

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 15, 2001

Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Rex Burkholder, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Rod Monroe, Carl Hosticka

Councilors Absent: None

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** convened the regular council meeting at 2:04 p.m.

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

### 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

**Councilor Burkholder** introduced Dale MacHaffie, Metro Central Community Enhancement Grant Committee, and Bruce Penney, Skyline Parent Teacher Association (PTA). Councilor Burkholder reviewed the goals of the Enhancement Committee and the grant making process. His comments are included in the meeting record.

**Mr. Penney** said Metro's \$20,000 grant provided the impetus for rebuilding the Skyline Elementary School playground and creating a public park. He thanked the council for the grant and presented a plaque in appreciation.

**Councilor Burkholder** said the Skyline Elementary School playground was an eloquent statement of what the Metro Community Enhancement grants could accomplish.

**Councilor Atherton** said he was delighted to hear Mr. Penney's story. He recounted a similar situation at his children's school in Lake Oswego. The work done at Skyline Elementary, and the community spirit it created, would live on for many years.

**Mr. MacHaffie** reviewed the twenty-one grant requests that were wholly or partially funded by the Metro Central Community Enhancement Grant Committee. A copy of his report is included in the meeting record.

**Councilor Burkholder** thanked the Metro Central Community Enhancement Grant Committee for its work.

### 3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

**Mike Burton, Executive Officer**, said yesterday he met with Judge Laura Pryor, Gilliam County Court, and Mike Hahn, CEO, Churchill Capital, the parent company Specialty Transportation Services, Inc. (STS), and Gary Goldberg, STS President. Mr. Hahn reaffirmed Churchill Capital's commitment to continuing the STS Corporation. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) inspection showed STS trucks had a better failure rate than the national and Oregon averages. STS was in the process of catching up its payments with all its vendors, and currently had a positive cash flow. STS did not disclaim the possibility that it could file Chapter 11 bankruptcy if it is unable to work out an agreement

with its vendors, but it was very unlikely, according to Mr. Hahn. Audits should be available by the end of March. Executive Officer Burton said he felt encouraged by Mr. Hahn's remarks, although Metro would need to remain vigilant. He said he would give the council transcripts of the meeting, in which Mr. Hahn stated that *The Oregonian's* stories were misleading, incomplete and included outright false statements. He would ask the council prior to March 22, for its advice on whether to proceed with the default.

**Councilor Monroe** noted the comment that Churchill wanted to shed itself of its unprofitable enterprises. However, the records showed that for the last year, this enterprise had been unprofitable. Did that make him concerned?

**Executive Officer Burton** said this was part of the confusion caused by *The Oregonian's* articles. STS had experienced problems, but not with this particular contract. Currently the company was too spread out. By shedding a lot of its overhead, the company would move to a profitable point. To date, STS had met its commitment to move the region's garbage, and was still charging Metro the lowest rates in the area.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** thanked Executive Officer Burton for the update.

**Executive Officer Burton** commented on Ordinance No. 01-888B. He said he appreciated the committee's work and felt the changes were on mark and may be overdue. He urged the council to pass the ordinance.

#### 4. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

**Alexis Dow, Metro Auditor, and Joe Gibbons, Senior Auditor,** presented the audit report on Metro's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Program. A copy of the report and the presentation materials contain information presented by Mr. Gibbons and are included in the meeting record.

**Councilor Atherton** said the purpose of the TOD program was to jumpstart an economically and socially good idea. He asked if the report used increased assessed valuation as a performance measure.

**Mr. Gibbons** said no, he was limited in the report to a few vital performance measures. He would need to look at the relative importance of tracking increased assessed valuation, based on the stated mission goals and objectives.

**Councilor Burkholder** said the TOD program made a similar presentation that morning to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). He asked how the audit differed from the program's self-evaluation. What was the added value of an audit?

**Mr. Gibbons** said this audit developed a measurement system to be used and recognized as a management tool. He had worked closely with TOD program staff over the past six months, so it was not surprising that their presentations were similar. His audit focused on how to measure and eventually demonstrate the worth of the program.

