmation by the Council; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code Chapter 2.19.130 authorizes representatives and alternates for the SWAC; and

WHEREAS, vacancies have occurred in the SWAC membership; and

WHEREAS, the Council President has appointed JoAnn Herrigel as an alternate member of the Clackamas County Cities representatives, Wendy Fisher as an alternate member of the Recycling Industry, Composting representatives, Les Joel as an alternate member of the Recycling Industry, End User representatives and Lori Stole as the Washington County Citizen representative subject to confirmation by the Metro Council; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council confirms the appointments of Ms. Herrigel, Ms. Fisher, Mr. Joel and Ms. Stole to Metro's SWAC.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3540 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE APPOINTMENT OF JOANN HERRIGEL, WENDY FISHER, LES JOEL AND LORI STOLE TO THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)

---

Date: February 10, 2005

Prepared by: Susan Moore

### BACKGROUND

The 25-member Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), representing recyclers, the hauling industry, disposal sites, citizen-ratepayers and local governments, evaluates policy options and presents recommendations to the Metro Council regarding regional solid waste management and planning.

The following individuals have been recommended to serve as members of the SWAC:

1. Ms. Herrigel has been recommended to serve as an alternate government representative for the Clackamas County Cities.
2. Ms. Fisher has been recommended to serve as an alternate representative for the Recycling Industry Representatives, Composting (see Attachment 1).
3. Mr. Joel has been recommended to serve as an alternate representative for the Recycling Industry Representatives, End Users (see Attachment 2)
4. Ms. Stole has been recommended to serve as the Washington County Citizen Representative (see Attachment 3).

### ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

#### 1. Known Opposition

There is no known opposition.

#### 2. Legal Antecedents

ORS 192.610 "Governing Public Meetings", Metro Code Chapter 2.19.030, "Membership of the Advisory Committees" and 2.19.130, "Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee", are the relevant legal documents related to these appointments.

#### 3. Anticipated Effects

This resolution is intended to appoint the following individuals for a two-year term of service on the SWAC:

1. Ms. JoAnn Herrigel as the Clackamas County Cities alternate representative.
2. Ms. Wendy Fisher as a Recycling Industry Representative, Composting alternate representative.
3. Mr. Les Joel as a Recycling Industry Representative, End Users alternate representative.
4. Ms. Lori Stole as the Washington County Citizen Representative.

#### 4. Budget Impacts

None.

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The Council President has reviewed or is aware of the qualifications of Ms. JoAnn Herrigel, Ms. Wendy Fisher, Mr. Les Joel and Ms. Lori Stole and finds them qualified to advise Metro in the matters of solid waste management and planning. Therefore, Council confirmation of these appointments by adoption of Resolution No. 05-3540 is recommended.

M:\rem\od\projects\Legislation\2005\053540 SWAC st\frpt herrigel\_fisher\_Joel\_stole.doc

**WENDY FISHER**  
3630 NE 22<sup>nd</sup> Ave.  
Portland, OR 97212  
503.221.2968 work cell  
503.310.2516 other cell  
wendyf@emeraldnh.com

## EXPERIENCE

### **Project Development Specialist** **Cedar Grove Composting, Inc.**

**September 2004 - present**

- Site and permit Portland foodwaste composting facility once tonnage requirements have been secured
- Assist in advancement of Portland Composts! program as requested

### **Interim Solid Waste Manager, Management Analyst, and Recycling Project Specialist**

**Washington County Solid Waste and Recycling: Hillsboro, Oregon**

**1999 – May 2004**

- Chair of the Composting Council of Oregon from 2001 – 2004:
  - Directed organization on important issues including legislation and policy regarding high value farmland, foodwaste recovery, DEQ rulemaking; Led organization in successful effort to limit clopyralid application working closely with DEQ and Department of Agriculture
  - Increased membership from 25 - 60; Oversaw development and administration of website; Wrote email news updates
  - Worked in conjunction with other industry organizations to perform outreach and education and expand recovery of organics including Oregon Tilth, OMRI (Oregon Materials Recovery Institute), Washington Organic Recycling Council (WORC); Authored Compost User's Guide with WORC
- Managed organics recovery program including a residential foodwaste pilot, annual Metro Compost Bin Sales; Served on Soils for Salmon Committee and regional Metro organics workgroup
- Other major duties included permitting and monitoring franchise agreements to ensure compliance of regulatory, financial, administrative, legal, and nuisance criteria (County had regulatory authority over two landfills, two compost facilities, 16 haulers); Performed annual solid waste rate analysis and setting for County residential, commercial, and dropbox customers; Wrote Administrative Rules; Led sustainable design/practices for County projects including writing and receipt of \$280k grant from DEQ to address management strategies for stormwater runoff

### **Program Analyst**

**1996-1998**

**City of Escondido Public Works Department: Escondido, California**

- Evaluated city recycling programs including Christmas trees, storm drain pollution education, home composting. Work included applying for, expending, reporting, evaluation of \$450,000 in grant funding
- Designed and oversaw development of oil and household hazardous waste programs including securing funding, hiring, and contracting for capital project

### **Management Analyst**

**1992-1993**

**Recycling By Nature, Inc. (environmental consulting firm): Carmel, California**

- Developed recycling programs for ten tenants at Los Angeles International Airport. Tracked and evaluated budgets for contracted projects totaling \$250,000
- Gathered and used statistical data to design and track waste minimization methodologies and documented findings in 1992 City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Generation Study; Performed 1993 Port of Los Angeles Waste Audit

## EDUCATION

**Master of Art in International Public Administration**

**Monterey Institute of International Studies: Monterey, California**



**Bachelor of Science in Political Science and Economics**  
University of Oregon: Eugene, Oregon

**Mr. Leslie B. Joel**  
13095 SW Wilmington Lane  
Tigard, Or 97224  
(503) 650-4206 W  
[ljoe1@alumni.uchicago.edu](mailto:ljoe1@alumni.uchicago.edu)

ATTACHMENT 2-1  
RESOLUTION NO. 05-3540

**Professional Summary:** Over 15 years of experience in complicated manufacturing environments combined with an extensive engineering and business education. Assignments have ranged from solving specific process problems to generating broad strategic plans. Key skills include the ability to separate complex problems into analyzable pieces, the persistence to solve nagging process issues, the ethical conduct to develop cooperative supplier relations, and the ability to effectively communicate on the factory floor and in the corporate boardroom.

**Blue Heron Paper Company – Oregon City, OR**

Nov, 1999-Present

**Deink Plant Manager**

In addition to responsibilities described below:

- Appointed to a nine member Senior Management Group that successfully converted our facility to an autonomous, 40% employee owned company.
- Transitioned the plant from a captive raw material customer to an independent buyer. Negotiated pricing, quantity, and transportation of over 14,000 tons of waste paper on a monthly basis. Identified new suppliers and material types.
- Restructured department job duties to accommodate headcount reduction while maintaining employee morale. Developed electronic communication of weekly business issues for all employees.
- Appointed to multiple METRO (regional government) committees to improve recycling and waste reduction. Board member – Association of Oregon Recyclers

**Smurfit Newsprint Corporation – Oregon City Mill**

Nov, 1995-Nov, 1999

Departmental accountability for safely producing standard recycled pulp and high-grade bleached pulp. Managed 18 union employees and 1 salaried employee while controlling an annual budget exceeding \$25 Million. Plant operates 24 hrs/day, 7 days/week.

- **Production:** Increased daily average production 16 %, resulting in annual savings of \$1,100,000.
- **Quality:** Significantly improved standard pulp quality, allowing recycled pulp usage to increase from 55% to 63%. High-grade pulp improvements opened new markets for value added grades. One new grade accounts for 12% of total mill production
- **Maintenance:** Reduced total downtime from 244 hours/year to 65 hours/year.
- **Costs:** Reduced high-grade bleaching costs by 10 % resulting in annual savings of \$235,000. Standard chemical costs were reduced by 30%, saving \$995,000 per year.
- **Employees:** Issued first written Minimum Expectations for each position and implemented a comprehensive employee training program.
- **Leadership -** Leader of Division's first multi-disciplinary customer support team that was assigned to our most important customer. Youngest leader of a weekend duty team, providing management decisions 10 weekends per year.

**Smurfit Newsprint Corporation – Newberg Mill**

**Deink Plant Supervisor**

Jan, 1994 - Nov, 1995

Performed front-line supervision for the production of over 600 tons per day of recycled pulp. Assumed Department Manager position during a 6-month period.

**Production Assistant**

Dec, 1991 – Jan, 1994

Responsible for developing my knowledge of mill operations, analyzing process improvements and cost reductions, and providing relief shift supervision.

**Jefferson Smurfit Corporation – Corp. Headquarters**

Sept, 1990 – Dec, 1991  
Summer, 1989

**Corporate Planning Manager**

This MBA entry position provided exposure to all production divisions while performing necessary financial and strategic assignments.

- **Mergers & Acquisitions** - Conducted financial and strategic analysis of acquisition candidates, up to and including Due Diligence. Analysis included revenue and cost projections, competitor examination, market development, and financial structure. These tasks required close cooperation with the operating divisions, sales, treasury, tax, and legal.
- **Strategic Planning** - Developed 5-year Strategic Plans for two Joint Ventures. Plans covered examination of markets, competition, finances, and operations. My recommendations lead to one Joint Venture being dissolved, eliminating a major cash drain.

**GE Aircraft Engine Business Group – Lynn, MA**

July, 1985 – Sept, 1988

**Product Quality Engineer** - Resolved difficult product problems for a varied customer base and in-house shops by analyzing outside suppliers' manufacturing processes. Negotiated changes with the suppliers and monitored the effectiveness of any changes. Directed a diverse team performing the first proactive process evaluation of a complex casting. The evaluation resulted in a lower reject rate and reduced production costs.

**GE Manufacturing Management Program**

July, 1983 – July, 1985

This program provided an understanding of manufacturing dynamics through four rotating shop floor assignments in two locations. The assignments included Maintenance Planner, Production Foreman, Process Control Engineer, and Manufacturing Engineer.

Summers – Oilfield Roughneck, Research & Design Engineer, Home Remodeling

**UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

MBA Finance and Marketing Concentration

June, 1990

Worked part-time restoring an 1880 Victorian mansion

**BOSTON UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

M.S. Manufacturing Engineering

May, 1988

**CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

B.S. Mechanical Engineering and Engineering and Public Policy

May, 1983

**LORI PORTER STOLE**  
January 2005

Lori has been involved with sustainability, product stewardship and recycling/waste prevention for the past 8 years. Her experience includes:

- An active board member of Recycling Advocates for the last 8 years, helping to organize the group's activities, write articles, give presentations and track legislation.
- Member of the Washington County SWAC for the last 8 years.
- Assoc. of Oregon Recyclers member; served as facilitator for an all-day e-waste forum.
- Developed a sustainability program for the Beaverton School District which is currently being implemented. A district waste prevention/recycling program was designed as a subset of this. Lori helped to get staffing for this program, is providing technical assistance, and is leading implementation at her local elementary school.
- An associate of the Zero Waste Alliance (ZWA).
- Designed a state sustainable schools program, which has been accepted as the successor to an Oregon Solutions initiative, and is a project of the Oregon Sustainability Board. This project is beginning a funding and implementation phase. Ownership has been given to ZWA, with Lori as project manager.
- Helped to originate the WEPSI project (Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative), a multi-stakeholder dialogue aimed at developing solutions for dealing with the electronic waste stream, and subsequently became staff to the project.

Educational background includes:

- Numerous workshops, classes and conferences have provided instruction in various aspects of sustainability and the natural step principles, product stewardship, recycling and waste prevention, P2, green building, green chemistry, green purchasing.
- BS in Chemical Engineering from University of Washington

Other Experience:

- 1986 – 1995: Project manager for Wacker Siltronic, a Portland silicon wafer fab, with responsibility for all project aspects from planning, design and implementation through start-up.
- 1984 – 1986: Equipment engineer at Wacker-Chemie, a large chemical manufacturing facility in Germany.
- 1982: Environmental education for the Hudson River Sloop Clearwater organization.
- 1978 – 1981: Engineer in the research dept. of Dupont's Polymer Products Dept.
- Environmental awareness and leadership experience as river rafting guide, mountain climbing instructor/leader, kayak and canoe instructor.

**Resolution No. 05-3552, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Mike Leichner, Ray Phelps, George Simmons, Paul Matthews, Matt Korot, and Michelle Poyourow to the Metro Rate Review Committee.**

Metro Council Meeting  
Thursday, March 3, 2005  
Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE ) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3552  
APPOINTMENTS OF MIKE LEICHNER, RAY )  
PHELPS, GEORGE SIMMONS, PAUL ) Introduced by David Bragdon,  
MATTHEWS, MATT KOROT, AND MICHELLE ) Council President  
POYOUROW TO THE METRO RATE REVIEW )  
COMMITTEE )

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.170 established the Rate Review Committee (RRC) to enhance the credibility of solid waste disposal rates and the rate setting process; to provide a rational, consistent, stable and predictable process for establishing solid waste disposal rates; and to make recommendations to the Metro Council regarding proposed solid waste disposal rates; and,

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.030 states that all members of all Metro Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Council President subject to confirmation by the Council; and,

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.170 authorizes representatives for the RRC; and,

WHEREAS, terms have expired and vacancies have occurred in the RRC membership; and,

WHEREAS, the Council President has appointed Mike Leichner and Ray Phelps to represent persons engaged in the business of hauling solid waste, George Simmons to represent persons with business-related financial experience, Paul Matthews as the member with experience in establishing rates, Matt Korot to represent persons involved with a local recycling or waste reduction program, and Michelle Poyourow to represent citizen ratepayers, subject to confirmation by the Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2) limits advisory committee members to serving no more than two consecutive full two year terms on the same committee; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the resolution would result in a third consecutive two-year term for Mr. Matthews, notwithstanding the provisions of Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, Mr. Matthews is a recognized, independent expert on rate-setting who has specialized and unique knowledge of solid waste rates; who has no direct interest, financial or otherwise, in the recommendations of the committee; and who, through his voluntary participation on the committee, provides considerable value to Metro for which he would be compensated in his normal line of business; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council confirms the appointments of Mr. Leichner, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Korot, and Ms. Poyourow to Metro's RRC.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3552 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE APPOINTMENTS OF MIKE LEICHNER, RAY PHELPS, GEORGE SIMMONS, PAUL MATTHEWS, MATT KOROT, AND MICHELLE POYOUROW TO THE METRO RATE REVIEW COMMITTEE

---

Date: March 3, 2005

Prepared by: Douglas Anderson

### BACKGROUND

The Solid Waste Rate Review Committee (RRC) is established to:

- Enhance the credibility of solid waste disposal rates and the rate setting process.
- Provide a rational, consistent, stable, predictable process for establishing disposal rates.
- Make recommendations to the Metro Council regarding proposed solid waste disposal rates.

The RRC has the authority and responsibility to review and make recommendations to the Council on:

- Proposed solid waste disposal rates and charges at facilities owned, operated or under contract to Metro and at Metro franchised facilities as provided under the terms of a franchise agreement;
- All policy and technical issues related to solid waste disposal rate setting;
- Direct and indirect expenses included in proposed solid waste disposal rates before the committee; and
- Any technical analysis of proposed rates or rate setting procedures, developed by Metro staff or a consultant to Metro, for facilities under the purview of the committee.

