

# Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736  
[oregonmetro.gov](http://oregonmetro.gov)



Metro

## Minutes

Thursday, January 6, 2022

10:30 AM

<https://zoom.us/j/615079992> (Webinar ID: 615079992) or  
888-475-4499 (toll free)

**Council meeting**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Council President Peterson called the Metro Council Meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

**2. Public Communication**

Council President Peterson opened the meeting to members of the public wanting to testify on a non-agenda items.

**Be Marston:** Oregon Convention Center employees, spoke regarding their frustrating experience with Levy. Since Levy took over operations in August 2021, they testified that there have been ongoing errors on their paystubs. Hours worked and gratuities are often miscalculated.

**Dave Moore:** Oregon Convention Center employees, spoke regarding their frustrating experience with Levy. Since Levy took over operations in August 2021, they testified that there have been ongoing errors on their paystubs. Hours worked and gratuities are often miscalculated. Though Levy retroactively pays employees to make up for these errors, these retroactive payments provide no detail regarding what employees are being paid for, and has been a source of confusion.

**Hisae Mikoshiba:** Oregon Convention Center employees, spoke regarding their frustrating experience with Levy. Since Levy took over operations in August 2021, they testified that there have been ongoing errors on their paystubs. Hours worked and gratuities are often miscalculated.

**Marissa Madrigal (COO)** indicated that her office would follow up with these employees.

**Walt Mintkeski (6815 SE 36th Ave)** requested Councilors to submit written testimony to Senator Wyden, urging him to include a price on carbon and an offsetting dividend in the

reconciliation legislation.

**Councilor Craddick** recommended the Metro Council drafted and submitted testimony to Senator Wyden as a group rather than individually.

**Pres. Peterson** agreed and requested that Marissa Madrigal follow up with Metro's federal liaison, and have them submit a draft.

Seeing no further discussion on the topic, Council President Peterson moved on to the next agenda item.

### 3. Consent Agenda

- 3.1 Considerations of the Council Meeting Minutes for the December 7, 2021 Meeting
- 3.2 Resolution No. 21-5218, For the Purpose of Amending the 2021-26 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Amend Three Projects Impacting Gresham and (ODOT) Allowing Federal Approvals and Phase Obligations to be Approved (NV22-02-NOV1)
- 3.3 Resolution No. 21-5219, For the Purpose of Amending the 2021-26 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Add Portland's 82nd Ave Safety Upgrade Project Funded with \$80 Million from the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (NV22-04-NOV3)
- 3.4 Resolution No. 22-5235, For the Purpose of Organizing the Metro Council and Confirming the Deputy President

### 4. Resolutions

- 4.1 Resolution No. 21-5220, For the Purpose of Adopting the 2021 Regional Transportation System Management and Operations Strategy, Replacing the 2010 Regional 2010-2020 Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan

Council President Peterson called on [Caleb Winter] [he/him], Margi Bradway [she/her], Kate Freitag [she/her], Scott Torney [he/him], and Chris Gergich [he/him] to present to Council.

Explained how the new TSMO plan is fundamentally rooted in equity, and how it incorporates equity concerns in its decision-making and further transportation equity in the region.

*Councilor Discussion:*

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked whether TSMO's focus on equity included equity for disabled citizens, and not just racial equity. He also asked whether the plan included vehicle electrification.

Staff explained that, in accordance with Metro's guidelines around diversity and inclusion, their team placed a larger emphasis on racial equity, but also considered other forms of equity. Staff also clarified that though EVs are an area of significant interest, it is outside of the scope of TSMO's strategy.

**Councilor Nolan** raised concerns that TSMO's strategy does not acknowledge the dramatic changes caused by climate change, and may not be aggressive enough in reducing greenhouse gasses. They would support TSMO's strategy if questions like, "Would this project or action worsen greenhouse gas emissions in the region?" were used to screen future projects.

During the presentation, Staff acknowledged that TSMO does not include climate change as a key issue. They further explain that TSMO's strategy demonstrates its commitment to addressing climate concerns through its plan to reduce VMT, reduce reliance on single operating vehicles, shifting towards EVs, and other objectives that will reduce emissions.

**Councilor Nolan** followed up with two additional concerns: that TSMO uses VMT per capita rather than total VMT, and they hope TSMO does not assume an unrealistic rate of fleet

electrification.

