

# **Metro**

*600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736  
oregonmetro.gov*



**Metro**

## **Minutes**

**Tuesday, June 15, 2021**

**2:00 PM**

**Revised 6/14**

**<https://zoom.us/j/471155552> or 877-853-5257 (toll free)**

## **Council work session**

**2:00 Call to Order and Roll Call**

Council President Peterson called the Work Session to order at 2:00 p.m.

**Present: 7 -** Council President Lynn Peterson, Councilor Christine Lewis, Councilor Shirley Craddick, Councilor Juan Carlos Gonzalez, Councilor Bob Stacey, Councilor Gerritt Rosenthal, and Councilor Mary Nolan

**Work Session Topics:**

2:05 Clackamas County SHS Local Implementation Plan

Presenter(s): Patricia Rojas, Regional Housing Director  
Sonya Fischer, Clackamas County Commissioner  
Jill Smith, Housing Authority of Clackamas County  
Vahid Brown, Housing Authority of Clackamas County

Attachments: [Work Session Worksheet](#)  
[Clackamas County LIP](#)  
[SHSOC Clackamas County LIP Considerations](#)  
[Draft Resolution No. 21-5173](#)

Council President Peterson introduced Patricia Rojas, Regional Housing Director, Sonya Fischer, Clackamas County Commissioner, and others to present on the topic.

Staff pulled up the *Clackamas County SHS Local Implementation Plan PowerPoint* to present to Council.

Commissioner Fischer gave an introduction and background information on the topic. Rojas explained what the local implantation plans are, which included engagement & equity and the required elements of the plans. She discussed the regional outcome metrics of the Supportive Housing Work Plan and the steps of review & recommendation. Rojas explained the oversight committee recommendation.

Jill Smith, Housing Authority of Clackamas County mentioned the background of the Clackamas County SHS Local Implementation Plan. Smith mentioned the work of Local Steering Committee. Vahid Brown, Housing Authority of Clackamas County discussed the development of the Clackamas County Plan, the current capacity, and the gaps and needs for community engagement. Brown also discussed the racial disparities in the homeless service system, and the strategies to advance racial equity in access, housing, and services. Brown mentioned several priority investments, the first-year goals and the funding allocation for the investments. Smith explained their current progress, their commitment to regional priorities and the next steps.

*Council Discussion*

**President Peterson** thanked Commissioner Fischer and Clackamas County staff for their work.

**Councilor Lewis** asked when they will get additional staff.

Smith noted that Brown was hired and three others in April. She mentioned that they hoped to hire more people if they receive funding.

**Councilor Lewis** noted that Oregon City, OR codes allow for services to be in place. She asked about code issues outside of Oregon City. She mentioned that one of the Mayors on MPAC suggested that MPAC visits a homeless shelter and that the Metro Council could have a convening role.

Smith mentioned that they only have authority to effect code in unincorporated Clackamas County. She explained that there are sixteen cities that they will need to negotiate code changes with.

**Councilor Nolan** asked if they are taking federal and state funds and using them in only areas outside of the Metro boundary. They also asked what the population of people is outside of the Metro boundary.

Smith explained that once Clackamas County receives SHS funding, they will begin prioritizing the federal, state, and general funds for housing and support to areas outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. She noted that it would be incentive for providers to serve areas outside of the boundary.

Smith explained that when she was referring to half of the county being rural it was based on land area, not population. She noted that those in rural areas are not being well served.

Commissioner Fischer noted that half of their residents are outside of the boundary. She explained that the measure was designed to prioritize areas outside the boundary.

**Councilor Craddick** asked if the funding from the measure was intended to be supplemental to the funds the county is using. She also asked how Clackamas County's plan would work within the measure.

Carrie MacLaren, Metro Attorney, explained that it is a requirement that the county's funding for homelessness remain the same before the measure. She noted that staff will need to look into if that use of the funding would be consistent with the code or the intent of the measure. MacLaren mentioned that the intention of measure was to provide additional funds for homeless services within the Metro region, not to replace existing funds. She noted that the code provision was Section 11.01.160.

