



**METRO**

**Agenda**

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
DATE: April 30, 2008  
DAY: Wednesday  
TIME: 2:00 PM  
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

- 2:00 PM**      1.      **REVIEW OF REMAINING STEPS TO ASSURE READINESS FOR BUDGET APPROVAL**
- 2:05 PM**      2.      **ANY CARRY-OVER DISCUSSION TO REACH CONCLUSION ON TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS?**
- 2:15 PM**      3.      **CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND MOVING TO CONSENSUS ON COUNCIL PROPOSALS**
- 3:00 PM**      4.      **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**
- 3:05 PM**      5.      **BREAK**
- 3:15 PM**      6.      **PERFORMANCE MEASURE PROJECT**
- 4:05 PM**      7.      **NEXT STEPS ON PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**ADJOURN**

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: April 30, 2008 Time: 2:15 pm Length: 2.5 hours

Presentation Title: Continued Discussion and Deliberation of Proposed FY 2008-09 budget (Ord 08-1181)

Department: Office of the Chief Operating Officer

Presenters: Representatives of all departments will be available

- 2:15 – 2:20 Review of remaining steps to assure readiness for budget approval
- 2:20 – 2:30 Any carry-over discussion to reach conclusion on technical amendments?
- 2:30 – 3:15 Continued discussion and Moving to Consensus on Council proposals
- 3:15 – 3:20 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.

### BREAK

- 3:30 – 4:20 Performance Measurement Project
- 4:20 – 4:30 Next steps on Performance Measures

Note: Discussion of Council proposals may continue for as long as Council determines is desirable to reach readiness to proceed to final budget consideration. If this requires additional time, we will postpone Performance Measures to another session.

**EXPECTED OUTCOME: Final list of balanced amendments to go forward for Council vote on May 1 or May 6.**

**Status review of performance measurement project.**

**LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION** \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No

Resolution 08-3939, approving the budget and authorizing the COO to transmit the approved budget to the TSCC, is scheduled for final consideration on May 1 or May 6. Following the TSCC hearing on June 5, 2008, Ordinance 08-1181 adopting the budget is scheduled for final consideration on June 19, 2008.

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

**DATE:** April 24, 2008

**TO:** David Bragdon, Council President  
Rex Burkholder, Councilor  
Kathryn Harrington, Councilor  
Carl Hosticka, Councilor  
Robert Liberty, Councilor  
Carlotta Collette, Councilor  
Rod Park, Councilor

**FROM:** Margo Norton, Deputy CFO

**RE:** **Compendium of Budget Documents**

This packet contains the materials you will need for next week's work sessions. They will also be posted electronically.

## **Packet 1: Questions and Responses**

We have received written questions from President Bragdon and Councilors Burkholder, Harrington and Liberty. Questions were assigned through Finance Managers or Department Budget liaisons to first line respondents and then compiled into this document. The questions and answers become part of our permanent budget discussion record.

## **Packet 2: Department Budget Amendments**

This packet contains several technical amendments and three substantive amendments from departments forwarded by the Budget Officer for your consideration. Separate transmittals remind the Council how these actions have been taken up previously, providing expediency for the technical amendments and more deliberation for the substantive amendments.

## **Packet 3: Council Proposals and Management Response**

For convenience we have reprinted the Council proposals, joined with the management response and a summary spreadsheet.

Electronic Distribution:  
Senior Directors  
Finance Managers  
Council Assistants

**1. With regard to enterprise revenues forecast for the DRC: how are the services which are sold to outside parties costed and priced? Are they based on the marginal costs of doing the work or does an element of the price also include some share of overhead? To the extent our services compete with services provided by private sector firms, how do we determine whether or not we are competing fairly?**

*Response:* ORS allows Metro to charge for “GIS” data-up to market rates. When Metro began the program in 1991, Ernst & Young were engaged to develop a marketing study that set the foundation for this part of our operation. The current ‘shop rate’ of \$85/hr recovers our costs, contributes to our computer replacement fund, and helps fund RLIS data set maintenance.

Regarding competition with the private sector, this has never been an issue, and to the contrary, the business community generally sees our services as complementary, offering products and services they find valuable. Our market level pricing does not unfairly compete with them. To date, Metro has not received a complaint of unfair government competition, this includes the pricing of RLIS, which is viewed as a tremendous asset to the region and a bargain for current and high quality data.

In the next fiscal year, we will be updating the DRC business plan and developing an inventory of other GIS resources in the region. This exercise will give us a better understanding of regional GIS business practices so that we can revisit these questions with current information.

**2. With regard to operating hours (or more specifically opening hours) at the hazardous waste receiving stations: do we periodically review the hours that we are open to determine whether or not we are maximizing service and convenience relative to staffing costs?**

*Response:* Solid Waste and Recycling management conducts informal reviews of the hazardous waste facility hours on an occasional basis to establish staffing levels relative to 1) processing waste and 2) customer service. Most recently this subject was considered as part of a study comparing Metro’s HHW program with 23 other leading programs [Cascadia Consulting Group, Comparison of Household Hazardous Waste Programs, 2005]. This study concluded that Metro’s permanent facilities “...provided more days of service than fixed facilities in many other jurisdictions” and that Metro “offers more comprehensive services than other programs in terms of...availability of services.”

**Hours:** Metro’s two permanent hazardous waste facilities are open 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Saturday. The staff comes in at 6 a.m., spending the first three hours doing waste processing tasks before the facilities open to the public. Being open to the public 9 to 4 provides service to the bulk of the self-haul customers bringing trash to the transfer stations. In the comparison with other regions, Cascadia Consulting Group found two programs with permanent facilities that were open more days per year than Metro’s, but neither of these provided mobile events. The combination of Metro’s permanent facility hours and extensive roundup program provides a more comprehensive overall level of service than any other program surveyed.

**Staffing costs:** At present, SWR does not track throughput by time of day. However, staff is fully occupied even when customer traffic is slow — mainly, processing waste; but also ordering supplies, processing paperwork for Conditionally Exempt Generator customers and waste shipments, housekeeping and maintenance, etc. In general, there is occasionally additional work to do at both facilities, and staff is supplemented with interns and temporaries as needed. The temporary employees are utilized for the hours needed, no more.

**Convenience:** SWR solicits comments from the customers using Metro’s hazardous waste services by providing comment cards. On occasion, comments are received about the program’s operating hours, and in particular a handful of commenters over the years have expressed a preference for Sunday hours. Current hours result in more than 46,000 customers using the facilities annually, one of the highest participation rates in the nation.

**3. With regard to OMA: what workload or specialization factors determine to what extent we retain outside counsel and to what extent we rely on in-house counsel?**

*Response:* The general rule is that in-house lawyers are expected to fill the legal needs of Metro for general legal work including all agency contracts, employment and Metro Council policy development matters. Litigation is handled in-house for purpose of discovery and possible settlement discussions or motion for summary judgment purposes. Land use litigation is handled in-house exclusively. Workload fluctuations are handled by having the attorneys who want to learn new subject areas assist those who are experiencing peak demand for services.

Use of outside counsel is generally reserved for specialization-driven needs. Examples are Bond Counsel, or special tax Counsel related to Tax exempt bonds; litigation where cases have a high probability of going to a jury trial (this is a mix of specialization and workload management since Metro has very few such cases, rarely one a year on average and jury trials require an immense amount of time to prepare); and other specialized matters (we have outside counsel assisting on the environmental liability issues related to Willamette Cove).

**1. Question (B2): Explain large increase in enterprise revenue.**

*Response:* Enterprise revenues are expected to increase approximately 14.5 percent over the current year budget. There are several factors leading to this increase.

- Part of the apparent increase is that the current year budget is conservative. FY 2006-07 enterprise revenues exceeded \$108 million. Enterprise revenues for the current year will approach the same levels. A good portion of the increase is driven by record attendance at the zoo.
- In the current year the Solid Waste and Recycling department assumed the opening of a new private facility – Columbia Environmental – with the diversion of approximately 40,000 tons of waste. The new facility has not yet opened, resulting in more waste through Metro facilities. Both revenues and expenditures are increased as a result. A mid-April amendment was processed through Council.

The three largest sources of ENTERPRISE revenue are Solid Waste, MERC and the zoo. The increases are a little different in each case.

- ZOO: Record breaking attendance continues to be the leading reason. With our reserve policies firmly in place, to protect against unexpected conditions, the zoo is forecasting their revenues more realistically. Also, the proposed budget includes some small fee increases, the special Dinosaur exhibit this summer, and plans to increase “shoulder” season attendance.
- MERC also has some rental increases, a longer run Broadway series, and some additional local events.
- SOLID WASTE has the largest increase. In part, the delayed opening of Columbia Environmental results in more tonnage through the system. Contractual increases in transportation and transfer station operations are captured in increased rates. The proposed budget also includes \$2.3 million in anticipated revenues for the diesel retrofitting project, which may require some adjustment before adoption.

Finally, the proposed exemption of zoo revenues from excise tax has the net effect of increasing zoo enterprise revenues by approximately \$1.1 million for the 10-month period the exemption would be in effect (the ordinance would take effect September 1, 2008) while decreasing excise tax revenue.

The table below breaks out major enterprise revenues by category. It does not include internal Risk Management charges, which are reflected in the budget as enterprise revenue.

	<b>Compared to FY 2007-08 Budget</b>				
	<b>FY 2007-08 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2008-09 Budget</b>	<b>\$ Change</b>	<b>% Change</b>	<b>June 30, 2008 Estimate (2)</b>
<b>Solid Waste</b>	\$53,201,659	\$61,154,735	\$7,953,075	\$14.95%	\$54,900,000
<b>MERC</b>	27,343,233	30,428,569	3,085,336	11.28%	27,890,000
<b>Oregon Zoo</b>	15,220,206	18,498,650	3,278,444	21.54%	15,570,000
<b>Regional Parks</b>	2,480,146	2,590,812	110,666	4.46%	2,480,000
<b>Planning</b>	828,160	991,821	163,661	19.76%	730,000
<b>Other (1)</b>	989,138	1,161,138	172,000	17.39%	1,080,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$100,062,542</b>	<b>\$114,825,724</b>	<b>\$14,763,182</b>	<b>\$14.75%</b>	<b>\$102,650,000</b>

(1) Other includes Smith and Bybee Lakes education program fees, business license program fees, parking revenue at Metro Regional Center, and lease revenue at Metro Regional Center

(2) June 30, 2008 estimate based on 2nd quarter financial reports

**2. Question (B2): Explain large increase in Miscellaneous Revenue**

*Response:* The FY 2008-09 miscellaneous revenues includes the first year of construction of the Blue Lake Nature and Golf Learning Center. The project calls for approximately \$2.75 million in additional revenue currently not identified. This revenue is reflected in the budget as a miscellaneous revenue, resulting in the very large increase compared to the current year.

**3. Question (B7): Zoo shows large increase in donations. What is purpose and what is plan if levels not reached?**

*Response:* As can be seen from the table below, although the FY 2008-09 budget appears to reflect a large increase in donations, it is right in line with prior year actual receipts. Donations fund specific education or conservation programs. No core functions are funded through donations. To the extent that donations are not received the specific programs will be scaled back to match.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
FY 2005-06 Actual	\$1,500,390
FY 2006-07 Actual	1,400,985
FY 2007-08 Amended Budget	1,106,369
FY 2008-09 Proposed Budget	\$1,310,795

**4. Question (B11): 14% contingency in general fund. Is this reasonable?**

*Response:* As indicated by the chart below, the General Fund contingency is made up of several components. The chart demonstrates that we have followed the financial policies for general contingency and stabilization reserves and have followed the multi-year plan put in motion last fall during the reserves discussion.

<u>Contingency</u>		
Contingency		
* Contingency	\$3,277,295	Per approved reserve policy – 4% of total Expenditures
* Opportunity Account	500,000	Per approved reserve policy
* Reserve for Future Planning Needs	351,000	Per Ordinance 07-1160B; amended by Ordinance 08-1173
* Reserve for Furture Election Costs	290,000	Per Ordinance 07-1160B
* Reserve for Reg. Afford. Housing Revolving Fund	1,000,000	Per Ordinance 07-1160B
* Reserve for Metro Regional Center Remodel	413,000	Per Ordinance 07-1160B
* Recovery Rate Stablization Reserve	2,096,867	Per Metro Code
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$7,928,162</b>	

**5. Question (B13): Landfill closure expenses are becoming clearer. When we will have certainty and what are plans if there is a shortage or a surplus?**

*Response:* SWR is currently working with DEQ on a Record of Decision that will generate additional costs for remediation. Currently, the range is between \$3 to \$7 million, which would be expended over a three to four year period, commencing approximately FY 2011. Staff expects the estimates to firm-up by 2010. As the costs become better known, the department would engage in a continuing dialogue with Council on potential sources of funds. At present, the department is maintaining an undedicated fund balance of approximately \$7.2 million, which would cover the upper range of the current estimate. If there is a surplus, the department would work with Council on the appropriate use of the surplus funds. If a shortage appears to be looming, the department would research potential sources of additional funds. The Regional System Fee is the most logical candidate for a rate-based source of new funds.

**6. Question (MERC 1): Objectives for 08-09 should include response to external financial auditor recommendations**

*Response:* The principal recommendations in the external audit have been satisfied during the current year. Those closed, with no cost impact, include: resolution of component unit question, reconciliation of account transactions between MERC and Metro, control over vendor establishment and compilation of Aramark documents. Underway in the current year are: contractor engaged for the Aramark performance audit including payroll controls; participation in the Metro fixed asset inventory project; installation and implementation of Smart Maintenance to track capital assets.

**7. Question (MERC 2): Coordinate response between Expo, MERC and COO to CRC project potential impacts of Marine Drive Interchange re-design.**

*Response:* As discussed at the work session, the realignment of Marine Drive is a relatively recent and fluid discussion. The earliest proposal has been changed at least once already. An ultimate design may provide both disadvantages and advantages to Metro. President Bragdon's suggestion about determining a set of "fixed principles" by which any realignment proposal might be evaluated is a good one. MERC will identify resources in the proposed budget to engage expert consultant advice to position MERC and Metro to evaluate and take advantage of whatever opportunities are presented.

**8. Question (zoo): What is being done to respond to the parking situation?**

*Response:* Two specific actions to manage the existing parking lot are reflected in the proposed budget: an increase in the parking fee from \$1 to \$2 and a "rail to rail" incentive which will allow MAX riders to ride the zoo train without cost. We are continuing efforts to secure a long term agreement for overflow parking.

**9. Question (C41): Sustainability as an organizing principle is not being applied. Program description reads as a collection of activities not directed at a common goal**

*Response:* We will modify the current narrative to better reflect and integrate Sustainability as an organizing principle.

**10. Question (C42): Rewrite purpose of the UGR effort as being "to inform decisions regarding growth management" not "adoption of amount of UGB expansion"**

*Response:* Yes, we will revise this sentence.



**11. Question (C47): Sustainability as an organizing principle is not being applied. Re-write to frame in 3-Es of sustainability.**

*Response:* We will modify the current narrative to better reflect and integrate Sustainability as an organizing principle.

## VOLUME 3

**12. Question (A7): Chart shows expenditures by Council goal. Is this the best measure of effort and importance? What other measures could be presented?**

*Response:* Two years ago, Council requested that the program budget be organized around goal, so that it could see the amount being spent on each goal area. This is now the third year the budget has been presented this way.

Additional charts could be considered, such as personal service costs by goal, FTE by goal, or even operating costs exclusive of specific types of expenses, such as planning's pass-through grants, the Solid Waste operator contracts, or the natural areas land expenditures. We are very willing to discuss and explore different options.

The Regional Indicators and the Metro Key Performance Indicators listed under each goal are measures directed at determining whether the goals are being achieved and Metro's strategies within the goal areas are working. The expenditure and FTE charts measure effort; these other measures help to evaluate progress.

**13. Question (B5): Suggested perf. Measure: Energy consumption/efficiency rating of new and existing buildings, eg, % of new buildings that meet LEED, Energy Star, or other standard for energy efficiency**

*Response:* Good suggestion. This suggestion will be considered by the Performance Measurement team, which will assess the availability of this and similar data and make a recommendation on the best measure to use.

**14. Question (B6): Strategies should include: Parking management programs in centers**

*Response:* Good suggestion. The strategy may be inherent within one of the other strategies, but it may be appropriate to call out parking management separately. The performance measurement team will look into developing an appropriate performance measure and data source for this.

**15. Question (B14): Suggested perf. Measure: "Information that is clear, written in plain English and readily usable in policy formulation"**

*Response:* Staff can add this as a performance measure. We propose testing all of the documents that we produce for public policy formulation using a check through MS Word that could tell if the information is presented at the 8th grade level. *Rex may have other suggestions of how to measure our performance along this indicator.*

**16. Question (C23): The Urban Reserves program shows funding continuing until 2013. My understanding is that this process ends in Winter 2009; why is it shown continuing for another 4 years?**

*Response:* Yes, the majority of this effort will conclude in FY 2009-10. Beyond FY 2009-10, we anticipate that staff will have a decreased level of involvement after the Metro Council designation, as LCDC considers the designation, and reserves are put into place. Planning will decrease the amount of funds required for FY 2010-11 through FY 2012-13 to better reflect the estimated resources required.

**17. Question (C23): Question (C43): The Private Facility Regulation program expects rapidly increasing costs, almost doubling in 6 years. Why is this happening and have other options for this service been considered, eg, outside auditors?**

*Response:* The near-doubling between FY 2006-07 and FY 2012-13 is a result of three basic factors: two new FTE (in FY 2006-07 and FY 2007-08), an increase in the Law Enforcement Intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) in FY 2007-08, and trending from FY 2008-09 at the standard department assumptions for personal services and materials and services (7 percent and 2.25 percent per year, respectively). Growth pressures on this program come mainly from three areas (1) An increase in the number of applications has increased the licensing workload; (2) growth in the number and average distance of facilities has increased travel time for inspectors; and (3) the complexity of the system and growing sophistication of violators has increased the demand on case-making for enforcement actions. The program already outsources a considerable amount of work—mainly, the investigatory functions, which are covered by the IGAs with law enforcement agencies. During the last several years, the program has utilized job-sharing with Engineering to cover inspection demand. As new waste reduction initiatives become more regulatory and enforcement-oriented during the next several years, the program intends to work with Waste Reduction to redeploy current staff before making any proposals to add new resources. Finally, the department intends to analyze the resources needed for this program during the strategic planning project in 2008.

**18. Question (C45): SW reduction program shows a growing deficit. What are the assumptions leading to this conclusion?**

*Response:* All SWR programs have growing “deficits,” in order to show the program-specific demands on the Regional System Fee over time. The Solid Waste Reduction budgets for personal services and materials and services (excluding grants) are trended at the standard department assumptions of 7 percent and 2.25 percent per year, respectively. (Grants are not trended.) An additional assumption is that Waste Reduction will continuously redeploy staff as projects wind down and new projects emerge over time. For example, some staff who worked on the Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery project last year are now working on the Recycle at Work project.

**19. Question (E11): COO function is expected to do a lot. Is there need for additional staff support to oversee agency?**

*Response:* This question addresses capacity in the Office of the COO which will be the subject of a specific Council-COO discussion in the near future.

**13. Question (E12): Communication strategy should have performance measure relating to penetration of sustainability message internally and externally (possibly covered in Workforce Communication)**

*Response:* Good suggestion. It makes sense to include this in Workforce Communication. We will work to establish baseline data with questions in the employee survey.

**14. Question (E38): Recruitment and retention: What is the expected retirement of senior executives and how is continuity of program being planned?**

*Response:* With the exception of the current HR Director, we do not yet know the retirement plans of the senior management team. General workforce longevity and specific retirement intentions are among the information that will be gathered through the employee survey beginning in May. With this information, Human Resources will develop an agency-wide succession plan.

**15. Question (E40): Risk management: Has an inventory of exposure to climate change-related effects been made of Metro owned properties, eg, severe storms, flooding?**

*Response:* No specific inventory of potential, changing or new exposures related to climate change-related factors has been made. Our claims history identifies prior flood exposures for Solid Waste and Regional Parks, and wind damage for the Oregon Zoo and Expo.

**1. The agency and employees have much to be proud of, as the major accomplishments FY07-08 demonstrate, and generally good goal setting with the Major objectives for FY 08-09**

*Response:* Information only, no response needed. Thanks for commenting.

**2. Many of the major objectives seem to be stated as tasks to be completed (a measurable key result) versus an objective that will be reached through that result. Pages C-47 (PAGR) and C-42 (Planning) provide good clear objectives with the 'as measured by' result clarity. While this may be an improvement over past years of budget work, there is room for improvement so that objectives are miscast as specific results.**

**a. Planning (C-42) – Just a few more words would really make the objectives more meaningful for our regional customers (taxpayers/ stakeholders/partners) Ex., 2nd sub-item: 75% of concepts plan (how many plans though? 75% of a small number is still small while 75% of a larger number gives a different scale/context. 3rd sub-item (example addition)"...corridors for economically strong, vibrant sustainable communities.' Last bullet 'Implement three to five new TOD projects' – in support of what strategy? (A few more words would help.)**

*Response:* Planning will add further clarification on these objectives. The following will be included in the department's narrative:

**1st Bullet:**

- Implement the Making the Greatest Place program to support the alignment of local and regional actions that leverage private investment to create the vibrant and prosperous communities envisioned in the 2040 Growth Concept. This includes:
- Heighten efforts to inspire local jurisdictions to implement policies and tools that increase capacity in centers and corridors as vibrant communities.
- Better align funding, land supply and investment decisions into a performance based, outcome-oriented framework .
- Provide technical and financial assistance to communities to complete concept plans for 2,000 – 3,000 acres and adopt them into local comprehensive plans in addition to continued support for planning over 12,000 acres in the Damascus area.
- Develop a strategy to address infrastructure needs, especially those needed to support vibrant centers and corridors.
- Establish a long term plan for the region with the evaluation of urban and rural reserves leading to their adoption in 2009.
- Prepare the next Urban Growth Report to inform decisions regarding growth management in 2009.