**Councilor Burkholder** asked about the source of funding for the audit.

**Mr. Gibbons** said the audit was funded through the Auditor's department budget.

**Councilor Burkholder** asked if Mr. Gibbons had an estimate of the audit's cost.

**Ms. Dow** said no, she did not. It was not the practice within Metro, or within her office, to cost-out the results of their work. In terms of how the audit differed from the staff report, she noted that the role of the Auditor's Office was to provide independence and verification, and to assure the public that departments were not self reporting only the positives and glossing over the negatives. The objective of the audit was to establish a measurement system that could gauge how much service was derived from what level of effort.

**Councilor Burkholder** said the council was constantly asked to justify the costs of its support services, and he was concerned about duplication of activities and the resulting costs.

**Ms. Dow** said although a lot of the background work was duplicative, it did not require a lot of staff time. The audit report and the staff report reached different audiences, which was valuable.

**Mr. Gibbons** said the TOD program had clearly defined its mission, but had not fully defined its linkages and the long-term goals, short-term objectives and specific measures, for now and for the future. He worked closely with the department to do that. The TOD staff was trustworthy, but the public may not believe department reports to be anything more than self-congratulation. The Auditor's Office brought independence to the process and was not beholding to the department staff. The Auditor's Office worked with the program staff and reported to the public on the status of the performance measures and how they could be enhanced.

**Councilor Monroe** thanked the auditor for the report, which verified the manager's report at JPACT. He noted the timeliness of the report. The TOD program accessed a few scarce federal discretionary dollars, and used them to push the envelope and to allow the kind of development Metro envisioned along light rail and other transit lines. Without the TOD program, many of these projects would simply not be economically viable at this time. Therefore, other less desirable, less dense, less multi-use multi-modal developments would take place. Once those kinds of developments took place, it was impossible to replace them a few years later. In the next few months, Metro and JPACT would decide whether to continue the TOD program. The similarity of the two reports validated it.

**Councilor Park** asked for clarification on the measurement of service versus effort. Was the goal to measure the service and the effort put forth by Metro staff, or how it was actually working on the ground with the developer?

**Ms. Dow** said the Auditor's Office looked at how much effort and how many resources were used by Metro to achieve a goal, and whether or not the goal was achieved.

**Councilor Park** asked if outside sources of information were incorporated into the report.

**Ms. Dow** said the Auditor's Office worked hand in hand with the Transportation Department, and received a lot of information from them, but they verified the information using other sources.

**Mr. Gibbons** said a lot of the internal modeling and assumptions used by the TOD managers to project certain accomplishments were not audited or evaluated. However, they did discuss methodologies and approaches, where the program was going, and how it measured its success, with over a dozen stakeholders, both in the region and elsewhere.

**Councilor Park** referred to the earlier question about tax base as a possible performance measure. At JPACT that morning, they discussed how to protect the public's investment in light rail, in terms of what

development occurred in the area. It was mentioned that by going through the TOD program, one development that would have been worth about \$2 million was instead worth roughly \$6 million. In terms of tax base, this resulted in a difference of about \$40,000 a year in tax base dollars for the local jurisdiction, and another \$10,000 to \$20,000 for the school district. Was this discussed or considered in the report, when considering service versus effort?

**Mr. Gibbons** said no, but it was an interesting concept. The audit was not just geared to the service and efforts, but more importantly, to the accomplishments and the measurement of those accomplishments.

**Councilor Park** said in his opinion, Metro should measure the generation of revenue that results from public investment.

**Ms. Dow** said the audit focused on transit, based on the program's current mission statement. Metro or a participating local government may decide that it would be valuable to measure increased property valuation.

**Councilor Park** said he thought increased property valuation should be a performance measure, based upon long-term sustainability.

**Mr. Gibbons** said that particular item did not tie with the program mission, goal and objectives, as currently defined. This was a policy question, and maybe should be discussed with the TOD managers.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said that would be the objective of tax increment financing.

**Councilor McLain** thanked the auditors for the report. She has questioned the value and applicability of past audit reports; however, this report supported the superb value of the TOD program, its staff, and its partners.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** asked about the chart of cost per induced rider (Appendix D of the report). Did the audit look into the methodology behind the forecast? Investment in light rail may only serve people who already ride transit, whereas a development that brings 300 people to a particular street corner is likely to induce more ridership. Therefore, it might be valid to compare different development alternatives on a particular street corner, as opposed to comparing development of a street corner to building a transit line, which were different types of activities.

