

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, November 22, 2005
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

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

1. ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

2. PROGRAMMATIC BUDGETING DISCUSSION

Paul Couey, Finance and Administrative Services, said the main focus of the exercise was to prepare for the December 13 presentation. Council President Bragdon reminded Council that the budget exercise was designed at a 150% level and would ultimately need to come in at 100%. Councilor Liberty asked about the exact figure of program outlays and how that compared to the current year. Kathy Rutkowski, Finance, said she would provide this information to Council.

Councilor McLain asked if all programs were on the worksheets. Mr. Couey said everything except Central Services. Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer, said they were pretty much looking for general guidelines at this point. Do Councilors think programs are the right size, too big, or too little? Councilor McLain had a question about the way the programs were broken down. Mr. Stringer said all the Councilors' questions were helpful in preparing a better budget, but to keep in mind that this was a transition year.

Councilors then used their colored markers on the over-sized charts to indicate whether they wanted to maintain or reduce programs. They also had the option to enhance programming, with the caveat that this might require additional funding.

After marking up the charts, Council discussed details. Councilor Hosticka asked about the placement of departmental information next to the programs. Mr. Couey said it was for descriptive purposes only, to help identify the programs. Councilor Burkholder said the format was helpful in identifying areas of overlap and similar outcomes, but that he wanted to be able to provide more specific input. He noted that there were three different areas for conservation education – should this then be a separate program? Which department would be the most effective at doing this? Was there an opportunity to coordinate this program better? Councilor McLain wondered what the best way to implement the programs would be. Were there opportunities for synergy?

Mr. Couey told Council that the opportunity to enhance programs was still there, but it would probably require reductions in other areas. The current exercise was really a question of priorities. Councilor Burkholder wondered where in the process ideas for different funding alternatives would be. Councilor Liberty thought that some of the line items were too vague for his input to be of much help. Also, the amount of narrative assigned to each program seemed disproportionate to

the budget dollars associated with each program. Mr. Couey said a lot of these questions could be answered outside of work session by staff.

Councilor McLain thought they ought to support options that would potentially supply some revenue. Councilor Hosticka said his support for Measure 37 issues was up in the air until the court case was resolved. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on Measure 37 issues – tracking claims versus policy development.

Mike Wetter, Council Office, asked that Council provide comments of a general nature. Councilor McLain expressed strong support for the Data Resource Center and wondered if the storefront be used more extensively. She also wanted a discussion about what performance measures meant. She thought the performance measure task had become diluted. Lastly, she wanted to make sure that the budget for the New Look was closely coordinated.

Councilor Newman identified his priorities. For Planning, it was the New Look; for Solid Waste, it was the proposed disposal system; for Parks, it was the bond measure; and for the Zoo, it was the master plan. He thought it might be more helpful to focus the discussion on which programs were the most important for each department. Councilor Liberty agreed. Mr. Couey wanted to narrow the discussion to what Council's primary interests were. He was highlighting programs he thought Council was concerned most with. Councilor Liberty was concerned with the tram line on MERC, trade shows, and resource needs.

Councilor Hosticka observed that some items had dedicated funding associated with them, so reducing or maintaining was beside the point. He agreed with the priorities that had been already identified. Nature in Neighborhoods was a priority.

Councilor Park said it was confusing to look at programs that had funding from different sources, as well as having potential revenue streams lumped in with revenue expenditures. He wanted more information so he could visualize potential trade-offs. Mr. Couey said that that information would be of greater value later in the process.

Council President Bragdon thought that disposal center planning was extremely important. It was a big discussion in terms of a policy decision even though it wasn't a big line item in the budget. He agreed with the general priorities as previously laid out. Councilor Burkholder supported the priorities also but he also wanted to see that current programs were being well managed. He wanted a chance to comment on where the funding for various programs was coming from.

Councilor Park said he needed more time to study the issues. He would like to see more information on strategic planning associated with each program and to separate out enterprise revenues from excise-tax revenues. Councilor McLain thought this was a good beginning. She wanted to maintain input on more line item detail level decisions.

Mr. Couey summarized the programs that had been highly prioritized – community and guest services (zoo) master planning; 4 new parks design and construction (parks); new look at 2040 (planning); regional transportation plan (planning); 2006 open spaces bond measure (parks); disposal services (solid waste); conventions, trade shows, and consumer shows (MERC) (enterprise planning), and Nature in Neighborhoods (parks).

