

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

June 24, 1999

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Rod Monroe (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Ed Washington, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, David Bragdon, Jon Kvistad

Councilors Absent: None

Presiding Officer Monroe convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:04 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

None.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. MPAC COMMUNICATION

Councilor McLain reviewed the MPAC meeting from last night. She said it was a great presentation for Elaine Wilkerson on the growth report. She noted that the staff had been working on this for the last five to six months. She noted the presentations that had been made this past week that let people know how they were doing and updating the 1997-growth report. She said they talked about the Metro Code which included an update from Dan Cooper on some of the Metro Code changes that needed work on since they have changed to an urban reserve process and review process of the urban growth boundary. She said there were some small items on the end of the agenda that she missed.

Councilor Bragdon wanted to supplement Councilor McLain remarks on the meeting, and stated that Andy Cotugno, Transportation Planning Director, gave a brief presentation about the regional transportation plan.

Councilor McLain described her new grandson, Ryan Michael.

Presiding Officer Monroe congratulated her.

Councilor Washington said it was true she did not look like a grandmother.

6. METRO LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Dan Cooper, General Counsel, said transportation funding continued to be held in the Senate pending the Senate President search for support for his plan to increase the gas tax 5 cents instead of the approved 6 cents, repeal the weight mile tax and substitute the diesel tax. He stated that at last report the bill was being vigorously opposed by AAA of Oregon and would lead to an impasse that would lead to nothing. They would be talking with Mr. Phelps about what level of activity Metro could have to change the results. By tomorrow Mr. Phelps may have some strategies that Mr. Cooper would discuss with the Presiding Officer Monroe, Executive Officer and other councilors. He said there continued to be the possibility of Day Road rather than Dammasch Prison siting bill. Metro would continue to monitor the siting. Since last Thursday the governor had signed Senate Bill 1031, annexations to the Metro jurisdictional boundaries, this was now law. Senate Bill 87 despite our 100% neutrality, failed.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked despite or because of.

Mr. Cooper said Mr. Phelps did not know because he was not involved in it.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked if there were any questions for Mr. Cooper.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

7.1 Consideration meeting minutes of the June 17, 1999 Regular Council Meeting.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of June 17, 1999 Regular Council Meeting.

Councilor Kvistad asked for the minutes.

Councilor Bragdon asked the same.

Seconded: **Councilor** seconded the motion.

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

8. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

8.1 **Ordinance No. 99-793C**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget for Fiscal Year 1999-00, Making Appropriations, and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes, and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 99-793C.

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

Councilor McLain said that everyone had worked very hard and had done a very good job on the budget. She stated that they had to take the budget to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission, a public hearing was held, and with that it had been received and the

recommendations were attached in Exhibit A. In consideration of what would be seen in the ordinance, there were 7 items that were major issues, that she reviewed. The fiscal year 1999-00 Metro Budget in the total amount \$ 384,940,335 was in Exhibit B. She invited staff to be available for questions.

Presiding Officer Monroe they were here for the purpose of answering questions.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 99-793C. No one came forward, Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing.

Councilor Kvistad said, over the last 3 years as the chair of the council, he had serious concerns about where we are and where we were going with the budget. He showed a slide presentation and walked through the budget. Councilor Kvistad stated his concerns about the excise taxes, where Metro had come from and the need to take care of the needs of the agency. Beginning in 1994 and 1995, at the same time that Metro had had fiscal crisis, this agency was siphoning off money for project facilities. He wanted to do something about this. Simply on OCC, Expo and the Zoo from 1994, \$882,000-\$107,000,000 had been budgeted and was projected to be higher next year. In departmental summaries a look at spending occurring showed a continuous need to spend. Councilor Kvistad stated that this was brought to his attention by Councilor Park on temporary employees, he had identified that they had over a 1,000,000 temp hours. These were not line items, he stated that we didn't know where they came from and how the dollars were spent. This needed to be addressed. Metro seemed to be in poverty but came up with magic Metro money, a crisis in ending fund balance but we had enough money for a 100,000+ position in Executive Office department. He stated that council voted on this but he was not part of that. Children's admissions at the Zoo increased, why? Councilor Kvistad did not feel comfortable with the \$400,000,000 budget. Contiguous emergency funds were decreasing, he saw this as a danger zone. He talked about garbage money, where was the money coming from, where it was going, and how was that working. He stated that Councilor Washington was just now starting the hearings. He had seen people coming in wanting a piece of the money. He suggested a 24 month moratorium on any new spending projects, also a budget committee to determine a policy for the interim use of this money pending the outcome of the REM hearings process that Councilor Washington was chairing. He also would like to set a priority of reserving these funds for this agency only or giving back to the public or a combination of both. Councilor Kvistad made the quote "the Metro budget, just say no because I am going to today"

Presiding Officer Monroe asked for additional comments from council.

Councilor McLain closed indicating she appreciated the comments of Councilor Kvistad. She said they needed to remember that 99.1% of the budget was a fee, the public was receiving a service that they had asked to be refined. The budget had been able to be maintained at the present level. We did have a capital fund that was voter approved to do projects at the Oregon Zoo. She wanted to congratulate this council, especially Jon Kvistad for the work at the Expo Center because they were able to add, with this fee for service, another building. She pointed out that one of the things she believed the individual departments had done was reorganize their FTE and temp help to get more service or more projects completed. She stated that most of the time these were special projects that Metro did not have the permanent FTE to handle. She noted a recent survey pointed out that the planning fund was recognized as one of Metro major responsibilities as well as one of the items the public liked. She ended by saying it was easy to vote for the budget this year because the review from executive and staff had made a statement

that we were going to review the projects and services on a yearly basis and those that did not work would be cut and those that did work would continue. She said she was pleased to bring this Ordinance No. 99 793C as the finished budget as approved by the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Kvistad voting no.

8.2 **Ordinance No. 99-808**, Amending the FY 1998-99 Budget and Appropriations Schedule in the Growth Management Department of the Planning Fund transferring \$42,350 from Contingency to Personal Services to fund annexation processing services purchased by the local jurisdictions and declaring emergencies.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 99-808.

