

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, July 10, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: (none)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JULY 12, 2007//ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

President Bragdon reviewed the July 12, 2007 Metro Council agenda. Item No. 6.2, Ordinance No. 07-1148, would be moved up on the agenda to accommodate the attendance of City of Gresham officials, and the scheduled Executive Session (refer to agenda) had been canceled.

Councilor Harrington asked if there would be a public hearing on 6.1, Ordinance No. 1147A (EDWRP); President Bragdon clarified that there would be.

Councilor Harrington advised that a B version would likely be introduced on July 12, 2007, and that it would be a substantial vote and that could not be voted on.

President Bragdon asked if Councilor Harrington wanted to introduce the proposed amendment or vote on it.

Councilor Harrington clarified that she would like to introduce on July 12, 2007. She understood that Councilor Liberty would not be present or able to vote at the Council meeting scheduled on July 19, 2007, that there was not a meeting scheduled for July 26, 2007, and proposed that action be taken on August 2, 2007.

After some discussion, President Bragdon agreed to postpone until August 2, 2007, with action to be taken on August 16, 2007.

2. SEPTEMBER 2007 NATURE IN NEIGHBORHOODS CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAM LAUNCH

Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department and Janelle Geddes, Nature in Neighborhoods Program, provided a timeline of the project (a copy was retained for the record).

Councilor Liberty said this session was to update the Council on work done by staff and the development of the program, and to confirm the direction the program was taking. The most important aspect of today's meeting was to ensure that the Council was comfortable with the plan scheduled for consultation with the program as it evolved.

Councilor Liberty provided a brief overview of the program from inception.

Staff made a presentation on the project timeline and the Council consultation schedule, an update on staffing for this part of the bond measure, the development of the handbook, the review of comments, outreach plan, performance measures, and kickoff events, to be concluded by ensuring that the program was on track, the consultation arrangements made sense and that Council was comfortable with the direction in which the program was moving. The only contemplated action by Council was the confirmation of the composition of the Grant Review Committee, and that meeting would occur in September 2007.

Councilor Liberty asked if that was all clear and the Council agreed that it was.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said the timeline started today and went through the first round of the program in the fall of 2008. They anticipated that a cycle of programs would continue following the fall of 2008.

Ms Brennan-Hunter gave an overview of the proposed handbook and said that it included the key criteria and goals of the program, how applicants would apply for grants, and the process for the evaluation of proposals. Internal and external reviews of the handbook were completed during a rough draft stage (refer to handout). The feedback received was that the handbook was a good beginning; the structure made sense and it was a strong way to administer the program. They received clarifying comments and feedback on improvements that could be made on certain details of the program administration. The external reviewers identified what appeared to be two major concerns that were unresolved, but did not necessarily change the program: first was that when the resolution passed and the Council referred the bond measure to the ballot, it identified a ten percent limitation on staff time, and some of the non-profit organizations and community groups felt that it could be a limiting factor for some projects. Second was that the Grant Review Committee identified community representatives and feedback was received that there might be interest in having specific designees in the environmental justice representative and a local jurisdiction representative. There was room for Council flexibility at the time, and President Bragdon had made the decision when the Grant Review Committee was appointed and confirmed.

Councilor Newman asked what the match requirement was on the grants and Ms. Brennan-Hunter clarified that it was two-to-one, and that the ten percent had not changed. He asked if the ten percent applies only to Metro funds and not what was matched, and Ms. Brennan-Hunter further clarified that was correct.

Councilor Burkholder asked if awarding the first round of grants in spring of 2008 would affect planting and construction schedules. When working on a capital project, the timeframe in which to complete the work was usually limited, particularly if it was riparian-area related.

Ms Brennan-Hunter said there was a potential for some projects to be affected, and they anticipated offering the program with a rolling deadline and that the critical mass of projects would go before the review committee, giving the flexibility to community groups to design projects around it. There was enough flexibility in the program that they would be able to work with any affected groups.

Councilor Burkholder said that with the passage of the bond measure in fall of 2006, it was a long span of time to get the first round of funding and he was concerned that if we missed a season the first round of planting may not occur until the fall of 2008.

