



**METRO**

**Agenda**

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
DATE: January 15, 2008  
DAY: Tuesday  
TIME: 2:00 PM  
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

- |                |           |   |         |
|----------------|-----------|---|---------|
| <b>2:00 PM</b> | <b>1.</b> | <b>DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING,<br/>JANUARY 17, 2008/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING<br/>OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS</b> |         |
| <b>2:15 PM</b> | <b>2.</b> | <b>OREGON ZOO POLLING RESULTS<br/>DISCUSSION</b>  | Vecchio |
| <b>3:00 PM</b> | <b>3.</b> | <b>DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT EARMARK PRIORITIES<br/>FOR FY '09 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS</b>   | Cotugno |
| <b>3:30 PM</b> | <b>4.</b> | <b>BREAK</b>  |         |
| <b>3:35 PM</b> | <b>5.</b> | <b>WASTE ALLOCATION PROJECT</b>   | Hoglund |
| <b>4:20 PM</b> | <b>6.</b> | <b>COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION</b>  |         |

**ADJOURN**

**OREGON ZOO POLLING RESULTS  
DISCUSSION**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, January 15, 2008  
Metro Council Chamber

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: 01/15/2007 Time: 2:15 p.m. Length: 45 minutes

Presentation Title:     Poll Report    

Department:     Oregon Zoo    

Presenters:     Tony Vecchio (Oregon Zoo, Director)    

    Adam Davis (Davis, Hibbits, and Midghall Inc., Polling Consultant)    

    Penny Serrurier (The Oregon Zoo Foundation Board of Trustees, Chair)    

    Kim Freed (The Oregon Zoo Foundation, Managing Director)    

### ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Issue: Metro Council requested that The Oregon Zoo Foundation hire a consultant to conduct preliminary polling to determine public reception of a bond measure to fund specified capital improvements for the Zoo as recommended by the Oregon Zoo Future Vision Committee (FVC). This work session segment is the Foundation's presentation to Metro Council of the polling consultant's report.

Background: The FVC hired a consultant team to examine all aspects of the Oregon Zoo and develop recommendations for a sustainable strategic business plan. One of their recommendations included working with Metro Council to identify an appropriate revenue/ bond program to meet capital facility needs for: a new vet hospital and quarantine building, an improved and enlarged on-site elephant facility with an auxiliary off-site elephant facility, a parking structure, and a regional conservation education center.

### OPTIONS AVAILABLE

Action is not required at this presentation. This is an informational presentation only.

### IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

If poll results prove positive, this could provide additional capital funding support of possibly \$90-120 million to fulfill the FVC 10-year Master Plan goals as recommended by the FVC consultants.

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

The Oregon Zoo and The Oregon Zoo Foundation request that Metro Council review the polling results with consideration toward presentation of a bond proposal for capital improvements suggested by the FVC.

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION      Yes   X   No

DRAFT IS ATTACHED      Yes   X   No

**DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT EARMARK PRIORITIES  
FOR FY '09 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, January 15, 2008  
Metro Council Chamber

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: January 15, 2008 Time: 2:45 p.m. Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Development of project earmark priorities for FY '09 transportation appropriations

Department: Planning and Parks

Presenters: Andy Cotugno (Mel Huie will be available for the Trails item)

\* In all categories, use additional sheets if necessary and attach supporting material.

### **ISSUE & BACKGROUND**

Every year, JPACT organizes a lobby trip to Washington, DC in March to meet with members of the Oregon delegation to review requests for project earmarks to consider in the appropriations process. Development of the list was initiated in November with the directions to limit requests from the highway appropriations bill to no more than two projects each and only include projects that can be completed in the time period and are reflected in the financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan. The list attached to this resolution is the result of that process.

Included in this list are two project requests from Metro – a trails request and a TOD request.

The \$1.5 million TOD request is a proposal to partner with Pacific University on their campus expansion in Hillsboro adjacent to the Westside LRT. Use of TOD funds would ensure their project maximizes the density of the project and includes a mixed-use element. This project would build on a successful first phase project a few years ago for the Pacific University building that is now occupied. The University has established a very successful program to facilitate transit useage by the faculty and students.

#### The trail projects are:

Request \$1.3 million to design and build a “green” trailhead at Metro’s Blue Lake Regional Park. It will serve as an example of green and environmentally sustainable design and construction. The trailhead would serve the Gresham / Fairview Trail, 40-Mile Loop Trail on Marine Dr., and points east through Fairview, Troutdale, and the Port of Portland property. These trails would connect to the Columbia Gorge network of trails. Rather than purchasing privately owned land, the trailhead could be built on land already owned by the public. Thousands of dollars will be saved. Metro will maintain the facility. The project has the support of the local jurisdictions and trail advocacy organizations.