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

Councilor McLain opened by saying this came in front of the Growth Management Committee and at this time she brought forward this particular budget change. She said we were transferring money from one fund to another to help Metro with the transition period in the annexation processes and services that had been purchased by local jurisdictions from us. The boundary commission went away in January of this year, and many of the services needed to be carried over by the county or by Metro. Metro had a person who did work with the commission, Ken Martin who worked in this building but was being contracted by the local jurisdiction that wanted boundary annexation work completed for them. She stated this had been going on for 5 to 6 months, it seemed to be working quite well, and local jurisdictions were now asking for hourly rates for other projects on their books. She stated that it was helping us through the transition of not having a boundary commission and making sure that Metro and the counties were able to take over those functions. She suggested an aye vote.

Presiding Officer Monroe thanked Councilor McLain and asked if there were questions of members of the council.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 99-808. No one came forward, Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing.

Councilor Bragdon asked if it was costing the citizens of these jurisdictions who used these services any more with Metro or with the Boundary Commission.

Councilor McLain responded that this was conversation that went on in the sub-committee of MPAC when they went through writing the code and the changes for this commission. They conducted a study to figure out what the cost and overhead was, and what a fair rate would be. She stated that they were not identical to the boundary commission, because the work had been split up differently. They agreed to look at those fees very concisely to see if they were fair market value. They may be more or less depending on how it had been split up.

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

8.3 **Ordinance No. 99-810**, For the Purpose of Amending the Budget and Appropriation Schedule for FY 1998-99 by Transferring \$50,000 from Contingency to Personal Services in the Zoo Operating Fund, and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 99-810.

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

Councilor Washington opened with saying that this was just an adjustment of \$50,000 in the Zoo operating budget for fiscal year 98-99 this was needed for additional temporary and visitor services. The result of this was there was a higher than expected start up labor for the new entrance facilities and a greater than projected catering volume which needed additional funding for temporary services. This was a one time transfer, they did not anticipate any additional transfers from contingency at least for the balance of this year, and there was the money in contingency. This will reduce the line item from \$663,510 to \$612,510 and increase the personal service line from \$9,085,648 to \$9,135,645. He stated that this was just on of those things where they needed just a little extra money. He urged an aye vote.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked Councilor Kvistad if he was going to ask about the temporary services.

Councilor Kvistad said no, he was in favor of this. He stated he could ask for a list of who they were and what they were doing, because they may be part of the 1,000,000 temporary hours he had spoken of before concerning the budget.

Presiding Officer Monroe said he was just checking he didn't want it to seem that he wasn't paying attention.

Councilor Bragdon suggested a truce here, and said that we wouldn't let Councilor Kvistad ask if there were temporary employees if we didn't ask him to talk about the importance of having contingency for just this sort of thing.

Presiding Officer Monroe conferred that sounded well.

Presiding Officer Monroe then opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 99-810. No one came forward. **Presiding Officer Monroe** closed the public hearing.

Councilor Washington thanked the Presiding Officer, Councilor Bragdon, and Councilor Kvistad, for allowing him to be neutral in this situation. He then closed by urging an aye vote.

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

9. RESOLUTIONS

9.1 **Resolution No. 99-2764**, For the Purpose of Approving Metro Membership in the "For the Sake of Salmon" organization.

Motion: **Councilor Park** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2764.

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

Councilor Park opened by saying that this was something that the Presiding Officer brought to the Growth Management Committee based upon a letter he had received inviting Metro to join this organization for the sake of the salmon. He invited Senator Bradbury to speak on this.

Senator Bill Bradbury said for the sake of salmon was formed in 1995 because there was a recognition that just suing each other wasn't going to save the salmon. It was going to take all of us to save the salmon. He stated that the endangered species act listing clearly made that very apparent. That was the effort Metro was involved with, supporting the watershed-based approach, where you involve as many stakeholders as possible.

Presiding Officer Monroe said it tweaked his interest when he said it would not cost anything, and all the sudden he became a strong supporter.

Councilor Park asked for a short list of the members of this organization

Senator Bradbury said there were 62 organizations in 3 states, California, Oregon, Washington. There were a number of federal agencies. There were the tribes represented by the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission which included 23 treaty tribes in the state of Washington. Local governments were Metro, City of Portland, counties throughout the region, and City of Seattle. On the non-governmental side there were environmental organizations in all three states, Pacific Rivers Council, Trout Unlimited, the fishing, boat sport and commercial industries. Agriculture was represented by both the California and Washington farm bureaus, Industry, Utility, and Timber was a member. It was a pretty broad ranging group and the challenge we faced were finding something all those people could agree on. That was what we hung our hat on.

Councilor Park stated that from what they had touched on there was no financial obligation to this membership. The activities were basically to provide support for conferences, to try to get people together to talk about issues, to support voluntary watershed organizations. Some people might be nervous with the environmental groups' coalitions. He urged an aye vote.

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

9.2 **Resolution No. 99-2789**, For the Purpose of Declaring Support for Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Initiative and Federal Funding for Watershed Recovery in Response to Endangered Species Listing.

Motion: **Councilor Park** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2789.

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

Councilor Park opened by communicating that there was no financial obligation to Metro, this resolution communicated our support for the \$100,000,000 that was being proposed by the Clinton administration for the four western states for recovery of fish habitat. He brought out that our support on this was perfectly logical, and we recognized that we would not be receiving this money directly, however the watersheds that were in our region may be possible recipients. He then asked Senator Bradbury and David Moskowitz, the Salmon Recovery Coordinator, to go into more detail.

Mr. Moskowitz said this effort to come up new money in the congressional budget was testimony to the broad support there was for the west coast salmon recovery. In the congress there usually was not a lot of support for increasing budgets, yet we still found a lot of support in the Senate for this new effort with new money approximately \$80,000,000 to be divided between the states and \$20,000,000 for implementation of the recently signed US/Canada Salmon Treaty which would help our rivers even though a lot of the action in Puget Sound and off the coast of British Columbia and Alaska. He stated there was a lot of work to do in the house, back in D.C., the Metro – Council resolution would be sent to our Oregon delegation so they could talk with their colleagues and urge support in the house which was where the real battle was.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked Mr. Moskowitz how he really felt about being called the fish guy.