**2nd Bullet:** Re-worded to read: Complete the state-mandated component of the RTP Update to be adopted by the end of 2009 that is aligned, compliments and supports state land use planning and transportation goals.

**3rd Bullet:** Re-worded to read: Provide leadership to develop a regional transportation finance strategy to include state funding, federal funding and the elements of a regional funding measure to address significant gaps in the region's transportation infrastructure.

**4th Bullet:** Re-worded to read: Advance the regional high-capacity transit (HCT) agenda, including Milwaukie LRT, Columbia River Crossing LRT, Eastside Streetcar, Lake Oswego Streetcar and the regional HCT plan to continue to provide the long term vision of the region's transportation priorities.

**5th Bullet:** Re-worded to read: Implement three to five new TOD projects to advance program goals to encourage and catalyze development along transit and in centers.

**3. C-7, Metro Council:**

- a. This section doesn't seem to have any major objectives for the Council wrt Making the Greatest Place program. Seems to me like a significant opportunity. IMHO we want to establish new policies or directions in FY 08/09 for infrastructure/financing, PBGM, plus regional agreement for Reserves as well as complete the outcomes based approach for the RTP. (I may be going too far out in time on the RTP objective.)
- b. Also, do we have an objective wrt agency performance measures ala 'adoption of updated Metro agency performance measures?'
- c. Lastly, do we want to give ourselves (or proactively demonstrate) our role in regional collaboration through these objectives? Example objective: Metro Councilors actively engaged in collaborative venues across the region, including but not limited to: reserve coordination efforts, business? other?

*Response:* President Bragdon has placed this on the April 29 work session agenda.

**4. C-19, Objective 08-09: "Put performance measures into operation" As one Metro Councilor, while it is good to operationalize the performance measures, I would like to see the performance measures defined and acknowledged by Council as an early step.**

*Response:* The objective anticipates the continuing Council discussions of the performance measurement project in May 2008 and thereafter. As noted in earlier Council discussions performance measurement is a multi-year project, and the Finance and Administrative Services Department will continue to shepherd whatever implementation the Council determines.

**5. While MERC and the Zoo are referred to as 'Enterprises,' the budget information, particularly objectives, don't seem to be stated in 'business' terms. (C-33 for MERC, C-38 for Zoo.) Yes, Revenue objectives are important, 'business or enterprise' operations must also manage the expense side. I believe that business operational management is being done – but I don't see it reflected in the budget info (ex. in dept summaries and program section.). One idea: "Reduce gap between revenue to expenses to an xyz% level." I don't see the budget info giving a sense for how such an objective is being set for this next fiscal year let alone managed on a year-to-year basis. Interestingly, page D-25 (MERC, Volume 1, Fund Summary) does state that 'Enterprise revenue is projected to grow 11 percent.'**

*Response:* Zoo management agrees that the budget documents are generally heavy on revenue and light on statements about cost. That said, zoo management pays close attention to the zoo's operating costs and manages expenditures through per cap monitoring, weekly and monthly activity reports, monthly comparisons to prior year data, and other analyses. In addition, we're working to formalize monthly revenue and expenditure goals that can be actively managed by divisions to balance revenue generation with cost and customer service considerations. The program budget document includes more balance between revenues and costs in the indicators of success sections (see volume 3, pages B-30, C-24, and C-26).

MERC uses numerous profitability factors including Food and Beverage Gross Margins, Operating Margins, Strategic Fund Balance Goal. Staff compensation incentives rely on operating margins. Performance measures form a basis for many budget decisions including Facility Evaluations, MWESB Purchasing, Economic Impact, Attendance/Tickets, Occupancy Rates and Customer Service Surveys. Many of these measures and critical success factors are included in the Program Budget Volume 3, Pages B-28 and D-31 or in the MERC Commission budget documents and MERC Commission monthly financial reports.

**6. C-58: Solid Waste and Recycling: As far as I could tell, this is the only department that I references RLI – interesting given that this is an investment in employee skill development to help ensure that Metro is more effective in providing value and services to the region. Information? General response needed?**

*Response:* The Solid Waste and Recycling department’s objective is to take a lead role in assisting the agency with RLI principles and strategies. Other departments have incorporated RLI techniques into their business, program and outreach practices. MERC includes RLI in its strategic plan.

**7. C-28, Information Technology, Section “Service Level Changes from FY 2007-2008” last sentence on page, “while these represent... represents a significant new service delivery under this cost structure.” New service to support what business objective? Can you help me make the association?**

*Response:* The new service cited is the implementation of the PeopleSoft asset management module. Implementation of this module is in direct response to the agency’s need to track assets from their original acquisition, through their ultimate replacement or retirement. The asset module is intended to address a need in the agency for improved tracking of assets, a point that has repeatedly outlined by the Office of the Metro Auditor. In addition, Moss Adams reported on this need in their 2006-2007 audit. The implementation is designed to address the audit comments and lack of controls on asset inventory as well as to meet CAFR reporting requirements.

In addition, the asset management module will provide regular updates of asset information to the renewal and replacement system being developed by Finance section staff. With the capability of the module in place, asset life-cycle events can be tracked from PO through retirement.

**8. Unfunded projects: I appreciated seeing these items specific.**

*Response:* Information only, no response needed. Thanks for commenting.

**9. F-19, Info. Tech., Unfunded Projects: So what risk are we taking on as a result of this unfunded project? Is it a business performance risk to the Zoo (ala business performance goals) or managing a liability (ala if it breaks we’re toast) or other?**

*Response:* The write-up under F-19 “Unfunded Projects” is a remnant of the migration to the renewal and replacement program. The write-up does not reflect the new reality under the renew and replacement program. Under the new renewal and replacement program all business essential network equipment replacements are anticipated and accounted for abased upon their appropriate lifecycle for replacement. As such, there is no risk to the business continuity of the zoo operation since all network essential equipment are funded for replacement.

A corrected version of the unfunded on F-19 should read: Priority projects that remain unfunded include an upgrade to the Tower Records Management (TRIM) software and continued upgrades of the zoo in building network infrastructure.” The later of these is being addressed on a building by building basis as facilities are upgraded or replaced.

**10. A-6: As one Metro Councilor, I don't believe that we have adopted the Goals as articulated. What's happening? Adopting a budget with a proposed recasting of current Council adopted goals, to me is not a substitute for adopting a refined set of Council Goals i.e. don't skip that independent step.**

*Response:* We anticipate a discussion of the refined Council Goals as an independent step in May and June as part of both the general performance measurement discussions and performance based growth management.

**11. B-5 thru B-7, Goal 1 : Lots of feedback – too numerous to type up. Let's talk.**

*Response:* The Regional Indicators, Metro Strategies, and Key Performance Indicators at the beginning of each goal section are a "work in progress." Some reflect existing Metro requirements; some will be part of the performance based growth management outcomes; and some are measures currently being considered. Future steps will be designed to limit the number of measures and improve their quality, and include an analysis of data availability for each measure, discussions with council to get feedback on any missing measures, additional areas of focus, or suggested deletions, and a plan for external review of the regional indicators. There is still much work to be done, and future council work sessions are anticipated. The manager for this project (Jeff Tucker) would also be happy to meet with you and any other Councilor individually about the implementation of performance measurement at Metro.

**12. B-10 DRC: Issues & Challenges & CSF, Customer Service: The measure articulated doesn't give a sense for how you are managing you business to get high ROI from the potential external customer pool? Why the info does communicate the % of revenue from external sources (thanks) there isn't a sense through measures how you are managing for the two customer bases you serve. I'm encouraging the use of performance measures to help manage your business sets.**

*Response:* The DRC provides services to three primary customer groups: internal Metro department staff, local and other government agencies in the region, and external (all other) customers. The DRC also provides services to these customers in this priority order. The performance measures will be modified to provide additional clarity to services and revenue from the DRC's two external customer groups—local regional government agencies and other external customers.

**13. B-10 DRC: CSF – '...DRC Clients...' does this apply to external customers, internal customers or both?**

*Response:* This applies to both internal and external customers and the language will be changed to reflect this.

**14. B-12 ELUF: If I understand this correctly, the issues and challenges section issues an important 'heads up', via the second and third bullets... flagging that we have some work ahead of us in the UGR work. While the adoption of that (UGR) will be in the 2nd half of 2009, i.e. in FY09-10, we may have some approach work a the Council level in 1st half 2009 (2nd half of FY08-09.)**

*Response:* Agreed. Budget narrative will be modified to reflect this.

**15. B-12, ELUF, issues and challenges: ‘Open source licensing of MetroScope’ Seems like an incomplete articulation. Note: I am well versed in open source licensing (SW Development.) What’s the issue (maintenance, platform issue, resources, what?)**

*Response:* Replace last bullet under Issues and Challenges with:

Apply the advantages of open source licensing of MetroScope, and also prepare documentation, data files and software dissemination protocols to permit other regional MPOs in Oregon and Washington State to access this tool for their own integrated modeling needs. The hope is to gain broader acceptance of the model and to make it available to other researchers so that we can learn from and take advantage of innovations and evolutions of the software that other developers may introduce in the course of others using the model.

**16. B-12 Changes from FY 2007-2008 current service levels, ‘forming a separate group.’ For what result? Efficiency? Still n the same organization. Why is this so significant? I’m puzzled as to why a ‘how’ statement is articulated versus communicating via a result/impact statement.**

*Response:* Changes from FY 2007-08 Current Service Levels:

In FY 2008-09, the DRC will be reorganized to be comprised of two major sections—ELUF and DRC. ELUF will be separated from the DRC to increase our expertise and technical capabilities in this area, and allow for more efficient and effective management and provision of land use modeling and forecasting services in direct support of all land use modeling and forecasting activities at Metro.

**17. B-14 Land Monitoring... ‘Prog. Perf. Measures: I am surprised that there is no reference to the recent audit report – ex. Implement efficiency steps as committed in Planning dept response to audit report on Functional planning. I believe that this is just a matter of timing (audit report & publication of Volume 3, end of March.) As the saying goes” “There’s opportunity in everything.”**

*Response:* In response to the Metro Auditor’s report on Functional Plan Compliance Process, March 2009, management agreed to develop a work plan for use in redesigning the compliance process and bring it to Council for consideration, including budget implications. Based on the work plan, staff will propose a budget amendment to Council at a later date, if needed.

In addition, we stressed in our response to the audit that the changes to the Functional Plan Compliance include linking to performance monitoring. With this linkage, Functional Plan Compliance would focus on regulatory requirements that Metro has mandated and how local governments have complied. Broader delineation of what we are trying to accomplish would come out of Functional Plan Compliance and move into definition of performance measures that establish what we are trying to accomplish and tracking of information about how well we are doing.

**18. B-16: Prog. Perf. measures, 2nd asterisk statement, “Numbers are dependent upon the level of funding” – the level of funding for TOD specifically or for transit service expansion/investments, or both? (I assumed TOD.)**

*Response:* We mean dependent on the level of funding for TOD specifically and will clarify the narrative to reflect this.



**19. B-16 Prog. Perf. Measures, Last item – seems like there is a complimentary one. This last one says ‘partner’—but with the Metro shift to tools and services, what about those communities that take advantage of the tools without needing (major) partnerships. My thinking is one level is highly intensive (resource intensive, \$\$ or staff interaction) and the other is usage of the tools/services in a less Metro intensive way (serving more customers but with a lower per instance and lower cumulative expense. In my vernacular, serving multiple market segments with different ‘products’ while both serve to achieve the same objective: ‘... supporting centers & corridors.’**

*Response:* We are not exactly sure what Councilor Harrington is raising, but... We clearly have a strategy of heavy involvement with locals where we are doing TOD projects, LRT project development and implementing MTIP projects like boulevards. In other parts of the region we may only rely upon our toolkits and general open seminars.

The appropriate measure here would be the number of communities implementing policies and programs that re-enforce or support efficient development in centers and corridors. May we suggest: “The number of communities applying SDCs, density bonus or other design/code tools, urban renewal or other financial incentives to support more compact, transit supportive and mixed use development.”

**20. B-21, left hand side, last item: Shouldn’t ‘houses’ be ‘homes’ as in residential units without commenting on specific form?**

*Response:* Yes, good catch. The measure should be ‘homes’ and not ‘houses.’

**21. C-14: Prog. Perf. Measures: Does any one external to Metro test the inventory? These two performance measures just don’t seem to communicate ‘progress’ to the goal of 2015. While the work is important and meaningful, the performance measure doesn’t seem to promote that.**

*Response:* The comparison against the inventory is completed biennially and published in a peer-reviewed technical report titled, State of the Watersheds. The report has been reviewed by staff of Johnson Creek Watershed Council, City of Gresham, OR Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Fish and Wildlife Service and Portland’s Planning and Environmental Services Bureaus.

The inventory itself is the product of years of work by the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (chaired by Councilor Carl Hosticka) and the Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee (chaired by Andy Cotugno) approved in 2002, with many corrections incorporated in the adoption of Nature in Neighborhoods (title 13) in 2005.

You make a good comment about the performance measurements. We are developing measures to better capture progress toward program goals.

**22. C-16: Prog. Perf. Measures: Why not a # (and %) of new areas getting attention per year and/or # & % of ‘revisits’ per year? But differently: The Issues and Challenges section is clear. Why not use your performance measures to help manage/address the program issues & challenges?**

*Response:* The budget document on page C-16 will be revised to reflect additional performance measures to address the program issues and challenges described in the text on that page. These new measures will assess the number of new areas getting attention per year and the number of recurring visits per year. These measures also indicate whether our outreach and development of partner capacity efforts are fruitful.

The suggested new performance measures are:

- Number of Metro properties receiving a minimum of 50 hours of volunteer effort annually
- Number of recurring individual volunteers who volunteer 20+ hours annually

The measure of “Number of individuals and groups volunteering 50+ hours with Metro Parks and Greenspaces” will probably be removed, as it is too general and these new measures are more specific to the identified issues and program goals.

**23. C-22: Issues and Challenges: Forecasting tools for 40-50 year timeframe (is a risk). Another is State LCDC grant funding for the project.**

*Response:* We agree, and are in the process of developing long term methods and tools to identify and measure such changes. We also recognize that this is definitely a challenge that also requires a stable source of funding.

Our efforts in this area will include:

- Engaging a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives of cities, neighboring communities, business groups, developers, farmers, land use advocates, environmental organizations and the public to reach key milestones consistent with the State administrative rules.
- Integrating public involvement processes, data collection and analysis and the development and recommendations and findings among Metro and the three counties.
- Developing a reasonable approach to defining need for urban reserves with appropriate forecasting tools for the 40 – 50 year timeframe.

**24. C-22 Perf. Measures: There must be some learnings/best known methods from prior UGR adoption and UGB cycles that test and measure stakeholder engagement, transparency.**

*Response:* We are in the process of revising these measures to include measuring stakeholder engagement.

**25. D-10: Changes from FY 2007-08 current service levels; I still wonder why this position isn’t in Planning – but as long as the work is collaborative and getting accomplished, so be it.**

*Response:* Locating the position in either the Office of the COO or Finance allows the position to integrate with other finance related activities elsewhere in the agency. In either case, the collaboration with Planning is going well.

**1. What are the risks, opportunities and costs for the organic food waste recycling program. What would another \$1 on the regional system fee buy for this program?**

**Response: Budget.** An additional \$1 on the Regional System Fee would provide approximately \$1.4 million to support the program. This would go a long way in helping the region secure a local processing site. It might be used to help purchase or lease property, to “buy-down” the tip fee to keep rates low for participants as an incentive to participate, it could help with the capital costs of facility infrastructure, or a combination of the above.

**Risk.** The main risks to the program stem from not having a local facility in operation. Costs would be lower and tons recovered would be higher with a local facility.

- Without a local facility, the program cannot expand beyond its current size. Other local jurisdictions may be less likely to implement a food waste composting program. The City of Portland will be unable to implement its residential food waste collection program adopted in the new Portland Recycles plan.
- Per-ton costs will increase significantly if the materials must continue to be transported to a remote facility. Costs are estimated to rise by \$11 to \$16 per ton, significantly reducing the economic advantage over disposal.
- Metro Central is close to capacity with regard to reloading the materials and there is no room at South to take on some of the tons. A local facility would alleviate this situation.
- A secondary risk is that Metro’s current contractor, Cedar Grove, may be unable to perform due to the costs they are incurring under the current contract. (For example, there is no escalator in the contract so they are taking bigger and bigger losses as fuel prices skyrocket.) Cedar Grove has indicated that it may more economic sense to default on the contract and pay the \$500,000 performance bond than it is to continue the contract under the current terms and conditions. There is only one other permitted and operating food waste composting facility that could provide the service—a facility in Tenino, Washington that has indicated it would charge \$49 per ton for a long-term contract with Metro, which would increase the organics tip fee to \$57.50 when the transfer charge is included. This still involves long-haul to a remote facility and will not allow the program to grow for the reasons stated above. If Cedar Grove exits from the Metro region, the City of Portland’s program, which has nearly 300 participants currently, would probably collapse. The fallout from this failure could be significant in terms of not only steps backward in recovery, but also the in political, public relations and local government partnership realm.

**Opportunities.** The opportunities are the inverse of the risks identified above.

- A local facility would ease the burden on the transfer stations for reload; would help ensure continuation of the Portland programs; and would allow other local jurisdictions to begin programs under a stable system.
- There would be a significant increase in the recovery rate.
- A local facility would reduce costs. Over fifty 335-mile round trips would be eliminated per month from Portland to Cedar Grove, in vehicles that get only about 4 miles per gallon. A local facility would also reduce long-haul trips to Columbia Ridge Landfill; recovering just 50,000 tons of the 270,000 tons of organics we dispose annually would result in over 1,600 fewer loads trucked to the landfill each year.
- A local facility would increase environmental sustainability. There would be a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions not only from the reduction in vehicle emissions, but also from the process itself: conservatively, every ton of food removed from the landfill and composted represents a one ton reduction in greenhouse gas emissions compared with landfill methane production. Finally, the compost itself would be returned to productive use.

**Costs**

- As it stands now, this program has cost Metro very little. The program initially included \$500,000 in capital improvements grant funding for the operator (which Cedar Grove declined). This funding was then re-allocated to other programs, including the organics capital grants described below.
- The FY 2007-08 materials and services budget for organics is \$245,000—about 5 percent of the total Solid Waste Reduction Program budget. Of this, \$25,000 goes to the Fork it Over program, \$120,000 is for grants for businesses needing equipment or capital improvements to participate in the program, \$100,000 was slated for reload improvement

grants but will remain unused (staff is evaluating a proposal to use these funds to offset Cedar Grove's increased costs for a short term while facility siting attempts continue). In addition, approximately 0.20 FTE is assigned to the organics program.

- An important challenge for the program is to maintain a processing charge that is competitive with the tip fee for disposal. The \$47.50 per ton that is currently charged for food waste at the transfer station covers the \$39 paid to Cedar Grove and the \$8.50 paid to Allied for reload services. The only subsidy on this rate is exemption from Metro's transaction fee (\$3 per load, which would otherwise be used to pay for fixed scalehouse costs). As indicated in the "Risk" section, Cedar Grove faces upward pressure on its costs, mainly from fuel.

**2. In February 2009 television broadcasts are switching to high definition. The cost of converting TVs to receive the new signals is, I recall, about \$40. What does Solid Waste anticipate will happen with older TVs? We will be facing a wave of TVs that are thrown out and replaced instead of being upgraded?**

*Response: Part A. What does Solid Waste anticipate will happen with older TVs?*

Consumers have two main options: 1) purchase a converter with a \$40 federal voucher (see detail below); or 2) purchase a new TV and recycle the old one. With successful implementation of a new state law, the department expects recycling to be easier than before:

- Under Oregon's new e-waste producer responsibility program, households will be able to drop off their old TVs and computers for free at drop centers and participating retailers. Manufacturers will pay for their environmentally sound collection and recycling. The program starts January 1, 2009.
- The new e-waste program includes a landfill disposal ban on TVs and computers effective January 2010.
- Metro staff expect that many of the drop sites currently listed on Metro's recycling hotline that take TVs and computers (currently, most charge a fee) will participate in the new free drop-off program. Metro has actively supported development of such a network of for-profit and not-for-profit collectors in lieu of having governments collect e-waste.

*Part B. Will we be facing a wave of TVs that are thrown out and replaced instead of being upgraded?*

Experts are divided on whether there will be a wave of discarded TVs at the time of conversion, or whether the discards will emerge more smoothly over time. Metro staff leans towards believing there will be a noticeable increase but not a tidal wave of discards in the Portland metropolitan area. Again, consumers with analog TVs can purchase a digital converter. Satellite and cable TV systems will not be affected.

