

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, June 13, 2006
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Robert Liberty (excused)

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

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JUNE 15, 2006/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the June 15, 2006 Metro Council agenda. Councilor McLain agreed to carry Item 4.1 (budget), since Councilor Hosticka would be in Eugene to accept his Teacher of the Year Award. Measure 37 claims hearings have been scheduled for several upcoming meetings. Councilor McLain was concerned that the outcomes that Council desired were not necessarily related to the process that had been devised. Councilor Newman agreed but added that the nature of Measure 37 was to be confusing. Councilor Park mentioned that the confusion made it difficult for Metro to honor its obligations under state law. Council discussed the difficulty of dealing with claims that were inside the urban growth boundary (UGB) but outside Metro's jurisdictional boundary. Councilor Burkholder sympathized with the claimants, who had to work through this process with us. He was comfortable with proceeding with our current process, so that we could learn as much as possible. Councilor McLain thought Council needed more discussion and information about the valuation models that were being used. She also mentioned the conflicting burdens on jurisdictions, to meet comprehensive planning mandates, in the face of such confusion.

Council President Bragdon floated the idea that Metro's approach was too philosophical. Perhaps we needed to be more tactical; a lot of the claims had come out of the time lag between UGB incorporation and the lack of zoning. Maybe we could just deny claims and wait for them to work through the years-long appeals process. He compared Metro's responsibilities with those of other jurisdictions. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), agreed that Metro had some flexibility in responding to claimants. He remarked on the differences in the valuation methods. There were four or five more claims hearings scheduled. Councilor McLain wanted to make sure that Metro's decisions did not damage Title 11 and wondered about the effects on Metro's New Look work.

Regarding the construction excise tax, Mr. Jordan reported that 10 of the jurisdictions had already approved the inter-governmental agreements (IGAs). This represented all cases where it had been voted on it so far. He expected that they would all be completed by July 1. He thanked Alison Kean Campbell and Reed Wagner for their tremendous efforts in getting these approved.

2. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REVIEW

Karen Feher, Financial Planning Department, reviewed the summary of amendments (a copy is included in the meeting record). The amendments were classed into two categories: 1) Department Technical Amendments and 2) Councilor Amendments. Ms. Feher felt all the amendments were fairly straightforward. Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), clarified a

question of Councilor Newman's regarding the \$0.25 increase in zoo admissions. Mr. Jordan said he would provide additional information about this. The ordinance approving the zoo increase was being drafted, for Council vote later in the year. Councilor Newman stressed the importance of ticket-buyers realizing that the increase was being dedicated to conservation. Mr. Jordan agreed to schedule information on this into a future work session.

Moving right along, Ms. Feher finished her brief description of each amendment. Councilor Newman questioned when solid waste funds could be spent and when they were restricted. Ms. Feher explained that the Smith and Bybee project was closely related to the St. Johns Landfill. Council President Bragdon asked for clarification between technical amendments and Councilor amendments. Ms. Feher responded that Councilor amendments could be either technical or substantive; department amendments were solely technical.

Margo Norton, Deputy CFO, said the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC) hearing was scheduled for 2 p.m. tomorrow, June 13. The 20 draft questions had been submitted (a copy is included in the meeting record). Councilor Hosticka wanted to know if Council would be accountable for answers given during the hearing. Mr. Jordan explained the role of the TSCC compared to the alternative of each agency having its own citizen budget committee. Councilor Newman asked if the responses were typically given verbally or in writing. Mr. Jordan said that, during his brief tenure, they tended to be in writing.

Council President Bragdon asked that a statement to the effect that no Metro funds were available for a headquarters hotel be added to the first question. Councilor Hosticka was pleased to have staff include a disclaimer stating that Council policy was decided during the Council's own processes.

3. GRANT APPLICATION FOR INTEGRATED CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, introduced Jonathan Makler, Planning Department, and said that Mr. Makler was hired to coordinate agency collaboration in corridors. Mr. Makler recounted a brief history of Council interest in such coordination and the applicability of the grant money. It was to be a Metro-managed grant. A second round of funding would be available in a subsequent grant cycle. He described other funded activity that was taking place around this subject, including other agencies' involvement. Councilor Burkholder asked about any required match; Mr. Makler said Metro's match would come from other federal sources. Councilor Newman wondered whether we wanted to include Washington State or Clark County as grant partners, with an eye toward furthering partnerships. Mr. Makler said the smaller focus resulted from expediency and in response to the grant's weighting of various factors. In response to staff's request for the green light, Council signaled its approval.

4. SMITH AND BYBEE UPDATE

Jane Hart and Chris Carlson, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, presented an update on the Smith and Bybee trail project, including next steps, based on previous Council directives. Ms. Hart identified issues that had been considered in the studies. Parks was seeking Council approval of the general direction of the work. She discussed the complication of the bridge feasibility study. Council asked for clarification about the code change and the costs that would be incurred. Staff was ready to do the bridge part of the study. The bridge study could proceed, even if it ultimately proved unfeasible. Ms. Carlson said they were trying to juggle multiple issues—to negotiate the South Slough alignment, the pedestrian bridge, and the railroad crossing. The crucial goal was to try to get across Columbia Blvd. and to provide neighborhood access. There were still a lot of

unknowns. More information would be available in the fall, as these studies and negotiations proceeded. Council and staff discussed the progress to date, the negotiations that were underway, and which steps needed to be accomplished. Ms. Carlson discussed options for avoiding pedestrian access at grade on Columbia Blvd. In response to Councilor Park, Ms. Hart stated that the envisioned trail was to be paved, 10 feet wide, with fencing on the landfill side. Council in general thought there was a benefit to completing the trail as far as Columbia Blvd. while waiting to see what other fruit was borne out of the study and negotiations. It could be a good first phase. Council thought it was worth looking at the bridge. Council consensus was to go ahead with the bridge study, and well as phase I studies. Councilor Burkholder pointed out that, if the trail were to connect to Columbia Blvd., it would qualify for federal transportation dollars. Ms. Carlson said all this would be revisited in the fall.

