

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL GREATEST PLACE WORK SESSION MEETING

Wednesday, January 17, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:00 p.m. He provided an overview of the work session. He noted that even if the State approved an extension on the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) decision, we had some statutory things that had to be done such as adopting a Regional Transportation Plan. Then, within that context he wanted the Council to comment on what we would like to be saying about what we had done as well as comments on the things Council saw as challenges to get from here to there. Finally, he wanted to go back and get into a discussion with staff about whether some of the things needed to move forward, backward or how they needed to connect with each other.

Robin McArthur, Planning Department, introduced Megan Gibb, Transit Oriented Development Program, who will be working with Phil Whitmore in the Transit Oriented Development program. Ms. Gibb provided Council information about what she would be doing in the program. Ms. McArthur provided a framework for the session. She noted a draft roadmap (included in the record), which was based on the assumption that Metro would receive a two-year delay from the legislature. If they didn't receive the delay, Metro was required by current state law to have an Urban Growth Report (UGR) by December 2007 and if an UGB amendment was warranted, 50% of that amendment must be accomplished by December 2008 and the final 50% must be accomplished by December 2009. There was a lot of work to be done if the delay was approved. Councilors suggested changes to the timeline. Councilor Park asked about the extension. Dick Benner, Metro Senior Attorney, explained what would happen if we didn't get the extension. Ms. McArthur said she had developed a very general timeline. Councilor Liberty asked about the Urban Growth Report. Ms. McArthur said Dick Bolen, Data Resource Center, was developing a draft UGR. Ms. McArthur said the timeline was just one version of how they could sequence events, products and process. She asked Council to provide them with input about the timeline. This timeline was just a draft.

Council President Bragdon suggested Ms. McArthur start on the left hand side of the timeline. Councilor Park commented on the UGR and the need to have better estimates. Mr. Bolen talked about the 50-year draft UGR. Councilor Hosticka talked about where they wanted to end up. On the UGR he was assuming we would still talk about forecasting scenarios and risk analysis. He thought the sooner they could look at drafts of that, the better for political purposes and to help define the process. Councilor Hosticka suggested getting that process fine-tuned enough so they can actually use it sometime in the future. From his viewpoint, it was never over. So what he looked forward to by 2010 was that there was a process in place that allowed future councils to make adjustments in real time so they have considerations that they would like to implement within shorter time periods than the current one but based upon a more accurate assessment of what was going on. He wanted to see rural reserves designated and in place by that time. Councilors continued to discuss the chart. Ms. McArthur said they had a lot of work to do to get to the point of designating reserves. Councilor Hosticka said if there was a performance based system in place, when the consideration of adjusting the UGB occurred, they could adjust the

UGB on a more frequent basis as time goes on by drawing into the Urban Reserves that had been designated. Ms. McArthur talked about the stars on the chart that represented the legislative agenda. She noted that Metro Policy Advisor Committee (MPAC), for the first time ever, agreed to a regional legislative agenda, which included a two-year delay, some enabling legislation or work on how to make the urban and rural reserves as well as including some efforts on financing transportation. The Metro Council had been encouraging a regional infrastructure strategy. The region hadn't adopted that yet but the Council had been encouraging that to happen. This may evolve in the legislation session. If not, they wanted to make sure the work they do in the region builds toward 2009 and the thought was in 2009, having laid this groundwork, they could potentially look at more tools, more focus on developing centers and corridors and possibly an infrastructure financing piece. That would require a state law change. She also talked about possibly more work on urban and rural reserves. Councilor Hosticka talked about the legislative session. He said that we had to designate the urban reserves by the end of 2008 so that we can get some preliminary planning in the urban reserve if they were going out to 2009 or 2010. Council President Bragdon said he thought there were two boxes, which shaped other things, collaboration with partners. He was open on the question of 2008 or 2009 on the reserves. There had to be enough of a gap for the concept planning to take place. He suggested other things to think about were that there would be an additional legislative session and elections would occur to replace several of the councilors.