Some of the arguments that have been put forth to support the notion of a wave include:

- A recent Nielsen Co. study that showed 25% of Portland TVs get over-the-air signals.
- Oregon's landfill disposal ban on TVs and computers becomes effective January 2010.
- There may be incorrect information given out to try to get people to upgrade services or unnecessarily buy new TVs.
- Many consumers will use the conversion as a reason to upgrade to high definition TV.
- Prices on new digital TVs continue to decline.
- Consumers may choose to switch to more green "Energy Star" TVs.

Some of the arguments against a wave include:

- Most households are already on cable or satellite where an older TV will continue to work.
- Household will keep TVs for movies or video games, or get a converter box.
- TVs, like computers, tend to get stored and require outreach programs to get them recycled, as opposed to "flooding" the disposal and recycling infrastructure all at once.
- At DEQ's e-waste bill advisory meetings, non-profits that take TVs for resale have said that they receive and successfully re-sell a good number of late model TVs.
- Programs are in place to support conversion vs. discarding the old TV:
  - Households are eligible for two \$40 coupons to help defray the cost of a conversion box estimated at \$50 to \$70.
  - To help promote conversion, the DEQ has published a fact sheet on the switch to digital TV and how to obtain a converter box coupon. (Older analog TVs hooked up to cable or satellite services do not need converter boxes.)

- Oregon Public Broadcasting is conducting a very heavy promotion of this option.
- The federal program dispensing these coupons looks pretty easy to use.
- And finally, the free drop-off recycling program that begins January 2009 (as described in the response to the first part of the question, above).

**3. The Zoo Future Vision Committee consultants' recommendations about more budget autonomy for the Zoo led to a response from management and the counsel to explore ways of creating more management incentives for rewarding success in enterprise activities (other than salary bonuses). In what ways does the proposed budget follow up on this concept at the Zoo?**

*Response:* The zoo proposed budget includes \$100,000 to incent excellent management and enterprise activities. Chief Operating Officer Jordan requested the zoo include the amount in the proposed budget. Metro management is considering a draft policy that outlines the threshold for earning the incentive and the method of allocating the funds. The current draft targets incentives such as staff training and the acquisition of vehicles, equipment, or workspace furnishings that help staff perform their daily responsibilities.

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

DATE: April 25, 2008

TO: David Bragdon, Council President  
Rex Burkholder, Councilor  
Carlotta Collette, Councilor  
Kathryn Harrington, Councilor  
Carl Hosticka, Councilor  
Robert Liberty, Councilor  
Rod Park, Councilor

FROM: Kathy Rutkowski, Budget Coordinator

RE: **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2008-09 PROPOSED BUDGET**

Attached are the requested technical amendments to the FY 2008-09 budget. Technical amendments propose necessary changes to the budget as a result of updating projections, correcting errors, or carrying over funds from the previous fiscal year for approved but as yet uncompleted projects. The five-year Capital Improvement Plan will also be amended to reflect changes, if any, to capital projects greater than \$50,000. Capital project detail sheets have been included for any amended CIP project.

The technical amendments are fairly standard. A small amount of time has been reserved on the agenda for the Council's Tuesday, April 29, 2008 work session to review and discuss these amendments should any of the Councilors feel it is necessary. The Council is tentatively scheduled to vote on the technical amendments at its meeting of Thursday, May 1, 2008. Historically, unless there are concerns about any particular amendment, the technical amendments are voted on as a package.

A summary table of contents of the technical amendments is included with this memo.

## Attachments

cc: Mike Jordan, Chief Operating Officer  
Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer  
Margo Norton, Deputy Finance Officer  
Karen Feher, Capital Budget Coordinator  
Ann Wawrukiewicz, Financial Planning Analyst  
Department Directors  
Department Finance Managers

**FY 2008-09 Proposed Budget  
Requested Technical Adjustments  
April 25, 2008**

**Summary of Technical Amendments:**

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Summary of Amendment</b>	<b>Page #</b>
GENERAL 1	Reconciliation of MTOCA transfer	1
GENERAL 2	Transportation speaker series	3
GENERAL 3	Office of Metro Attorney & Human Resources salary adjustments	4
GENERAL 4	Adjustment to infrastructure finance analyst position salary	5
GENERAL 5	Regional Leadership Initiative carry over	6
PARKS 1	RV fee forecast revision	7
PARKS 2	Nature in Neighborhoods staff allocation change	8
PARKS 3	Carry forward of restoration projects	9
PARKS 4	T-6 diesel spill remediation resource alignment	11
PARKS 5	Various project carry forwards	12
PARKS 6	Lone Fir Cemetery Master Plan & Stabilization Costs	14
PLANNING 1	Career ladder reclasses	15
PLANNING 2	Technical corrections to planning budget	17
PLANNING 3	Transportation Research & Modeling Services changes	18
PLANNING 4	Grant recognition	19
ZOO 1	Operating project carry forwards	21
MERC 1	Capital Project carry forwards	22
MERC 2	Headquarter Hotel project carry forward	23
SW&R 1	Waste Reduction & Outreach project carry forward	24
SW&R 2	Solid Waste capital project carry forwards	26
CAPITAL 1	Various Metro Capital Fund project carry forwards	33
R&R 1	Various General Renewal & Replacement projects	43

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
GENERAL	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** General Fund/MERC

**DATE:** 4/15/08

**DRAFTED BY :** Karen Feher

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: MTOCA Reconciliation**

This amendment is the result of reconciling the amount due to MERC in the Metro Tourism Opportunity and Competitiveness Account (MTOCA) funding from the "Other" Solid Waste per ton Tax. The \$53,656 represents additional amounts due to MERC in FY 2005 and 2006 of \$306 and \$53,348 respectively as displayed on the attached reconciliation.

<b>Department</b>	<b>Fund</b>	<b>Line Items</b>		
		<i>Acct #</i>	<i>Account Title</i>	<i>Amount</i>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Non-Department	General Fund	5810	Transfer of Resources	\$53,656
Non-Department	General Fund	5999	Contingency	42,999
Non-Department	General Fund	5990	Ending Fund Balance	(92,655)
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
MERC	MERC	4970	Transfer of Resources	\$53,656
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
MERC	MERC	5725	Buildings & Related (CIP)	\$53,656

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None



*Query on MTOCA Payments*

Fund	Description	DeptID	Descr	Account	Description	Class	Description	Sum Total Amt	Year	Prog	Project	Amt Due	Bal Due	MERC Rec.	Amt Due - MERC Rec
010	General Fund	99999	Non-Dep	5810	Trans of Res.	8850	MERC Pool Cap OCC (Trfs)	504,000	2005	00050	57540	540,449	36,449	540,143	306
								0	2006			689,556	726,005	636,208	53,348
010	General Fund	99999	Non-Dep	5810	Trans of Res.	8850	MERC Pool Cap OCC (Trfs)	1,324,462	2007	00050		652,113	53,656	652,113	0
010	General Fund	99999	Non-Dep	5810	Trans of Res.	8555	MERC Combined funds	669,720	2008	00050		669,720	<u>\$53,656</u>	669,720	0
<b>TOTAL</b>								<b>\$2,498,182</b>				<b>\$2,551,838</b>	<b>\$53,656</b>		53,654

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
GENERAL	2

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Public Affairs and Government Relations

**DATE:** 4/21/2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Ann Wawrukiewicz

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Transportation Speaker Series**

This proposal carries forward funding for the Transportation Speaker series.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Non-Department	General Fund (010)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$15,000
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
PAGR	General Fund (010)	5240	Contracted Professional Services	\$15,000

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
GENERAL	3

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Office of Metro Attorney / Human Resources

**DATE:** 4/21/2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Ann Wawrukiewicz

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Personal Services Adjustments**

This proposal adjusts personal services for two central service departments that are small enough to be affected by deviations from average in the PEP matrix. Total adjustments for OMA are \$18,630 and for HR are \$31,994.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5010	Salaries- Regular Employees Full Time	\$10,115
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5015	Wages- Regular Employees Full Time Non exempt	3,960
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5020	Salaries- Regular Employees Part Time	348
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5025	Wages- Regular Employees Part Time Non exempt	-57
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5089	Salary Adjustments	646
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5100	Fringe Benefits	3,138
Metro Attorney	General Fund (610)	5190	Bond Recovery	480
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5010	Salaries- Regular Employees Full Time	21,999
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5015	Wages- Regular Employees Full Time Non exempt	2,657
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5089	Salary Adjustments	1,125
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5100	Fringe Benefits	5,388
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5190	Bond Recovery	825
Non-Department	General Fund	5999	Contingency	(\$50,624)

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

The merit pool for non-represented employees is developed Metro-wide across all departments and all funds. The system relies on smaller than average merit increases to offset larger than average increases. In very small departments such as OMA and HR, these offsets may not always occur, as was the case this spring when non-represented salary adjustments were made. The result is a higher than anticipated starting point at July 1, 2008. This amendment corrects resulting shortfalls in personal service budgets for 2008-09.

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

Use of contingency to fund this request is a short-term need. The costs associated with the Office of Metro Attorney and Human Resources are incorporated into the cost allocation plan. At the end of FY 2008-09, the actual expenditures will be included in the final run of the allocation plan. Any under expenditures during the year will offset the salary increase, and departments will be assessed only the actual costs.

An analysis of merit pool allocations will be conducted prior to the next budget cycle to avoid this problem in the future.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
GENERAL	4

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Finance & Administrative Services

**DATE:** 4/17/08

**DRAFTED BY :** Kathy Rutkowski

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Infrastructure Finance Position**

Through ordinances 07-1160B adopted September 27, 2007 and amended through 08-1173 adopted February 7, 2008, the Council allocated reserves to provide for a three-year limited duration Infrastructure Finance Analyst position. The FY 2008-09 allocation reserved \$150,000 for all salary, fringe and professional services related to the work. The budget set a priority of funding the position related costs first then placed the remaining balance in the materials & services of the Planning department for professional services assistance. The FY 2008-09 budget was prepared prior to filling the position.

The actual salary and fringe costs of the position are higher than what is reflected in the budget. This action requests that \$16,000 be transferred from the associated project related materials & services to pay for the higher salary costs. Approximately \$35,700 still remains for materials & services for this project in FY 2008-09. The total cost for infrastructure financing remains within the \$150,000 in reserves allocated by the Council through two mid-year budget amendment actions.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
FAS	General Fund	5010	Salaries-Regular Employee	\$11,700
FAS	General Fund	5089	Salary Adjustment-Merit pool	200
FAS	General Fund	5089	Salary Adjustment-Other Adjustment pool	200
FAS	General Fund	5089	Salary Adjustment-Class Study pool	200
FAS	General Fund	5100	Fringe Benefits	3,200
FAS	General Fund	5190	PERS Bond Recovery	500
Planning	General Fund	5240	Misc. Professional Services	(\$16,000)

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

The action retains the intent of the original reserves allocation by funding staff related costs first then providing for additional outside assistance as needed.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
GENERAL	5

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Human Resources

**DATE:** April 21, 2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Cary Stacey, RLI Program Manager

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Regional Leadership Initiative**

The Regional Leadership Initiative (RLI) and the IT department will pool funds in early FY 2008-09 for a Learning Management System (LMS), an online interactive calendar used to offer and fill training opportunities throughout Metro. An RFP for the LMS has already been released but a contractor has not yet been selected.

<b>Department</b>	<b>Fund</b>	<b>Line Items</b>		
		<i>Acct #</i>	<i>Account Title</i>	<i>Amount</i>
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Non-Department	General Fund (610)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$7,000
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Human Resources	General Fund (610)	5440	Program Purchases	\$7,000

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: RV Fee Forecast Revision**

In March 2008, the state provided Metro with an estimate of the RV Fee state-shared revenues it will be distributing in FY 2008-09. The state estimate for Metro is \$432,417. The proposed budget has an estimate of \$404,940. Metro is required to adopt a revenue forecast that is consistent with the state estimate. This technical amendment increases the estimate by \$27,477. This amendment does not increase budgeted appropriations.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Parks	160	4139	Other Local Government Shared Revenue	27,477
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Parks	160	5999	Contingency	27,477

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	2

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** *Nature in Neighborhoods Staff Allocation Change*

The proposed FY 2008-09 budget for Nature in Neighborhoods includes an allocation of time where 25% of the program assistant and 25% of a regional planner would be charged to the Natural Areas Bond Fund because of the support these positions provide to the Capital Grants program. This amendment changes the allocation, so that 50% of the regional planner is charged to the Natural Areas Bond Fund, and none of the program assistant is charged. This change more accurately reflects the anticipated time allocation of these positions. The net impact is an increase in the Natural Areas Bond Fund budget of \$5,155, and a decrease in the General Fund budget of the same amount.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
Parks	General (160)	5010	Regular Employees-Full Time-Exempt	(12,866)
Parks	General (160)	5015	Regular Employees-Full Time-Non-Exempt	9,116
Parks	General (160)	5100	Fringe Benefits	(1,405)
Parks	General (160)	5999	Contingency	5,155
Parks	N.A. Bond (351)	5010	Regular Employees-Full Time-Exempt	12,866
Parks	N.A. Bond (351)	5015	Regular Employees-Full Time-Non-Exempt	(9,116)
Parks	N.A. Bond (351)	5100	Fringe Benefits	1,405
Parks	N.A. Bond (351)	5990	Ending Fund Balance	(5,155)

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

There is no net change in staffing or program impacts. This change reflects the current allocation of work.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	3

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Restoration Projects – Carry Forward**

A number of restoration projects occurring on Metro properties are multi-phased over several years. Given the magnitude, complexity, variance in availability of plant material, and unpredictable weather, restoration schedules are exceedingly difficult to pinpoint. This amendment recognizes that expenses for completing specific current restoration projects will be necessary in FY 2008-09 and carries forward appropriation and the associated grants. Projects and the amount needed to carry forward includes:

- Gales Creek (\$60,000): USDA Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) grant to complete restoration of 235 acres of floodplain wetland located south of Forest Grove at Gales Creek/Tualatin River confluence
- Clackamas River (\$5,000): Located at confluence of Richardson Creek and Clackamas River, this floodplain enhancement project is funded by USDA Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program (WHIP)
- Tualatin River: Located adjacent to the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, Metro is contributing to the floodplain restoration with partners Tualatin Riverkeepers through funds from USDA WRP (\$98,200) and Tualatin Soil & Water Conservation District (\$43,700).
- Gotter Prairie (\$15,000): Remaining funds available from WRP will be used to complete Phase II restoration of this Tualatin River floodplain site near the community of Scholls.
- Canemah (\$26,000): With funds contributed by OWEB, completion is anticipated of the treatments for the oak release project at Canemah Bluffs in Oregon City.
- Howell (\$11,000): The WHIP-funded project at Howell Park will complete the established of riparian forest around the emergent wetland and Gilbert River.
- Multnomah Channel (\$384,400): With the majority of funds contributed by Ducks Unlimited, this floodplain restoration project on Multnomah Channel is expected to be completed in FY08/09 depending on design/engineering modifications and permits. (This project is being completed by Ducks Unlimited, with Metro “booking” the activity after it is completed.)

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Parks	160	4100	Grants - Federal – Direct	189,200
Parks	160	4110	Grant - State - Direct	26,000
Parks	160	4120	Grants -Local - Direct	428,100
			<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>	<b><i>\$643,300</i></b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Parks	160	5250	Contracted Property Services	258,900
Parks	160	5250	Contracted Property Services (Multnomah Channel)	384,400
			<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>	<b><i>\$643,300</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

These projects are included in the work plans of existing Science and Stewardship staff.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A



**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

The grant revenue associated with this project is carried forward.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	4

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: T-6 Diesel Spill Remediation Resource Alignment**

In FY 2005-06, the Port of Portland paid Metro \$91,740 to conduct environmental restoration activities at Smith & Bybee Wetlands Natural Area. This payment was for remediation of a diesel spill at their T-6 marine terminal. The FY 2008-09 proposed budget includes expenditure appropriations related to this environmental remediation in the Smith & Bybee Fund (Fund 761). However, when the payment was received in FY06, it was deposited into the Parks Operating Fund, and now consolidated into the General Fund. This technical amendment transfers the \$91,740 paid to Metro for this purpose from the General Fund to the Smith & Bybee Fund, to align the revenue with the proposed expenditures.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><u>Requirements</u></b>				
Parks	General Fund (010)	5810	Transfer of Resources	\$91,740
		5999	Contingency	(\$91,740)
<b><u>Resources</u></b>				
Parks	Smith & Bybee Fund	4970	Transfer of Resources	\$91,740
<b><u>Requirements</u></b>				
Parks	Smith & Bybee Fund	5990	Ending Balance	\$91,740

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	5

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** *Project Carry Forward*

This amendment requests the carry forward of funds for several specific projects:

**Connecting Green Carry Forward**

In FY 2007-08, the Council approved a special appropriation to enhance the efforts to create a regional system of connected parks, natural areas and trails. At the end of the 2007-08 fiscal year, there will still be \$95,000 remaining of this special appropriation. This amendment carries forward that unspent amount and directs it toward continuing the Connecting Green efforts, with a special emphasis on the development of the regional trails priority list, but also to advance work on marketing and branding, development of the regional system, and planning for restoration work.

**Smith & Bybee Trail and Bridge Feasibility Study – Carry Forward**

The bridge study is expected to be complete at the end of July 2008. The completion of the project was delayed when project staff was assigned to manage the Natural Areas Bond Refinement process. A total of \$3,000 will need to be carried forward into FY 2008-09. The trail study will be complete by October 2008. The same project manager’s Refinement process took precedence over this project. New tasks added to the project include a cost estimate update, grant application, and a phasing plan. A total of \$15,000 will need to be carried forward to finish out this project.

**Tonquin Trail Master Plan – Carry Forward**

The Tonquin Trail Master Plan is an MTIP-funded project to master plan the trail connection from the Willamette River in Wilsonville, through the new Graham Oaks Nature Park, and up to the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge in Sherwood. Due to delays in establishing the multi-party contracts with ODOT, Metro and local cities, this project will not begin until July 2008. This project carried forward the MTIP grant and the associated expenditures for this project into the next fiscal year.

**Springwater Trail Construction – Carry Forward**

Metro applied for and was awarded a \$210,000 from the City of Portland’s Bureau of Environmental Services to be used toward construction of the Sellwood Gap regional trail. The grant is one of several that went to agencies and neighborhood groups who were proposing livability improvements to the neighborhoods most impacted by the construction of the "Big Pipe" project. Metro Parks has been coordinating with Portland Parks & Recreation, PDOT, and the private property owner to ascertain best use of these funds, which will be combined with other funding sources to complete the trail gap, but negotiations are taking longer than anticipated. Since the project is not on Metro-owned property it is not a capital project and will not be considered a Metro asset. This amendment carries forward the \$210,000 grant-funded project

Department	Fund	Line Items			
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount	
<b><i>Resources</i></b>					
Parks	General (160)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$113,000	
Parks	General (160)	4100	Grants – Federal Direct	188,000	
Parks	General (160)	4145	Government Contributions	230,157	
				<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>	<b><i>\$531,157</i></b>

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b>Requirements</b>				
Parks	General (160)	5030	Temporary Employees	\$25,000
Parks	General (160)	5100	Fringe Benefits	3,500
Parks	General (160)	5240	Professional Services	252,657
Parks	General (160)	5205	Operating Supplies	40,000
Parks	General (160)	5300	Payments to Other Agencies	210,000
<b>Total Requirements</b>				<b>\$531,157</b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

This amendment carries forward under spending in FY 2007-08 for the Connecting Green planning efforts, and directs that carry forward to be targeted toward furthering the regional trail prioritization project, currently being done by a paid intern. It also allows for funding for other initiatives of the Connecting Green program, including restoration, and regional system development. Existing project staff will continue to work on the other projects identified.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	6

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Lone Fir “Block 14” Master Plan and “Stabilization Costs” Carry Forward***

In the FY 2007-08 budget, Council approved a special appropriation to master plan the site at Lone Fir Cemetery where the Morrison Building used to stand, known as Block 14. This planning work is to incorporate this block into Lone Fir Cemetery and to engage the public on developing a master plan to recognize its historical significance. Fundraising for the actual improvements can take place once the conceptual plan is in place. The work began in January 2008. Because of the extensive public involvement nature of this project, it will not be completed by the end of the FY 2007-08 fiscal year. This amendment carries forward the estimated remaining amount of the consultant contract.

In FY 2006-07, the City of Portland gave Metro \$150,000 to “stabilize” the Morrison building site (demolition and debris removal, plants to stop soil erosion, fencing, lighting, etc.). Part of the stabilization activities has been postponed pending completion of the conceptual plan to ensure that the stabilization activities are aligned with intended future uses. To date, \$23,826 has been spent, with an additional anticipated \$29,000 to be spent by June 30. The contribution was coded to the Parks account of the Metro Capital Fund. Expenditures for the remaining balance of \$97,174 will likely not be considered capital outlay. This action requests that the balance of funds be transferred to the Regional Parks Operating Department in the General Fund and appropriated for purposes related to the Lone Fir Cemetery.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Parks	General (160)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$70,000
Parks	General (160)	4970	Transfer of Resources from Metro Capital Fund	97,174
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Parks	General (160)	5240	Contracted Professional Services	\$167,174
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$97,174
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	5810	Transfers of Resources to General Fund	\$97,174

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

Existing parks planning staff is assigned to the project.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
PLANNING	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning

**DATE:** April 11, 2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Barbara Moog

<b><u>Type of Amendment:</u></b>		<b><u>Amendment to:</u></b>	
Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Career Ladder Reclasses***

The Regional Planner and Transportation Planner classification series include a career ladder. As incumbents in the positions meet certain professional standards and knowledge requirements managers may request that Human Resources review the positions for reclass. The reclass requests, however, must be included in the budget. This action requests the addition of three career ladder opportunities for next year.

