

**MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL  
STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA COMMITTEE MEETING**

Wednesday, April 26, 2000  
Council Chamber

Members Present: Susan McLain (Chair), Rod Park (Vice Chair), Bill Atherton

Also Present: Doug Riggs, PacWest Communications; Mel Huie, Parks & Greenspaces; Nancy Goss Duran, Office of the Executive Officer; Karen Withrow, Office of Citizen Involvement; Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst; Dan Cooper, Office of the General Counsel

Members Absent:

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 4:08 PM.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

**1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 15, 2000, STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA COMMITTEE MEETING**

The minutes were not considered at this meeting.

**2. METRO LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES & KEEPING THE COUNCIL INFORMED**

**Chair McLain** noted that she hoped this committee would be proactive and affective at watching legislative packages and pre-work for the session, and having a way to get people comfortable with Metro's stand on issues, whether that was neutral or active, or whether they would monitor it. She asked Mr. Riggs to keep track of who was speaking on what issue because of time constraints in their own schedules, and to give an update at each meeting on things he was aware of with legislative packages.

**Doug Riggs, PacWest Communications**, said the federal legislative process was ongoing at this time and the committees had received by now special requests from individual members of the delegation for particular projects. He said he was in Washington DC with Councilor Monroe and Andy Cotugno, Director of Transportation, to discuss transportation issues in March. He noted he would be going back in May on other issues and that February through June was the key timeframe for getting priorities to the committee budgets. He reported that Metro had come up with a comprehensive package to present in March to the Northwest delegation. He noted there had been some bumps in that road because one of the letters had left out a key Washington County commuter rail proposal which caused some concern. They were monitoring that and hoped to get it resolved. The second issue was a land conservation bill, HR 701, which took money out of the oil and gas royalty trust fund and was a gigantic, several hundred million dollar package with the potential to move this year or next. He said it was of interest to Metro because it set aside money for land acquisition and related environmental projects. The key here was with the federal ESA listings coming down, it would have tremendous impact on region as far as set-backs as well as how to compensate landowners. He said this bill could be an opportunity to say that Washington and Oregon had salmon and ESA listings coming down, was there an opportunity for a pilot

project to fund this region to deal with those very real, ongoing issues. He said the bill was supposed to be sent to the House floor by this point. It was passed out of the House Resource Committee and directed to the Budget Committee and the Agriculture Committee, both of which passed on taking any action. He said it was being held up right now because the leadership in the House opposes the bill. He felt if it could get on the floor, it would probably pass. The concern, particularly east of the mountains, was people were afraid the government would come buy more land. He said it was not smooth sailing, but there was an opportunity to work on the issue, maybe month or 2 down the road. He said there would be problems also if it got to the Senate. The third area he reported on was the Parks and Greenspaces trails issues. About a month ago, a group of district legislative staffers took a trip put together by Mr. Huie and Mr. Ciecko to tour projects the Parks and Greenspaces Department was working on. Every office invited to attend the tour sent a representative. He said it was a fantastic trip and lasted all morning, into the early afternoon, and there were requests for more, maybe an event at Oxbow. He felt it would a good way to build goodwill.

**Mel Huie, Parks and Greenspaces**, handed out copies of *Federal Funding Proposals for Metropolitan Greenspaces Program Portland OR/Vancouver WA* dated April 2000 to the committee (see copy with permanent record of this meeting). The programs proposed for funding were Greenspaces Restoration (wetlands, natural areas and riparian corridors), Environmental Education (grants and GreenScene), and Salmonid Education and Enhancement (grants). He noted that the Trails and Greenways proposal (transportation efficiency act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century TEA-21 and national trails system) was for legislation only, not for funding.

He shared a letter Mr. Burton and Mr. Ciecko sent to Congress listing appropriations requests from Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces for FY 2001 (see copy of letter in permanent record of this meeting). It included a request for funding of greenspace habitat restoration and environmental education grants and for Johnson Creek watershed willing seller land acquisition program. He said there was interest for this program already among some of the congressional delegates, but that it would take a couple of years to get the delegation informed and interested. He suggested a field trip to show the projects. He noted that 9 years ago, there was no money to put together a plan, and that Senator Mark Hatfield and Congressman Les Aucoin had helped launch a greenspaces plan that ultimately led to the bond measure. He said they were looking at ways to acknowledge their help.