Request \$1 million to design and build a “Bike / Ped” Bridge over the Sandy River in Troutdale. Starting in 2009, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), will begin the replacement of the twin I-84 bridges (e.g. one eastbound, one westbound) over the Sandy River. Rather than putting in a substandard and narrow bike lane on one of the new bridges, it makes more sense to build a new freestanding bridge (and bridge approaches) south of I-84. The new bike/ped bridge would be better aligned with where the trail alignment is located and would better complement the future Troutdale Riverfront mixed-use development on the Sandy River (behind the Columbia Gorge outlet mall).

Request \$700,00 to update Metro’s Greenspaces Trails Master Plan. The plan was last updated in 2001. Better coordinate the plan with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), local transportation/trails/bike and pedestrian plans, and growth management Plans. Begin planning work towards connecting trails and health. Finally, coordinate with Clark Co./Vancouver Parks to establish a seamless four-county, bi-state regional trails system.

Also of interest for this lobby trip is the dual track associated with reauthorization of the six-year transportation bill scheduled for next year. Meetings are being set up with other interest groups and congressional offices close to the issue to develop allies in policy development that is favorable to the

Portland region's approach linking land use, multi-modal transportation and their connection to climate change and energy.

**OPTIONS AVAILABLE**

Provide direction to the Metro Council members of JPACT for input to the resolution. Consideration of the resolution is scheduled for JPACT on February 14 and the Metro Council on February 14. The resolution needs to be finalized in order for packets to be printed and shipped to Washington DC in time for the March 4-6 trip.

**IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

Are the two Metro earmark requests supported by the Metro Council?

Are there any directions to the Metro Council members on JPACT?

**LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION  Yes  No**  
**DRAFT IS ATTACHED  Yes  No**

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3891
PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL	)	
TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR	)	
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009	)	Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
APPROPRIATIONS		

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region relies heavily on various federal funding sources to adequately plan for and develop the region's transportation infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, Metro must comply with a wide variety of federal requirements related to transportation planning and project funding; and

WHEREAS, the Metro region's Congressional delegation has advised the region's transportation agencies to develop a coordinated request for legislation related to the annual federal transportation appropriations bill; and

WHEREAS, Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommended adoption of this resolution at their regular meeting on (date approved by JPACT); now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council hereby approves Exhibit A of this resolution, entitled "Metro Area FY 09 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List" and directs the Chief Operating Officer to submit this resolution to the Oregon Congressional delegation.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_ day of February 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

FY '09 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List			
Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	Source	Purpose
<b>Regional Highway Earmark Priorities</b>			
Columbia River Crossing (ODOT)	\$ 5.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Final Design
Columbia River Crossing (WsDOT)	\$ 5.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Final Design
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10.00</b>		
<b>Regional Transit Earmark Priorities</b>			
South Corridor I-205/Portland Mall LRT Project (T/M)	\$ 80.00	FTA 5309 New Starts	Construction
Portland - Streetcar Loop Project	\$ 40.00	FTA Small Starts	Construction
TriMet Bus Replacement	\$ 8.00	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Replacement	Replacement
Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project DEIS	\$ 4.00	FTA Section 5339 Funds	Draft EIS
SMART Bus - Wilsonville	\$ 2.00		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 134.00</b>		
<b>Regional Support for Local/Agency Priorities</b>			
ODOT:I-5/I205 Interchange	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	
Port of Portland: Airport Way/I-205 Northbound Access	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	
Port of Portland: I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	
Metro: Pacific University TOD Project	\$ 1.50	STP, TCSP Funds	Construction
Metro: Trails	\$ 3.00	TCSP	Construction/Planning
Portland: NE Cully Blvd. Street Improvement	\$ 1.60	Surface Transportation Projects	Construction
Portland: Eastside Burnside/Couch Couplet	\$ 2.50	Surface Transportation Projects	Construction
Gresham: Springwater/US 26 Industrial Access	\$ 5.00	TCSP; STP	Construction
Milwaukie: Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$ 1.50	TCSP	Replacement
Wilsonville: Kinsman Road	\$ 2.00	STP	Construction
Washington County: I-5/Highway 99W Connector	\$ 10.00	STP	Right-of-Way
Washington County: Hwy 217 Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy to Allen Blvd. Interchange	\$ 0.75	NHS	PE/DEIS
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33.85</b>		
<b>Non-Transportation Appropriations Bills</b>			
Port of Portland: Columbia River Channel Deepening	\$ 29.00	Energy & Water	Construction
Multnomah County: Beaver Creek Culverts	\$ 5.00	Energy & Water	Construction
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 34.00</b>		
<b>Regional support for OTA Transit Priorities</b>			
South Clackamas: Bus Replacement	\$0.50	FTA 5309 Bus	Replacement
City of Sandy: Bus Replacement & Facility	\$ 1.00	FTA 5309 Bus	Replacement/Facility
City of Canby: Bus and Bus Facility	\$0.95	FTA 5309 Bus	Replacement/Facility
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2.45</b>		
<b>Regional support for Washington/Clark County Priorities</b>			
Note: SW Washington projects to be inserted here			
<b>Total</b>			
<b>Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations</b>	<b>\$214.30</b>		