Pursuant to Metro Code section 2.19.030(b), the Council President has appointed the following individuals to serve on the Rate Review Committee, subject to confirmation by the Council:

1. Mike Leichner, President of Pride Disposal (a collection company franchised in Tigard, Sherwood and Washington County) and Pride Recycling (a local transfer station franchised by Metro). Mr. Leichner is re-appointed to one of two positions on RRC representing "persons engaged in the business of hauling solid waste."\* Mr. Leichner currently serves in this capacity on the RRC, and this re-appointment is for his second 2-year term.
2. Ray Phelps, Regulatory Affairs Manager for Allied Waste Industries, Inc. Allied is a major solid waste firm with Oregon interests ranging from collection and facilities to landfills. Through its wholly-owned subsidiary BFI, Allied also holds the contract to operate Metro's transfer stations. Mr. Phelps is appointed to the other of two positions on the RRC representing "persons engaged in the business of hauling solid waste,"\* a position formerly held by Dean Kampf of Waste Management. This is Mr. Phelps' first appointment to the RRC.
3. George Simmons, President of AGG, a company that provides solid waste and recycling collection services to customers within the unfranchised commercial market in the City of Portland. Mr. Simmons is appointed to the RRC position representing "persons with business-related financial experience,"\* a position formerly held by Dr. James Strathman of Portland State University. This is Mr. Simmons' first appointment to the RRC.

---

\* The citations in these numbered paragraphs are the membership specifications in Metro Code section 2.19.170(b):

4. Paul Matthews, Senior Vice President of Integrated Utilities Group, an economic consulting firm that provides financial, ratemaking, and expert witness services to water, wastewater, storm water, solid waste, and other utilities throughout North America. Mr. Matthews manages the Portland office of IUG where he also specializes in cost-of-service, financial planning, conservation and capital, and infrastructure related projects. Mr. Matthews is re-appointed as the person on RRC having "experience in establishing rates,"\* a position currently held by Mr. Matthews. Mr. Matthews has served two consecutive terms on the RRC, and this re-appointment is for his third consecutive term. In regard to term limits set forth in Metro Code §2.29.030(c)(2), see "Legal Antecedents," below.
5. Matt Korot, Recycling & Solid Waste Program Manager for the City of Gresham. Mr. Korot oversees all aspects of Gresham's solid waste programs, including rate-setting for franchised collection services. Mr. Korot is appointed to the RRC position representing "persons involved with a local recycling or waste reduction program,"\* a position formerly held by Mr. Jerry Powell, Editor, *Resource Recycling*. This is Mr. Korot's first appointment to the RRC.
6. Michelle Poyourow, Junior Economist with the Public Power Council, an organization that represents the Pacific Northwest's consumer-owned utilities, focussing on BPA rate-making, revenue requirements and policies, power supply planning and conservation issues. Ms. Poyourow's appointment is to the RRC position representing "citizen ratepayers,"\* a position formerly held by Mr. Bernie Deazley. This is Ms. Poyourow's first appointment to the RRC.

## ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

### 1. Known Opposition

There is no known opposition.

### 2. Legal Antecedents

ORS 192.610 "Governing Public Meetings" and Metro Code sections 2.19.030, "Membership of the Advisory Committees" and 2.19.170, "Rate Review Committee," govern these appointments.

Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2) limits advisory committee members to serving no more than two consecutive full two year terms on the same committee. The Council President has appointed Mr. Matthews to a third term notwithstanding this provision of the code, because: (a) Mr. Matthews has special and unique knowledge on solid waste rates and rate-making; (b) his knowledge and advice are of great benefit to Metro; (c) he would normally be compensated for the time he voluntarily provides to Metro; and (d) he has no direct interest in the outcome of the committee's work.

### 3. Anticipated Effects

Adoption of this resolution will confirm the Council President's appointments to the Rate Review Committee and thereby establish full membership to complete the committee's review and recommendations on Metro's FY 2005-06 solid waste rates.

### 4. Budget Impacts

None. This resolution simply establishes new membership for a standing committee.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Council President recommends adoption of Resolution No. 05-3552.



Agenda Item Number 4.2

**Resolution No. 05-3551, For the Purpose of Designating Council Projects and Assigning Lead Councilors and Council Liaisons.**

Metro Council Meeting  
Thursday, March 3, 2005  
Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING ) Resolution No. 05-3551  
COUNCIL PROJECTS AND CONFIRMING )  
LEAD COUNCILORS AND COUNCIL ) Introduced by Council President David  
LIAISONS ) Bragdon

WHEREAS, from time to time, certain projects or issues may arise that would benefit from the focused attention of a subset of the Council; and

WHEREAS, members of the Council have identified a list of such projects; and

WHEREAS, those projects identified have been defined and put forth in the form of project proposals, included in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Council President, working with members of the council, has designated specific councilors to play lead and/or liaison roles on projects as specified in Exhibit A:

Now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Council confirms the project proposals, including the designation of projects, project definitions, lead councilor assignments, and councilor liaison assignments as specified in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

**Metro Council Project Proposal**  
February 15, 2005

**Lead Councilor:** Susan McLain (West), Rod Park (East)

**Council Liaisons:** None

**Project Title:** Neighbor Cities

**Project Begin Date:** February 25, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Scoping Phase - June 1, 2005

**Project Description:**

The project will open a dialog with neighboring cities to determine their interests and concerns regarding their relationship with the Metro region, and to discuss mutual interests and goals. The discussion may include the following issues: economic and demographic trends, transportation, urban growth, agricultural resources and other natural resources. Urban growth is of particular interest because growth policies in one urban area affect growth pressures in neighboring areas.

The project's first phase is the Scoping Phase, which involves one-on-one contact by a Metro Councilor with local elected officials to solicit and listen to their issues on a range of topics. The COO may visit with the city/county managers prior to a Councilor's visit. Notes will be taken and a summary along with a verbal update will be provided to the Metro Council. The Lead Councilors will make a recommendation to the Council on venues to address shared issues.

Subsequent program activities may include a symposium on shared issues and research on the relationship between the region's economy and the economies of neighboring cities.

The Lead Councilors have divided the neighboring cities assignments as follows:

Councilor McLain - North Plains, Banks, Gaston, Scappose, St. Helens, Yamhill-Carlton, McMinnville, Newberg, Yamhill County and Columbia County.

Councilor Park - Sandy, Boring, Estacada, Canby, Aurora, Hubbard Molalla, Woodburn and Marion County.

**Outcome:**

The outcome of the Scoping Phase of this project is to:

- (1) make contact with the elected officials in the neighboring cities;
- (2) identify issues of mutual concern; and
- (3) make a recommendation to the Metro Council on mechanisms by which the issues might be addressed.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The project directly supports the Council's operating objective to *"Maintain open working relationships with other governments and organizations and provide a venue for regional collaboration."* It also supports goals and objectives related to economic vitality such as *"Land is available to meet the need for housing and employment,"* and *"Access to jobs, services, centers and industrial areas is efficient."*

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

Council Support Specialist - 40 hours \$1,200.00

- Appointments
- Master Calendar
- Synthesis/Summary of Issues
- Coordination with other staff
- Follow up

Planning Staff/DRC Staff - 25 hours \$1,500.00

- Prepare support materials as requested by Councilors
- Follow up

Planning staff and DRC support can be accommodated in the budget under the existing allocation for 2040 Refinement Planning. Council support can be incorporated into the existing budget and duties.

I:\gm\community\_development\projects\Urban Partners05\MetroCouncilProjectProposalUrbanPartners.doc

## Metro Council Project Proposal

**Lead Councilor:**

**Council Liaisons:**

**Project Title:** Disposal System Planning

**Project Begin Date:** February 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Draft, November 2005; final, May 2006 (coincident with RSWMP).

**Project Description:** The main purpose of this project is to determine whether the disposal needs of the region are being met in the most efficient and effective manner; and to recommend adjustments where the system can be improved. Historically, Metro has been the primary provider of disposal services, and—through its regulatory authority RSWMP—Metro has ensured that the private disposal system operates in a complementary and environmentally sound manner. Over the last decade, there have been significant changes in the private solid waste industry. This fact, coupled with Metro’s own strategic planning initiative during the last year, call for a timely examination of the regional disposal system and the roles played by the public and private sectors. This project is intended to fulfill such an examination.

**The main questions to be addressed are:** in conjunction with the RSWMP update,

- What does the region need from the disposal system?
- What is the best way to fill those needs?

**Outcome.** This project will provide recommendations and/or policy direction for the regional disposal system. The following specific issues will be addressed. For the 2005 to 2009 timeframe, recommendations on disposal needs including public access, putrescible waste transfer capacity, and dry waste processing; and regulatory needs including entry criteria for new facilities, policy on waste authorizations (“tonnage caps”), allocation of putrescible waste to disposal sites, and recommendations on economic regulation. For the post-2009 period (after the solid waste bonds are retired), policy direction on Metro’s role in the disposal system, and how that role should be filled—*e.g.*, continue to own transfer stations, vs. divest and regulate. If the latter, determine the appropriate regulatory level and model (*e.g.*, leverage market competition vs. franchising vs. “public utility model”). If the former, set in motion the plans for maximizing the asset value of the transfer stations and for transitioning to a private system. These directions will also guide other major decisions including examination of alternative transport modes and procuring a new transport contract by 2009, procurement of a transfer station operating contract by 2010; and addressing the fiscal needs of the agency.

### **Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

- 2.3 The region’s waste stream is reduced, recovered and returned to productive use, and the remainder has a minimal impact on the environment.
- 4.2 Public services are available and equitable.
- 4.3 Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:** Approximately 1.0 FTE is targeted for the project during calendar 2005 over 3 persons: Doug Anderson as project manager, with two assigned staff. The

department has budgeted up to \$50,000 for consultant assistance, primarily technical work related to asset valuation. There are several decision milestones that can affect the direction and level-of-effort during the course of the project, so this resource level is subject to change as the project moves forward. This project is funded from the Solid Waste Fund, using revenue raised from the Regional System Fee.

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** David Bragdon

**Council Liaisons:** Susan McLain

**Project Title:** Fish and Wildlife Bond Measure November 2006

**Project Begin Date:** February 14, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** November 2006

**Project Description:**

Develop and take before the voters for approval a fish and wildlife property acquisition and restoration bond measure. Bond funds would be used to purchase from willing sellers those properties deemed of the greatest ecological importance for fish and wildlife habitat and fund habitat restoration efforts.

**Outcome:** Take the measure forward to the voters no later than November 2006.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

This program directly meets two of the Council's goals:

**Goal: Great Places**

Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible and physically distinct places to live, work and play

**Objectives:**

*February 3, 2005*

- 1.1 Natural areas, park land and outdoor recreation infrastructure are available near housing and employment
- 1.3 A diversity of artistic, cultural and recreational opportunities is available

**Goal: Environmental Health**

The region's wildlife and people thrive in a healthy urban ecosystem

**Objectives:**

- 2.1 Natural areas are large enough, have appropriate balance of species and are interconnected with other natural areas so that normal ecological processes are maintained.
- 2.2 Our community is inspired to create a better future for wildlife and the environment.
- 2.5 Urban land is used efficiently and resource land is protected from urban encroachment.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

This project will require 0.5 FTE dedicated to it through the vote, planned for November 2006.

The FY 2005-06 Proposed Budget will include a special project allocation request for \$215,136 consisting of the following:

\$60,176 0.5 FTE salary and related fringe benefits. This position will oversee the development of program options for Council consideration and coordinate the multiple public involvement processes necessary.

\$20,000 Bond Counsel. It will be necessary to retain qualified Bond Counsel to ensure that the process and product of the ballot measure conform to applicable laws. Bond Counsel will assist in the wording of related Council resolutions and ordinances, and provide legal advice to staff. Counsel will need to be retained beyond November 2006, through the sale of general obligation bonds, if the ballot measure is approved by voters.

\$14,800 Information Sheets and Meeting Facilitation. A series of public information / fact sheets about the ballot measure will need to be created, printed and distributed at a series of open houses throughout the region.

\$90,000 Options. Council may decide to use one of the strategies employed in the 1995 ballot measure, where options-to-buy certain properties were acquired prior to the vote and included in information sheets, so that citizens would know of specific properties that would be purchased if they voted for the measure. These options-to-buy would only be exercised if the ballot measure were passed. The budget includes \$75,000 for the purchase of options, and \$15,000 for appraisals and other due diligence necessary prior to purchasing the options.

\$25,000 Public Opinion Research. A scientific poll should be conducted to determine various elements of the ballot measure, including what types of property should be purchased, how large the measure should be, and whether it should include other projects beyond open space purchases.

\$5,160 Project Contingency.



**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Date:** February 15, 2005

**Lead Councilor:** Rex Burkholder

**Council Liaisons:** Robert Liberty

**Project Title:** Housing Choice for All

**Project Begin Date:** January 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** March 2006

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

The region's residents have indicated that a diversity of safe, healthy and affordable housing near jobs, schools and transportation facilities is an important regional value, contributing to productive citizenship and quality of life. Yet despite previous efforts by Metro and other public, private, and nonprofit organizations, the supply of such housing remains insufficient (as defined by the Metro Council in Title 7 of the Functional Plan).

The project will answer questions such as: What are the barriers to housing supply? Why is housing not being built as conceived in the 2040 Growth Concept mixed-use areas where substantial infrastructure investment and services currently exist? How could the region achieve the Affordable Housing Goals in Title 7 of the Functional Plan?

The region's housing market is large and complicated by a broad range of stakeholders with varying interests. HCTF will assemble some of the region's key leadership from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors to develop broadly supported strategies for increasing the region's housing supply.

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?):**

The HCTF will complete an analysis and develop a report. The report will include recommendations on policies and programs to:

- o Significantly increase the production of “work-force” housing in the 2040 mixed-use areas and corridors, and other locations in the region.
- o Identify opportunities for Metro to provide leadership, data, funding, and technical assistance in housing production, and prevent the loss of affordable housing.
- o Identify opportunities for local governments and other entities, including non-profit and for-profit organizations to provide leadership, establish partnerships and implement tools and strategies that will increase the supply of affordable housing, while taking into account unique local characteristics.

The work of the HCTF will be considered complete and successful if strategies for implementation have been identified and public, private, and nonprofit partners including Metro have committed to act on the strategies.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

Metro Council has identified, through its strategic planning, an aspiration for the region that “The region’s residents choose from a diversity of housing options” and has declared this as a strategic objective.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The current budget allows for about 2 FTE through June 2005.

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Chair:** Mayor Hammerstad, City of Lake Oswego

**Lead Councilors:** Robert Liberty, Carl Hosticka

**Project Title:** Ballot Measure 37 Task Force

**Project Begin Date:** February 16, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** September 16

**Project Description:**

On December 9, 2004 the Council adopted Resolution No. 04-3520, which provided for the creation of a Measure 37 working group “composed of representatives of local governments in the region and other organizations that will be affected by claims or which can contribute expertise to advise the Metro Council and staff...” The Working Group was directed to

- (a) [Provide advice] “on potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37, coordination among public entities in the region, policy options to maintain the region’s commitment to the 2040 Growth Concept, and a coordinated claims and waiver process.”
- (b) Estimate the potential consequences to the region of compensation of claims filed under Ballot Measure 37, or of waiver of land use restrictions in lieu of compensation, to the extent possible...
- (c) Develop a plan for coordination among Metro and the public entities in the region subject to Ballot Measure 37 on responses to claims submitted under the measure, including a database to record and track claims;
- (d) Develop policy options to respond to the potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37, considering among other matters:
  - (i) Potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37;
  - (ii) Alternative methods to achieve the policies of the Regional Framework Plan and the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept in a post-Ballot Measure 37 environment and to reduce adverse consequences of claims; and
  - (iii) Potential actions by the 2005 Legislative Assembly to mitigate the adverse consequences of Ballot Measure 37 in the region; and
- (e) Develop a proposed process, open to the public, to address claims under Ballot Measure 37:
  - (i) Submitted to Metro and arising from land use restriction in the Metro Code;

- (ii) *Submitted to Metro and arising from land use restrictions in the Metro Code that derive from land use restrictions in state law;*
- (iii) *Submitted to cities and counties within Metro's jurisdiction and arising from land use restrictions in city and county land use regulations that derive from land use restrictions in the Metro Code.*

**Outcomes & Products:**

The outcomes and products for this project, dependent on resources, are:

1. Increased understanding about Measure 37, information exchange and cooperation between Metro and state and local governments regarding claims, claims processing, payments and/or waivers.
2. A public process for reviewing and acting upon Measure 37 claims made against Metro.
3. A public database containing information about Measure 37 claims made in the three-county region.
4. Comments and evaluation of any legislation proposed to modify or replace Measure 37.
5. An estimation of the potential scope and impact of future claims made under Measure 37.
6. Recommendations regarding methods to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept and fulfill other Metro goals and mandates while also implementing Measure 37.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The following Council goals and objectives apply to this project:

- Great Places Goal- “Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible and physically distinct places to live, work and play.”
- Environmental Health 2.5- “urban land is used efficiently and resource land is protected from urban encroachment.”
- Smart Government Goal- “ Metro leads a fiscally sound, efficient and congruent system of governance where public services are funded appropriately and provided by the most suitable units of government.”
- 4.3 “Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.”
- Communications and Leadership Excellence 3.3- “Maintain open working relationships with other governments and organizations and provide a venue for regional collaboration.”

