

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, November 13, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Kathryn Harrington, Carl Hosticka, Robert Liberty, Rex Burkholder, Carlotta Collette

Councilors Absent: Rod Park (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 15, 2007//ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the November 15, 2007 Metro Council agenda. Councilor Harrington had questions about Agenda Item 5.4. She was unclear on some of the wording in the staff report that reported on financial trends; she was unsure of what it would be used for and why it was so unique. Councilor Harrington explained that she was looking for more information. Suzanne Flynn, Metro Auditor, explained she had been considering a bi-annual report. Ms. Flynn presented examples and explained she hadn't had time to complete this project. She wanted to hire someone to develop the spreadsheets, do the analysis behind the indicators and present her with the information as a package. From that point she could enter the data yearly and complete a bi-annual report. Mr. Jordan asked Suzanne about staff meeting the criteria the contract review board would want to look at. Councilor Harrington had additional questions about Agenda Item 6.1. She felt she had caught a typing mistake and had concerns about the wording on page 9, item 11. Councilor Harrington wanted to make sure that something, which was mentioned, was fair under Measure 49. Metro Attorney Dan Cooper answered her questions. He explained some of the wording and informed the Councilor that he would get additional information to her before the Thursday Council Meeting. Council President Bragdon and Mr. Cooper informed Councilor Harrington that Thursday was only the date of the first reading; they would not be voting at that meeting. She continued with questions related to land use and the Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Cooper further explained Measure 49 and land use requirements. Councilor Harrington had a final question about page 10, item B. The question related to notification and the 100-foot requirement. She felt this didn't compare well with other space requirements. Mr. Cooper explained the Measure 37 code to the Council and that there may have been policy reasons for the change. Council President Bragdon informed the Council that Councilor Liberty would carry that item.

2. BUSINESS RECYCLING OPTIONS

Councilor Harrington introduced the presentation. She had been working with staff on business recycling options; she discussed the changes and improvements that had been done to the policy. Councilor Harrington also explained that the project cost was less expensive than previously estimated.

Mike Hoglund, Director of Solid Waste and Recycling, gave an overview and outline of the presentation. He explained they would begin by providing a broad introduction because they

hadn't yet had an opportunity to brief Councilor Collette on the project. He talked about the region's recovery goal and the five programs they were working on to reach that goal.

Marta McGuire, Associate Solid Waste Planner, had powerpoint slides that accompanied her presentation. They were attached to the minutes. She informed the Council of current recycling rates and goals. She explained the options for increasing business recycling, what actions would allow Metro to reach their goal and the recycling rates they would need to achieve. She described the elements and requirements of both the mandatory and voluntary programs. She continued by explaining the various opportunities and challenges created by the two programs. Ms. McGuire also informed the Council that there would be repercussions for not following the recycling requirements under the mandatory program. The mandatory program was recommended by a stakeholder workgroup and requires local jurisdictions to pass legislation. The voluntary program was preferred by the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and in this program, each jurisdiction would develop its own new or enhanced program. The largest unknown aspect of the voluntary program was the end result. Ms. McGuire informed the Council of the benefits that increased recycling rates would bring. Councilor Burkholder asked the presenters who this program would be mandatory or voluntary for. Ms. McGuire explained it was businesses that would be affected, she explained that if recycling requirements weren't met under the voluntary program, local governments would be held responsible. Councilor Collette asked who the stakeholders were. Ms. McGuire informed the Council of the stakeholders who had been identified.

Heidi Rahn, Associate Solid Waste Planner, spoke of the mandatory vs. voluntary impact on business. She explained the most significant differences between the two programs. She shared with the Council a case study that had been conducted on a restaurant in Beaverton and the changes that had occurred when the business began to recycle. Councilor Liberty inquired about the size of the restaurant. Ms. Rahn continued by explaining to the Council the impact the two programs had on local governments.