Councilor Bragdon asked for kinds of projects this was used for.

Mr. Moskowitz described one of the key parts of the fund was having state mechanisms by which there was an ability to pass this money through local governments. He said that, in the past, Oregon had had the watershed enhancements board or GWEB. It was the only state in the west that had had a very effective mechanism with state money, federal money down to the local watershed level. It was very possible that mechanism would be changed by this Oregon legislature and the creation of an Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, OWEB. This was an effort that may change things a bit but it was meant to be broader. Both California and Washington had, just this year, created a mechanism to pass through both state funds and federal as well as private funds. The way it worked in Oregon was the GWEB had a board that reviewed projects by applicants, that had a set of criteria and priorities and applied a certain amount to streamside fencing, creation of off chance rearing habitat and agricultural lands on the coast. Most of this was hands on; he would defer to Senator Bradbury to give some examples.

Senator Bradbury said he thought that Moskowitz did a good job and that the governor in this state had made it very clear that if this federal money arrived it would be spent by the governors watershed enhancement board or the new OWEB if it came to pass. That meant that most of the money went to projects that had been the result of in the watershed council doing a watershed assessment, developing and prioritizing the action plan, then implementing the action plan. That was what the money was for, that was exciting because the President and the federal government had recognized the significant impact on habitat that these kind of voluntary watershed associations could have.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked for additional questions.

Councilor Atherton added that when you were dealing with the federal government it could be good news and bad news. There was always the question why should federal taxpayers save salmon on West Coast. Federal taxpayers had received the benefit from these lands.

Councilor Park thought people were beginning to recognize that recovery efforts was going to be a long battle and the area of critical need was on private property. We needed to find good incentives to help people create the habitat that was necessary, if it were just on the federal lands we would have a different mechanism. The reality was with private property rights we just need to encourage people to do the right things. When you treat people with respect they want to do

the right thing, that was just natural. It did not have a financial impact on Metro, and it would be decided on in Congress, with the four states involved. He urged an aye vote. The recommendation would be a cover letter sent to the congressional delegations drafted by the Presiding Officer and the Executive Officer.

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

9.3 **Resolution No. 99-2797**, For the Purpose of Appointing Dorothy Sperry to the Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2797.

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

Councilor McLain said the WRPAC bylaws were passed by this council and in that particular update we had some new members added and some other folks that they were confirming. There would be a couple more coming because there had been changes in some agencies that had some time for change of staff. This change was from the Port of Portland and would allow Dorothy Sperry to become the regular member and Mary Gibson to be the alternate member. She said WRPAC was notified in their packet and they chose not to vote since it was not an agency appointment.

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

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on resolutions: 99-2795A, 99-2806A and 99-2804A.

Councilor Kvistad spoke to Resolution No. 99-2795A, the Unified Work Program. As part of the failure of South/North light rail there was still a major need in Clackamas County to deal with transportation issues. As such we tried to address that and made some commitments to the county. There was \$1.5 million for a study of the Transportation Alternatives as part of the funding package just approved. That meant we needed to amend our work plan in order to improve our projects or make new ones.

The second resolution was to amend the Locally Preferred Strategy for the northern light rail segment now to be called IMAX. This resolution started to show the alignment and the scope of work. We will move on to complete technical work necessary to have that project be viable and in place.

The third resolution, in part, was endorsing the IMAX project and, in part, was for the south corridor finances strategy. What this meant was, we were not going south with the light rail. We heard the voters; the only project we would be working on was the north segment. Today the Council would consider endorsement to move forward with IMAX. The final decisions would come from federal government in November. For now, saying we were looking at the segment, how did you pay for it once the studies were done. How do we fund improvements? The money already in the reserve for the south/north was set aside for rail in the corridor, \$55 million. Over and above that was for HOV lanes and other projects. We said we would take any savings and add additional money into a new flexible fund to allow us to look at things like new HOV, new bus, other items and Washington County Commuter Rail. Roy Rogers, Washington

Commissioner, was the member who supported this and brought it to our attention. It got unanimous support from JPACT to go forward.

Mr. Richard Brandman, Transportation Planning Director, discussed the south light rail. He said when the election was lost and the listening posts were held, Metro heard clearly no south light rail and the suggestion not to forget to do something with some kind of alternative. Traffic was expected to double over the next twenty years. The study in the Work Plan was intended to break the study area into 3 distinct segments because there may be improvements required in each segment that were different from others. They would look at options and would come up with a strategy that was cohesive. They would look at the expansion of McLoughlin Blvd. The over all study would conclude no later than Dec 2000. Staff had worked with the community, Tri-Met and City of Portland to develop an alternative. Part of the problem was costs. Would there be another way to do it with less cost and impact. He indicated that Fred Hansen, Tri-Met General Manager, would be here to tell you the answer to those questions. A tremendous public involvement effort had been held as well. In general we were finding the community was in favor of the north light rail about 2 to 1. We produced a supplemental draft environmental impact statement on this project. That triggered a 45-day public comment period. The project would have significant benefits. There would be a time savings of about 45%. There were concerns about traffic diversion and what would the interchange at the Expo look like. If this resolution were approved over the next several months the Transportation Department would develop the final environmental impact statement. If this was successful we could negotiate an agreement with the federal government by the end of this year potentially, and could start operation in 2004.

Councilor Atherton asked if the \$114 million was from Lloyd Center to Expo Center?

Mr. Brandman said that was correct.

Councilor Atherton said people might ask why this lower cost proposal was not made the other time.

Mr. Brandman said they had looked at this project in the mid 1990s. He showed the new alignment on map and showed the alignment on the previous alignment map on the east side of freeway north of downtown. By shifting the light rail to the west side you changed the access to the Elliot neighborhood and Emmanuel Hospital.