Rojas mentioned that there should be consistency and access to services, regardless of boundaries. She noted that more discussions are needed, like on the intention of the measure and the impact of the funding going outside the boundary.

Smith noted that they will not use all the funding outside of the UGB. She mentioned the difficulty of getting providers to work outside of the UGB.

**Councilor Craddick** acknowledged that Clackamas County's population distribution makes this a challenge.

**President Peterson** commented on the need to meet the intention of the ballot measure and to show progress. She mentioned the challenges with Clackamas County and that they want to be partners in this with the county.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if they needed 800 housing units or 800 people that needed housing. He also asked if there are any senior groups that could potentially lose their housing because of apartments going to market rates.

Smith confirmed that the 812 units is for the Metro bond goal, but the need is greater. She was not aware of any senior developments with expiring contracts soon, but HUD would notify them.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked about their alignment with several different health systems, including the mental and physical health systems. He asked about the relationship between the county and the Tri-County Commission.

Brown discussed the investments from Health Share of

Oregon for the Metro 300 program, the development of the Connect Oregon program, and their work with community corrections and with law enforcement. He explained how their plan aligns with the behavioral health system.

**Councilor Gonzalez** summarizes some of the major points from the discussion such as scaling up to address the crisis and the need to work as a region.

**President Peterson** dropped off the meeting, Councilor Craddick continued to run the meeting.

**Councilor Stacey** raised concerns about using funds generated by those inside the Metro boundary to provide services for those outside of the boundary.

Smith mentioned that there is no intention to use the SHS funds outside the UGB. She noted that they want to prioritize other funding for areas outside of the boundary.

**President Peterson** rejoined the meeting.

Commissioner Fischer explained the intention of using “local government” in the language of the Ordinance. She noted that Clackamas County is not trying to reduce their investment but did not have to keep those investments within the Metro boundary.

**Councilor Lewis** commented that all parties did not interpret the language of the measure in the same way. She also mentioned that constituents pay taxes and expect some level of service. Councilor Lewis hoped that people in Clackamas County can get the help they need, instead of having to go to just Oregon City.

**Councilor Craddick** asked when they will receive a data plan for how and when they will collect data.

Rojas explained that they are negotiating with the county partners on annual work plans and quarterly updates. She noted that the annual work plan will detail what they will track in year one. Rojas mentioned that the counties have their own systems to track their work and staff is working with the counties to come up with administration structures.

Councilor Craddick confirmed that services will start before the whole data plan is in place but that there will be data still collected initially.

Rojas stated that Councilor Craddick's statement was correct.

President Peterson thanked Commissioner Fischer, Smith, and Brown for their work.

3:05    Rose Quarter Updates

Presenter(s):    Margi Bradway, Metro  
                         Eliot Rose, Metro

Attachments:    [Work Session Worksheet](#)  
                         [I5RQ Values and Outcomes](#)  
                         [ICA RQ Slides](#)

Council President Peterson introduced Margi Bradway, Metro and Eliot Rose, Metro to present on the topic.

Staff pulled up the I-5 Rose Quarter project *PowerPoint* to present to Council.

Rose explained the Rose Quarter Improvement Project and the organizational structure. He mentioned the Council

values, outcomes, and actions. Rose noted the Independent Cover Assessment (ICA) team's timeline and the six scenarios. He discussed the live poll results from a community workshop and discussed the scenario elements for Concepts 1, 4, and 5. Rose gave a comparison of the concepts.

*Council Discussion*

**President Peterson** noted that purpose of the committee and ICA is not to program the space, but to maximize the amount of programmable space and opportunity in that programming.

**Councilor Gonzalez** asked if the cost estimate is just for the lid or for the entire project.

Rose noted that it was for the entire project.

