

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

August 13, 1991

Council Chamber

Committee Members Present: Jim Gardner (Chair), Richard Devlin,
Susan McLain

Committee Members Absent: Lawrence Bauer, George Van Bergen

Chair Gardner called the regular meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

1. Update on Status of Regional Emergency Planning Program FY
1991-92 Work Plan

Becky Crockett, Regional Planning Supervisor, reported the primary focus of the Regional Emergency Planning Program work plan was to strategically seize opportunities of regional significance without intimidating the local risk managers. She indicated local managers expressed interest in the function Metro would play in the regional emergency plan.

Ms. Crockett distributed a copy of the proposal for Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) funding. She said \$56,000 in funds were to be awarded to local governments. She indicated the application was filed in June for these funds and said \$16,000 in funds were awarded to Metro. She indicated there was some concern over the funds being awarded to a regional government instead of a local government body.

She said the intent of the preliminary work program was to have the emergency manager complete the work program when hired. She said the preliminary plan was reviewed by local emergency managers and the plan was acceptable to them.

Ms. Crockett said staff has been working closely with the Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Committee (OSSPAC). She said the committee has been established as a permanent committee through Senate Bill 96 at the last legislative session. She said Metro staff attended meetings and volunteered to supply technical information the committee was seeking. She said staff has been working on policy issues to present to the committee at an August 23, 1991 meeting. Councilor McLain asked who initiated the contact. Ms. Crockett indicated staff attended the meeting and initiated the conversation with the committee.

Ms. Crockett reported there has been overwhelming support from jurisdictions and entities interested in the program. She said the City of Los Angeles invited staff to attend a conference, Portland General Electric has requested help in equipping facilities for seismic activity, Portland State University has a intern prepared to do a thesis on the issue, and the Corp of Engineers,

neighborhood associations and other bodies have also expressed interest. She said a small number of local emergency managers are concerned about Metro's role. She felt some of the concern might stem from competition for funding. She said private industry, including consultants David Newton and Associates, are interested in the program. She displayed maps of local seismic activity prepared by David Newton and Associates.

The committee discussed concerns about risk managers who might oppose Metro's participation. Don Carlson, Council Administrator said forum discussions might alleviate some of the concerns by opening communication with those individuals. Councilor Gardner noted the plan included public forums.

2. Update on Status of Housing Planning Program FY 1991-92 Workplan

Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner, gave a staff report on the regional housing work program. He indicated the Housing Forum was well attended. He said the proposed work plan had been distributed. He outlined the 7 tasks included in the table of contents of the work plan, filed in the record of this meeting.

Councilor Devlin questioned if 1.5 FTE would be sufficient to complete the tasks. Mr. Turpel said all the tasks could be completed with 1.5 FTE, with the possible exception of task 2, Jobs/Housing Balance Analysis, which may require additional staff time.

3. Resolution No. 91-1483, For the Purpose of Authorizing Issuance of a Request for Proposal to Select Consultant Services for Phase I of Region 2040, A Coordinated Transportation and Land Use Study, to Waive the Requirements for Council Approval of the Contract, and to Authorize the Executive Officer to Execute the Contract Subject to Conditions

Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director, presented the staff report. He said consultants will be asked to submit Statements of Qualifications, and that three consultant teams will be selected to prepare detailed responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP). He reported the major work product from this phase will be six development alternatives, including a base case which reflects existing plans and policies. He said other work products include design criteria, a strategy for reaching the public, a definition of mixed use urban centers, and evaluation criteria. He said evaluation of the alternatives and selection of a preferred concept will occur in Phase II, to be budgeted in a future year. He said although Council had adopted a budget note requiring Council approval of the contract, this step should no longer be necessary,

since a sufficient level of detail about the scope of work has now been provided. Mr. Cotugno emphasized the importance of obtaining approval of the contract so that the work could be started shortly.

Councilor McLain asked how many consultant teams were expected to respond to the RFP and what process was used to invite proposals. Rich Carson, Planning and Development Director, said several teams were anticipated to respond. He said consultants have been contacted through national and local directories.

Mr. Carson reviewed a memorandum dated August 13, 1991, in which he and Mr. Cotugno responded to questions raised by Council staff about the content of the RFP. He said that staff plans to add explanatory text to the RFP which briefly outlines the anticipated scope of work during Phase II.

Councilor Devlin stated the budget note requiring contract approval was adopted because at that time, the scope of work was not yet defined. The Committee inquired about language in the RFP providing that concepts developed by the consultant team will be reviewed to insure they are "generally reasonable". The Committee queried if the phrase referred to a determination that a concept is internally reasonable, or reasonable based on external factors. Mr. Cotugno explained the process is intended to establish that there is a reasonable range of alternatives. He said there will need to be a collective sense that reasonable choices are not arbitrarily eliminated. Staff indicated this language would be revised.

The Committee discussed ways in which the Committee and Council could be involved. Mr. Carson said staff will be glad to work with the Council in any way throughout the process. Don Carlson, Council Administrator, asked whether Council would be involved through a resolution. Mr. Carson said it would be more informal. Mr. Cotugno indicated that formal action would be a good idea.

Committee discussion then focused on the desirability of Council approval of the final contract. Councilor McLain pointed out that policy decisions will be based on how the consultants present the six scenarios, so the Council needs to feel comfortable with the process for how these scenarios are developed.

Mr. Carlson asked whether the proposers will have discretion to modify the scope of work. Mr. Cotugno responded that although the scope of work is drawn as closely as possible, there will be a difference based on the expertise of the group selected.

Mr. Carlson clarified that this is a multi-year contract, and that the Code requires Council approval unless it is waived. He said

that this requirement could be viewed as an opportunity to further inform the Committee and Council about the project.

Councilor Gardner said if the Committee recommends waiver of final approval, it will be a recommendation that the Council act in a different manner than was intended during the budget process. He said there is a value in coming again to Council and that it emphasizes the importance of the contract. He said it also would be an opportunity to acquaint the full Council with how the Region 2040 study relates to the Regional Urban Growth Goals and objectives (RUGGO's), which the Council will have recently adopted at the time the contract comes to the Council for approval. Councilor Gardner said he would like the full Council to hear about the work plan before approving the contract.

The Committee discussed modifying the schedule to expedite Council approval, and noted that the date of final Committee review and Council approval will depend on the date selected for the second Council meeting in November.

Motion: Councilor Devlin moved to recommend full Council adopt Resolution No. 91-1483.

The Committee agreed by consensus to amend Resolution No. 91-1483 by deleting paragraphs two, three, and five, and by amending the title to reflect the deletion of Council waiver of the contract review. Councilor Devlin also requested that staff add language to the RFP clarifying the scope of work in Phase II, and indicated it was his understanding that the "reasonableness" reference will be rewritten. Staff will also revise the schedule in the RFP to indicate the contract will be submitted to the Committee and Council by the end of November, with the contract to be signed by December 1.

Vote: All those present voted aye. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed as amended above.

With no further business before the Committee, Chair Gardner adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan Lee
Committee Clerk