**Ms. Dow** said that was correct. The purpose of the chart was to determine the success of one of the goals: to induce ridership. The chart simply compared the different ways of inducing ridership, rather than evaluating the benefits of spending that dollar.

**Mr. Gibbons** said the chart's purpose was to demonstrate the relative bang-for-the-buck provided by TOD.

**Councilor Atherton** said he was wrestling with the question of how to evaluate the TOD program, and was very interested in the audit report. He wanted to see some measurable, assessed valuation. Values went up when an area was used and enjoyed by people.

**Ms. Dow** suggested that a high level of induced ridership implied that a developed property had the requisite housing and retail amenities to attract people to live in the area. While it was not defined in terms of property values, it was still defined in terms of whether the project was a success.

**Councilor Atherton** asked if we lived for transit or did transit live for us?

**Ms. Dow** said that was a policy question.

**Councilor Atherton** said he was familiar with the area around 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and East Burnside. On sixteen acres, 200 feet from a light rail stop, instead of building a transit-oriented village; the site was developed into a massive parking lot with big box retail. Maybe if the TOD program had been in effect then, some of the people's vision could have been changed with just a little incentive.

**Mr. Gibbons** agreed. He added that the TOD program managers had staked out sites with the same potential that the 122<sup>nd</sup> and East Burnside had a few years ago. He noted Hillsboro Central as an example.

## 5. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** reviewed the MPAC meeting on March 14. The meeting focused on the Parks Subcommittee report, which MPAC took under advisement. MPAC also discussed the industrial and jobs portion of land use planning and made suggestions to Andy Cotugno, Planning Director. MPAC canceled its meetings on March 28, and April 11. Instead, MPAC would meet on April 4.

## 6. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

**Dan Cooper, General Counsel**, updated the council on House Bill (HB) 2733, requiring mandatory notice to property owners any time Metro takes action. The committee established a working group; Mr. Cooper, Jeff Stone, Chief of Staff, and Doug Riggs, Metro Lobbyist, attended the first meeting. They left with the following understanding: 1) Metro will send its own notices rather than reimburse cities and counties, 2) Metro only needs to send out notice prior to a public hearing, rather than before the hearing and after adoption, 3) notice will only be sent when Metro is adopting functional plan requirements that require zone changes or restrictions on a property's uses. This was similar to Metro's current policy, particularly with regard to the present Goal 5 work.

**Mr. Cooper** said a hearing was scheduled for next Monday on HB 2979, which would eliminate Metro's charter authority over any matter of metropolitan concern, and reduce it to the power to coordinate only. Mr. Cooper recommended that Metro staff testify at the hearing to explain Metro's Goal 5 program, its status, Metro's work with local governments to develop a vision statement and the connection between Metro's Goal 5 work and federal 4(d) regulations. Most importantly, HB 2979 was an attempt to prejudge Metro's Goal 5 program prior to the public hearings process, and assume that it had to be limited legislatively.

**Councilor McLain** recommended that staff relate Metro's Goal 5 work to state law in its testimony. She added that arbitrarily defining only major bodies of water as regionally significant ignored the scientific process, which Metro had painstakingly followed. She noted the upland areas and their relationship to the other parts of the water system. She said she saw this as the most important thing the counsel office had talked about during this session. She asked his strategy in working with the Executive Officer and the Chief of Staff.

**Mr. Cooper** responded that was his question. He recommended being as proactive as possible on this bill because it was the first major environmental issue Metro was connected with to be heard in a committee. He said they should be prepared with councilors and the Executive Officer to testify and explain every step Metro has taken and how much work it has been. He said they should relate to the committee that

legislative interference in the middle of the process would be viewed as very unfriendly and inappropriate.

**Councilor Hosticka** asked if there was any indication of what other local governments' thought of the bill and whether they were willing to go talk about it.