**Chair McLain** noted that Senator Hatfield had done some good work on raising money for the Jackson Bottom Interpretive Center and the USA Lab in Hillsboro.

**Mr. Huie** continued that the good news was they were in the President's proposed budget, so with the combination of the two, it looked good. Of course, he said, you never know. The bad news was that the Republican Congress is cutting back funding for the interior department at least a billion dollars because they need to save money for a proposed tax cut. The last thing he highlighted was the continuation of the TEA-21 funding for small trail and bikeway programs. He reported they had been able to get money for the Peninsula Crossing Trail and the OMSI to Springwater trail, and hopefully the Willamette Shoreline study. He also mentioned that they needed to have congressional support for the rail banking law, which had been under threat to be demolished.

**Chair McLain** was proud of the transportation staff for embracing the program. She noted Mr. Huie had been persuasive in getting people in his department to understand the value of the program.

She noted the full color Greenspaces Grants Program map and chart in the funding proposal book which had every project that had ever been awarded by all three of their programs and the years they were awarded. She said this chart would be extremely important and helpful to the Council and asked for copies for the PR department.

**Mr. Huie** said he would be happy to provide them. He complimented Lynn Wilson, the project manager currently running the grant programs for the community, for doing such a good job. He also thanked Mr. Riggs for plugging away in Washington DC. He added he would get 15 or so copies of the book for the PR department.

**Michael Morrissey, Senior Council Analyst**, asked if this was the package of items that the Parks Department was putting forward for consideration.

**Chair McLain** said this was what they had taken to Washington DC to request the \$400,000. She said it generated from Council policy, through the Greenspace Master Plan and the bond measure work to have education and restoration and salmonid grants. She said it had been an ongoing project for as long as she could remember working with Mr. Huie.

She noted the chart that Mr. Morrissey had produced to help keep track of the work the committee will be doing. She asked Mr. Riggs to use the chart and help in the updating of it from meeting to meeting.

**Mr. Huie** asked to add the Johnson Creek willing seller land acquisition to the chart so everything would be listed.

**Councilor Atherton** noted that Ballot Measure 30 could be listed under "other". He said the election in November would have voters reaffirm unfunded mandates.

**Chair McLain** wanted to be clear that they had not taken any action pro, con, or otherwise, and until they did that as council action, this committee would review things as interested parties to help craft alliances or actions. She added that Ballot Measure 30 would be added to the list.

**Councilor Atherton** said there was another big item missing from the list under Growth Management, repealing the 20 year land law.

**Chair McLain** said they could put it on, but not to say repeal, because the only action they had from the council was they wanted another hearing on it.

**Councilor Atherton** said he had resolution to bring to the council to vote to repeal it.

**Mr. Riggs** asked to have the chart on disk. He said it would be helpful to build a master list for the committee.

**Dan Cooper, Office of General Counsel**, responded to Councilor Atherton's point about the chart. He said he had laid out placeholders for preliminary issues. He noted that the 20 year land supply would be under the UGB listing when the issues were broken down to specifics.

**Ms. Goss Duran** commented that there was another category, "regional". She thought there would be a series of issues that the Council would have to decide whether to weigh in on or not. One of those issues was a bioengineering capital improvements to PSU and OHSU. She added that if we wanted their help on issues, we may have to weigh in on their issues as well.

**Chair McLain** said local jurisdiction priorities could be an issue for the chart. She commented that they had received some good letters from partners regarding issues.

### **3. RELATIONSHIP WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES, INTERNAL & EXTERNAL**

**Chair McLain** said she and Councilor Monroe had asked Mr. Cooper last year to look at how advisory committees were formed and by what process. She said Beth Ann Steele and Karen Withrow and Ms. Goss Duran had done a good job on reviewing the document, draft Ordinance No. 00-860 (see a copy of the letter of review from Ms. Goss Duran with permanent record of this meeting).