*Reclass Associate Transportation Planner to Senior Transportation Planner (position #990).*

This position is responsible for significant portions of transit analyses and NEPA documents. With a high degree of independence, the incumbent prepares and monitors consultant contracts, conducts complex technical evaluations, develops work programs and coordinates with staff and consultants to ensure timely completion. The incumbent conducts complex technical research and analyses using specialized transportation planning software and computerized models to forecast future transportation conditions. The incumbent prepares reports covering complex technical analysis of various transportation issues and presents findings to technical, steering, and citizen advisory committees and elected officials. The incumbent also represents Metro at meetings with federal, state, and local agencies involved in obtaining project approvals. The incumbent is operating at the Senior Planner level.

This amendment is necessary in order to enable the successful completion of transit alternative analyses and environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. These projects are multifaceted and complex. They require technical specialists operating with a high degree of responsibility and independence to enable the projects to obtain the necessary planning approvals and move into detailed design and construction. If the position is not classified and compensated at the appropriate level, Metro will not be able to retain the level of skills necessary to implement these projects. Reliance solely on consultant expertise has not proved cost effective, as these positions coordinate extensively with staff and consultants from other jurisdictions and represent Metro in numerous meetings with agencies and the public.

Additional cost is estimated to be \$4,246 (\$3,020 salary, \$1,129 fringe, and \$97 variable bond recovery) and is funded by the FY 2008-09 Other Adjustments (AFSCME) salary pool.

*Reclass Assistant Regional Planner to Associate Regional Planner (position #346).*

With a high degree of responsibility and independence, the incumbent performs in-depth technical analysis and prepares reports that support various long-range planning initiatives. Incumbent assists in policy formulation and evaluation and has been instrumental in coordinating work for the Data Resource Center. The incumbent has demonstrated the level of skills needed to perform effectively at the Associate Regional Planner level and is currently operating at the Associate Regional Planner level. Incumbent has completed all mandatory training through the Metro Human Resources department and is scheduled to receive Regional Leadership Initiative training during the next several months.

This amendment is necessary to ensure the position is classified and compensated at the appropriate level. Metro needs to retain staff with the skill levels needed to perform complex planning tasks effectively. If the position is not classified and compensated at the appropriate level, Metro will not be able to retain the level of skills necessary to effectively implement the region's long-range planning program. This expertise is particularly important as this position coordinates extensively with other Metro staff and staff from other jurisdictions, and represents Metro in meetings with other agencies and the public.

Additional cost is estimated to be \$3,573 (\$2,546 salary, \$946 fringe, and \$81 variable bond recovery) and is funded by the FY 2008-09 Other Adjustments (AFSCME) salary pool.

*Reclass Associate Regional Planner to Senior Regional Planner (position #964).*

With a high degree of responsibility and independence, the incumbent performs in-depth technical analysis and prepares reports that support various regional planning initiatives. Incumbent assists in policy formulation and evaluation and has been instrumental in coordinating and managing work for various Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects. The incumbent has demonstrated the level of skills needed to perform effectively at the Senior Regional Planner level. She has quickly learned and contributed to the success of the TOD program; she is a strong collaborator and is skilled at establishing and maintaining good stakeholder relationships. Incumbent has completed, or is scheduled to complete, all mandatory training through the Metro Human Resources department and is scheduled for Regional Leadership Initiative training during the next several months.

This amendment is necessary to ensure the position is classified and compensated at the appropriate level. Metro needs to retain staff with the skill levels needed to perform complex planning tasks effectively. If the position is not classified and compensated at the appropriate level, Metro will not be able to retain the level of skills necessary to effectively implement the region's TOD program. This expertise is particularly important as this position coordinates extensively with other Metro staff and staff from other jurisdictions, and represents Metro in meetings with other agencies and the public.

Additional cost is estimated to be \$11,538 (\$8,310 salary, \$2,962 fringe, and \$266 variable bond recovery) and is funded by the FY 2008-09 Other Adjustments (AFSCME) salary pool.

**BUDGET IMPACT:**

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
Planning	General Fund (140)	5010	Salaries-Regular Employee (position #990)	\$3,020
Planning	General Fund (140)	5100	Fringe Benefits	1,129
Planning	General Fund (140)	5190	PERS Bond Recovery	97
Planning	General Fund (140)	5089	Salary Adjustment-Other Adjustment pool (AFSCME)	(\$4,246)
Planning	General Fund (140)	5010	Salaries-Regular Employee (position #346)	\$2,546
Planning	General Fund (140)	5100	Fringe Benefits	946
Planning	General Fund (140)	5190	PERS Bond Recovery	81
Planning	General Fund (140)	5089	Salary Adjustment-Other Adjustment pool (AFSCME)	(\$3,573)
Planning	General Fund (140)	5010	Salaries-Regular Employee (position #964)	\$8,310
Planning	General Fund (140)	5100	Fringe Benefits	2,962
Planning	General Fund (140)	5190	PERS Bond Recovery	266
Planning	General Fund (140)	5089	Salary Adjustment-Other Adjustment pool (AFSCME)	(\$11,538)

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PLANNING	2

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning

**DATE:** April 8, 2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Barbara Moog

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Technical Corrections**

Additional review of the proposed budget has identified several areas where corrections are needed.

**Regional Travel Options Program – correction of expenditure classification**

Metro’s Regional Travel Options Program grants fund individual projects aimed at encouraging and facilitating non single-occupant-automobile travel. The Proposed FY 2008-09 budget includes a \$50,000 grant to Portland State University to help pay for construction of a secure bicycle parking structure (project was included in the FY 2007-08 budget but has been moved to FY 2008-09). Although this grant will be used to help pay for a capital project, the capital asset will not be owned by Metro and the grant amount is being moved from Capital Outlay to Grants & Loans.

**Transportation Research and Modeling Services – Fund Balance Adjustment**

The FY 2008-09 Proposed Budget incorrectly allocated \$65,000 of Fund Balance to Contracted Professional Services. This amendment requests that this \$65,000 be removed from the budget.

**TGM Grant**

The Planning Department was approved to receive a TGM grant and had projected carrying over \$40,000 of this grant into the FY 2008-09 budget. Due to a number of factors, we will not be pursuing this grant and it should be removed from the budget.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Planning	General Fund (140)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	(\$65,000)
Planning	General Fund (140)	4120	Local Grants Direct (TGM)	(\$40,000)
			<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>(\$105,000)</b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Planning	General Fund (140)	5240	Misc. Professional Services	(\$105,000)
Planning	General Fund (140)	5740	Equipment & Vehicles	(\$50,000)
Planning	General Fund (140)	5445	Grants & Loans	\$50,000
			<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>(\$105,000)</b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A



<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
PLANNING	3

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Sherrie Blackledge

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical  
Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget  
Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: TRMS Modifications**

This amendment outlines modifications for specific projects within Transportation Research & Modeling Services (TRMS) section:

**Bike Model Refinement – Carry Forward**

In FY 2007-08, the Metro Council approved a special \$50,000 appropriation for Bike Model Refinement. At the end of FY 2007-08, there will be \$15,000 remaining of this special appropriation. This amendment requests carry forward of the unspent amount so it can be used to complete the Bike Model Refinement work.

**Transportation Research and Modeling Services – Contracted Professional Services Increase**

TRMS requires additional programming services that Metro staff is unable to provide. We are requesting an increase of \$25,000 in the Contracted Professional Services budget to cover these programming services. The increase will be allocated to the projects that use the services and will be paid by a reduction in grant-funded contingency.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Planning	General (010)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance (Bike Model Refinement)	\$15,000
			<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>	<b><i>\$15,000</i></b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Planning	General (140)	5240	Professional Services	\$15,000
Planning	General (140)	5240	Professional Services	\$25,000
Planning	General (140)	4100	Contingency (grant funded)	(\$25,000)
			<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>	<b><i>\$15,000</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PLANNING	4

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning

**DATE:** April 21, 2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Barbara Moog

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Grant Recognition**

This action requests the carry over or recognition of additional grants for projects currently included in either the current year FY 2007-08 adopted budget or the FY 2008-09 proposed budget.

*DLCD Grants for Urban and Rural Reserves*

The Planning Department expects to receive a \$500,000 DLCD grant late in FY 2007-08 for Urban and Rural Reserves work. We do not expect to use any of these grant funds during FY 2007-08 and are requesting the grant funds be carried over into the FY 2008-09 budget.

*EPA Grant for Brownfields Program*

The primary objective of Metro’s brownfields program is to focus assessment, cleanup, and education in economically disadvantaged areas located in communities that do not have established brownfields programs. This grant will enable Metro to (1) continue research to determine which sites might be candidate sites for assessment funds; (2) continue to educate the general public about brownfields, inform them about where they exist, and raise awareness about the benefits of cleaning up these sites; and (3) develop remediation/redevelopment plans for selected sites.

*USGS Grant for Aerial Photography and LiDAR Consortium*

Metro leads an aerial photo and LiDAR consortium that is composed of local jurisdictions and other regional partners. This arrangement allows each participant to share in the costs of acquiring aerial photography and other visualization data. Because of this approach, each year Metro saves more than 80% on the purchase price of aerial photography. The non-monetary rewards of this service are the public relations benefits, evidenced by the number of users expressing gratitude for the ease of obtaining high quality data and aerial photos for the region. The funds in this amendment come from a USGS grant to cover their part of the data costs; there is no Metro match required for this USGS grant.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Planning	General Fund 140	4100	Federal Grants-Direct (EPA)	\$200,000
Planning	General Fund 140	4100	Federal Grants-Direct (USGS)	\$70,000
Planning	General Fund 140	4110	State Grants – Direct (DLCD)	\$500,000
			<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>	<b><i>\$770,000</i></b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Planning	General Fund 140	5240	Contracted Professional Services	\$770,000
			<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>	<b><i>\$770,000</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
ZOO	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Oregon Zoo

**DATE:** April 17, 2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Craig Stroud

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Zoo Project Carry Forwards**

In addition, this amendment carries forward \$100,000 to pay the operations contract payments for the temporary dinosaur exhibit and \$10,000 to purchase automated ticket issuing kiosks for non-member admission ticket sales. The zoo's new ticketing system, acquired in FY 2006-07, is working well, however, other system priorities have delayed the kiosk project into FY 2008-09.

Department	Fund		Line Items	
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
Oregon Zoo	Metro General Fund - 120	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$110,000
			<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>	<b>\$110,000</b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Oregon Zoo	Metro General Fund - 120 Department 26920 Project ZTE06	5290	Temporary Dinosaur Exhibit	\$100,000
Oregon Zoo	Metro General Fund - 120 Department 26100	5750	Automated Ticket Kiosks	\$10,000
			<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>	<b>\$110,000</b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

NA

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

NA

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

NA

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
MERC	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:**     MERC    

**DATE:**     4/17/2008    

**DRAFTED BY :**     Cynthia Hill    

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Capital Project Carry Forward***

This action requests the carryover of several capital projects.

Department	Fund	Line Items			
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount	
<b><i>Resources</i></b>					
MERC	MERC (OCC)	3500	Beginning Balance	\$271,563	
	MERC (Admin)	3500	Beginning Balance	46,881	
				<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$318,444</b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>					
MERC	MERC (OCC)	5725	Building & Related (CIP)	\$146,563	
	MERC (OCC)	5745	Equipment & Vehicles (CIP)	125,000	
	MERC (Admin)	5725	Building & Related (CIP)	28,728	
	MERC (Admin)	5745	Equipment & Vehicles (CIP)	11,900	
	MERC (Admin)	5755	Office Furniture & Equipment	6,253	
				<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>\$318,444</b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

Several capital projects included in the current year will not be complete by June 30<sup>th</sup>. This amendment carries forward the funding to complete projects over the next several months.

	<u>Amount</u>
<b><i>Oregon Convention Center</i></b>	
Rework Payphone Bank Area	16,000
MTOCA Project Balance (AV project)	35,563
Rework the Dragon Café to Brew Pub Concept	95,000
Replace 6' x 8' Rectangular Tables from Original Inventory	125,000
<i>Subtotal Oregon Convention Center</i>	<u>\$271,563</u>
<b><i>Administration</i></b>	
NVR - PCPA ASCH Bar Upgrade	28,728
NVR - EXPO Center Food & Beverage Equipment	11,900
Business Intelligence Software	6,253
<i>Subtotal Administration</i>	<u>\$46,881</u>
<b><i>Total Project Carryover</i></b>	<b><u>\$318,444</u></b>

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
MERC	2

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** MERC

**DATE:** 04/17/2008

**DRAFTED BY :** Cynthia Hill

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** *Headquarter Hotel project*

Carry-over Headquarter Hotel Project Funding

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
MERC	MERC (OCC)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$122,000
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
MERC	MERC (OCC)	5030	Personal Services	\$18,000
	MERC (OCC)	5100	Fringe	2,000
	MERC (OCC)	5240	Contracted Professional Services	102,000
			<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>	<b><i>\$122,000</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

Carry-over estimated balance of current funding for the current phase of the HQH project. Costs include Personal Services for temporary project manager, and Materials and Services for financial and legal services.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
SW&R	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Solid Waste & Recycling

**DATE:** 4/21/08

**DRAFTED BY :** Meg Lynch

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Waste Reduction & Outreach***

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b>Resources</b> SW&R	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, Operating Account	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$174,000
<b>Requirements</b> SW&R	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, Operating Account	5240	Contracted Professional Services	\$174,000

Contract	Explanation	Amount
Residential Outreach	This project was designed to educate residents in the region about the proper preparation of materials for their curbside recycling in order to improve the quality of materials received at recovery facilities and markets. An evaluation of a primarily media-oriented campaign conducted in FY 06-07 indicated a more point-of-service education campaign (e.g., tagging improperly prepared bins) could be more effective. Consultations with local governments about the best program design resulted in the FY 07-08 program not starting until early 2008. Staffing limitations of the contractor (Community Environmental Services, Portland State University) will result in only half the work being completed in FY 07-08. These funds will be used to continue the work in FY 08-09.	\$74,000
Business: Outreach Campaign	Metro Council has required additional information and time to determine whether to adopt the required business recycling requirements policy. As a result, the business outreach campaign was not fully fielded in FY 07-08.  A multi-year contract for the business outreach campaign will be entered into this fiscal year, FY 07-08, in the amount of \$270,000; \$70,000 will expended on the contract this fiscal year from another line item. In FY 08-09, \$100,000 will be carried over from FY 07-08 and used with \$100,000 in FY 08-09 funds for the campaign, after	\$100,000

	Council has determined what new business policy will be followed. The campaign will therefore be able to incorporate any notifications needed to the business community regarding Metro policy changes such as recycling requirements.	
--	--	--

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

This is a delay, not a change regarding implementing the program. There are no impacts on staffing.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A



<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
SW&R	2

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Solid Waste & Recycling

**DATE:** 4/21/08

**DRAFTED BY :** Jim Watkins

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** *Capital Project Carry Forward*

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b>Resources</b> SW&R	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, Renewal & Replacement Account	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$318,000
	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, General Account	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$105,000
<b>Requirements</b> SW&R	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, Renewal & Replacement Account	5725	Buildings & Related - CIP	\$90,000
		5745	Equipment & Vehicles – CIP	\$228,000
	Solid Waste Revenue Fund, General Account	5745	Equipment & Vehicles – CIP	\$105,000

Contract	Explanation	Amount
MCS Compactor replacement	Delivery of a new cylinder for compactor No. 1 is expected in late June. If it arrives on time, no carryover would be required, since the money budgeted in FY 2008-09 will cover the remaining cost of this contract plus the rebuilding of compactor no. 3 scheduled for next fiscal year. Unfortunately there is significant risk that the cylinder will arrive after July 1 and thus require the carryover. This project is under contract with SSI. One hundred thousand is carried forward for this project and the overall project is reduced by \$100,000.	\$100,000
MCS HHW Chiller Replacement	Project is under contract, but chiller will not be delivered until after July 1. We had anticipated completion of the project in FY 2008-09, but had expected to have more of the project completed this year.	\$28,000

Contract	Explanation	Amount
MCS Replace Transfer Scale	This project will be re-advertised within two weeks. We learned that the project would substantially exceed the budgeted amount. We stopped the procurement and investigated alternative approaches to reduce the price. The scale will not be delivered until about September. The \$100,000 reduction to the MCS Compactor replacement project is transferred to this project.	\$190,000
MCS Seismic Clean up	This project is going to bid this month. The work involves removal of an old non-functional air handling system that represents a hazard in the event of an earthquake. The actual work can be completed within a two-week period. While it is possible that this could be completed by July 1, there is a risk that it will not be.	\$75,000
MCS Chimney Removal	During the preparation of procurement documents, Metro staff identified a number of things that will substantially increase the cost of this project. We have learned that it is a reinforced structure and that it is significantly heavier than anticipated and therefore will cost significantly more to demolish. We have chosen not to go to bid on the demolition at this time and are retaining an engineer to determine if stabilization of the chimney is more cost effective. We do not know what the cost will be so we <u>propose to carry forward \$30,000</u> for additional engineering and we will need to amend the CIP and budget the appropriate amount of money later.	\$30,000

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

No program or staffing impacts.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** Metro Central - Compactor Replacement **Fund:** SW Renewal & Replacement Account  
**Project Status:** Incomplete **Funding Status:** Funded **FY First Authorized:** 2004-05 **Department:** Solid Waste and Recycling  
**Project Number:** TEMP208 **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:** 1 **Facility:**  **Division:** Environmental & Engineering Services  
**Source Of Estimate:** Preliminary **Source:**  **Start Date:** 7/07 **Date:** 11/9/2007 **Cost Type:** Equipment  
**Type of Project:** Replacement **Request Type:** Continuation **Completion Date:** 6/09 **Prepared By:** Paul Ehinger

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
Equipment/Furnishings	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$900,000

**Funding Source:**

Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$900,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$900,000

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

**Project Description / Justification:** **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 10 **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:** 2011-12

The two compactors at Metro Central Transfer Station were installed in late 2000 and early 2001. Metro staff estimates that they will be at the end of their useful life in 2010 and 2011. This project is for replacement of these units.

A study will be conducted to determine if the existing units can be refurbished instead of replaced with new compactors. This could result in substantial cost savings.

Inspection of the compactors showed that the units at Metro Central are in more immediate need of refurbishment than the units at South. The schedule has been changed to reflect this.

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** Metro Central HHW - Chiller Replacement **Fund:** SW Renewal & Replacement Account  
**Project Status:** Incomplete **Funding Status:** Funded **FY First Authorized:** 2007-08 **Department:** Solid Waste and Recycling  
**Project Number:** TEMP265 **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:** 2 **Facility:**  **Division:**   
**Source Of Estimat:** Preliminary **Source:**  **Start Date:** 12/07 **Date:** 11/19/2007 **Cost Type:** Equipment  
**Type of Project:** Replacement **Request Type:** Initial **Completion Date:** 6/09 **Prepared By:** Bob McMillan

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
Equipment/Furnishings	\$0	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$68,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$90,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$68,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000

**Funding Source:**

Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$68,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$68,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

**Project Description / Justification:** **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 15 **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:** 2009-10

This project is to replace the air conditioning chiller that serves the flammable materials bulking room at the Household Hazardous Waste facility. This chiller is original equipment from the facilities construction in 1992. It's maintenance costs are rising as components wear and parts become less available. A new chiller of similar size and weight will be installed in the same location.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Metro Central - Transfer trailer Scale Replacement			<b>Fund:</b>	SW Renewal & Replacement Account		
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2007-08	<b>Department:</b>	Solid Waste and Recycling
<b>Project Number</b>	76966	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	1	<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/07	<b>Date:</b>	12/4/2006
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Replacement	<b>Request Type</b>	Initial	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Bob McMillan
<b>Cost Type:</b>	Equipment						

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000
Equipment/Furnishings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000

### Funding Source:

	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** Estimated Useful Life (yrs):  First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:

Replacement of the transport trailer scale. This scale is used to weigh out going transport trucks to determine tonnage and highway weight limits. This project cost has increased to allow upgrade for larger equipment expected from the new transport contract.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Metro Central - Seismic Cleanup			<b>Fund:</b>	Solid Waste General Account		
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2003-04	<b>Department:</b>	Solid Waste and Recycling
<b>Project Number</b>	76963	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	2	<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/07	<b>Date:</b>	10/1/2003
<b>Cost Type:</b>				<b>Facilities</b>			
<b>Type of Project:</b>	New	<b>Request Type</b>	Continuation	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Paul Ehinger

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
Project Contingency	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000

### Funding Source:

Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:**

**Estimated Useful Life (yrs):**

0

**First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

2009-10

Metro Central Transfer Station was constructed in various phases beginning in the early 1920's. The building was used for various industrial activities during its 80 year life. In many cases the remnants of these activities still remain in the form of extraneous duct banks, crane rails, electrical conduits, etc. These items add dead load to the building structure and harborage for pests. Structural studies done as a part of the recent roof replacement indicate that it is desirable to reduce the loading on the building to increase the factor of safety. These items could also represent hazards during an earthquake since they are apt to break loose and cause falling debris. Birds continue to be a significant problem in MCS and this project will help reduce the areas available for roosting and nesting. Also included in this project is the addition of restraints to the light fixtures in this building to improve earthquake safety.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Metro Central - Chimney Removal			<b>Fund:</b>	Solid Waste General Account		
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2002-03	<b>Department:</b>	Solid Waste and Recycling
<b>Project Number</b>	76964	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	3	<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>	URS	<b>Start Date:</b>	5/07	<b>Date:</b>	12/1/2006
<b>Cost Type:</b>				Facilities			
<b>Type of Project:</b>	New	<b>Request Type</b>	Continuation	<b>Completion Date:</b>	12/08	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Paul Ehinger

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$110,000	\$110,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$140,000
Project Contingency	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$165,000

### Funding Source:

Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$165,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$165,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):**  **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

The existing chimney, which was part of the original steel mill facility construction, was not originally designed to withstand forces due to a seismic activity. As a result, the chimney is deficient in overturning resistance. The loads on the foundation due to gravity and overturning forces are such that compressive failures and instability exists. The best option is to remove the chimney.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
CAPITAL	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Various

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**DRAFTED BY :** Jeff Tucker / Kathy Rutkowski / Craig Stroud

<b><u>Type of Amendment:</u></b>		<b><u>Amendment to:</u></b>	
Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Capital Project Carry Forward***

This amendment requests the carry forward of funds for a variety of capital projects. Detail sheets from the Capital Improvement Plan are attached for each project.