**Resources Required/Budget Implications:**

This project will require between 1.5 and 2.0 FTE for a 6-month period of time. They do not include legal department time. Other expenses should not exceed \$30,000.

**Workplan and Project Activities**

A workplan will be developed during the first few weeks of the project. Various activities and work products will be assigned to staff or informal Task Force subcommittees, or done in consultation with

other Metro advisory committees. The workplan will allow limited resources to be focused on the highest priority for the Task Force while still producing the products and carrying out the activities described in this paper.

***Convening, Coordination & Basic Research***

- Task Force meetings would be staffed;
- Topics outlined in the list of meeting topics would be addressed by the Task Force members;
- A basic data base on claims would be assembled and a simple assessment based on that data base;
- Sharing of information regarding claims made and acted upon by local governments within the three-county area;
- Some mapping of claims;
- Production of web pages with information about claims and the work of the Task Force;
- Evaluation of proposed legislation and;
- A process for claims against Metro will be developed and reviewed by the Council.

Metro's work in developing and maintaining a data base would be aided by work on this subject being done by other governments and by nonprofits.

***Estimating Implications of Measure 37 for the Region and Implications for Achieving the 2040 Growth Concept and Fulfilling Metro's Other Goals and Mandates***

The Task Force will assess trends in the location of claims and initial impacts on adopted Metro policies in coordination with a project with Portland State University (PSU) and other research efforts. To the extent permitted by available time and budget, additional analysis will be performed to evaluate impacts on implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and the execution of state and regional

***Methods for Implementing Measure 37 While Also Achieving the 2040 Growth Concept and Fulfilling Metro's Other Goals and Mandates***

As its highest priority, the Task Force will consider and make recommendations to Metro regarding how to achieve both fairness to landowners and to carry out Metro's 2040 Growth Concept and related planning and Charter goals and mandates.

I:\gm\community\_development\staff\neill\Measure 37\finalprojproposal.doc

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Carl Hosticka

**Council Liaisons:** Susan McLain, Brian Newman

**Project Title:** Nature in the Neighborhoods – Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program Implementation

**Project Begin Date:** June 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** June 2006 and continuing in following years, adapted as necessary to meet new challenges and respond to progress over time.

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

This project will implement the fish and wildlife habitat program adopted by Metro Council in May 2005. The project will address the issue of how to accommodate the growth in this region so that residents can have the access to nature, clean water and healthy streams that they value.

The program is intended to motivate and inspire property owners and residents to be good stewards of the land using a mix of regional land development standards, effective education and awareness about the value of habitat and meaningful incentives for stewardship, including financial incentives.

A guiding principle in the program implementation is to use Metro's resources to leverage the constructive actions of cities and counties, non-profit organizations, businesses and individuals with a program that is broadly supported and integrated for effectiveness. Activities include:

**Government Coordination:** Assist local jurisdictions in improving environmental conditions and in meeting DEQ requirements for Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, State land use planning requirements.

- Complete LCDC acknowledgement process for Goal 5
- Consult with NOAA Fisheries for Endangered Species Act compliance

*February 3, 2005*

- Assist cities and counties in preparing TMDL implementation plan for DEQ Clean Water Act compliance
- Assist cities and counties in meeting Metro's functional plan requirements
- Assist cities and counties in reviewing development code to eliminate barriers to low impact development;
- Apply for grants and other support for cities and county program implementation

**Habitat Friendly Development Program:** Establish a Green Development Practices Program to reduce impacts of new development and increase public awareness of the value of habitat areas.

Activities include:

- Coordinate habitat protection and water quality messages within Metro and with other public message opportunities;
- Promote green development practices to the development community through a variety of technical assistance, education and outreach activities. Examples include an awards program, sponsoring seminars/conferences, and actively working with the development community to promote green development practices.
- Expand public access to stewardship programs through Metro's web site, and/or other tools.
- Provide information to the development community and homeowners about the value of the habitat.

**Monitor and Reporting Program.** Establish a program to monitor regional progress in habitat conservation and restoration and report annually to the Metro Council. Activities include:

- Improve baseline data on existing habitat and water quality conditions
- Develop and implement methods for tracking and recording implementation of restoration projects region-wide
- Coordinate with other agencies that actively collect data to improve consistency in protocol and efficiency in data sharing
- Present a regional progress report on the key environmental indicators approved by Council,
- Participate in state and local task forces to develop monitoring strategies
- Apply for additional funding and partnerships to support monitoring and reporting activities

**Restoration Element.** Support restoration of habitat areas through out the region. The program could focus on directly funding habitat restoration projects or on using Metro's resources to leverage the success from non-profit and other agencies. The proposal below focuses on the latter. Activities include:

- Offer technical and/or financial assistance to groups that are actively conducting restoration projects. Examples include assisting with administrative matters, mapping, coordination or through a grants program
- Coordinate with existing non-profit and governmental agencies to establish restoration priorities for the region, especially in those watersheds where few priorities have been identified;
- Map and track restoration progress
- Seek additional funding for major restoration efforts, including coordinating on federal funding requests.
- Define target areas for acquisition that are key to restoration

**Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Bond Measure:** This effort, being led by the Parks Department and described elsewhere, is an important part of the fish and wildlife program implementation because it sets priorities for target areas and will need to coordinate with the other elements of this program.

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?)**

To be successful and achieve meaningful results, the program must be broadly supported by cities, counties, residents and the development community because the future habitat conditions depend on actions by everyone. A key measure of success will be the level of involvement by not a few but by many.

Overtime, success will be measured by changes in on-the-ground conditions, including measures of how well performance and implementation objectives have been met:

- Preserve and improve streamside, wetland, and floodplain habitat and connectivity.
- Preserve large areas of contiguous habitat and avoid fragmentation.
- Preserve and improve connectivity for wildlife between riparian corridors and upland habitat.
- Preserve and improve special habitats of concern.
- Increase the use of habitat-friendly development throughout the region.
- Increase restoration and mitigation actions to compensate for adverse effects of new and existing development on ecological function.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

This program supports many council goals and objectives dealing with preserving natural areas.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The FY06 budget proposes 4.35 FTE in the Planning Department and Public Affairs Department and additional FTE in Parks.

The FY06 budget includes \$75,000 that Metro expects to receive through an award through a DEQ grant for DEQ TMDL coordination, providing technical assistance for habitat friendly development practices and monitoring.



**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Rod Park

**Council Liaisons:** None

**Project Title:** Oregon Convention Center Subsidy Gap

**Project Begin Date:** February, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** December, 2005

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

In fiscal year 2002-03, the \$116 million expansion of the Oregon Convention Center came in on time and under budget. The expansion almost doubled the size of the center, positioning Portland to compete for a much larger share of the national and international convention market, and add jobs to the region's economy. At the time the funding package was assembled for the facility's expansion, operating funds were identified to sustain the facility only for the short term, with the expectation that the Metro Council, along with public and private sector stakeholders, would develop a longer-term solution.

Since the events of September 11, 2001 and the downturn in the national travel and meeting industries, competition for scarce visitor dollars has become even more intense. Now, Metro must compete with much larger "Tier One" locations such as Las Vegas or San Francisco---parts of the country that never used to compete for the smaller events that typically consider the Portland metro region.

The size of the funding shortfall must be identified, and a funding solution must be developed, or the Oregon Convention Center will be forced to make budget cuts that will jeopardize basic center operations. Metro council and staff will work with appropriate stakeholders to develop a funding solution.

*February 3, 2005*

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?):**

The size and nature of the funding gap will be determined. Funding sources to bridge the gap will be identified and financial commitments will be secured.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The project meets several of the objectives identified by the council:

- The region is strong in tourism jobs.
- Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.
- Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.
- Maintain asset value of facilities through preventative maintenance, monitoring and fully funding renewal and replacement reserve.
- Maintain stable and appropriate level of funding for Metro programs.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The project will be supported with existing MERC staff. Total support will be less than 1 FTE and no special budget allocation will be required.

### **Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Susan McLain

**Council Liaisons:**

**Project Title:** Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update

**Project Begin Date:** January 2004

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Draft -- September 2005; Final -- May 2006

**Project Description:** RSWMP is a ten-year plan for the region, administered by Metro. It sets direction for the future, identifies roles and responsibilities, and fulfills a state requirement that Metro have a waste reduction plan.

The updated Regional Solid Waste Management Plan will provide policy and program direction in waste reduction and facilities and services for the next decade (2006 to 2016). The Plan is shaped in a public process, with local government and private sector service providers as leading partners.

**The main question to be addressed is:** What policy direction for the solid waste system should be charted in the updated Plan?

**Outcome:** An updated RSWMP, which must be approved by Metro Council and DEQ in mid-2006. Interim products will include a vision statement, values, system goals, objectives and policies. The vision, policy and values will be used to set the overall direction for the related disposal system planning activity that will be staged concurrently with the RSW update.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

- 2.3 The region's waste stream is reduced, recovered and returned to productive use, and the remainder has a minimal impact on the environment.
- 2.4 Metro is a model for green business practices.
- 4.1 Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.
- 4.2 Public services are available and equitable.
- 4.3 Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:** Approximately \$80,000 will be expended for consultants (public involvement and plan development). Between 2.5 and 3.0 total FTE (over approximately 12 staff) will be assigned to the project for calendar 2005. Project is funded from Solid Waste Fund, using regional system fee.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPOINTING )  
MEMBERS OF THE BALLOT MEASURE )  
37 TASK FORCE )

RESOLUTION NO. 05-3554  
Introduced by Councilors Carl  
Hosticka and Robert Liberty

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 04-3520 on December 16, 2004 (For the Purpose of Directing the Chief Operating Officer to Formulate Regional Policy Options Relating to Ballot Measure 37);

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 04-3520 directed the Chief Operating Officer to convene a Ballot Measure 37 Work Group composed of representatives of local governments in the region and other organizations that will be affected by claims or which can contribute expertise to advise the Metro Council on potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37, coordination among public entities in the region, policy options to maintain the region's commitment to the 2040 Growth Concept and a coordinated claims and waiver process; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 04-3537 on January 20, 2005 (For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Councilors Carl Hosticka and Robert Liberty as Liaison Councilors to the Ballot Measure 37 Work Group; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that individuals as noted in Exhibit A to this resolution are appointed to serve on the Ballot Measure 37 Task Force.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Exhibit A to Resolution No. 05-3554  
Ballot Measure 37 Task Force Appointments

Judie Hammerstad, Mayor, City of Lake Oswego, Chair  
John Leeper, Washington County Commissioner  
Martha Schrader, Clackamas County Commissioner  
Todd Scheaffer, National Association of Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP), Specht  
Development  
Sheila Martin, Portland State University, Institute for Metropolitan Studies  
Doug Bowlsby, Senior Vice President, Bank of America  
Jim Chapman, President, Legend Homes; President, Home Builders Association of  
Metropolitan Portland  
Mary Kyle McCurdy, Staff Attorney, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Bonny McKnight, Chair of citywide land use organization, Portland  
Keith Fishback, Washington County Farmer  
Margaret Kirkpatrick, Land Conservation and Development Commissioner  
Jack Hoffman, MPAC Chair, ex officio member  
Robert Liberty, Metro Councilor, Council Liaison  
Carl Hosticka, Metro Councilor, Council Liaison

**MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, February 17, 2005  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

There were none.

**2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

**3. METRO CENTRAL ENHANCEMENT GRANT SLATE 2005-06 AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SERVICE**

Councilor Burkholder said there were two enhancement funds established for the north and northwest Portland area. He talked about the funds and introduced Leland Stapleton and Scott Rosenlund, members of the Central Enhancement Committee.

Leland Stapleton said they were on the Metro Central Enhancement Committee. He felt it would be helpful to give information about the program. He provided details on the grant program. He spoke to the criteria for awarding grant funds. Scott Rosenlund talked about the projects that they funded this year. This year the Committee found some discrepancies concerning rental fees. They were able to take these savings and make additional awards. He thanked Karen Blauer, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, and the rest of the Metro staff for their help.

Council President Bragdon asked if there were other elementary schools in the district? Mr. Rosenlund said Chapman School was the only one in the district. Councilor Liberty asked about large grant proposals? Mr. Stapleton said the most they had awarded was \$60,000. They had not had those kinds of requests but were open to this kind of request. Mr. Rosenlund said they had partial funded or fully funded some of the projects depending upon the request. Councilor Liberty asked what the total budget was. Mr. Stapleton responded to his question. Councilor Burkholder presented certificates of appreciation to both Mr. Rosenlund and Mr. Stapleton for their service.

**4. OREGON STATE MARINE BOARD'S ANNUAL AWARD FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE.**

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director, said that Dan Kromer had received an Oregon State Marine Board's Award for Professional Service. This was one of the highest professional awards the Board gave. He felt the award spoke volumes about Mr. Kromer's service. This award in part was based on Mr. Kromer's work on the Chinook Boat Landing. He had also undertaken this type of work with two other smaller facilities. He noted that Mr. Kromer had served Metro for twenty years. Mr. Kromer will also be overseeing the opening of Cooper Mountain. Council President Bragdon presented a plaque to Mr. Kromer.

**5. METRO LEADERSHIP IN RIPARIAN RESTORATION ALONG THE CLACKAMAS RIVER**

Mr. Desmond introduced Curt Zonick. He talked about Metro's restoration projects and his project to control Japanese Knotweed in the Clackamas Watershed. He felt this was a model for the region and the agency.

Curt Zonick, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, presented a power point presentation on riparian restoration along the Clackamas River to eradicate Japanese Knotweed. He spoke to the partners on this project, which included The Nature Conservancy, Americorps, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB), Clackamas River Basin Council, United States Department of Agriculture and State of Oregon. He talked about the noxious weed, Japanese Knotweed. It was an aggressive vegetative weed. He shared how the weed spreads, the distribution of the weed and how it inhibited native plants from growing. Metro managed property in and outside the Metro jurisdictional boundary. He said Metro sought funding from OWEB and was awarded grants over the past several years to go after the weed. He said each of the grant years they had raised funding to pay Americorp workers to flesh out the infestation. The Americorp crew went out and mapped the weed and then began to treat it. He talked about how they got rid of the weed through stem injection. In one year they had killed about 40% of the infestation. He spoke to their outreach efforts. The Clackamas River Basin Council was prepared to take over the project this year.

Councilor Burkholder asked about the property owners that didn't want to cooperate. Was there a way to obtain public right of way to these properties? Mr. Zonick said they had refused a survey but felt they would be willing to participate in eradicating the weed infestation. Mr. Zonick said there were a dozen knotweed groups working in the area. He talked about working cooperatively with their partners and the lead that Metro had taken. Councilor Newman thanked the Americorp volunteers for their hard work. He wondered if there was a ban among the nurseries on this weed. Mr. Zonick said they were working on this. Councilor Park talked about why weeds were brought in to certain areas. He also talked about the injection methods and why it was superior. He appreciated the hard work of Americorp as well. He also noted that Multnomah County no longer supported a weed board and felt that made their work even harder.

