

Metro Council — MPAC Work Session

June 30, 1997

Oregon Convention Center

Call To Order: The meeting was called to order by Gordon Davis, Facilitator, at 8:00 AM.

Members Present: Councilor Ruth McFarland, Mayor Lou Ogden, Mayor Tom Lowry, Councilor Susan McLain, Jim Sitzman, Commissioner Judie Hammerstad, John Hartsock, Mayor Rob Drake, Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad, Peggy Lynch, Jim Zehren, Councilor Lisa Naito, Commissioner Linda Peters, Councilor Ed Washington, Mayor Jill Thorn, and Jean Schreiber

Mr. Davis began the meeting with an exercise for the participants designed to help participants in the process of changing their points and frames of reference. He asked participants to turn off their preconceived points of reference and look at the issues in a different way.

Mr. Davis stated that he had discussed the meeting with a number of participants beforehand in order to obtain some idea of the tasks that needed to be accomplished at this meeting. These included:

- The partnership between Metro Council and Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) has deteriorated significantly in the last six months.
- Certain members of MPAC are frustrated that Metro Council does not give clear and specific directions regarding its wants and needs.
- Metro Council believes that it receives inconsistent feedback from MPAC.
- MPAC does not know what the Council is doing at all times; as well, Metro Council believes itself to be in the same situation with regard to MPAC.
- MPAC has expended a great deal of energy trying to ascertain the means to formulate their process work more efficiently but little seems to have been accomplished in this direction.
- Metro Council is frustrated that sometimes it thinks that MPAC forgets that it is an advisory body.
- MPAC is frustrated that it does not seem to have a direct communication link with the Council.
- Metro Council believes that MPAC wants veto power. Their recommendations, according to some Council members, are more than just recommendations but, in fact, actually are looking for veto power over Council actions.
- MPAC members believe that Metro Council really does not understand local government issues and that none of the Metro Councilors have had direct local government experience. Members of MPAC have generally expressed concerns that Metro Council does not understand what it is like to be at the level of local government.

June 30, 1997

Page 2

- Metro Council members believe that MPAC embraces the concept of partnership as a group but when they are back in their local jurisdictions, blame Metro for problems because it provides a convenient scapegoat.
- MPAC members believe the Council is not sympathetic to the time limitations of members. Scheduling and time frame of many issues do not really reflect the realities of local jurisdiction individuals who have other jobs as well as their elected offices and must expend a portion of their time and energies fulfilling these other responsibilities.
- Metro Councilors seem frustrated when they receive recommendations from MPAC and are brought forward as a single recommendation but then receive telephone messages from individual MPAC members who disagree with said recommendations.
- MPAC believes that Metro Council does not understand the importance of this process and the amount of time required for the process to work in terms of information-gathering and moving out to involve the constituents in the process.
- Metro Council is frustrated that MPAC does not communicate effectively with non-participating local governments. MPAC does have direct, broad representation but what of the opinions of other municipalities, etc., who are not seated on the committee.
- MPAC is frustrated with Council members because they don't attend MPAC meetings and so there is no direct connection and dialogue.
- Metro Council believes that MPAC often presents 'all or nothing' final decisions rather than advice.
- MPAC believes that Council sometimes appears arrogant. However Council makes its decisions, or takes its position, MPAC members seem to think that the Council has given the impression of arrogance.

Mr. Davis then discussed the conclusions he drew regarding the above statements.

- He stated that when he encounters feelings such as those stated above, his fundamental conclusion is that communication has broken down. There is normally a lack of clarity about the role played by each individual in the process. There is a lack of clarity about the assignments received by individual members. There is a lack of clarity about the process involved and which they must use.
- When there is lack of clarity about role assignments and process, communication breaks down very quickly.

Mr. Davis continued that in this particular case between MPAC and Metro Council, it seems clear that there are some personality and ego conflicts. This is not unusual. The particulars of this case indicate that this aspect is overlaid on the breakdown of communications and is making it very difficult to effectively deal with some of the communication issues. His conclusion was that most members believe that the partnership called for in the Charter and Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) between Metro Council and MPAC has clearly broken down. Ideally, what should have been a cooperative process has now become an antagonistic if not adversary process. Commitment hovers at a low level.

June 30, 1997

Page 3

Mr. Davis then discussed his three-part agenda for the day:

- Discussion of Roles;
- Discussion of Issues;
- Discussion of Communications.

He then asked for observations from the participants.

Commissioner Linda Peters stated her wish that a common understanding of the roles of both Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and Metro Council might be achieved in the day's process.

John Hartsock shared his belief that so much of the advisory role of MPAC must be returned to the local jurisdictions and those municipalities must 'buy into' what is decided at the committee level. This is often difficult to achieve.

Peggy Lynch observed that there may be difficulties in communications with the 24 municipalities and three counties involved and the even larger bodies of citizens involved on those levels.

Councilor Susan McLain stated her belief that MPAC seems to interact in a different manner with Metro Council than does the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), etc. She stated her belief that the structure itself causes the difficulties.

Jean Schreiber, representing five cities in Clackamas County, outlined her concern that she does represent MPAC to thousands of citizens at the local level. She is constantly questioned about Metro's impact upon these localities. She hoped that this meeting would open communications in a more effective fashion and place her on the 'inside track' in order to be able to more effectively advise her constituents.

Commissioner Judie Hammerstad stated that the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) process opened lines of communications with the municipalities not influenced by Metro Council by Metro Council's input.

Jim Sitzman built upon Jean Schreiber's comments by asking what significance the time frame contains.

Councilor Ed Washington discussed the fact that this type of meeting should have been held approximately two years earlier. He stated that Council has never gathered with MPAC and MPAC has not held this kind of a meeting with Council.

Jim Zehren stated that previously, in Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting, there was a sense that specific Metro Councilors were assigned to MPAC, were regular members, and attended the meetings. This seems to not be the case at the present time. He stated that he had noticed a problem in the physical way in which members of Metro Council interact at meetings with Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). Another point he made was related to the important topic of the Regional Framework Plan. He hoped that the energy expended in this meeting would follow both groups through the discussions of this plan.

Councilor Susan McLain was concerned that members of both groups actually attend the meetings and vote on these important issues. She further stated that it took her nearly two years to get a place on the agenda of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting.

June 30, 1997

Page 4

Jean Schreiber believed that what the citizens of the region were saying was important for the Council to be aware of. It was the local jurisdictions that often provided that feedback to the Council. Metro couldn't function well without this direct feedback. She wished the Council had a better feel for what was going on out in the region. MPAC represents many of those citizens in the local jurisdictions and tends to hear from them more regularly than does Council. MPAC felt that sometimes the single voice of a constituent was heard whereas MPAC, a group voice, was not. She encouraged the Council to listen to the collective voice, MPAC has local jurisdiction experience.

