

# MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 19, 1998

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer) Ruth McFarland, Susan McLain, Patricia McCaig, Ed Washington, Lisa Naito, Don Morissette

Councilors Absent:

Presiding Officer Kvistad convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:05 p.m.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

## 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

None.

## 3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

## 4. MPAC COMMUNICATION

**Councilor McLain** said MPAC had canceled their April 8th meeting and invited Council to meet with them on April 9th at 5:00 p.m. She indicated three councilors had agreed to meet with MPAC, Councilors McFarland, Washington and McLain. She noted Councilor Naito was checking her schedule.

**Councilor Morissette** indicated he would not be attending the April 9th meeting.

**Councilor McCaig** said she wanted to clarify that there had been discussion about the joint meeting and the Presiding Officer had offered the specific date of May 28th. She noted that April 9th was not a regularly schedule meeting with MPAC, this was not the meeting the council agreed that they would attend. She was unable to attend and didn't like the way this had come back to council as if by not attending that the councilors were not participating or were not completing their end of the bargain. She did plan on attending the May meeting, the one that the council had collectively agreed would be scheduled.

**Councilor McLain** said this was correct, it was not the official seven councilors meeting with MPAC. She was trying to accommodate the local partners, MPAC had indicated that they did not feel that they could go forward with their meetings in April and May until they had had a discussion with the Council. They were willing to meet with whomever could come on April 9th.

## 5. SOUTH NORTH LIGHT RAIL PRESENTATION

**Mr. Richard Brandman, Transportation Planning Department, South North Project Director** noted the official DEIS document and the South North draft. He provided an overview the DEIS. The draft DEIS document draws no conclusions. Information was included regarding all the choices that were at hand with respect to the S/N Project. Included also were decisions to be made with respect to how much of full corridor could be proposed for construction at one time. There were alignment options, choices which would be made by Metro Council.

The Transportation Planning Department was currently in a formal public comment period, dictated by the Federal Transit Administration. Metro staff, noted Mr. Brandman, worked evenings and weekends in the preparation of this document. The public comment period runs until the end of April at which time a decision-making process would begin.

Federal funding prospects for this project looked very good. A delegation was in Washington, D.C. just last week. Mr. Brandman noted that this delegation had a good reception from the Congressional Authorizing committees, the Appropriating committees as well as the Federal Transit Administration staff. Metro's federal funding for this project looked very good. The Authorizing committee was familiar with Metro's project.

Mr. Brandman introduced Mr. Clayton Hering, chair of the Downtown Oversight Committee for the S/N Project. This committee was charged with the examination of issues in the downtown area. Also present, as noted by Mr. Brandman, was Rick Williams, chair of the S/N Project Citizen's Advisory Committee.

**Mr. Clayton Hering** said in his role as the Chair of the Downtown Oversight Committee and also as a past president of APP and a current board member of same, he was pleased to say that among downtown interests, business and non-business, there was a broad consensus in support of the completion of the transit plans. It was part of a key to growth management overlay. The S/N Project phase was very important and they were excited about what they had heard coming from Washington, D.C., concerning federal funding. They were hopeful that they would be able to be creative enough to put together the remaining pieces of the financial puzzle. Mr. Hering thought Portland was blessed by doing some things that were very, very good. Being active in the capital investment markets, he could say without any qualifications that Portland was viewed as a city that was doing things right. The capital markets, liked the fact that the region had solid growth management and liked the fact that Metro dealt with a regional approach to transportation issues. Consequently, he felt that boded well for the vitality of the private sector. The role of the downtown oversight committee was to work well with the process and with the various constituents.

The committee had three issues which they must analyze and were in the process of doing so. Ultimately the committee would make a recommendation. Those three issues were:

- A) The entry at the north end of the city; trying to take into consideration as much vision as they could about the future to be able to hook up with high-speed rail, perhaps running north and south on the west coast as well as the ability to further develop the north end of Portland.
- B) The second issue related to half-mall versus full-mall. The consensus seemed to be that they didn't want to lose the war but, on the other hand, the full mall was the way to go.