**6. CONSENT AGENDA**

6.1 Consideration of minutes of the February 10, 2005 Regular Council Meetings.

6.2 **Resolution No. 05-3538, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Loretta Pickerell to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

Motion:

Councilor McLain moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the February 10, 2005 Regular Metro Council and Resolution No. 05-3538. Councilor Newman seconded the motion.

Councilor McLain spoke to Loretta Pickerell's service on SWAC.

Vote:

Councilors Burkholder, McLain, Liberty, Park, Newman, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.

**7. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING**

**7.1 Ordinance No. 05-1072,** For the Purpose of Amending the FY 2004-05 Budget and Appropriations Schedule Accepting \$850,000 of Federal Funds From the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) For a Regional Travel Options Marketing Campaign; Recognizing \$150,000 of the New Grant Funds to Increase the Materials and Services Budget of the Planning Department to Hire Consultants to Develop and Implement the Marketing Campaign; Transferring \$54,655 of TriMet Grant Funds From Contracted Services to Personal Services to Add 1.0 FTE Regional Travel Options Program Manager (Manager 1); and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1072.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder provided an explanation of this budget amendment. These dollars had been directed to the Metro area. Metro was chosen as the group to carry out the project. The reason why there was a management position being included in the amendment was that the program was being transferred from TriMet to Metro. Councilor Newman talked about the possible cuts to the Regional Travel Options (RTO) program in 2008-09 and asked would it effect this position? Councilor Burkholder said it would effect this position unless other funds were available. Councilor Newman asked Michael Jordan about hiring limited duration positions. Mr. Jordan responded that there was no normal response. They weren't taking on any new staffing with the expectation that the position would transfer to another project. Council President Bragdon acknowledged Councilor Newman's concern. Councilor Burkholder urged support.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1072. No one came forward to testify. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote:	Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, McLain, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
-------	---

**7.2 Ordinance No. 05-1073,** For the Purpose of Amending the FY 2004-05 Budget and Appropriations Schedule Recognizing \$48,820 in Grant Funds and Private Contributions For Specific Projects in the Zoo Operating Fund; Adding \$48,820 to Revenue and Operating Expenses in the Zoo Operating Fund; and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion:	Councilor Newman moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1073.
Seconded:	Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion

Councilor Newman said this amendment recognizing grant funds. They received money to help further mentoring of teenagers to run the Family Farm. These dollars would help increase the amount of hours that our Zoo employees could mentor teenagers. He explained where the grant funds came from. The second program that was being funded was to assist in the breeding program for native Pigmy Rabbits. This was a threaten species and the funds would help with the breeding program. The third program was to help with the veterinarian hospital at the Zoo. Councilor McLain said it sounded like a good project. She asked about the Pigmy Rabbits project. Councilor Newman said the baby rabbits were taken back to Washington State. Council President Bragdon congratulated the Zoo on their efforts.



Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1073. No one came forward to testify. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, McLain, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
---

**8. RESOLUTIONS**

**8.1 Resolution No. 05-3544, For the Purpose of Endorsing an Updated 2005 Regional Position on Reauthorization of Transportation Equity Act For the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21).**

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 05-3544.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder explained the endorsement for transportation funding. He also spoke to Resolution No. 05-3548. One was a one-year appropriation and the other was a six-year reauthorization of funds. There were no major changes. There were several new policies that they were getting comments on but in general this was similar to what had been requested for approval the last time. Councilor McLain talked about the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and asked the Councilors that served on Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) about the update. Councilor Burkholder said the RTP update would be consider this fall. Councilor McLain asked if this was consistent with the RTP? Councilor Burkholder said yes they were. All of these policies were open to further discussion.

Councilor Liberty said he would vote against the resolution. He explained that he supported many of the projects but opposed one project, Sunrise Corridor Project, which he felt, was fundamentally flawed. He explained his rationale for opposing the project. He believed we needed more transportation projects in the Clackamas County area. He was also not comfortable with the RTP projects. He felt they ought to do planning in terms of centers. He asked, were these the best investments? Third, too much transportation planning was done by a small group of experts. He felt they needed a new more transparent process. He felt they needed a fundamental change in the RTP. There had been a lot of progress in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Councilor Park said he would be supporting this resolution. They were not talking about the RTP but federal reauthorization. He suggested that they need to be looking as this as a regional government even if we disagreed with a certain project. He talked about the MTIP list and certain projects that we might not support. The policy that the Council and JPACT had adopted continued to move towards a centers focus. Council President Bragdon said he would be voting yes with some reservations. He felt it would be important to involve the city of Damascus in the Sunrise Corridor project. He agreed this whole process continued to improve. Councilor Hosticka asked about Exhibit B. Councilor Burkholder said this was what a House committee had put out. Councilor Burkholder spoke to the usefulness of this unified regional approach to the region. They were presenting a united front when they went back to Washington DC.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, Newman, McLain, and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 aye, the motion passed with Councilor Liberty voting no.
--

**8.2 Resolution No. 05-3548, For the Purpose of Approving Portland Regional Federal Transportation Priorities For Federal Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriations.**

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 05-3548.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder said this was an appropriation request list. He said each representative was allowed to allocate about \$45 million. This was a request for funding for a regional list. This was their wish list. He urged approval. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on the I-5/I-405 project. Councilor Burkholder responded to his question. Councilor Liberty asked if the Council had taken a position on this project. Councilor Burkholder said they had not taken a position on this project. Councilor Liberty said he questioned certain projects. Councilor Park said this was to request funding for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) so they could determine the best project. He was hopeful that this money could be used to further the center work that was being done. Councilor Liberty asked about the participation of Damascus in this project. Councilor Park asked Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, to respond to the question. Mr. Cotugno said this was intended to examine freeway options, parkway options etc. It was not concluded who would lead the project. Councilor Liberty asked if Damascus could be the lead? Mr. Cotugno said Damascus would be an approval body. Council President Bragdon asked about the MTIP grant and Damascus participation. MTIP funding was set aside for concept planning. The EIS process would look at alternatives. It was an open question what the design or phasing of the project would be. He added that this was a lobbying request. Any federal funds resulting from this request still had to be approved by the Council. Councilor Park commented on the concept planning of that area. He talked about the partnership between Damascus, Metro Council, Clackamas County and Oregon Department of Transportation. He was hopeful this would be a good funding exercise.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, Newman, McLain, and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 aye, the motion passed with Councilor Liberty voting no.
--

**9. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

Michael Jordon, COO, reminded Council that there was a retreat next Wednesday starting at 1:00 pm in Room 601.

**10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

Councilor Burkholder talked about a comment letter that they would like to send to John VanLandingham, Chair of Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). They were looking for a head nod from the Council. This was a major change in the rule. Council President Bragdon asked about the hospital siting in Springfield and if that had caused this proposed rule change. Mr. Cotugno explained the structure of the transportation-planning rule. Councilors asked further questions about the planning rules. Mr. Cotugno provided some history on the issue. Council President Bragdon asked if Council was supportive of this letter. They agreed. Councilor Burkholder acknowledged Tom Kloster's efforts in this area. He had done great work in this area, which was helpful to all of the urban areas around the state.

Councilor Liberty said they had convened the Measure 37 Task Force. They were interested in looking at more details of the Task Force scope of work. They would be meeting to discuss budget implications of the project.

Council President Bragdon said he met with illegal dumping personnel to discuss the program. He felt they had come to some clarification about the program. Councilor McLain said she had helped with the development of this program many years ago. It was only a two county program not a three county program. She had calls from citizens in Washington County about the clean up program. She talked about regional equity. She hoped that they could talk more to Washington County about their program. Council President Bragdon said one of the issues they addressed was regional equity. He explained changes in workdays of the inmates, which would help with cleaning up Washington County areas. He also talked about deputizing our parks rangers in Washington County and the need for changes in that area. He was hopeful to report back in a couple ways.

Councilor McLain said she and Councilor Park met about the neighboring cities issue. They would be providing a project proposal on this issue. They were trying to keep the budget low. Council President Bragdon urged involving the state agencies.

#### **11. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17,  
2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
6.1	Minutes	2/10/05	Metro Council Minutes of February 10, 2005	021705c-01
8.1	Exhibit A	2/17/05	Amended version of Exhibit A to Resolution No. 05-3544	021705c-02
10	Letter	2/10/05	To: John VanLandingham, Chair LCDC From: Council President Bragdon and Councilor Burkholder, JPACT Chair Re: Comments on the proposed amendments to the transportation planning rule	021705c-03
5	Power Point Presentation	2/17/05	To: Metro Council From: Curt Zonick, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department Re: Controlling Japanese Knotweed in the Clackamas Watershed	021705c-04

Resolution No. 05-3551

Exhibit A-1

**Metro Council Project Proposal**  
February 15, 2005

**Lead Councilor:** Susan McLain (West), Rod Park (East)

**Council Liaisons:** None

**Project Title:** Neighbor Cities

**Project Begin Date:** February 25, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Scoping Phase - June 1, 2005

**Project Description:**

The project will open a dialog with neighboring cities to determine their interests and concerns regarding their relationship with the Metro region, and to discuss mutual interests and goals. The discussion may include the following issues: economic and demographic trends, transportation, urban growth, agricultural resources and other natural resources. Urban growth is of particular interest because growth policies in one urban area affect growth pressures in neighboring areas.

The project's first phase is the Scoping Phase, which involves one-on-one contact by a Metro Councilor with local elected officials to solicit and listen to their issues on a range of topics. The COO may visit with the city/county managers prior to a Councilor's visit. Notes will be taken and a summary along with a verbal update will be provided to the Metro Council. The Lead Councilors will make a recommendation to the Council on venues to address shared issues.

Subsequent program activities may include a symposium on shared issues and research on the relationship between the region's economy and the economies of neighboring cities.

The Lead Councilors have divided the neighboring cities assignments as follows:

Councilor McLain - North Plains, Banks, Gaston, Scappose, St. Helens, Yamhill-Carlton, McMinnville, Newberg, Yamhill County and Columbia County.

Councilor Park - Sandy, Boring, Estacada, Canby, Aurora, Hubbard Molalla, Woodburn and Marion County.

**Outcome:**

The outcome of the Scoping Phase of this project is to:

- (1) make contact with the elected officials in the neighboring cities;
- (2) identify issues of mutual concern; and
- (3) make a recommendation to the Metro Council on mechanisms by which the issues might be addressed.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The project directly supports the Council's operating objective to "Maintain open working relationships with other governments and organizations and provide a venue for regional collaboration." It also supports goals and objectives related to economic vitality such as "Land is available to meet the need for housing and employment," and "Access to jobs, services, centers and industrial areas is efficient."

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

Council Support Specialist - 40 hours \$1,200.00

- Appointments
- Master Calendar
- Synthesis/Summary of Issues
- Coordination with other staff
- Follow up

Planning Staff/DRC Staff - 25 hours \$1,500.00

- Prepare support materials as requested by Councilors
- Follow up

Planning staff and DRC support can be accommodated in the budget under the existing allocation for 2040 Refinement Planning. Council support can be incorporated into the existing budget and duties.

I:\gm\community\_development\projects\Urban Partners05\MetroCouncilProjectProposalUrbanPartners.doc

## Metro Council Project Proposal

**Lead Councilor:**

**Council Liaisons:**

**Project Title:** Disposal System Planning

**Project Begin Date:** February 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Draft, November 2005; final, May 2006 (coincident with RSWMP).

**Project Description:** The main purpose of this project is to determine whether the disposal needs of the region are being met in the most efficient and effective manner; and to recommend adjustments where the system can be improved. Historically, Metro has been the primary provider of disposal services, and—through its regulatory authority RSWMP—Metro has ensured that the private disposal system operates in a complementary and environmentally sound manner. Over the last decade, there have been significant changes in the private solid waste industry. This fact, coupled with Metro’s own strategic planning initiative during the last year, call for a timely examination of the regional disposal system and the roles played by the public and private sectors. This project is intended to fulfill such an examination.

**The main questions to be addressed are:** in conjunction with the RSWMP update,

- What does the region need from the disposal system?
- What is the best way to fill those needs?

**Outcome.** This project will provide recommendations and/or policy direction for the regional disposal system. The following specific issues will be addressed. For the 2005 to 2009 timeframe, recommendations on disposal needs including public access, putrescible waste transfer capacity, and dry waste processing; and regulatory needs including entry criteria for new facilities, policy on waste authorizations (“tonnage caps”), allocation of putrescible waste to disposal sites, and recommendations on economic regulation. For the post-2009 period (after the solid waste bonds are retired), policy direction on Metro’s role in the disposal system, and how that role should be filled—*e.g.*, continue to own transfer stations, vs. divest and regulate. If the latter, determine the appropriate regulatory level and model (*e.g.*, leverage market competition vs. franchising vs. “public utility model”). If the former, set in motion the plans for maximizing the asset value of the transfer stations and for transitioning to a private system. These directions will also guide other major decisions including examination of alternative transport modes and procuring a new transport contract by 2009, procurement of a transfer station operating contract by 2010; and addressing the fiscal needs of the agency.

### Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:

- 2.3 The region’s waste stream is reduced, recovered and returned to productive use, and the remainder has a minimal impact on the environment.
- 4.2 Public services are available and equitable.
- 4.3 Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:** Approximately 1.0 FTE is targeted for the project during calendar 2005 over 3 persons: Doug Anderson as project manager, with two assigned staff. The

department has budgeted up to \$50,000 for consultant assistance, primarily technical work related to asset valuation. There are several decision milestones that can affect the direction and level-of-effort during the course of the project, so this resource level is subject to change as the project moves forward. This project is funded from the Solid Waste Fund, using revenue raised from the Regional System Fee.



**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** David Bragdon

**Council Liaisons:** Susan McLain

**Project Title:** Fish and Wildlife Bond Measure November 2006

**Project Begin Date:** February 14, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** November 2006

**Project Description:**

Develop and take before the voters for approval a fish and wildlife property acquisition and restoration bond measure. Bond funds would be used to purchase from willing sellers those properties deemed of the greatest ecological importance for fish and wildlife habitat and fund habitat restoration efforts.

**Outcome:** Take the measure forward to the voters no later than November 2006.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

This program directly meets two of the Council's goals:

**Goal: Great Places**

Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible and physically distinct places to live, work and play

**Objectives:**

*February 3, 2005*

- 1.1 Natural areas, park land and outdoor recreation infrastructure are available near housing and employment
- 1.3 A diversity of artistic, cultural and recreational opportunities is available

**Goal: Environmental Health**

The region's wildlife and people thrive in a healthy urban ecosystem

**Objectives:**

- 2.1 Natural areas are large enough, have appropriate balance of species and are interconnected with other natural areas so that normal ecological processes are maintained.
- 2.2 Our community is inspired to create a better future for wildlife and the environment.
- 2.5 Urban land is used efficiently and resource land is protected from urban encroachment.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

This project will require 0.5 FTE dedicated to it through the vote, planned for November 2006.

The FY 2005-06 Proposed Budget will include a special project allocation request for \$215,136 consisting of the following:

\$60,176 0.5 FTE salary and related fringe benefits. This position will oversee the development of program options for Council consideration and coordinate the multiple public involvement processes necessary.

\$20,000 Bond Counsel. It will be necessary to retain qualified Bond Counsel to ensure that the process and product of the ballot measure conform to applicable laws. Bond Counsel will assist in the wording of related Council resolutions and ordinances, and provide legal advice to staff. Counsel will need to be retained beyond November 2006, through the sale of general obligation bonds, if the ballot measure is approved by voters.

\$14,800 Information Sheets and Meeting Facilitation. A series of public information / fact sheets about the ballot measure will need to be created, printed and distributed at a series of open houses throughout the region.

\$90,000 Options. Council may decide to use one of the strategies employed in the 1995 ballot measure, where options-to-buy certain properties were acquired prior to the vote and included in information sheets, so that citizens would know of specific properties that would be purchased if they voted for the measure. These options-to-buy would only be exercised if the ballot measure were passed. The budget includes \$75,000 for the purchase of options, and \$15,000 for appraisals and other due diligence necessary prior to purchasing the options.

