

Minutes of the Metro Council Planning Committee  
February 17, 1994  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

Committee Members Present: Jon Kvistad (Chair), Jim Gardner (Vice Chair), Mike Gates, Susan McLain, Rod Monroe, Terry Moore,

Committee Members Absent: Richard Devlin, Ed Washington

Other Councilors Present: Judy Wyers

Chair Kvistad called the regular meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

**1. Consideration of the January 20, and February 2, 1994 Planning Committee**

Motion: Councilor Gates moved to approve the minutes.

Vote: Councilors Gardner, Gates, Monroe, Moore and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors McLain, Devlin and Washington were absent. The vote was 5/0 and the motion passed.

**2. Introduction of Resolution 94-1902, Amending the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Bylaws**

Chair Kvistad noted the item was informational only.

Motion: Councilor Gates moved to introduced the resolution.

Vote: Councilors Gardner, Gates, McLain, Monroe, Moore and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors , Devlin and Washington were absent. The vote was 5/0 and the motion passed.

**3. Consideration of Resolution 94-1905, Amending the FY 1994 Metro TIP to Allocate Funds to Support the Oregon Transportation Finance Committee Public Outreach Program**

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved to recommend Council adoption of the Resolution.

Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director, presented the staff report, a copy of which is included in the record of this meeting.

Vote: Councilors Gardner, Gates, Monroe, Moore, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors Devlin, Washington, and McLain were absent. The vote was 5/0 and the motion passed.

**4. Consideration of Resolution 94-1900, Endorsing the NW 112th Linear Park for Funding as Part of ODOT Region 1 Priorities for Transportation Enhancement Funding in the 1995-1998 Transportation Improvement Program**

Mr. Cotugno presented the staff report, a copy of which is included in the record of this meeting. He explained the history of the project. He stated an amendment at JPACT provided for funding for the project only if the road was constructed.

Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel, summarized his memorandum dated February 17, 1994, a copy of which is included in the record of this meeting. He explained that there was no appeal of the 112th Street functional classification and no change in classification from the previously adopted and acknowledged plan. He explained that a claimed violation of the Bike Bill was not upheld by LUBA. He stated the LUBA decision did seem to require a 14 foot outside lane or shoulder area for bikes if an exception to the Bike Bill was not properly invoked. He discussed the regional impact of the decision based on the definition of a "system" plan. He stated LUBA's decision did not set precedent, but referred the matter back to the County for additional information. He explained that portions of the decision were in appeals.

In response to Councilor Moore, Mr. Shaw agreed that bikeways in rural and urban areas did differ. He further clarified that the issue was not raised at LUBA.

In response to Councilor Gardner, Mr. Cotugno stated that the project must be included in or consistent with comprehensive plans prior to construction. He stated this action would hold funds available for construction for the Linear park only if the project was proven to be included in, or consistent, with the comprehensive plan.

Councilor Moore noted that Washington County staff contended the project was consistent with the comprehensive plan. She stated the ordinance to include the project was in appeal. Mr. Cotugno illustrated an example of providing funding for a project not in the comprehensive plan. He stated construction of the Westside LRT included mitigation of wetlands area construction by replacing the wetlands in another area that might not be identified yet in the comprehensive plan, but is consistent with the intent.

Mr. Shaw stated his understanding was that Washington County considers any alignment within the identified corridor in compliance with requirements for siting the project. He stated LUBA would address the issue.

Mike Hoglund, Transportation Planning Manager, explained the State requirements did not require the project to be in a comprehensive plan to request the funding. He stated additional planning would need to be approved prior to the allocation of funds.

Chair Kvistad opened the public hearing.

Charlotte Corkran, 130 NW 114th Ave., Portland, OR 97229 appeared to testify. She expressed concern that the ranking of the project was high based solely on information provided by Washington County. She stated the proposal by Washington County contained incorrect information that prejudiced the ranking. She stated it would be difficult for people using the park trails to connect to nearby roads. She stated the area is not a scenic area, but rather continuous backyards. She noted significant sums were included for planting indicating the area was not scenic as reported by Washington County.

Patricia Miller, 11165 NW Cornell Road, Portland, OR 97229 appeared to testify. She provided a written copy of her testimony, a copy of which is included in the record of this meeting. She discussed the history of the area and public involvement process. She expressed concerns about the elevations in the park. She stated no North/South connection was established in the plan for connection to the Westside LRT. She had safety related concerns for the proposed project.

Irma Trommlitz, 515 NW 112th Ave., Portland, OR, 97229, appeared to testify. She expressed a desire to focus on the process for the Linear Park. She stated none of the projects submitted by Washington County had public involvement. She stated she was in favor of the park, but did not necessarily agree with the road construction. She explained the road would be a busy road in a residential area and the linear park would provide the only method to make the area pedestrian friendly. She advocated examining the cost of the project. She stated the park would provide the only way to cross between Miller, Barnes and Saltzman Roads. She stated there was support for the project in the affected area. She expressed concern about the number of hearings held on the issues and stated she felt there were too many. Councilor McLain redressed Ms. Trommlitz's comments about the number of hearings.