Staff explained that TSMO does not rely on the Transportation Travel Demand Model, but they are planning a more in-depth conversation around climate, and they would be happy to have that conversation at a future meeting.

**Councilor Craddick** suggested that traffic signage could be used for education purposes, like encouraging alternative modes of transportation or explaining the negative consequences of GHG emissions.

Staff explained that there are certain policies around how traffic signage is used, and would not allow them to be used the way **Councilor Craddick** suggested. However, the idea is worth discussing and they would pass her idea on to the people who work on such policies. Staff also mentioned using signage to display transit times, but that technology is still a work in progress.

**Councilor Craddick** also asked whether New Development could help pay for new infrastructure.

Staff explained that they receive no direct funding from Development, though there is a great deal of cooperation.

**Councilor Craddick** then asked, on a scale from 1-10, how much progress has been made towards completing the connectivity of the system.

Staff agreed that they are at about 4 out of 10. Much of the foundation has been laid, but funding for system upgrades are still needed.

**Councilor Lewis** asked how this work affects different agency boundaries, since it overlaps with many.

Margi explained how TSMO affects different agency boundaries, and applauded the work of staffers who coordinate between them. She explained that TSMO fits in

pretty seamlessly with the different jurisdictions, but funding is a different story.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if there is a nexus of connection between pandemic safety and TSMO.

Staff explained that they are studying whether transportation-related changes caused by COVID are short-term changes or long-term trends.

4.2 Resolution No. 21-5206, For the Purpose of Adopting Metro Council's Values, Outcomes, and Actions for the I-5 Bridge Replacement Program

Council President Peterson called on Elizabeth M'ros Ohara [She/Her], Metro Director of Government Affairs, to present to Council.

Staff pulled up the [*Interstate 5 Bridge Replacement Program Update*] to present to Council.

Presenter provided an update on the I5BRP, with regards to finalizing its values, outcomes, and actions.

**President** Peterson postponed council discussion until after public testimonies.

*Council Discussion:*

**Councilor Lewis** said that changing the word "bolded" to "all" in the values and outcomes statement, as suggested during public testimony, was worthy of discussion.

**Councilor Nolan** suggested clarifying the traffic and revenue study so that all options assume congestion pricing, is consistent with council's previous discussion around the project.

Metro Attorney Carrie Maclaren recommended that council

first take a motion on the resolution itself, and then begin discussion.

**Councilor Nolan** makes a motion on the resolution, and is seconded by **Councilor Lewis**.

**Council began discussion regarding the first part of the outcomes and Values statement:**

- *Conduct analysis to determine how VMT can be reduced by a combination of...*

**Councilor Gonzalez** believes this part of the statement is a 'friendly amendment' that he would welcome on the docket.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if this statement is an amendment to Exhibit A or the resolution itself.

**President Peterson** clarified that it is an amendment to Exhibit A of the Values and Outcomes statement.

**Councilor Craddick** recommended adding a GHG emissions target, but was unsure about how to phrase it.

**President Peterson** answered that, up to this point, the council had agreed on a combination of

- 15% mode split, shifting travel demand to other modes
- And gather information regarding what is needed to reach that goal

Because they are quantifiable and measureable goals. She further clarified that council had previously discussed a specific GHG target, but was not added to the V&O statement.

Margi Bradway clarified that the existing draft asks the project team to meet statewide GHG goals.

**Councilor Nolan** pointed out that the current draft does not specify a 15% shift towards alternate forms of transit, and instead says ‘ambitious.’ However, if it is understood that the true goal is 15%, then they could support this amendment.

**President Peterson** clarified that the word ‘ambitious’ so the council would not be limited to just 15%.

**Councilor Nolan** then asked for Margi Bradway’s input. Margi Bradway clarified that the project team had not yet completed the transit modeling, and they do not know if 15% is attainable. However, the intent behind the goal was clear to the team.

In technical meetings, the Metro team and the City of Portland asked the IBRP team to include modeling with the most aggressive tolling and transit ridership assumptions, and they agreed.

**Councilor Rosenthal** expressed support for the amendment as is, but asked if anyone has considered using tolling to encourage EV use and adoption. He also asked if ODOT has set any aspirational goals of their own regarding GHG emission reduction.