\$25,000 Public Opinion Research. A scientific poll should be conducted to determine various elements of the ballot measure, including what types of property should be purchased, how large the measure should be, and whether it should include other projects beyond open space purchases.

\$5,160 Project Contingency.

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Date:** February 15, 2005

**Lead Councilor:** Rex Burkholder

**Council Liaisons:** Robert Liberty

**Project Title:** Housing Choice for All

**Project Begin Date:** January 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** March 2006

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

The region's residents have indicated that a diversity of safe, healthy and affordable housing near jobs, schools and transportation facilities is an important regional value, contributing to productive citizenship and quality of life. Yet despite previous efforts by Metro and other public, private, and nonprofit organizations, the supply of such housing remains insufficient (as defined by the Metro Council in Title 7 of the Functional Plan).

The project will answer questions such as: What are the barriers to housing supply? Why is housing not being built as conceived in the 2040 Growth Concept mixed-use areas where substantial infrastructure investment and services currently exist? How could the region achieve the Affordable Housing Goals in Title 7 of the Functional Plan?

The region's housing market is large and complicated by a broad range of stakeholders with varying interests. HCTF will assemble some of the region's key leadership from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors to develop broadly supported strategies for increasing the region's housing supply.

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?):**

The HCTF will complete an analysis and develop a report. The report will include recommendations on policies and programs to:

- Significantly increase the production of “work-force” housing in the 2040 mixed-use areas and corridors, and other locations in the region.
- Identify opportunities for Metro to provide leadership, data, funding, and technical assistance in housing production, and prevent the loss of affordable housing.
- Identify opportunities for local governments and other entities, including non-profit and for-profit organizations to provide leadership, establish partnerships and implement tools and strategies that will increase the supply of affordable housing, while taking into account unique local characteristics.

The work of the HCTF will be considered complete and successful if strategies for implementation have been identified and public, private, and nonprofit partners including Metro have committed to act on the strategies.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

Metro Council has identified, through its strategic planning, an aspiration for the region that “The region’s residents choose from a diversity of housing options” and has declared this as a strategic objective.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The current budget allows for about 2 FTE through June 2005.

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Chair: Mayor Hammerstad, City of Lake Oswego**

**Lead Councilors: Robert Liberty, Carl Hosticka**

**Project Title: Ballot Measure 37 Task Force**

**Project Begin Date: February 16, 2005**

**Estimated Date of Completion: September 16**

**Project Description:**

On December 9, 2004 the Council adopted Resolution No. 04-3520, which provided for the creation of a Measure 37 working group “composed of representatives of local governments in the region and other organizations that will be affected by claims or which can contribute expertise to advise the Metro Council and staff...” The Working Group was directed to

- (a) [Provide advice] *“on potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37, coordination among public entities in the region, policy options to maintain the region’s commitment to the 2040 Growth Concept, and a coordinated claims and waiver process.”*
- (b) *Estimate the potential consequences to the region of compensation of claims filed under Ballot Measure 37, or of waiver of land use restrictions in lieu of compensation, to the extent possible...*
- (c) *Develop a plan for coordination among Metro and the public entities in the region subject to Ballot Measure 37 on responses to claims submitted under the measure, including a database to record and track claims;*
- (d) *Develop policy options to respond to the potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37, considering among other matters:*
  - (i) *Potential consequences of claims submitted under Ballot Measure 37;*
  - (ii) *Alternative methods to achieve the policies of the Regional Framework Plan and the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept in a post-Ballot Measure 37 environment and to reduce adverse consequences of claims; and*
  - (iii) *Potential actions by the 2005 Legislative Assembly to mitigate the adverse consequences of Ballot Measure 37 in the region; and*
- (e) *Develop a proposed process, open to the public, to address claims under Ballot Measure 37:*
  - (i) *Submitted to Metro and arising from land use restriction in the Metro Code;*

- (ii) *Submitted to Metro and arising from land use restrictions in the Metro Code that derive from land use restrictions in state law;*
- (iii) *Submitted to cities and counties within Metro's jurisdiction and arising from land use restrictions in city and county land use regulations that derive from land use restrictions in the Metro Code.*

### **Outcomes & Products:**

The outcomes and products for this project, dependent on resources, are:

1. Increased understanding about Measure 37, information exchange and cooperation between Metro and state and local governments regarding claims, claims processing, payments and/or waivers.
2. A public process for reviewing and acting upon Measure 37 claims made against Metro.
3. A public database containing information about Measure 37 claims made in the three-county region.
4. Comments and evaluation of any legislation proposed to modify or replace Measure 37.
5. An estimation of the potential scope and impact of future claims made under Measure 37.
6. Recommendations regarding methods to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept and fulfill other Metro goals and mandates while also implementing Measure 37.

### **Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The following Council goals and objectives apply to this project:

- Great Places Goal- "Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible and physically distinct places to live, work and play."
- Environmental Health 2.5- "urban land is used efficiently and resource land is protected from urban encroachment."
- Smart Government Goal- "Metro leads a fiscally sound, efficient and congruent system of governance where public services are funded appropriately and provided by the most suitable units of government."
- 4.3 "Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope."
- Communications and Leadership Excellence 3.3- "Maintain open working relationships with other governments and organizations and provide a venue for regional collaboration."

### **Resources Required/Budget Implications:**

This project will require between 1.5 and 2.0 FTE for a 6-month period of time. They do not include legal department time. Other expenses should not exceed \$30,000.

### **Workplan and Project Activities**

A workplan will be developed during the first few weeks of the project. Various activities and work products will be assigned to staff or informal Task Force subcommittees, or done in consultation with

other Metro advisory committees. The workplan will allow limited resources to be focused on the highest priority for the Task Force while still producing the products and carrying out the activities described in this paper.

#### ***Convening, Coordination & Basic Research***

- Task Force meetings would be staffed;
- Topics outlined in the list of meeting topics would be addressed by the Task Force members;
- A basic data base on claims would be assembled and a simple assessment based on that data base;
- Sharing of information regarding claims made and acted upon by local governments within the three-county area;
- Some mapping of claims;
- Production of web pages with information about claims and the work of the Task Force;
- Evaluation of proposed legislation and;
- A process for claims against Metro will be developed and reviewed by the Council.

Metro's work in developing and maintaining a data base would be aided by work on this subject being done by other governments and by nonprofits.

#### ***Estimating Implications of Measure 37 for the Region and Implications for Achieving the 2040 Growth Concept and Fulfilling Metro's Other Goals and Mandates***

The Task Force will assess trends in the location of claims and initial impacts on adopted Metro policies in coordination with a project with Portland State University (PSU) and other research efforts. To the extent permitted by available time and budget, additional analysis will be performed to evaluate impacts on implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and the execution of state and regional

#### ***Methods for Implementing Measure 37 While Also Achieving the 2040 Growth Concept and Fulfilling Metro's Other Goals and Mandates***

As its highest priority, the Task Force will consider and make recommendations to Metro regarding how to achieve both fairness to landowners and to carry out Metro's 2040 Growth Concept and related planning and Charter goals and mandates.

I:\gm\community\_development\staff\neill\Measure 37\finalprojproposal.doc

## **Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Carl Hosticka

**Council Liaisons:** Susan McLain, Brian Newman

**Project Title:** Nature in the Neighborhoods – Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program Implementation

**Project Begin Date:** June 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** June 2006 and continuing in following years, adapted as necessary to meet new challenges and respond to progress over time.

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

This project will implement the fish and wildlife habitat program adopted by Metro Council in May 2005. The project will address the issue of how to accommodate the growth in this region so that residents can have the access to nature, clean water and healthy streams that they value.

The program is intended to motivate and inspire property owners and residents to be good stewards of the land using a mix of regional land development standards, effective education and awareness about the value of habitat and meaningful incentives for stewardship, including financial incentives.

A guiding principle in the program implementation is to use Metro's resources to leverage the constructive actions of cities and counties, non-profit organizations, businesses and individuals with a program that is broadly supported and integrated for effectiveness. Activities include:

**Government Coordination:** Assist local jurisdictions in improving environmental conditions and in meeting DEQ requirements for Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, State land use planning requirements.

- Complete LCDC acknowledgement process for Goal 5
- Consult with NOAA Fisheries for Endangered Species Act compliance

*February 3, 2005*



- Assist cities and counties in preparing TMDL implementation plan for DEQ Clean Water Act compliance
- Assist cities and counties in meeting Metro's functional plan requirements
- Assist cities and counties in reviewing development code to eliminate barriers to low impact development;
- Apply for grants and other support for cities and county program implementation

**Habitat Friendly Development Program:** Establish a Green Development Practices Program to reduce impacts of new development and increase public awareness of the value of habitat areas.

Activities include:

- Coordinate habitat protection and water quality messages within Metro and with other public message opportunities;
- Promote green development practices to the development community through a variety of technical assistance, education and outreach activities. Examples include an awards program, sponsoring seminars/conferences, and actively working with the development community to promote green development practices.
- Expand public access to stewardship programs through Metro's web site, and/or other tools.
- Provide information to the development community and homeowners about the value of the habitat.

**Monitor and Reporting Program.** Establish a program to monitor regional progress in habitat conservation and restoration and report annually to the Metro Council. Activities include:

- Improve baseline data on existing habitat and water quality conditions
- Develop and implement methods for tracking and recording implementation of restoration projects region-wide
- Coordinate with other agencies that actively collect data to improve consistency in protocol and efficiency in data sharing
- Present a regional progress report on the key environmental indicators approved by Council,
- Participate in state and local task forces to develop monitoring strategies
- Apply for additional funding and partnerships to support monitoring and reporting activities

**Restoration Element.** Support restoration of habitat areas through out the region. The program could focus on directly funding habitat restoration projects or on using Metro's resources to leverage the success from non-profit and other agencies. The proposal below focuses on the latter. Activities include:

- Offer technical and/or financial assistance to groups that are actively conducting restoration projects. Examples include assisting with administrative matters, mapping, coordination or through a grants program
- Coordinate with existing non-profit and governmental agencies to establish restoration priorities for the region, especially in those watersheds where few priorities have been identified;
- Map and track restoration progress
- Seek additional funding for major restoration efforts, including coordinating on federal funding requests.
- Define target areas for acquisition that are key to restoration

**Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Bond Measure:** This effort, being led by the Parks Department and described elsewhere, is an important part of the fish and wildlife program implementation because it sets priorities for target areas and will need to coordinate with the other elements of this program.

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?)**

To be successful and achieve meaningful results, the program must be broadly supported by cities, counties, residents and the development community because the future habitat conditions depend on actions by everyone. A key measure of success will be the level of involvement by not a few but by many.

Overtime, success will be measured by changes in on-the-ground conditions, including measures of how well performance and implementation objectives have been met:

- Preserve and improve streamside, wetland, and floodplain habitat and connectivity.
- Preserve large areas of contiguous habitat and avoid fragmentation.
- Preserve and improve connectivity for wildlife between riparian corridors and upland habitat.
- Preserve and improve special habitats of concern.
- Increase the use of habitat-friendly development throughout the region.
- Increase restoration and mitigation actions to compensate for adverse effects of new and existing development on ecological function.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

This program supports many council goals and objectives dealing with preserving natural areas.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The FY06 budget proposes 4.35 FTE in the Planning Department and Public Affairs Department and additional FTE in Parks.

The FY06 budget includes \$75,000 that Metro expects to receive through an award through a DEQ grant for DEQ TMDL coordination, providing technical assistance for habitat friendly development practices and monitoring.

**Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Rod Park

**Council Liaisons:** None

**Project Title:** Oregon Convention Center Subsidy Gap

**Project Begin Date:** February, 2005

**Estimated Date of Completion:** December, 2005

**Project Description (What questions will the project answer? What issue/problem will be addressed?):**

In fiscal year 2002-03, the \$116 million expansion of the Oregon Convention Center came in on time and under budget. The expansion almost doubled the size of the center, positioning Portland to compete for a much larger share of the national and international convention market, and add jobs to the region's economy. At the time the funding package was assembled for the facility's expansion, operating funds were identified to sustain the facility only for the short term, with the expectation that the Metro Council, along with public and private sector stakeholders, would develop a longer-term solution.

Since the events of September 11, 2001 and the downturn in the national travel and meeting industries, competition for scarce visitor dollars has become even more intense. Now, Metro must compete with much larger "Tier One" locations such as Las Vegas or San Francisco---parts of the country that never used to compete for the smaller events that typically consider the Portland metro region.

The size of the funding shortfall must be identified, and a funding solution must be developed, or the Oregon Convention Center will be forced to make budget cuts that will jeopardize basic center operations. Metro council and staff will work with appropriate stakeholders to develop a funding solution.

*February 3, 2005*

**Outcome (What will result from the project? What must be in place for the project to be considered complete?):**

The size and nature of the funding gap will be determined. Funding sources to bridge the gap will be identified and financial commitments will be secured.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

The project meets several of the objectives identified by the council:

- The region is strong in tourism jobs.
- Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.
- Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.
- Maintain asset value of facilities through preventative maintenance, monitoring and fully funding renewal and replacement reserve.
- Maintain stable and appropriate level of funding for Metro programs.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:**

The project will be supported with existing MERC staff. Total support will be less than 1 FTE and no special budget allocation will be required.

### **Metro Council Project Proposal**

**Lead Councilor:** Susan McLain

**Council Liaisons:**

**Project Title:** Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update

**Project Begin Date:** January 2004

**Estimated Date of Completion:** Draft -- September 2005; Final -- May 2006

**Project Description:** RSWMP is a ten-year plan for the region, administered by Metro. It sets direction for the future, identifies roles and responsibilities, and fulfills a state requirement that Metro have a waste reduction plan.

The updated Regional Solid Waste Management Plan will provide policy and program direction in waste reduction and facilities and services for the next decade (2006 to 2016). The Plan is shaped in a public process, with local government and private sector service providers as leading partners.

**The main question to be addressed is:** What policy direction for the solid waste system should be charted in the updated Plan?

**Outcome:** An updated RSWMP, which must be approved by Metro Council and DEQ in mid-2006. Interim products will include a vision statement, values, system goals, objectives and policies. The vision, policy and values will be used to set the overall direction for the related disposal system planning activity that will be staged concurrently with the RSW update.

**Connection to Council Goals and Objectives:**

- 2.3 The region's waste stream is reduced, recovered and returned to productive use, and the remainder has a minimal impact on the environment.
- 2.4 Metro is a model for green business practices.
- 4.1 Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.
- 4.2 Public services are available and equitable.
- 4.3 Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.

**Resources Required / Budget Implications:** Approximately \$80,000 will be expended for consultants (public involvement and plan development). Between 2.5 and 3.0 total FTE (over approximately 12 staff) will be assigned to the project for calendar 2005. Project is funded from Solid Waste Fund, using regional system fee.

## BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE	)	RESOLUTION NO. 05-3552A
APPOINTMENTS OF MIKE LEICHNER, RAY	)	
PHELPS, <del>GEORGE SIMMONS</del> MIKE MILLER,	)	Introduced by David Bragdon,
PAUL MATTHEWS, MATT KOROT, AND	)	Council President
MICHELLE POYOUROW TO THE METRO RATE	)	
REVIEW COMMITTEE	)	

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.170 established the Rate Review Committee (RRC) to enhance the credibility of solid waste disposal rates and the rate setting process; to provide a rational, consistent, stable and predictable process for establishing solid waste disposal rates; and to make recommendations to the Metro Council regarding proposed solid waste disposal rates; and,

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.030 states that all members of all Metro Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Council President subject to confirmation by the Council; and,

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.170 authorizes representatives for the RRC; and,

WHEREAS, terms have expired and vacancies have occurred in the RRC membership; and,

WHEREAS, the Council President has appointed Mike Leichner and Ray Phelps to represent persons engaged in the business of hauling solid waste, ~~George Simmons~~ Mike Miller to represent persons with business-related financial experience, Paul Matthews as the member with experience in establishing rates, Matt Korot to represent persons involved with a local recycling or waste reduction program, and Michelle Poyourow to represent citizen ratepayers, subject to confirmation by the Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2) limits advisory committee members to serving no more than two consecutive full two year terms on the same committee; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the resolution would result in a third consecutive two-year term for Mr. Matthews, notwithstanding the provisions of Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, Mr. Matthews is a recognized, independent expert on rate-setting who has specialized and unique knowledge of solid waste rates; who has no direct interest, financial or otherwise, in the recommendations of the committee; and who, through his voluntary participation on the committee, provides considerable value to Metro for which he would be compensated in his normal line of business; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council confirms the appointments of Mr. Leichner, Mr. Phelps, Mr. ~~Simmons~~ Miller, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Korot, and Ms. Poyourow to Metro's RRC. Mr. Matthews' appointment is notwithstanding Metro Code section 2.19.030(c)(2).