Mr. Hogle explained policy enforcement and how businesses would be informed of the new recycling approach. He provided information on the Curbside Recycling Program in Seattle and informed the Council of how the new policy could be enforced using a mandatory enforcement program. The recommendation of the group selected to work on the project was that Metro would have an enforcement role. Mr. Hogle explained the enforcement approach would be phased in. Councilor Hosticka had questions related to program costs and how the program would be enforced. Mr. Hogle explained the approach that would be taken if a business was not meeting requirements. Councilor Liberty felt Metro should also acknowledge businesses that exceed requirements.

Mr. Hogle referred to the agenda packets and talked about the business recycling costs vs. benefits. He spoke about annual universal costs. Councilor Liberty asked if any of the costs were tied to scale. Mr. Hogle explained that some of the business recycling costs were fairly linear. Ms. McGuire explained that the necessary infrastructure was already in place. Mr. Hogle explained benefits of business recycling and provided an estimated cost benefit. He continued by summarizing a review of program options and a timeline of meetings that had been held related to this topic. He concluded by asking the Council which program they would prefer and explained the next steps that would need to be taken.

Council President Bragdon asked the presenters about the various business sectors and how significant the office community was in program predictions and cost calculations. Councilor

Harrington agreed that it would be helpful to see pie charts of the businesses that would be affected by this program. Council President Bragdon opened the discussion up to the Council, so the Councilors could provide feedback and state which policy they felt most comfortable with. Councilor Harrington said at this point she would be happy proceeding with the mandatory program. Councilor Liberty wondered if there was a way to differentiate between business types. Mr. Hoglund responded that the City of Portland currently had a mandatory business-recycling program in place and that Metro could benefit from looking at their program. He provided the Council with a list of some of the municipalities with mandatory recycling programs already in place. Councilor Burkholder felt there were unanswered questions related to the mandatory program, after reading through the material felt that local governments didn't know what the costs would be. He wondered about businesses with many buildings and what approach would be taken in this situation. He felt the uncertainties in the voluntary policy were high. Based on the information he had been presented with, Councilor Burkholder thought the mandatory program was the best choice. Council President Bragdon felt the mandatory approach was the way to go. Councilor Collette wanted to make sure there would be plenty of hand holding for local governments and didn't want smaller governments being overburdened with mandatory new processes. Councilor Hosticka felt that if the voluntary program were chosen, Metro should have outcome targets. He felt Metro should start by drafting a mandatory report and see where negotiations lead. Councilor Liberty referred back to image 14 in the presentation packet; he had questions about the program costs between the two programs. Council President Bragdon finished by thanking the presenters.

3. BREAK

4. PORT OF PORTLAND MASTER PLAN

Andy Cotugno, Metro Planning Director, provided background on the master plan. He explained the process was just beginning and because of this they weren't facing any issues yet. How the Airport Master Plan worked with the surrounding transportation plan was discussed. Mr. Cotugno informed the Council that this plan was a starting point and asked what issues they wanted him to carry back to the Port of Portland. Councilor Liberty questioned controversy over the previous master plan because of parking and labor issues and asked about the possibility of a third runway. Mr. Cotugno responded that another runway wouldn't be needed for at least 25 years; because of this it wasn't discussed in the 20-year plan. Mr. Cotugno talked about rail service and how this could affect expansion needs at the airport. Councilor Hosticka inquired about general aviation in the smaller airports around the region. Councilor Burkholder mentioned that because the airport was in his district, he was very familiar with this issue. He knew that much of their actions were due to federal regulations and wanted to ensure that a public process would be used if the airport felt the need to expand. Councilor Hosticka felt that in addition to water quality, there were more issues in the natural resources category. He knew that Metro owned natural areas property in the flight path and felt Metro should have a way to express their concerns if they were impacted by the new plan. Mr. Cotugno responded that in recent years the airport had taken a wildlife management approach.

