



METRO COUNCIL RETREAT
Meeting Summary
May 1, 2013
Oregon Convention Center, VIP B Room

Councilors Present: Council President Tom Hughes and Councilors Bob Stacey, Sam Chase, Kathryn Harrington, Carlotta Collette, Craig Dirksen

Councilors Excused: Councilor Shirley Craddick

Staff Present: Martha Bennett, Alison Kean Campbell, Andy Shaw, Ina Zucker, Annierose Vonburg, Kelsey Newell, Nikolai Ursin, Colin Deverell, Ramona Perrault, Beth Cohen

Public Present: Staff from Cascade Policy Institute. Name not retained for the record.

Council President Tom Hughes convened the retreat at 9:26 a.m.

Ms. Martha Bennett of Metro distributed the final draft of the Metro Council agreements regarding meetings, communication, conflict agreement, and workload balance. The handout was a follow-up to the Council's team building retreat held on Jan. 30 – 31, 2013. Ms. Bennett stated that the final document was shared with the agency's senior leadership team. (Handout included as part of the meeting record.)

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the May 1 council retreat was to provide the Metro Council time to discuss its shared strategic agenda.

2. REVIEW STRATEGIC AREAS

Ms. Bennett distributed a graphic of a strategic planning model and stated that the Council is good at identifying its vision and values, council initiatives and agency programs. However, she argued that the overall strategy – the strategies in how the outcomes and vision are achieved – was missing. (Planning model graphic included as part of the meeting record.)

After further review of the Council's 11 goal areas identified at the Feb. 12 retreat, Ms. Bennett proposed 6 draft strategies for Council consideration:

1. Infrastructure
2. Innovated Planning
3. Natural Environment
4. Role in regional economic development and job creation
5. Changing demographics
6. Build increased citizen support

She noted that a majority of the Council's draft goal areas were organized under the above categories. However, goals that addressed the agency's budget or earthquake preparedness for example, were not included because staff viewed these as a tool versus a strategic initiative, or did not believe the goal would help to move the agency towards its desired outcomes. From there, Ms. Bennett very briefly overviewed the current council initiatives that address each of the above strategic areas.

Council discussion

Ms. Bennett asked councilors to respond to each of the proposed strategic areas and consolidated goals, and asked if any strategic areas were missing.

- Councilors discussed Goal 9 which called for convening a regional discussion about the best approach to providing and funding children's services in the region. The majority of the Council believed that much of Metro's activities served the future generation and children specifically. Councilors believed that elements of Goal 9 were addressed throughout the 6 strategies and therefore should not be elevated to an individual strategy. Councilors agreed to continue the discussion at a later date.
- Councilors discussed Strategy 6 regarding building increased citizen support. Some councilors believed that this was an important strategy and that the other strategies' success depended on it. Additionally, councilors discussed Metro's transition from individual citizen engagement to engagement with local jurisdictions over the past 10 years. Councilors commented that citizen engagement should not just be left to local partners only.
- Council discussed Metro's unique role as a regional government, and the need to articulate the strengths and challenges of the regional model.
- Councilors discussed the Metro venues. Councilors believed the venues were a subset of Strategy 4 regarding economic development and job creation. Councilors cited the venues impact on tourism as an example.

Ms. Bennett stated that the next step was to follow-up with the department directors to confirm that each department strategy plan aligned with the Council's 6 strategic areas. Some councilors ask that an additional time be scheduled to do a cross-comparison of the strategies and goals prior to the Council's consideration and adoption of the strategy areas.

3. COST BENEFIT DISCUSSION

Ms. Bennett led the council in an exercise to quickly identify possible risks and the rewards for each of the 6 strategy areas. Flipchart responses were as follows:

INFRASTRUCTURE:

Risk	Reward
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing infrastructure up is risky; • Metro may have to go at this alone; • Local jurisdictional opposition to Metro pursuing regional money; • Allocation of “scope” creep; • Need to connect to Strategy 6 regarding “citizen support” to be successful; and • Voter resistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public needs to address gap; • No one else is going to “save” Metro from this issue; • Strengthening the region and community; • Only address cross-regional mobility; • Failure to address could be a drag on the regional economy; • Address needs of citizens; • Build partnerships with the private sector; • Modern and efficient infrastructure that supports a healthy economy ; • Efficient development of land in the urban growth boundary; • Enable implementation of innovative planning and works. Need to assess successful future; and • Voter support.