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

0303050..  
04

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPRESSING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 05- 3556
RESPECT FOR MAURICE CHEEKS	)	
	)	Introduced by Metro Council President
		David Bragdon

WHEREAS, the Metro Council represents the 1.3 million citizens of the metropolitan area, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has an interest in the recreational and cultural facilities of our region, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council values the spirit of teamwork which enables 25 cities in our region to function together as a team, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council is also concerned with the future and "growth management," and

WHEREAS, Maurice Cheeks worked valiantly to coach a collection of players to grow and function as a team, and

WHEREAS, Maurice Cheeks embodies the ethics and community spirit we value; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council does resolve:

1. To thank Coach Maurice Cheeks for the example of hard work and team spirit he has set for our community, and
2. To wish Coach Maurice Cheeks all the best in his future endeavors.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 3rd day of March, 2005

---

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

M E M O R A N D U M

030305c-03

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736

TEL 503 797 1700 FAX 503 797 1794



METRO

DATE: February 17, 2005

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Ted Leybold: Principal Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Final Cut List Recommendations

\* \* \* \* \*

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a report that summarizes the selection of projects and programs to receive federal funding. There are three general categories of decision processes that select the projects to receive federal funds and lead to the adoption of the MTIP report (currently scheduled for fall 2005).

First, federal (and state) funding for transportation projects administered by the Oregon Department of Transportation are selected by the Oregon Transportation Commission through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. The draft STIP proposes funding for transportation projects in the Metro region in the following amounts for federal fiscal years 2006 through 2009:

**Draft ODOT 2006-09 STIP (Metro Area)**

Highway and Road Modernization (Capacity):	\$202.3 million
Road Safety projects	\$14.1 million
Road Operations	\$16.4 million
Road Preservation	\$85.6 million
Bridge projects	\$24.2 million
Bicycle/Pedestrian	\$1.8 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$344.2 million</b>

This does not include other funds forecasted at approximately \$32 million that have yet to be programmed or determined to be inside or outside the Metro area. It also does not include the forecasted \$108 million for maintenance and \$9.8 for planning and project development work in Region One that is not programmed in the STIP. It also does not include projects from the Metro region that may be funded through the Transportation Enhancements program (\$7.9 million statewide in 2007-08).



For further information regarding the STIP process, contact Jill Vosper at 503-986-4124 or visit the ODOT website at [www.odot.state.or.us/stip](http://www.odot.state.or.us/stip).

Secondly, the public transportation agencies TriMet and SMART are forecasting the following federal transportation funding support in 2006 through 2009 to be programmed in the MTIP:

**Draft Transit 2006-09 STIP (Metro Area)**

Operating Assistance	\$132.2 million
Bus & Rail Fleet Maintenance	\$29.3 million
Requested Capital Projects (2006 only)	\$69.3 million
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-205 LRT</li> <li>• Beaverton-Wilsonville Commuter Rail</li> <li>• South Waterfront Streetcar</li> <li>• Bus and Rail Maintenance Facilities</li> </ul>	

Local revenues generated by these transit agencies through employer taxes and other sources are not programmed in the MTIP. Local agency revenues such as state transportation trust fund pass through revenues to cities and counties (approximately 40% of state gas and weight-mile taxes and other fees), and other locally generated transportation revenues are also not programmed in the MTIP report.

Finally, regional flexible funds, (from the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) grant programs) are being allocated through the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 competitive application process. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council will award \$62.3 million of funds for fiscal years 2008 and 2009. This will add to the \$54.75 million of these funds previously selected for funding in years 2006 and 2007.

The Metro staff recommendation to the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) included a base package of projects that most clearly implement the program objectives and policy guidance provided by JPACT and the Metro Council. The recommendation included projects in the emphasis modal categories where clear technical score breaks distinguish those projects from lower scoring projects in those categories, program funding at levels consistent with previous allocations, and projects from the non-emphasis categories that best meet the additional policy direction as to when to propose funding for those projects. Consideration of a fair and reasonable contribution from regional flexible fund sources was also given to projects when special circumstances warranted such as large project cost, multiple agency interests or project cost increase responsibility.

Additionally, a list of "Potential Adds" projects that represent projects that also addressed the program objectives and policy guidance provided by JPACT and the Metro Council but not as distinctly as the recommended base package of projects was presented for further consideration. From these projects, TPAC recommended two options (Options A and B) of a final list of projects and program funding for public comment and JPACT and Metro Council consideration. These recommendations are listed in the attached table titled "Funding Recommendations".

Also attached is a summary of the Transportation Priorities program objectives and policy direction to staff on the development of a recommended set of projects proposed for funding and an explanation of how the TPAC recommendations meet these policy directives.

# Funding Recommendations

## Transportation Priorities 2006-09

	Project code	Project name	Metro Staff Recommendation		TPAC Recommendation <sup>3</sup>	
			Base package recommendation (millions of \$) <sup>1</sup>	Potential Adds <sup>2</sup>	Option A funding amounts	Option B funding amounts
<b>Planning &amp; Travel Options</b>	<b>Planning</b>					
	PI0005	Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0.300		\$0.300	\$0.300
	PI0001	MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1.731		\$1.731	\$1.731
	PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$2.000		\$2.000	\$2.000
	PI5053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.300		\$0.300	\$0.300
	PI0002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500		\$0.500	\$0.500
	PI1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.688		\$0.688	\$0.688
	PI8000	Bike Model and Interactive Map: region wide		\$0.201		\$0.201
	PI0004	Livable Streets Update: region wide		\$0.200		
	<b>Bike/Trail</b>					
	Bk1009	Springwater Trail-Sellwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umatilla	\$1.629		\$1.629	\$1.629
	BK4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	\$0.685	\$1.651	\$0.966
	Bk2055	Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310		\$0.310	\$0.310
	Bk2052	MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction	\$0.890		\$0.890	\$0.890
	Bk5026	Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 5-6)	\$0.742		\$0.742	
	Bk3012	Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675		\$0.675	\$0.675
	Bk3072	Powerline Trail (north): Schuepbach Park to Burntwood Dr. (ROW)		\$0.600	\$0.600	\$0.600
	Bk5110	Jennifer St:16th to 122nd		\$0.550		
	<b>Pedestrian</b>					
	Pd3163	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.660		\$0.660	\$0.660
	Pd5054	Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450		\$0.450	\$0.450
	Pd2105	Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside		\$1.400	\$0.900	
	Pd1227	Tacoma St: 6th to 21st		\$1.402		
	Pd1202	SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry		\$0.538	\$0.538	
	<b>Regional Travel Options</b>					
	n/a	Program management & administration	\$0.340		\$0.340	\$0.340
	n/a	Regional marketing program	\$2.960		\$2.960	\$2.460
	n/a	Regional evaluation	\$0.300		\$0.300	\$0.300
	n/a	1 TravelSmart project	\$0.500		\$0.500	\$0.500
	n/a	1 TravelSmart project		\$0.500		
	<b>Transit Oriented Development</b>					
	TD8005	Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$3.000		\$3.000	\$2.500
	TD0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1.000	\$0.500	\$1.000	\$1.500
	TD0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2.000	\$1.000	\$2.650	\$2.000
	TD0004	Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment		\$0.500	\$0.500	
	<b>Transit</b>					
	Tr1001	I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16.000		\$16.000	\$16.000
	Tr1002	I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600		\$2.600	\$2.600
	Tr8035	Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750		\$2.750	\$2.750
	Tr1106	Eastside Streetcar (Con)		\$1.000	\$1.000	
	Tr5126	South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II		\$1.150	\$1.150	\$1.000
	<b>Road Capacity</b>					
	RC6014	SW Greenburg Road: Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1.000		\$1.000	\$1.000
	RC1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)		\$1.411		\$1.000
	RC7000	SE 172nd Ave: Phase I; Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW + \$1.0m)		\$2.000		\$2.000
RC6127	Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street		\$1.400			
RC2110	Wood Village Blvd: Arata to Halsey		\$0.815			
<b>Road Reconstruction</b>						
RR1053	Naito Parkway: NW Davis to SW Market		\$3.840			
Fr3166	10th Avenue at Highway 8 intersections		\$0.837			
RR2035	Cleveland St: NE Stark to SE Powell		\$1.540		\$1.000	
<b>Boulevard</b>						
Bd3020	Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$0.580	\$1.140	\$0.580	\$0.580	
Bd1051	Burnside Street: Bridge to E. 14th (PE)	\$1.650		\$1.650	\$1.650	
Bd1260	Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (PE)	\$0.400		\$0.400	\$0.400	
<b>Freight</b>						
Fr4063	N Lombard: Slough over crossing	\$2.210		\$2.210	\$2.210	
Fr3016	SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS: I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0.341		\$0.341	\$0.341	
Fr4087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$1.800	
Fr6086	Kinsman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1.400		\$1.400	\$1.400	
Fr8008	Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System: Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0.179		\$0.179	\$0.179	
<b>Large Bridge</b>						
RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.500	\$1.000	\$1.500	\$2.000	
<b>Green Streets</b>						
GS1224	NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2.457		\$2.457	\$2.457	
GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1.000		\$1.000	\$1.000	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$56.908</b>	<b>\$25.109</b>	<b>\$62.931</b>	<b>\$62.867</b>

<sup>1</sup> **Base Package:** Project and program funding that best meet policy objectives and direction from a technical evaluation perspective.

<sup>2</sup> **Potential Adds:** Projects and program funding that meet policy objectives and direction, but not as definitively as the Base Package recommendation. Need policy-level determination of which projects/programs to include in the final funding package.

<sup>3</sup> **Options A & B:** Transportation Policy Alternative Committee (TPAC) recommendation options for public comment and JPACT/Metro Council consideration.

: Reduction from Base Package recommendation

## **Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Policy Objectives**

The primary policy objective for the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 program is to leverage economic development in priority 2040 land-use areas through investments that support:

2040 Tier I and II mixed-use areas (central city, regional centers, town centers, main streets and station communities)

2040 Tier I and II industrial areas (regionally significant industrial areas and industrial areas), and

2040 Tier I and II mixed-use and industrial areas within UGB expansion areas with completed concept plans

Other policy objectives include:

- emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue
- complete gaps in modal systems
- develop a multi-modal transportation system with a strong emphasis on funding bicycle, boulevard, freight, green street demonstration, pedestrian, regional transportation options, transit oriented development and transit projects and programs
- meet the average biennial requirements of the State Implementation Plan for air quality for the provision of pedestrian and bicycle facilities (5 miles of bicycle improvements and 1.5 miles of pedestrian improvements, independent of road/bridge capacity or reconstruction projects)

## **Implementation of Program Policy Objectives For Narrowing To Final Cut List**

1. Support economic development in priority land use areas.

In addition to the quantitative technical summary, provide information in the staff report on how each project or modal category of projects addresses:

- link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs,
- transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
- support of livability and attractiveness of the region.

2. Emphasize priority modal categories in the following manner:
  - A. Emphasize projects in the bicycle, boulevard, freight, green street demonstration, pedestrian, regional transportation options, transit oriented development and transit categories by:
    - proposing the top-ranked projects at clear break points in technical scoring in all of the emphasis categories (with limited consideration of qualitative issues and public comments).
  - B. Nominate projects in the road capacity, reconstruction or bridge categories when the project competes well within its modal category for 2040 land use technical score and over all technical score, and the project best addresses (relative to competing candidate projects) one or more of the following criteria:
    - project leverages traded-sector development in Tier I or II mixed-use and industrial areas;
    - funds are needed for project development and/or match to leverage large sources of discretionary funding from other sources;
    - the project provides new bike, pedestrian, transit or green street elements that would not otherwise be constructed without regional flexible funding (new elements that do not currently exist or elements beyond minimum design standards).
  - C. When considering nomination of applications to fund project development or match costs, address the following:
    - Strong potential to leverage discretionary (competitive) revenues.
    - Partnering agencies illustrate a financial strategy (not a commitment) to complete construction that does not rely on large, future allocations from Transportation Priorities funding.
    - Partnering agencies demonstrate how dedicated road or bridge revenues are used within their agencies on competing road or bridge priorities.
3. As a means of further emphasis on implementation of Green Street principles, the following measures should also be implemented:
  - Staff may propose conditional approval of project funding to further review of the feasibility of including green street elements, particularly interception and infiltration elements.
  - Strong consideration will be given to funding the Livable Streets Update application in the Planning category. This work would document the latest research and further the training and education of green street implementation in the region.

## **Transportation Priorities 2006-09: *Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept***

### **Explanation of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Project/Program Recommendations**

Following is a summary of the rationale used by Metro staff to implement the policy direction provided by JPACT and the Metro Council in developing a Final Cut List recommendation. The summary is organized by mode category.

#### **Bike/Trail**

- The top six technically ranked projects were nominated for inclusion in the final cut list base package. The fourth, fifth and sixth ranked projects had similar technical scores while there is a more pronounced break point between the sixth and seventh ranked project.
- The Marine Drive trail gaps project was initially reduced in recommended funding in the Base package by the amount that project was thought likely to receive through the state Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding program. Subsequent communication with the TE staff indicates the project is not likely to receive funding through that program. TPAC recommended this funding be restored in the Option A add package.
- The Trolley Trail project was reduced in recommended funding in the Base package by half to allow coordination with the area sewer districts for the potential use of the trail right-of-way for a sewer trunk line. Slowing the rate of funding for this project would allow better construction coordination and the potential for shared construction costs. The Option B package would eliminate all funding consideration for this project in this funding cycle.
- Right-of-way for the Powerline Trail from Schuepback Park to Burntwood Drive is included in the Option A package to help secure the undeveloped Mt. Williams property where the project is located prior to the expiration of a purchase option owned by a consortium seeking to secure the property for park and trail use.
- The projects included in the Base package will meet progress needed on air quality Transportation Control Measures of 5 miles per biennium. Option A proposed projects would provide 7.6 miles of new bicycle facilities. Option B proposed projects would provide a total of 5.5 miles of new bicycle facilities. However, the location of the 2.3 miles of MAX multi-use path project is located in the Gresham regional and Rockwood town centers and therefore is eligible to meet required pedestrian improvements. As proposed funding for the Pedestrian improvements may not meet air quality TCM requirements (further definition is needed for the Forest Grove Town Center project) a portion of the MAX path project may be needed to meet the pedestrian projects need.

## Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the bicycle modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

None of the projects in the bicycle/trail category remove or reduce a congestion barrier that is preventing development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, all of the projects, other than the Springwater Trailhead project, would provide an alternative mode option to priority land use areas that have or are forecast to have congestion.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The development of a regional bike system and bike access to 2040 priority land use areas contribute to the economic vitality of the region by increasing bike trips that do not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces in those areas where efficient use of land is most critical. The provision of a well-designed network of bicycle facilities also contributes to the overall livability and attractiveness to both companies and work force to locate in the region.

