## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

June 25, 1991

Council Chamber

Committee Members Present:	Jim Gardner (Chair), Richard Devlin
	(Vice Chair), Susan McLain, George
	Van Bergen

Committee Members Absent: Lawrence Bauer

Other Councilors Present: Roger Buchanan

Chair Gardner called the regular meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

<u>1.</u> <u>Review of FY 91-92 Smith and Bybee Lakes Program Contracts</u> for Council "A/B" designations

Jessica Marlitt, Council Analyst, explained the Smith and Bybee Lakes Program Contracts designations were inadvertently omitted from the FY 91-92 Approved Budget Contracts list which the Committee reviewed at its last meeting. She listed the proposed contract designations for the program.

- <u>Motion</u>: Councilor Van Bergen moved to recommend full Council approve the proposed Smith and Bybee Lakes program contract designations in the FY 91-92 Approved Budget.
- <u>Vote</u>: All those present voted aye. Councilor Devlin was absent. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Chair Gardner announced that Karla Forsythe, Council Analyst, would be the new analyst for the Transportation and Planning Committee, replacing Ms. Marlitt who will leave Metro July 12, 1991.

2. Update on Ranking Process for Six-Year 1993-1998 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director, reported the TIP was part of a six year process for the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). He said the information forwarded to ODOT from the Council would be included in their document to the Commission and then to the public for review and final adoption in July of 1992.

Mr. Cotugno distributed two packets, indicating the first packet was the criteria used in ranking the metropolitan area's transportation projects and the second was a list of projects as ranked by staff. He said only new projects and modernization projects not already committed or under construction were Transportation and Planning Committee Minutes June 25, 1991 Page 2

included. He said they were also separated according to the funding account (per ODOT).

Mr. Cotugno noted bridge funds were given particular concern. He indicated the funds were managed by the State but included funds for local bridges. He felt the program should be managed without regard to ownership of the bridges. He also suggested using a two year program instead of the six year program with bridges.

Councilor Devlin commented on the delays on current projects. Mr. Cotugno said some delays resulted from the Surface Transportation Act, increase in costs and continuation of past trends. Councilor Devlin cited problems in the Six Corners area in his Metro subdistrict.

Mr. Cotugno also noted higher ranking was given to those plans including transit, pedestrian and bicycle access.

It was noted the State will probably not release the formal ranking report until the end of the calendar year.

## <u>3.</u> Ordinance No. 91-408, Amending the Planning Procedure for Designating Functional Planning Areas and Activities

Ms. Marlitt reported Ordinance No. 91-408 would amend Ordinance 86-207 and clarify Metro's process for developing functional plans. She noted Section 2 of Ordinance No. 86-207 was changed per the Committee discussion June 11, 1991 and also noted these provisions would be formally included in the Metro Code as Chapter 3.06.

<u>Motion</u>: Councilor Van Bergen moved to recommend full Council adopt Ordinance No. 91-408<u>A</u> as amended.

Councilor Devlin noted the use of the term "issues of metropolitan concern". Mr. Shaw said the term was insignificant and would not change the purpose or intent.

<u>Vote</u>: All those present voted aye. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

## 4. <u>Discussion of RUGGO Worksession for Council June 27, 1991,</u> review of staff memo dated June 19, 1991

Councilor Van Bergen questioned if the Regional Urban Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) would mean "controlling growth" or "managing growth". He expressed concern with the affect of RUGGOs in determining Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) decisions. He also said some issues may be addressed in the Charter. Transportation and Planning Committee Minutes June 25, 1991 Page 3

Chair Gardner said urban growth management issues and regional goals and objectives by Metro were inherited from the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG). He said many of the CRAG goals and objectives were obsolete and needed to be revised and readopted to ensure legal consistency with statewide land use goals. He indicated with the rapid growth the region was experiencing, individual jurisdictions would be at a disadvantage to try and work through the growth problems at only a local level.

The Committee then discussed the proposed Regional Policy Advisory Committee (RPAC) and its functions and powers. Councilor Van Bergen was concerned in a lawsuit a petitioner might cite the Council did not follow the advise of RPAC.

Councilor Van Bergen discussed problems that sometimes occur when staff represent the Executive Officer and not the Council. He said this was not done in bad faith, but without direction of Council and might create further confusion. Chair Gardner noted three members of the Council would be asked to serve on RPAC.

Mr. Cotugno distributed a report on Region 2040 studies, the joint Transportation and Planning and Development Departments' project funded for a total of \$280,000 in FY 91-92. He and Rich Carson, Planning Director, said the study would provide scenarios for implementing the RUGGOs.

The Committee discussed urban reserves. Councilor McLain praised the concept of the Region 2040 study.

Chair Gardner adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Lee Committee Clerk

slatp:625.min