Councilor Newman commented that when they did have consensus, they adopt a resolution, which explained intentions. One of the big stumbling blocks to the two-year extension was mistrust. He thought a resolution would provide more certainty. Second, he talked about the two-year process. He asked Dick Benner, Senior Metro Attorney, if we get the two-year extension and so the UGR would be due in 2009, could they do it a year early and then have two years to do the first 50%? So the UGR would be available in December of 2008 and then make the first UGB decision in December 2010. He said if they had a UGR adopted, they would know how big the map would need to be. This would allow a full two years to have a process for concept planning of the areas that were likely to come into the boundary. Ideally there would be more urban reserves than there were lands required to bring into the boundary because of the UGR. It would make sense to have a UGR in December of 2008, designate urban and agricultural reserves all in one quarter then have a full two years. If they had urban reserves then local governments and the private sector were doing the concept planning to get their lands brought into the UGB so that they had a concept plan that met 2040 and a finance plan that was based in reality so it could actually be urbanized. Then the Council would make the UGB decision based on that. Even if they designated the reserves and we had a UGR in 2009 that only gave them a year for concept planning. If they could do a UGR in December they would have two years before they made the UGB decision in 2010.

Ms. McArthur asked Mr. Benner if there was any reason why they couldn't do this. Mr. Benner said you could do the UGR prior to the end of the cycle. This triggers accounting for 50%. You could take action on the first 50%. Ms. McArthur said the key word was adoption. What if you prepared the UGR based your work program on certain ideas of what it might look like and then officially adopt it once you had a game plan. The adoption triggers the one-year 50%. Mr. Benner said as long as you don't adopt it and hold on to the report and then adopt it once you have a work plan in place. Councilor Newman recapped. He said those two years were critical. Where he hoped to be was the Metro designated urban reserves and agricultural reserves so the region had some certainty about where they grow in 30 to 50 years, then once a UGR decision was made, those lands do concept plans and develop financial plans and they compete on the basis of quality and how they meet 2040. Councilor Liberty pointed out that if you were accommodating 700,000

people or 350,000 housing units, there were many different way to design this. You could put all of the housing units into the 7 regional centers; build 1-50 unit every block. A big chunk of that total could be put in the central city. He projected about 80 transit stops outside the centers so you could put half of your development by transit stops. These designs were very different but all complied with 2040. When you talk about implementing 2040, was it drawing on the regional centers or town centers or corridors? These entities each had different implications for transportation infrastructure. For Councilor Liberty, the first question was what was 2040? He hoped that they had a better idea of what 2040 really meant. Second, performance bases for urban growth boundary expansions criteria was very important and should tie back in not only to performance of new areas and performance of existing areas. He talked about rural reserves, farm and forest landscape. It implied some beginning level of conversation with neighboring cities. Under investment, if by 2011, we actually had the local capital improvement programs listed that could transform the landscape. Under the regional transportation plan, he wanted the partners to have a better understanding of what a regional system really was. He wanted an integrated system. Last, he hoped by the time they were at 2010, they had a regional housing choice plan which was tied to performance measures.

Councilor Harrington said she shared many of the concerns that other councilors had expressed. Her biggest concern at this point was that they were getting buy in from their jurisdictions and stakeholders. She didn't believe they were bringing enough people along with them. She was concerned about the amount of the work that had to be done by 2010 including not just at Metro but also throughout our region. She wanted to know about the public involvement piece. How they already plugged in the minimal requirements for public involvement? She was hopeful for the opportunity to adjust as they go. She urged as much collaboration as possible to create buy in for the plan. Councilor Liberty talked about helpful rule making to make Metro Council's job better and easier.

Councilor Hosticka said the way this looked to him was that there were two parallel but isolated tracks. Number one and then two, three, four and five. There was plenty of interaction between those two tracks. When you say the local jurisdictions recalibrate their capacity in 2007 and if they were not changed until 2010, his bet was that once they started talking about the reserves and the UGR, it will wake people up for a number of different reasons. His advice was that he started with the assumption that no jurisdiction in the area that he represented wanted more land. Maybe individual developers wanted more land but no jurisdictions were planning for more land. If the same thing happened this go around that happened last time, he felt it was going to build backpressure and suggest another recalibration.

Council President Bragdon said the issue was how do we intentionally wake them up and make sure that they were supportive of how they proceed. Ms. McArthur talked about the collaboration that was going on already. Councilor Park said one of the key issues was the performance-based issue. At some point they would have to make some decisions. Councilor Liberty said one of the things that struck him about this set of decisions was that UGB adjustment, a lot of attention, press coverage, awareness. There was no focus for that discussion. There was no plan for the inside. Councilor Newman said one of the reasons that it was difficult to get attention was that Metro had very little control. It was local governments who had to the leadership role. Councilor Liberty said this went back to Councilor Harrington's point. There were a few things where Metro, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and local governments were making decisions. The strategy for the 2040 was to bring these entities together and bring them along together. He felt most of the growth would be inside the UGB. He suggested that if they don't talk about it, it kept the dynamic on the edge.