Councilor McLain commented that there are some Councilors who attend local jurisdiction and CPO meetings on a regular basis. The kernel of Ms. Schreiber's comment was that the Metro Councilors have to have an ability to function out in their districts. She believed that most of the Councilors spent time in their districts communicating with their constituents instead of remaining at Metro.

Mr. Davis then addressed the question of the role of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

Charter:

- The charter specifies the role of MPAC.
- First, it principally focused on the role of MPAC with regard to the Regional Framework Plan. The Council shall adopt a Regional Framework Plan 'with the consultation and advice of MPAC.
- Secondly, it specifies the proposed contents of the Regional Framework Plan and, if other things need to be in the plan, advice and counsel is to be sought from MPAC in doing that.
- Third, the Charter states that Metro Council may amend the Regional Framework Plan after consultation and advice from MPAC.
- Fourth, the one very different role played by MPAC as defined by the Charter, and that is the question of whether Metro, as an organization, should assume some service function that is now being provided by local governments. Except when such a take-over is approved by a majority of voters, the Charter states a majority of MPAC members voting members must approve that service take-over.

Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs), on the other hand, identify a number of groups, cities and counties, whose purpose in regional planning is to identify regional issues. That is all the RUGGOs say about MPAC with regard to regional planning activities.

- MPAC may identify issues of regional concern for cities and counties to consider in their local planning.
- MPAC shall recommend periodic updates to the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs).
- MPAC may provide comments on reviews of issues of local concern.

Performance Measures: There is a concept in the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) that the Council, in consultation with MPAC will develop performance measures.

Monitoring and Updating: Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs), the Regional Framework Plan and the Functional Plan shall be reviewed every seven years or at other times upon consultation and advice from MPAC. The concept of 'what should be the frequency of review' is of primary importance in this regard. The role in which Metro Council may come to MPAC for

June 30, 1997

Page 5

consultation is open for question. Should, for example, the Functional Plan or Regional Framework Plan be reviewed more or less frequently.

Functional Plans: In this regard, the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) are quite specific and fairly extensive in terms of their description of the role of MPAC who may recommend that Metro Council designate an area or an activity for the development of the Functional Plan. MPAC as a body, could say that a Functional Plan needs to be prepared for a specific locality or for a certain activity. MPAC may recommend this to Metro Council at any time. The Council may also refer a Functional Plan proposal to MPAC. MPAC has a every well-defined role in interpreting Functional Plans against local comprehensive plans to the extent of holding hearings, preparing reports, etc. Council also may refer Functional Plans to MPAC for consideration before final adoption. MPAC on the other hand, may prepare and present to Metro Council reports on inconsistencies between Functional Plans and local comprehensive plans.

Councilor McLain stated her belief in parallel but separate courses for Metro Council and MPAC to follow. She also divulged the idea that three members of MPAC should be Metro Council members.

Mr. Davis noted that Metro's charter and the RUGGOs requires that MPAC and Metro Council exist as "semi-independent" bodies; in actual practice, however, both seem to have and set their own agendas.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad said that is in fact the way that these entities operate but may not necessarily been envisioned in this way.

Peggy Lynch stated that MPAC's agenda has been "directly" responsive to the time-line and actions of Metro Council to be certain that their agenda would allow MPAC the time to do the consultation and advising in a manner that is reasonable as well as to do the outreach required of MPAC.

Councilor Lisa Naito stated her concern was the manner in which Council received information - whether it came from MPAC or from local jurisdictions. Metro must acquire an understanding of what the needs are of the local governments. She stated her willingness to attend MPAC meetings. She continued, however, that at recent MPAC meetings, information was being presented to MPAC that had already been presented to her in different committees which she attends. She stated that this was not the best use of Metro councilors' time. She wants to be at MPAC when critical issues are being discussed and to be involved in the process but does not want to come to meetings if they are counterproductive to her time. Her recommendation was to have an ongoing, special group, that meets regularly with three councilors in an informal, information-sharing gathering.

Jim Zehren stated that MPAC has been doing a great deal of listening to constituents in recent months but felt that perhaps twice-monthly work sessions would be in order at this point in time.

Councilor Susan McLain stated her agreement with the institution of such work sessions.

Jean Schreiber said she was not clear in her mind what the current Council expected in that. She knew that in her own area there were advisory groups whose advise could or could not be accepted. She is not sure that the current Council accepted MPAC's advisory role.

Councilor Lisa Naito stated that she is aware of the fact that many decisions Metro makes will impact what local jurisdictions are able and unable to do as well as how local constituents will respond.

June 30, 1997

Page 6

Mayor Rob Drake stated that the Functional Plan, which needed to be completed sooner rather than later, at present was occupying the attention and time of MPAC and that the Framework Plan has a 1998 deadline and this would next occupy the attention of MPAC. He believes that part of what MPAC and Metro Council are experiencing is a part of the normal, grinding political process.

Commissioner Judie Hammerstad stated her preference for spending more time discussing the common issues of the local jurisdictions. In this way, a better regional agenda would result.

Jim Zehren wished that Charlie Hales were at this meeting because he viewed MPAC as a planning commission. Mr. Zehren was not sure this was an accurate picture of the role that MPAC played. The Charter indicates that the role of MPAC is clearly advise and consultation nothing more than that. Informally, the question is how much weight does MPAC carry with the region government.

Commissioner Linda Peters stated her agreement with Commissioner Hammerstad and Mr. Zehren's statements. Metro Council is charged with the regional perspectives and MPAC is the body that negotiates local perspectives. The unique thing that Metro Council brings is the regional perspective. Members of MPAC believe that MPAC has a regional perspective and that the value of MPAC is the combination of local jurisdictional experience with regional perspectives.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad asked for specifics, taking out of consideration in this contingency, the urban reserve decision. He requested specifically which items have come forward from MPAC that Council did not accept.

Commissioner Linda Peters asked for the reason for taking the urban reserve decision off the table at this point since this seemed to be the point of greatest contention between Council and MPAC.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that these the urban reserve decision and the Regional Framework Plan were two separate and distinct area of consideration. He sees this as the crux of the problem. When it comes to the Regional Framework Plan, approximately 95% of the recommendations of MPAC were directly accepted by Council. The implementation steps, the local involvement steps, are more problematic in nature. The urban reserve decision is not the role of MPAC functions as a specific. This, in his opinion, is where the discordance lies.

Peggy Lynch thanked Presiding Officer Kvistad for his insights on this matter.

Commissioner Peters stated the urban reserve decision could not be more personal to local governments than it is. There was a definite lack of communication between Council and MPAC on this issue. Local governments must take responsibility for the urban reserve when they become urban and do the implementation to make those a part of the region.

Councilor Ruth McFarland thought the majority of the decisions made by Metro Council that came from MPAC recommendation were unanimously approved by Council. The ones she identified as sources of trouble could be categorized as individual kinds of entities. She believed that the more troublesome decisions actually came from individual municipalities. Often the cities or counties involved simply told Metro that if a certain recommendation is accepted by Council, they will not implement it. She did not see these as coming from MPAC.

