

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, October 25, 2005
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Robert Liberty, Rex Burkholder, Brian Newman

Councilors Absent: Susan McLain (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:03 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, OCTOBER 27, 2005/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the October 27, 2005 Council agenda.

Lydia Neill, Planning, reported on an open house held in Hillsboro last Thursday on the subject of the industrial lands remand. There was a good turnout, with most viewpoints being generally favorable. She presented the comments that were submitted at the meeting; copies of which are included in the meeting record. Council President Bragdon asked if the City of Hillsboro had made any comments; Ms. Neill stated that they would be submitting a letter soon, detailing their findings.

2. BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS FOLLOW-UP

Kathy Rutkowski, Budget Coordinator, responded to Council questions from a previous work session. She presented a memorandum summarizing the responses, a copy of which is included in the meeting record.

3. NATURE IN NEIGHBORHOODS

Stacey Triplett, Nature in Neighborhoods Program, discussed the Nature in Neighborhoods grants program. The Measure 56 notice has gone out; calls are coming in; and a survey is taking place. A new staff is being hired to coordinate the program. Ms. Triplett reviewed the three major policy issues involved.

Monitoring Program: Ms. Triplett will chair a task force. The questions are: What are the most effective resources Metro can use to truthfully reflect regional outcomes in habitat protection and stewardship of natural resources? Who should be involved in determining them?

Encouraging Practices: Major question: Is there a non-monetary incentive that is effective at delivering new construction projects with above-average habitat-friendly practices that can be implemented by Metro or partners? Metro is coordinating outreach with the Homebuilders Alliance. Councilor Newman said he thought there were also other regional partners we could reach out to. Councilor Park questioned the term “non-monetary incentives.” Even though Metro had no funding to pay for such projects, were there other tools, such as tax abatements, that we could use? Ms. Triplett said that the current project would involve only Metro money. Council President Bragdon agreed that, even if Metro was not directly handing over any cash, that we could point out other ways in which these projects would benefit developers.

Councilor Burkholder asked who the market for this concept was. Ultimately, it would be the buyer who would live in the home; the builder was only the intermediary. Councilor Newman emphasized the role of education; he wondered whether something like a design competition would be valuable.

Councilor President Bragdon asked about outreach to architects and other entities, and whether there was the potential for other agencies to be obstacles. Ms. Triplett stated no; the project was going directly to the homebuilders.

Councilor Liberty asked if there were specific segments of the building industry where we wanted to focus our energy? Mr. Triplett stated that the commercial building industry seemed like a natural fit, due to our recycling and rebuilding efforts. Councilor Liberty thought it would be beneficial to also look at opportunities to “green” existing construction.

Council President Bragdon had a question about the monitoring program, and what the baseline of “regional outcomes” would be. Ms. Triplett said they wanted to show some “roads not taken” alternatives, to show how the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) has successfully preserved quality of life. Councilor Burkholder thought we ought to bring together whatever existing efforts were being made, through the Data Resource Center (DRC), which would help demonstrate the effectiveness of our efforts.

Regarding the issue of encouraging practices, Councilor Newman thought the Council ought to hear regularly from the new coordinator. Ms. Triplett said she envisioned plenty of opportunities for this information. Council President Bragdon thought these projects were about gathering information as well as applying it. Ms. Triplett said we were consulting with the same consultant who did the 2040 plan. This would be put into a larger context.

Restoration Grants: How is the region’s ability to produce measurable improvements in natural areas and significant habitat supported by the restoration grant program? Is this working? If not, how can we improve it? Ms. Triplett said that invitations to submit grants will go out on November 4th, with a deadline of January 12, 2006.

Councilor Newman asked about how we would be reaching out and informing people about these grants. Janelle Geddes, Parks, said that, in addition to the newsletters from the Councilors, there were media releases being planned, and the information will be on the Metro web site. We will be talking to other agencies and getting names from them. We also had names of people who have previously expressed interest, as well as the fish and wildlife list. Ms. Geddes thought we had good outreach planned. Councilor Newman asked if there were environmental education associations that we could target. Response was that was already covered, there were a lot of networks that would be hooked into.