Ms. Geddes said that applicants would have up to thirty-six months to spend the monies. The recipients would not be shorted time, and it was anticipated that many of the larger scale projects would be developed with a timeline, and would be received prior to the spring of 2008.

Councilor Liberty further clarified that the structure may require Metro to make a commitment to leverage the funds, that we could be the last or first place, and if the funds didn't come through then the project would lose the funding of the match, and that many things could affect the cycle. He said that the advantage of a beginning with a rolling review approach was that it allowed the participants to set the schedule that worked best for them.

Ms Brennan-Hunter said that they hoped to receive more projects in the fall, which would allow them to pull the Grant Review Committee in and potentially award projects sooner than expected.

Councilor Burkholder voiced his concern about the delay and spoke to the fact that some projects that met the criteria may be quicker to put into place, and that smaller projects to follow would be less complex to put together, but that we needed to follow through on our promise to the public to get something out there.

Councilor Hosticka asked if there was a fixed dollar amount per round or per year, or if it was flexible.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter clarified that it was up to fifteen percent of \$15 million per year, and Ms. Geddes clarified that up to a quarter of a million dollars would be allocated up to fifteen percent.

Councilor Hosticka asked if they anticipated allocating, and Ms. Geddes said that it would be decided by the size of the project, but that it could be rolled over if necessary.

Councilor Liberty said that as the program moved forward, and more sophistication would be developed and that movement building would be an aspect.

Councilor Park spoke to Councilor Burkholder's concern of the gap of time and clarified that if these were the type and scale of the projects anticipated, they would require a waiting period to apply for the proper permits, etc.

Councilor Newman said that if we did outreach press around the launch in September, so that it was not just the award of monies later, but actually in September when the applications were in, that the public would know that we were following through on the bond measure.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said that they anticipated a conversation with the Grant Review Committee about the additional program measurement tools, and with the Natural Areas Citizens Performance Oversight Committee about program performance measures and methods. They would then return to the Council this fall.

President Bragdon asked for questions and comments of the Council.

Councilor Burkholder said that he was excited about the program.

Councilor Park felt that the wording of Draft Performance Measure #5 (refer to packet) was not clear.

Ms Brennan-Hunter clarified that they expected that regional capacities would vary, and they wanted to ensure that they were reaching out to areas with less capacity than those that were more organized would have.

President Bragdon agreed with Councilor Burkholder about the span of time and the rounds of awards, and asked if it was an ongoing, rolling process.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter clarified that it was ongoing, and that if six applications of critical mass were received they would go before the Grant Review Committee, and if a span of time were to pass with no proposals received, they would check in with the Council.

President Bragdon asked if the projects were to be weighed against each other.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter clarified that they were.

Councilor Newman asked if applications that did not achieve the goals of the program would be dismissed.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter clarified the process by explaining that the applicant would send a letter of interest describing the project and partnership, which was then evaluated to see if it met the goal of the program. The applicant would then be invited to complete a full proposal. If there were at least six proposals, they would be weighed against each other before the Grant Review Committee.

President Bragdon spoke to this being a disadvantage and gave the example of two great proposals being received and granted in March, then two mediocre in April; would subsequent projects that met the criteria be denied?

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said that if additional proposals met the goals of the program, the Council would have the flexibility to work through it.

Councilor Liberty said that over time, the process would become clearer, and the grouping of proposals was to ensure that the Grant Review Committee's time was being used efficiently.

President Bragdon said that grouping for the efficiency of the committee was correct, but if each batch were to be graded on a curve and they were unequal batches, it was not good.

Jim Desmond, Director, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, clarified that if the first group of ten was strong, and they wanted to award all, that 50% would be spent for the year. They could also choose to award nothing.

President Bragdon said that there needed to be absolute criteria to apply throughout the year.

Councilor Liberty agreed, and he hoped that we were not in a position to worry about spending the money too quickly in the year.

Ms. Geddes said that not all projects would need 100 percent funding, and they could allocate funds to the applicants, who would then search for a match if they did not already have it.

Councilor Liberty said that using a rolling approach for administrative detail was better and it may work out better to have deadlines.