**STAFF REPORT****IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3891, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009 APPROPRIATIONS**

---

Date: December 11, 2007

Prepared by: Andy Cotugno

**BACKGROUND**

The region annually produces a position paper that outlines the views of the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), a regional body that consists of local elected and appointed officials, on issues concerning transportation funding that are likely to be considered by Congress during the coming year. This year priorities are limited to the FY '09 appropriations bill. Next year, the focus will be on the new six-year authorization bill.

The Portland region is pursuing an aggressive agenda to implement a high-capacity transit system. This effort involves implementing two projects concurrently within the next three to five years: opening the Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail and completing construction of the I-205/Downtown LRT. Project development is also underway for the next LRT corridor to Milwaukie and streetcar to the Eastside and Lake Oswego. Additionally, there are several complementary projects for which the region is requesting funding: bus and bus facility purchases regionwide, Wilsonville Park and Ride, highway projects and others. All of these projects have a strong economic development emphasis.

Oregon and Washington continue developing a cooperative strategy to address the transportation needs in the Columbia River Crossing Corridor through a multi-modal project. Furthermore, for the first time, this resolution proposes the Columbia River Crossing as the region's highest priority for funding through the Federal Highway Administration. This is in recognition of the regional and national significance of the I-5 corridor and this segment, particularly relating to the impact on movement of freight. The intent is to have a preferred alternative for the Columbia River Crossing defined through the NEPA process in 2008 to allow the region to seek designation in the next authorization bill as a "Project of National and Regional Significance." Designation of the Columbia River Crossing as the highest regional highway priority is not intended as an exclusive priority to the exclusion of funding for other projects. In addition, it is in recognition that it may be the priority at this point in time but another project will be designated as priority in the future, much like the multi-year, multi-project approach to implementing a regional light rail system. Finally, designation of the Columbia River Crossing as priority is with the understanding that the analysis that is underway will likely lead to identification of improvements beyond the project area that may need to be addressed in the future.

Beyond these regional transit and highway priorities, the resolution endorses a list of priority projects for earmarking through the federal highway appropriation from throughout the region. To ensure this resolution is limited to the highest priorities, the list is limited to no more than two projects per agency or subregional group of local governments. Included in the list are two priorities from Metro: A TOD project in partnership with Pacific University in Hillsboro by the Metro Planning Department and trail projects by the Metro Parks and Greenspaces Department. In addition this resolution endorses the project requests outside Metro's boundary from the transit districts surrounding Metro in Oregon and developed by the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council.

This FY '09 appropriations request for earmarked funding from SAFTEA-LU represents the consolidated regional request. Additional independent requests should not be submitted by any member jurisdiction or agency represented by JPACT (with exception of ODOT outside the metro region). Each member jurisdiction has limited their requests to two priorities each.

## **ANALYSIS/INFORMATION**

- 1. Known Opposition** None known.
- 2. Legal Antecedents** Projects within the region earmarked for federal funding must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by Metro Resolution No. 07-3831A, Approving the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.
- 3. Anticipated Effects** Resolution would provide the US Congress and the Oregon Congressional delegation specifically with the region's priorities for transportation funding for use in the federal transportation appropriation process.
- 4. Budget Impacts** Metro is involved in planning related to several of the projects included in the priorities paper and must approve many of the requested funding allocations. Failure to obtain funding for one or more of the projects could affect the FY 09-10 Planning Department budget. However, most of the funding requests deal with implementation projects sponsored by jurisdictions other than Metro.