- C) The third issue related to the exit from the downtown area at the south end and how that was to be handled in relationship to Portland State University and to the ultimate crossing of the river which they, on the Downtown Oversight Committee were not involved in the ultimate decision, but rather did they interfaced with whichever recommendation was ultimately made.

He concluded by saying that the consensus of downtown business interests as well as other interests were solidly behind the S/N Project. They were excited about the fact that the S/N Project could now be assessed with a superior kind of reality in terms of funding options. They were anxious to be moving through the process.

**Rick Williams, Chairman of South North Light Rail Citizen Advisory Committee** was chairman of the S/N Project Light Rail Citizens Advisory Committee. Every time they came to a point like this, it was exciting. When they recently completed the cost-cutting phase of this process, they made some very hard decisions. They were pleased with the process and pleased with the type of information that Metro was able to give them.

Mr. William's role today was to update members of Metro Council on the issues relegated to the Citizen's Advisory Committee as well as their process in considering these issues. The Citizen's Advisory Committee was staffed by 17 individuals representing a constituency. Each one of those constituencies represented a point along the light rail line. The Committee took their role very seriously, realizing that they must make decisions that affect the whole system and occasionally this was very difficult. He had received a copy of the DEIS and had begun to read it and looked forward to the time when he could look at it as a doorstep because the light rail project would have been built. He would keep the DEIS around in a more functional purpose. The Citizen's Advisory Committee was going back to assess the purpose and need of the light rail system. They were considering the impact light rail would have on all of our lives. There were hard decisions to make such as the issue of I-5. They would struggle over the north and south downtown entries as well as the half-mall alignment, Ross Island Crossing, Milwaukie and how the S/N Project would be taken to Clackamas Town Center. The information was there and now it was time to make the decisions. Open houses were currently underway. He noted that Metro was also having public meetings on April 8 and April 13. The Citizen's Advisory Committee work sessions were on April 2 and April 16. They were having one complete meeting starting at 6 p.m. in May and they would notify the Council of this meeting. They were asking the public to come and just talk to them. The CAC would take that information and what they had learned from the open houses and the public hearings into their decision-making process in May. He had often come to the Council before and there has been criticisms about public input and public outreach of this process. He took those criticisms personally and he thought the Council should too. Metro staff needed to be commended for the many of meetings that had taken place throughout the region.

**Councilor Ed Washington** thanked Mr. Hering and Mr. Williams for coming to present to the council. Councilor Washington noted that when the first phase of the light rail was constructed, 6 cities were competing for federal funding. Now there were 30. He felt the S/N Project alignment was very important to our nation since the Portland region was serving as a model for the nation. People were beginning to understand the need for light rail.

**Mr. Brandman** noted that Mr. Leon Skiles would be assisting him. He then showed slides of the light rail alignment plan. He stated that a full length alignment from Clackamas Town Center to Vancouver was under examination. That alignment had several choices; the south end at Clackamas Town Center; the north end of Clackamas Town Center. The line continued to the

west toward Milwaukie. Again, two alignment choices were present, one along Railroad Avenue and the second along Highway 224. In Milwaukie, there was one alignment option which served that vacant Safeway site in downtown Milwaukie which would be a major redevelopment opportunity. The alignment then continued north along McLoughlin Blvd. and saved the trees and brought them then to one of the many choices as to how to cross the Willamette River. Two options were being considered. One was the Carruthers option which served SE Portland neighborhoods as well as OMSI; the other was the Ross Island Crossing which served some of the SE Portland neighborhoods as well as a major redevelopment opportunity in north Macadam where this was approximately 110 acres of redevelopable land. Moving through downtown Portland presented two choices: A full alignment that went all the way along the transit mall from PSU to the train station and then crossed the Steel Bridge. There was also a half-mall alignment which would stop at Pioneer Square and then tie into the existing MAX alignment on Morrison and Yamhill that would go across First Avenue and then across the Steel Bridge on the existing tracks. The choice there was not so much one of preference but one of economics and what could be afforded. Moving further north, there were options adjacent to the Blazer Arena, one on the west side of the freeway right next to the facility; the other would be on the east side of I-5 but, again, within a very short walk of the Rose Garden. Moving north once again, there was a major decision regarding Interstate Avenue versus the top embankment of I-5. The line would then cross into Vancouver and stop at Clark College and the Veterans Hospital in downtown Vancouver.