Peggy Lynch stated that MPAC gave very specific and concrete suggestions. Advice was given as to how to make individual property decisions from a global perspective. Council's deliberations seemed to be focused on a parcel-by-parcel process.

June 30, 1997

Page 7

Councilor McFarland stated that most councilors had the global picture and voted consistently against any parcel that contained EFU (exclusive farm use) land within its boundaries. There were details that came up which negated some of those kinds of approaches and the Metro councilors felt that those details must be considered also.

John Hartsock stated that there was a mechanical issue involved: The words of 'consultation,' 'advise,' and 'reprimand' - perhaps the price Metro Council has to pay for that advice is affecting it. Some issues follow the advice in a straightforward manner but others, wherein there is a major disagreement, both sides can go back to the issue and redefine the roles. The other piece of the puzzle is the comment that Metro and MPAC's agendas are different. Are the agendas different today? Is that the issue on the table today?

Commissioner Hammerstad stated that the urban reserve subcommittee on MPAC went through a detailed process but the only vote taken was to eliminate the Stafford Triangle. A list of eight items was presented to Council for guidance in these matters and they were not followed, Commissioner Hammerstad contended. One of those items concerned difficult land lot decisions. MPAC wanted those decisions to come back to local government after the decisions were made by Metro Council and formalized. That was not accomplished. As a result, many constituents are talking to County Commissioners and Metro Councilors wanting to have specific pieces of property defined and no process is in place for that.

Mr. Davis stated that he was still struggling from an outside perspective in trying to understand the various roles. What he hears the participants describe as an independent set of rules and yet the Metro Charter and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) both state common goals of Metro Council and MPAC and toward which both bodies were working. Metro Council, with the ultimate responsibility, is looking for advice and consent of a broad spectrum of people that MPAC represents. What he hears described are more independent relationships of a set of independent agendas. Structurally, that is very different from what is contained in the Metro Charter and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs). Are the two bodies moving toward independent agendas or is there a commitment to the ideal that is contained in the charter and in the RUGGOs.

Councilor McLain stated that this year's agenda was much better than before. When working with the Regional Framework Plan timeline, both groups have done well. She felt that both bodies are committed towards common goals. Her concern was the articulation of that work and making certain that the decision point at both the Council level and the work sessions that were available to MPAC were reasonable, recognizable and predictable.

Councilor Ed Washington stated that his interpretation of MPAC's role has always been tied to what is in the charter. He stated that MPAC, in their vision of themselves as a planning board, has created problems.

Jim Zehren stated that MPAC does not have just a local jurisdiction; they also have a regional responsibility. It would be helpful if all participants would put aside the notion that each has a completely unique perspective. Ultimately, perhaps, Metro Councilors do have the more regional point of view but no one has a 'lock on a particular perspective.'

Commissioner Linda Peters stated that she had been thinking about independence versus common goals and partnership. She believes that she is nearer the common goals, partnership end of the spectrum. Her assumptions and observations have been that both bodies are working in a coordinated way towards the same goals.

June 30, 1997

Page 8

Mayor Drake stated that common goals are critical and a common agenda-setting process is critical. A parallel path for both organizations is extremely important.

Tom Lowry, speaking in an advisory role only, stated that he sees MPAC as having an advisory role only. MPAC has no power. All it can do is give advice to the Council, make reports, etc. Metro Council has the right to give that information and advice as little or as much weight as they choose. MPAC has the responsibility to help Metro develop a plan for growth that will work. If Metro puts out a plan that does not work and voters perceive this, Metro will cease to exist. Metro Council must take the local agendas into consideration and not ignore them. On the other hand, the agenda of one locality is only one part of the entire Metro region and Council must recognize this as well.

Councilor Ruth McFarland responded by saying that Metro Council tries to take a regional view of matters. She enlarged upon this by stating that while she understands the highways and byways of her district, Gresham, the same thing is not true to the same degree of her understanding of the issues of Washington County. The same holds true for all the Metro Councilors. Councilor McFarland maintained that she listens to all the issues from each of the three counties and the 24 cities in the Metro region but must balance that information with what she knows of the region as a complete entity. She stated her belief that Council thinks long and hard before overturning recommendations of MPAC. On a pragmatic note, she stated that Metro Councilors do not have the time to talk with all the constituents that MPAC members do. Metro Committee For Citizen Involvement (MCCI) is another group used in the same manner by the Council.

Peggy Lynch stated that part of MPAC's agenda is moving from the point just enunciated by Councilor McFarland. MPAC must be certain that constituents and local governments know what decisions are being made and recommended to Council and that they are informed of such in a timely manner.

Gordon Davis characterized what he believed had gone on in the past 45 minutes: The charter and the RUGGOs define MPAC's role as one of advice and counsel. It clearly leaves the decision-making to the Council. This has not been a point of disagreement. But another reality, less articulated in the Charter, is that despite what the RUGGOs and the Charter say, there will always be tension between MPAC and the Metro Council because both are elected bodies that must answer to constituencies. The key is how that tension will be managed. Returning to the topic of an executive committee, Mr. Davis asked how such a committee would work and whether the Council had an executive committee of any sort.

Commissioner Peters said that three Council people have been appointed to MPAC. They and the Presiding Officer could serve as the Council's part of the executive committee. The Chair, the vice-chair and the second vice-chair could serve from MPAC. She suggested they might meet an hour before MPAC does.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he sees the regular meeting as a work-in-progress discussion. He suggested that the agenda-setting could be done at an annual meeting.

Gordon Davis said he didn't know who the three Council members appointed to MPAC were and asked if anyone knew. He said that if three plus one isn't a majority, then they would still have a problem if a contentious issue emerged.

Councilor McLain stated that it would be three members in addition to the Presiding Officer. She said the three members are she, Don Morissette, and Patricia McCaig.

June 30, 1997

Page 9

Gordon Davis asked what the down side might be of having the executive committee.

Jean Schreiber said she thought it might be that such a committee would be a small group talking to one another instead of having a broader discussion with entire group. The discussions at MPAC often have much dissension. She feared if that discussion isn't heard by the seven decision-makers, they wouldn't know the rationale behind any conclusion. She said she had found value as a citizen in attending meetings at which she could listen to decision-makers deliberate so she could understand their concerns and their perspectives on them. She felt MPAC needed to hear from the Council in general at the beginning of the Framework Plan or whatever major decisions come up. By listening to the Council's concerns, MPAC would be able to identify points where the Council might want or need advice. That would be mutually helpful.

Gordon Davis summarized three things he thought people were saying. 1) there is value in all of MPAC and all of the Council periodically getting together and talking; 2) there is a need to manage the process-- for a mechanism that manages the agenda-setting process, defines the scope of work, and schedules progress of items on the agenda things; and 3) there is a need to be certain that communications flow between the two bodies and among individual members.