President Bragdon said that he did not want to award monies because we thought it was the best we could give at the time. He commented that four of the five external reviewers lived in Portland, and that he saw this kind of participation as more reflective of the region, and not just the City of Portland. He asked if any of the Council were on the committee.

Councilor Liberty answered that there would be one to three.

President Bragdon said that he wanted Councilor Liberty on the committee. He asked that Councilor Liberty circulate the specifications to the Council so that they could give suggestions. He spoke to the fact that some of the people who knew a lot about this would also be applicants, and a geographic announcement was not necessary.

Councilor Liberty clarified that Metro Council was one of three of three positions; water quality control was two positions; Metro Resource Natural Staff was one position; non-Metro fish and wildlife experts was one position; there were up to three other representatives, such as community neighborhood non-profits and parks design development crews.

President Bragdon asked if there was a provision that those appointed not be employed by the applicants or recipients.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said that she was not certain if it was in the draft before the review committee, but should be put into place as a guideline.

Councilor Harrington said that she appreciated the handbook, and spoke to the value of the grant writing class offered with the Nature in Neighborhoods program. She asked if there would be similar classes offered with this program.

Ms. Geddes clarified that during the first 4-5 months of the program they would be giving local, jurisdictional outreach and then focused convening sessions in the local communities, to give an understanding of the process and then discuss grant-writing skills at that point. Ms. Geddes pointed out that the Nature in Neighborhood grant writing classes she conducted were open to the community, and not just those applying for grants.

Councilor Harrington asked if Ms. Geddes's were offering the focused convening sessions, would the grant writing tutorials be a "wait and see" approach.

Ms. Geddes answered that it would be, but that there would be an element in the convening sessions that spoke of the strong implications and what they meant.

Councilor Liberty asked Ms. Brennan-Hunter about staffing.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter said the Natural Areas Grants Coordinator position had a very strong applicant pool, and they expected to have a final candidate for the position by the end of July.

Councilor Hosticka commented that it looked good.

Councilor Liberty asked President Bragdon if he was satisfied with the direction.

President Bragdon said he was satisfied with the direction.

Councilor Liberty said that there were specific comments about getting grants out the door, and that we needed to account for the timeline for permitting and that it would be something to think about in the application process that might include a pre-review. He spoke to President Bragdon's concern of ensuring that applications were not being graded, and that good projects received good funding. The launch event should be inexpensive but include fun activities for kids, possibly after a council meeting following those planned in September.

Jim Labbe, Audubon Society/Coalition for a Livable Future (CFLF), asked if the Grant Review Committee would not only play a role in the evaluation of projects, but also reviewing and continuing feedback on the process. Would they receive both elements back?

Deb Lev, Portland Parks and Recreation, wondered about the impact of program on their staff, and about the definition on what could be capitalized.

Mr. Desmond said that as pre-applications came in, if capitalization was a close call, a discussion with local government Chief Financial Officers would be initiated about their practices and technical questions.

Linda Robinson, Portland Citywide Parks Team/citizen activist, said that one thing not addressed in the presentation was that the letter of interest, at least the draft, would require a certification of ability to capitalize, but the feeling was that until they had the full proposal, how would they determine what projects could be capitalized. It was not developed enough to make that determination. Would the local jurisdiction be willing to certify that it would capitalize until they saw the proposal?

Mr. Labbe said that with the capitalization was the opportunity to see where there needed to be policy development at all levels, where local governments standards recognitions could be more inclusive, and should be part of the learning process of the grant proposal.

Ms. Robinson said that it was important that outreach go to the jurisdictions that own land, including state agencies, (ODOT and others), and not just the cities and counties, so that they have an idea of what was going on when approached by citizen groups, school districts, etc, with requests to use publicly owned land.

President Bragdon thanked Ms. Robinson and others for the time and efforts spent on the program. He looked forward to the Council's suggestion of names by the time of handbook completion in August.

Councilor Liberty said that with the kickoff and vote in September, the action would be confirmation.

Ms. Brennan-Hunter asked if the Council was okay with the ten percent cap and the composition of the Grant Review Committee as it read in the resolution.

President Bragdon said yes.