Council President Bragdon said Council had talked about commissioning a study to assess the cost of growth on redevelopment vis-à-vis communities. He saw some limitations in pursuing this. He wanted the reaction from the whole group. He said if you were doing a capital improvement to the region which was dedicated to fulfilling the 2040 concept, what would that look like? This was not currently funded. The other part had to do with the Brownsfields Task Force, which was now being put together. He felt they had a good list of candidates.

Malu Wilkinson, Planning Department, said she was going to go into more specifics on the focus on investments category. They were relying on it to get to the point where the local partners would want to adjust their capacity expectation and focus more investments in centers and corridors, as well as employment and industrial areas that directly impact the performance based UGB. Council had pointed out that it was an ongoing process that will continue to happen over time. They would be relying on their partners. For centers and corridors, she wanted to highlight key work tasks. They would be publishing the toolkit in late spring. They would be coming to Council as they were developing the toolkit. This information would provide technical assistance to jurisdictions in the region. They would be completing a conditions assessment of centers this spring so that they have a good understanding of what centers needs were so that Metro could help local jurisdictions achieve their centers strategies and so that Metro could see more investment inside the UGB in the centers. To further that, they would be initiating solution teams in a couple of centers. The conditions assessment will help Council decide where they focus their efforts. Another piece was continuing to increase aspirations through the continuation of Get Centered. There had also been talk of another tour to Vancouver BC and interregional tours to share with the jurisdictions what was happening in other parts of the region. For corridors, they were working on better understanding what the needs of different corridors were, what the zoning in different corridors was and what they could do to help different corridors achieve more in terms of capacity.

Ms. Wilkinson then talked about housing. They would continue to provide technical assistance to local governments. The work had started in Washington County. There would also be working to identify, obtain and implement a revenue source to form a regional housing choice trust fund. They would plan to form a Housing Choice Advisory Committee to advise and assist Metro to implement the recommendations of the Housing Choice Task Force. They would be working with the Regional Housing Inventory Team to develop a housing database. This could help them better understand the extent of the need and help local governments understand what they had. Another key thing that they would be doing related to housing was to continue the demographic trend analysis that they had heard about having to do with age related housing and impact on how that affected their need for land. This also might have implications for the performance based UGB. Councilor Liberty commented on the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program, which was to help support the Centers strategy. It was not a program in itself. She said in terms of the Brownsfield, Council would be hearing more about this as they went along. The Brownsfield Task Force would be established this year. They also submitted another grant to assist in this work. They would have Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) inventory completed as well which included all of the Brownsfield sites. Metro was not duplicating efforts. For employment and industrial lands, they would be assessing existing conditions in the region. They were going to look at where non-retail jobs have located over the last five to ten years. They were going to be inventorying and categorizing industrial lands, updating the inventories they had done in the past. They were going to look at how current and future trends impact our land needs. They were trying to get a better understanding of the type of industry that happens in buildings, industrial uses can happen in different types of buildings than has happened in the past. They will

also be looking to identify strategies to better utilize the land inside the UGB working with stakeholders and partners. They will be working to develop criteria for identifying and bringing online new land. This related to the performance based UGB.

Ms. Wilkinson said over the past several months, they had been learning more about infrastructure with their partners in the region. Infrastructure had been identified as one of the key barriers to implementing 2040 as well as accommodating the growth that was anticipated. They had also had regional agreement that it was important to pursue a regional infrastructure strategy. They had been focusing on figuring out how to better understand what the comparative costs of infrastructure were in different locations. They had been scoping out and refining a study to do this. As they had been doing this, they had some questions about the information they would be able to get out of that study and would it best answer the questions that the Council had and that they had been hearing from the region. As they had refined what they think the work would be, they hoped to better focus our resources to help with this. They wanted advice from the Council about this issue. They thought that they should refocus their resources on identifying what the regional infrastructure needs were to support 2040 and assess what the gap was between those needs and what was funded locally. Then they would explore funding or financing options. They proposed to look at the issue, the comparative cost issue, but would not conduct original research or take a case study approach but look at the national studies that have happened and look at the data they had in house. They would use this information as a way of understanding the different cost of infrastructure for different types of growth patterns. Councilors asked questions about this plan. Council President Bragdon said he saw this plan would help people wake up to what could be done as well as what it would cost. Councilor Liberty said there was no agreement on what infrastructure was. Councilor Hosticka suggested that they needed some comparative analysis. Council President Bragdon said the question was, was the national existing literature sufficient? Staff was saying that they felt it was sufficient rather than doing a lot of case studies, which you had to do a lot of to be meaningful. Staff felt the body of literature that already existed was sufficient. Councilor Hosticka said they don't have any basis on which to assess the statement such as the cost of replacing old pipes. It seemed to him that it would be helpful to have some sort of capacity to assess those statements.