**Howell Territorial Park Upgrades Carry Forward**

Howell Territorial Park Upgrades to Restrooms and Interpretive Signage (FY 2007-08 budget = \$95,000) – This project has been designed and a contractor has been selected for the restroom upgrades, which should be completed by the end of FY 2007-08, but may slide into July. The signage upgrades will not be completed until FY 2008-09. Implementation of the signage upgrades will begin May 2008 and is anticipated to be completed September 2008. This amendment carries forward \$65,000 into FY 2008-09 to finish this project. *Carry forward = \$65,000*

**Stafford Field Station Carry Forward**

In January 2008, the Council approved a CIP change to purchase and install a new field station building at the Borland property on the Tualatin River. That pre-fabricated building has been ordered; however delivery and installation is not anticipated until August 2008. *Carry forward = \$70,000*

**M. James Gleason Boat Ramp – Design & Engineering Carry Forward**

Land Use and permit approval has taken longer than anticipated due to unforeseen requests from regulatory agencies to change the schematic designs and engineering of the in-water water attenuator. Design and engineering is now anticipated to be completed in October 2008. This amendment recognizes that expenses for design and engineering will be necessary in FY 2008-09 and carries forward appropriation and the associated state grant. *Carry forward = \$90,000*

**Third floor office remodel**

The current year budget included \$30,000 in the Council Office for office furniture and \$120,000 for a remodel to the Council Office area. Both of these budgeted costs have been folded into the larger discussion of a general 3rd floor office remodel. The scope and extent of this project is under discussions but actual expenditures will likely be delayed until next fiscal year. This action requests the funding be carried over and appropriated in the Capital Fund for this project. *Carry forward = \$150,000*

**Budget Module**

The capital budget allocates \$150,000 to research and, if feasible, implement a central budget preparation module. Due to the six-month upgrade of the People Soft financial system this year and the agency-wide performance measurement initiative, Finance and IT staff have been unable to work on this project. This action requests the funding be carried over and re-appropriated in the Capital Fund for this project. *Carry forward = \$150,000*

**Storm Water System Improvements**

A mid-year FY 2007-08 budget amendment provided \$250,000 for storm water system improvements at the Oregon Zoo. The improvements were necessary in order to move forward on other capital projects. A contract is currently being negotiated and signed. Its anticipated that work on the improvements will carry over in next year. This action request the carry over of \$125,000 related to the project. *Carry forward = \$125,000*



Predators of the Serengeti

The Oregon Zoo Capital Budget for FY 2007-08 included \$2 million towards the Predators of the Serengeti exhibit. Necessary improvements to the storm water system have slightly delayed construction. This action requests the carry over of \$1.67 million. *Carry forward = \$1,670,000*

Red Ape Reserve (Orangutan Exhibit Renovation)

The Oregon Zoo Capital Budget for FY 2007-08 included \$1.8 million towards the renovation of the Orangutan exhibit. Necessary improvements to the storm water system have slightly delayed construction. This action requests the carry over of \$1.575 million. *Carry forward = \$1,575,000*

Security Camera System Improvements

A recent technical assessment of the digital recording equipment in the Metro building recommended a replacement of the Open Eye HDDR with a newer version that will meet our increasing requirements. This project will relocate the recording equipment from the front desk to a more secure location on the first floor. The project will also replace the single HDDR with Windows 2000 software with two current production Open Eye models that use the current Metro standard of Windows XP software. *Carry forward = \$35,000*

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b>Resources</b>				
General	General Fund (010)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$30,000
<b>Requirements</b>				
General	General Fund (010)	5810	Transfer of Resources to Capital Fund	\$65,000
		5999	Contingency (reserved for future MRC needs)	(\$35,000)
<b>Resources</b>				
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$135,000
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	4110	State Grant – Oregon State Marine Board	90,000
FAS	Metro Capital (612)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	270,000
FAS	Metro Capital (612)	4970	Transfer of Resources from General Fund	65,000
Zoo	Metro Capital (325)	3500	Beginning Fund Balance	\$3,370,000
<b>Total Resources</b>				<b>\$3,930,000</b>
<b>Requirements</b>				
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	5261	Capital Maintenance-CIP	65,000
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	5715	Capital-Improvements Other Than Buildings	90,000
Parks	Metro Capital (360)	5725	Capital – Buildings & Related (CIP)	70,000
FAS	Metro Capital (612)	5725	Buildings & Related	185,000
FAS	Metro Capital (612)	5755	Office Furniture & Equipment	150,000
Zoo	Metro Capital (325)	5725	Capital – Buildings & Related (CIP)	3,245,000
Zoo	Metro Capital (325)	5715	Capital-Improvements Other Than Buildings	125,000
<b>Total Requirements</b>				<b>\$3,930,000</b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

Existing staff is expected to continue work on this project.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Howell Territorial Park Restroom & Kitchen Upgrade			<b>Fund:</b>	General Fund Renewal and Replacement Fund						
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2007-08		<b>Department:</b>	Regional Parks and Greenspaces			
<b>Project Number:</b>	TEMP296	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	5		<b>Facility:</b>	Regional Parks		<b>Division:</b>	Parks & Visitor Services
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/07		<b>Date:</b>	12/7/2006		<b>Cost Type:</b>	Facilities
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Expansion	<b>Request Type</b>	Initial	<b>Completion Date:</b>	12/08		<b>Prepared By:</b>	Jeff Tucker			

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior							
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013		Total
Construction	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000
Equipment/Furnishings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,000

Funding Source:										
Excise Tax Renewal & Replacement	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,000

Annual Operating Budget Impact										
<b>Annual Revenues</b>				\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$12,000
<b>Annual Expenditures</b>										
Materials and Services				\$0	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$2,000
Subtotal, Expenditures:				\$0	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$2,000
<b>Net Operating Contribution (Cost):</b>				\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$10,000

**Project Description / Justification:** Estimated Useful Life (yrs): 20 First Full Fiscal Year of Operation: 2009-10

The barn at Howell Territorial Park has housed Oregon Historical Society materials until Summer 2006. OHS removed all of its materials, and Metro now has full use of the barn. This project would upgrade the barn for community and other revenue generating events. To effectively accommodate expanded activities in the barn, restrooms will be upgraded to ADA standards in FY 2007-08. Updates and upgrades to all park interpretive and wayfinding signage, which are already designed, would also be fabricated and installed in FY 2008-09.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

**Project Title:** 
**Fund:**

**Project Status:** 
**Funding Status:** 
**FY First Authorized:** 
**Department:**

**Project Number:** 
**Active:** 
**Dept. Priority:** 
**Facility:** 
**Division:**

**Source Of Estimat:** 
**Source:** 
**Start Date:** 
**Date:** 
**Cost Type:**

**Type of Project:** 
**Request Type:** 
**Completion Date:** 
**Prepared By:**

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior							
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total	
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$67,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$67,500	
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	

Funding Source:	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior							
	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total	
Excise Tax Renewal & Replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** \_\_\_\_\_
 **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 
**First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

This project would replace the existing pre-manufactured office building at the Stafford Field Station (Boarland) with a new pre-manufactured office. The new building would increase the available office space, accommodating the anticipated expanding land management demand.

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** M. James Gleason Boat Ramp Renovation Phase I & II **Fund:** Regional Parks Capital Fund

**Project Status:** Incomplete **Funding Status:** Funded **FY First Authorized:** 1997-98 **Department:** Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**Project Number:** 70170 **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:** 2 **Facility:**  **Division:**

**Source Of Estimat:** Based on Design **Source:**  **Start Date:** 3/98 **Date:** 11/30/2007 **Cost Type:** Facilities

**Type of Project:** Replacement **Request Type:** Continuation **Completion Date:** 6/09 **Prepared By:** Jeff Tucker

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Plans and Studies	\$40,858	\$0	\$40,858	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,858
Land and Right-of-Way	\$322,693	\$0	\$322,693	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$322,693
Design and Engineering	\$407,882	\$85,000	\$492,882	\$90,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$582,882
Construction	\$332,087	\$0	\$332,087	\$2,322,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,654,487
Project Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1% for Art	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,400
<b>Total:</b>	\$1,103,520	\$85,000	\$1,188,520	\$2,435,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,624,320

**Funding Source:**

Multnomah County	\$120,000	\$0	\$120,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$120,000
Grants - State Marine Board	\$371,587	\$12,896	\$384,483	\$2,060,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,445,283
Grants - OR Fish & Wildlife	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
G.O. Bonds - Local Share	\$489,185	\$72,104	\$561,289	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$561,289
Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$31,158	\$0	\$31,158	\$375,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$406,158
Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$51,590	\$0	\$51,590	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$51,590
<b>Total:</b>	\$1,103,520	\$85,000	\$1,188,520	\$2,435,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,624,320

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

<b>Annual Revenues</b>				\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$240,000
<b>Annual Expenditures</b>									
Personal Services				\$0	\$38,495	\$38,495	\$38,495	\$38,495	\$153,980
Materials and Services				\$0	\$21,632	\$21,632	\$21,632	\$21,632	\$86,528
Renewal and Replacement				\$0	\$33,300	\$33,300	\$33,300	\$33,300	\$133,200
Subtotal, Expenditures:				\$0	\$93,427	\$93,427	\$93,427	\$93,427	\$373,708
<b>Net Operating Contribution (Cost):</b>				\$0	(\$33,427)	(\$33,427)	(\$33,427)	(\$33,427)	(\$133,708)

**Project Description / Justification:** **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 40 **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:** 2009-10

Facility master plan completed in March 1998. In 1998, purchased from the Port of Portland two adjacent parcels necessary for implementation of improvements. Project design completed in 2001. Land use review approved in 2003, with waterside permitting currently underway. Funding for the project is coming from the Oregon State Marine Board, Metro, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Metro's share comes from Multnomah County's local share money and the renewal and replacement reserves.

Phase I includes entry/exit improvements. Phase II includes "waterside" improvements, including new pilings and new floats, as well as a new wave attenuator.

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** Council/COO Building Space Remodel **Fund:** General Fund Capital Fund  
**Project Status:** Incomplete **Funding Status:** Funded **FY First Authorized:** 2007-08 **Department:** Finance  
**Project Number:** 01510 **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:** 4 **Facility:**  **Division:** Property Services  
**Source Of Estimat:** Preliminary **Source:**  **Start Date:** 7/07 **Date:** 12/5/2006 **Cost Type:** Facilities  
**Type of Project:** New **Request Type:** Initial **Completion Date:** 6/09 **Prepared By:** Brian Phillips

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Construction	\$4,664	\$0	\$4,664	\$120,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$124,664
Equipment/Furnishings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$4,664	\$0	\$4,664	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,664

**Funding Source:**

Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
Fund Balance	\$4,664	\$0	\$4,664	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,664
<b>Total:</b>	\$4,664	\$0	\$4,664	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,664

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

**Project Description / Justification:** **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 15 **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:** 2009-10

This project will remodel the third floor of Metro Regional Center as well as making other required or needed upgrades to the building such as the creation of a room for nursing mothers as required by new Oregon law.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Develop Enterprise Business Applications Software			<b>Fund:</b>	General Fund Capital Fund			
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	1998-99		<b>Department:</b>	Information Technology
<b>Project Number</b>	56135	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	5		<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Division:</b>	Information Technology			<b>Date:</b>	4/22/2008		<b>Cost Type:</b>	Equipment
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/08			
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Expansion	<b>Request Type</b>	Revision	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09		<b>Prepared By:</b>	Scott Robinson

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Equipment/Furnishings	\$334,528	\$0	\$334,528	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$484,528
<b>Total:</b>	\$334,528	\$0	\$334,528	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$484,528

### Funding Source:

Other - Cost Allocation Plan	\$102,285	\$0	\$102,285	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,285
Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$232,243	\$0	\$232,243	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$382,243
<b>Total:</b>	\$334,528	\$0	\$334,528	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$484,528

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

#### Annual Expenditures

Materials and Services				\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$120,000
Subtotal, Expenditures:				\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$120,000
<b>Net Operating Contribution (Cost):</b>				\$0	(\$30,000)	(\$30,000)	(\$30,000)	(\$30,000)	(\$120,000)

#### Project Description / Justification:

Estimated Useful Life (yrs):

12

First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:

2009-10

Metro operates a complex business enterprise with complex budgeting requirements. Currently budgeting is accomplished via a series of spreadsheets and access databases which are inefficient and prone to error. In addition, the lack of workflow surrounding budget submission means that completing the budgeting process is an extremely labor intensive effort.

Metro FAS and IT have proposed the implementation of a budgeting module to improve the efficiency, quality and workflow surrounding the budgeting process. Specifically, the anticipated budget of \$150,000 is expected to provide licensing, hardware and implementation services necessary to implement a budgeting module and subsequently integrate with the core PeopleSoft finance and HR systems.

This project is being moved to fiscal 2008-09 due to resource limitations in FAS and IT that are fully engaged in the current PeopleSoft finance upgrade and the asset management module implementation. With the closure of these projects in 2008, FAS and IT resources will be aligned to complete this project.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Storm Water Connection to Big Pipe			<b>Fund:</b>	Zoo Capital Projects Fund			
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2007-08		<b>Department:</b>	Oregon Zoo
<b>Project Number</b>	TEMP334	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	0		<b>Facility:</b>	Oregon Zoo
<b>Division:</b>	Construction Maintenance			<b>Date:</b>	12/21/2007		<b>Cost Type:</b>	Facilities
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	1/07		<b>Prepared By:</b>	Craig Stroud
<b>Type of Project:</b>	New	<b>Request Type</b>	Initial	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09			

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Construction	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000

### Funding Source:

Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):**  **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

The zoo has been working diligently on the Predators of the Serengeti and Red Ape Reserve projects by obtaining architectural, survey, and design element plans, and working with the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services (city) on approvals and construction permits. During this process, the city stipulated that the two construction projects require incorporation of storm water separation and diversion to the combined sewer overflow pipe that runs along Highway 26 as a condition of approval and permitting.

Zoo staff obtained preliminary plans and drawings for diverting storm water for the two major projects. Both projects require connecting arterial storm water lines to a 30-inch main that runs down a ravine on the south edge of the zoo property to connect to the city's combined sewer overflow system on Highway 26. The cost to install these lines and connect to the system was estimated by the zoo's engineering firm at \$250,000. This cost was not anticipated in the zoo's budget requests for the two major projects, and existing project appropriation is insufficient to cover these costs.

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:**  **Fund:**

**Project Status:**  **Funding Status:**  **FY First Authorized:**  **Department:**

**Project Number:**  **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:**  **Facility:**  **Division:**

**Source Of Estimat:**  **Source:**  **Start Date:**  **Date:**  **Cost Type:**

**Type of Project:**  **Request Type:**  **Completion Date:**  **Prepared By:**

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$50,730	\$330,000	\$380,730	\$170,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$550,730
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,465,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$3,540,000
1% for Art	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$50,730	\$330,000	\$380,730	\$3,670,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$4,125,730

**Funding Source:**

Grants	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$104,973	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$104,973
Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donations	\$50,730	\$330,000	\$380,730	\$3,565,027	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$4,020,757
<b>Total:</b>	\$50,730	\$330,000	\$380,730	\$3,670,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$4,125,730

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

<b>Annual Revenues</b>				\$0	\$2,100,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000
<b>Annual Expenditures</b>									
Personal Services				\$0	\$64,000	\$66,000	\$68,000	\$70,000	\$268,000
Materials and Services				\$0	\$30,000	\$32,000	\$33,000	\$34,000	\$129,000
Subtotal, Expenditures:				\$0	\$94,000	\$98,000	\$101,000	\$104,000	\$397,000
<b>Net Operating Contribution (Cost):</b>				\$0	\$2,006,000	\$1,502,000	\$1,199,000	\$896,000	\$5,603,000

**Project Description / Justification:**  **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):**  **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

Convert the existing Alaska Tundra exhibit into additional African exhibits, including lions, wild dogs, cheetahs, and caracals. The exhibit's name is 'Predators of the Serengeti'. The project includes upgrades to building structure, utilities and animal containment areas. The new exhibit will provide visitors with viewing opportunities for close-up interaction with exhibit predators. Included will be interpretive graphics that educate visitors about predators. These animals all have a strong conservation message and will contribute to the Zoo's mission. The exhibit will focus on in-situ environmental conservation projects and community education and sustainable economic practices. The existing Alaska Tundra exhibit will be completely renovated and incorporated into the Predators exhibit. The Oregon Zoo Foundation has committed to a capital campaign to finance the \$4 million exhibit renovations and \$1 million for an operating endowment. The exhibit will positively influence attendance.

The FY 2011-12 project is the addition of Hyenas to the exhibit. This expansion of the exhibit will use a portion of the prior Tundra exhibit that was not converted in the original construction.



## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Red Ape Reserve "Orangutan"			<b>Fund:</b>	Zoo Capital Projects Fund		
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2007-08	<b>Department:</b>	Oregon Zoo
<b>Project Number</b>	ZPR12	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	1	<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/07	<b>Date:</b>	12/4/2006
<b>Cost Type:</b>							Facilities
<b>Type of Project:</b>	New	<b>Request Type</b>	Initial	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Craig Stroud

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Design and Engineering	\$0	\$95,000	\$95,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,000
Construction	\$0	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$1,415,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,545,000
Project Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$144,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$144,000
1% for Art	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$1,575,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000

### Funding Source:

Excise Tax Renewal & Replacement	\$0	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$1,575,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$1,575,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

<b>Annual Revenues</b>				\$0	\$405,360	\$205,382	\$156,064	\$118,568	\$885,374
<b>Annual Expenditures</b>									
Materials and Services				\$0	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$68,000
Subtotal, Expenditures:				\$0	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$68,000
<b>Net Operating Contribution (Cost):</b>				\$0	\$388,360	\$188,382	\$139,064	\$101,568	\$817,374

<b>Project Description / Justification:</b>	<b>Estimated Useful Life (yrs):</b>	20	<b>First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:</b>	2009-10
---	-------------------------------------	----	---	---------

Construction of a new indoor exhibit, the construction of new holding/shift rooms, and the renovation of existing outdoor exhibits.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
R&R	1

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Various

**DATE:** 4/16/08

**DRAFTED BY :** Kathy Rutkowski / Karen Feher

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical                                            Proposed Budget                     

Substantive                                            Approved Budget                     

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: *Renewal & Replacement Project Carry Forward***

**Correction to project**

In reconciling and finalizing the renewal & replacement budget for FY 2008-09 a portion of the M. James Gleason boat ramp project was double budgeted. This request corrects the budget by removing that portion and returning it to the ending balance reserves.

Several renewal and replacement projects were inadvertently left off of the Renewal and Replacement listing as follows:

Human Resources Printer                      \$15,000 (new listing)  
 Phone System Replacement                      \$30,000 (new listing)

Several renewal and replacement projects have timing changes that bring them into the budgeted fiscal year as follows:

Carpet Replacement                      \$75,000 (timing change)  
 Waterproof Parking Structure                      \$75,000 (timing change-carry forward)  
 MRC Planter Repairs                      \$33,000 (timing change-carry forward)

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
General	R&R Fund (611)	3500	Fund Balance	\$108,000
				<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>
				<b><i>\$108,000</i></b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Human Resources	R&R Fund (611)	5750	Office Furniture and Equipment (non-CIP)	\$15,000
Fin & Admin Svc	R&R Fund (611)	5755	Office Furniture & Equip (CIP)	\$30,000
Fin & Admin Svc	R&R Fund (611)	5725	Buildings & Related (CIP)	\$75,000
Fin & Admin Svc	R&R Fund (611)	5261	Capital Maintenance (CIP)	\$108,000
Parks	R&R Fund (611)	5710	Improvements other than building	(\$150,000)
General	R&R Fund (611)	5990	Ending Balance	\$30,000
				<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>
				<b><i>\$108,000</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

None

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

N/A

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

N/A

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** 
**Fund:**

**Project Status:** 
**Funding Status:** 
**FY First Authorized:** 
**Department:**

**Project Number:** 
**Active:** 
**Dept. Priority:** 
**Facility:** 
**Division:**

**Source Of Estimat:** 
**Source:** 
**Start Date:** 
**Date:** 
**Cost Type:**

**Type of Project:** 
**Request Type:** 
**Completion Date:** 
**Prepared By:**

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Equipment/Furnishings	\$35,400	\$0	\$35,400	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,400
<b>Total:</b>	\$35,400	\$0	\$35,400	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,400

**Funding Source:**

Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,000
Fund Balance - Capital Reserve	\$35,400	\$0	\$35,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,400
<b>Total:</b>	\$35,400	\$0	\$35,400	\$30,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,400

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

**Project Description / Justification:** \_\_\_\_\_
 **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 
**First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

The funding in FY 2009 is the replacement of the handsets for all Metro users. A portion of the user phones were replaced in FY 2008. By 2010, the telephone system at the Regional Center will be past its useful life both in physical and technological terms. The part of the project in FY 2009-10 is a voice mail upgrade.