INNOVATIVE PLANNING:

Risk	Reward
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure; • Alienated from jurisdictional planning; • Push against “if not broke don’t fix” mentality; • Concern that one size doesn’t fit all jurisdictions; • Let some loud voices determine Metro’s strategies; • Questioned if innovative planning is always practical; and • Innovate planning costs money and can be expensive. Potential for non-monetary rewards in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move towards desired outcomes; • Better place, better solutions; • Opportunities for all; • Economic development component; • Regional competitiveness; • Core function of Metro; • Quality of life is a key competitive advantage of region; and • Successful in achieving the voters’ direction in the charter.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT:

Risks	Reward
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is never done; • Many of the strategies entail raising or expending funds. Unsuccessful in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of life; • Environmental benefits; • Connects to core value for Oregon

<p>finding permanent funding for regional resources management. Additionally, this requires voter approval;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal realities may make for political discomfort; • Restriction to development for economic and land development; and • Can be polarizing issue. 	<p>residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits have a market (e.g. economic) value that can be marketed; and • Behavior change.
--	--

ROLE IN REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/ JOB CREATION:

Risk	Reward
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental impact; • Over position or “jobs wash;” • If focus is just on jobs , risk walking away from quality of life issues if multidimensional; • Equity impacts; and • It takes time for Metro to participate and have a role in this space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional strategies for marketing the region help to improve the economic competitiveness of the region. For example, a partnership with GPI and others; • Prosperity; • Helps build credibility with business groups and helps to build connections; • Articulate the return on investment and return on community; • Don’t take control of the strategy, but rather brings a balanced voice to the table. Be a participant in creating the economic development plan; and • Brings the Metro region together and strengthens the partnership between the public and private sectors.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS:

Risks	Rewards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fail to have equitable region; • Fatigue from local jurisdictions (e.g. city councilors); • Don’t adjust for how demographics may change in the future; • There are consequences with not dealing with this issue; • Might have to be satisfied with progress versus achievements; • Who says Metro is in charge. Polarized issue; • This strategy is expensive. For example how affordable is affordable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More equitable region and in particular around the smart growth; • Wider and stronger partnerships – such as with the Health sector; • Structure that enables Metro to deal with changing demographics better. Regional structure allows Metro to tackle this issue. Growth plan provides opportunity to discuss; • Portland’s downtown is still healthy; • Metro will have a community where everybody has access to a quality of life and economic development opportunity;

<p>housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro may be identified as stepping on toes of others and may receive an allegation of scope creep; • Metro needs a defined role; • Failure to be implemented; and • Metro’s bad situations are not bad enough and therefore not perceived as an important problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stronger economy and environment; • Addressing changing demographics now will build a stronger community; • Enables Metro to be more focused and strategic with resources; • Tools to do opportunity mapping; • Might be regional efficiency; • Real need; • Potential to attract more resources, such as a federal grant, if the region has an integrated strategy; and • Need to understand how our policies affect all race ethnicity, income, age groups.
--	--

BUILD CITIZEN SUPPORT OR GET SUPPORT FROM THE CITIZEN:

Risk	Rewards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expensive in terms of money and time; • Potential to be bogged down in the process and non-action. Approach citizen support so broadly that Metro is not getting the support the agency needs on larger initiatives; • Leads to a mediocre result – especially when aiming for consensus; • Defining “good enough”. How do we measure citizen support; and • Citizens may define the problem different. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information percolates up to local government partners. Preference to hear from citizen versus imposing rules; • Get support for more important priorities; • Additional recognition for the work Metro is trying to lead; • Citizens can inspire and bring new ideas. There is a potential to get involvement earlier so citizens can help define the problem; • Metro is successful in achieving the region’s 6 desired outcomes, and that there is something for everyone; • Metro fulfills the legal requirements; and • Regionalism is not lost in future generations or taken for granted.

In addition, Ms. Bennett presented five areas for further Council discussion. She stated that in order to reach the Council’s desired outcomes, investment would be needed. That said, she noted that the investments would not all have to be publically funded. The five areas were:

- Phase 2 of Community Investment Initiative (CII)
- Transportation funding
- Parks and natural areas funding
- Charter single family neighborhoods

- Construction Excise Tax scheduled to expire in Sept. 2014

Councilors stated that none of the above areas required immediate prioritization or action, but further Council discussion would be required. Councilors also noted that Metro may not want to take on each of the above as council initiatives. Ms. Bennett summarized council direction as:

- (1) More explicate discussion with the CII Leadership Council around public and private funding is needed;
- (2) Don't assume the natural areas long-term funding needs will end in 5 years; will require new money or voter approval; and
- (3) Transportation funding will require legislation; don't assume Metro will be the lead.

4. AGREEMENT ON NEXT STEPS

Council President Hughes stated that staff would create agreements of the above 6 strategy areas for Council consideration and future adoption.

5. ADJOURN

Seeing no further discussion, Council President Tom Hughes adjourned the Council retreat at 12:09 p.m.

Prepared by,



Kelsey Newell, Regional Engagement & Legislative Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 1, 2013

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1.	Handout	2013	Council agreements	501130-01