**Mr. Cooper** said Mr. Chandler had already had inquiries from Multnomah County, Washington County, 1000 Friends and the Audubon Society. Mr. Cooper suspected there was a lot of support that could be rallied for the position if they made the effort to get the word out.

**Councilor Hosticka** felt it would be helpful if local jurisdictions weighed in unless they were going to testify in favor of the bill.

**Mr. Cooper** said that was why he referred to the vision statement which MPAC had an almost unanimous vote on last summer that reconciled a lot of previous differences with local governments.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said that vision statement was technically a MPAC document that was accepted by the Council so it could be characterized as the view of local government.

**Councilor Park** said the Growth Committee had asked MPAC last year if they wanted to not have Metro do the Goal 5 work on their behalf as required by the state. Their response was they wanted Metro to go forward with the work.

**Councilor Hosticka** said it would be helpful to have MPAC members at the legislature to testify.

**Councilor McLain** suggested asking Craig Dye or Kendra Smith to testify from Washington County.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said these technical questions should be explored over the next couple of days. He said if they were going to take a position at the hearing, they needed some validation on behalf of the council.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved that the Council be proactive in defending the interests of the region per this legislation as it applied to natural resource work. .

**Seconded:** **Councilor Monroe** seconded the motion.

**Councilor McLain** said it was important for Metro to have its partners testify in Salem to validate the work that Metro had done and that they had been working closely together.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain, and the motion passed.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said he would follow-up with Mr. Cooper and Mr. Stone and the lobbyist to get a strategy together. He said he would keep in close touch with the council on the matter.

**Mr. Cooper** continued that the Natural Resources committee was tentatively scheduling some hearings on a series of bills related to the urban growth boundary sometime in the last week of March. He added that several of those bills have been introduced by the Homebuilders. He said there was still time to decide what position to take on those bills.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said he had had some correspondence on HB 3540, sponsored by Senator Deckert, which would deprive millions of zoo visitors from throughout the state of the ability to park at the zoo. He said he had expressed his personal view that it would not be a good thing.

**Councilor Burkholder** asked about HB 2140 and HB 3400.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said HB 3400 would enable the creation of a regional housing advisory board, consisting of all the jurisdictions in the Metro region. It would enable them, with three-fourths or two-thirds approval of each of the jurisdictions to raise revenues to provide affordable housing. He said the mayors of Beaverton and Gresham as well as former commissioner Linn had been in Salem lobbying on behalf of the bills. He added that Commissioner Sten had asked if Metro should be participating. Presiding Officer Bragdon said he had left a message with Mayor Drake to find out if they wanted Metro there.

**Mr. Cooper** said Metro had been formally invited by Representative Max Williams to testify in front of his committee on Measure 7. He said it was important to have a formal position on the bill if they testified. He said he would put something on paper.

**Councilor Burkholder** said bills that interested him were HB 2140, the Governor's bill to "dedicate" 2¢ of the gas tax for modernization and another, setting up a cultural trust fund account. He said several councilors probably had bills they would like the council to support and take a position on. He felt they needed a process whereby they could discuss them at the same time.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said the current process was that staff distributed a list of bills weekly for the councilors to flag items of personal concern. Those items go back to Mr. Stone or Mr. Cooper for a reading on each particular bill so the lobbyist does not go to hearings unnecessarily. As things become active, they are brought to council for their position. If things happen between meetings, he and the Deputy Presiding Officer poll members individually, as a quick response team. He proposed they continue with the current process.

**Mr. Cooper** said Mr. Stone and he had recently reviewed the bill list and had come up with recommendations. He said there were some environmental or affordable housing bills unrelated to the regional bill that may be appropriate for the council to take a position on. There were also a couple that they recommended opposing. Some they would continue to monitor.

**Councilor McLain** agreed with the basic process. She said Councilor Burkholder's question about getting individual councilors' concerns over bills or resolutions to the council for their feelings was a good one. She suggested having a separate sheet of paper in Mr. Cooper's office listing bills that individual councilors were concerned about but were not on Mr. Cooper's list.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** suggested working with the Chief of Staff with those questions.

**Mr. Cooper** said he would appreciate any information the councilor had of a specific bill because of the many bills popping up at this busy time. He said they would put it into the system and have it analyzed and the council can add it to the list or not.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said they would keep it as a standing item on their weekly agenda.