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Approve Resolution 08-3891 for submission to the Oregon Congressional delegation for consideration in the Federal Fiscal Year '09 Appropriations Bill.

**WASTE ALLOCATION PROJECT**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, January 15, 2008  
Metro Council Chamber

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: 1/15/08                      Time: 3:35                      Length: 45 minutes

Presentation Title: Waste Allocation Project

Department: Solid Waste & Recycling

Presenters: Mike Hogle, Doug Anderson

### **ISSUE & BACKGROUND**

**Issue.** Metro limits the amount of putrescible waste that may be managed by transfer station franchisees and non-system licensees. On December 31, 2008, all but one of Metro’s wet-waste regulatory instruments expire. Renewals will require Council action.

On the surface, the issue appears simple: *how much waste should be authorized in the new franchises and licenses that will take effect on January 1, 2009?* However, waste allocations have widespread effects—many with policy implications—on collection rates, public and private disposal costs, the geographic distribution of services, ratepayer equity, and system efficiency.

To ensure that next year’s waste allocations will meet policy objectives to the maximum extent possible, the department is launching its Waste Allocation Project—an outgrowth of the Disposal System Planning/Transfer System Ownership Study of two years ago. The first phase of the project is devoted to developing a consensus on the policy objectives that the allocations should serve.

That first phase begins at this Work Session. By the end of the session today, staff hopes, at a minimum, that Councilors will be up to speed on the issues and their significance. Even better if Councilors can begin to identify the policy objectives they would like to see implemented.

Attached is a matrix to help you brainstorm the policy options. This tool will be described later in this worksheet, together with the next steps in the project.

**Background.** Background is provided through a series of questions and answers.

***What are tonnage authorizations?*** A tonnage authorization (or “tonnage cap”) is the amount of putrescible waste that Metro authorizes a licensed or franchised operator to accept each year.

Current authorizations are shown in the table on the next page.

**Current Tonnage Caps**

Facility	Location	Owner	Cap (tons/year)
American/Arrow / <sup>***</sup> /	Portland	Waste Connections	41,980
Columbia Environmental / <sup>**</sup> /	East Portland	Columbia Environmental, LLC	38,000
Forest Grove TS	Forest Grove	Waste Management	no cap / <sup>*</sup> /
Pride Recycling	Sherwood	Pride	65,000
Troutdale TS	Troutdale	Waste Management	65,000
Willamette Resources, Inc.	Wilsonville	Allied	65,000
Total of capped facilities:			274,980

TS = Transfer Station

- \* Forest Grove, like the Metro stations, is defined as a Regional Transfer Station. Regional Transfer Stations are not subject to caps. Forest Grove is governed by a non-system landfill license, currently 175,000 tons/year.
- \*\* Columbia Environmental has not yet opened. It is owned by a partnership of local independent haulers.
- \*\*\* American and Arrow are franchised haulers authorized to deliver waste to transfer stations in Vancouver, WA.

***When were the caps established?*** In 1998, when Metro made an explicit policy decision to authorize privately-owned facilities to begin accepting limited quantities of putrescible waste.

***What policy objectives did allocating waste serve?*** Primarily, *ratepayer cost containment*. Secondly, preservation of material recovery efforts and limiting the impact of disposal operations on local communities.

*Cost containment.* In the mid-1990s, the wet-waste disposal needs of the region were met by only 3 facilities—the Metro and Forest Grove transfer stations.<sup>1</sup> Because of increasing traffic congestion, by 1998 off-route transport cost<sup>2</sup> was one of the fastest-growing components of collection rates. By providing more disposal sites distributed throughout the region, haulers would be able to shorten their off-route travel distances and reduce costs—cost savings that would be passed on to the ratepayer through the local government rate process.

*Recovery and local impacts.* The initial cap in 1998 was 50,000 tons of wet waste + dry residual disposed per year. The cap was placed on disposal to encourage material recovery: an operator could accept 100,000 tons if he achieved a 50 percent recovery rate, but only 50,000 tons if he performed no recovery. By keeping the scale small (transfer stations typically handle 3 to 8 times this amount of tonnage), the local impact would remain small.

***So why is this an issue?*** Because there is not consensus that all policy objectives were achieved.

*Cost Containment.* Several jurisdictions testified that off-route cost savings helped cancel the effect of other cost pressures such as labor and medical insurance in their collection rates. So initially, the cost containment objective was met—at least partially.