Bradway mentioned that ODOT's Cost of Complete Report estimated that the project was in the 700 million range and the lid scenarios would add on to the cost. She mentioned that the cost estimates were from the ICA team based on early designs.

**Councilor Lewis** asked about the quality and structural integrity of cover. She explained that she wanted to know if the durability or design of cover was perceived to be consistent across those three scenarios.

Rose explained some of the challenges, such as the shape of parcels, environmental quality issues and difficulty of development.

Bradway added that there are conversations about the level of building that the lid could support. She mentioned that



the bigger or more structurally sound the lid is proposed, the higher the cost.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if the designs had the same structural assumptions.

**President Peterson** commented that they are not at that level of detail right now.

Rose noted that the structural assumptions are the same regarding the structure that is to come.

Rose continued the presentation by mentioning the trade-offs, the next steps, and some remaining questions.

#### *Council Discussion*

**President Peterson** mentioned that they will not be deciding today but asked if the Council had questions.

**Councilor Craddick** asked about the benefit of the scenarios that move the on and off ramps to the South end. She also asked about the partnerships on the project.

**President Peterson** noted that the Rose Quarter is too close to I-405 and to the I-84 interchange. She explained that taking traffic to one side to minimize the impact of the highway to the lid and the community. She suggested that the South end was chosen to reduce the impact to the school, which ODOT has suggested moving the highway center line to West to reduce the impact.

Bradway noted that the City of Portland, Multnomah County, and the Albina Vision Trust pulled out of the project. She mentioned that that it has cause difficulty for Metro because they do not want to speak for their partners.

**President Peterson** discussed the make-up of the steering committee and mentioned that she was one of the two elected officials still on the committee.

**Councilor Craddick** asked about the impact of the legislature modifying funding for the Rose Quarter project.

Bradway explained that Rose Quarter Penny, or HB 217 and spreading funding out to other projects. She added that there would still be funding for Rose Quarter, but not enough for the full project.

**Councilor Lewis** asked if there is an IGA to compensate them for their work.

Bradway explained that they are not being compensated for Rose Quarter, but they have asked ODOT for compensation. She added that Metro is classified differently for the NEPAs for Rose Quarter and I-5 Bridge projects. Bradway mentioned that Rose Quarter is not supporting any of the partner staff work.

**Councilor Lewis** asked staff for more information about why Metro was classified differently offline.

Bradway agreed that they can discuss offline.

**Councilor Gonzalez** commented that the three scenarios are moving in the right direction but noted the importance of having community support. He spoke to the importance of fighting for funding for a project they really care about.

**President Peterson** noted that they will get more detail and policy direction on the scenarios. She added that getting

partners back to the table is needed for representation of different interests.

**Councilor Nolan** mentioned that they cannot support Scenario 1 because it is not responsive to community interest. They explained how they could support Scenario 4 and Scenario 5. Councilor Nolan raised concerns about how ODOT had treated previous members of their community advisory committee. They also commented that they need to manage the width and the throughput of the project.

**President Peterson** noted that they are working both on the width and the throughput for the project.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if there is a scenario that is better for getting people to the places they want to go to and how.

Bradway discussed the difference between making space and making place. She explained that there is a disconnect because ODOT is moving forward with the mainland lid design with a different team than the ICA. Bradway mentioned Metro's work with Albina Vision and that Metro is talking to other partners about urban design.

**President Peterson** noted ODOT's challenge of creating this space and then having to give it to the community. She explained that many different partners and interests need to figure out the creation and visioning of the space.

Rose added that ICA team has done a lot of technical analysis and design recommendations. He mentioned that Scenarios 4 and 5 best serve the values of the project.

**Councilor Craddick** asked staff what else they needed from

the Council.

**President Peterson** explained that this work session was meant to give the Council background information and they will have a conversation about direction later.

4:05 Adopted Council Budget Work Session

Presenter(s): Marissa Madrigal, Metro  
Brian Kennedy, Metro

Attachments: [Council Summary Document](#)

Council President Peterson introduced Marissa Madrigal, Metro and Brian Kennedy, Metro to answer questions on the topic.