**Councilor Park** added they should keep an eye on the principles to make it easier for Mr. Cooper and the lobbyist to keep on top of their concerns by the actual principle rather than a bill number. In our

discussions, if a certain set of concepts were adopted, they could give us a list of bills directly related to that.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** suggested the councilors look over the list and check with Mr. Cooper and Mr. Stone. He said they would have a good discussion of those items at the next meeting.

## 7. CONSENT AGENDA

7.1 Consideration of minutes of the March 1, 2001 Regular Council Meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the March 1, 2001, Regular Council meeting.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Park** seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain, and the motion passed.

## 8. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

8.1 **Ordinance No. 01-891**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget for Fiscal Year 2001-02, Making Appropriations, and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes, and Declaring an Emergency

**Councilor McLain** reviewed the budget process. She said they were now in the second part of the review of the yearly budget. The next meeting will be Tuesday, March 20<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 PM.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing. No one appeared to speak with regard to Ordinance No. 01-891. Presiding Officer Bragdon closed the public hearing. He declared that consideration of the ordinance would be continued.

8.2 **Ordinance No. 01-888B**, For the Purpose of Amending Provisions of Metro Code Chapter 6.01 Relating to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission Regarding Powers, Budgets and Terms of Members.

**Motion:** **Councilor Burkholder** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 01-888B

**Seconded:** **Councilor Park** seconded the motion.

**Councilor Burkholder** summarized the ordinance. (See details in the agenda packet included with the permanent record of this meeting.)

**Councilor Atherton** noted an addition on page 8 of 9 of the ordinance, "all Metro elected officials shall received notice of all meetings in the same form, manner and substance given to all commission members". He asked if that included agendas and background materials.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** and **Councilor Burkholder** said that was correct.

**Councilor McLain** said had been addressed at the Regional Facilities Committee meeting. It was important that the Council receive these notices so they had the information to do their jobs.



**Councilor Park** recalled a discussion that this was to relieve the MERC Commission from an onerous notification process that was expensive and cumbersome, but at the same time, the council needed to stay in the loop. His other issue was that in the appointment process there was a possibility this was inconsistent with work done on the visitors development initiative and the Oregon Convention Center Advisory Committee, insuring that the east Multnomah County cities were represented. He said it was important to his district because of the uniqueness of the taxing mechanism. He stated that it would be the intent of the council to ensure that area would be represented by any of the various methods within the ordinance. He supported the resolution.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** explained the history of the ordinance.

**Councilor Burkholder** supported Councilor Park's intent. He urged adoption of the ordinance.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing. No one appeared to speak with regard to Ordinance No. 01-888B. Presiding Officer Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed.

8.3 **Ordinance No. 01-895**, For the Purpose of Establishing Criteria for Metro Council District Reapportionment and Declaring an Emergency.

**Motion:** **Councilor Monroe** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 01-895.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Burkholder** seconded the motion.

**Councilor Monroe** reviewed the staff report. (See details included in the agenda packet with the permanent record of this meeting.)

**Councilor Park** asked for clarification on section 1(d), developing the reapportionment plan. He asked if the list was prioritized.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said it was not.

**Councilors Monroe** said these were guidelines in no particular order.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing. No one appeared to speak with regard to Ordinance No. 01-895. Presiding Officer Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Vote: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed.

## 9. RESOLUTIONS

9.1 **Resolution No. 01-3037**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Executive Officer to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County for Preliminary Engineering on the Wilsonville Beaverton Commuter Rail Project.

**Motion:** **Councilor Hosticka** moved to adopt Resolution No. 01-3037.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Monroe** seconded the motion.

**Councilor Hosticka** said this agreement gave Metro the ability to move forward on the commuter rail project, which was a high priority for the region. He said Washington County was doing most of the work, however Metro was the receiving entity for federal money for the project so it was a joint effort with the cities and Metro. He urged approval.

**Councilor Burkholder** noted there was no reference included for providing access to people on bicycles, for providing parking, for providing safe crossings for bicycles, or for having provisions for carrying bicycles on the transit. He asked if they could put some emphasis into the IGA to include that as well as the other modes it accommodates.

