

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING

Tuesday, September 24, 2002
Council Annex

Councilors Present: Carl Hosticka (Presiding Officer), Rex Burkholder, Bill Atherton, Rod Park, Susan McLain

Councilors Absent: Rod Monroe (excused), David Bragdon (excused)

Others Present: Mike Burton

Presiding Officer Hosticka convened the Council/Executive Officer Informal Meeting at 2:10 p.m.

1. UPCOMING LEGISLATION

There was no discussion.

2. CONSULTANT UPDATE ON METRO'S STRATEGIC COMPENSATION STUDY

Lily Aguilar, Human Resources Director, introduced John Hankerson, consultant for the Strategic Compensation Study. She said he would be giving an overview of the study. John Hankerson gave a power point presentation on the Strategic Compensation Study (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record). This study did not include MERC. He gave an overview of project objectives resulting in a strategic pay program. The project focus was what we were currently doing, needs for the future, and recommendations for how to change things to meet those future needs. He summarized the work plan. Any pay strategy would have a cost impact. He reviewed their diagnosis and assessment of the pay program. He noted there was an orientation around market. He felt that the number of classifications was a lot and there was opportunity to reduce that number. He spoke to the commonalities of practice and inconsistencies in evaluation. He talked about the current benefit plan and its inconsistencies. Human Resource challenges include multiple systems, escalating health care costs, training, bargaining, etc. The Study approached compensation from a total pay perspective. He noted benefits were better than the market base. He talked about the pay mix. He gave an overview of the results of the survey of other public sector groups. They were trying to build a total reward strategy including discretionary contributions. He talked about the reward system design.

Councilor McLain noted design choices impacts. Mr. Hankerson said the Draft Reward Strategy was being market driven, linked pay to the market, noted that total compensation was targeted above market median, talked about fairness issues, etc. He noted design considerations. He spoke to challenges at Metro including transition, bargaining units, managing different applications of market data, different needs within the organization, funding issues, PERS, and increasing health care benefit costs. He summarized the next steps for the plan.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked about the timeframe. Mr. Hankerson said soon, but some of the changes will take time. Councilor McLain said MERC had its own compensation study also. She recognized differences within the agency. She suggested analyzing both studies.

Mike Burton, Executive Director, said Metro Code allowed for two different compensation plans. Ms. Aguilar said they would be conducting a class comp study. She clarified what this study was. Councilor McLain asked about combining the compensation studies. Ms. Aguilar reminded Council of Metro's practices on doing class comp studies. She suggested some revisions in these practices. Councilor McLain

talked about fragmented compensation. She thought the whole package concept was a good idea and made some suggestions including better defining the discretionary contribution. Mr. Hankerson explained the concept of the idea and the four components. Councilor Atherton talked about market conditions. Mr. Hankerson said they were trying to create flexibility and explained the areas they could work with. Councilor Atherton asked who were the respondents to the study. Mr. Hankerson said they were not private sector but public. Councilor Atherton talked about perceptions that governments had the better paying jobs. Mr. Hankerson said it might be the perception but not always the truth. He was optimistic about the results of the study and the recommendations being brought forth. Councilor McLain talked about pay increases not having common criteria. Ms. Aguilar said they would be bringing recommendations back to the Council sometime this Fall.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park talked about costs on alternatives analysis. Mary Weber, Manager of Community Development for the Planning Department, spoke to estimates of time and costs to study additional lands. She said a low-ball park would be \$22,000 for the consultant. She talked about what could be done in-house as well. She also talked about additional lands that would have to be studied in addition to the 25000 acres. She noted time constraints and staff needs. Councilor McLain said she felt the figures were conservative. She thought the agricultural impact would need outside assistance. Ms. Weber explained details of their current analysis. Councilor Burkholder explained his rationale for his suggestions. He felt if they could have done this work in the next month then they could go forward. He did not feel there was enough time. Mr. Burton said it was his intention to bring some additional recommendations back to Council around October 1st. Councilor Park suggested continuing the discussion during Task 3. He said they would give an overview at the next Community Planning Committee. Richard Benner, Senior Assistant Counsel, talked about what individuals would have to bring to Council in order to consider additional lands. Councilor McLain suggested including what it meant to impact agricultural land in the conversation. Councilor Park said a conversation about competing industries was also on the table.

Mr. Benner discussed the Urban Growth Boundary ordinance and the order of the decision-making tract. They had broken down the entire decision into four components: forecast, capacity analysis, added capacity and expansion of the UGB. He explained that the ordinance was structured to tie into the decision tract. He explained the exhibits were policy decisions. Ms. Weber said the exhibits were the amended language. Councilor McLain spoke to "a number" versus "a range". Ms. Weber said the ordinance was Council's decision. The ordinance would need to have a number in it. She further explained the exhibits. The Council would have to decide on a number. Council discussed the draft ordinance. Dan Cooper, General Counsel, explained the decision process. Councilor McLain felt that doing just one ordinance made it complicated. Mr. Benner explained the numerous decision points. Mr. Cooper said if they stayed on the path they were on they would have one package. Councilor Burkholder said there was one "whereas" missing, housing. Mr. Cooper said the first "be it ordained" dealt with that item. Mr. Benner talked about capture rate application. Ms. Weber said the ordinance was a legal document. They needed a document that told the story. Councilor McLain talked about the process of amendment. It needed to be done in a way that was logic. Mr. Cooper further explained the process. Mr. Burton said what Mr. Benner was trying to do was outline the decision process. Presiding Officer Hosticka asked about the numbers. They would be Mr. Burton's numbers. Those would be the numbers that would have to be amended. Councilor McLain said Mr. Burton's suggestion about a checklist was a good idea. Mr. Cooper said that was what the ordinance was intended to do.

Councilor Park said the public would be testifying to Mr. Burton's recommendations. Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested giving staff direction prior the November 5th Community Planning Committee meeting. Councilor McLain said she felt staff had already done the work. Councilors continued to discuss changing numbers, how that would impact policy changes. Councilor Burkholder suggested adding more land for parks. He asked how difficult would it be to change the calculations? Council and staff talked

about MetroScope, its usefulness and what it would not do. Councilor Park said they could not do a Tier 5 analysis in the timeline allotted. Councilor McLain suggested presenting their questions to staff at the Community Planning Committee next week. Councilor McLain asked what Mr. Yee picked, the mid-point? Councilor Park said Mr. Yee number was a forecast. Ms. Weber suggested having Mr. Yee meet with Councilor McLain. Councilor Atherton talked about repetition error. He asked what the statute said in terms of the future being like the past. Mr. Benner responded to his question. Mr. Cooper added clarification to Mr. Benner's response about the statute.

4. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2002

| ITEM # | TOPIC | DOCUMENT DATE | DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION. | DOCUMENT NUMBER |
|--------|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------|
| II | POWER POINT PRESENTATION | SEPT 2002 | STRATEGIC COMPENSATION STUDY | 092402CE-01 |
| III | URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY DRAFT ORDINANCE | 9/23/02 | TO: METRO COUNCIL FROM: DICK BENNER, LEGAL COUNCIL AND MIKE BURTON, EXECUTIVE OFFICER DRAFT UGB DECISION TRACK FOR 2002 COUNCIL DECISION PROCESS AND DRAFT ORDINANCE | 092402CE-01 |