3. BREAK

4. EXPLORATION AND FRAMING OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION AND NATURAL AREAS MAINTENANCE BALLOT MEASURE

Councilor Burkholder provided handouts of the budget, the work plan, and the rationale in draft format (copies were retained for the record). He thanked Kathryn Sofich, Council Staff, and Eliot Rose, Council Intern, for their hard work and assistance with the project, Mike Wetter and Reed Wagner, Council Staff, and Jeff Tucker and Heather Nelson-Kent, Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff, for their input and support. He said the plan is to see the project progress past the point of just being an idea. He would like to bring the plan back to the Council in January or February to be considered for ballot measure placement in the election in May of 2008. He addressed policy question #7 of the proposal and said that these were things that they could not answer yet in terms of how much to ask for and how to allocate monies between the identified needs. Was the Solid Waste Excise Tax the best form? This was the proposal put forth so far and that was tested, but they needed to look at the questions (refer to handout). Was there a nexus between what Metro did in terms of encouraging people to care for nature, education and outdoor school; there seemed to be a very close connection. The definition of need was based on the idea of whether there was a role for Metro to support the Environmental Educational Conservation Education program. The question of how much would vary and depended on whether they decided there was a minimum they would support, or to fund the whole program. Regional conservation education were programs that Metro currently funded through the Zoo, Parks or the Nature in Neighborhoods Grant program. If he were to bring a resolution to set up a Council project, how would the Council like to be involved? Would individual councilors like to be involved in the process, or would they prefer a checking-in process of the next six months, and reporting in terms of decision points for the Council to make about the form as it prepared to make the decision.

Councilor Harrington agreed with Councilor Burkholder's concern of the operation and maintenance of regional areas and said that she had questions to pursue with staff. She would like a one-page plan that showed every property that we had, including those of which to keep in preservation, those which had special level of access, and targets with a current point of access. She was comfortable with the project plan approach.

Councilor Liberty thanked Councilor Burkholder and Ms. Sofich for their work. He spoke to the Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants program, and asked if we would be able to backfill with someone else. Funding of the education activities discussed was monies of a supplemental program.

Councilor Burkholder asked if that was particularly related to the outdoor school.

Councilor Liberty clarified that it is was. He spoke to problems with a spending cap, and this would help with that if we funded subsisting activities. He understood that there was support for flexibility. One approach was to say it was a broad category to make allocations counts by Council every year and asked how the budget and campaign would intersect. Tie-ins were the mission, and this was related to the charter mission of planning and policy-making.

President Bragdon had three substantive areas of emphasis regarding policy and three regarding procedure. The first substantive was operations and maintenance; it was important on a policy basis that it was something shared in terms of regional facilities as distinct from just Metro-owned facilities. There are regional needs that were not necessarily owned by the regional government, that should be part of this, and a sharing mechanism should be in place based on usage or significance, regardless of ownership. Local sharing was important and should not be an entitlement, but should be related to significance or local effort being made. The second substantive was the opportunity to tie this to what would be coming forward in the next months with the Zoo Master Plan Conservation and Conservation Education Program. Information would be available in September to show the quantifying of the numbers of people served, potential for expanding tickets, and more. The third substantive area was being supportive of the idea of sharing, but there should be a basis of matching on recognition of local effort. The first procedural was not in the work plan but needed to be. The Council wanted to be highly involved. and their fingerprints needed to be on it. He wanted intense stability to shape it. There needed to be a threshold of conversation to see where it fit and linked with or met other undertakings such as transportation and the Zoo, and how the things could complement each other. The second procedural area was stakeholder involvement, and the constituency that was missing was local government. The franchise on Solid Waste and the rate-setters on the Solid Waste side, were also the park operators and were important to the success of past efforts, and to leave them out would not be good. The third procedural area was how much evaluation we could do on the agency, and what the political path was. It related to us not just "rubber stamping" and referring something, but that our fingerprints needed to be on it. If our name was to be on it, there needed to be a real political commitment from the Council, that they would not just vote to refer it, but to also be out talking to groups and doing other things that were necessary to make a campaign happen. He said that was something the Council needed to discuss further.