Margi Bradway referred to the current gas tax as an incentive to switch to EVs. She expressed doubt about implementing a specialized tolling program to also incentivize EV usage in the near future. The IBRP has yet to finalize the basic design of the bridge, and is not ready to discuss more specific details like variable tolling.

**President Peterson** broadened the scope of inquiry and asked if the project team have looked into incentives for EVs. If not, she asked that they consider it. Elizabeth Mros-O’hara added that is ongoing climate work,



and that would be a good place to bring this up.

**President Peterson** asked Elizabeth Mros- O'hara to find another portion of Appendix A where they could include more words on this topic, so discussion around the current topic can continue.

Margi Bradway recommended bringing this question to the IBRP team and the Climate Work Group, and invite them to present to council on a later date.

**President Peterson** agreed. She then began discussion around the second part of the V&M statement:

- *Conduct an investment grade traffic and revenue study in advance of any bridge size or design decision...*

**President Peterson** then asked staff to explain an investment grade traffic and revenue study entails.

Staff explained that investment grade analysis is usually conducted for private and public sector bonds. There is a more specific analysis conducted for projects that will include tolling. Such analysis is very expensive and highly specialized. It is usually done after determining a finance plan and what you plan to build, and is used to identify any potential risks.

Staff added that conducting such an analysis for multiple alternatives, which is the current ask, is unusual and very expensive.

**President Peterson** added that public testimony articulated another desired outcome that the IBRP not overdesign based on tolling, traffic, and other assumptions. She raised concerns that this tool may not achieve this outcome.

**Councilor Nolan** asked staff to provide additional details

regarding the cost of investment grade analyses  
Staff clarified that investment grade analyses are both resource intensive and highly specialized, only a few firms actually perform them.

**Councilor Nolan** disagreed with staff, and said that multiple analyses would be a worthy investment, especially since its cost would be a significant fraction of the overall project cost. It would provide critical information that would inform the rest of the project.

**Councilor Rosenthal** agreed with **Councilor Nolan**. He believes, compared to the costs of the entire project, the costs of additional assessments is insignificant, while the information gathered is not.

**Councilor Gonzalez** asked if there are other methods and/or assessments to accomplish the aforementioned outcome. Though he does not disagree with the amendment, he expressed his openness to possible alternatives. Staff responded that for the current planning phase, the models being run right now would be sufficient.

**President Peterson** asked if there is a way to accomplish the desired outcome of not over-designing the bridge, while also accommodating for the expected hybrid design that comes out of an iterative design process.

**Councilor Lewis** recognized that the investment grade analysis is typically done after a bridge design has been determined, but she believes we should break from that norm for this particular project. She is worried that if the analysis is done too far into the design process, the council will have to either make a decision they dislike or start over.

**President Peterson** suggested that council keeps the current language of the amendment for now, and discuss changes with the project team at a later date. The only change she suggested was to clarify the intended outcome: to 'right-size' the bridge.

**President Peterson** then began discussion around the third part of the V&M statement:

- *Conduct a Health Impact Assessment to determine air quality impact on human health in the corridor between Downtown Portland and Downtown Vancouver.*

**Councilor Rosenthal** agrees with the amendment in principle, but raised concerns about the health impact on places outside the project impact area.

Margi Bradway described the different ways to conduct an HIA. She suggested that council leave the amendment as is for now, and she would discuss with the project team and return with a proposal at a later date.

**Councilor Lewis** expressed her support for this amendment, but clarified that Metro would go far beyond the minimum requirements for an HIA.

**Councilor Gonzalez** also expressed his support for this amendment. He agreed with **Councilor Lewis**, but also raised some technical questions about the controlled variables used in an HIA.

**President Peterson** answered **Councilor Gonzalez's** questions.

**Councilor Craddick** also expressed support for this amendment.

**President Peterson** then began discussion on a fourth amendment proposed by **Councilor Nolan**:

- *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that no later than May 10,2022, the Metro Council will begin a formal public review to determine whether the IBRP has satisfactorily completed and published the results of, the actions required in Exhibit A...*

**Councilor Nolan** clarified the intent behind this amendment: to get information regarding Metro's Values, Outcomes, and Actions in advance of any major decision. According to their timeline, the IBRP team hopes to submit an LPA to council for consideration. **Councilor Nolan's** amendment would require the project team to submit relevant information at least 1 month in advance so council may evaluate and determine if the team has delivered on their promises to council.