Page two of the briefing book was shown to Congress last week. The Federal Transportation Administration rates projects from across the nation and these projects were rated based upon information that was provided by the local jurisdiction as well as the FTA regional offices which, in Metro's case, was in Seattle. The projects were rated in the light of many criteria. On the report that was yet to be published for 1998, Metro's report for the S/N Project was rated high for integration with surrounding land uses. Only two projects would receive that rating out of the 30 that were moving forward. Metro was rated high for the reliability and stability of the capital financing plan. Only one project received a rating that high in 1997. Metro was rated medium-high for the stability of the operating / financing plan.

Some major advantages of the S/N Project were briefly noted by Mr. Brandman. First, the light rail produced 33% faster transit travel times than the comparable bus system. Second, it produced 39,000 more daily transit trips than an expanded bus network. Third, it produced over \$50 million per year in the value of travel time savings. Finally, it was an important element of the region's air quality maintenance plan with respect to the amount of admission reductions that the project could afford.

In discussion that Metro Transportation Planning Department had had with the public regarding the S/N Project, they felt that it was important to remind themselves "why is it that we are engaged in doing this project in the first place." What they were trying to do was respond to growth. The region was growing 40% faster than the national average. New information that became available today indicated that the Portland area was growing double that of the national average. That growth would challenge Metro's ability to accommodate the growth in traffic that would result from that increase in population and employment.

In the past, Metro's Transportation Planning Department had examined a variety of options. A serious process, lasting several years, was undertaken screening an all bus system, river transit, commuter rail and light rail. At the end of that process, Metro Council recommended in 1993 that light rail be studied in this corridor. In 1995 Metro Council reconfirmed that the Transportation Planning Department move forward with this option. The Environmental Impact

Statement compared doing a light rail project versus not doing a light rail project but just expanding the bus system.

Among the chief findings regarding the S/N Light Rail Project presented by Mr. Brandman included the following facts:

- Carry 68,000 Light Rail rides per day
- Attract 38,000 new transit rides per day (30% increase)
- Provide over 30% faster travel times than buses
- Carry 3,000 riders at peak-load point = 1.5 freeway lanes with the capacity to grow to 3 lanes in each direction
- Provide twice the new capacity at 1/3 the cost of expanding highway facilities in the corridor
- Reduce gasoline consumption by 11,000 gallons per day
- Reduce air quality emissions by 1,000 tons per year

The project would most likely not be able to be completed at one time. Congress wouldn't give all the money at one time and local resources as well were not available at one time. The full-length project would create nearly 68,000 rides per day. The first MOS (minimum operable segment), going from Milwaukie to Vancouver, would create 56,200 light rail trips per day. MOS 2 would go from Clackamas Town Center to the Rose Quarter and would generate 27,700 rides per day and MOS 5 would go from Clackamas Town Center to Lombard, generating approximately 40,200 rides per day. This project would attempt to accomplish both south and north Portland pieces simultaneously.

Often Metro's Transportation Planning Department was asked about new riders. Were people just being taken out of the bus and put on trains or were people actually getting out of their automobiles. Estimates revealed that with an all-bus system in the year 2015, there would be approximately 126,000 trips on the transit system in the S/N Corridor. With the light-rail alternative, approximately 164,000 trips per day would be completed representing about a 30% increase.

The peak-hour ridership chart revealed peak-hour ridership for the shorter alignments, there were less people on the train so there were less people getting out of their automobiles. This confirmed something that was almost intuitive: The more rail built, the more people would be willing to ride.