Mr. Davis said he was most concerned about how they might resolve a situation wherein the Council takes a different course of action from that recommended by MPAC. He said that the issues that are appropriate for MPAC to advise on, need to be defined. He pointed out that the members of MPAC are decision-makers in other roles and are accountable to their constituents. More important, even though MPAC and the Metro Council might share some common goals, their ideas on how to achieve those goals might be very different. because they have different perspectives. He likened the situation to that of a foot soldier and a General in a war situation. The foot soldier has more to lose by decisions such as where to spend the night. Likewise, those closer to their constituents pay a higher price for the decisions they make. Establishing the guidelines for deciding which subjects might be appropriate to advise on. That way MPAC members would know from the outset how their advice might or might not be used. The advice from MPAC is and should be treated differently from that of citizens who show up. MPAC was formed to bridge the trust gap between local government and Metro. Local governments wanted to be sure their voices were being heard. He expressed concern that the feedback process would work.

Councilor McLain pointed out that the fact that someone had to ask who the representatives from the Council were on MPAC indicates that only one of those appointed to MPAC has taken the role seriously. She suggested that if those who are appointed to the body don't attend the meetings, then they cannot serve as a liaison. That might be part of the underlying tension.

Councilor Naito stated that if the executive committee were to be established, it should have the power to call a full MPAC/Council working meeting. She said that whether she served on the executive committee or not, she would like to be able to hear the issues and discussion when the entire group is present.

Peggy Lynch said they were doing something on the performance measures that has promise for providing a prototype for how to work on specific policy areas and that sort of thing. They have a committee that is part growth management committee, part council, part citizen, some business folks, and some Metro staff. Together they have a series of work sessions to hammer out the substance of what the performance measures should be and how they should be related to what kinds of decisions. That might serve as a model for joint working committees, whether it is the whole MPAC and as many of the Council as want to meeting in work sessions with staff at early stages of major decision-making process, it might help avoid revisiting those issues.

June 30, 1997

Page 10

Gordon Davis said the way he understood it, the executive committee would deal only with process, not with the substance of issues. Its role would be solely management. To that extent, part of what it would look at would be how individual issues would be managed. That executive committee might decide on a case-by case basis how the issue would move through the process. He asked whether there wouldn't be some substance to it, in light of the fact that they must manage time for both sides. Adding some substance would ensure that it is a meaningful group.

Jim Zehren said that it would involve some substance, but that the purpose would not be to deal with the issue directly so much as the interrelationship between those two. Mr. Zehren continued that he would be more comfortable if the executive committee did not make an immediate report if it met the hour before the regular meeting. He said he would prefer time to process the report.

Jim Zehren said that if one of the purposes is to head off divisive issues, then they would need to have representatives from both bodies that could meet and talk. That means the Presiding Officer of the Council needs to be there and chair of MPAC--the leaders of the two bodies--signing off on issues.

Judie Hammerstad brought up the fact that even when they had a work session of the Council, the Presiding officer did not ask for input, just on the basis of politeness. She said she recognized that politeness cannot be legislated, but that lack of it can cause problems in working relationships.

Gordon Davis said that, although he did not disagree with the basis of what she was recommending, that if you can establish reasonable decision-making and process-management mechanisms, when people's individual styles don't match, at least the process can function. The process can ensure opportunities where individual personalities might fail.

Councilor McLain said that certain issues can make even polite people act impolitely. The recognition that MPAC deserves an elevated position on the Metro agenda suggests that if the Council meetings set aside time for the executive officer, it could also set aside time at the beginning of the meeting for an MPAC representative. She said the Council could make a place at the beginning of the agenda, so the MPAC representative would not have to wait through the whole meeting. She would support that.

John Hartsock stated that weekly meetings would probably be too much, but that once or twice a month would be very appropriate.

Councilor Naito said perhaps the day after the regular meeting might be best.

Councilor Washington said that the important thing is not when, but assuring MPAC that a slot would be available whenever they needed it. He suggested also, with respect to joint meetings with Metro Council, that sometimes there is a fifth Thursday in a month. That could be set aside for the joint Council MPAC meeting.

Peggy Lynch said she thought the joint sessions should be issue oriented, not process oriented, and they should be poised at the beginning of the process. If the session time were set, then they would not have the flexibility to meet as needed. The other part that she did not want forgotten was that the Metro executive staff is part of this, because part of the timing frustrations for Council and MPAC is staff-driven. They would need to know when the reports would be done and the information in order to start making decisions. Perhaps in the executive meeting, the executive side must be represented to have a voice in when these discussions would take place.

June 30, 1997

Page 11

Gordon Davis reiterated that if they were to proceed with a joint forum between MPAC and the Council, they need to include staff to deal with scheduling.

Linda Peters said that the process could be complicated by the fact that she and two or three of the official positions might be occupied by people considering running for the same office, so that could create a situation in which they might feel they need to do something to set themselves apart from the pack as having achieved something unusual and wonderful for the region, but the reality is that all three of the races would suffer if the product, in the Framework Plan, that will be credible in the eyes of the holders.

Councilor McFarland said that in general, the Council does not intentionally go against what MPAC recommends. On occasion, they may want to argue. But in general the Council does listen. She said MPAC gives the Council the opportunity to have access to groups of people all over the region otherwise inaccessible. Council members cannot talk with people all over this region. MPAC members are the conduit. She said that MCCI acts as a conduit in the same way. Councilor McFarland said that the Council does pay attention to the input from MPAC. The Council sometimes must modify the input, but it does not ignore it.

Peggy Lynch said that part of their problem with agenda-setting is the constantly moving target, which in turn makes it difficult to have the conversation to which Councilor McFarland referred. To make sure that everyone is communicating and working together, MPAC needs to have adequate notice. That hasn't been the case in the past six months. Focusing on the Regional Framework Plan then, and the opportunities mentioned by Councilor McLain for MPAC and the Council to touch base, Ms. Lynch said that as she understood it, MPAC was expected to provide consultation and advice to the council on August 13. She wanted to know what, in terms of process, the Metro Council planned to do with that advice. Also, as they go through their committee structure, at what point will MPAC have an opportunity to revisit the document and advise on the document before it goes to public hearing. She said it would be important to know if there are problems with the contract, so the problem can be hashed out jointly before a final decision is made.

Gordon Davis clarified his understanding of the difficulty Ms. Lynch described. Given the size and diversity of the body, by its very nature the process will be one of dialogue and compromise. That is normal. What Ms. Lynch seemed to be saying is that the normal process was not taking place, either because the mechanism does not exist for that to happen or because the calendar is too short or because people have forgotten about the value of doing that. Using the example of the Urban Reserves decision, perhaps if the mechanism had been in place, even if the outcome had been the same, people would have been more comfortable with their level of participation.

