

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Wednesday, April 30, 2008
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Robert Liberty (excused)

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

1. **REVIEW OF REMAINING STEPS TO ASSURE READINESS FOR BUDGET APPROVAL**

- a. Agreed on revisions on the Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC) Substantive Budget Amendment (Amendment MERC 3).
- b. Mike Hogland, Director Solid Waste and Recycling, gave a review and recommendations for the Rate Review Committee. There are four recommendations and observations from the committee – 1) local programs will be pressured; 2) manage rates by managing costs; 3) placeholder for diesel retrofit; 4) exercise caution in the use of undesignated fund balance and self hauling pricing.
- c. Michael Jordan, COO, discussed the Excise Tax and its concerns with the Zoo.
- d. Technical amendments will be moved as a group.
- e. Substantive amendments:
 - i. Solid Waste Substantive 1: With the supply of a line item appropriations will be brought forward.
 - ii. Councilor Burkholder 1 and 2 brought forward.
 - iii. Councilor Park 1 brought forward.
 - iv. President Bragdon 1 will not be brought forward, but two notes added to the budget, one to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program and one to the Capital Grant Program.
 - v. Councilor Hosticka 1 will come forward but as a carry over designated.
 - vi. Councilor Hosticka 2 will not come forward as originally proposed.

2. **ANY CARRY-OVER DISCUSSION TO REACH CONCLUSION ON TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS?**

- a. Property Tax Compression discussion initiated by Councilor Park on Tuesday, April 29th work session.

3. **DETERMINE READINESS FOR APPROVAL ON MAY 1 OR LIKELIHOOD OF CONTINUANCE TO MAY 6: WHAT REMAINS TO BE RESOLVED TO BE PREPARED FOR FINAL VOTE.**

- a. Diesel Retrofit: Solid Waste and Recycling Substantive 1.
 - vii. Mr. Hogland gave a management response:
 1. Office of Metro Attorney: Daniel Cooper, Metro Attorney, and Marv Fjordbach, Office of Metro Attorney, discussed the initial action of using monies from regional system fees as against the statute that states spending of solid waste fees for disposal only as opposed to collection.

2. Mr. Hogland discussed other possible options, one of which included an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant that could be applied for.
- viii. Council addressed what was being asked for: \$800,000 instead of \$7 million (total) for FY 2008-09.
- ix. Councilor Harrington expressed reservations on overall approval based on what appears to be a lack of work-through for the project.
- x. Councilor Park asked if the number for particulate matter was a region-wide number.
- xi. President Bragdon asked if there was a portion of the regional system fee that could fund a regional coordinating function.
 1. Mr. Cooper response: That still needed to be explored.
- xii. Councilor Hosticka asked about a decision to approve or deny occurring on April 30th?
 1. There were a few options:
 - a. Hold off until next year
 - b. Look to Local Governments
 - c. Approve the proposal
 2. Create a Budget Note that states: With further Council discussion, Council would place some monies into contingency with the possibility of using them for a Diesel Retrofit. However, Council would like to hear more about programmatic development options before grant is applied for and those monies are released from contingency.
- f. Substantive Councilor Burkholder 1: Would be brought forth and voted on May 1.
 - i. Councilor Park was comfortable with the amendment as a starting point.
 - ii. President Bragdon was supportive
 - iii. Councilor Collette was supportive
- g. Substantive Councilor Burkholder 2: Would be brought forth and voted on May 1. Council wanted to see an appropriation of the cost before a vote on the amendment.
 - i. Councilor Collette asked if this was a region wide program? She expressed the reservation that it seemed to only help Multnomah County and the Portland area. Upping fees for all the region's residents to help only one portion of the region was unfair.
 1. Response: The intent was to help existing programs and to offer incentive to others to restart their programs.
 - ii. President Bragdon: Was concerned about regional equity with the program. This may not be the best reason to raise a regional system fee.
 - iii. Councilor Harrington saw it as a tool to reach younger people of the region and was at the heart of what Metro strived to do.
- h. Substantive Councilor Park 1: Would be brought forth and voted on May 1.
 - i. Very straight forward.
 - ii. According to Management, there was no clear funding source.
 1. TOD options might help fund
 2. Add a note stating it was Council's intent to get Integrating Habitat ideas on the ground.
- i. Substantive President Bragdon 1: Council would wait a month to fully flesh out options for this amendment.
 - i. President Bragdon offered to drop the amendment but wanted to add an option for looking for new opportunities to achieve the continued momentum

of the Integrating Habitat design competition. He wanted to investigate other avenues to achieve ideas of the amendments.