**Capital Project Request - Project Detail**

**Project Title:** Carpet Replacement **Fund:** General Fund Renewal and Replacement Fund  
**Project Status:** Incomplete **Funding Status:** Funded **FY First Authorized:** 2002-03 **Department:** Finance  
**Project Number:** 56180 **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:** 4 **Facility:**  **Division:** Property Services  
**Source Of Estimat:** Preliminary **Source:**  **Start Date:** 9/08 **Date:** 10/3/2003 **Cost Type:** Facilities  
**Type of Project:** Replacement **Request Type:** Initial **Completion Date:** 6/12 **Prepared By:** Brian Phillips

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Capital Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$111,000	\$0	\$386,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$111,000	\$0	\$386,000

Funding Source:	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$111,000	\$0	\$386,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$111,000	\$0	\$386,000

**Annual Operating Budget Impact**

**Project Description / Justification:** **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):** 20 **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:** 2012-13

This is the estimated timing and cost for the renewal and replacement of the Metro Regional Center Carpets.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

**Project Title:**  **Fund:**   
**Project Status:**  **Funding Status:**  **FY First Authorized:**  **Department:**   
**Project Number:**  **Active:**  **Dept. Priority:**  **Facility:**  **Division:**   
**Source Of Estimat**  **Source:**  **Start Date:**  **Date:**  **Cost Type:**   
**Type of Project:**  **Request Type**  **Completion Date:**  **Prepared By:**

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior							
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013		Total
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$125,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$125,000

### Funding Source:

Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$125,000
<b>Total:</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$125,000

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Estimated Useful Life (yrs):**  **First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:**

This four year project is to waterproof the parking structure beginning with the top floor. The top floor costs three times the amount need for the subsequent lower floors. Failure to complete this project will result in building structural damage.

## Capital Project Request - Project Detail

<b>Project Title:</b>	Rebuild Metro Regional Center planters			<b>Fund:</b>	General Fund Renewal and Replacement Fund		
<b>Project Status:</b>	Incomplete	<b>Funding Status:</b>	Funded	<b>FY First Authorized:</b>	2006-07	<b>Department:</b>	Finance
<b>Project Number</b>	01505	<b>Active:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dept. Priority:</b>	1	<b>Facility:</b>	
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/06	<b>Date:</b>	11/30/2005
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Replacement	<b>Request Type</b>	Initial	<b>Completion Date:</b>	6/09	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Brian Phillips
<b>Source Of Estimat</b>	Preliminary	<b>Source:</b>		<b>Start Date:</b>	7/06	<b>Date:</b>	11/30/2005
<b>Cost Type:</b>	Facilities						

Project Estimates	Actual	Budget/Est	Prior						
Capital Cost:	Expend	2007-2008	Years	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Capital Maintenance	\$51,649	\$32,000	\$83,649	\$78,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$161,649
<b>Total:</b>	\$51,649	\$32,000	\$83,649	\$78,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$161,649

### Funding Source:

Fund Balance - Renewal and Replacement	\$51,649	\$32,000	\$83,649	\$78,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$161,649
<b>Total:</b>	\$51,649	\$32,000	\$83,649	\$78,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$161,649

### Annual Operating Budget Impact

**Project Description / Justification:** Estimated Useful Life (yrs):  First Full Fiscal Year of Operation:

The planters at the Regional Center will be 15 years old by 2010, and deterioration is occurring in both the structures and the irrigation. A complete remodel will restore these to another 15 years of use. After completion of the first two planters, it was discovered that an original design flaw needs to be repaired on the remaining six planters. The remaining planters are smaller and not hooked to the building allowing three to be completed in each year.

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

DATE: April 25, 2008

TO: David Bragdon, Council President  
Rex Burkholder, Councilor  
Carlotta Collette, Councilor  
Kathryn Harrington, Councilor  
Carl Hosticka, Councilor  
Robert Liberty, Councilor  
Rod Park, Councilor

FROM: Kathy Rutkowski, Budget Coordinator

RE: **SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2008-09 PROPOSED BUDGET**

Attached are three requested substantive amendments to the FY 2008-09 budget. Substantive amendments propose changes to the budget for new expenditures that were not anticipated or incorporated at the time the budget was originally prepared. Some of these amendments may not have significant policy implications or are for the purpose of implementing prior Council decisions. However, because they have not been included in the budget previously, they have been designated as substantive amendments.

A small amount of time has been reserved on the agenda for the Council's Tuesday, April 29, 2008 work session to review and discuss these amendments. The Council is tentatively scheduled to vote on the substantive amendments at its meeting of Thursday, May 1, 2008. Historically, each substantive amendment is discussed and voted on individually.

Amendment	Sponsor	Summary of Amendment	Change	Page #
GENERAL 6	Cooper	Creates a specific appropriation in the General Fund dedicated to paying claims and judgments under the former ORS 197.352 (Measure 37)	\$100	1
PARKS 7	Jordan	Responds to audit recommendations by providing additional support in the Pioneer Cemetery operation necessary to ensure proper compliance with state law and regulations, and to ensure that the necessary internal controls are in place to prevent errors or fraud.	\$75,352 (net position cost)	2
MERC 3	Woolson	Engages expert consultation services to advise MERC and Metro concerning options and opportunities regarding the Columbia River Crossing project.	\$100,000	4

## Attachments

cc: Mike Jordan, Chief Operating Officer  
Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer  
Margo Norton, Deputy Finance Officer  
Karen Feher, Capital Budget Coordinator  
Ann Wawrukiewicz, Financial Planning Analyst  
Department Directors  
Department Finance Manager



<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>#</b>
GENERAL	6

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Office of Metro Attorney

**DATE:** 4/17/08

**SPONSOR :** Dan Cooper

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical   
 Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget   
 Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:**

As recommended by the Office of Metro Attorney, this action would create a specific appropriation in the General Fund dedicated to paying claims and judgments under the former ORS 197.352 (Measure 37).

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
Non-Department	General	5749	Claims - former ORS 197.352	\$100
		5999	Contingency	(\$100)

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

Minimal

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Metro is currently appealing judgments entered by the Clackamas County Circuit Court arising under former ORS 197.352(6). This amendment would provide an appropriation authorized under ORS 197.352(10) for payment limited to the amount of the appropriation.

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

In light of the very minor dollar amount, it is recommended this amount be taken from the General Fund contingency.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
PARKS	7

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:** Office of the COO

**DATE:** April 21, 2007

**SPONSOR :** Michael Jordan

**Type of Amendment:**                      **Amendment to:**

Technical	<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Substantive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Approved Budget	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT: Cemetery Program Support**

Metro asked Moss Adams to conduct a review of the Pioneer Cemetery program in the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department. That review found several significant internal control problems and made a series of recommendations, specifically around “separation of duties,” to decrease the possibilities of errors and increase compliance with state rules governing cemetery operations.

Department analysis of the cemetery program activities over the last 18 months shows a solid trend of increased sales and services in the cemetery program. This increased activity makes it even harder for the 1 staff person overseeing sales and services to keep up with demand. Combined with the additional responsibilities for improved internal controls over this program, the increased sales activity necessitates additional staff support. This amendment provides additional staff support to assist this program.

This position will also have some additional capacity to assist with administering the shared electronic resources of the Connecting Green Alliance, assisting with events and committees, and doing research in support of planning efforts and special projects.

Funding for the position is described below under *Options for Funding this Amendment*.

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
<b><i>Resources</i></b>				
General	General (010)	4050	Excise Tax	\$72,320
Parks	General (160)	4280	Grave Services	22,000
Parks	General (160)	4285	Grave Sales	12,875
				<b><i>Total Resources</i></b>
				<b><i>\$107,195</i></b>
<b><i>Requirements</i></b>				
Parks	General (160)	5010	Personal Services	\$48,991
Parks	General (160)	5100	Fringe Benefits	24,995
Parks	General (160)	5201	Office Supplies (computer & software)	1,366
Parks	General (160)	5240	Contracted Professional Services (cemetery related)	17,000
Parks	General (160)	5999	Contingency (see Parks Amendment #1)	(27,477)
General	General (010)	5999	Contingency	42,320
				<b><i>Total Requirements</i></b>
				<b><i>\$107,195</i></b>

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

This amendment creates a new 1.0 FTE Assistant Management Analyst position.

### **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

The additional support in the Pioneer Cemetery operation is necessary to ensure proper compliance with state law and regulations, and to ensure that the necessary internal controls are in place to prevent errors or fraud. Mistakes in this program have significant and long-term consequences, and Metro has a responsibility to protect the interest of those who purchase graves as well as the general public in its operations of these cemeteries.

### **OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

This amendment is paid from three sources.

1. A technical amendment to restate the R.V. Fees State Shared Revenue (Parks Amendment #1) provides a resetting of the base projections, meaning that this additional revenue is an ongoing source of an estimated \$27,477. Parks Amendment #1 placed the additional revenue in contingency. This amendment utilizes that revenue and reduces the contingency.
2. As mentioned above, an analysis of the revenues in the cemetery program over the past 18 months, excluding one-time-only block sales, shows a significant increase in sales and service activity. That analysis shows that for FY 2008-09, we should see \$34,875 more in revenue than the proposed budget projects. Associated with that additional revenue is an estimated \$17,000 in additional contracted services associated with those increased burials, for a net gain of \$17,875.
3. A review and reconciliation of estimated excise tax to be generated next year based on budgeted revenues indicates approximately \$72,320 more in revenue than is currently in the Proposed Budget. This action would recognize that revenue, allocate \$30,000 to funding this position, and place the balance of \$42,320 in the General Fund contingency.

<i>For FP Use Only</i>	
Department	#
MERC	3

**AMENDMENT TO FY 2008-09 BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT:**     MERC    

**DATE:**     4/14/2008    

**SPONSOR :**     David Woolson    

**Type of Amendment:**

Technical  
Substantive

**Amendment to:**

Proposed Budget  
Approved Budget

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** *Expo Consultant – Columbia River Crossing*

Department	Fund	Line Items		
		Acct #	Account Title	Amount
MERC	MERC (555)	5240	Contracted Professional Services	\$100,000
MERC	MERC (555)	5990	Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance	(\$100,000)

This project is to engage expert consultation services to advise MERC and Metro concerning options and opportunities regarding the Columbia River Crossing project.

**PROGRAM/STAFFING IMPACTS:**

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

This amendment is proposed at the recommendation of Metro Council President.

**OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THIS AMENDMENT**

Fund Balance

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

DATE: April 24, 2008

TO: David Bragdon, Council President  
Rex Burkholder, Councilor  
Kathryn Harrington, Councilor  
Carl Hosticka, Councilor  
Robert Liberty, Councilor  
Carlotta Collette, Councilor  
Rod Park, Councilor

FROM: Margo Norton, Deputy CFO

RE: **Packet 3: Council Proposals and Management Response**

For convenience we have reprinted the Council proposals, joined with the management response. Each response was assigned to a primary drafter who consulted with other content specialists to produce an initial draft based on our understanding of the proposer's desired outcome, augmented by Council discussion on Tuesday, April 15. The drafts were then reviewed by the Senior Management Team on Wednesday, April 23.

A summary spreadsheet displays the proposals, the source of funds where identified, and a multi-year cost estimate.

Electronic Distribution:  
Senior Directors  
Finance Managers  
Council Assistants



**COUNCIL PROPOSALS**  
**SPENDING IMPACT**

as of April 24, 2008

Proposer	Short Title	Phasing?	Source of Funds*	Year 1 2008-09	Year 2 2009-10	Year 3 2011-12	3-year Total	OnGoing?
Burkholder-1	Climate Change**	phase 1 plan phase 2 implementation	RRSF unidentified total	75,000 - 75,000	- ? ?	- ? ?	75,000	?
Burkholder-2	Waste Redux Education (12,000 participants increasing to 18,000+)		SW Rate	1,400,000	1,600,000	1,800,000	4,800,000	YES
Park-1	Nature in N'hood Grants		RRSF	awarded	100,000	150,000	250,000	?
Bragdon-1	Integrating Habitat	removing barriers/Title 13 "getting one built" analysis defray developer's "Cost plus"	unidentified unidentified unidentified total	42,000 175,000 217,000	33,000 100,000 133,000	- - 300,000 300,000	650,000	
Hosticka-1	DRC/ Performance based growth management		carryforward	175,000	-	-	175,000	
Hosticka-2	Concept Planning			defer?	?	?		
SW-1	SW Diesel Retrofit**		grants RRSF or opportunity fund unidentified total	400,000 400,000 800,000	? ? 950,000 950,000	? ? 950,000 950,000	2,700,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>2,667,000</b>	<b>2,783,000</b>	<b>3,200,000</b>	<b>8,650,000</b>	

\*Note 1: Source of Funds

Any expenditure of Recovery Rate Stabilization Fund (RRSF) is subject to spending limit calculation and assumes excise tax exemption for Zoo is implemented.

\*\*Note 2: Jurisdiction

Purpose of proposal may require additional Metro legislation to establish jurisdiction.





Councilor	#
<b>Burkholder</b>	<b>1</b>

**Council Proposals**  
**For Budget Amendment**  
**Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Convening Regional Partners to Create a Regional Climate Change Action Plan

**Concise Description**

The State of Oregon has established greenhouse gas reduction targets that call for arresting the growth of greenhouse gas emissions by 2010, reducing emissions to at least 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, and reducing emissions to at least 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. These are ambitious targets, and immediate, comprehensive action is necessary in order to meet the state’s goals. In April 2008, the Metro Council passed Resolution 08-3931, directing the agency to “develop a regional climate change action plan to meet the State’s greenhouse gas reductions targets and coordinate a regional approach to meeting the goals outlined in this plan.” The proposed amendment would fund the creation of this action plan by staffing and supporting an effort to convene representatives from governments, non-governmental organizations and private companies from across the region to conduct a baseline inventory of the region’s greenhouse gas emissions by sector, discuss possible actions the region could take to reduce its collective greenhouse gas emissions, assess the effectiveness and feasibility of the proposed actions and prioritize them accordingly, and draft an implementation plan for consideration by the Metro Council.

**Objective**

This proposal will create a plan to reduce the region’s greenhouse gas emissions 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and to ensure that governments, non-governmental organizations, private companies, and residents within the region understand and are invested in the plan so that it can be implemented effectively. The plan will be considered successful if the estimated greenhouse gas reductions due to the actions proposed therein enable the region to meet the State of Oregon’s targets.

**Duration (put an ‘x’ in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

One time    Specific length: **One year**    \_\_\_\_\_ On-going

**Cost Estimate**

The estimated cost of creating this plan is \$100,000, the majority of which will be staffing and support expenses. Other jurisdictions, including the city of Portland and Multnomah County, the cities of San Francisco, CA and Berkeley, CA, and King County, WA have created climate action plans, gathering input from staff in many different departments within the convening jurisdiction, from other governments and districts throughout the area, and sometimes from the private sector. In each case, one full-time staff person or the equivalent was needed to coordinate between the different departments and governments and compile their work into a plan. While Metro’s proposed plan is more ambitious than the others mentioned here because it affects a greater population and more jurisdictions than the other efforts, it is possible that Metro will be able to partner with the National Policy Consensus Center and others to create its plan.

While a regional climate change action plan will not generate revenue in the short term, the effort and associated costs required to mitigate climate change grows as time passes. Due to the unprecedented nature of climate change, no cost estimates for adaptation exist, but the expenses associated with adjusting to climate change’s impacts on the region’s natural resources, infrastructure, and economy are projected to be large. In light of these facts, a modest investment in creating a regional climate change action plan in the short term is a prudent fiscal choice.

Councilor	#
<b>Burkholder</b>	<b>1</b>

**Funding Options**

No redeployment of existing effort is required in order to fund this proposal.

**Relationship to other programs**

Several of Metro’s existing programs reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging more efficient use of resources and transportation, including: Transit-Oriented Development, the Green Streets Handbook, the Recycling Information Hotline, Making the Greatest Place, and Regional Travel Options. However, reducing greenhouse gas emissions is not a stated goal of these programs. Recently passed Metro Council Resolution 08-3931 states that sustainability “shall be the guiding principle for all Metro policies and programs,” and a regional effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will help to highlight the importance and greenhouse-gas reducing potential of Metro’s land-use, transportation planning, and travel options programs.

Council Resolution 08-3931 also directs Metro’s Chief Operating Officer to “coordinate existing and future Metro policies and programs toward meeting the [Oregon state] definition of sustainability... and to communicate Metro’s policies and programs to the public in terms of how they address sustainability.” Toward this end, the 2008 budget funds a new sustainability officer position to coordinate Metro’s internal sustainability efforts, and a regional climate plan will provide the sustainability officer a chance to share best practices with staff counterparts from the growing number of governments and other organizations in the region that have similar positions. Climate change is also an issue of increasing public concern, and the outreach involved in creating and implementing a regional climate action plan would provide Metro with an opportunity to demonstrate a strong public commitment to working on sustainability issues, both through the climate plan itself and through other Metro programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Stakeholders**

Many of Metro’s partner governments have taken steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within their respective jurisdictions. Portland, Beaverton, Gresham, Lake Oswego, Hillsboro, Milwaukie, and Oregon City, which together represent over 60 percent of the population under Metro’s jurisdiction, have all signed onto the U.S. Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement, pledging to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2012; Multnomah and Clackamas County have both signed the Sierra Club’s Cool Counties initiative, which calls for an 80 percent reduction in greenhouse gas levels by 2050; and many large private companies in the region, including Nike, PGE and Intel, have taken steps to reduce emissions due to their operations. In a series of interviews conducted by Metro staff in fall 2007, many of these parties suggested that Metro convene stakeholders to create a climate change action plan in order to assist companies and governments in coordinating their individual efforts. Furthermore, the Portland area has gained a reputation as a national leader in sustainability, and is attracting a growing number of green businesses and advocacy groups, all of which are likely to lend resources to and benefit from a regional climate change action plan.

## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Convening Regional Partners to Create a Regional Climate Change Action Plan

### **Desired Outcome**

To convene a forum and committee, in coordination with partners, for the purpose of developing a Regional Climate Change Action Plan.

Recently passed Metro Council Resolution 08-3931 states that sustainability “shall be the guiding principle for all Metro policies and programs,” and a regional effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will help to highlight the importance and greenhouse-gas reducing potential of Metro’s land-use, transportation planning, and travel options programs.

Council Resolution 08-3931 also directs Metro’s Chief Operating Officer to “coordinate existing and future Metro policies and programs toward meeting the [Oregon state] definition of sustainability... and to communicate Metro’s policies and programs to the public in terms of how they address sustainability.” Toward this end, the 2008 budget funds a new sustainability officer position to coordinate Metro’s internal sustainability efforts, and a regional climate plan will provide the sustainability officer a chance to share best practices with staff counterparts from the growing number of governments and other organizations in the region that have similar positions.

Several of Metro’s existing programs reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging more efficient use of resources and transportation, including: Transit-Oriented Development, the Green Streets Handbook, the Recycling Information Hotline, Making the Greatest Place, and Regional Travel Options. However, reducing greenhouse gas emissions is not a stated goal of these programs.

### **Effort Required**

This effort should be phased, with convening of the forum and committee and the development of the Regional Climate Action Plan serving as the outcomes of phase 1. This will include the work of a limited duration position, along with the staff support from the parks, SW&R, OMA, and council departments. This first phase is exploratory and, therefore, will produce options for Council, likely including an option to move forward with future activities, and associated costs, within the 2008-09 fiscal year.

### **Cost**

The estimated cost for the FY 2008-09 budget includes the limited duration employee, working  $\frac{3}{4}$  FTE for nine months, for an approximate cost of \$60,000, plus the costs associated with the forum and committee (which may be shared with partners) of approximately \$15,000, for a total of \$75,000. Upon completion of the initial nine-month phase, future outcomes, phases, associated costs, and Metro’s role will be evaluated. The funding associated with this proposal does not provide resources for activities beyond this first phase, therefore, any decision to move forward at the end of this phase may include future costs, perhaps within the 2008-09 fiscal year.

### **Stakeholders**

Many of Metro’s partner governments have taken steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within their respective jurisdictions. Portland, Beaverton, Gresham, Lake Oswego, Hillsboro, Milwaukie, and Oregon City, which together represent over 60 percent of the population under Metro’s jurisdiction, have all signed onto the U.S. Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement, pledging to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2012; Multnomah and Clackamas County have both signed the Sierra Club’s Cool Counties initiative, which calls for an 80 percent reduction in greenhouse gas levels by 2050;

and many large private companies in the region, including Nike, PGE and Intel, have taken steps to reduce emissions due to their operations. In a series of interviews conducted by Metro staff in fall 2007, many of these parties suggested that Metro convene stakeholders to create a climate change action plan in order to assist companies and governments in coordinating their individual efforts. Furthermore, the Portland area has gained a reputation as a national leader in sustainability, and is attracting a growing number of green businesses and advocacy groups, all of which are likely to lend resources to and benefit from a regional climate change action plan.

