

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, February 28, 2006  
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 2:04 p.m.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 2, 2006/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Council President Bragdon reviewed the March 2, 2006 Metro Council agenda.

Council President Bragdon conveyed comments of Chief Operating Officer Michael Jordan about a request for proposals for the agriculture/urban study. Councilor Park said they were discussing measuring the pieces. Regarding the bond measure, Council President Bragdon would like all amendments and decisions made before the formal adoption next week.

### **2. METRO NATURAL AREAS BOND MEASURE**

Council President Bragdon said the main focus would be on the grant program. Council discussed increasing the amount for the grant program. Councilor Burkholder was concerned that a too-large grant program would end up being more of a local share. He wanted to make sure that this was what Council intended; if not, how to prevent it? Also, a larger amount for grants would mean more work for Metro staff.

Councilor Liberty wondered how much detail needed to be resolved immediately. Council President Bragdon understood that Council could support staff work to this point. Daniel Cooper, Senior Attorney, said that the measure described some of the details but that the rest would be done through attachments that would be fleshed out later. There was quite a bit of flexibility, legally. The main issues were more about the political implications. Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, said the current version gave a dominant flavor with many details to be worked out, but it could not withstand a complete overhaul at this point.

Councilor Liberty noted that Council had not yet reached agreement about how to target “under-natured” areas. Council President Bragdon said he thought there was a general comfort level with the memo Chris Carlson, Parks, had drafted. Any amendments would have to be addressed to the work that had already been done.

Councilor Newman supported a larger grant program. The capital projects had been lowered from \$16 million to \$6 million. That “freed-up” \$10 million ought to go into the grant program. This would be shifting within the previous total amount, rather than adding to it.

Councilor Hosticka wanted some information about a breakdown from year to year over the life of the bond measure – if we changed the amounts for the total measure, what would this translate to on an annual basis? Council and staff discussed the 1995 bond measure, and how much of the

previous bond was actually spent on projects, since some was paid from the bond interest. Councilor Hosticka wanted to see specifics on how much money would actually be available. He supported Councilor Newman in philosophy. Mr. Cooper said that in the last measure, all the interest was allocated to the regional share. When requests were made to increase the local share, by the interest, this was not done. It was understood that the interest would go into the regional share.

Councilor Newman asked how much interest could be generated over the life of the bond. Mr. Cooper said that, if bond interest rates were in the predicted range, there was a limit to the amount of interest earnings we could receive, compared to how much we paid out. With \$220 million, we wouldn't spend anywhere near all of it in the first three years, so we could have a significant amount of interest. Last time it was about \$20 million. With the Expo financing, the interest was less. But we would be talking about at least \$10 million. Mr. Desmond said that last time some of the money went to pay the increased price of land and some to administrative costs.

Councilor Park said he didn't want to get too tied up in criteria. The grant program was a minor part of the overall program. He preferred not to go over \$21 million. He felt that staff could draft the language to give sufficient flexibility. Council President Bragdon thought that \$11 million was a good amount. His main concern was the overall salability of the measure. We needed to keep the focus on the promise of keeping significant lands safe from development.

Several councilors would have amendments prepared to present at the March 7 meeting, to adjust the amount of the grants portion. Mr. Desmond submitted a spreadsheet and a map (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). The map was from 1996, showing how the target areas and willing sellers had been approached. The refinement process worked well last time. He didn't want Council to get too fixated on the maps that had been shown so far this time. There was a lot of flexibility throughout the process. The decisions about target areas did not need to be made to a fine level of detail before next week.

Council and staff discussed the different approaches that would be taken regarding previous target areas and new target areas, including whether to take any of the old target areas off the current list. Councilor Park was uncomfortable with that. Councilor Burkholder had proposed taking a few of the old target areas off. Council President Bragdon asked Mr. Desmond to discuss the new list of target areas. It was the same as the last list, but with the addition of why the areas were valuable.