Councilor Monroe stated the issue for discussion was whether the project should be designated for construction. He explained that the project would only proceed contingent upon the decision to construct the road. Councilor Moore stated she requested technical review of the ranking given to the project.

Mike Borresen, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation, appeared to testify. He explained the existing plan would eliminate 28 homes. He stated the proposed park could exist regardless of the route of the road. He stated the Northwest Subarea Study included the 112th component to reduce traffic on Cornell Road. He explained the Linear Park would tie into the Metro Greenspaces Master plan that sites a portion of the Peterkort Property in the plan. He stated pedestrian access was ensured in the project.

Councilor Moore stated the distances for an inter modal connection were great. She stated portions of the development of the pedestrian portion development was deferred. She asked if Washington County would build that connection. Mr.

Borresen stated Washington County was committed to constructing a sidewalk connection to the Sunset Light Rail Station. He stated the facility would be a minimum of five feet.

Councilor Gardner questioned the connections. He queried how someone on 113th could connect South on Cornell to approach the park. Mr. Borresen stated sidewalk connections would exist. He stated someone on the Westside of Cornell would have to cross Cornell and then double back to access the park. He explained the reason for the need to double back existed because of the elevations of the park. Councilor Gardner stated he did not understand the need for the pedestrian overpass. He stated he foresaw the project being used more for recreation than transportation. He stated he preferred bike paths adjacent to the road. Mr. Borresen agreed that most bicyclist would use the road, while pedestrians would use the park paths. He stated bike lanes would exist on both sides of 113th and the park paths were not intended to replace those lanes.

Councilor Moore expressed concerns that the interchange would be zoned for no pedestrian crossing. Mr. Borresen stated the intent at this time was to allow pedestrian crossing at all four crossings. He stated in the future that could change.

With no other citizens appearing to testify, Chair Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Motion: Councilor Monroe moved to recommend Council adoption of the Resolution.

Councilor Monroe explained the amendment at JPACT would ensure a pedestrian bike path but did not approve road construction. He discussed the importance of the work done by Washington County staff. He stated Metro needed to trust those efforts. He stated to deny funding would be a "blow" to regional partnership.

Councilor Moore asked that the Committee agree that the project was endorsed with the understanding that Washington County commits to construct the connection of the sidewalk to the Sunset Light Rail Station. The committee expressed no objections. She stated she would not support because she had asked for additional technical review and her concerns to that effect had not been addressed. She stated defining the project as an inter modal project was a "stretch".

Councilor Gardner expressed concerns about the inability to separate the issue between approving the funding of the project and of approving the road construction. He stated he felt the park was a "carrot" for the residents in the affected area. He stated the road should have a lane for bicycle transportation. He stated the path through the park was more recreation oriented. He stated he could not support the project because he did not feel the road would be built based on discussions to date.

Councilor McLain stated she would support the Resolution as amended by JPACT. She stated her understanding was that the project met the standards established by Metro. She stated the project was reviewed. She said the review should be improved and plans for improving that review were underway. She explained the contingency list needed improvement. She said standards for citizen involvement should be developed for partnership projects. She discussed the amendments at JPACT as being satisfactory to solicit her approval of the Resolution.

Councilor Gates spoke in favor of pathways away from roadways. He stated the paths provided for enjoyment for bicyclists and a break for motorist in dealing with issues related to bicyclist being on the road. He favored mixed use development such as this project.

Vote: Councilors Gates, McLain, Monroe, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors Gardner and Moore voted nay. Councilors Washington and Devlin were absent. The vote was 4/2 and the motion passed.

## **5. ISTEA Priorities - Briefing**

Mr. Cotugno discussed his memorandum dated February 10, 1994, a copy of which is included in the agenda packet of this meeting. He explained ISTEA required Congress to approve a National Highway System. He suggested Metro comment on projects of significant in the Metro boundaries. He discussed those projects that include: Westside LRT, South/North Project, High-Speed Rail (if it does not compromise LRT), and Freight Rail Improvements in the Rivergate Area. He stated comments should include concerns about the Seismic Retrofit Bridge Program. He stated if the I-5 Salem Bypass

received increased funding, the Metro region may see a decrease. He stated the Columbia Gorge Highway should be designated a Scenic Byway and be eligible for special category funds as is US 101.

Mr. Cotugno responded to questions from the Committee. Councilor Gardner discussed issues related to High Speed Rail. Councilor Gardner stated that funding for High Speed Rail was included in the Federal Railroad Funds and Light Rail was in Transit Funds. He stated an incremental approach was being used to develop high speed rail. Mr. Cotugno disagreed, stating ODOT written documents discussed the project approach using different scenarios. He stated the funding available was from one political source and the source could change based on that political administration.

**6. Councilor Communications**

No Councilor communications were heard.

With no further business before the committee, Chair Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan Lee  
Committee Recorder

**APPROVED**  
**Date** 4.7.94