**Councilor Lewis** expressed her support for this amendment, and suggested the council receive monthly updates rather than just one, and invite experts to testify and advise council.

**Councilor Gonzalez** expressed his support. He believed this amendment will ultimately result in better decision making.

**Councilor Rosenthal** liked the idea and intent behind the amendment, but did not believe the IBRP team would be able to sufficiently answer all of council's questions. He also asked if the June deadline for the LPA would shift if Metro were to reject whatever the IBRP team submitted. Staff clarified that the IBRP team already has an LPA. They would present a Modified LPA to council in June, and they are seeking endorsements from all 8 partner agencies. Staff

added that other partner agencies and advisory groups have created desired outcomes and performance measures, and they believe these measures address the concerns brought forth by council. Staff requested that the amendment requested information regarding the Modified LPA, instead of the LPA.

**President Peterson** added that deadlines for this project are not static, simply because there is so much work to be done on the IBRP.

**Councilor Craddick** referred back to public testimony, where council heard multiple people expressed their desire to see Metro hold ODOT accountable and make sure they follow through with council's decisions. She asked **Councilor Nolan** if this amendment would help achieve that end.

**Councilor Nolan** said yes. They clarified that this amendment was inspired by testimony submitted to council, and is intended to hold both the **Councilors** and partner agencies accountable. They also reiterated their disapproval of the LPA, and they expect the Modified LPA to substantively reduce GHG emissions, and move towards climate stewardship.

**Councilor Craddick** expressed her appreciation for input provided by **Councilor Nolan** and past public testimony. She also stated that the IBRP is not solely a transportation project, but a tool that will help the region meet its climate goals.

**Councilor Nolan** referred back to former Councilor Liberty's public testimony, where he argued that equity must be comparative. Though no longer in the amendment, they expressed their desire to see the cost-benefit ratio for

BIPOC and low-income communities be at least equal to the cost-benefit ratios for White, middle, and upper class communities. They wished to hear staff acknowledge and agree to this stipulation.

Staff reminded council about the IBRP's Equity Advisory Group and their work. They also suggested inviting Sebrina Owens-Wilson, Metro's lead on equity for the IBRP, to come and present regarding this subject. After reading the council's Values, Outcomes, and Actions statement, she recommended council bolster the work of the EAG.

**President Peterson** recommended returning to this amendment at a later date, and revise the language to add **Councilor Nolan's** stipulation.

**Councilor Nolan** agreed, but reiterated their commitment to representing the interests of their BIPOC constituents, that supporting the EAG and pushing for more equity work are not mutually exclusive, and that there is still much to be done.

**Councilor Rosenthal** suggested revising the amendment's language from "advancing racial equity" to "advancing equity for all disadvantaged groups," because use of the former phrase may imply that racial equity is the only form of equity that interests Metro.

**Councilor Gonzalez** argued against revising the language. He believed that this language reflects Metro's equity framework, which includes all forms of equity. Leading with race does not prevent Metro from advancing other forms of equity.

**Councilor Lewis** agreed with **Councilor Gonzalez**. She does not wish to leave other disadvantaged groups behind, but

believes that Metro's unique focus on racial equity has more strengths than weaknesses.

**Councilor Lewis** proposed multiple amendments:

- An amendment that would require council to hold monthly work sessions to discuss the IBRP and progress on their values, outcomes, and actions.
- An amendment, based on public testimony that would change the word "bolded" to "all" in the following sentence from Metro's Values, Outcomes, and Actions statement. She believed it is worthy of discussion, but acknowledged the weaknesses of this change, as they relate to the bridge's construction. *Specifically, Metro Council expects the IBRP Project Team that bolded Actions described are addressed and shared with project partners...*

**Councilor Nolan** suggested additional language, which is underlined below:

- *Specifically, Metro Council expects the IBRP Project to assure that all Actions described are addressed and committed to and shared with project partners...*

**President Peterson** believed this addition was unnecessary, and moved to change the amendment's language without **Councilor Nolan's** suggestion. She also reminded council that the Values, Outcomes, and Actions statement can be revised at a later date if needed.