### **Funding Options**

Recovery rate stabilization fund may be an appropriate source. Expenditures would be calculated against the charter spending limit.

### **Constraints and Risks**

There are no overwhelming constraints or risks for Phase 1 of this proposal. It may be necessary to enact additional Metro legislation to establish jurisdiction prior to any implementation phase.

Councilor	#
<b>Burkholder</b>	<b>2</b>

**Council Proposals  
For Budget Amendment  
Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Enhanced waste reduction education for 6th graders in the region

**Concise Description**

This proposal would complement and expand Metro's waste reduction education outreach by integrating waste reduction curriculum and practices into Outdoor School programs around the Metro region. Metro waste reduction education staff will work with Outdoor School staff and the Educational Service Districts to further refine the waste reduction education currently provided as well as enhance the program to add new activities such as:

- Lesson plans/activities for teachers to use at evening class meetings
- Recreation activities with waste reduction themes (Resource Rescue, Paper making, Bugged by Pesticides)
- Meal-time programs: waste reduction techniques, life histories of various products, waste audits

Metro staff will act as advisors for Outdoor School staff on curriculum resources and waste reduction techniques, allowing the Outdoor School staff to determine the most efficient and meaningful way to integrate the waste reduction messages and practices into their current programs. This will require some upfront work to coordinate and train, however less Metro staff time will be required once the program is implemented. Metro waste reduction education staff will meet with Outdoor School staff annually to review curriculum and assist with staff training to ensure the curriculum is up-to-date and is being delivered in an effective and accurate manner.

Expanding Metro's waste reduction education curriculum to include 6th graders attending Outdoor School has a number of advantages:

- Metro's Waste reduction outreach is greatly expanded to 12,000 sixth graders per year.
- Helps meet Metro Council and Solid Waste goals for increasing awareness about protecting our region's natural resources.
- Metro's investment to Outdoor School can leverage investment from Educational Service Districts.
- Metro's investment can stabilize future of Outdoor School to ensure this message continues.
- Outdoor School infrastructure and expertise is in place.
- Outreach also reaches classroom teachers and high school student volunteers involved in Outdoor School.
- Promotes Metro programs in schools to classroom teachers that attend Outdoor School (approx. 500 per year)

**Objective**

1. Increase the level of waste reduction awareness of sixth graders in the region attending Outdoor School in a natural environment, allowing for the students to understand the immediate connection between waste reduction and their role in conservation and protecting the natural environment. To reach this outcome teachers will complete written evaluations at the end of each week. Culminating activities with students will be monitored and teachers will capture knowledge gained by the students through discussions during activities. Administering a pre and post test on waste reduction concepts will be considered and possibly implemented.

Councilor	#
<b>Burkholder</b>	<b>2</b>

2. Expand the number of students who receive waste reduction education, in addition to reaching both high school students working as camp counselors and classroom teachers who prep and follow up with the students before and after their Outdoor School experience. This outcome will be measured through Outdoor School staff tracking numbers of students and teachers each week along with hours/week involved in waste reduction education and activities and submitted to Metro staff.

3. Provide a stable funding source to outdoor school programs in the region by leveraging funds to ensure school districts can provide either a three or six-day program. This will increase the number of students who attend outdoor school in the Metro region, helping to ensure an environmentally literate public. This outcome will be met by the expanded and continued operation Outdoor School programs around the region.

**Duration (put an 'x' in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

\_\_\_ One time                                      Specific length:                                      X On-going

**Cost Estimate**

Willing to spend:\$1.3-1.4 million

Estimated cost: \$1.3-1.4 million

Categories of expense: Metro waste reduction education staff can incorporate the role of advisor and monitor into annual work plan. Estimated time on this project: 40-60 hours for initial curriculum development and 30 hours/year for monitoring, updating and training ODS staff.

This proposal does not generate revenue.

**Funding Options**

If redeployment of existing effort is required to fund the proposal, what area of the budget are you willing to reduce (does not have to be a strict dollar-for-dollar, but identification of a targeted area)?

It is suggested that funding for this proposal come from an increase of \$1 in the Regional System Fee.

**Relationship to other programs**

Providing waste reduction education at Outdoor School complements and expands what is currently done classrooms. Because of the hands-on, in-the-field nature of Outdoor School activities, it is expected that students will make memorable connections between their choices and behaviors and the impact on conservation of natural resources and waste generation. Students are more likely to make changes in their consumption and disposal behaviors with memorable connections such as these. Increasing the number of students who receive waste reduction education as well as enhancing the education for those students who already receive some level of waste reduction education can play an important role in reversing the current upward trend of waste disposal in this region and help Metro reach our waste reduction goal of 64%. This budget proposal supports a number of Metro Council goals and objectives:  
2.2: Our community is inspired to create a better future for wildlife and the environment.  
4.6: Metro encourages and supports the leadership of other organizations and governments that serve the interests of the region’s residents.

This budget proposal also supports Solid Waste and Reduction school education goals and objectives, i.e. provide programs that prepare students for making responsible environmental choices in everyday adult life.

Lastly, this budget proposal also complements the work of Connecting Green. Currently, Environmental Education is one of the five elements included in this project and work is beginning to create a unified vision and long-term strategy for meeting the environmental education need by institutionalizing and permanently funding environmental education programs in the Metro region. Outdoor School is a vital program, providing an effective mechanism to educate students about the importance of caring for our natural areas.

### **Stakeholders**

Affected positively:

- Educational Service Districts in Metro's region
- The region's 6th graders attending public schools, high school counselors, and classroom teachers
- Conservation/environmental education groups
- Foundations supporting outdoor school programs

Affected negatively:

- Metro solid waste customers

## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Enhanced waste reduction education for 6th graders in the region

### **Desired Outcome**

Management's understanding of the desired outcomes is:

1. Increase the level of waste reduction awareness of sixth graders in the region attending Outdoor School in a natural environment, allowing for the students to understand the immediate connection between waste reduction and their role in conservation and protecting the natural environment.
2. Expand the number of students who receive waste reduction education, in addition to reaching both high school students working as camp counselors and classroom teachers who prep and follow up with the students before and after their Outdoor School experience.
3. Provide a stable funding source to outdoor school programs in the region by leveraging funds to ensure school districts can provide either a three or six-day program. This will increase the number of students who attend outdoor school in the Metro region, helping to ensure an environmentally literate public.

The Solid Waste & Recycling Department currently provides school education activities within its Waste Reduction Education and Outreach Program. The objectives of the current school education activities are different from, although complementary with, the objectives of the proposed amendment.

The primary purpose of the school education activity is to create behavior change by :  
Promoting recycling opportunities through environmental education and information;  
Integrating resource conservation, recycling, and waste reduction concepts into school curricula and classroom activities for all students;  
Promoting waste and toxics prevention through demonstration projects and other approaches.

Through these efforts, the program also implements the requirements of state law on providing technical and educational assistance to schools, development of curricula and teachers' guides, and providing instructional and audiovisual materials for use in recycling and waste reduction education. [Oregon Revised Statutes 459A.750]. This service is available to any school in the Metro region upon request.

The FY 2008-09 proposed budget for the current school education program is \$537,589 (approximately 30 percent of the \$1.753 million operating budget for the Waste Reduction Education and Outreach Program).

The school education program reaches over 42,000 elementary and secondary school children per year (43,420 in the most recent year for which comprehensive statistics are available). This equates to less than \$12.50 per child.

### **Effort Required**

The estimated staff time on this project is 40 to 60 hours for initial curriculum development and 30 hours per year for monitoring, updating and training Outdoor School staff. This level of effort would require some adjustment in staff's assigned duties and current work schedule.

Central services staff would generate, review and execute the intergovernmental agreements or grants that govern this program. Central services staff would also have to monitor performance reports, and review and approve invoices for disbursement of funds. At year end, Metro's external auditor would have to



verify that funds were expended according to agreements, with special attention to compliance with the Oregon statute restricting the use of these funds (see “Constraints and Risks” below).

### **Cost**

Councilor Burkholder has proposed a \$1.3 to \$1.4 million cost per year, initially reaching 12,000 students per year. We estimate that over 18,000 6th graders are enrolled across the region. If all districts offered a program at some minimum standard level, the costs would increase by about 34% over the first three years, then level off at some standard inflationary rate in subsequent years.

### **Stakeholders**

- o Educational Service Districts providing Outdoor School in the Metro region This group includes at least (a) the service providers; and (b) finance staff. See “Constraints and Risks” below for comments on coordination efforts with the latter.
- o The region's 6th graders attending public schools; high school counselors, and classroom teachers
- o Conservation/environmental education groups
- o Foundations supporting outdoor school programs

### **Funding Options**

An increase of approximately \$1 in the Regional System Fee for the initial program is the only funding option identified so far.

### **Constraints and Risks**

An important constraint is the limitation on use of the funds to “solid waste and related planning” under state law. Metro will have to monitor all expenditures carefully to ensure compliance with state law.

Management has requested a legal opinion from the Metro Attorney to determine if the proposed use of funds is consistent with state law.

Additional conversation with the Educational Service Districts and School Districts regarding the funding model is necessary. To date, the Portland Public Schools finance section has not been contacted.

Therefore, management recommends that the following questions about feasibility and implementation be addressed:

- o The ability to alter the curriculum, since it is currently aligned to state instructional standards.
- o To what degree are the participating agencies willing and able to accept more oversight.
- o The funding source must be a multi-year commitment, since pulling it would result in collapsing the Outdoor School offering.
- o Is the money intended to be offered to the Educational Service Districts to offset program costs and therefore, lessen the co-pay to individual participants?

Ideally, these questions would be addressed prior to adopting the dollar increase on the tip fee.

Other risks:

- o Once funded, schools could shift resolution credits to other priorities. A reduction in funding from Metro would not have an alternative funding source.
- o Given the complexity of school funding, without knowing more specifics about the funding model, it is unclear whether the funds would not result in some level of supplementation of existing funding.

Equity issues

Of the three Metropolitan Education Service Districts, only Multnomah and NW Region offer an Outdoor School Program. The Clackamas Education Service District does not offer a program to its component districts, although at least one district offers its program independently. For NW Region, the program is offered on a contract basis and transit dollars (dollars provided by the state to the Educational Service Districts who then distribute to school districts to purchase services) can be used to cover the program. Currently all districts in Washington County participate at some level with the exception of Beaverton School District. Beaverton School District takes all of its transit dollars and allocates them to supplying their own services.

It is not clear from the proposal what would be included or not in terms of coverage. Since the Outdoor School Program is widely divergent in its form and shape across school districts and since it is offered and coordinated by Educational Service Districts on behalf of its constituents, the number and variety of equity considerations could be substantial. Funding models differ by agency and participation varies radically by individual component district.

### Options

Management notes that the Council has at least four action options on this proposed amendment:

1. Vote on the amendment based on current information.
2. Direct SWR staff to evaluate the merits and benefits of the proposed amendment, and compare it with existing waste reduction education efforts. This could be done within the SWR strategic planning process over the next year.
3. Direct management to evaluate the merits of the program in the context of *all* Metro conservation-related education programs over the next year.

Vote on the priority of the stated objectives for this amendment, and direct management to identify and analyze all options for achieving these objectives, including current efforts and Outdoor School.

**Council Proposals**  
**For Budget Amendment**  
**Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Nature in Neighborhoods Restoration and Enhancement Grant Program

**Concise Description**

The Nature in Neighborhoods Restoration and Enhancement Grant Program is in its third year of funding neighborhoods, schools, local non-profit organizations and local government proposals for watershed improvement projects and environmental education in their local neighborhood and community. This program has been very well received and has resulted in 52 funded projects in two years. In May 2008, the third year of projects will be awarded and it is anticipated that an additional 12 projects will receive funding.

The program was created in 2005 when Metro Council passed Resolution No. 05-3580A that transferred \$1,250,000 from the Recovery Rate Stabilization Reserve to a General Fund Reserve for the program. Of this funding, \$1,000,000 was used to fund 52 projects over two funding cycles. In spring of 2007, Metro Council approved an additional \$250,000 of funds for a third year of projects (FY 07-08).

These projects have leveraged approximately \$3.60 for every Metro dollar invested (for a total of \$4.6 million dollars on project value) in the initial 2 years and it is anticipated in the 3rd round of funding that the program will leverage a similar amount.

The program has received 181 pre-applications to date with a total request of \$5 million dollars. This indicates that there is an interest and need for funding that focuses on community driven watershed restoration and environmental education. It is estimated that after the completion of the 3rd year funding of projects, approximately \$6 million dollars of projects (total value) will have been completed.

Funding this program for the 08-09 fiscal year for an additional \$250,000 will allow these community driven watershed health efforts to continue building throughout the region. Applicants receive technical assistance prior to submitting projects and through project implementation that has proven to be very helpful to the applicant in ensuring project success. The support that applicants have received has significantly improved the project proposals we have received. This investment broadens and deepens the community's understanding to watershed health and is creating lifelong stewards.

**Objective**

The desired outcome for this program is to continue to engage citizens in watershed restoration throughout the region through voluntary action and involvement. Success measurements include numbers of participants involved, including hours contributed to watershed health improvement and environmental education efforts, new groups and new projects participating in each funding cycle, partners and depth of partnerships and regional equity. As funded project numbers increase across the region with new participants and/or partners in addition to existing organizations, community capacity to do watershed restoration projects increases. Different needs may arise which may decrease the requests for the Nature in Neighborhoods Restoration and Enhancement Grant program as it is currently shaped. This would indicate that the program has achieved the desired result of significantly increasing the awareness and participation in watershed health by the citizens of the region and the program. It is inherent for the program to monitor when this shift occurs and suggest adapting the program to the changing needs to capitalize on the increased community capacity and awareness to expand those projects that are successful. To this end, it is being suggested that after the funding cycle is completed that an evaluation be conducted to see how this program works in conjunction with the Nature in Neighborhoods capital grants program

that is just now getting underway. The goal of this evaluation is to determine if potential funders are using both grant programs for similar activities or if these grant programs are serving distinct needs.

**Duration (put an 'x' in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

X One time    Specific length: \_\_\_\_\_    \_\_\_\_\_ On-going

**Cost Estimate**

This program is staffed with 1.0 FTE and is included in the proposed budget and no additional FTE is proposed. There are no additional costs to implement the program.

This program does not generate revenue.

**Funding Options**

Proposed source of funding: Solid Waste Rate Stabilization Fund.

Amount: \$250,000 dollars

**Relationship to other programs**

With the advent of the Open Spaces Bond Measure passed by the voters in the fall of 2007, this program informs and complements the Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants program. The Restoration and Enhancement program has the opportunity to fund those types of projects, including those on private land, which the Capital Grants program cannot. With programs that can fund both capital and non-capital projects, this strengthens both programs and serves the recipients in their restoration and environmental education efforts. Increasing the depth of partnerships and increasing participation in both programs in order to strengthen projects is occurring due to the programs informing each other.

**Stakeholders**

Affected positively:

Local community groups, local jurisdictions, non-profits.

## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Nature in Neighborhoods Restoration and Enhancement Grant Program

### **Desired Outcome**

The desired outcome is to continue to engage citizens in watershed and habitat restoration throughout the region through voluntary action and involvement.

In May 2008, the third round of Restoration and Enhancement Grants will be awarded by the Metro Council. This amendment would authorize staff to plan for a fourth round of awards totaling \$250,000.

The prior rounds of Restoration and Enhancement Grants have leveraged approximately \$3.60 for every Metro dollar invested in the 52 funded projects. These projects have proven successful in getting citizen volunteers engaged in restoration projects within their neighborhoods. Based on this success and a significant number and quality of pre-applications for the current round of funding leads, management believes that this program will continue to fund quality and successful programs that will achieved the desired outcome.

The leverage provided by in-kind volunteerism has been an indicator of success for this program. For the most recent round of awards, it is estimated that 13,273 hours of direct citizen involvement in restoration, enhancement or environmental education will be incurred. The dollar value of this contribution is nearly \$250,000 and is approximately 1650 eight-hour days of volunteerism.

There are other programs within the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department that also impact the desired outcome of habitat restoration and volunteer engagement. The Science and Stewardship team and the volunteer services team regularly join efforts to complete restoration and enhancement projects. These actions are exclusively on Metro-owned property, funded mostly through state and federal grants. The Capital Grants Program, funded by the Natural Areas Bond, has a similar focus of leveraging local action and money toward habitat improvement. However, the funding source for this program limits the Capital Grants Program to only capital projects on publicly owned (non-Federal) land. The Restoration and Enhancement Grant Program is the only Metro program focusing on supporting local groups and local volunteers to do this work on non-Metro owned property.

### **Effort Required**

The proposed FY 2008-09 budget includes staff support to manage the reimbursement, project oversight, and communications phases the existing grant program. These existing staff resources area adequate to manage the request for proposals, evaluation, and award phases of this new round.

### **Cost**

The estimated cost in FY 2008-09 will be negligible, as the awards will not be considered and determined until May 2009. Budgetary impacts will be mostly in FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11, when reimbursement requests are fulfilled. Total grant expenditures for the entire round would not exceed \$250,000.

### **Funding Options**

A potential source of funding is the Solid Waste Rate Stabilization Fund. This has been the source of funding for the first three rounds of grants. Use of this funding source includes this expenditure in the calculation of expenditure limitation under the Metro Charter.



Councilor	#
<b>Bragdon</b>	<b>1</b>

**Council Proposals**  
**For Budget Amendment**  
**Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Nature in Neighborhoods: Integrating Habitats Follow Up Actions

**Concise Description**

The Integrating Habitats design competition was an unexpectedly rousing success. It has activated constituencies who want to take the next steps to get the designs built. If Metro does not take the lead on removing the code barriers to nature friendly development, the designs will remain just good ideas and nothing else.

The success of the design competition was the first step to building on-the-ground projects. The second step is convening two short-term task forces that will remove code barriers. One task force of building permit managers from participating local jurisdictions will secure actual building permits for selected designs. The second task force of local developers will identify potential building sites, including Metro owned properties and future TOD projects, and connect developers with projects. Both task forces will identify regional leadership opportunities for champions of nature friendly development.

Sustaining the movement that the design competition created will be a valuable indicator of Metro’s leadership. Sustaining the movement will require spending to increase visibility via the web and printed material. This spending will broaden exposure to the concepts and practices of nature-friendly designs and will encourage development practices to include ecological stewardship in their approach. Now is the time to capitalize on this momentum and get the designs built.

**Objective**

The Metro Council would accomplish the following by supporting this proposal: Regional support and a clear mandate for buildings that create and enhance habitat. Members of the task forces become advocates with a concerted campaign to reach out to other jurisdictions and decision-makers in the region;

- Increased utilization of nature friendly designs by the public, development community, and local jurisdictions;
- Increased capacity for developers and participating jurisdictions to build nature friendly designs;
- Adding sophisticated web-based outreach and interactive engagement with local, national, and international audiences to Metro’s menu of promotional tools. The lessons learned and best practices learned from the use of innovative web enabled promotional tools would be available for use by other programs in the agency.
- Local codes would be reformed to accommodate green building techniques.

The Metro Council can monitor the success of the above desired objectives and outcomes with the following performance measures:

- Responsiveness of local jurisdictions and development community to code reform;
- Success of task forces in eliminating code barriers, obtaining building permits for designs and connecting developers to designs;
- Demand for Integrating Habitats information, data, expertise and exhibition displays.

**Duration (put an ‘x’ in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

One time                                      X Specific length: Entire FY 2008-98                                      \_\_\_\_\_On-going

Councilor	#
<b>Bragdon</b>	<b>1</b>

## Cost Estimate

The estimated total price tag for this budget proposal is \$275K. Revenue generation potential is limited.

### Project 1: Getting the Designs Built

\$200K would be needed to:

Hire 1 FTE for 20 months to coordinate the project: hire and manage contractors, manage budget, staff the task forces

Contract with a facilitation and urban design expert to lead and facilitate the task forces.

Hire engineering consultants to create plan details for selected designs to be built.

Contracted services including creative services and file sharing support would be required.

### Project 2: Sustaining the Movement

\$75K would be needed to:

Hire one .5 temporary FTE for 20 months to coordinate the project: hiring and managing contractors, content generation, and construction of various web prototypes.

Make the designs accessible and useable via the web and the exhibition.

Hire contractors for script writing, web design, shipping crates and display fabrication, video production.

Reductions to the proposed funding amount will limit the ability of Metro to take advantage of the momentum that the design competition created, will prohibit projects getting built, and will greatly limit the responsiveness to constituents that are asking for follow up action.

## Funding Options

One possible solution: Finish the RSWMP document (it was to have been finished in 2006) and abolish 2.5 FTE in solid waste department. This solution is in the spirit of redirecting resources to programs and projects that are successful and results oriented.

## Relationship to other programs

This proposal supports the Metro Council's direction to encourage the use of nature-friendly development practices and is a key part of broadening the movement of the Nature in Neighborhoods initiative. This proposal relates to the overall goals of programs and projects that fulfill Goal 3: Protect and enhance the region's natural assets.