Councilor Hosticka said he thought the separation of greenways was new. Was this a new subcategory? Mr. Desmond said the total amounts could ultimately be adjusted. Councilor Hosticka thought the greenways ought to be identified individually, the same as the other target areas. Councilor Liberty mentioned that Wapato Lake was kind of a political area. And what about Damascus? There were very valuable properties alongside a new city. Did this raise any concerns about fairness? Damascus was unique in having a large amount of target area; was it getting too much? Council President Bragdon thought that Upper Rock Creek, Damascus, and Stafford were more urgent due to the increased urbanization that those areas were facing.

Councilor Burkholder wanted to make sure there was a connection between who was paying for the properties and their ability to access the land they were protecting. Large chunks of land far away from urban areas were a nice boon to those who lived there. Where was too far away?

Council President Bragdon walked through the target areas. Mr. Desmond's only exception to the refinement philosophy was Scouter Mountain. If people thought they were voting to acquire Scouter Mountain, we'd better not take it off the list. Councilor Park wanted to know if we wanted to focus on areas facing imminent urbanization. Council President Bragdon thought yes.

Councilor Liberty asked, if we take Scouter Mountain off the list now, were there more things worth buying in that area? Mr. Desmond said there were a lot of buttes east of the Willamette River. Councilor Newman thought we ought to try to get a balance between the expensive, closer-in properties, and the cheaper, farther-out properties. His constituents were more concerned about areas immediately threatened with development. Mr. Desmond thought we needed to keep in mind that, though an area may seem far out today, within 10-20 years they will be developed areas all around it.

Mr. Desmond discussed the other areas. Basically we are trying to juggle saving parcels that protect water quality and habitat, that may be under the most threat, and that have the most connection to the voters. Councilor Hosticka was concerned about using Wilson Creek as the identifier. His constituents have discussed what might end up happening on Stafford. Mr. Desmond changed the wording from Stafford Creek to Stafford Basin.

Councilor Liberty wanted to know, if some areas were removed from the list, what would the freed-up money be spent on? Mr. Cooper explained more about the individual acquisitions, with the willing sellers, that was the nitty-gritty of it. It was more about a procedure than about individual properties. Council discussed their preferences about which target areas to focus on. They agreed that the proposed process provided sufficient flexibility.

Council President Bragdon asked staff to rewrite the baseline for the draft; and also get together with Susan to discuss the changes in her area. Councilor Hosticka asked if we were paying for timber value on the large forested areas? Staff said yes.

Councilor Liberty said there was significant opposition in the area, from farmers, in regards to Wapato Lake. Councilor Park thought the concern of the farmers was would it make harder to farm – it was a matter of drainage and buffering, and wildlife that would consume crops (“grain-predators”) – also, why were we looking there at all? It was not necessarily threatened by development. The Washington County Commissioners are meeting today – Mr. Desmond thought they were going to request that Wapato be removed from the list. Councilor Park thought there were ways in which the farmers' concerns could be addressed. Councilor Liberty recognized that the opinions of the farm community were diverse.

Council and staff discussed various ways to deal with Wapato Lake – 1) remove it entirely 2) just leave it in as is 3) write it in but with conditions. Staff agreed to write amendments for the different approaches.

Council President Bragdon then reviewed the carry-overs from last time. Councilor Newman said he was comfortable leaving the carry-overs on, but he wanted to make sure it was understood that the focus would remain on the new projects. Councilor Liberty asked if the blue ribbon committee looked at the previous target areas? Staff thought not, they looked at it in general but not at specific sites. Mr. Desmond commented that if Wapato was taken off, it would affect the total target acreage; this would have implications for selling the bond measure.

Council President Bragdon summarized that Council wanted a little more urban emphasis. Maybe bump the overall number up a bit to accommodate that, to around \$224-\$227 million.

**3. BREAK**

**4. DISPOSAL SYSTEM PLANNING**

Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, introduced Daniel Pitzler, CH2MHill. Mr. Pitzler was seeking Council approval of investigating the three different transfer station models – public, private, and hybrid. Council received three documents and were shown a media presentation (a copy of each is included in the meeting record). Mr. Pitzler said he mostly wanted to focus on Council's values regarding waste disposal. He summarized the presentation from a few weeks ago. Key issues were competition, economies of scale, transport distance, and rates.