**Ross Roberts**, High Capacity Transit Coordinator, responded that the attached work program was a fairly general preliminary scope of work. He said they could work with the county to include Councilor Burkholder's elements. He said station design would generally include station furniture and automotive parking and landscape as well as bicycle facilities. He suspected that it was an oversight but he would work to get it included.

**Councilor Burkholder** asked Mr. Roberts to report back to him.

**Councilor Atherton** noted there was a potential for adding a bike trail along the line. He asked if it could also be added to the IGA.

**Richard Brandman** responded that Washington County was leading the project. He said their grant was for the purpose of constructing a commuter rail line and, to his knowledge, they had not done any work on trying to integrate a trail into the design. He suggested that would be a discussion to have with Washington County.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** added that the jurisdictions in that area were putting some attention into the Fanno Creek Trail which was basically the same corridor and far more attractive as a natural route.

**Councilor Atherton** said he had ridden the line to see the lay of the land and it looked good to him. He said he would like to pursue the idea.

**Councilor Hosticka** said he had assumed, as the work moved forward, that there would be an opportunity to have public input about what ought to be in the design.

**Mr. Brandman** said now would be the time to have that discussion. He said Washington County had been waiting for the money for quite some time and they were anxious to proceed. He said the issue could be raised with them and Councilor Atherton could be involved.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said the issue that needed to be raised was Councilor Hosticka's issue, which was the process for getting citizen input and then getting back to the Councilor Atherton with the information so he and other interested parties could make their views known to the county.

**Mr. Brandman** said the county has had an extensive citizen involvement process to date. He said he would get that information back to Councilor Atherton.

**Presiding Office Bragdon** opened a public hearing. No one came forward. He closed the public hearing.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain, and the motion passed.

## 10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

**Councilor Hosticka** reported that the state land board met on Monday and agreed to the same provisions on the sale of the Wilsonville tract that this committee had. He said there would be a celebration in the future. All the approvals were in place.

**Councilor Monroe** said Councilor Burkholder and he had led a delegation of about 15 locally elected officials and representatives of Tri-Met and the Port of Portland to Washington DC. They met with all of the Oregon representatives and one Washington representative. The delegation was well prepared and spoke with one voice regarding transportation projects. He said they received a message back loud and clear that if Oregon did not come up with a way to match the federal transportation dollars, we would be losing millions of federal dollars in funding because there was not a local match.

**Councilor McLain** reviewed a report about the Regional Water Consortium that she had placed in the Councilor's boxes. She noted that Councilor Hosticka also attended the consortium meeting.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** announced that the first Council Reapportionment Task Force meeting would be next Thursday, March 22<sup>nd</sup> at 3:30 p.m. in the Council chamber.

## 11. ADJOURN

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

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**Attachments to the Public Record for the Meeting of March 15, 2001**

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

<b>Document Number</b>	<b>Document Date</b>	<b>Document Title</b>	<b>TO/FROM</b>	<b>RES/ORD</b>
031501c-01	3/15/2001	Speaking notes RE: Metro Central Enhancement Committee Grants	TO Metro Council/ FROM Rex Burkholder	Citizen Communications
031501c-02	3/15/2001	Metro Central Enhancement Grants - Overview by Organizations; 2001 Grand Funding Cycle	TO Metro Council/ FROM Dale MacHaffie	Citizen Communications
031501c-03	3/00/2001	Audit Report: Metro Transit-Oriented Development Program: Improving Accountability Through Enhanced Measures of Service Efforts and Accomplishments	TO Metro Council/ FROM Alexis Dow	Auditor Communications
031501c-04	3/15/2001	Audit Report Presentation: Metro's Transit-Oriented Development Program	TO Metro Council/ FROM Alexis Dow, Joe Gibbons	Auditor Communications
031501c-05	3/1/2001	Minutes of the Metro Council Meeting	TO Metro Council/ FROM Chris Billington	Consent Agenda
031501c-06	3/13/2001	Community Planning committee Report on Resolution No. 01-3037	TO Metro Council/ FROM Carl Hosticka	Res. No. 01-3037