Mr. Jordan said Councilor Hosticka was touching on the very issue that troubled staff. \$75,000 would buy a considerable amount of capacity but they couldn't do enough to counteract the statements because every center and corridor were in a different state of readiness from even the most fundamental infrastructure perspective let alone the list of thirty that Councilor Liberty spoke about. He said he thought they were going to have to do comprehensive infrastructure analysis not case study scenario. If you don't do comprehensive infrastructure analysis at some level, even if it was getting everyone facilities plan and comparing it to their comprehensive plan or aspiration comprehensive plan for centers and do a gap analysis, you wouldn't be able to argue that because everyone will have a gap up. It might be more bang for the buck to take the \$75,000 and combine it with some other money to do a more comprehensive infrastructure analysis. Councilor Liberty said there were some things Metro was planning to do and there were some things that they could ask their local partners to do, part of that was what your plan for infrastructure centers and corridors was. The other thing they could ask their partners was about the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Jordan said all of the plans were currently in compliance with 2040 to this point. They had adopted targets for populations as well centers land use planning for regional or town centers. Understanding that basis, they could compare their public facility plan to their comprehensive plan. Have they even made the appropriate level of planning to accommodate the current targets? His gut was that they vary dramatically across the region as to how capable they were of meeting the current targets let alone the next level they wanted to get

to. This was the base level analysis. They were talking about inventorying what was out there and seeing how capable local governments were right now. If they were to choose one of Robert's scenarios, let's accommodate everything in the boundary, whatever choice you pick was this 2040 compliant, how capable were they of making this happen from an infrastructure perspective? This was the analysis they wanted to use.

Councilor Harrington said she wanted to make sure she was in the same place as where staff was. Council President Bragdon said they hadn't actually started on the work plan that had been talked about in November. Councilor Harrington asked which questions needed to be answered from the perspective of the Council. Ms. McArthur said the budget that was approved last year at this time allowed for \$75,000 to take care of this work. At that time, they didn't envision the idea of a regional construction plan. Throughout the year through the mayors and chairs forums, interest was generated. They were suggesting that the \$75,000 could be better spent. Councilor Harrington wondered whose time this project would be taken out of. Councilor Newman provided some history about the budget allocation. They wanted to look at what was out there nationally. You should use the money to help you tell stories about choices. Council President Bragdon said the national information was probably sufficient if it was put in a local context. On the infrastructure issue, it was a matter of asking, what were the types of investments that can really build 2040. He would guess there was a huge disparity. He provided some examples such as in Gresham. He wanted to do some thinking about what ought to be a plan that was designed to build and promote 2040. Mr. Jordan said he thought there were three different lines of discussion, first, there needed to be a level of assessment regionally about where we were. We currently don't know. He couldn't tell them how well proposed or well funded any one community public facility plan was and how comprehensive it was. They just didn't know. For Council to be regionally strategic about what they were going to do, they needed to understand these things. There was a level of inventory and understanding that needed to occur. He said that was what they were talking about as a base level of understanding. Second, there was an engagement issue. How were they going to engage individuals more broadly in this discussion? Third, there was a question about what was 2040? What public investments would be necessary to get there? What was being proposed was some base level inventorying and study to understand where we were. That would be done in parallel time, assuming over the next period of time, somewhere on the chart, the other issues such as how do we engage, and toward what end? These were the things that had to be woven together. They need to spend some money to aggregate a base level of where we were right now.

Councilor Harrington said some of the items were informational deliverables and others seemed to be activities that may have deliverables associated with them. It was hard for her to draw a string between the various things in each one of the categories. Council President Bragdon asked if there was a staff work plan. Ms. McArthur said there was. Councilor Harrington asked if there were certain points where they would pull certain items together and come up with some particular Council action. Ms. Wilkinson said they were trying to illustrate all of the things that they were doing which can fall into technical assistance, inventory assessment, developing tools and understanding trends that all lead into how local jurisdictions recalibrate their capacity expectations. In terms of when it came to Council, she couldn't say when that was. They could come back on each one of these topics. Ms. McArthur said she needed guidance. They had liaisons groups that had been established by the Council President for each one of these topic groups. They flesh out the specific work program issues with Council President Bragdon and Councilor Liberty for the investment piece. Councilor Hosticka was the lead on the performance based UGB. She provided other lead and liaison links to the program. They get direction from the whole Council at the work session and then go through the detail work with those liaisons. Part of

the question was, when did they elevate questions to the broader Council? Council President Bragdon said that was part of what they did at the Greatest Place work sessions with the full Council. Councilor Liberty made further suggestions about revisions in the timeline and decision making points. Councilor Park added his comments. Ms. McArthur refocused the conversation back to infrastructure.