Councilor Kvistad followed up by saying, in terms of the financing of the project itself and where we were going, it had been an interesting kind of journey for all. This was a very constrained environment and with 24 cities, 3 counties and special districts, we needed to come up with a balanced package. There had been a unanimous vote from JPACT, a body that wasn't necessarily prone to unanimity when it came to doling out dollars. This was a good testament to why the federal metropolitan planning organization worked. He thought that this was a good thing to keep in mind.

Mr. Brandon said this also came recommended unanimously from Portland City Council and the Tri-Met Board. He said you might be hearing from them.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened public hearing on all three resolutions, indicating that each person would have three minutes to speak and could speak to one or more of the resolutions under consideration.

Fred Hansen, Director of Tri-Met, gave a comprehensive approach to look at needs in the south/north corridor. He emphasized factors: listening posts were critical to identifying that the north area continued to support light rail. The southern area wanted transit but alternatives to light rail. Dick Reiten, CEO of NW Natural Gas, led a business and neighborhood effort to look at alternatives. The original communication had zero displacements by being located on Interstate Ave. He said there were additional steps that needed to be taken. He stated that they had about 5% of the engineering level that needed to be completed, 30% would be completed during this next several months if approved. Traffic, nature of urban design, bus program, these and more issues would be addressed in the next several months. They were beginning on the bus work.

Presiding Officer Monroe said Councilor Washington was also a member of JPACT, his district played a critical role in neighborhoods. He had played an instrumental role with all the meetings being the chair.

Per Fagering, 4108 SE 16th, Portland OR 97202 said he was opposing the resolution. He said the stops were too far apart and some residents in the neighborhood under the Albina Community Concept Plan which would be high density, would be 10 blocks away from a stop. Businesses between stops would suffer and go out of business for the basic purpose of bringing people from Vancouver, when the I-5 was being repaired, the people came from Vancouver on existing tracks and it was good. People wanted a pedestrian friendly Interstate. Streetcars were better suited for people who lived there. Finally, money could be better spent. Local agencies were putting up \$110 million and there was better ways to spend it. Here was a possibility of commuter rail. The Interstate project should serve people in the neighborhood, not across the bridge.

Terry Parker, 1527 NE 65th Ave Portland, OR 97213 said there was zero tolerance. The public wanted zero taken away. That meant Expo park and ride must be moved or replaced. Capacity must be increased. Costs must be part of total project. Zero take aways also meant any financing plan, urban renewal district or developing tax incentive would not be caused to raise taxes on any other property. You had also heard truly regional service. Today there were multiple regional centers; old-fashioned service was not good enough. He suggested that trains must also go from Gresham to Expo center, direct express bus connections should bypass the downtown congestion. He added in 1978 as chairman of Banfield Citizen Advisory Committee he suggested a line be built to airport in conjunction with the Banfield line.

Councilor Kvistad asked about photos.

Mr. Parker said they were his.

Greg Kantor, Vice President Public Affairs at NW Natural Gas appeared before the council, represented Dick Reiten. He wanted to speak to how the proposal for line had evolved and received. In early February after discussions with a number of people in the business community Mr. Reiten asked Fred Hansen whether it was still possible to capture federal funds for a light rail project. Mr. Hansen said it was if they moved quickly. He stated that some voters said no to North/South because they did not want to increase property taxes. This proposal would not. Some felt it was too expensive. This proposal was about a 3rd of the cost. This would displace no homes. It had the potential of capturing more than \$250,000,000 in federal funds. Enthusiasm for line extended across the Columbia. Region-wide 63% said they supported the line. In

addition to the public support, there was strong business support for the project. The petition that he mentioned early included the region's largest companies as well as numerous small companies.

Rick Williams chair, IMAX Advisory Committee stated that it had 15 members representing communities along the line. He wanted to outline the process of developing the detailed white paper recommending which supported moving forward with IMAX They had met 6 times since April. The process included 1) Community involvement, communicate using simple terms reach out beyond established groups 2) traffic was a concern, staff was working hard to address those questions, how it correlated with I-5 trade corridor. PIR was a very high concern. 3) urban design, this had to be integrated into a coherent vision to the enhancement of the community 4) funding, we were supported by mayor for urban renewal, 5) economic development, business and public should be part of planning 6) bus/lightrail interface, recommended beginning with the premise that existing bus service would not be eliminated. What was there that wouldn't work, 7) environmental issues, getting to Vancouver. The committee looked forward to finishing and bringing work to the Council. The Citizen Advisory Committee recommended moving forward with this project.

Presiding Officer Monroe thanked Mr. Williams for his of years of work on the project. He said we need more people like you in community.

Councilor Bragdon asked Mr. Williams if that work should not be considered finished with the white paper. It had a lot of history. He hoped that the 15 members on the citizens advisory committee would continue to be a part of the process.

Mr. Williams agreed and said they would stay with project as long as they could.

Gerald Milner said one of the reasons for advocating this project was concern for people in Portland. He shared that concern as well. He documented in the handout (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). Historically they had under invested in buses in North Portland. To compare the regions, there were much fewer in that area. Second, he spoke to the tremendous cost savings, the project would cost \$12 for additional rider, average cost for present riders is 1.80. If you read the specs carefully, they were going on purchasing 24 trains, and they were only going to have 17. This was a future cost. There was also travel time savings. Note you were comparing a bus that stopped every 2 blocks vs. a train that skipped every 5. Express buses were considered. Fourth, economic development to North Portland, there was no evidence that that occurred. You were willing to cut out the middle of a road in North Portland. He also expressed concern about rail congestion in the proposed plan. Tri-met had never successfully operated a train more than every 5 minutes because trains stacked up. This project proposed a train every 2.6 minutes. This was not feasible.