### *Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

On-street bicycle projects, outside of vehicle capacity or reconstruction projects that are required to build bike facilities, only have the dedicated funding of a state program that allocates approximately \$2.5 million per year to bicycle and pedestrian projects on state facilities. Off-street trails are one of several eligible project types that compete for statewide Transportation Enhancement grants of approximately \$4 million per year. Additionally, one percent of state highway trust fund monies passed through to local jurisdictions must be spent on the construction or maintenance of bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

### *Complete gaps in modal systems*

The bicycle projects recommended for further consideration all complete gaps in the existing bicycle network. While the Springwater Trailhead project does not strictly complete a gap in the provision of a bike trail or lane, it does provide needed user facilities on the trail system that do not exist today.

### *Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

### *Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

The bicycle and trail projects recommended for further consideration would provide 8.65 miles of a required 5 miles of new bicycle facilities for the two-year funding period. This

assumes the MAX multi-use path project in Gresham would be applied to meeting requirements for the provision of pedestrian facilities and is included in the calculation of that category.

## **Boulevard**

- The top three technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration as there is a clear break point between the third and fourth ranked projects.
- As the Rose Biggi project is adjacent to the TOD acquisition site in Beaverton that is also recommended for funding, only preliminary engineering is recommended in the base package to reserve availability of resources for other areas of the region. PE is the minimum effort necessary to sustain momentum on the extension of the road north to Hall Boulevard.
- The Burnside Street project may receive a federal earmark that would complete PE funding for this project phase.
- Recommended funding for the Killingsworth project is reduced by the amount the project is likely to receive through the state Transportation Enhancement funding program. This recommendation may be revisited as the TE funding award process progresses. PE funding is recommended for the remaining segment between N Commercial and NE MLK Boulevard.

## Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the boulevard modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Boulevard projects recommended support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

None of the projects in the boulevard category remove or reduce a congestion barrier that is preventing development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, all of the projects would enhance the trip end experience for users of alternative modes to access priority land use areas that have or are forecast to have congestion.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The recommended projects are a direct investment in priority 2040 mixed land use areas and support further economic development in those areas by providing the facilities and

amenities necessary to support higher densities of development, a mix of land use types and higher percentage of trips by alternative modes and by enhancing land values in the vicinity of the project.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

While elements of Boulevard projects are eligible for different sources of transportation funding, they have no source of dedicated funding to strategically implement these types of improvements in priority 2040 land use areas.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The recommended projects add new or enhance existing pedestrian and some bike facilities to the regional network. The Rose Biggi project would construct a new collector level motor vehicle connection within a regional center to meet regional guidance on street connectivity.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

The Boulevard projects recommended for further consideration would only provide preliminary engineering funds and therefore not contribute to the required 5 miles of new bicycle facilities and 1.5 miles of pedestrian facilities for the two-year funding period.

**Large Bridge**

- The Sellwood Bridge type, size and location study and preliminary environmental work is proposed for funding in the base package in the amount of \$1.5 million.
- The recommendation for this project is based on this project best meeting the policy direction for inclusion of projects in the non-emphasis categories. The project has the potential for regional flexible funds to seed local and state project development funds that could then leverage a large allocation from federal and state Bridge Replacement funds to reconstruct the Sellwood Bridge. ODOT Region One is proposing \$1.5 million in STIP funding for this project with the County providing \$2.1 million of matching funds. These funds will be used to solicit \$12.8 million additional funds, currently under recommendation by the state bridge committee to the Oregon Transportation Commission for PE and right-of-way costs. The total effort will be used to solicit additional HBRR and other federal funds in the future to complete construction of the project.
- An additional \$500,000 is recommended in the Option B package to solicit discussion on the need for additional Transportation Priorities funding to secure the \$12.8 million of HBRR Local Bridge funds.



## Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the large bridge modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Sellwood Bridge project supports the redevelopment of the South Waterfront and Tacoma main street and the greater North Milwaukie industrial area. Industrial, office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas.

Due to bridge cracking, the Sellwood Bridge is currently closed to all vehicles greater than 10,000 lbs gross vehicle weight. This represents a significant barrier to the attractiveness for any business development in the vicinity of the bridge that would rely on truck access.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

With one 4-foot sidewalk occluded by light and sign posts, narrow travel lanes and no bike lanes, the current bridge is a significant barrier to access to the network of multi-use paths and bicycle lanes in the area. A new bridge provide greater connectivity between the east and west sides of the Willamette River.

### *Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

Bridge projects receive dedicated sources of revenue from federal and state funding sources. Award of these funds is done on a competitive process and allocation of regional flexible funds would be intended to develop enough project detail to effectively compete for those sources of revenue.

### *Complete gaps in modal systems*

Meets the narrowing policy objectives of and providing new pedestrian and bicycle facilities that do not exist and are not likely to be constructed without programming of regional flexible funds. The project would also reopen the bridge to freight and transit traffic that is currently rerouted to the Ross Island Bridge approximately 2.5 miles to the north.

### *Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, a new bridge would provide new bicycle lanes, replace a single side substandard sidewalk, provide local freight access and serve two regional bus routes that can no longer use the current bridge.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*  
As a replacement or reconstruction project, this project does not address this policy goal.

### **Green Streets**

- The top technically ranked green street demonstration projects for street and culvert retrofits are recommended for the final cut list base package. While these were the only candidate applicants in these categories, both are strong projects and worthy of funding.
- The Cully Boulevard project will provide improvements in a 2040 mixed-use main street located in a low-income and minority community and will provide technical data on water quantity/quality improvements associated with green street techniques.
- The Beaver Creek Culverts project will support recovery of endangered species, removing barriers associated with transportation facilities and will leverage a large local match and state restoration grant (70% of total project cost). To balance the program, funding is recommended to be reduced by \$470,000 to a regional share of \$1,000,000. The reduction would need to be made up from other sources or by a reduction in work scope such as reconstructing 2 of the 3 culverts or constructing lower-cost retrofit options.

### Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the green street modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

#### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Cully Street project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure. Additionally, green street design principals and the removal of fish barrier culverts are part of the region's management plan to address the listing of several native fish species under the federal endangered species act. Demonstrating programmatic implementation of the management plan is important to staying in compliance with the act and preventing lawsuits or federal actions that could hinder future ability to attract traded sector jobs to the region.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

Neither of the applications address a specific transportation congestion barrier to development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, the Cully project would provide on-street parking, sidewalks and bicycle lanes that are lacking today and deter access and investment in the area.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The Cully Street demonstration project supports the economic development of a mixed-use main street. As a demonstration project for innovative stormwater management techniques in the public right-of-way, the project has the potential to promote a less costly, environmentally sensible means of managing stormwater runoff region wide. The Beaver Creek culverts retrofit project support economic development by supporting the provision of wildlife within an urban area, increasing its attractiveness to companies and work force to locate in the area.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue.*

There are no sources of dedicated revenue to support the demonstration of innovative stormwater management techniques in the public right-of-way. There are state grants available through the Oregon Water Enhancement Board to restore stream habitat, including retrofit or replacements of culverts. However, these grants require local match funds and are competitive relative to the needs and range of project eligibility.

*Complete gaps in modal systems.*

As a demonstration project category, Green Streets projects do not directly address this policy.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan.*

As a demonstration project category, Green Streets projects do not directly address this policy.

## **Freight**

- All or a portion of the top five technically ranked projects are recommended for further consideration by Metro staff in the freight category. There was a clear break point in the technical score between the fifth and sixth ranked projects.
- The Base package proposes to split with the Port of Portland the increase in project costs discovered subsequent to application for and the proposed award of OTIA III funds to the N Leadbetter railroad over crossing project. Option B restores full funding of the cost increase to the project.

## Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the freight modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Lombard Slough over crossing project is the central freight connector through the region's largest regionally significant industrial area with 190 companies and 8,000 industrial jobs. If the Lombard Slough over crossing is weight limited in the future, it would require an 11 mile out-of-direction travel between South Rivergate, where many traded-sector companies are located, and Terminal 6, the region's only inter-modal container terminal. The Leadbetter extension project would provide grade-separated access over a rail spur from a large traded-sector employer (Columbia Sportswear) and developing industrial land to the entrance of Terminal 6, extending the capacity of the existing warehouse facility and number of potential employees located there.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

Without the Lombard Slough bridge improvement, a 113 acre vacant parcel, one of 25 industrial sites of statewide significance identified by the Governor's Industrial lands Task Force and the potential for an additional 1,000 new jobs (scenario of recent Vestas proposal), would not be able to fully develop. The Leadbetter extension project would increase attractiveness to three developable parcels in the vicinity by creating an alternative to increasing number and length of delays caused by rail traffic blockage. The Tualatin-Sherwood ATMS project would improve operating efficiencies of a congested major freight route connecting a large industrial area, including several hundred acres of vacant industrial land brought into the UGB in 2002 and 2004, with I-5 and 99W. The Kinsman Road project would create a new extension from an existing regional freight road connector and provide new access for 175 acres of vacant industrial land in west Wilsonville that is awaiting development until local concurrency requirements for road capacity can be met.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

By supporting the retention and expansion of traded-sector companies that can grow jobs independent of local economic conditions and supply high-wage jobs, freight projects as a category support the livability and attractiveness of the region.

The freight data collection infrastructure would provide data that would allow more accurate tracking and forecasting of truck movements to better understand freight transportation needs in the region.

### *Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

The five recommended freight projects are road capacity, reconstruction or operations projects. These projects are eligible for funding through state trust fund and pass through

revenues. The OTIA III process has also dedicated \$100 million of statewide funding to these types of projects.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The Lombard slough over-crossing project would prevent the closure of freight traffic on the regional freight system. The Kinsman Road and Leadbetter projects would provide new connections to the motor vehicle system.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

As capacity, reconstruction or operational projects, this project category does not address this policy goal.

**Planning**

On-Going

- MPO Required Planning is recommended for funding. This funding continues the practice of previous allocations (adjusted 3% annually for inflation) to the Metro planning department for the provision of regional transportation planning services necessary to carry out MPO functions. Use of regional flexible funds for this purpose began as an alternative to collection of dues from local transportation agencies.
- Regional Freight Planning is recommended for funding. Funding for regional freight planning services began in FFYs 2004 and 2005 as freight and economic development became prominent regional and political issues. This allocation would fund these services for 2006 through 2009.

Corridor Planning

- The Milwaukie light rail Supplemental EIS is recommended for funding at \$2.0 of its \$3.725 million cost from regional flexible funds. This effort is needed to make the project eligible to receive federal funds.
- The Willamette Shoreline – Highway 43 Transit alternatives analysis is proposed for funding. Preliminary engineering phase is not recommended at this time but should await further development of a strategy for corridor improvements through the AA process.
- Three of the four Multi-Use master plans (Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, and the Mt. Scott to Scouter's Loop trail) are recommended for funding. These trail projects span multiple local jurisdictions that need technical support to prepare trails to enter preliminary engineering and continue efforts provided at Metro to developing regional trail projects through implementation of the Greenspaces bond measure. The Sullivan's Gulch trail is not recommended for funding as it was not indicated as a local priority to the city of Portland and to the degree of cooperation and effort that will be needed to complete master planning work for this project.

- The Next Priority Corridor analysis is recommended for funding. This work would address the fourth corridor from regional flexible funds of the 18 corridor plans the state Department of Land Conservation and Development requires the region to complete as part of the adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan. JPACT has requested ODOT also contribute to the completion of a second corridor study in this time frame conditioned on regional funding of one corridor study.

#### Planning Enhancements

- The Bicycle Interactive Map and Model Update is recommended for funding in the Option 2 package.

#### Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the planning category addresses the following policy guidance.

##### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

None of the candidate planning activities claimed a direct link to the retention or attraction of a specific traded-sector business to the region. However, planning activities are necessary to ensure federal funding eligibility and adequate transportation services to the region, both essential to retaining and attracting traded-sector businesses to the region in general.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of frequent transit service. The Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS and the Willamette Shoreline AA are steps in providing reliable frequent transit service to the Central City and Milwaukie and Lake Oswego town centers, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas. Other planning activities proposed for funding support economic development by ensuring the 2040 priority land use areas are adequately served by transportation services and that requirements are met to allow state and federal funding to be allocated to projects serving those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Transportation planning activities support the livability and attractiveness of the region by ensuring the transportation system adequately serves the comprehensive land use plans of the region and local communities.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

General planning transportation activities, but not specific corridor planning activities, are supported through limited federal planning revenues, though not enough to cover planning services provided to the region.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

Planning activities identify and direct funding to projects that complete gaps in modal systems.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

Planning activities identify and direct funding to projects that develop multi-modal systems. This is an emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

While used to develop, coordinate and report on the implementation of the annual requirements, planning does not construct new facilities to meet State air quality plan requirements.

**Pedestrian**

- The top two technically ranked projects are recommended for funding on the final cut list base package as there is a clear break in the technical scoring between the second and third ranked projects and no clear break between the third and fifth ranked projects.
- \$900,000 is recommended for the Rockwood Pedestrian to MAX project is in the Option A package.
- The Capitol Highway (PE) pedestrian project is recommended for funding in the Option A package.
- The ODOT Preservation Supplement request is a result of regional policy request to ODOT. The funding amount from regional flexible funds would provide cost sharing with ODOT Region One from funding proposed in the draft STIP outside of their preservation program to provide pedestrian and potentially bicycle and transit improvements in conjunction with their preservation work. It appears at this time that ODOT will be able to provide pedestrian improvement treatments on the two urban preservation projects (Powell Boulevard: 50th to I-205, and NW Yeon) with existing STIP revenues. A preliminary cost analysis of adding bicycle lanes on SE Powell between 71<sup>st</sup> and 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenues, consistent with the Portland TSP, was cost prohibitive at between \$5 and \$7 million as a preservation supplement project.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the pedestrian modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

*Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Pedestrian projects recommended support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of a well-connected local street system to support walking trips within the mixed-use area. The Forest Grove and Milwaukie town center pedestrian projects are steps in providing pedestrian access on their well connected downtown street networks, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The pedestrian projects recommended contribute to the economic vitality of the Forest Grove and Milwaukie mixed-use areas by providing access by users who would not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

Pedestrian projects outside of vehicle capacity or reconstruction projects that are required to build bike facilities only have dedicated funding limited to a state program that allocates approximately \$2.5 million per year or as one of several eligible project types that compete for statewide Transportation Enhancement grants of approximately \$4 million per year. Additionally, one percent of state highway trust fund monies passed through to local jurisdictions must be spent on the construction or maintenance of bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The pedestrian projects recommended for further consideration all complete gaps, either with new facilities or upgrading substandard facilities, in the existing pedestrian network.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

The pedestrian projects recommended for further consideration would provide .26 miles (+ Forest Grove – still confirming length of project) of a required 1.5 miles of new pedestrian facilities within mixed-use areas for the two-year funding period. The MAX multi-use path project, evaluated in the Bike/Trail category could contribute a portion of its 2.32 miles of pedestrian improvement to meet air quality plan requirements for the provision of pedestrian facilities as it is located in the Gresham regional and Rockwood town centers.



## Road Capacity

- The SW Greenberg Road project in the Washington Square regional center is recommended for funding as the top tier road capacity project with a clear break point in project score between it and the next tier of projects (#2 through #5). The \$1 million request would complete project funding of local resources and prior regional award of PE funds for a total project cost of \$5 million.
- The Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls Ferry/Oleson Road intersection project is located in the Raliegh Hills town center. Funding is recommended for a portion of the PE costs in the Option B package. Funding would be conditioned on the completion of some planning work for the large portion of the town center area to be impacted by the right-of-way acquisition process. The county is seeking to use progress on PE work to solicit state and federal funds for right-of-way and construction.
- Right-of-way acquisition costs of \$2 million is recommended for funding of the 172nd Avenue project in the Option B package. This would address the \$1.0 million estimated right-of-way costs and a start on construction costs. This project is located in the newly expanding urban area on the east side of Happy Valley. The application will leverage \$10 million of County funds to complete construction of the project. The County has begun master planning of the area surrounding this project and anticipates designating much of it as Regionally Significant Industrial Area to serve as a job base for Happy Valley. This is also the only project proposed for funding in the recently expanded urban growth boundary area, which when master planning is completed, is one of the priority land use emphasis areas. This funding is recommended to be conditioned on completion of the Damascus master plan and for the project design to be consistent with implementation of the master plan.

### Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the road capacity modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

#### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The SE 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project will provide the primary arterial access to the future Rock Creek industrial area. Forecasts of expected traded-sector jobs will be available upon completion of the Damascus concept plan.

The B-H/Scholls project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure. No specific link to the retention or attraction of traded-sector jobs was provided by the project applicant.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas  
Upon completion of the Damascus concept plan, the SE 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project will address the primary urban infrastructure need to development of the future Rock Creek industrial area. The Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls Ferry/Oleson intersection project, if tied to the development of a Raleigh Hills town center planning effort, is of a scale and impact to provide significant redevelopment opportunities in that area. The Wood Village Boulevard project would provide new access and development opportunity in the Wood Village town center.
- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

Road capacity projects are supported through pass through state trust fund revenues to local jurisdictions, system development charges and some local taxes or improvement districts. However, some jurisdictions have maintenance needs that are larger than state pass-through revenues and which generally take priority over capacity projects.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

Other than the Wood Village Boulevard project, which would complete a gap in the motor vehicle street system between Halsey and Arata Road, these projects expand existing motor vehicle connections. New connections to complete gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle system would be provided with these projects, however.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, all of these projects would provide new or upgrade substandard pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these roads (current Greenburg Road has existing sidewalks but no bike lanes).

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

These projects do not address this policy goal.

**Road Reconstruction**

- The Cleveland Street project is recommended for funding at \$1 million in the Option B package. If funded, it would be necessary to work with the City of Gresham to define a phase of the project that could be completed with this amount or additional sources secured. This project demonstrated strong connections to the development of the Gresham regional center and adds sidewalk, bicycle and transit elements that are currently missing from the existing facility. It also strongly incorporates green street elements, providing another demonstration project for the region.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the road reconstruction modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

*Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Cleveland Street project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties in the regional center to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

Road reconstruction projects are supported through pass through state trust fund revenues to local jurisdictions, system development charges and some local taxes or improvement districts. However, some jurisdictions have maintenance needs that are larger than state pass-through revenues and which generally take priority over reconstruction projects.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The recommended project does not complete gaps in the existing motor vehicle system but provides new pedestrian and bicycle facilities, completing gaps in those modal systems.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, the project would provide new or upgrade substandard pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

These projects do not address this policy goal.

Regional Travel Options

- The Regional Travel Options program is recommended for further consideration at the level of funding needed to implement the programs strategic plan, with the exception of providing vanpool capital assistance, in the base funding package.
- \$500,000 is recommended to be eliminated from the RTO Program in the Option B package. No specific guidance on which portion of the program to eliminate was provided.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the regional travel options category addresses the following policy guidance.

*Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The RTO program is regional in scope and therefore markets and provides travel option services, reducing congestion region wide.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

*Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

These programs are not supported by other sources of dedicated transportation revenues although they do leverage funding from private Transportation Management Associations and other grants.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The RTO program does not construct projects and therefore does not address this policy goal.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. RTO projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by educating and providing incentives to reduce trips or use existing pedestrian, bicycle and public transit facilities.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

While the RTO programs promote use of the facilities provided by the requirements, it does not specifically address this policy goal.

**Transit Oriented Development (TOD)**

- The TOD rail station area and urban centers programs are recommended for funding equal to the previous allocation.

- The Beaverton TOD site acquisition project is also recommended for funding at \$2 million, equal to the previous allocation to the Gresham Civic station site in the previous allocation. This would be a \$1 million cut from the requested amount. It is recommended that the City of Beaverton investigate use of other sources to match the large regional contribution to the project. \$650,000 of this cut would be restored in the Option A package.

- The Gateway TOD site would be funded for \$500,000 in the Option 1 package.

- The urban centers program is recommended for an additional \$500,000 in the Option B package but the same \$500,000 is recommended to be eliminated from the TOD category, with no specific recommendation on what project or program to reduce, in the Option B package.

### Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the transit oriented development category addresses the following policy guidance.

#### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas  
The TOD program and recommended projects address market development barriers to development in 2040 priority mixed-use land use areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The TOD program and recommended projects support implementation of regional and local comprehensive plans by supporting mixed-use development at densities and with amenities beyond what the current market will bear in emerging mixed-use areas.

#### *Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

While urban renewal and other programs facilitate new development, transit oriented development projects are specifically designed to increase the efficiency of the regions investment in the transit system and is not supported by other sources funding.

#### *Complete gaps in modal systems*

The TOD program and projects do not address this policy goal.

#### *Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. TOD projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by increasing the density and design of development in areas well served by existing pedestrian, bicycle and public transit facilities. This increases the use of those facilities and makes them more cost-effective.

#### *Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

While the TOD programs promote use of the facilities provided by the requirements, it does not specifically address this policy goal.

## **Transit**

- The existing commitments (by Metro Resolution) to rail transit projects in the region are recommended for funding.
- The Frequent Bus program is recommended for funding at a rate equal to the previous allocation amount.
- The Eastside Streetcar is recommended for funding in the Option A package.
- The South Metro Amtrak station is recommended for funding at \$1.15 million in the Option A package and for \$1 million in the Option B package.

### Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the transit modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

#### *Economic development in priority land use areas*

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

Office and commercial space in the mixed-use areas served by these transit projects may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of frequent transit service. The existing rail commitments and the Frequent Bus capital improvement program are steps in providing reliable frequent transit service to mixed-use and industrial areas region-wide, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The development of a comprehensive regional transit system with frequent and reliable access to 2040 priority land use areas contribute to the economic vitality of the region by increasing trips that do not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces in those areas where efficient use of land is most critical. The provision of a well-designed network of transit facilities also contributes to the overall livability and attractiveness to both companies and work force to locate in the region.

#### *Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue*

The existing rail commitments and the Eastside Streetcar fund applications are used to leverage large federal grants to construct those projects. Currently, TriMet general fund revenues are committed to transit service as a means of not having to cut bus service hours and to start new light rail service during the on-going recession. While this was a

resource allocation choice, on-street capital improvements for the Frequent Bus program now come solely from the Transportation Priorities program. The south Amtrak station improvements are not eligible for any other source of transportation revenues.

*Complete gaps in modal systems*

The rail commitments and Eastside Streetcar projects extend high frequency service to new areas consistent with the RTP and local Transportation System Plans, however, they do not strictly fill in gaps within the existing rail network. Frequent Bus improvements will allow new frequent bus service connecting gaps in the existing system.

*Develop a multi-modal transportation system*

This is a modal policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. Transit projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by providing higher efficiency transit service in the corridors served by those projects.

*Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan*

While the rail commitment and Frequent Bus program do not result directly in the provision of additional service hours as required by the air quality implementation plan, they do contribute to service efficiencies that can then be reallocated to providing additional transit service.

# Metro Staff Recommendation

Base Package, Options for Additional Projects and Not Recommended for Funding at This Time

Planning			Bike/Trail			Pedestrian			
Score	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Score	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Score	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Score	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Score	
<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			
n/a	Ongoing Programs	\$2.719	93	BK1009 Springwater Trail-Sellwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umatilla	\$1.629	90	Pd3163 Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.660	
n/a	Corridor Planning	\$2.800	82	BK4011 Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 28th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	88	Pd5054 Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450	
	*Please see Planning Summary Sheet on back for detailed project list.		81	BK2055 Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310				
			76	BK2052 MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Rubv Junction	\$0.890				
			75	BK5026 Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 5-6)	\$0.742				
			73	BK3012 Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675				
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$5.519</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$5.212</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.110</b>	
<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
n/a	Program Enhancements	\$0.401	87	BK5110 Jennifer St: 106th to 122nd	\$0.550	78	Pd1227 Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st	\$1.402	
			65	BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burntwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0.600	75	Pd2105 Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$1.400	
						74	Pd1202 SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0.538	
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
n/a	Corridor Planning	\$0.290	BK4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave. to 28th	\$0.685	44	Pd1019 Transit Safe Street Crossings	\$0.500	
n/a	Ongoing Programs	\$1.350	BK5026	Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 7-8)	\$0.742	n/a	Pd8007 ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0.250	
			53	BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burntwood Dr. (Con)	\$0.900				
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.640</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$2.327</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.750</b>	
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			
n/a	Corridor	\$4.125	63	BK8057 Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hwy. 217 to Fanno Creek Trail	\$1.256	68	Pd1080 SE Hawthorne: 20th to 50th	\$0.822	
n/a	Program Enhancements	\$0.300	53	BK8020 Powerline Trail (South): Barrows to Beef Bend Rd.	\$0.942	63	Pd3021 SW Scholls Ferry Road: Raleigh Hills town center	\$0.436	
						50	Pd3093 SW Murray Blvd (west side only): TV Hwy to Farmington (+ bike lane)	\$0.923	
						40	Pd5209 SE 129th Sidewalks and bike lane: Scott Creek Ln. to Mountain Gate Rd.	\$0.707	
						n/a	Pd8007 ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0.250	
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$4.425</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$2.198</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$3.138</b>	
	<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$11.985</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$9.737</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$4.998</b>	
<b>Regional Travel Options</b>			<b>TOD</b>			<b>Transit</b>			
<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			
n/a	Program management & administration	\$0.340	98	TD8005 Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$3.000	n/a	Tr1001 I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16.000	
n/a	Regional marketing program	\$2.960	95	TD0002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program Site acquisition: Beaverton regional	\$1.000	n/a	Tr1002 I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600	
n/a	Regional evaluation	\$0.300	88	TD0003 center	\$2.000	93	Tr8035 Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750	
n/a	1 TravelSmart	\$0.500							
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$4.100</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$6.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$21.350</b>	
<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
n/a	1 TravelSmart	\$0.500	95	TD0002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program Site acquisition: Beaverton regional	\$0.500	81	Tr1106 Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1.000	
			88	TD0003 center	\$1.000	57	Tr5126 South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II	\$1.150	
			81	TD0004 Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment	\$0.500				
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
n/a	Regional Vanpool fleet	\$0.503	98	TD8005 Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$0.500	28	Rc8038 SW Ash Street extension (PE-ROW)	\$0.639	
n/a	1 TravelSmart projects	\$0.500	95	TD0002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$0.500				
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.003</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.639</b>	
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			
n/a	2 TravelSmart Projects	\$1.000				28	Rc8038 SW Ash Street extension (construction)	\$0.212	
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.212</b>	
	<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$6.603</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$7.000</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$22.201</b>	
<b>Road Capacity</b>			<b>Road Reconstruction</b>			<b>Boulevard</b>			
<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			
74	Rc8014 SW Greenburg Road: Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1.000				102	Bd3020 Rose Biggl extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$0.580	
						97	Bd1051 Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.650	
						95	Bd1260 Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (PE)	\$0.400	
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$2.630</b>	
<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
65	Pd6127 Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street	\$1.400	91	RR1053 Naito Parkway: NW Davis to SW Market	\$3.840	Bd3020	Rose Biggl extension: Crescent St. to Hall (ROW)	\$1.140	
65	Rc1184 Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry Intersection (PE)	\$1.411	91	Fr3166 10th Avenue at Highway 8 Intersections	\$0.837				
65	Rc2110 Wood Village Blvd.: Arata to Halsey	\$0.815	88	RR2035 Cleveland St.: NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1.540				
62	Rc7000 SE 172nd Ave: Phase I; Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2.000							
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
Rc7000	SE 172nd Ave: Phase I; Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2.300	84	RR5037 Lake Rd: 21st to Hwy 224	\$1.884	Bd3020	Rose Biggl extension: Crescent St. to Hall (Con)	\$2.087	
48	Rc5103 Clackamas County ITS: Safety and operational improvements at 4 railroad crossings	\$0.500				Bd1051	Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.710	
						Bd1260	Killingsworth: I-5 Overpass	\$0.935	
						Bd1260	Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (Con)	\$1.679	
						89	Bd3184 Cornell Road: Saltzman to 119th	\$2.535	
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$2.800</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.884</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$8.946</b>	
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			
Rc1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry Intersection (PE)	\$1.489	81	RR2001 NE 242nd Ave.: Stark to Glisan	\$0.840	87	Bd3169 E Baseline: 10th to 20th	\$2.447	
56	Rc3114 NE 28th Avenue: East Main to Grant	\$1.682	70	RR1209 NW 23rd Avenue: Burnside to Lovejoy	\$2.694				
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$3.171</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$3.534</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$2.447</b>	
	<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$6.971</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$5.418</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$14.023</b>	
<b>Freight</b>			<b>Large Bridge</b>			<b>Green Streets</b>			
<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			
79	Fr4063 N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2.210	71	RR1012 Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.500	88	GS1224 NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2.457	
77	Fr3016 SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS: I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0.341							
68	Fr4087 N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0.900				93	GS2123 Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1.000	
67	Fr8088 Kinsman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1.400							
65	Fr8008 Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System: Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0.179							
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$5.030</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.500</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$3.457</b>	
<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
Fr4087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0.900	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.000				
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
61	Fr2074 NE Sandy Blvd. (PE/ROW): 207th to 238th	\$0.630	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.100	GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$0.470	
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.630</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$1.100</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.470</b>	
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			
Fr4063	N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2.210							
Fr4087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$1.200							
45	Fr8065 SW Herman Road: Teton to 108th Avenue	\$2.000							
	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$5.410</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>		<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>	
	<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$11.070</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$2.600</b>		<b>Mode Category Total:</b>	<b>\$3.927</b>	
								<b>Roads and Bridges Recommended Total</b>	<b>\$13.617</b>
								<b>Planning and Travel Options</b>	<b>\$43.291</b>
								<b>Recommended Total:</b>	<b>\$56.908</b>
								<b>Expected 2008-09 Funding Authorized:</b>	<b>\$62.228</b>
								<b>Remaining funds to be allocated:</b>	<b>\$5.320</b>
								<b>Total Next Tier project cost</b>	<b>\$22.924</b>

Planning & Travel Options

Roads & Bridges



## Planning Application Summary Sheet

Score	<b>Planning</b>		Requested Amount (millions of \$)
<b>Recommended for Funding</b>			
<b>Ongoing Programs</b>			
n/a	PI0005	Regional Freight Planning: Region wide	\$0.300
n/a	PI0001	MPO Required Planning: Region wide	\$1.731
			<b>Subtitle: \$2.031</b>
<b>Corridor Planning</b>			
n/a	PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$2.000
n/a	PI5053	Multi-Use Path Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott - Scouter's Loop	\$0.300
n/a	PI0002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500
n/a	PI1017	Willamete Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.688
			<b>Subtotal: \$3.488</b>
<b>Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
<b>Program Enhancements</b>			
n/a	PI0004	Livable Streets Update: Region wide	\$0.200
n/a	PI8000	Bike Model and Interactive Map: Region wide	\$0.201
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.401</b>
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut</b>			
<b>Corridor Planning</b>			
n/a	PI5053	Multi-Use Path Master Plans: Sullivan's Gulch	\$0.290
n/a	PI1017	Willamete Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit preliminary engineering: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1.350
			<b>Subtotal: \$1.640</b>
<b>Not Recommended for Further Consideration in First Cut</b>			
<b>Corridor Planning</b>			
n/a	PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$1.725
n/a	PI5016	I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0.300
n/a	PI3121	Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study: Highway 217 to Baseline Road	\$1.900
<b>Program Enhancements</b>			
n/a	TD0005	Fuller Road at I-205	\$0.500
			<b>Subtotal: \$4.425</b>
			<b>Mode Category Total: \$11.985</b>

030305C-05

030305c-05

Metropolitan Transportation  
Improvement Program (MTIP)  
**Final Public Comment Report**



**METRO**  
PEOPLE PLACES  
OPEN SPACES



March 2005

Transportation Priorities  
2006-09  
Investing in the  
2040 Growth Concept