Council President Bragdon suggested talking about the Shape of the Region. Councilor Hosticka reported on where they were with performance based growth management. He talked about what they would do between now and the end of the year. They would talk about what it was, what was being measured. They would have to work with the Councilors individually or as a group to define what criteria should be used to measure performance and how we would use those criteria in making decisions. They had a year's worth of groundwork to define what it was. Then, they had another year of trying it out. They had agreed that was what Council wanted to do. Some examples included development in corridors and centers. Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, said another example would be employment land. Councilor Hosticka said this all fed into the UGR to define what need was. The information should provide guidance on whether or not the UGB needed to be expanded. How we perform would be the main thing that informed that question. Councilor Liberty said it was not just performance base growth management. It also had to do with the nature of expansion. Another question would be what kind of performance they would get out of reserves. Councilor Hosticka reminded that this was only the first step in the process. The question was how does that iterative process work so they could define what it was that they were using to make a decision? They were then trying to evaluate what the effects of those decisions were as well when they face the next round of decisions.

Councilor Park reported on Neighboring Cities and that they were now coming to the realization that there was a push and pull effect on their communities as well as on our region. Councilors asked clarifying questions about the neighboring cities meetings. Mr. Jordan said the conversations vary dependent upon the city. In Newberg, the conversation was an incredibly energetic discussion. There was a high level of desire to engage from cities of Newberg and McMinnville. Everyone acknowledged the desire to continue to talk and the need to engage and the fact that we were related. Mayors Thompson from Canby and Malone from Sandy had agreed to be the leadership group who would continue neighbor jurisdiction meetings. Councilor Hosticka asked what they hoped to get out of these conversations. Council President Bragdon said it was good to have relationship building. Mr. Jordan added if we chose to accomplish rural reserves, some of these reserves would be in the middle of some of those communities. If you want to get to the policy end, a lot of discussion would have to occur. With the neighboring cities of size, we ought to be as concerned about them as a center as we were about centers inside the boundary. The market acted the same way. Councilor Hosticka said the flip side of that was, can those communities retain any identity at all? Councilor Park said it seemed that legislative action would be required.

Councilor Newman talked about the Shape of the Region, the agriculture inventory, the natural features work and the great communities work. He talked about getting groups together which included local governments, service districts, development industry, agricultural community, neighboring city leaders to talk about the research that had already been done. The idea was to see if these groups agreed with some of the findings. Would they have strong feelings that were different from the findings? Would they demonstrate or have more conversation about the tradeoffs as they moved forward to designate urban and rural reserves. This was also an opportunity for stakeholders to engage with each other. He didn't want this to be confused with a broader process of community engagement. This was to initiate discussions with smaller groups

so Metro could be informed about how others felt about what Metro had developed thus far. They sought buy in. At this point, they would then check in or revise the process further. He then spoke to next steps. Councilor Newman said what he was looking for today was acknowledgment that this was a very complex conversation. He asked Council if they agreed that this made sense for a first step and then in May have a better sense of how to go forward with all of the interested parties to talk about the future of this region and where were they going to grow and where were they not going to grow. Then they would develop a collaborative process to get them to a point that in December 2008 Metro could make a decision on urban and rural reserves that have ownership over it from all of the different parties. Councilor Harrington asked clarifying questions about this part of the timeline and appreciated the approach that Councilor Newman was taking. Ms. McArthur responded to her questions. Councilor Hosticka commented that a number of cities had formal processes that were getting underway such as Wilsonville and Tualatin. He asked what point did they mesh up or link with the local processes that were going on. He thought originally that they were going to do that in caucus meetings. He talked about the need for a broader engagement. Councilor Hosticka asked if he should meet with the jurisdictions individually. Councilor Harrington said Forest Grove and Cornelius had already contacted her about having a conversation.