Connie Hunt, Hayden Island Neighborhood Association, 3650 N. Lotus Beach Drive, Portland, OR 97217. Her question was was this project worth further consideration. Her response was no. It was fatally flawed and no amount of discussion could help it. Begin work on a project that would work. She pointed out some major flaws: traffic, the project did not raise the level of service to an acceptable level. Park and ride for Expo was big flaw because she lived there. The interchange on Marine Drive would prohibit anyone from using the park and ride, if they tried they would just add to an already failed system. Port of Portland was planning a project on the West End of Hayden Island which would directly impact traffic. Economical

development, she did not believe this would develop in the area. She recognized the need for development but remained unconvinced this was the one. The project would displace businesses both during and after construction, it would victimize businesses. She expressed concerns about the creation of urban renewal district. The funding resources seemed very vague but if there was a free pot of money this project did not deserve funding.

Jerrie Johnson, 6336 N. Campbell, Portland, OR 97217, spoke in opposition to the full Interstate alignment. She was concerned about the large amount of traffic that would be diverted into her neighborhood. She commented that in the year 2015, with or without lightrail, the Going Street intersection, Lombard and Denver/Argyle would have F-LOS (level of service) designations. She had great concerns about the isolation of the area between I-5 and Interstate Avenue, which would once again be divided. Access in and out of the neighborhood would become less achievable as well as impact the neighborhood businesses on Interstate. She cautioned that emergency vehicle access must be carefully assessed; she reminded the council that Interstate Avenue was a main conduit for emergency vehicle access. She also had great concerns about the 3 school crossings on the proposed rail line, 2 directly on the line, and one a block away. She wondered how much Expo could hold; because they already had the exhibit halls, a proposed park and ride and a proposed pavilion. She said there was already PIR and East Delta Park and Hayden Island activity and she felt the entire complex needed to be studied for the whole picture before any plans were carried out.

Tad Winiecki 16810 NE 40th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686, summarized his written testimony (a copy of this testimony can be found in the permanent record of this meeting). He said an important fact about transportation systems in any area was that if you did not have to pay the driver, smaller vehicles were more economical. His recommendation to Metro was don't build more lightrail lines because they were not economically competitive with buses since the 1930s. He suggested expanding bus service and supporting research for planning for personal rapid transit which was a demand response, non-stop, origin to destination transit system that would use small computer controlled vehicles and operate 24 hours a day. He also suggested letting a transportation company build and operate the personal transportation system as a utility franchise like telephone or electricity, then it would not require any tax money.

Councilor Atherton was concerned about the isolation of Interstate to I-5 mentioned by Ms. Johnson. He asked if the proposed high density was part of the original plan.

Ms. Johnson said part of the Albina plan allowed for high density once the lightrail was initiated.

Councilor Atherton said he had attended the listening post when a number of women came in to speak about respiratory problems in their children as a result of living near the freeway.

Ms. Johnson said she did not have personal experience with that, but had heard comments at the meetings.

Councilor Atherton asked why Ms. Hunt specifically mentioned the traffic in and out of the neighborhood and whether she felt it would be adequately mitigated.

Ms. Hunt knew they would try to pursue mitigation but because this committee was more concerned about the eco development of the project, they were willing to accept that kind of

overflow. She said when she first joined the committee she thought they would be more concerned about improving the transportation system. She found it was much more complicated than that and felt the committee had accepted that the pursuit of economic development was much more important than the negative overflow prospects of transportation in the neighborhoods. She said they saw it as a way to revitalize north Portland, although she did not agree and felt it was not the right tool to use, and too expensive to use as a development tool.

Stephen Iwata, City of Portland, 1120 SW 5th, #702, Portland, OR 97204 spoke for Commissioner Charlie Hales who had to be in Salem. He handed out a resolution adopted last week by the Portland City Council in support of the MAX alignment and urged the Metro Council to adopt the same. (A copy of the resolution can be found in the permanent record of this meeting.) He said they had taken about 4 hours of public testimony. He said there was a tremendous probability for economic improvement and job opportunities with this lightrail project. He said the council also recognized that the I-5 freeway had a significant adverse impact to adjacent neighborhoods and the lightrail could act as a catalyst to bring the neighborhood together in terms of access to jobs and economic revitalization. He said they were also looking at the bus system for better transit connections.

Allen Hipolito, 4907 N Williams, Portland, OR 97217, spoke as Director of Environmental Programs at the Urban League of Portland. He read a quote from the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council about urban revitalization, "Urban revitalization is very different from urban redevelopment. The two concepts are not synonymous and should not be confused with each other. Urban revitalization is a bottom up process. It proceeds from a community based vision of its needs and aspirations and seeks to build capacity, build partnerships, and mobilize resources to make the vision a reality. Revitalization does not lead to the displacement of communities through gentrification that often results from development policies and governments must not simply view communities as an assortment of problems but also as a collection of assets." He felt this lightrail project was on track. The commitment to community involvement was the most fundamental agreed to by the CAC. The League's main perception was that meaningful community participation was fundamental to a project's chances of success. He said these burgeoning coalitions were the future of this region's growth management strategies and should be nurtured. He urged the council to recognize their challenging role in the future of this project. He felt they were making a structurally inclusive model that, when replicated, would open the door for environmental justice communities throughout the country to access and impact growth management and transit decision making.

Neil Brown, 2205 N. Skidmore Ter., Portland, OR 97217, was opposed to lightrail along Interstate Avenue. He was very disappointed with the process and with the whole idea of turning a moderately busy 4-lane road into a 2-lane road and assuming the traffic would go away. He did not believe the neighborhood would be better off by having traffic pinched down to 2 lanes to make room for the lightrail train. He was angry and disappointed and did not think there had been a serious attempt to get public involvement. The voters had not been asked about the lightrail again this time, except in a fashion likely to select people supportive of the project. He felt very few people would walk into the Interstate MAX office to say they did not approve. He thought the council should get a clue that people did not want the lightrail since they had already voted against it 3 times. He thought it was interesting that members of a so called "Citizen's Advisory Committee had been hand picked by the director of Tri-Met, the one party with everything to gain from this process. He questioned the objectivity of their findings and the

reasonability of the project under consideration. He said again he was very disappointed that it was going ahead.

Presiding Officer Monroe said in his 25 years of experience, it was his considered opinion that they tended to hear from the opposition much more than those in support.