Councilor Liberty wanted to see a bigger discussion about finances and the changing mission of various departments. Councilor Newman said that, at this stage, Council was giving guidance to

the Council President, to staff, and to department heads about priorities that would really shape the budget. The line item discussion could take place once more specific figures were brought in. Mr. Couey supported that comment; he asked Council about the December 13 presentation – what could staff do between now and December 13 to help Council prepare? Councilor Park thought maybe a prioritized list would be a good tool to have, with information on where the funding was coming from.

Councilor McLain said that the excise tax came from specific places and was sometimes spent in other places. She was concerned that the future of the excise tax and disposal income would affect the fate of various programs and departments. Mr. Couey said he would respond to specific questions for this exercise and also to help prepare for future budget processes.

Councilor Burkholder appreciated the opportunity to examine the program budget document; it helped him see things in different ways. It was an opportunity to better organize services and to identify overlap and potential efficiencies. He said that one thing missing from the budget was the work being done on the budget; the same went for performance management. Mr. Couey explained to Councilor McLain that the next work session would discuss shared services, including communications.

Councilor Park wanted help identifying areas that were not already included in the budget. How could Council get more information on areas that were not highly visible to the Council, such as at MERC? How could programs such as entertainment be made more visible to the Council?

Councilor Liberty had a question about conservation education. It might not necessarily be a cost savings to put all program activities into the same department.

Finally, Mr. Couey's asked whether Council would like to have a summary of their priorities in preparation for December 13. Council declined the offer but said that the overall discussion had been helpful.

3. BREAK

4. BOND MEASURE DISCUSSION

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks Department distributed two documents to Council; copies of each are included in the meeting record. He presented the results of the Blue Ribbon Committee's (BRC) work and summarized Council decisions and staff work on this concept. The BRC was charged with preparing a first presentation draft; by March 2006, that will be made into a final product. The BRC has finished their work; it will be presented on December 8. Mr. Desmond thought their findings were consistent overall with their charge, as well as with the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee's (GPAC) independent results. The primary difference was in the size of the measure. BRC recommended \$220 million; they were concerned about taxpayer tolerance, not appearing to overreach, and competing ballot measures. They were comfortable with an annual household cost in the low \$30s. GPAC's suggestion would be \$270 million; the difference was not in the land acquisition, it was on the local share side. BRC recommended 20% versus 30% from GPAC. Mr. Desmond discussed the future of the bond measure, including the upcoming timeline. He was most concerned to get Council direction on the criteria of the local share for projects.

Councilor Park asked about total acreage. Mr. Desmond discussed the preliminary target areas map and how they would relate to the current project. Councilor Liberty wanted more information on income distribution in relation to the properties being considered. Councilor Burkholder wondered how much land could potentially be captured. Mr. Desmond said about 4,200 acres. Councilor Liberty would like to see more data on geography, what other landscapes were adjacent to the target areas?

Jim Morgan, Parks, presented a truly awesome video flyover of the preliminary target areas. He discussed the rationale behind target selection; watershed and headwaters protection and habitat corridors were major criteria. Recreational opportunities were less significant.

Councilor Liberty had some questions about where we might get the most land for our money. Mr. Desmond said more detail would be available in the next session. He didn't want Council to lose sight of the big picture when people started nit-picking a half-acre here or two blocks there. Mr. Desmond's most important need to hear from Council was about the local share.

Council President Bragdon asked Council to comment on the target areas. Councilor McLain liked the idea that we had two elements – acquisition as well as capital improvement areas. Councilor Park was disappointed at the amount of land that would be obtained. Mr. Desmond said the cost of land has really gone up. Plus, the target areas have been chosen to be more within the urban growth boundary (UGB). Councilor Park thought we ought to concentrate inside the hard edges.

Councilor Burkholder wondered if the priority should be to fill in the holes or to expand our vision beyond what was looked at the last time around. Where was Metro competing with the state parks budget? Council President Bragdon spoke to focusing on areas closer to urban areas.

Councilor Hosticka thought the proposal included a good mix of close-in and edge properties. Councilor Newman supported the previous comments. The east end of the map would be an easy sell. He wanted to make sure that the land that we obtained was of the most value and importance to residents of Metro. Councilor Liberty agreed. To complement the regulatory program, we ought to focus closer in. To take it to the ballot, it should also achieve some 2040 objectives. Areas closer to the UGB made more sense. He wanted feedback from local governments to see what they thought about getting value for their money.