- ii. Nature in Neighborhoods staff did not feel they alone could achieve the amendment's goal.
- j. Substantive Councilor Hosticka 1: Would be brought forth and voted on May 1.
 - i. Councilor Park asked to clarify that this was both a process and a product measurement within the Council proposal.
- k. Substantive Councilor Hosticka 2: Councilor Hosticka offered to issue a letter to Washington County to offer suggestions about future urban growth boundary (UGB) processes instead of a budget amendment. The letter stated that Metro was willing to participate in discussion with Washington County for concept planning. Councilor Hosticka would meet with individual Councilors to assess whether they would sign the letter or not.
 - i. Councilor Harrington expressed reservations that the letter proposed was more of a strong arm than a helpful approach.
 - ii. President Bragdon supported the approach more than a proposal and was willing to sign the letter.
 - iii. Councilor Collette was willing to sign.
 - iv. Councilor Burkholder supported the idea, but wanted to see it more fleshed out.

4. BREAK

5. PERFORMANCE MEASURE PROJECT

- a. Status:
 - i. Critical Success Factors were internal and Metro's focus
 - 1. By end of May it would be determined where there was real data
 - ii. Regional Indicators
 - 1. Consultant evaluated and made recommendations on what data could be collected, and what each RI data availability was. The goal was to return to Council by end of May.
 - iii. Key Performance Indicators
 - 1. Fall level discussion.
 - iv. Program measures
 - 1. These were the least connected to the whole project. One major effort in the summer and fall was to connect to the overall project.
- b. How was this in communicating to the general public?
 - i. Councilor Burkholder wanted to see this as a key factor when creating measures and narrowing the focus.
 - ii. Mr. Jordan stated the Metro Council needed to be comfortable enough with measures before taking them as final to the public.
- c. Regional Indicators: Next steps: Councilor Harrington wanted to make sure Council was not just getting a report, she wanted to see some engagement with Council.
 - i. One of the major objectives was the limit of the number of proposed measures.
 - ii. What was the engagement
 - 1. During the summer there would not be a significant amount of engagement

2. The significant amount will happen in August and September. This would help management create viable data streams.
 - d. How does this project integrate other areas? What is being measured?
 - i. The project strives to show how Metro informs the region and Council when it is time to make major decisions, and to ensure decisions follow goals and are accomplished.
 - e. How do Council goals fit in here?
 - i. They are a separate issue that may require a separate resolution in May to finalize goals.
- 6. NEXT STEPS ON PERFORMANCE MEASURES**
- a. What does management need from Council?
 - i. Notion whether the focus of sustainability is agreeable.
 - ii. Discussion on Goals
- 7. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS**
- a. Councilor Harrington had good feedback on Reserves Core 4 retreat saying the board was working synergistically.
 - i. A staff member asked to have more references to rural reserves when discussing urban reserves.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Prepared by,



Sarah Erskine
Financial Planning Assistant

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
 APRIL 30, 2008**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
6	Report	4/30/08	Performance Measurement Project, Status Report, April 30, 2008	043008cw-1
2	Letter	4/28/08	To: President David Bragdon and Metro Councilors From: Portland Public Schools and the Board of Education Re: Outdoor School April 28, 2008	043008cw-2
1	Memo	4/30/08	To: President David Bragdon and Metro Councilors From: Mike Hogle, Solid Waste and Recycling Re: Recommendations of the Rate Review Committee on rate management April 30, 2008	043008cw-3
2	Amendment	4/30/08	Amendment to FY 2008-09 Budget, Revised 4/30/08, Budget Amendment from MERC, sponsored by David Woolson, revised April 30, 2008	043008cw-4
1	Memo	4/24/08	To: Metro Councilors From: Margo Norton, Finance Re: Compendium of Budget Documents April 24, 2008	043008cw-5