

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

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Council Chamber

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

Also Present:

Members Absent:

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 4:20 PM.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 11, 2000 STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA COMMITTEE MEETING

Motion: **Councilor Atherton** moved to adopt the minutes of the July 11, 2000 State & Federal Legislative Agenda Committee meeting.

Vote: Chair McLain and Councilors Park and Atherton voted aye. The vote was 3/0 and the motion passed unanimously.

2. METRO LEGISLATIVE TEAM REPORT

Jeff Stone, Chief of Staff, reported that the legislative team recommended one-on-one briefings to learn the councilors' preferences for a topic for a possible summit/conference. His preliminary advice for the most appropriate topic was the 4(d) issue.

Bruce Warner, Chief Operating Officer said he had started discussions with the Presiding Officer and the Executive Officer. He said the initial reaction was that targeted legislative briefings on Metro in general as well as some other issues being dealt with would be most appropriate.

Chair McLain thought there had been direction given at the last meeting regarding specific options about timing and topics and that the team would determine which, if any, would be best. She supported the legislative tours, but said they took a long time and there was no guarantee that anyone would show up. She wanted the team to go to each councilor with the same set of possibilities to get their ideas and input. She said if it did not happen within the next week, one opportunity would have been lost already. She suggested they talk to the councilors by phone if they could not do so in person.

Councilor Atherton said Mr. Stone had mentioned the ESA as the likely topic. He said they had earlier discussed the concept that a major summit issue was an urban agenda as opposed to a rural one. He asked if legislators had any interest in that. He said it was a different world than it was 10-15 years ago.

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

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Page 2

Mr. Stone responded that those issues and differences were seen in Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas counties. He said for example, he had met last Friday with two Republican state representative candidates who had come to learn more about Metro. They did not know much about Metro's, and one of them even thought that Metro managed Tri-Met. He felt an urban agenda was an important distinction and said they were finding from the tours that other areas had a far different perspective than perhaps the inner city of Portland. He said Councilor Atherton's point was well taken and the legislative team would try to be as balanced as possible when they talked to folks about these things. He said they had hoped to come to this meeting with a sense of the councilors' priorities, but not all of them had returned their priority sheets. He believed they would have them all by the weekend.

Councilor Atherton said he wasn't thinking so much of what the councilors thought was important, but what the legislators felt were urban issues on which they would have to work together.

Mr. Stone said when he was talking about the differences between Clackamas, Washington and Multnomah counties, he was talking about those legislators, and not about the council's perspective on how to grow. He felt the most interesting thing learned from the tours so far was how Metro was perceived and how the counties saw growth affecting their communities. He felt it was a good educational piece to have them come hear Metro's perspectives and share their own because everyone needed to work together in order to have a livable community.

Chair McLain noted that Councilor Atherton's topic area from last few meetings was the idea that the growth issue was central as far as livability and what the communities wanted or did not want.

Councilor Atherton said there was a change in the state land use law that had in the past focused on protecting farm and forest. His sense was they were not making the connection with the legislature on this. He said there were some clear reforms that should be made or at least debated about urban issues that were not being taken care of.

Chair McLain hoped that at the one-on-one meetings with the councilors, he and the others could think about how they could pose that as part of the agenda for a committee session, or as a strategy or setting where that conversation could happen.

Mr. Riggs, Pac/West Communications, reported there had been significant movement on the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA). He reminded the committee that it had passed the house two months ago on an overwhelming basis. He said a key vote had been Senator Gordon Smith who had worked out enough of the issues to feel comfortable with the vote. The Senator offered three amendments, which were accepted on a bipartisan basis and as a result, the bill passed out of committee on a vote of 13 to 7. He said the bill's prognosis was uncertain. He said it could be included in a continuing resolution that could be included in the final budget resolution at the end of the year. He presented a draft thank you letter to Senators Smith and Wyden for the committee's consideration.

Chair McLain felt all seven councilors should sign.

Mr. Stone recommended that Mr. Burton's signature also be included.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Page 3

Chair McLain asked if it was appropriate for a letter to go to the administration. She thought they should send one.

Councilor Park asked Mr. Riggs to comment on whether the key amendment had been the willing seller piece.

Mr. Riggs said there were a number of key amendments and the willing seller issues were very important. He said the big hold-up in the senate was a dispute between coastal oil states vs the rest of the states. In the original version, a large percentage of the money went to Alaska and Louisiana.

Mr. Morrissey commented on the draft letter where it said "...the legislation will give local governments and jurisdictions a new tool to use to respond to federal directives and mandates", and then it called out "...recent 4(d) rules". He asked if 4(d) was included because it was in the bill or because they were trying to send a signal that Metro might consider using the purchasing power to respond to the 4(d) rule. He said if it was the latter, he was not sure that signal should be sent just yet.

Mr. Riggs responded that he included it because 4(d) was something that Senator Smith was interested in. He was concerned about the impact of federal rules on local jurisdictions which was one of the elements that led him to be supportive of this. He agreed they should not put anything in the letter saying this was the only way they would use the funding.

Chair McLain agreed that it should not be singled out without conversation.

Councilor Park commented that a couple of years ago, Congress passed the Conservation Reserve Program for agriculture to help with restoration along streams, mitigation for loss of production land, etc. He asked if it would be too specific to consider this potentially as an urban component to that type of program.

Mr. Riggs said it was, in essence, an opportunity for an urban CRP type of program. He said a concern of the conservatives and Republicans in Congress was that urban areas needed a little more focus. He understood one of Senator Smith's amendments was intended to move in that direction.

Chair McLain asked Mr. Stone to take charge of getting the letter completed.

Mr. Warner said at the last committee meeting, they had discussed the legislative interest survey and the principles by which they would start looking at issues in an attempt to prioritize them. He said it was the team's intent to sit down next week to take a first cut at prioritizing issues. He said that way they could take a look at the issues and the principles together to see how the team had thought about it so they could have a work session on the principles.

Chair McLain said that would be a good exercise for next meeting.

3. METRO LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES & KEEPING THE COUNCIL INFORMED

Mr. Riggs reported that there had been a tour with two legislators and one candidate that day. He noted there had been excellent questions and a very good discussion to conclude the

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

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Page 4

afternoon. He said Councilor Park had joined them for the end of it. He said there would be another on Thursday with three, possibly four, coming.

He said there was interest expressed by legislative leadership and committee folks on 4(d). he mentioned the legislative picnic they had talked previously. He said a target date of September 16th or 23rd, and either Oxbow or Blue Lake park was being explored for that over the next couple of weeks.

ADJOURN

Chair McLain said the work the legislative team had been asked to do would drive the next committee agenda. She wanted to have the structure in place and the principles decided, and to make sure the "larger event" was nailed down as to what type, where, when, and how. She said she had no additional items for the next agenda so there would not be a meeting unless that work was done or there an action item came forward.

There being no further business before the committee, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting at 4:44 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Grant
Council Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 25, 2000

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

Document Number	Document Date	Document Description	TO/FROM
072500leg-01	July 25, 2000	Draft thank you letter RE: HR 701 (drafted by D. Riggs)	Senator Smith/Council