Council discussed public access and the role of open spaces to provide habitat area, and how much the public weighed each of these values; previous polls have shown support for habitat for habitat's sake as well as water quality. Not everyone demands convenient personal access.

Councilor McLain commented on the difference between the natural areas on the east side and the west side. There was a different quality to the Damascus area, where there was still something to save and was close in, compared to the Hillsboro/Cornelius area where development was being urged. She also urged Council to realize that people in areas other than downtown Portland consider themselves to be urban residents. She thought the west side best met the criteria laid out by the BRC.

Council President Bragdon said the local share should be a plus in trying to sell the measure. Mr. Desmond said that everybody agreed that they did not want to scale back the 1995 scope. They were allowed to acquire land for future nature parks as well as to build improvements in current nature parks. The BRC and GPAC wanted more flexibility. They wanted to be able to use the

money to buy the land but not necessarily to build the facilities. That was a change from 1995. On the capital improvement side, Council had asked staff to include restoration, fish and wildlife, that came out of, that was not there in 1995, although a project like that may or may not have been eligible. Everybody on committees agreed with concept that some areas of the region were pretty built out. Clackamas County wanted to be able to do just about anything – community centers, swimming pools, for Metro to pay interest, etc. BRC and GPAC thought this was asking a bit much. In general, the west side jurisdictions did not feel that way. They felt the nature side of the spectrum needed more attention, and they had other funding sources to do the recreational development.

Councilor Park asked if there was any chance to go back and look at some sites that had been previously not funded. Mr. Desmond said there had not been any suggestions on this. Councilor Liberty examined the tension between the theme of the bond measure and the way it was going to be sold. Council and staff discussed how local share money would be authorized to be used. Councilor Liberty emphasized regional equity and income equity. He wanted to make sure that low-income neighborhoods received some attention. Councilor Burkholder thought maybe some screening criteria could be included.

Council discussed various strategies to support Councilor Liberty's requirements. Mr. Desmond suggested that this criterion would be eligible for the public discussion that would happen when the specific areas were proposed.

Mr. Desmond summarized the three major questions: 1) Would building ballfields meet the criteria? Both of the committees as well as the majority of the Council was against this; 2) Could jurisdictions buy land for future neighborhood parks? Both of the committees said yes to this and Council was mostly in favor of it; 3) Should there be some sort of income filter? Neither committee had discussed this, and Council thought there might be future opportunities to look at it. Council discussed what an income filter would be and how to implement it.

Councilor Burkholder suggested other ways in which Councilor Liberty's objective could be addressed. Council asked staff if they could provide some feedback from the jurisdictions on whether this would be a welcome concept. Council agreed that they would investigate alternatives to achieve Councilor Liberty's objectives.

Ken Ray, Public Affairs, suggested some talking points for Council in their outreach to the community in January and February 2006.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION, HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h), TO CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL CONCERNING THE LEGAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF A PUBLIC BODY WITH REGARD TO CURRENT LITIGATION.

Deferred until December 15.

6. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION

Councilor McLain discussed two newspaper articles regarding the recent Cornelius UGB decision (copy of each included in the meeting record). She urged Council to keep these views in mind during the next go-round.

Metro Council Work Session Meeting

11/22/05

Page 6

Councilor Burkholder reminded us that he would host a December 8 holiday party.

Councilor Park had an announcement about a meeting next Tuesday in Wilsonville at 6 p.m.

Council President Bragdon asked for a volunteer to make a motion on December 8, regarding a proposed order to issue a final order of solid waste license with Greenway Recycling. Councilor Burkholder stepped up.

Council discussed other upcoming meetings and assignments.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
NOVEMBER 22, 2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	11/24/05	Notice of Cancellation	112205c-01
4	Memo from Mike Ragsdale	10/25/05	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jim Desmond, Parks RE: 2006 Bond Recommendations	112205c-02
4	Map	11/22/05	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jim Desmond, Parks RE: Preliminary Target Areas	112205c-03
6	Article	11/22/05	TO: Metro Council FROM: Susan McLain RE: Metro on UGB: We're done	112205c-04
6	Article	1122/05	TO: Metro Council FROM: Susan McLain RE: Cornelius: 'A Metro afterthought?'	112205c-05