Councilor Harrington wanted to ensure that transportation needs of people and products were being met, she also had noise concerns and noted that aviation noise extended to other districts. She mentioned noise associated with helicopters and problems caused by this noise. Councilor Liberty felt the Cincinnati airport was similar to the Portland Airport (PDX). He felt PDX could benefit from a stronger identity and sustainable elements incorporated into airport design. He noted the lost view from the terminal, which was blocked by the parking structure. He

also mentioned the Native American history associated with the land. Councilor Liberty felt that partnerships could be developed with the tribes in the region.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon wanted to discuss expectations for tomorrow's Council Meeting. Councilor Harrington discussed some of the items that would be covered at that meeting, she distributed schedule information and provided an overview of the presentation. Councilors Hosticka and Collette had minor questions; Councilor Harrington explained she would go into greater depth at the meeting. Councilor Hosticka noted that the Council hadn't yet defined what "performing" meant. It was assumed this was already known and he felt this was an incorrect assumption. Councilor Burkholder asked about public outreach. Robin McArthur, Regional Planning Director, responded that milestones had been identified but they wanted to confirm that the Council agreed with those milestones. Once those were solidified, they would develop an outreach approach.

Councilor Burkholder introduced what Metro would put on the ballot and for what purpose. There was a poll conducted and he wanted to share that information with the Council. The public had strong opinions and ideas. He gave the Council some insight to the public's ideas that surrounded transportation. Councilor Harrington inquired about funding the poll. Richard Brandman, Deputy Planning Director, explained the handout he provided to the Council, which was attached to the minutes. He provided a commentary of the survey as he guided the Council through the data and answered questions. He pointed out significant figures and gave feedback. Councilor Hosticka questioned the breakdown of percentages; he felt the figures could be seen as polarized and questioned the interpretations that were provided. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on the wording of a question. Council President Bragdon agreed that the wording of that question implied congestion relief.

Councilor Burkholder questioned source titles and fees. He didn't want things limited by their definition. Council Liberty referred to some of the transportation statistics and felt getting additional data could support new planning work. He felt that a follow up on this poll would be useful. Council President Bragdon asked for feedback from the Council and felt things were being discussed at the state level that might not happen at the local level. He questioned where Metro could play a valuable role and the level of political will and interest. He also felt transit wasn't being picked up at the local level. Councilor Harrington explained upcoming project dates and discussed Metro and County responsibilities. Councilor Hosticka wondered if Metro could give access to a larger revenue generating capacity for local governments. He felt Metro was caught between state and local desire to handle the issues and that Metro could benefit if energy created at the local level could be harnessed and put into a regional context.

Councilor Liberty wanted to pick up the pieces that were missing and do something positive that would fill in gaps. He would like something to be done. Councilor Burkholder questioned issues which always needed funding, such as sidewalks or light-rail; he felt a fee would give us the ability to have flexible dollars.

Mr. Brandman also said that a small follow-up survey could be beneficial and that local governments agreed with this idea. Council President Bragdon talked about a regional approach. Councilor Hosticka said that with enough similarities, benefits of collaboration could be shown.

Councilor Liberty discussed spending. Councilor Burkholder questioned pursuing something independently and what should be put on a regional level. Mr. Brandman said maintenance should not be a regional issue, but instead a local issue. The larger issues are of regional importance. The Council discussed bridge maintenance and which organizations held the responsibility for this type of routine and expensive maintenance.

On another issues, Councilor Harrington addressed solid waste issues, related to RSWAMP. Councilor Burkholder questioned the need for a staff response. Mr. Hoglund mentioned that the comment period had ended. He discussed meeting goals and timelines.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:26 p.m.

Prepared by,

Erika C. Storie
Council Operations Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
NOVEMBER 13, 2007**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	11/15/07	Agenda: Metro Council regular meeting, November 15, 2007	111307cw-01
2	Recycling	11/13/07	Options for Increasing Business Recycling, Powerpoint Slides	111307cw-02
3	Recycling	11/13/07	Options for Increasing Business Recycling, Tables 1 and 2	111307cw-03
4	Transportation	10/23/07	Regional Transportation Public Opinion Survey	111307cw-04
5	Timeline	11/13/07	Major Milestones/Timeline	111307cw-05