The next chart on travel time was rather interesting in that it demonstrated that one of the key benefits of the S/N Project was the reduction in travel time that all kinds of commuters, not only business travelers but shopping trips, medical visits and recreational riding. They would experience a very significant reduction in transit travel time. The value of travel time savings would be approximately \$100 million per year. Nationally this looked excellent and looked to be near the top of all other proposed projects nationwide that DOT was considering.

Another question frequently asked regarded the fact that "this was nice for the transit advocates" but no one else would ride the train. Nearly 213,700 miles per day, 14,900 hours of travel per day, 4500 hours of delay in travel daily, 16 lane-miles of congestion, 3 - 9% reduction in rush hour automobile travel times in the corridor were saved with train ridership.

Still another question related to what percentage of new trips would be on transit. Looking at the location of the light rail, 49% of new trips on the system would be on transit with the S/N Light Rail. Only 6% of the new trips would be on transit absent the S/N Light Rail.

Another benefit that related to the City of Portland was the reduction of the parking demand downtown as a result of the project because all of the people riding in on transit would not be driving their cars into downtown and therefore looking for parking places. Nearly 4,000 parking spaces would be cleared up should the S/N Project be completed.

A study of developable land with new light rail access revealed that approximately 430 acres of this land would lie within 1/4 mile of a light rail station.

About 1000 tons of emissions would be reduced per year and about 11,000 gallons of gasoline per day would be saved.

The next issue discussed was the cost of light rail. Built today, the full-length option would cost about \$1.3 billion. This would provide for a 21-mile alignment. Inflationary impacted these figures since inflation impacted everything. The inflated cost would be \$2 billion to \$2.5 billion dollars. Even though the project cost many dollars, there was an avoided cost which was the cost of not constructing the added highway capacity in the same corridor: Adding one lane and interchanges to SE McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 224 would cost about \$3 billion which would add capacity of about 3,000 vehicles per hour whereas the light rail costs about \$1 billion for that south segment in inflated dollars. Added would be the capacity for 6,000 people per hour so it was about double the capacity for one-third the cost.

In conclusion, Mr. Brandman noted the letters of support contained in the briefing book from such groups as the Association for Portland Progress, Fred Meyer, The Portland Trailblazers. Mr. Brandman then discussed the actual decision-making process.

**Councilor McFarland** asked Mr. Brandman what the non-methane hydrocarbons actually were.

**Mr. Brandman** responded that non-methane hydrocarbons were one of the two pollutants that caused smog. Non-methane hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides together mixed with sunlight created smog.

Mr. Brandman concluded, page 24 discussed the decision making processes. He invited the council to attend the open houses. The South / North Steering Committee would be conducting public hearings in April.

**Councilor Naito** suggested that the Council might want to have at least one public hearing.

**Mr. Brandman** affirmed that Councilor public hearings would be scheduled somewhere within the June time frame.

**Councilor Washington** said it was important to keep the July date. He stated that he would be happy to discuss with the council appropriate dates for public hearings.

**Councilor Morissette** said it was a nice presentation but Mr. Brandman had left out one thing: The fact that the voters voted against the south north light rail funding. There was sprawl now and VMTs would be going up regardless of light rail until the housing issues were discussed and settled.

**Councilor McLain** appreciated the conversation and the changes made to the presentation since it was heard in committee. She commented to Councilor Morissette that the package that was put forward to voters included dollars for light rail as well as other money to the rest of the state of Oregon. This vote amounted to an incredibly complex vote because of the wide spectrum of issues put together at the state level. It was not a clear-cut 'yes' or 'no' on light rail only.

**Councilor Washington** thanked the staff for their work in presenting this information to council.

**Councilor Naito** asked when were the decision points on the alignments actually made. Was it a recommendation by the Steering Committee?

**Mr. Brandman** responded in the affirmative. The first recommendation would be by the project management group which involved sifting through the technical information. This was scheduled for May 21, 1998. On May 27, the Downtown Oversight Committee would make their recommendation on those three issues. On May 28, 1998, the Citizens Advisory Committee would make their recommendation.