Councilor Burkholder addressed the Smith and Bybee budget amendment. Part of the lateness was due to the timing of the resolution. Council President Bragdon thought it was actually more of a technical amendment; he didn't have a problem with it.

5. BREAK

6. ZOO PARKING UPDATE

Tony Vecchio, Zoo Director, said he was hopeful that the latest proposal would succeed, despite past efforts. The issue went back to 1998, before the Max station opening. Neighborhood residents wanted to use the zoo parking lot as a park and ride, which Mr. Vecchio had opposed. There was an impasse of several years' duration, but the neighborhood groups recently broached the issue again. Mr. Vecchio felt some common ground had been reached. The current proposal was to offer a \$25 fee, to about 100 local residents, weekdays only, from mid-September to mid-March (the zoo's off season). Councilor Burkholder asked how many parking spaces there were; Mr. Vecchio said about 920. Staff was concerned that it would have a negative affect on zoo business. Mr. Vecchio thought the negative impact would not be that great. Another concern was that it was too selective to offer it to the neighbors and not the general public. Mr. Vecchio thought there was precedent to offer mitigation to those most affected.

Councilor Hosticka asked whether administrative costs would exceed revenues; Mr. Vecchio thought it was a break-even scenario, requiring no extra staff or patrolling of the lot. Councilor Newman wondered why we didn't just have a policy that "it's not a park and ride" and find other ways to give benefits to the neighbors, such as free concert admissions. Councilor Burkholder thought it was because the tradeoff was to encourage people to use mass transit. The neighborhood was not very walkable. He was concerned that September might be too early to start the "parking season," but he felt it was a good effort at a compromise. Mr. Vecchio distributed an example of the pilot parking program material (a copy is included in the meeting record). Councilor Newman wanted to make sure the neighborhood understood it was a trial program and that it could be ended or modified if it affected zoo business. Councilor McLain said that, in 1992, when the zoo Max station was being considered, shared parking was a topic during those discussions. She felt the current proposal was a good faith effort demonstrating the choices that had to be made. Councilor Newman felt the project had the potential to be a Trojan Horse, with increased demand for a park and ride. Mr. Jordan reminded Council that the zoo's parking permit was issued by the City of Portland, and we wanted to get it permitted permanently, but the neighborhoods have been an obstacle. Thus it was in Metro's self-interest to make compromises, with an eye toward getting a permanent permit from the City. Mr. Vecchio thought the tone of negotiation with the neighborhoods had improved.

7. TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND INVESTING IN OUR COMMUNITIES

Cancelled due to Councilor Liberty's absence.

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(e), DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO NEGOTIATE REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Members Present: William Eadie, Chris Carlson, Hillary Wilton, Michael Jordan, Jim Desmond

Time Began: 3:58 p.m.

Time Ended: 4:26 p.m.

9. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor McLain wanted to follow up on the Metropolitan Exhibition-Recreation Commission (MERC) software—the Event Business Management Software (EBMS), and whether her concerns had been addressed. She thought it was a fly in the face and that it was serving to separate MERC from the rest of Metro. She thought MERC did not follow Council directive. MERC and the zoo should have bought software together. Councilor Hosticka agreed that it was bad form. One issue was that EBMS and PeopleSoft were not compatible. Council and staff discussed the ramifications of MERC separating itself. Metro's staff would have no way to audit them, yet we would be accountable.

Mr. Jordan said that we originally thought we were going to have to move the entire accounting function over to MERC, or at the least do double data-entry. The EBMS implementation was being delayed, until at least July 1. They were trying to work out a way for EBMS to report to PeopleSoft; it wouldn't be as detailed a report but it will be something. He reported that Mr. Stringer was equally concerned about his fiduciary responsibility to the Council. An alternative would be for MERC to do its own auditing. Mr. Jordan stated that he was in communication with Mr. Miller but had no authority over him. He reflected on the section of the code that said Metro would supply accounting services to MERC; any change to this would have to be done by Council. Council was concerned about the appearance of a lack of accountability from MERC. They thought perhaps Council President Bragdon ought to talk to the MERC chair. Mr. Jordan reminded us that under the Visitor Development Initiative (VDI), we were required to have an outside consultant look at our support service costs for the convention center.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Prepared by,



Dove Hotz
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
JUNE 13, 2006**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	6/15/06	Agenda: Metro Council Regular Meeting, June 15, 2006	061306c-01
2	Technical amendments	6/6/06	To: Metro Council From: Karen Feher Re: FY 2006-07 Approved Budget, Summary of Amendments	061306c-02
2	Technical amendments	6/12/06	To: Metro Council From: Margo Norton Re: TSCC Hearing and TSCC Draft Responses	061306c-03
6	Zoo parking	undated	To: Metro Council From: Tony Vecchio Re: Thank you from neighborhood associations	061306c-04