<sup>1</sup> Other facilities were available for dry waste only (e.g., Hillsboro Landfill) or specialized wastes (e.g., tires).

<sup>2</sup> This is the time-and-travel cost when a hauler leaves a collection route to go to a disposal facility; and then back to the route or home to the truck barn.

However, the 50,000 ton cap was not sufficient to meet demand at several facilities. So there might have been greater cost savings if more haulers could use these facilities. Furthermore, in 1999 and 2000, some station operators testified that 50,000 tons did not allow for full utilization of capital, which kept their tip fees artificially high.

When Council increased the caps to 65,000 tons (and eliminated the cap on dry waste) in September 2001, there was no corresponding drop in private tip fees—and in fact, some facilities raised their fees. Several Councilors voiced concern that these tip fee increases had usurped the off-route savings, and thereby foiled Metro’s intended cost containment objective. Facility operators responded that tip fee increases were real: they faced other cost pressures, and their tip fees would have been even higher had Metro not provided the additional tonnage.

*Local impacts and hauler access.* At least two facilities have testified they continue to have to “manage” demand. Historically, haulers have testified that they do not have the access they expected when the “caps” policy was adopted, but they have not weighed-in on the topic recently. Nor have jurisdictions weighed-in on local impacts of extra tonnage. So the question of whether 65,000 tons is the “right” number to achieve policy objectives remains an open question.

## **OPTIONS AVAILABLE**

At this stage of the project, SWR is scoping potential policy outcomes and options are wide open at this point. At this Work Session, SWR will initiate brainstorming of the possible options for outcomes. For this, see “Questions Presented for Consideration,” below and on the next page.

## **IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

After today’s Work Session, the department intends to go through a similar exercise with other stakeholders. For each stakeholder group, staff will compile and synthesize the results, and return to them for confirmation. The intended product is a consensus Statement of Objectives that will guide the project scope in its subsequent phases—generation of options, evaluation, recommendation.

Staff anticipates that there will be competing objectives among stakeholders, so subsequent rounds may be needed to iron out the differences. If agreement cannot be met, the Council’s opinion will prevail.

SWR intends to involve the Council and other stakeholders in each of these phases.

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

The main question today is:

***What policy outcomes would Councilors like to obtain from next year’s waste allocations that will drive the scope of this project?***

## Using the department's Policy Outcomes Matrix

SWR has developed a 4-box matrix tool (attached) to help stimulate thinking.

The idea is to help Councilors focus their thoughts on the following categories. For each Councilor, please consider:

1. What are my imperative outcomes (“must-haves” and “cannot-haves”) from this project?  
*That is, the project would be considered unsuccessful if these outcomes are not realized.*
2. What are my optional outcomes (“nice-to-haves” and “prefer-not-to-haves”)?  
*That is, the project would be better if these outcomes are achieved, but do not crater the enterprise if they are not.*

For example,

- o You might brainstorm your must-haves by framing the issue as follows:  
*Waste SHOULD be allocated to private operators if \_\_\_\_\_*  
Some responses might be:
  - ... if ratepayers realize cost reductions or future cost containment.
  - ... if Metro retains sufficient tonnage to remain influential in the market (as discussed in the Metro Transfer System Ownership Study, June 2006).<sup>3</sup>
- o You might frame your nice-to-haves as:  
*Waste COULD be allocated to private operators if \_\_\_\_\_*
  - ... services such as hazardous waste are distributed more equitably across the region.
  - ... the allocation methodology is simple and understandable.
- o For your cannot-haves:  
*Waste MUST NOT be allocated to private operators if \_\_\_\_\_*  
... it jeopardizes Metro's ability to meet its contract obligations or bond covenants.
- o For your prefer-not-to-haves:  
*Waste SHOULD NOT be allocated to private operators if \_\_\_\_\_*
  - ... it results in new, excess transfer capacity.
  - ... publicly-owned transfer stations must become subject to caps..

We encourage you to jot some ideas in the matrix and bring them to the Work Session.

**LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION Yes No**  
**DRAFT IS ATTACHED Yes No**

---

<sup>3</sup> Some purists might recognize that this is an output, not an outcome. (The outcome is what Metro is trying to achieve through its influence—e.g., low rates.) But this is brainstorming so there are no wrong answers.

**SCOPING FRAMEWORK  
WET WASTE ALLOCATION PROJECT  
POLICY OUTCOMES**

<b>Imperatives</b>	<b>Options</b>
Must-Haves	Nice-to-Haves
Cannot-Haves	Prefer-Nots