

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

December 10, 1991
Council Chamber

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

Committee Members Absent: None

Chair Gardner called the regular meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. Consideration of Resolution No. 91-1530, For the Purpose of Considering the Recommendations of the Region 2040 Management Committee for Consultant Selection and Contract Approval

Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director, presented the staff report. He said the project was budgeted for \$280,000. He said the team will help define alternative growth scenarios which will be evaluated in Phase II. He said the management committee expressed minor concerns about public involvement and national expertise, and that the consultant proposed a flexible approach which overcame these concerns. He also said the first step will be for the consultant to work with Metro to define the technical methodology and the public involvement process, and to sort out Metro staff responsibilities.

Councilor Gardner asked Mr. Cotugno to respond to two questions raised by Council staff. Mr. Cotugno explained that Phase I products will include up to six different policy choices with geographic maps and evaluation criteria to assist in choosing a preferred option, and further definition of the concept of mixed use urban centers. He said in Phase II, the alternatives will be evaluated and a preferred regional land use and transportation concept will be selected. He said implementation efforts after Phase II could include changes to the Regional Transportation Plan, changes to the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs), development of a plan concept under RUGGOs, and additional Urban Growth boundary administration policies. He said an open question for the future will be whether other functional plans should be adopted to implement the Region 2040 preferred choice. He clarified that Phase II will not identify specific functional plans.

Councilor McLain expressed concerns that the number of committees involved in the project gives the appearance of a cumbersome, complicated process. She said the Region 2040 management committee appears to be a smaller version of the RUGGO group, and noted that it lacks Council participation. She also indicated her concern that policy issues come to the Transportation and Planning Committee and Council with little background explanation. She believed the Council should not just be educated about policy

issues, but engage in a flow of ideas, because the Council represents the regional viewpoint as distinguished from the jurisdictional viewpoint. She was concerned that the review process for this project gets further away from Council involvement.

Mr. Cotugno said the management committee is not a policy committee, since policy is developed through the existing policy advisory committees, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and the Regional Policy Advisory Committee (RPAC) established under RUGGOs. He said with so many policy interests, a management committee is critical. He said that Council staff was invited to attend the meetings. He does not favor having an elected official on the committee, because each jurisdiction will then want to bring an elected official and it will become a policy committee.

Karla Forsythe, Council Analyst, said she had attended almost all committee meetings and noted that while she and other invited non-members had not voted on the selection, they had the opportunity to participate fully in the discussion. She said one way of addressing Councilor McLain's concerns might be through a more participatory role for Council staff.

Councilor Devlin asked when the preferred option would be selected. Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner, said the selection of the preferred option most likely is 2-3 years away. Mr. Cotugno added in his view, if a program needs a functional plan, it should be addressed without waiting for Region 2040 completion.

Councilor Devlin noted neither the Transportation and Planning Committee nor the Council are listed on the consultant's workflow diagram as part of the review process. He believes the failure to list them could impact the way the process is viewed. He asked for revisions to the workflow to show both the Transportation and Planning Committee and the Council, and that the revised version be submitted to the Urban Growth Management Policy Advisory Committee at its December 11, 1991 meeting. Councilor McLain reiterated the importance of including both the Transportation and Planning Committee and the Council in the process.

Councilor Gardner asked for a very simple description of what this project means and how it fits with the whole planning function of Metro. Mr. Cotugno said RUGGO was a guiding light, but the drawback was there are too many ways to interpret it on the ground. He said Region 2040 takes RUGGO one step further, by giving a better physical guide of how the region should grow.

Councilor Van Bergen expressed his concern that matters come to Council after they are solidified, and inquired about the extent to which the Council can impact policies at the end of the process.

Mr. Cotugno said the project was divided into phases to address this concern. He said Phase I will set out alternatives, which can then be debated with the choices in front of the public.

Councilor McLain said staff brings a level of technical expertise to the management committee, and Council staff brings the citizen perspective as seen by Councilors. She said she believes both are important, and although elected officials should not participate, the Council should be represented on the Committee. Councilor Devlin expressed his view that Council staff reports to the Council and the Executive Officer's staff reports to the Executive Officer, but that all other Metro staff report equally to both. Councilor Van Bergen disagreed.

Councilor Gardner noted a consensus among committee members that the management committee should include the appropriate Council analyst as a full member.

Motion to Amend: Councilor McLain moved to include the appropriate Council analyst as a full member of the management committee.

Vote on Motion to Amend: All those present voted aye. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Motion: Councilor Devlin voted to recommend Resolution No. 91-1530 to full Council for adoption.

Councilor Van Bergen indicated he would vote against the resolution, because of a lack of confidence in the Cogan group.

Vote: Councilors Devlin, Bauer, Gardner, and McLain voted aye. Councilor Van Bergen voted nay. The vote was 4/1 and the motion passed.

2. Five Year Financial Planning, Phase II: Five Year Program Descriptions - Planning and Development Department

Chair Gardner deferred this item to a future meeting.

3. Consideration of Resolution No. 91-1526, For the Purpose of Endorsing Comments and Recommendations Regarding ODOT's November 1991 Draft Oregon Transportation Plan Policy Element

Mr. Cotugno presented his staff report. He informed the Committee of the public hearing process the draft would go through. He also reviewed the five areas of concern addressed in the resolution: urban mobility, support of multi-modal transportation, adequate funding, urban mobility consistent with statewide plan, and

continued support of Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). He said there was discussion about adopting California tail pipe standards but the concept was not endorsed in this resolution.

Chair Gardner noted the draft plan was very general. Mr. Cotugno said the plan represents a major departure for ODOT. He said he would be communicating Metro's comments in a letter.

Councilor Devlin asked how the six-year program would be made consistent with the transportation plan. Mr. Cotugno said the six year program has been ODOT's highway plan for how it spends money. He said it was still likely to be dominated by highway projects, but could be implemented to target funds for transit. He said he believes plan goals will be addressed in evaluating the six-year program.

Chair Gardner asked if the constitutional restriction of highway revenues was addressed. Mr. Cotugno said the draft plan does not explicitly address removal of restrictions on highway revenues, but the language is sufficiently flexible to support funding for all modes. He noted that the public has testified in favor of amending the constitutional restriction.

Motion: Councilor Devlin moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. 91-1526.

Vote: Councilors Devlin, Gardner, Bauer and Van Bergen voted aye. Councilor McLain was absent. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Councilor Van Bergen requested on an unrelated item that Larry Shaw, General Counsel inform Dan Cooper, General Counsel to provide him with any correspondence related to the Riedel Composter facility.

4. Five Year Financial Planning, Phase II: Five Year Program Descriptions - Transportation Department


Mr. Cotugno distributed a handout. He explained the handout outlined existing and proposed programs over the next five years. He gave a summary of those programs and timelines.

Mr. Cotugno also explained the Transportation Department had unpredictable revenue sources and programs and was difficult to forecast. He said some of the regular programs might increase due to the new Surface Transportation Act. He also noted many inter-related projects were underway. Mr. Cotugno stated the department needed a new comprehensive finance package.

Transportation and Planning Committee Minutes
December 10, 1991
Page 5

With no further business before the Committee, Chair Gardner
adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Lee".

Susan Lee
Committee Clerk

sl
C:\TP\101091.MIN