Mr. Pitzler said that Metro's current disposal system was complex. We were trying to achieve goals beyond simple disposal. We were currently doing a fairly good job achieving our objectives. He discussed the strategy table – a tool for comparing the different models. First he looked at the private system option. Elements of the strategy table include transfer station ownership and operation, Metro regulation of waste flow, transfer rate setting, how to handle new entry into transfer station ownership, self-haul issues, recovery targets and compliance monitoring, and disaster response. Councilor Burkholder asked about bidding for the right to accept waste. Mr. Pitzler said if we didn't control collections, it was hard to do that.

He then discussed the public system – the key feature was that all the transfer stations would be publicly owned. Services would be contracted out. Collections would remain unchanged.

Finally, the hybrid system. This would involve tweaking more than fundamentally changing the model. Key features would be pricing changes at Metro stations, sustainability standards, and bid out the 10% wet waste. Councilor Burkholder pointed out that this model also included privatization of self-haul.

Mr. Pitzler said he was happy to accommodate Council comments; he could return to another meeting or do one-on-one briefings. Councilor Hosticka observed that there were many permutations – how did the options get selected? Mr. Pitzler said he wanted to show differences, and also to achieve a system that could be implemented. They seem to be reasonable systems, that would work, that would provide competition, and that could be realistically achieved.

Councilor Newman talked about how the different systems related to Metro's regional goals. Councilor Burkholder wondered if the three models could be analyzed in terms of cost and benefit. Mr. Pitzler said yes. His goal as a consultant was to make sure the Council was following a good process, not necessarily to guarantee a good outcome. He proposed the evaluation methodology – a triangle matrix of value modeling, cost, and risk – the goal is to be a decision aide, not to spit out the perfect decision.

Mr. Pitzler described the value modeling methodology that he proposed to use. This included elements of – 1) developing an objectives hierarchy 2) alternatives 3) performance measures 4) weighting the relative importance of the objectives and 5) scoring.

Mr. Pitzler had a chart restating Council values to see if he as a consultant understood them properly. He had added a value of stakeholder support. He also discussed some second-level

objectives. Then he asked Council to provide their values, using the handout. He had an amazing spreadsheet. After entering Council scores, he looked at the ones with the biggest disparity. One was in the progress toward compliance with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RWSMP) sustainability goals – there was a wide disparity here. Another one with a wide disparity was enduring funding is available for Metro general government. The most important one, however, was the RSWMP sustainability goals.

Mr. Hoglund said they were looking at some of the risk analysis. This could influence other things such as the values. Around the end of March, they would have that information. Councilor Newman requested staff to make sure that each assumption was actually legally possible.

## 5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Burkholder announced that he and Councilor Park had been to a consortium meeting in Central Point – the discussion was that they were starting to get a growing awareness that we have a shared interest in issues like housing prices, population growth, lack of ability to influence areas outside jurisdictional boundaries. Some of the discussions have been encouraging, with the potential for more cooperation between regions. Councilor Park said that there was a lot of interest in Metro's modeling skills, especially for transportation. They discussed the Big Look and the role of other governmental agencies in addressing growth issues, and transportation.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz

Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
 FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
1	Agenda	3/2/06	Metro Council Agenda for March 2, 2006	022806c-01
2	Bond measure	2/28/06	TO: Metro Council FROM: Ken Ray RE: Public outreach and comments related to proposed Natural Areas Bond Measure	022806c-02
2	Bond measure	Undated	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jim Desmond RE: 2006 Bond Measure	022806c-03
2	Bond measure	Undated	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jim Desmond RE: Refining the target areas	022806c-04
4	Disposal system	Undated	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dan Pitzler, CH2MHill RE: Draft definition and implementation steps	022806c-05
4	Disposal system	2/28/06	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dan Pitzler, CH2MHill RE: Metro disposal system project, strategy table	022806c-06
4	Disposal system	2/28/06	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dan Pitzler, CH2MHill RE: Metro disposal system project, weighting of first level objectives	022806c-07
4	Disposal system	2/28/06	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dan Pitzler, CH2MHill RE: Metro Disposal System, Council values and system options	022806c-08