Councilor Newman said C-4 wanted to initiate its own process. They wanted to engage people to ultimately propose something to the Metro Council. He felt this was great as long as their proposal was consistent with 2040. He urged that the conversation could not be just about the edge. It had to be about neighboring cities, centers, and corridors. It also had to be about where you grow. He said he didn't want to discourage those conversations, he wanted to engage them. Councilor Hosticka said he thought that was what these caucuses were intended to do. You don't want to set up two different tracks that don't meet well. Mr. Jordan said there was need to coordinate with any local process. They did have an idea about framework, what their expectation was of the caucus and how it got populated. Councilor Harrington said they were planning to have a symposium as well as focus groups to get feedback on the body of research. In addition, the local communities were interested in engaging but we needed to repeat that educational step so they had a norm covered. Then they also needed to have a subsequent step of how they participate. Councilor Liberty talked about symposium as a kick off event. They needed to be looking at the edge as well as inside. Mr. Jordan said they were trying to provide a depth of perception, that there would be representation of non-edge as well as edge interests. He concurred with Councilor Liberty that the kick off event was rolling out the agricultural urban study. Councilors asked clarifying questions about the goals of the symposium and the need for buy in from all of those who participated.

Ms. Deffebach said they entered into this study collaboratively with the three counties. They had already established a partnership with the three counties. The other partners were also planning other events. They had tried to coordinate their work. Mr. Jordan explained the reason for the caucus groups. He also spoke of defining the governance for this process and the struggle they were having with this issue. Councilor Newman suggested communicating our hope for collaborative relationships with out regional partners. He suggested asking the local partners how the governance piece should be set up.

Council President Bragdon summarized that they had started working on a time table and he felt Council had agreement that by March 2007, they would like to have this time table adoptable by resolution. In the discussion of the timetable, Council wanted to hear some options as to whether some of the boxes needed to be moved. He felt staff should think about this and come back to Council. They had also done a lot of cross-fertilization on the issues. There was also a midcourse

correction on the investing piece and infrastructure. There was a big to do list. First, refinement on the timetable to include finer detail on how it interfaced with other items on the timetable. Second, they needed to discuss the engagement part of this initiative. He felt this was a critical discussion. Related to this was the engagement with other local efforts. He also felt the governance piece needed more discussion. Councilor Park talked about the requested extension and timeline. Councilor Hosticka said he had talked with committee members and they were ready to move on this as soon as possible. Ms. McArthur said the question the legislature was asking was how this would work at Metro. She felt imbedding the process and timeline in a resolution was helpful to package in order to share with the legislature. Ms. McArthur said they would also come back in February 2007 to talk about the regional infrastructure plan in more detail.

Ms. McArthur introduced the Symposium. Council President Bragdon talked about the agenda for the Symposium. He asked what Council needed to know that they didn't already know? Sherry Oeser, Planning Department, said they had 234 registered for the event. She talked about the logistics of the Symposium. Councilor Newman expressed concern about the framing at the beginning of the Symposium as well as the next steps proposals. He suggested talking about what this meeting was and what it was not. Councilor Hosticka talked about his opening comments having to do with the AgUrban Study. He noted elements of the study. He suggested talking about the six elements to put the study in context. He suggested sharing what work had already been done and the purpose of the meeting which was to report to people about the work that had been done to date. Councilor Newman suggested acknowledging that this was not the interactive process. Tim O'Brien, Planning Department, said Lane Shatterly, Land Conservation and Development Commission, would be introducing the results of the studies. Ms. McArthur said she would be talking about the 6 elements in detail in her presentation. Councilor Newman suggested alluding to the focus groups. Councilor Hosticka noted that the ground rules would be set by Mr. Shatterly. Councilors continued to talk about the logistics of the Symposium. Councilor Harrington added that those who were attending wanted to be informed and to share their expectations.

ADJOURN

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

Prepared by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Billington', written in a cursive style.

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
JANUARY 17, 2007**

Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1/17/07	Agenda: Metro Council work session meeting, January 17, 2007	011707c-01
undated	TO: Metro Council FROM: Robin McArthur RE: Draft "Road Map" for Regional Choices, 2007-2010	011707c -02
1/17/07	TO: Metro Council FROM: Robin McArthur RE: Regional Infrastructure Analysis Discussion	011707c -03
1/16/07	TO: Metro Council FROM: Robin McArthur RE: New Look Focus Groups Event Brief	011707c -04
1/7/07	TO: Metro Council FROM: Robin McArthur RE: New Look Shape of the Region Event Brief	011707c -05