Commissioner Peters said she thought it might have happened that way if the presiding officer had thought it was MPAC's business to be involved in that way. But Metro's presiding officer has just said he did not think it was their business to be involved in that way.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that when it comes to the elements of the Functional Plan and the Framework Plan, RUGGOs, when it comes to implementation inside the Urban Growth Boundary, he has no problem with MPAC's involvement whatsoever. He said in his view, most of the time there has been a great deal of dialogue. He has differed and tension has arisen when the politics of the edge have come into play. Metro has been working with some of those parcels for five years, and it didn't need the friction that came out of the process, even though they appreciated the input. The politics of the edge became positioned against everything else concerned with building a better region. He said he did not want to talk around the friction that had occurred. He wanted to address it and go beyond it. They now have the Framework Plan, and the way MPAC has contributed and the way the staff has contributed is

June 30, 1997

Page 12

the way the process should be working. Council needs the advice and the help and the review as this progresses.

Gordon Davis said that it's clear that the conflict over Urban Reserves constitutes a key reason the joint meeting at hand was called. He referred to setting agendas, and asked whether the Urban Reserves issues had not been a part of an agreed-upon agenda, and if not, is that the source of the conflict.

Peggy Lynch said that contrary to what Jon Kvistad had said, when it comes to the Urban Reserves, in her view MPAC does have a role. The Metro Council told MPAC it was not part of their business. That was the conflict.

Gordon Davis said that the question of whether that issue should be a part of MPAC's agenda was not agreed upon. He asked how it would have been.

Jean Schreiber said that red-flagged the future of the process.

Peggy Lynch said that is not to say that after that initial comment was made there were not efforts on both sides to adjust that decision, among them MPAC's initial decision to work toward policy and not toward individual properties. But the bottom line is that because it wasn't in the charter, it was none of MPAC's business.

Gordon Davis said his understanding was that despite that, MPAC proceeded to play a role and took whatever came out of the process to Council, and Council acted upon it.

Peggy Lynch said that was correct.

Gordon Davis said in his view the fault lay in how the agenda was set and for people to have trust and confidence in that agenda-setting process, to agree on the agenda after it emerges from the process so that each party knows its role. Somehow that failed.

Peggy Lynch said this brings them to the point they are now, with the distrust over the Framework Plan. She asked what Metro really wants MPAC's role to be.

Susan McLain said she understood everyone really wants to move forward and use the example of the Framework Plan as a model of how they want to work together. She said that although she recognizes that the role of MPAC on Urban Reserves was not clear and she got caught in the middle, but she felt they tried to articulate the difference of opinion. Secondly, she said she was strongly advised by legal counsel to take to the state review board a plan that she believed would be acknowledged. She was challenged to take the advice from MPAC and from all the Councilors and the vote from all the Councilors to make certain it was defensible. She said that if the ultimate decision did not agree with all MPAC's advice, it was not because they did not go through the policy of eight that MPAC set, it was because they had to walk the map, and our package had to take in the entire region. The urban growth boundary management has been a Metro function since the beginning of Metro's time 20 years ago. So when Jon was talking about there being a difference between articulating how to use the resources, the density, and the transportation connections inside the urban growth boundary, which is MPAC's prerogative and implementation, and how they can together articulate urban reserves that will someday become your function and form is where we both have part of the pie, and we were trying to do that together. Perhaps the process was not perfect, but they did try. The task at hand is to refine that, as they are currently trying to do for the Urban reserves. Regarding the lines Jim talked about drawing. MPAC can zone that. In the current dealings with Fairview, Gresham, and Wood Village they are doing that. She said the process is

June 30, 1997

Page 13

in place to work through those definitions concerning lines. Council provides the big blueprint, MPAC deals with the details.

Jean Schreiber referred to Councilor McFarland's comments about why review by groups like MPAC is important when some of these regional issues arise, is that local governments know each other's business. The rules are understood and when they aren't, the officials know how to find out. What local officials are trying to preserve is the ability to look at regional issues as local officials. All the local officials know that decisions concerning urban reserves will affect local jurisdictions eventually, and they want to be certain they keep the regional concepts going into the future, long after the individuals currently participating are no longer part of the process.

Commissioner Hammerstad, referring to the disagreements and how to resolve them, said that the adoption of the Regional Framework Plan presents an opportunity to work out ways of doing that. One of the areas that this might offer an opportunity to address is Metro's authority outside the boundaries within currently designated urban reserves. It's not how those are going to be annexed into Metro. This is a legal and philosophical question. If a process exists for MPAC to forward recommendations and if Metro council or committee disagrees either with process or substance, then the issue goes back to MPAC and the differences are resolved. Whether this involves a process for overriding or some other process, some way needs to be designed whereby differences can be resolved. Then, even if the ultimate decision is one that MPAC disagrees with, MPAC members will feel their point of view has been seriously considered. With the urban reserve decision, it didn't seem as though MPAC's concerns had been heard.

Gordon Davis said that is the back and forth dialogue process he had suggested.

Peggy Lynch responded that she did not want a new position of sitting on a committee that the council can either take our recommendation or not. She has 315,000 people to represent. She said she does not have time if her voice is not even going to be acknowledged. She didn't want to do it.

Jim Zehren said that is a way in which this idea of having more councilor and MPAC members talking to each other. Maybe it's not that the members of the two bodies need to talk to each other all the time, but on these issues, where there's a strong difference, maybe that's when we need to get in the room together. It can't be just one councilor. But when big red flags go up, maybe a special meeting should be held. Maybe there ought to be joint executive meetings.

John Hartsock referred to the executive committee of MPAC meeting on a regular basis with the council and that solves Lisa's problem of going to the same meeting fifteen times over. Maybe there could be an annual meeting for agenda-setting, with both groups. But get it down to a manageable group of people whose schedules can be coordinated.

Jim Zehren said at least for the next six months.

Gordon Davis asked how the agenda could be set.

Linda Peters answered that it has varied in the past, depending on who the chairs were.

Peggy Lynch noted that the term "agenda-setting" was being used in two different ways. She said she understood Gordon Davis to mean defining the main issues.

Mr. Davis verified that was what he meant, but added that the process had not been institutionalized.

June 30, 1997

Page 14

Lisa Naito said that this type of a process would help her understand the issues. As it has occurred in the past, her first introduction to the issue is in a committee or council meeting, not at a point when the MPAC recommendation can change the outcome. If a group meets regularly to identify the problem areas well before they happen, at least people can at least have time to identify the common ground and identify why different policies exist. At least you feel as though you have been heard and your concerns responded to.

Judie Hammerstad said Councilor Naito's comments about time were particularly appropriate. MPAC might expect an issue to be considered and it won't be considered. They are operating under a different set of assumptions.

Councilor Washington said one of the things that happened is that there should have been a report on MPAC at the council meeting every week. It should be available. We should have a slot on the agenda the same as the executive report committee. That way MPAC will always have the opportunity to give aid to the council on a one-to-one basis.