**Councilor Gonzalez** believed the word "addressed" was ambiguous enough that it could allow for an outcome that does not meet Council's expectations. However, with the understanding that this statement is a living document, and Council's discussions and intentions are on the record, he would be ok with the wording.

**Councilor Craddick** asked for clarification around the High Capacity Transit (HCT) portion of the “Outcomes” statement. She also suggested “strengthening” it to ensure more collaboration.

Margi believed that there is already a great deal of collaboration between C-Tran, Tri-met, and Metro, but was open to discussing more specific language.

**Councilor Nolan** recommended that the last three bullet points under “Actions” be bolded because they are all decisions that affect the MLPA.

**Council** agreed to leave them as is, and bold them later if needed.

**Metro Attorney Carrie McLaren** recommended to Council that they propose and act upon amendments to Exhibit A and the Resolution.

**Council Agreed**

#### 4.2.1 Public Hearing for Resolution No. 21-5206

Public Hearings:

**Chris Smith [He/Him] from No More Freeways:** testified regarding the amendment he introduced on behalf of the coalition.

Three additional actions under the ‘GHG and Air Quality’ Section

- Include VMT reduction
- Conduct an Investment-Grade Financial Analysis early in the project’s timeline
- Health Impact Assessment to determine the air quality impacts throughout the whole corridor, from Downtown Portland to Downtown Vancouver.



**Brett Morgan [He/Him] from 1000 Friends of Oregon**

further advocated for the three additional actions mentioned in Chris Smith's testimony. He also advocated for Hayden Island residents, who believe their voices are not being heard.

**Doug Allen [SE Portland]** advocated for clear, measurable commitments for the IBRP, and to do their due diligence before approving additional funding for the project.

**Paul Rippey [St. John's]** sang their testimony and advocated for no new lanes because they would create induced demand. They also advocated for a congestion tax.

**Ron Buel** complained about the lack of financial transparency and deception on the part of ODOT, WashDOT, OTC, and other transportation agencies, and pushed Metro to get 'the real plan.'

**Diane Meisenhelter [Inner NE Portland]** testified in favor of tabling the MTIP amendment until ODOT can assure that any potential bridge designs will

- Not expand the freeway
- Include congestion pricing and rapid mass transit options
- Conduct a full health impact study of the entire corridor, including solutions to reduce further harm to disadvantaged communities.

Funding should also be withheld until ODOT formally agrees to these conditions.

**Robert Liberty** warned that ODOT has previously ignored Metro, and may do so again. They also believe Metro's equity actions are meaningless because it does not compare and contrast the harmful effects and benefits experienced by communities of color and white communities.

**Michael Boyles** took issue with the 3 options for the new bridge. They believe there is no significant difference between them, a deliberate choice made by IBR leadership.

**Joseph Cortright [City Observatory]** had four parts to their testimony

- Metro's Values and Outcomes statement should include information about the GHG calculator used.
- ODOT has not released any new traffic forecasts in 15 years, and is using old data for this project. Metro should not agree to the design of the new bridge until a new traffic forecast is done.
- GHG emissions have increased under Metro's Climate SMART Plan, and they must do more.
- Metro must insist that an investment grade analysis is conducted before finalizing the bridge design.

**Dan Kaufman** testified regarding his opposition to the IBRP and highway expansion, that these projects may be politically beneficial but harm the future.

**Peter** testified that the IBRP contradicted with Metro's Climate SMART goals.

**Sam Yerke** raised concerns about the experience of non-drivers. They argue that even if the new bridge provides options for alternative forms of transit, if the experience is poor, more people will choose to commute in automobiles.

Seeing no further public testimonies, Council President Peterson moved on to council discussion:

4.3 Resolution No. 21-5217, For the Purpose of Amending the 2021-26 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Add the Preliminary Engineering Phase and Partial Funding of \$71 Million Dollars

---

for ODOT and WSDOT's Interstate 5- Interstate Bridge Replacement Project (NV22-03-NOV2)

**Council President Peterson** called on Ted Leybold [he/him] from Metro, Ray Mabey and Greg Johnson [he/him] from the IBRP Team to present to Council

Staff pulled up the [*Interstate Bridge Replacement Project Proposed MTIP Amendment Powerpoint Presentation*] to present to Council.