Mr. Brown replied that his parents were at home because they were not comfortable in a confrontational circumstance like this. He knew others that felt the same way.

Jim Howell, 3325 NE 45th, Portland, OR 97213, supported IMAX and its future extension to downtown Vancouver. He said it would serve a well established transit corridor with speed, reliability and capacity. Prior to a Vancouver extension, there could still be high ridership if fast, frequent and reliable bus service was provided between Expo and C-Tran's downtown transit center. He felt, however, that park and rides at Expo and/or PIR would be counterproductive and would reduce total transit patronage and create unnecessary traffic congestion. He handed in written testimony (a copy of which can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.). he said good local transit access could be retained when the #5 was replaced if 4 intermediate local stops were added at Shaver, Alberta Ainsworth and Bryant. He said the additional stops did not need to have all the amenities of the primary stations. He said as Expo expanded some consideration should be given to lightrail station. He felt perhaps reorienting it to the east rather than the north should be considered.

Councilor Atherton asked about the frequency of the trains.

Mr. Iwata said the engineers were confident 2½ minute trains would work downtown.

Councilor Washington said to Mr. Howell that the Metro Operations Committee would be having some discussion about the Expo lightrail. He offered Mr. Brown to visit with his parents at their home.

Mr. Brown said he would be interested in getting further involved and would ask his parents if they would like a visit, but pointed out that after this council unanimously approved going forward with the project today, it would be a little late.

Lynn Peterson, 534 SW 3rd Ave, Suite 300, Portland, OR 97034, transportation advocate for 1,000 Friends of Oregon and member of the Coalition for a Livable Future, felt the biggest part of the project was the vision to increase access to citizens and provide transportation choices and a clean environment in north Portland and the region, not just blocks from the I-5 corridor. She said the overall vision benefited the entire region and many of the concerns would be met as they moved forward in process. She reiterated that this lightrail met the basic goals of Chapter 1 of the RTP. She said the biggest benefit of all was the further extension of lightrail across Columbia into Vancouver because that was what really impacted north Portland. She said without the lightrail they would see Level of Service "F" because there would be no capacity.

Don Arambula, 8224 N. Fenwick, Portland, OR 97217, said the Kenton Neighborhood Association supported the project and had always supported lightrail. They felt this was the best proposal they had seen. He commented that the growing amount of traffic through their neighborhood came from Vancouver and their feeling was that they would be providing a facility for those people just traveling through. He said reducing the street to 2 lanes would still serve the

neighborhood without providing the easy opportunity for cars to just pass through. He felt lightrail would provide dependable and more efficient transportation and added that it was important to do it right. They thought it was important to learn from the lessons of the west side and the Banfield.

Craig Flynn, 12048 NE Fargo Ct., Portland, OR 97220, shared his button that said "It's the Congestion Stupid". He said this line would do nothing to reduce congestion but would only replace the #5 bus. He said they kept hearing about community involvement. There had been lots of it, but the council did not like the answer 3 times so they were going to do it again without asking the people what they wanted. Why not? Because they would vote no again. He said they had learned it did not reduce congestion or improve transit out to east county. He said for some reason there was this huge trough of money all of a sudden, to build lightrail to the airport without a vote. He said this line would also probably be built without a vote. He felt public involvement was needed to spend that kind of money and the best poll of the people was the vote, not the focus groups. He said maybe they should prove the 2-5 minute headways would work by using the existing tracks to test it out. He was not convinced it would work.

Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing.

9.5 **Resolution No. 99-2795A**, For the Purpose of Amending the FY 00 Unified Work Program to add the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study and Amending the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) to Authorize FY 99 Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds.

Motion: **Councilor Kvistad** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2795A.

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

Councilor Kvistad said it was a real irony that he was moving these proposals because he had been one of the biggest critics of Tri-Met and the original west side project. He also was not a big supporter of South/North, but now he was moving this resolution that he not only supported, but felt would really make this a better region. He said 80% of the people he talked to felt this was the part of South/North that made sense. He said this work program on the south corridor alternatives would starting working and partnering with other jurisdictions from the region that needed help. He said this resolution in particular would make positive changes for Clackamas County and the region as a whole.

Councilor McLain said opportunities being maintained through this study were important, i.e., the opportunity to connect to other parts of the jobs/housing community. She found this resolution to work for continued connections, good air, keeping as many choices as possible, including not displacing people in neighborhoods. She agreed with Councilor Kvistad and said she would also vote in favor of the resolution.

Councilor Bragdon spoke about the south end of the project. He saluted Councilor Kvistad as a leader in this process. He felt financially and environmentally, that doing nothing about this lightrail line would be far more expensive in the end than building it now. He said it was important to move ahead on the south end because it addressed some of the concerns and gave an opportunity to explore all of the possibilities for southeast Portland as well as Clackamas County.

He supported the resolution. He recognized Clackamas County Commissioner Bill Kennemer's work with Councilor Kvistad on this issue.

Councilor Atherton said he had a proposed amendment to the resolution.

Presiding Officer Monroe clarified with Mr. Cooper whether they could amend something from JPACT or if they could just suggest amendments and send it back.

Mr. Cooper had not had a chance to review this, but said it was certainly true that any project approved by JPACT could not be unilaterally changed by the council without it going back through JPACT. He thought this was possibly one of the rare instances where they could do something to a resolution from JPACT without having to go back to them.

Presiding Officer Monroe said if there was support for this amendment, he would ask Mr. Cooper to check the JPACT by-laws. The Presiding Officer called for a second to Councilor Atherton's motion to amend.

Councilor Kvistad said there was a slight flexibility for making nonsubstantive modifications to JPACT resolutions, i.e. technical adjustments to correct language but not intent. He said they could sometimes make changes in the wording of the "WHEREAS", but if the direction in "BE IT RESOLVED" was changed, he would, as Chair of JPACT, ask for it to return to that committee.

Presiding Officer Monroe said that was also his understanding of the rules.