Gordon Davis said two concepts were being floated: 1) that there be some kind of smaller group from MPAC and the council--and executive committee or whatever of MPAC and either the council as a whole or some part of the council and that this committee set the broad work agenda. This might be the flash point at which everyone is drawn together, and 2) an institutionalized form of communication, such as through a designated slot on the council agenda.

Councilor Washington said he did not want to hear from folks only when there was a crisis. He would also like to hear from them when they are not in crisis. He would like to talk when people are not disagreeing; he said there is a lot to do other than deal with crises. He recommended setting aside a slot every council meeting. MPAC would not have to use it, but it would be there in the event they did.

Jean Schreiber referred to councilors "coming to MPAC" for advice and so forth, but this is the first time they talked about when. When does the council want to hear from MPAC and when do they want to associate with the concepts back and forth. This may be one way of doing it.

Councilor Washington said that his job is anything but part time. It can run from early in the morning until late at night. All the councilors try to be at meetings, but sometimes he gets "meetinged" out. The opportunity is there for MPAC to talk to the council. He does not make up his mind until he has heard the facts. He does not make accusations about MPAC. If he has an issue, he will take it to the person with whom he has the issue. It will not come out in the newspaper first. He would like to open an opportunity to hear about MPAC's concerns first, not out on the street.

Mr. Davis summarized a few issues:

- The group approved of the idea of providing MPAC with a regular spot on the Council agenda;
- There is a need to manage the process--i.e., to define the work agenda and determine how that agenda will be accomplished. Included with that is the concept of how issues will be moved forward to Council and how they will be moved back and forth when there is disagreement; and
- Executive committee forum. The exact composition of such a committee has not been decided, but it ought to at least include the Chair of MPAC and the Presiding Officer of

June 30, 1997

Page 15

the Council. This job of this forum would be to manage the process. Mr. Davis noted Jim Zehren's raised another piece of information, and that was the possibility that part of the management role would be to decide when an issue is a flash-point issue and should go to a joint meeting.

Mr. Zehren said they are going to have to manage conflict situations anyway; they might as well do it in an organized way. He said that if these situations are not being managed informally, then the process for handling those situations will need to be institutionalized. He said he didn't know how to determine which items should go to joint session. He said fundamental differences of opinion might require joint meetings of everybody. He said that one of the things they should always discuss was whether the two bodies have and significant problems and then how to manage those differences. He said maybe only the Presiding Officer and a few Councilors would need to attend an MPAC meeting. Maybe they just needed a bull session.

Mr. Davis added that also on this executive committee would be either the executive officer of Metro or some representative from staff to be able to have that piece.

Presiding Officer Kvistad spoke regarding the role of the presiding officer in relationship to MPAC and the Council. He said the Council itself had different views of the executive officer's role between the agency. Some of the friction in the past had to do with the policy differences between that part of the government and the Council. Council sees the role of MPAC being part of the Council, which they have never stepped away from that in terms of the way they talk about it. The problem has been the way in which we hit on two issues that have thrown the whole wagon over. But he did not think that was where the lack of coordination is. A one-to-one relationship between the Council, which is a policy body, and MPAC, which is a policy advisory body is where it needs to be. The executive staff involvement has sometimes been a problem because information goes to MPAC that Council never saw, because it came out of the executive side of the agency. But that's an internal things.

Mayor Drake said that Presiding Officer Kvistad brought up a good point. He said that his position in his agency is similar to the Metro executive officer's. He offered a different perspective on executive participation. Rather than seeing the executive staff as hindering the process, perhaps it could be seen as a third set of eyes and ears and as a source of assistance. With there being a partnership between the Council and MPAC, the executive role, in theory, could be that of facilitator. The ultimate product would be what goes out the door to the public, based on all the input. He likened the executive officer's role to being an ingredient in a cookie recipe, with all the ingredients being necessary to produce the cookie.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he agreed, as long as the executive role is that of an ingredient.

Mayor Drake said if ingredients are not properly balanced, the cookies won't turn out. He said that although back-and-forth situations might be difficult to be caught in the middle of, situations like that are inevitable. He said the fact is, the executive officer is still elected. That makes his input much more unique than if he were a hired county administrator.

John Hartsock said that staff workload is often responsible for delays. Many times, when Council has not heard from MPAC, it's because MPAC has not gotten anything from staff. Staff work is built into the interaction.

Jim Zehren said that executive staff also makes a lot of what MPAC does possible. But staff has limited time and resources, also. If the executive committee decides that a really important issue is coming up that will take a lot of resources in the next six months, it would be great to have the people who have the

June 30, 1997

Page 16

ability commit the resources. It seems there is a regional executive staff involvement that would be important in solving the problem.

John Hartsock said that the alternative is to have some sort of resolution here. Then you have the regional executive staff perhaps yet another cog in the problem is that they are not in the loop. You would have to bring them in eventually anyway.

Councilor Washington said he does not see this as an issue.

Councilor Naito said that one of the reasons this meeting was called is because the process had broken down between the Council and MPAC. The Council has issues with the executive, and they are making progress on those. But it is a separate thing. She preferred to focus on the relationship between MPAC and the Council. She agreed that there is a staff component that is important, but to interject the executive officer in talking about the executive committee could create some dynamics that won't necessarily help the process at hand. Perhaps sometime in the future that would make sense.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said Councilor Naito's comments speak more directly to what he was trying to say.

Peggy Lynch said that at some point the Council and the executive officer must work out their differences in order for the whole process to move forward because the differences affect MPAC's workings. MPAC gets caught in the middle. Separate from this discussion, that needs to be worked out. But if no one from staff is at the meetings who has some authority to say they can do the work asked of them in a particular timeline, the process will be frustrated.

Councilor McFarland clarified what she thought was being said: that if the Council and MPAC assign work to the staff and staff refuses to do the work, the work is stymied. She asked if they were giving staff a veto.

Peggy Lynch said no.

John Hartsock said it was more of a schedule issue.

Councilor McFarland said she did not see it that way. Justice delayed is justice denied. To her they were saying that if staff could not work a task into their busy schedule, it wouldn't be done.

Peggy Lynch said that to her it meant that they needed to know all the factors in accomplishing a goal. And if she had the power to get a report on time, then do it. But it is causing problems now. She said she believed having staff involved directly would help that situation.

Jim Sitzman said that if the point is developing ways to manage the process, and it is an important ingredient in managing the process, then you need to know what the resources are to do the job.

Peggy Lynch said that that if staff has a full work load already and you ask them to take on more, then you will need to help them establish priorities. She said she was not suggesting veto power, but rather a way of managing the system.

Councilor McFarland said that in her view, when you say staff needs to be included in planning, you are in effect asking them if they will agree to do the work.

June 30, 1997

Page 17

Peggy Lynch said that was not her thought.