Tim introduced the proposed MTIP amendment, Ray Mabey, and Greg Johnson. They presented regarding how the proposed amendment would address concerns raised by Council in their Values, Actions, and Outcomes Statement.

*Council Discussion:*

**Councilor Craddick** asked how the IBR team plans to “right-size” the bridge while upholding Metro’s climate values and desired outcomes.

Greg explained that reducing greenhouse gas emissions is one of the IBR team’s top priorities, and the best way to ensure that is to robust multi-modal corridors.

**Councilor Nolan** asked if the IBR team understood Council’s expectation that, with the passage of Metro’s Values, Actions, and Outcomes Statement, they add the requested items to their work plan before they recommend a MLPA.

Greg understood these expectations; he added that some of the items were already being discussed with Metro staff, and the IBR team would need to figure out how to fit others into the project timeline. Greg also reminded Council that the IBRP is an inter-agency project, and the IBR team must find a balances that meets the expectations of all stakeholders.

**Councilor Lewis** appreciated the responsiveness to

Council's and the region's concerns demonstrated in staff's presentation. She also urged them to have presentation materials that are updated in real time, since changes to the IBRP happen so often.

Greg insisted that the team is providing up-to-date information to stakeholders, and that they are more than happy to speak with any group that wishes to be heard.

**Councilor Lewis** then asked what Metro Council and staff's responsibilities are with this project.

Margi explained Metro's role in the NEPA project, the MTIP, and approving the MLPA.

**Councilor Rosenthal** asked if the June deadline for the MLPA is fungible.

Greg explained that the June deadline is meant to ensure the IBRP does not miss the opportunity to receive federal funding. That deadline has been moved once already, and the team has been explicitly instructed to not miss this one. If the additional items requested by Council could potentially prevent the IBR team from meeting the June deadline, they will discuss this issue with Council.

**President Peterson** expressed her appreciation for changing the deadline, which gives the IBR team more time to get it right.

**Councilor Gonzalez** expressed his appreciation for the IBR team's work, his hope that the MLPA is an effective roadmap for the project, and that he looks forward to hearing more from them.

Greg thanked **Councilor Gonzalez** for the kind words and reiterated his commitment to sharing information with Council and answering their questions.

**President Peterson** thanked Greg for his hard work and

acknowledged that he and the IBR team face a large trust-deficit.

**Councilor Nolan** asked Greg Johnson to respond to some of the public testimony that claimed the IBR team is unable and unwilling to consider alternatives that downsize the previously approved LPA. They also asked Greg to respond that the IBR team has looked at and are currently looking at LPAs that are downsized. Plus, the team does indeed have up-to-date data. He committed to a data-driven approach to designing a multi-modal bridge that also considers climate and equity issues. Greg added that the team is unwilling to comply if Council asks them to build a bridge “that will fail,” and that data will be the chief influence over the bridge’s design.

**Councilor Nolan** followed up her statement by clarifying their question, if the Council discussion and public testimony resonated with Greg Johnson and the IBR team, and if that had changed their thinking. They also disapproved of Greg’s statement that Council may ask them to build a bridge “that will fail.”

**Councilor Craddick** expressed similar concerns, that ODOT and the IBR team do share the same level of commitment to Metro’s expected outcomes for the bridge. The region does not have the luxury of simply utilizing demand-driven transportation design. However, they would still vote in favor of the resolution because of the time constraints on federal funding, and so that they can begin to answer Council’s questions.

**Councilor Gonzalez** echoed the same concerns as the other two **Councilors**, but signaled that he would vote for this project because he believes this project can satisfy all of the expectations laid out by Council. If the project does not,

then there will be more discussions.

**Councilor Lewis** saw flaws in the process, but believed passing this resolution was a more prudent choice. She reiterated they the resolution only approved “study and work” on the IBRP, and that it will yield answers to Council’s pressing questions. She also believed that further postponing this process would increase frustration and dollars wasted, without achieving the desired outcomes.