Mr. Cooper commented that the "BE IT RESOLVED" being added here was an additional item and not contradictory to the three resolves JPACT had already approved. He questioned whether the added resolve would have any affect until JPACT had approved it

Councilor Kvistad said the "BE IT RESOLVED" of the amendment used the word "intends" which substantively changed the document in his view.

Motion to Amend: **Councilor Atherton** moved to amend Resolution No. 99-2795A to include 4 new WHEREAS sections and one new "BE IT RESOLVED" to create Resolution No. 99-2795B (See a copy of the full amendment dated June 24, 1999, in the permanent record of this meeting)

Second: The motion to amend died for lack of a second.

Councilor Atherton felt Resolution No. 99-2795A did not adequately reflect the concerns of many people who were not making the land use/transportation connection. He said while tremendous resources were being put into the north part of the region where very little of the growth was taking place, growth was being pushed in the south part, even though many people there did not want it, and resources were not providing the kind of transit needed in that area. He felt that should be required before expanding the urban settlement. He felt they could not be putting everything into the north and give Clackamas nothing.

Councilor McLain agreed they had tried to be sensitive in their analysis of what the voters wanted. She said the people in the southern section had indicated that they wanted more diversity

than what was offered with the South/North. She said it had seemed very important at the JPACT table with Clackamas County and the others present, to put together a \$1.5 million package for Tri-Met to deal with some of the issues Councilor Atherton had brought up. She said the north was not getting everything and they had actively tried to integrate a northern and a southern solution that would work as a complete system and still took in the uniqueness of the different parts of the region. She agreed with Councilor Atherton that it was important to remember the south side, but she believed these programs did that.

Councilor Bragdon said the record would show Commissioner Kennemer voted for the original resolution at JPACT.

Presiding Officer Monroe offered his thanks to Councilor Kvistad and Commissioners Kennemer and Hales for working out the agreement that led to the unanimous decision by JPACT to forward all three of these resolutions.

Councilor Kvistad said this was about the southern region. He said the program was to fund a study of Clackamas County's needs, in direct response to a request from them. He explained this resolution amended the Unified Work Program to add funds to study the southern transportation corridor, and Commissioner Kennemer had worked very closely with everyone at the JPACT table to come up it. He recommended an aye vote on Resolution No. 99-2795A.

Vote on the Main Motion: The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Atherton voting no.

Presiding Officer Monroe wanted the record to show that the south study involved not only Councilor Atherton's district, but Councilor Bragdon's and his own district as well.

9.4 Resolution No. 99-2806A, For the Purpose of Amending the Locally Preferred Strategy for the South/North Light Rail Project to Define the Interstate MAX Project as the First Construction Segment and to Amend the FY 2000 Unified Work Program.

Motion: **Councilor Kvistad** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2806A.

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

Councilor Kvistad explained that this was the first of two pieces regarding the north section and the Interstate MAX project, and defined the corridor, the project, and the segment before council. He advised the council that the next piece (Res. No. 99-2804A) would be the financing package. He referred to maps the council had already seen, as well as the Supplemental DEIS (see a copy of this document in the permanent record of this meeting). He said there were a lot things in the reports that directly tied to how things were done and how they moved along.

Councilor Washington felt the process had been very fair and open. He said sometimes it was tough to sit and listen, and sometimes it was easy to be against something. He said he always tried to find the middle of an issue so he could take the good and try to make sense of it for the region. He said this package was not the full answer, but one very small piece of a very huge transportation picture for the region. It would not solve all of the problems, but it would help a great deal. There would be many more projects. He remembered when the section of I-5 from

downtown to Vancouver was built in the 1960s. He commented that now that it was packed, they were just trying to help make it a bit better. He said he would support the resolution.

Councilor Atherton had a proposed amendment to the resolution that he felt addressed the concerns of people who voted against lightrail in Clackamas County.

Motion to Amend: **Councilor Atherton** moved to amend Resolution No. 99-2806A to create Resolution No. 99-2806B (See a copy of the full amendment dated June 24, 1999, in the permanent record of this meeting)

Mr. Cooper said, in response to a question from the Presiding Officer, that this was a historical change to the amendment, was purely a style change and was not substantive. He said it would not require a return to JPACT.

Second: The motion to amend died for lack of a second.

Councilor Atherton's concern was the statement in the second "WHEREAS", "the voters in the region did not approve a ballot measure that would have reaffirmed the region's 1994 voter's approval of local funding for the South/North Corridor Light Rail Project." He said this was not a vote of reaffirmation because it was a substantially altered project. He felt the words were inappropriate.

Councilor Park said his historical perspective on the eastside lightrail was interesting because he originally thought lightrail was a mistake. He thought it was a fluke and a complete waste of time, money and effort. He served 8 years on the Mt. Hood Parkway committee and studied routes both inside and outside the UGB. From the citizen testimony, they learned there was no route acceptable to everyone, so the only possibility was to pick the one that affected the fewest amount of people. He said that was also true in this case, from listening to the testimony of the last 4-5 months. He thought this was the best route and type of system possible within their resources and he would support the resolution. He said it was not an easy choice and he knew it would not make everyone happy, but he thought there would be fewer unhappy people with this route.

Councilor Bragdon said this process was proof there was no one-size-fits-all solution, and those who said Metro was trying to impose that should look at how this process had worked. He hoped they would move ahead with this rail project because the people had supported it, and it was a great opportunity for the future. He said it was possible they could look back at the bond measure of November 1998 and say it was the best thing that never happened. He thought, frankly, what they had come up with now on the north end was a better project, partly due to the citizen involvement. He felt the most exciting part was the opportunity to revitalize an existing urban neighborhood that had been disadvantaged by transportation investments for many years. He commented that Dr. Mildner's figures about bus passengers in north Portland were exactly right, although he drew a different conclusion. He gave some caveats in closing: he said there was not been a vote when blocks of north Portland were bulldozed to build I-5. He did not think a vote to add lanes to I-5 would pass at this time, either. His final point was that this was not the full job, it was just the beginning to address the transportation needs of the area. Those needs included lightrail, but also the needed maintenance for the automobile network. He said they needed to maintain even while moving forward.