Councilor Stacey explained his budget note to make Willamette Cove an official project eligible for bond funding. He noted the importance of the project and mentioned that \$10 million was to be reserved from the 2019 Parks and Nature Bond for the project.

*Council Discussion*

**President Peterson** mentioned that the Councilors had received a memo answering some of their questions and follow-up from staff about the resolution that was passed.

**Councilor Lewis** noted her support of the project and that her question on \$10 million was answered.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if Metro is committed to making Willamette Cove comfortable to people to use. He also asked if people will be comfortable with the preferred alternative route.

**Councilor Craddick** raised concerns that other projects will not get done as planned but noted her support for the

project.

**Councilor Stacey** clarified that project is in Councilor Nolan's district.

Councilor Nolan discussed their budget note with Councilors Gonzales and Stacey. They mentioned that there was a memo that explains what was added and removed from the budget note.

*Council Discussion*

**Councilor Gonzalez** thanked the Councilors and their partners for working with them on the budget note. He also explained what the budget note does.

**Councilor Lewis** thanked the sponsors of the budget note for their work. She commented on the importance of collaboration with other jurisdictions and for staff to get information to the Council.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked Marissa Madrigal if this could be handled without a budget amendment.

Madrigal explained that the scope of the budget note can be done with existing resources.

**President Peterson** asked if they have considered making this a resolution instead of making a budget note. She also asked if it would show their partners that the Council was listening, would they consider a resolution and conversation in the IGA.

**Councilor Nolan** explained that because the direction is for this fiscal year and can be supported by appropriations already in the budget, they thought it would be appropriate to do a budget note. They noted that they did not consider

doing a resolution.

**Councilor Nolan** raised concerns that giving direction to their own staff is causing problems. They added that they would support having a resolution if the intention was for collaboration.

**Councilor Lewis** supported this being a stand-alone resolution. She raised concerns about creating the precedent of going through the budget process. Councilor Lewis commented on the need for staff to be working on the dataset in three weeks, instead of the Council still negotiating if it should be a budget note or a resolution.

**President Peterson** mentioned that the resolution could be as soon as next week, so they can have a conversation aligned with the IGA discussion. She noted that some of the partners were concerned about the process.

**Councilor Stacey** stated that it was counter-productive to change this to a resolution when they have had the discussion and determined that it can be in the budget. He noted that they should move forward but had no objection to the budget note becoming a resolution.

**Councilor Nolan** asked why their county partners are concerned with how they communicate with their own staff.

**President Peterson** mentioned that she wanted to bring these concerns to the discussion.

**Councilor Gonzalez** commented on the importance of them starting the work, instead of if it should be through a budget note or a resolution. He mentioned a recommendation the Council recently received and mentioned confusion on the

reason for moving from the budget note to a resolution.

**President Peterson** suggested that Councilors Nolan, Gonzalez, and Stacey follow-up with their county partners. She commented on the importance of setting themselves up for success and getting the information they need.

#### **4:50 Chief Operating Officer Communication**

Marissa Madrigal provided an update on the following events or items:

- Madrigal mentioned that the Workshare program is ending, two upcoming Juneteenth Barbeques and an update on RID Patrol.

#### **4:55 Councilor Communication**

Councilors provided updates on the following meetings and events:

- None of the Councilors provided updates.

#### **5:00 Adjourn**

There being no further business, Council President Peterson adjourned the Metro Work Session at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jemeshia Taylor, Legislative Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 15, 2021**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc. Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
1.0	PowerPoint	06/15/2021	Supportive Housing Services: Clackamas County Local Implementation Plan Presentation	061521cw-01
2.0	PowerPoint	06/15/2021	I-5 Rose Quarter Project Presentation	061521cw-02
3.0	PowerPoint	06/15/2021	Adopted Council Budget Notes and Amendments Presentation	061521cw-03