**Councilor Rosenthal** also shared their dissatisfaction with this process. They were far less optimistic about the bridge’s potential, and believed the end result would be a “functional bridge” but “not one I am proud of.” That said, they believed it was important to move forward with the project. Ray Mabey expressed his appreciation for Council’s work, and reiterated that he and the IBR team would work hard to apply Council’s values, and see their expected outcomes realized.

**President Peterson** shared the same thoughts as the rest of Council, and believed that a decision needs to be made so they can focus on other important projects. She expressed her appreciation for everyone’s hard work.

Seeing no further discussion on the topic, Council President Peterson moved on to public testimonies.

#### 4.3.1 Public Hearing for Resolution No. 21-5217

*Public Hearing:*

Council President Peterson opened the meeting to members of the public wanting to testify on **Resolution 21-5217**. Legislative Coordinator Jaye Cromwell explained the public hearing process.

**Representative Khanh Pham (OR House District 46)**

testified in support of Metro's Values, Outcomes, and Actions Statement. However, they expressed concerns that the IBRP may not help the region meet its climate goals and may divert funding away from other projects.

**Ukiah Steiner** provided recorded testimony in opposition to the addition of auxiliary lanes to the new bridge because it would create induced demand and increase greenhouse gas emissions.

**Robert Liberty** testified in opposition to the resolution and recommended that Council table it for 2 weeks so the IBR team can fully process it, and Council should request a refund if the IBR team does not meet expectations.

**John Kelly**, a retired city planner recommended that Metro reject the resolution, develop its own design for the IBRP, and reject any plan that does not meet their guidelines.

**Chris Smith (he/him)** expressed concerns about the resolution and its desired outcomes, asked for more timely release of meeting materials, and suggested ways to make public testimony more accessible.

**Ed Washington** expressed support for a new bridge, but noted that the region has been discussing a bridge replacement for over 30 years.

**Lynn Handlin (she/her)** testified in opposition to the current iteration of the IBRP. She believed it is a highway expansion project in disguise, and believes the project will ultimately increase greenhouse gas emissions.

**Kyle Johnson (Bike Loud PDX)** testified against allocating funds to ODOT and believed they are Oregon's primary obstacle on the path to the state's climate goals. Metro is

the “last line of defense” against ODOT.

**Cassie Wilson (she/her) (Sunrise Rural Oregon)** testified against allocating funds to ODOT without a guarantee the IBRP will not expand highways or increase VMT.

**Bob Ortblad (Watershed resident and civil engineer)** testified against the current IBRP bridge designs and believed they could cause preventable deaths. He advocated for an immersed tube tunnel design which he believed will be even more earthquake resilient.

**Aaron Brown (he/him) (No More Highways)** testified against allocating funds to ODOT for the IBRP and believed the IBR team has not been truthful about the bridge’s design. Metro should not allocated funds until they have a “right-sized” bridge design and “know what they’re paying for.”

**Willy Myers** testified in favor of passing the resolution and allocating funds to ODOT for the IBRP because the interstate bridge is crucial to the region’s economy and is vulnerable to earthquakes.

**Benjamin Fryback** testified against allocating fund for ODOT and investing that same amount of money into other transportation projects that have been underfunded.

**Joseph Cortright** testified against allocating funds for ODOT because they have yet to establish projections, and the projections they have are outdated.

**Peter** testified against allocating funds for ODOT and the IBRP, specifically because they opposed highway expansion.

Seeing no further discussion on the topic, Council President Peterson moved to approve Resolution 21-5217



**5. Chief Operating Officer Communication**

COO Marissa Madrigal provided an update on the following item:

- The region is experiencing difficulty processing its solid waste. Metro is working with its public and private partners, and ask that residents refrain from using its self-hauling until next week.
- RID patrol has added more work crews and has drastically reduced response times for site cleanups and its cleanup backlog.
- Metro's Regional Refresh Fund has awarded about \$88,000 to several organizations and jurisdictions for community-sponsored cleanup events.
- Metro is also working with multiple organizations on graffiti removal and paint donation.
- Metro's Innovation and Investment Grants are now available, specifically for programs related to waste management and/or waste prevention.

**6. Councilor Communication**

Councilors provided updates on the following meetings and events:

- There were none.

**7. Adjourn**

There being no further business, Council President Peterson adjourned the Metro Council Meeting at 4:15p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nathan Kim*

Nathan Kim, Legislative Assistant