Development of sophisticated web-based outreach products will serve as a proto-type for other Metro programs pursuing interactive engagement with a wider community through the web.

## Stakeholders

Stakeholders from green building practitioners, stormwater engineers, developers, development professionals, and local planners and officials, are asking for the additional tools and information that this proposal will provide them with. The tremendous success of Integrating Habitats indicates that Metro is providing an invaluable resource that is not available anywhere else. The above stakeholders will be positively impacted by this proposal, but above all, our natural surroundings will benefit.



## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Nature in Neighborhoods: Integrating Habitats Follow Up Actions

### **Desired Outcome**

There was considerable energy and excitement generated by the Integrating Habitats Design Competition. This amendment seeks to capitalize on that momentum to encourage the types of development showcased in the competition.

The desired outcome of this amendment is two-fold. First, Council wants to ensure that there are no barriers in the development codes of cities and counties that would effectively discourage the types of development showcased in the Integrating Habitats competition submissions. Second, Council wants to “get one of the designs built” successfully to show to the market and to cities that these types of developments are desirable and potentially profitable.

### **Effort Required**

#### **Removing Barriers to Development**

The current budget level includes staff-to-staff efforts to facilitate Title 13 compliance, which requires jurisdictions to remove barriers to this type of development. The current estimated time frame for the removal of these barriers pursuant to the Title 13 process is Jan. 2009. However barrier removal is just one issue, and it is not the same as encouragement of nature friendly practices.

This amendment would bring on a dedicated 0.5 FTE person (20 months-limited duration) to lead a task force of local government staff and developers to examine how to most effectively encourage habitat-integrated developments. This position would also develop the collateral materials (displays, handouts, web tools, etc.) to support dissemination of the designs and concepts from the competition.

#### **“Getting One Built”**

The current level of effort in the Nature in Neighborhoods program is to work one-on-one with developers and maintain a partnership with the Home Builders Association for recognition of members who use nature-friendly practices in developments around the region. Additionally, we offer peer-learning opportunities with case studies and field visits. Current efforts have been well-received and demand continues to be strong for programs and consultations.

This amendment goes beyond the existing efforts by creating a multi-phased strategy for development.

Phase One includes scoping activities, working with Metro staff (TOD program), possible outside government partners, and representatives of the development community. This phase will help determine feasibility and develop a more specific budget.

Phase Two includes recruiting a developer for partnership and conducting site analysis. This analysis will result in the selection of a project and partner developer for the pilot project and a development of a partnership agreement that itemizes roles and responsibilities of the developer and Metro, including financial commitments.

Phase Three includes implementation according to agreements developed in Phase Two.

## **Cost**

**Removing Barriers to Development** - \$42,000 in FY 2008-09 and \$33,000 in FY 2009-10 to pay for the 20-month limited duration 0.5 FTE employee to facilitate the task force work and continue to promote Integrating Habitats.

**“Getting One Built”** – Phase 1/2: \$95,000 in FY 2008-09 and \$70,000 in FY 2009-10 for the 20-month limited duration 1.0 FTE to follow the process outlined to research, determine feasibility partner with a developer.

Phase 2: Additional \$80,000 in FY 2008-09 and \$30,000 in FY 2009-10 in contracted professional services in support of this effort, particularly in the site analysis phase.

Phase 3: For FY 2010-11 a fairly significant sum of money (\$300,000) should be available as a direct contribution to the actual project. Using the TOD program experience as our guide for something this new and different, such a contribution from Metro (or another public partner) will be needed to defray the additional cost of incorporating Nature in Neighborhood features and as an incentive to demonstrate a commitment to the project, attract developers, and assure lenders.

## **Stakeholders**

Developers supportive of nature-friendly practices; the design community as evidenced by the participation in the recent design competition; the environmental community; all cities and design professionals who are experienced at successfully implementing restorative design elements.

## **Funding Options**

Management does not recommend taking away from existing Nature in Neighborhoods staffing or efforts to add and fund this new element.

## **Constraints and Risks**

Jurisdictions not in compliance with Title 13 may consider committee service premature and miss the opportunity to participate.

The “Getting One Built” proposal has several possible risks, including failure to find appropriate sites or willing development partners. Along the way, the Council will be updated regarding progress so that the strategy’s potential for success can be continuously evaluated. At the end of each phase, Council will have an opportunity to determine whether Metro should continue to the next phase.

Councilor <b>Hosticka</b>	# <b>1</b>
------------------------------	---------------

**Council Proposals  
For Budget Amendment  
Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Technical support in Data Resource Center for Performance Based Growth Management

**Concise Description**

The Performance-Based Growth Management Concept, one of the tracks of the Making the Greatest Place effort, is intended to develop an approach to growth management decisions that allow for a transparent and informed discussion and selection of major policy and investment decisions. This process, as envisioned, depends on the ability to evaluate policy choices and illustrate the effects of alternative decisions at the local and regional level. The level of effort involved will include measuring current and past performance along key indicators, sharing results of MetroScope scenarios at the local and regional scale for future policy and investment choices using illustrations.

This proposal will:

- Provide limited-duration authority for 1.5 FTE in FY 2008-09 for the Data Resource Center.
- Provide \$45,000 for funding for 0.5 FTE and \$90,000 for funding 1.0 FTE limited-duration positions.

**Objective**

The desired outcome is to implement a performance-based growth management system. This system will link performance measures directly with growth management decisions and support the alignment of decisions at the local and regional level. Through the decision-making process, performance is defined and illustrated in a way that is readily measurable and has clear cause-and-effect linkages with policy choices.

This proposal provides funding that is needed for the new performance-based growth management system to be successful. It provides the funding and limited-duration authority to allow the Data Resource Center to prepare the visualizations and performance measures to support this process.

**Duration (put an ‘x’ in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

X One time    Specific length: \_\_\_\_\_    \_\_\_\_\_ On-going

**Cost Estimate**

The cost for this amendment is estimated at \$45,000 for the 0.5 FTE limited-duration position and \$90,000 for the 1.0 FTE limited-duration person, for a total of \$135,000. Funding for the materials and services to support the visualization has been included in the base budget.

**Funding Options**

No source identified.

**Relationship to other programs**

This project supports all of the inter-related decisions that are linked to the Making the Greatest Place program. A successful outcome with Performance-Based Growth Management work directly affects all future growth management decisions.

Councilor	#
<b>Hosticka</b>	<b>1</b>

### **Stakeholders**

Local jurisdiction elected officials should be positively affected by the assistance in improving visualization and performance measure analysis related to local and regional decisions. Groups interested in growth management decisions should also support improved visualization and evaluation of policy and investment choices.

## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title:**

Technical support in Data Resource Center for Performance Based Growth Management

### **Desired Outcome**

The desired outcome is to implement a performance-based growth management framework that links measures of performance, evaluation of policy choices and actions at the local and regional level for effective growth management. Through the Making the Greatest Place effort, staff has worked with Council liaisons on this as one of several Council Project proposals for the last year. When completed, the new framework is intended to help leverage public and private investments to support compact, vibrant and prosperous communities as reflected in the 2040 Growth Concept, the adopted vision for future growth in the region.

Until now, activities have largely focused on defining the performance-based concept, resulting in preparation of a resolution for Council consideration of desired outcomes and principles to guide the new performance-based approach. Next steps in the process include completing several scenarios to illustrate the effect of various policy and investment effects on urban form, and documenting measures of past performance in achieving the desired outcomes. Key to completing these tasks are the resources necessary to appropriately visualize the scenario results and document measures of performance in a way that supports the decision-making process. Additional resources are needed for these visualization and documentation tasks.

### **Effort Required**

In addition to the resources allocated to performance-based growth management in the Land Monitoring and Management Program, staff estimate additional resources of .6 FTE and \$100,000 in materials and services to provide staffing and resources dedicated to the visualization of the results of the scenarios, the collection and analysis of data for performance measures, and preparation of reports and other material that summarizes past performance and identifies policy choices.

This effort is part of a phasing strategy that will support the preparation of the urban growth report in 2009 and growth management decisions in 2010-2011.

This effort will require coordination with central services in the activities relating to the agency-wide performance measures.

### **Cost**

The estimated cost for the additional resources in FY 2008-09 is \$175,000. This effort would require a commitment of a .6 limited duration FTE dedicated to the visualization effort and a materials and services budget dedicated to preparing the performance measures. Materials and services will be used for service contracts and data collection. Many performance measures being considered will require purchase of privately available data. In addition, creating 3D scenes of selected centers and corridors will require purchase of expertise that will effectively train DRC staff via collaboration with the contractor. Methods for displaying MetroScope output in the 3D realm require expert assistance, such as a standardized visual library of development types and buildings. The \$175,000 requested would cover \$75,000 for the .6 limited duration FTE and \$100,000 for the materials and services.

Beyond FY 2008-09, additional resources may be required, depending on the continued need for visualization services to support the Placemaking strategy in centers and corridors and to continue monitoring under the Land Management and Monitoring program. Costs in future years will be tied to

new data collection requirements that performance based growth management may define. At this time, these costs are unknown.

### **Stakeholders**

Completion of this effort will require coordination with local jurisdictions to collect data and present it for policy considerations. This will be completed using existing committees, such as MTAC, as well as coordination with local jurisdiction staff and stakeholders individually. Ultimately, greater coordination of data will be sought to reduce costs of data collection and analysis and improve quality.

### **Funding Options**

The \$175,000 requested is available in the Planning Department FY 2007-08 budget and can be used for the additional DRC resources through a carryover. The funds were budgeted in FY 2007-08 to support these activities but efforts have been focused on a regional discussion to define the performance-based concept, and data intensive efforts have been delayed into next year. Therefore, this amendment requests carry over of the FY 2007-08 funding for the same purpose. When we prepared our budget in December, this carryover was not anticipated.

### **Constraints and Risks**

This amendment proposal is consistent with the direction the Council has given through the Making the Greatest Place effort. As with any effort focused on new policies and decision-making processes, the presentation of the scenario results and the performance measures can be politically sensitive. Any changes in the process for making growth management decisions will have legal considerations and may require changes in state or Metro legislation.

Councilor	#
Hosticka	2

**Council Proposals  
For Budget Amendment  
Discussion beginning April 15**

**Short Title**

Provide funding in Contingency for a Pilot Project to demonstrate Great Community Planning.

**Concise Description**

Through the construction excise tax funds (# ordinance), the Metro Council has supported the concept planning for areas brought into the urban growth boundary between 2002 and 2005. This budget amendment puts money into Contingency to supplement funding for the concept planning process, in order to support development of a plan for areas that are integrated with the adjacent areas and together, create a Great Community.

Planning for a Great Community, where development of the new area complements and is integrated with the existing community, is a challenge that the region will continue to face as it initiates planning for urban reserves. Metro and the three counties are scheduled to designate urban and rural reserves in 2009. Concept planning for the reserve areas is scheduled to be initiated afterwards, and completed prior to future urban growth boundary decisions. This amendment supports a pilot project for use in developing an approach to these future planning efforts.

A subsequent vote of the Metro Council would be required to allocate use of the funds from Contingency for a particular concept planning project.

**Objective**

This supplemental budget would expand the scope of the current concept plan to take on additional tasks, including to:

- Consider park needs for the area as a whole and opportunities to meet those needs, both in and outside of the new area.
- Consider commercial needs for the area as a whole and opportunities to meet those needs both in and outside of the new area.
- Explore ways to include urban amenities in the areas, including libraries senior centers, community centers and schools for the area as a whole
- Create an arena for the public to express concerns, meet and participate in the planning for the whole area.

This proposal is dependent on the willingness for the lead (county or city) for the concept planning process to undertake the additional funds and accept the additional responsibilities.

The problems facing the planning for the new urban area are replicable across the region. As commitment to creating great communities at the edge increases, the need for the planning process to accommodate the mix of new and old development as a whole community will also increase. The planning for new areas presents an opportunity to evaluate park, commercial, civic structures and citizen involvement elements and plan for them as a one whole, great community.

**Duration (put an 'x' in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)**

X One time

Specific length: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ On-going

Councilor	#
<b>Hosticka</b>	<b>2</b>

**Cost Estimate**

\$300,000

**Funding Options**

No source identified.

**Relationship to other programs**

This proposal directly supports the goals of the 2040 Growth Concept and Making the Greatest Place program. It provides Metro with an opportunity to fulfill its role as a regional leader and convener in shaping the future of our region. In addition, it supplements the assistance provided via the construction excise tax.

**Stakeholders**

The local elected officials and their staff, and local residents, both in the new area to be planned and the surrounding area, will be positively affected by this proposal. Local jurisdictions do not have adequate funding to do all the planning on their own, and are appreciative of Metro’s help. All residents of the region will benefit from a well-planned community that has transportation options, infrastructure, services, parks and economic vitality.



## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Provide funding in Contingency for a Pilot Project to demonstrate Great Community Planning

### **Desired Outcome**

The desired outcome is to facilitate the establishment of great communities, where development in new urban areas complements and is integrated with the existing community. This proposal, by providing additional funding for concept planning activities, can help achieve this objective if the objective is supported by the existing community, the key stakeholders in the new community and the lead jurisdiction responsible for the planning.

Since 1998, Metro has brought over 24,000 acres of land into the urban growth boundary for urbanization, has required concept planning for these areas and has provided financial support, through the construction excise tax funds, to support the planning process. While many of these concept plans are completed and have been adopted into local comprehensive plans, others are not yet done or not yet begun. The current concept planning has been effective in linking the new areas to the existing communities, but in some areas, the challenges are greater and more coordination could help.

One of the communities with the need for better links between the existing and new communities is in the Bull Mountain area. The West Bull Mountain Community has sent a letter of support for greater integration of planning with the Bull Mountain Community to the Washington County Board of County Commissioners. Other examples could include the links between the existing community of Aloha and the South Hillsboro planning area, the link between Oregon City and Beaver Creek, and the future of the Cooper Mountain area.

In the future, when areas included in urban reserves are considered for urban boundary expansion, plans will need to demonstrate how the area supports the existing community. This current budget amendment can be a pilot for how to better integrate existing and new communities in recent urban area additions and in future additions. To be successful, the planning activities will need to be integrated between jurisdictions.

### **Effort Required**

Metro staff is already involved in concept planning activities. The additional scope would increase the level of activity at the staff level and increase the need for involvement at the political level as many of the issues that will need to be resolved will require political leadership.

### **Cost**

The estimated cost of \$300,000 in the Councilor's proposal should be adequate to add to the scope of one concept plan and possibly another, depending on the number of issues that need to be addressed.

### **Stakeholders**

Stakeholders include all of those jurisdictions that are currently responsible for leading concept planning efforts, including Washington County, Oregon City, City of Portland, and the existing communities, both incorporated, such as Tigard, and unincorporated. Financial partnerships with these jurisdictions would be needed because the additional planning work would be completed in tandem with the existing concept planning.

### **Funding Options**

Possible sources include: Any uncommitted Construction Excise Tax funds, uncommitted fund balance, unspent reserves, or remaining solid waste disposal account.

### **Constraints and Risks**

The risk is that the plans that are developed need to have the follow-on support for implementation, including financial commitments, that are not available and that there could be a number of political sensitivities involved in this work.

**FY 2008-09 BUDGET PROPOSAL**

**Department:** Solid Waste & Recycling  
**Program:** Disposal Services

**Date:** December 19, 2007  
**Contact:** Jim Watkins

**Proposal** Sustainable Operations

<b>Proposal Type:</b>		<b>Duration:</b>		<b>Priority:</b>	
New	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>	High	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	One-time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>			Low	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Has this proposal been vetted with the COO?** yes

**If yes, when?** December 27, 2007

What prior Council approval has this proposal been given?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conceptual approval When? _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial approval When? _____

**DESCRIPTION:** (Provide a brief description of the proposal)

The purpose of the program will be to address the goals and objectives contained in Chapter V (*Sustainable Operations*) of the RSWMP, consistent with the implementation strategies in Chapter VI. Initial activities would include the planning activities of the Sustainable Operations Work Group, as well as implementation of the Diesel Retrofit Program as recommended by that work group as well as SWAC. The Retrofit program is approximately a \$7 million program implemented over a 3-year period (estimated year 1 costs: \$2,300,000 Retrofit Program and \$50,000 Sustainable Operations Work Group consulting).

**POLICY IMPACT:** (Briefly discuss the following)

1. What Council goal or policy does this proposal relate to? The proposal will contribute to meeting the Council's **Environmental Health** goal, *Objective 2.4: Metro is a model for sustainable business practices;* and *Objective 2.6: Residents' health is enhanced by exceptionally clean air and water.* In addition, the proposal will contribute to meeting the Council's *Critical Success Factor 2: The Metro Council is recognized for solving regional problems and leading regional initiatives.*
2. What outcome will this proposal achieve? The work group will develop priorities and strategies for achieving the objectives, and will report on progress annually to the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee and Metro Council. The retrofit activity could reduce regional diesel particulate emissions (PM) by up to 2.5%.
3. Provide at least one performance measure for the proposal that demonstrates the desired outcome.
  - For the work group- the development of priorities and strategies for implementing the sustainable operations goals and objectives.
  - For the retrofit program, the proposal will achieve 24% reduction in PM emissions from the solid waste collection fleets as measured by the number of retrofit devices installed.

**BUDGET SUMMARY: \* (Provide a fiscal summary of the entire proposal)**

**Resources:**

Enterprise Revenues	\$7,000,000
Grants	_____
Donations	_____
Other Tax Revenues	_____
Interfund Transfers	_____
Other:	_____
Total Resources	\$7,000,000
Resources needed to balance	\$7,000,000

**Expenses:**

Personal Services **	_____
Materials & Services	\$7,000,000
Capital Outlay	_____
Debt Service	_____
Transfers	_____
Contingency	_____
Total Expenses	\$7,000,000
FTE	

## **Management Analysis For Budget Amendments**

### **Short Title**

Diesel Retrofit Project

### **Desired Outcome**

The principal outcome of the Diesel Retrofit Project is to achieve a 24% reduction in particulate matter (PM) emissions from the solid waste collection fleet as measured by the number of retrofit devices installed. This effort is projected to take place over the next four years. At the end of the project, the improvements to the waste collection fleet will lead to an overall reduction in total regional diesel PM by up to 2.5%, having considerable positive effects on air quality and human health. It is estimated that the region's collection fleet emits approximately 28 tons of PM per year with estimated health costs of \$109,000 per ton of PM per year.

The proposal will contribute to meeting the Council's Environmental Health goal, Objective 2.4: *Metro is a model for sustainable business practices*; and Objective 2.6: *Residents' health is enhanced by exceptionally clean air and water*. In addition, the proposal will contribute to meeting the Council's Critical Success Factor 2: *The Metro Council is recognized for solving regional problems and leading regional initiatives*.

This project is a new effort; there are currently no programs to reduce diesel emissions from the regional solid waste collection fleet.

### **Effort Required**

The Project Advisory Committee recommends a contract with an outside source to implement the program. The third party will provide overall management and execution of all program functions needed to acquire, install and maintain the retrofit products. Solid Waste & Recycling staff will provide project management services, and negotiate and execute intergovernmental agreements with participating local jurisdictions that initially could amount to 1.0 FTE during the first year and then decrease with time. Central services will review the third party contract, intergovernmental agreements and grants, and Public Affairs will provide the appropriate level of publicity. The project will be phased over four years.

### **Cost**

The entire project would cost about \$7 million over three to four years. The FY 2008-09 cost is estimated at \$800,000 for a first-year pilot/ramp-up stage.

### **Stakeholders**

The stakeholders are all the local governments in the region, franchised waste haulers and environmental groups for clean air. Considerable effort will be needed to coordinate with local governments to implement the intergovernmental agreements that require their haulers to participate in the retrofit program. The intergovernmental agreements could be considered financial partnerships since we are strongly encouraging local governments to require accelerated retirement of their older vehicles.

### **Funding Options**

The Solid Waste & Recycling department is looking to a federal Environmental Protection Agency grant for \$400,000 of funding in FY 2008-09, plus an equal amount of matching funds that are proposed to come from the Recovery Rate Stabilization Reserve of the General Fund. The FY 2008-09 uncommitted beginning balance of the Recovery Rate Stabilization Reserve is currently projected to be \$815,000. A proposed councilor amendment [Park #1] would use \$250,000 of these funds. Additionally, use of this funding source includes this expenditure in the calculation of expenditure limitation under the Metro

Charter. The FY 2008-09 budget would be subject to a Budget Note limiting expenditures to the amount of funds actually received and authorized for the project.

Because of the potential to attract grant funds, this may be seen as a proposal leveraging outside dollars. This would make consideration for the Opportunity Fund a possibility.

The department would seek other funding sources for future phases of this project. Options include local government revenue from solid waste collection rates, and an amendment to state statute that would allow Metro to expend disposal fee revenue (*e.g.*, the Regional System Fee) on this project.

### **Constraints and Risks**

There is a risk that expenditures from Metro's General Fund and Solid Waste Fund may be limited to certain aspects of this project. Other financial considerations include bond covenant restrictions until the bonds are retired (at least the first year of the project). If additional funding is limited in the future, the number of retrofitted trucks would be similarly limited. Sensitive political issues include whether and how strongly to encourage accelerated vehicle replacement for the region's aging collection fleet; and how best to achieve wide spread participation by local governments and their fleets in the program.

It may be necessary to enact additional Metro legislation to establish jurisdiction prior to any implementation phase.