**Councilor Naito** said that all of the recommendations were helpful and they may, in fact, be the final recommendations, but the process assumed that the recommendations of the steering committee would be the ones that were finally adopted. That was, in fact, correct but perhaps this should go to JPACT for a vote before going to the public for comment. If the date of July 30, 1998 was the goal for a final resolution, there must be a much earlier involvement of both JPACT and Metro Council to determine the preferred alternatives.

**Mr. Brandman** explained that, as these projects move forward, there would be pretty much of a consensus. If there was not, there were still opportunities. Each of the jurisdictions may have a nuance or could come up with a different recommendation. The reason why this was laid out the way it was because it gave JPACT an opportunity as well as Metro Council an opportunity to reflect on that which each of the individual jurisdictions was recommending to the council rather than the other way around. If JPACT released the recommendation to each of the jurisdictions, it would probably not work as well for the jurisdictions would feel as though the region had already made up its mind but they didn't agree. This would be an interactive process as Metro Council moved forward.

**Councilor McLain** had expressed a similar concern at the committee level. She noted the lines added for impute from the Metro Council. Both the Transportation Planning committee as well as Metro Council would be actively involved in the very issue of alignments and concerns, recommendations, hot spots all the way from today until July 8, 1998.

**Councilor Naito** said being involved in the discussion was far different from making a decision. If there was a consensus there was no problem but if not, there was a need to build one in. Councilor Naito expressed her concern over the short amount of time for the process.

**Councilor Washington** noted Councilor Naito's concerns and indicated that he would be willing to discuss these issues with Councilor Naito and anyone else to make certain those concerns were addressed.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** thanked Mr. Skiles and Mr. Brandman for their presentation.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration meeting minutes of the March 12, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of March 12, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McLain** seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

## 7. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 98-732**, For the Purpose of Revising Quasi-Judicial Urban Growth Boundary Amendment procedures in Metro Code 3.01.033, 3.01.035, 3.01.055, 3.01.065; and declaring an emergency.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** assigned Ordinance No. 98-732 to the Growth Management Committee.

7.2 **Ordinance No. 98-737**, Amending the FY 1997-98 budget and appropriations schedule in the Support Services Fund by transferring \$15,000 from the Administrative Services Department to the Office of the Auditor and transferring \$4,600 from Capital Outlay to Materials and Services within the Office of the Auditor to provide funding for conducting an implementation review of the InfoLink project.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** assigned Ordinance No. 98-737 to Finance Committee.

## 8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 **Resolution No. 98-2610A**, For the Purpose of Authorizing Release of RFB #98-6-REM for the Construction of a Latex Paint Processing Building at Metro South Station.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2610A.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McFarland** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor Morissette** noted that in the last several years Metro's facility had flooded, this resolution would move the facility to higher ground and provide better access. He encouraged the council to approve this resolution. He noted that in committee there had been comment about Title III and how this resolution would relate to Title III requirements. The cost was raised by \$8,000 due to Title III requirements. Stimson Lumber, a neighboring business, allowed Metro to mitigate on their property to allow for the building to be moved. If the company had not been good partners, the building would have remained where it was and been stuck in the flood prone area. He felt that the current Title III language was a problem and would continue to be a problem. He did not believe the Metro had adequately calculated the number of acres Title III would incorporate. Title III would dramatically increase the cost of doing things in this region. He thought we could find better ways to protect the streams than the current proposals that Metro had and this was just one example of how Title III effected Metro's own property. He assured the Council that this building would never have been located where it was if Title III had been in effect in the past. Title III impacted Metro as well as others. He added that he believed most of downtown Portland would not exist if, in its current form, Title III had been in existence.