Councilor Park said that with \$20 per ton we would approach a 30% plus capacity of recovery. He wondered if some of the field trips to the Zoo was part of a basic education package, and what type of organization the campaign side would have. He would like to see other agencies involved, and not just contractors.

Councilor Newman said that he was encouraged and would like to move forward. He wondered how a tax mechanism like this would work. He said that a stakeholder discussion was needed to determine how much waste a household versus office building would generate, and was construction and demolition included in the fiscal estimate.

President Bragdon said that the Zoo discussion would piggyback on the issue.

Councilor Newman spoke of the Zoo master plan and recommendation of a more expanded role, a strengthening of the Zoo brand and work vacuity.

President Bragdon said he wanted this to be seen as branding and that the Council's level of involvement be recognized as high.

Councilor Liberty spoke to the project not being connected to a funding source.

Councilor Hosticka said that he is in favor of moving ahead. He was less excited about the grab bag of regional conservation education programs, and spoke to back-filling money flushing through the system and not ending up where it was intended.

Councilor Burkholder asked if the Council supported moving this forward as a Council Project.

Councilor Newman said that he would like to see more information on the forecast of solid waste costs. The transport contract costs could go up and when bonds on our facilities went down, pressure would be put on other areas. A better sense of projections over the next decade would help him better understand how this fit in.

President Bragdon suggested a timeline be attached to reflect the high level of the Council's involvement be put on the calendar this fall. He said that many hours and stakeholder involvement was to be expected. He was comfortable moving forward with this as a Council project.

Councilor Hosticka voiced concerns about the inflation of those who collect the tax over those who pay the tax. He would want an analysis of how the mechanisms would be collected and ensuring that the burdens of collection were fair.

Councilor Park spoke to how funds would be distributed to education across the region. This could be similar to an excise tax issue on construction.

Councilor Liberty voiced concerns about the generators, and what their reaction would be.

President Bragdon agreed with Councilor Liberty about the availability of estimates from the Solid Waste Department before voting, and asked Councilor Burkholder if that were possible.

Councilor Burkholder said that lots of staff time and resources would be involved. A lot of discussion had taken place but that he held off on requesting numbers until the interest of the Council was determined. They did not have access to the actual number each individual business generated. He felt that it fit with Metro's goals and objectives and provided resources for the agency to do more. Some of the things that they had done were to pull back on the specificity of the earlier work of analyzing, and looked at what needed to be on the ballot measure, which was the issue of general versus specific on the issues, and what needed to be in the implementing of resolutions and ordinances, which would be the specifics of how to collect and distribute the monies. There were different levels of work that needed to be done with our legal staff. Discussion had taken place due to resource limitations in terms of local government discussions and various stakeholders. A lot of work needed to be done, and he needed to do more with the resources that he had in the Council Office. With general support he could obtain more information. The timeline would be critical and he needed to make sure that it was a priority before it went before the public. If there were questions, they would collect and try to answer them through the staff of Jim Desmond.

Councilor Park wondered about the Zoo Master Plan staff recommendation and how to take the idea forward.

Councilor Liberty said that they had specific recommendations about conservation and conservation education. He suggested to Councilor Burkholder that every child in the region be offered an educational trip to the Zoo as part of the curriculum.

Councilor Park asked if we moved along at a good pace, was the Zoo right there, or sitting at a station waiting to go to the next step.

Councilor Newman said he thought there would be separate conditions for its facilities and programming, including conservation education and conservation programs, but additional work needed to be done to level things out. Then they would decide what they wanted to prioritize.

President Bragdon asked if Councilor Burkholder would provide a timetable.

Councilor Burkholder said that a better timetable would be drafted with the resolution, along with answers to questions and coordination of a campaign.

Councilor Park asked about confidential reserves.

President Bragdon advised that the first discussion of confidential reserves was to be on July 26th. He asked if Councilor Burkholder could present a resolution to the Council before recess in August.