**Mr. Cooper** said the work product in the agenda packet was intended to create a document by which policy could be made. He said the list was not a complete inventory. He said Ordinance No. 00-860 would provide that anything not specifically mentioned would no longer exist. He noted some inconsistency with names of the committees that should be reconciled. He said the ordinance also set out standard policy on membership of committees created by the Council. He added that by-laws were not a source of creating a path to the membership. He said it was up to the Council to decide the committee's purpose and authority. He added that if the committee was not an official advisory committee, it should not be called advisory, but perhaps "task forces", and should be of limited duration. He said if a committee then chose to create a subcommittee, they had to allocate their own resources and the subcommittee had to follow the rules.

**Chair McLain** hoped this committee could, if Councilors Atherton and Park were agreeable, figure out if this document would be something they could work. She felt strongly that if they did not have their relationships with their own internal committees right, they could not interact with outside committees. She felt that getting their internal committees in order regarding equity and process, would start a really important conversation about the length and validity of some of these committees, as well as the use of some of the committees at the present time with work plans already in place.

**Councilor Atherton** appreciated the work that went into this issue. He suggested looking at priorities first and then perhaps other options besides standing committees. He felt they should focus their resources on getting answers and facilitating interested citizens to be able to participate in the committees.

**Councilor Park** suggested adding sunset clauses because the fact that Mr. Cooper had to work so hard to ferret out the existing committees suggested they were needed in order to not let the committees proliferate as they had.

**Chair McLain** said she was not expecting action at this time, she just wanted to start the conversation

**Ms. Goss Duran** felt one of the overarching thoughts on starting this process was the simplification of it and creating efficiencies and standardizing because of the maze of committees. One of the things that rose to the top quickly was when people volunteered for committees and were not chosen, nobody directed them elsewhere. She said they thought a database for the whole agency of people who wanted to participate would be a good thing. Regarding the sunset issue, she said they tried to cover that with the budgeting, that every year a committee would have to come up with their budget and bring it before Council as part of the budget process. That way, if the Council chose not to approve it, it was automatically sunsetted.

**Councilor Park** agreed that would also work.

**Ms. Goss Duran** thought it was important for the committees to know what they were spending.

**Karen Withrow, Office of Citizen Involvement;** said they were hoping, as part of the budget review process, to have the committees go through some type of an evaluation. She noted the attached form (see copy of form with permanent record of this meeting) that Tri-Met used to evaluate their committees as an example of how to do that. She suggested it could be part of a procedural or administrative application.

**Chair McLain** said the evaluation issue had come up and perhaps there could be some direction given to staff about how to use the new process.

**Ms. Goss Duran** agreed that everyone had performance measures.

**Chair McLain** said MCCI was a perfect example of a subcommittee that had tried a lot of different systems. Their subcommittees had caused failures in some ways because they didn't know what the other was working on.

**Ms. Goss Duran** suggested there should, at some point, be a gathering of committee chairs to talk about by-laws because they will all need to amend theirs if this passed.

**Ms. Withrow** added it would also be good to make clear to them that they had a responsibility to hold to some kind of budget.

**Councilor Park** asked if the budgeting concept Mr. Cooper was thinking of would be tracked by FTE or dollar amount.

**Mr. Cooper** said the Council would decide. He said they would go through the mandated committees and the enhancement committees and identify what advisory committees were funded from which funds.

**Chair McLain** asked the committee to review the information and come back for the next meeting ready to discuss the issues at hand.

**4. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**ADJOURN**

There being no further business before the committee, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting at 5:04 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Grant  
Council Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2000**

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

Document Number	Document Date	Document Description	TO/FROM
042600Leg-01	April 2000	Federal Funding Proposals for Metropolitan Greenspaces Program	/Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces department
042600Leg-02	March 15, 2000	Letter RE: Appropriations Requests from Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces for FY 2001	Members of Congress/Mike Burton & Charles Ciecko
042600Leg-03	April 21, 2000	Letter RE: Review of Ordinance No. 00-860	Chair McLain/Nancy Goss Duran
042600Leg-04	July 29, 1999	Letter RE: CAT Effectiveness Self-Assessment	Committee on Accessible Transportation/Kathy Miller