**Councilor McLain** supported this legislation. She felt it was a good idea, first, Title III was costing Metro \$8000 to do the right thing. Title III had not been passed yet but Metro was diligently looking at all of their facilities and realized that we had learned something from the past. There was \$60 million of damage for government agencies and public bodies in 1996 due to flooding. This was not acceptable. She felt if it cost \$8000 for Metro to build this paint facility then it was the right thing to do. The cities of Tualatin or Portland could be built today, but they would need better buffers along their stream corridors, perhaps then 213 streams would not have been degraded and 390 streams lost. She thought that it was important for the council to remember that the federal government had indicated that these streams and the endangered fish and wildlife throughout the region put Metro and the region to a higher standard. Title III helped with this higher standard. She believed this resolution was a good one for Metro's own solid waste system and Title III was the right thing to do. She said Metro must make sure it was a good model, a good leader. She felt that the Regional Environmental Management Department had gone out of its way to make sure that they could build a Title III facility with mitigation possible.

**Councilor McFarland** said first, she found herself disagreeing with Councilor McLain. She thought if there had been these kind of restraints in place previously, much of what was now downtown Portland would still be the streams and lakes that had been filled in over the years. Portland was built when the idea was supported that if you had a swamp you filled it in. However, we lived in the present not the past. The place where REM wanted to originally put the building was under water in 1996. Why Metro would agree to allow a building to be build there without any mitigation was beyond her understanding. She was not sure that she was comfortable with the cut and fill modification. She expressed some doubt that this would work. However, she was willing to wait and see. If this facility was flooded again she believed it would cost a lot more than \$8000. She felt that Metro was setting a minimum standard.

**Councilor Morissette** closed by saying to Councilor McLain that sometimes his point got moved in a different direction, this had just happened. First, the paint facility currently was in a much lower area, moving it to a higher area was a better thing to do. The \$8000 represented a small portion of what the true cost could have been had Metro not had a willing partner next door to allow mitigation. He did not believe that what we were creating in our rules and regulations was going to go far in cleaning up the rivers. What Title III would do was add a lot of burden. It was not a discussion as to whether one salmon would be saved by moving the paint building, it was to whether or not Metro would be able to do a fraction of what was already done in this region as we moved forward. He felt that moving the facility was a very good thing. He thought with Title III, Metro would not have been able to move the facility if the Stinson Lumber Company had not been willing to allow Metro to mitigate. Metro would have been stuck with Title III and required to keep the building in an inferior location. This was a problem for him. Councilor McLain had brought the Title III discussion to the REM Committee. Councilor Morissette felt that this discussion was important, Title III did have a cost and a ramification. He still considered this action very good, making a situation better than currently existed.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

8.2 **Resolution No. 98-2623A**, For the Purpose of Encouraging Governor Kitzhaber to consider the Location of A Women's Prison and Intake Center at the proposed alternative site located in an area of Metro's Urban Reserve Area (Rural Industrial Zone).

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2623A.

**Seconded:**      **Councilor McFarland** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:**      **Councilor McLain** invited the Major of Wilsonville and her staff to come to the dais. At the Government Affairs Committee meeting they were approached by the City of Wilsonville to bring forward a resolution that would show Metro was supportive of making sure the process worked well. This resolution would help Wilsonville and the State of Oregon. This resolution indicated that the Metro Council was recommending careful consideration of a proposed alternative site that was located in a Metro urban reserve area, the rural industrial zone in Wilsonville. She said Metro was not trying to tell the State or their super siting committee what to do, the Council was simply saying that they would like the State to look at this alternate site carefully. In the resolution, Metro was indicating that they were well aware of the situation and understood the sensitivity to it and how closely Metro would need to work with the State on this issue if this was accepted as the site.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 98-2623A.