Councilor Burkholder commented on the solid waste neighborhood waste disposal voucher program, how hit and miss that was; some neighborhoods just never seem to get informed about it. Ms. Triplett said she would try and learn from that example.

Councilors and staff discussed other distribution lists that could be used. They are all open to suggestions. Councilor Burkholder wanted to make sure we tracked which outreach was effective. Ms. Geddes said we would be very aggressive about going out and pushing for this information.

4. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon said the Blue Ribbon Committee met for the first time today and received a large amount of information. The committee asked for three different budget scenarios. They will meet again next week.

Councilor Park said the rate review policy advisory committee would be meeting; he recommended attendance as good practice for any discussion on rates.

Councilor Liberty reviewed the Housing Choices Task Force meeting in Wilsonville.

Councilor Hosticka talked about the UGB liaison meeting, i.e., “shape of the region,” – we need to have some conscious, explicit talk on how these issues fit together. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, will present Council with a summary of the Measure 37 decision in a week. Councilors wondered how this would affect any potential ballot measures.

Councilor Burkholder spoke to his concerns about an amendment to the corridor study. He presented a memo with attachments, which are included in the meeting record. His concerns centered around procedural issues with the planning process and with submitting changes to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). Councilor Newman thought it was important to keep the issues separate; one issue was about process, another was the Council’s relationship to JPACT, and the last was about the substance of the amendment.

Councilor Liberty expressed his concern that there was not enough attention being paid to the larger context. Councilors discussed the role of Council input, and where it should be placed along the decision-making process. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, advised Council on the various state and federal rules that informed the planning of projects and spending of funds. He responded to Council questions about where the decision points were.

Council and staff discussed how the proposed amendment would affect any previously-authorized projects, and whether there was enough consideration of placing the transportation studies into the larger context of growth in the region. Councilor Liberty wanted to see additional criteria being included in the corridor studies, such as incident response and demand management. Councilor Park commented that the amendment did not include these criteria. Council in general indicated the feeling that the larger context was being considered in many other studies and committees, but that the corridor studies were a specific subset of transportation and planning that was not charged with such considerations.

Council talked about some of the details of the proposed amendment, such as the definition of “provisional” or “final,” and what implications this would have for current projects and studies. Council focused on maintaining relationships with other partners involved in these decisions, such as JPACT.

Councilor Liberty felt that studies could take on lives of their own, with momentum building up to support actual implementation of the project; other alternatives would tend to be closed off by then. He thought a meeting between JPACT and the full Metro Council might be fruitful. Councilor Park reiterated that the corridor studies were the result of a lot of other planning and visioning that had taken place previously; he wondered if the proposed amendment would appear inconsistent to JPACT.

Council President Bragdon commented that the Council was generally agreed on the direction and goals around transportation, and that the discussion was primarily one of tactics. Councilor Newman asked if he could see some revised language by Thursday. Councilors discussed the mechanism by which any amendments would happen. They considered alternative tactics that could be used to address Councilor Liberty's fundamental concerns about keeping transportation planning in the context of "bigger picture" values, as well as the importance of maintaining good relations with JPACT. Council generally felt that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was the driver behind the corridor studies, not the other way around.

Council President Bragdon asked Councilors Burkholder and Liberty to work on some alternatives to bring back to the Council. He emphasized that resolutions are not official until they have been voted on. Councilor Burkholder said that these transportation issues were not limited to Metro, JPACT, or even other governmental agencies. There are many, many other stakeholders.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Prepared by



Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 25,
2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	10/27/05	Metro Council Agenda for October 27, 2005	102505c-01
1	Hillsboro Open House	10/20/05	To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill Re: Citizen Comments from Open House	102505c-02
2	Budget Assumptions	10/25/05	To: Metro Council From: Kathy Rutkowski Re: Follow-up on Financial Assumptions Discussion	102505c-03
4	JPACT/Corridor studies	10/25/05	To: Metro Council From: Rex Burkholder Re: Amendment to Corridor Study Resolution (with attachments)	102505c-04