Mr. Davis said the meeting needed to move forward. He asked if anyone present did not believe that an executive committee forum of some sort should be put together and be a focus for management of the MPAC/Council agenda. [Editor's note: no one spoke up.] Mr. Davis then asked how the body would be put in place. Thus far, the Chair of MPAC and the Presiding Officer of the Council had been named to sit on the committee, along with a staff person at some level, principally to advise the group on resource allocation and staff time. Mr. Davis then asked how many members should represent MPAC and how many should represent the Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said MPAC has two vice chairs, so MPAC had three obvious choices.

Gordon Davis asked if MPAC already had an executive committee.

Barbara Herget said 'yes.'

Presiding Officer Kvistad recommended the chair of the Land Use committee [Editor's note: Land Use here was used to mean Growth Management.] and the chair of the Government Affairs committee. He suggested that an even number would force resolution when conflict arises. This would be difficult, but productive.

Commissioner Peters asked who from staff would be on the committee.

Gordon Smith said he would return to that question after dealing with the suggestions at hand. He verified that the committee would consist of the chair and two vice chairs from MPAC, and from the Council, the Presiding Officer, the Growth Management Committee Chair, and the Government Affairs Committee Chair.

Commissioner Peters said the committee also needs to have staff representation. She said that the fact those present were unwilling to talk about that illustrated that it is a problem. She said staff should be a third main participant in this relationship.

Mayor Ogden asked about the role of the executive committee. Is it like a voting agreement? He thought it was just a working committee. He asked why a representative from the executive staff would not be put on the committee, since it was not a voting group or a policy-setting group.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he thought it was a safety valve committee to resolve friction between the Council and MPAC. They are the two that deal directly with policy creation, development, and implementation. The implementation part is where the executive officer comes into it. When it comes to policy development and decision-making, that's the Council. In terms of from whom you request policy advice, that's MPAC.

Peggy Lynch asked who does the work.

Rob Drake said that any meetings they would have would be public anyway, so the executive office should be invited as would any citizen. He did not want to get into a notion that they dictate who comes through the door beyond the Big 6. He would be concerned about that. He would not want the staff to not be invited to those functions. The committee is the one the joint committee has empowered. He said he did not care whether the staff person was Metro's executive officer or anyone else. He said anyone

June 30, 1997

Page 18

would be welcome to provide input. He said that's how he saw Metro's successes. He did not think they should be concerned about who on staff was there.

Councilor McLain said that in her view, if Metro's executive officer sat at the table, that would be fine. She clarified what she thought Councilor Naito and Presiding Officer Kvistad had said, and that was they needed to be certain they had parallel work in progress with MPAC. It would not be necessarily to keep anyone from participating. She said that if the executive officer helps with that, that would be good. But sometimes that would not be appropriate. She said that it would be appropriate for the people who actually do the voting and give the advice to work together. She said she thought it was important for Metro's executive officer to be there or whoever from staff has the knowledge. In her view, staff representation should be flexible and depend on the subject.

Jim Zehren agreed, and said some issues might not be resolvable without Mike Burton's being there. For others, it could be someone else or none from staff.

Councilor McLain said so flexible staff.

Commissioner Hammerstad mentioned that there was one point about this, quite a number of these things that we're dealing with also have an executive officer recommendation. Regional Framework Plan came out of that office first, so if you guide the work plan for the entire year, it might be appropriate that someone from that office be there in order to let you know where they are in bringing these recommendation forward. The Council do act totally independently, but under ideal circumstances the Council probably wouldn't.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that on what the matter of staffing the committee, we'll have one of our council analysts, it will be either the main coordinator staff or we'll have one of our council assistants actually take care of the minutes of the rest of the meetings, if indeed this work group needs additional staff work from the general pool of growth management or other staff. It would be the Council's prerogative to ask them to be available or just ask Mike to sit in. But we're looking at just dealing with that, but we'll have people there to staff the meetings to get Xerox copies or go get things. That's real simple stuff. Just have the time to get together and not preclude anybody else coming in. That seems pretty simple.

Peggy Lynch said the meeting needed to return to working on the mission of the group, which will then help us define the content of this new group.

Councilor Washington said he thought that was where they were. He said he thought a framework had been put in place that day within which to begin to work. He said he was comfortable with that. He wished to return to the subject of having work sessions. He suggested the fifth Thursday. He said he recognized that when crucial issues arise, an emergency session might have to be arranged. But he urged the group to select a predictable time and place that could be counted on when MPAC could talk to the Council or when the Council and MPAC could get together for a work session.

Councilor Naito suggested a combination of two things: the joint sessions should be set by the joint committee and be issue-driven. She said these could be set at either the MPAC slot of time or a time in conjunction with something else coming in. But she wished to return to an earlier idea, to return to an annual meeting without a set agenda. At that informal gathering, people could meet one another or just get together. That could be a regularly set meeting.

Councilor McLain said there are five "fifth Thursdays" in the coming year.

June 30, 1997

Page 19

Councilor Naito objected to setting a meeting time not knowing that an issue of importance would need to be discussed.

Councilor Washington said he recognized there would be times when no issues would be on the docket.

Gordon Davis said most people agreed to the idea of having joint work sessions, probably at the beginning of the year. The question then arises about how to manage other work sessions: should the executive committee call those on an as-needed basis or should they be organized around the fifth Thursdays?

Mayor Ogden said couldn't the committee determine that? That seems that would be a good task for the coordinating committee.

Jean Schreiber asked to return to the question of the big task of how to manage this process in the next six months for the Regional Framework Plan and the Urban Growth Report.

Jim Zehren said that the answer to a lot of the topics under discussion. There is a clear task with some definition yet to be applied to it, a clear target that must be met.

[NOTE: SIDE 1 OF TAPE ENDS HERE. TAKES UP AFTER WHATEVER THIS IMPORTANT CLEAR TASK WAS EXPLAINED.]

Gordon Davis suggested joint meetings, work sessions, fifth Thursdays, or whatever the case may be.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said this would be a good point to end this meetings. He felt they had actually gotten to an executive committee format being a safety valve as well as helping MPAC and the Council get through the Framework Plan. He said from his view the problem has not been on the details of the Functional Plan or Framework Plan elements. He acknowledged that they have had their differences. He thought that would be a pretty solid process. To facilitate that might give them six months of building trust and working out new systems of working together that will get them by. So many other issues are out there to deal with. He reminded the group that not all of the issues have to do with land use. They also deal with Greenspaces, solid waste, and transportation issues. The Functional Plan is one of the main priorities and it has to be done. But in his view, this is a good place to put in place the committee to help develop framework, and once that is done they might have all the outs they need to handle the friction.

Peggy Lynch said that besides the six months in which they must do the Framework Plan they also have a concurrent work plan regarding the urban growth report and the housing needs analysis, which are significant decisions of regional and local importance. When that executive committee is working on getting MPAC and the Council through the Framework Plan, they can't avoid the other big items looming on the horizon.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said those were components of the Functional Plan and the Framework Plan, and dealing with those issues will have to be done in conjunction with working on the plans.