Councilor Atherton said Clackamas County would enjoy this resolution and supported improving and upgrading the northern part of the line. He said they also appreciated the study money for the south part of the region and the discussion about creating a fund to apply towards improvements in the future. He said he would support the resolution but people needed to know the lightrail vote from Clackamas County had substantive and concrete reasons behind it.

Councilor McLain said Councilor Bragdon's point that this was not the end of the job, was important. She reminded the council that transportation work was never finished. When there were 20-30 year projects going, you had to keep going and your replacements had to continue the work also.

Presiding Officer Monroe commented that he had been involved in this project for many years and had listened carefully to citizens at listening posts. One of the things the citizens were concerned about was the high asthma and respiratory problem levels of children and the elderly in the vicinity of the freeway. He said it was getting worse because the freeway was more and more congested. He noted that when traffic was not moving very fast, it made the level of pollutants in the air higher. He believed a clean electric lightrail line with the capacity of a 6 lane freeway to Vancouver would help reduce the likelihood of that problem getting worse. He was hopeful for approval of this line because lightrail to Expo would help reach the ultimate goal of lightrail all the way to Vancouver so commuters would have another choice for traveling to work. He said transportation choices included automobiles, buses and lightrail, bicycles, walking, car pooling, etc. He said a network of transportation systems would provide people with choices and was the reason this region was being watched by the rest of the nation as an example of the right way to do things. He strongly supported the resolution and thought it was the right thing to do. He thanked Dick Reiten and the business community for taking the ball and running with it and making it possible. He thanked the congressional leaders and the federal government for making the money available and understanding that the automobile was not the only answer to transportation needs in the nation. He urged the council to support the measure.

Councilor Kvistad urged support of the resolution.

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

9.6 Resolution No. 99-2804A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Interstate MAX Light Rail Transit Project and South Corridor Financing Strategy and Amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

Motion: **Councilor Kvistad** moved to adopt Resolution No. 99-2804A.

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

Councilor Kvistad gave a brief overview of the resolution which set aside the first \$55 million for the north project and created the fund from which they could help fund the south corridor transportation package once it had been defined, and help Washington County with its commuter rail projects. He felt it would also give JPACT and the region a great deal of flexibility to be innovative and set aside some money up front.

Councilor Park asked for clarification to understand the intent of the resolution. He wanted to make sure “to be allocated first” was synonymous with “to be funded first”. He did not want any misconstruing of legislative intent in the future.

Councilor Kvistad responded that the intent was to be as confirming as possible even though when they were writing the resolution, the study had not been done yet, and they did not have alternatives before them. He said once the project was defined by Clackamas County and the study was done, the reason this fund was beginning was so they would have money to move forward with the program.

Councilor Washington thanked the council for their unwavering support to the project from the beginning. He said he and the citizens in his district appreciated it.

Councilor Kvistad said this had been the region’s work. He thanked Fred Hansen from Tri-Met and Neil McFarlane and his staff. He thanked Andy Cotugno and Richard Brandman and the rest of the Metro staff who helped him get up to speed on the issues. He thanked Roy Rogers and the Washington County commission, Bill Kennemer and the Clackamas County commission, Charlie Hales, Mayor Katz and his partners at JPACT. He thanked Dick Reiten for his good work.

He said he unabashedly supported this resolution because it was good for people in the long term, good for the community, and the region as a whole. He said it was the right thing to do and a terrific opportunity. He urged an aye vote on the resolution.

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

10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Atherton passed out a copy of the McGregor-Millet report published semiannually on the region’s apartment market. He called attention to the fact that the vacancy rate had been steadily increasing over the last couple of years. The report’s assessment was that the region was rapidly moving toward being overbuilt for apartments.

Councilor Park said he had not had a chance to go over the figures with Councilor Kvistad that he had used for the budget presentation. He said the hours quoted included regular staff overtime as well as the seasonal employees so the figure was equivalent of 606 FTEs. He said since there were 675 FTEs included in the budget, the actual accumulated amount for part time was 31 FTE, or about 64,000 hours. He wanted to clarify any misconceptions in the audience that there were more than a million seasonal or part time hours.

Councilor McLain said she had placed a resolution in the councilor’s boxes for review regarding a framework for keeping their water work consistent with their own facilities for their work to go forward in a progressive and parallel way. She said she took it to WRPAC and MPAC, and assumed she would take it to the Growth Committee in August. She thought it was a good place to start figuring out how the council could be proactive in budgeting and reviewing presentations. She said she would entertain suggestions or amendments to the resolution

Councilor Kvistad said he knew the MPAC meeting was wonderful contrary to reports in the paper. He said he would have comments about that at another time.

Councilor Park wanted to be last person on this day at this dais to congratulate Councilor McLain on becoming a grandmother.

11. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Monroe adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
06249c-01	no date	Benefits of the Interstate MAX Light Rail Project Downtown Portland to the Expo Center		
06249c-02	no date	Pictures (3) of trolleys at Woodstock/57th, Lents, and St. John's	Terry Parker collection	
06249c-03	June 23, 1999	Too Costly to be True: An Analysis of the North Portland Light Rail Proposal	Gerard C.S. Mildner, School of Urban Planning, PSU	
06249c-04	June 24, 1999	Higherway Transit Research	Tad Winiecki	Res. No. 99-2806 & Res. No. 99-2804
06249c-05	no date	City of Portland Resolution No. 35800		
06249c-06	June 24, 1999	Written testimony of Jim Howell	Jim Howell	
06249c-07	June 24, 1999	Proposed Atherton Amendment to Res. No. 99-2795A	Bill Atherton	Res. No. 99-2795A
06249c-08	April 1999	South/North Corridor Project supplemental draft DEIS		
06249c-09	June 1999	South/North Corridor Project supplemental DEIS Public Comment Report		
06249c-10	June 24, 1999	Proposed Atherton Amendment to Res. No. 99-2806A	Bill Atherton	Res. No. 99-2806A