Councilor Burkholder said that he could.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

President Bragdon discussed the Council Retreat of June 26th, and one of the items discussed was Council dynamics and use of work session time, and to make work sessions more responsive to Council interests. He and Mike Wetter, Senior Policy Advisor, met with Chris Billington, Council Operations Manager, to balance things on the work session agendas. He asked the Council where they wanted to see themselves spend their time. Staff had made many requests of him to come before the Council, and he felt that the current format might not engage the interest of the full Council. He cited that at least twelve hours per month were spent in the current format and asked that as they planned retreats, the councilors think in terms of topics, format and what worked and what didn't. He said that the demands of the next few months were high.

Councilor Newman, said that he was not aware of what all of the demands on their time were and asked if they could obtain a list.

President Bragdon said the Mr. Wetter had examples posted in the lab. Two issues were the two formal sessions about the Headquarters Hotel and two work sessions with Public Policy Management Group (PPMG).

Councilor Hosticka said that rule making with the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) would require the Council's time.

Councilor Harrington noted that some would be involved with the waste transport contract and Request For Proposals (RFP).

Councilor Burkholder said that some of the items were of a more informational nature and suggested a brown bag lunch format.

President Bragdon said that they needed to let staff know that some of the topics were of interest but optional and work session time would not be used. Work session time should be spent on key items directly related to the Council, such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Refinement, Headquarters Hotel, and Columbia River Crossings (CRC), all things that needed the fingerprints of the entire Council.

Councilor Liberty talked about a review of the Transit Oriented Development program and investments.

Councilor Newman asked if it could be part of the New Look Work Sessions.

President Bragdon said that it would be further discussed.

Councilor Burkholder said that RTP staff anticipated four public hearings combined with Council meetings throughout the region as part of the public outreach. He asked how much time the Council wanted to spend on it and how to fit it into their schedules. The goal was to hold one each in Washington County, Clackamas County, Multnomah County and East County. All were to be held at night because they were public hearings.

President Bragdon advised that after discussion with Chris Billington, that it was decided that it was too much, and that one meeting each would be held in Gresham, Hillsboro and at the Metro Regional Center.

Councilor Burkholder said he had not yet asked Ms. Ellis if they needed to full court press for the federal RTP as well as the state in spring of 2008. This may be the time to change the current process because it required a lot of time in the field.

President Bragdon said this related to better integration of conversation with Public Affairs staff assigned to transportation.

Councilor Newman advised that Future Elephant Center land acquisition in Arkansas had fallen through because the mineral rights on the property had been sold to a separate entity. The Council had not transacted the \$250,000 contribution authorized. He would follow up with Tony Vecchio, Director of the Oregon Zoo, and William Eadie and Hilary Wilton, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, about the availability of local sites that had not met the bond measure criteria.

Councilor Harrington advised of changes to the order of items to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting scheduled July 11th. She had attended the second Transportation Workshop of the Washington County Coordinating Committee on July 9th, and advised that Metro had not been invited to participate in the state legislative committee currently being formed.

Councilor Liberty asked about the **timeframe** of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee/Joint Policy Advisory Committee Transportation (MPAC/JPACT) merger.

Councilor **Harrington** said that they were looking forward to that discussion at the upcoming Council Retreat.

Councilor Liberty asked if transportation briefing on the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Study was still of interest.

Councilor Burkholder responded that Richard Brandman, Deputy Planning Director, would meet with Councilors Liberty and Newman to determine which measures were useful.

Councilor Park asked if various reports, including those on the Headquarters Hotel, were available; Mr. Wagner addressed the expected completion dates of several reports.

Councilor Newman asked why they had not received the Metro Entertainment-Recreation Commission (MERC) Central Services Costs; Reed Wagner would follow up with Kathy Taylor, Director of MERC Administration.

Councilor Hosticka asked for more information on the Low Impact Development (LID) for the Eastside Streetcar.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:09p.m.

Prepared by,



Maggie Voss
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
JULY 10, 2007**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	7/12/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, July 12, 2007	071007c-01
2	Program Timeline	7/10/07	To: Metro Council From: Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Re: Natural Areas Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Program	071007c-02
4	Project Proposal/Work Plan	June 2007	To: Metro Council From: Rex Burkholder, Metro Council Re: Exploration and Framing of Conservation Education and Natural Areas Maintenance Ballot Measure	071007c-03