**Mayor Charlotte Lehan, City of Wilsonville, 30000 SW Town Center Loop Wilsonville, OR 97070** briefed the council by saying that the City was in an odd position of continuing to oppose the siting at the Dammasch site but actively advocating for the prison at an industrial site in Wilsonville's urban reserve. This reserve would be expected to come into the city at some point in the future. She emphasized that they did not view this as a compromise site but as something that the City was actively advocating for because the more they looked at it the more benefits they had seen for both sites if they were able to site the prison in the rural industrial zone area. She clarified that what they were looking for from Metro was not a siting authority but rather support of the land use issue. Metro had some control of the land use issues. The indication from the Department of Corrections and the Governor's office was that they were seriously looking at the alternative site because it looked like it made more sense from a land use stand point. The State's concern was that on the flip side, the land use process would be so complex to be able to move this site. The City of Wilsonville had told the State that they would be their advocate and try to expedite the process as much as possible with Metro to move this area which was currently zoned rural industrial in their urban reserve. Part of the problem with the alternate site was that it was currently a tier two urban reserve and the City would be requesting that it be moved to a tier one. Half of the site was currently not in the urban reserves, so the City would need to make a minor amendment to the boundary in order to bring this land into the urban reserve and make it tier one. The Dammasch site was the City of Wilsonville's last opportunity to do any higher density residential. If a prison was sited at the Dammasch site and the City would not be able to do the kind of densities and residential development that they had scheduled at that site the City had no choice but to look to further expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary somewhere else. The City of Wilsonville was up against productive EFU land anywhere else they turned. It did not make sense to do the residential at the industrial site because it was currently zoned rural industrial and wedged up against urban industrial. The City of Wilsonville had a major trucking facility in the industrial area, they ran 10,000 truck a day on and off of the interchange. It would never be appropriate for residential area, it would always be industrial. They saw the prison as a benefit at the rural industrial site because it would help bring infrastructure to an area that was currently rural industrial, currently with no sewer or storm water management. They would like to get those infrastructures in place, it would be a catalyst to bring those services to the area.

**Stephan Lashbrook, City of Wilsonville Planning Director, PO Box 1282, Wilsonville, OR 97070** said that in terms of value, if the Dammasch area master plan was built out, it would have an assessed valuation exceeding \$400 million which they knew would not be achieved if there was a prison in the middle of the site. At the same time, if the prison was located at the north end

of town in an industrial area, the city would expect it to spur industrial development adjacent to it with an estimated assessed valuation approaching \$125 million. There was a benefit in both areas. In terms of the master plans, he pointed out the city's was the first urban reserve area to have a master plan completed. That master plan would be no good to the city with a prison in the middle. The city had started the master plan process for the industrial area to the north with the assumption that it would have a prison at that site, they were planning ahead for those urban reserve areas. Third, the city had community support for this idea. He found it remarkable that he and the mayor were at this meeting advocating for a prison. The Dammasch area master plan included 2300 housing units and probably more than that when it was ultimately built out. There were no plans to accommodate residential growth in the northwest industrial area but he felt that 1600 inmate were equivalent to 800 housing units. He concluded that the City of Wilsonville would need Metro's help to make this happen because they had made commitment to the Department of Corrections and to the Governor's office that they would do everything they could to advocate for this idea and to move the land use processes along that would bring the property into the city and make this proposal possible.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing. He then complemented the City of Wilsonville on coming up with an alternative and presenting it as a partner. He was a big supporter of the master planning that had already been done, this area was part of his jurisdiction. The City had done an outstanding job of preparing for the necessary densities and for the town center in their jurisdiction. The approach in working with the Governor's office to present an alternative was tremendous.

**Councilor Naito** said she was willing to support this once the language had been clarified in committee. With the change in language, the Metro Council was simply asking the governor to consider this proposal. There were many factors that the governor had to consider in the siting of the prison. She did not think that the Council could put their own beliefs forward based on the little evidence they had in place of the governor's considerations. She also supported this resolution because the city had an alternate site that was in Wilsonville. The siting of a prison was a very difficult one.

**Councilor McLain** said this resolution was very consistent with previous action taken by the council. The Metro Council had supported the greenspace master plan and the greenspace bond measure. They had indicated to the governor that they had interest with that program. It was also very consistent with Metro's master planning and the 2040 Growth Concept. She thought this proposal was a win win for both the governor and Wilsonville.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

## **9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

None.

## **10. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
031998c-01	3/16/98	Benefits of the South/North Light Rail Project	TO: Metro Council FROM: Richard Brandman	
031998c-02	March 1998	South/North Corridor Light Rail Project - Metro Council Briefing Book	TO: Metro Council FROM: Metro Transportation Planning Dept. and Tri-Met	