Peggy Lynch said that in her view the growth report has the possibility of being another flame point.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that's why they need to decide what the roles will be: where will be the appropriate areas of interest and where will be the focus.

June 30, 1997

Page 20

Councilor McLain said they had been through this before; both the Regional Framework Plan and the Housing Needs Analysis and passed the Urban Growth Boundary with due process. And if the executive committee started with this vehicle, as they relate to and parallel each other, she thought they would get to the issues mentioned. She thought it would be a good item for the first agenda on that committee meeting to be sure they had gotten the type of back and forth conversation and are committed to it. And that the Council be a direction and the committee be a direction on what we're expecting out of MPAC and how could this be used by the Council.

Commissioner Peters said she felt uneasy being part of that committee, but had a lot of interest in whether MPAC is perceived by the Council as integral player in the Urban Growth Report adoption. She asked whether that was nice but not essential.

John Hartsock restated that it was important to stick on building consensus in spite of minor disagreements on the degree of participation.

John Hartsock said that maybe the answer is that you set the first meeting.

Councilor Naito said she thought that would be something like what Councilor Kvistad said the role of MPAC was on the Urban Reserve issue. She said she had not heard his view on that as she had not been involved before. She said Councilor Kvistad's role might not represent that of the whole Council, but the role could be better articulated by the agenda committee. If indeed his view is the minority view, that could be communicated to MPAC.

Councilor Kvistad clarified what he has said about his view of MPAC's role. He said in his view MPAC does have a role. The definition and the level of participation needs to be defined. First, it is an advisory role. Secondly, how do you take the Council's need and translate this through the executive committee that is being formed and help the Council satisfy that need and give the kind of positive advice that the Council can then implement.

Jim Zehren added that they would then have a superior regional partnership when they are done.

Councilor Kvistad said that was the whole point of the exemption process.

Commissioner Hammerstad said she needed to raise a point of potential disagreement. The local partners will need to make all the urban reserve agreements and implement those urban reserves. When the decision is made, they are the ones that must implement that decision. If they have no way of putting in a meaningful decision, it could be decided that MPAC's advice would not be a top priority. If that becomes the case, it will certainly create disagreement, not just on the substance of the decision, but on the role in making the decision. That is the point of trying to define the role of MPAC. If they leave that to the executive committee, it could be a difficult and contentious discussion.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that was the whole point.

Councilor Washington said the executive committee would not replace either MPAC or the Council. In his view, it would exist to avert flash points. He said that if the committee were faced with a flash point, it would be the duty of the members to see to it that it didn't flash. He stressed his belief that such a plan would be workable.

Commissioner Peters said she thought flash points occurred when a mismatch in expectations arose unexpectedly. She said that the expectations should be clear. MPAC's expectation is that any policy

June 30, 1997

Page 21

adoption on the part of the Council that the local jurisdictions must then implement should be informed by MPAC advice. MPAC should have time to consider and deal with the document in some detail so they could come to consensus and provide a recommendation to the Council. The Council should then capitalize on that regional consensus in making its decision. On the other hand, in her view the Council's Presiding Officer thought that MPAC's advice was appropriate only on certain issues. She thought the Presiding Officer had a list in his mind of certain topics on a major MPAC wait-list and certain topics on a minor wait-list. She said that the rest of the people did not know what was going on. She recommended setting a time in the near future when the Presiding Officer could make it clear which topics he thought were not appropriate for MPAC to consider or on which MPAC's advice would not carry much weight. She emphasized that it would be the local jurisdictions that would face the problem of carrying out the decision.

Gordon Davis said he understood two or three things going on. One is the general notion that to the extent that the Metro Council is considering adopting policy that local governments must carry out, MPAC would like to play a role in helping shape that policy through its advice.

Peggy Lynch said it's not that they would like to play a role, it's that they expect to play a role.

Tom Lowrey said he didn't think the charter provided for that.

Commissioner Peters said it did go beyond what is expressed in the charter. But it's been their working assumption that that is the nature of their working relationship with MPAC. That MPAC understands the importance of having regional consensus on the level of local jurisdictions on matters.

John Hartsock said he hoped that Metro Council would accept MPAC's advice as a vital part, because MPAC people must carry out the decision. But it's at the discretion of the Council as to how much or how little of that advice they use.

Jean Schreiber agreed. She said if there are areas in which Council does not want MPAC's advice, MPAC needs to know what areas those are. If they don't know, problems will arise.

Jim Zehren said he would like to know more than a day before Council is asked to make a decision to avoid flash points. He said he expected differences, but he hoped they would be aired and dealt with appropriately.

Gordon Davis said he assumed that the management committee is supposed to define the scope of MPAC's input. If it is unable to do that, it would be due to significant disagreement among the members of the executive committee. It would then have to go to the Council as a whole. There's no other place for it to go.

Jean Schreiber said that when a disagreement surfaces, it will be the whole region who will be making the decision. She said it would behoove the whole Council. If MPAC and the Council do not learn to trust one another and pull together at all levels of government in this region, and trust is one of the big issues, we're going to lose it in the public arena for a long time.

Jim Zehren said he thought the discussion was going in circles. He thought the meeting should end with what the group had decided. Before ending, he wanted to call the new management committee something specific. The group agreed to call it the coordinating committee.

June 30, 1997

Page 22

Councilor McLain said she wanted to speak to Linda Peters' comments. She said she and Linda come from the same region and live close together. But from the beginning--and they have both been involved in this for about the same amount of time--been regionalists. But she and Linda now have a different perspective. When thinking about the first meeting of the coordinating committee, one of the items that they will need to address is the definition of roles. But it would be important to keep in mind that definition of roles does not mean duplication of roles. It means coordination of roles and parallelism of role to be successful. It does need consensus. But there will be some roles that Linda Peters, as a regionalist in Washington County will be able to express, support, and do. But there will also be things she needs to do on the local level. And Councilor McLain said she could help with that as a Councilor. But there are certain guidelines for roles or businesses that as Councilors they will need to address. It is her hope in that role definition that we will remember that when you have a discussion of that trust that you see both sides of it. She didn't often hear this. She said it is important to recognize that she respects MPAC and their role and want that parallelism. How badly do you want that regional council to assist and support you? This needs to be part of the dialogue too, why would she stay here in this position and try and give that support if MPAC didn't value it.

Commissioner Peters said they do and that was why MPAC was at this meeting. If we didn't you wouldn't see us at this meeting.

Mr. Davis called the meeting to a close. He gave some final comments. He said in his view, MPAC is not a planning commission. It has its constituency, with each member being an elected official. There will be that tension, always. He said it is fundamentally a healthy tension if it is managed well. He said he hoped that the coordinating committee offered a way to manage it better than it has been managed in the past. The next six months should shape up.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of Council

I:\MINUTES\1997\COUNCIL\MPAC630.DOC