

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, October 14, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Brian Newman, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 1:02 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, OCTOBER 16, 2003.

Council President Bragdon reviewed the October 16, 2003 Council agenda.

2. TUALATIN BASIN APPROACH TO GOAL 5

Brent Curtis, Tualatin Basin Coordinating Committee Chair spoke to the packet he provided to the Council (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He reviewed the overall goal of the Tualatin Basin Partners. They had to demonstrate that the overall environmental health of the site improved. He spoke to Metro and Clean Water Service inventories. They wanted to combine the two inventories to get a good picture of the environmental health of the Basin. He gave examples of individual regional sites and the existing environmental health through application of the methodology. There were 11 sites that were being considered to establish the baseline environmental health. Council President Bragdon asked about the functions and attributes of the sites. Councilor Hosticka asked about the points. Mr. Curtis said a point was representative of a reach. He further explained combining the two pieces of information to provide a judgment on existing overall health of a site.

He then spoke to the companion piece that went with the existing environmental health. It was Geographic Information System (GIS) based and would allow them to evaluate particular projects such as acquisition. It would not prioritize sites. It was an objective way of looking at what was going to be the benefits. This was called the Restore Model.

He then reviewed and highlighted the Economic Social Environmental and Energy (ESEE) methodology (a copy of this power point presentation is included in the meeting record). He talked about the various steps. This continued the watershed basin approach. They would be looking at the ESEE at the site level. They would be doing a more detailed evaluation of the sites. Local jurisdictions would be looking at each of their sites. Council President Bragdon asked about judgment difference among jurisdictions. Mr. Curtis said they would be looking at consistency and quality control. The intent was to create a basin-wide judgment. Councilor Park asked about a feedback loop in their process. Mr. Curtis said they had recommendation from the consultant about ESEE's allow, limit and prohibit. He talked about different levels including technical and policy levels. He spoke to the upcoming timeline including technical, policy and the public. Councilor Park clarified his question on the feedback loop. Mr. Curtis said they would have to go through periodic review just as Metro had to go through periodic review. He explained that the Clean Water Service had a short-term feedback loop concerning water quality. Councilor Park talked about the funding mechanism on the Tualatin River court order. Council President Bragdon spoke to performance measures to track success. Mr. Curtis continued talking about the

allow, limit and prohibit decisions. He felt that their definitions were similar to Metro's definitions of allow, limit and prohibit.

He then talked about four conflicting use land use categories. Councilor Hosticka asked what were the implications for using different categories. Mr. Curtis said the implications were unknown. Council President Bragdon said the hierarchies were slightly different. Mr. Curtis explained groupings higher order land uses and ESEE analysis. They had used zoning rather than 2040 land uses that Metro had used. Mr. Curtis said some of this would get adjusted as they continued their analysis. They were saying that they valued centers, employment and industrial lands. The analysis was a long way from being done. Councilor Park asked about categorizing centers. Mr. Curtis said these were analysis categories.

Councilor Hosticka said if we don't make a distinction in the ESEE analysis in commercial and industrial, and then they make a judgment at the program level, would that make a difference? Mr. Curtis responded that the administrative rules required that you do an ESEE analysis and the analysis shape the program. The analysis needs to contribute but it didn't have to be a linear connection. Councilor Hosticka asked if they were limiting their future choices by the choices that we make now.

Councilor McLain felt that Metro and the Tualatin Basin group had the same ingredients. There may be some difference and some need for refinement but that was later. Councilor Park asked about future urban category and gave an example of Shute/Evergreen. He asked Mr. Curtis how he would classify this area. Mr. Curtis said they don't have strict land use definitions except for the Shute/Evergreen area. He then spoke to impact areas, inner and outer. Councilor Hosticka asked by including the rest of the basin, did everyone have to get noticed? Mr. Curtis said it was their intention to notify everyone that had their property included on a resource. He said they were sending these notices beyond the requirements of the law. If you were changing uses of the land, you have to notify citizens. Councilor Burkholder talked about conflicting use categories. The location was very critical. There may be some areas that were being looked at differently than Tualatin Basin. The whole question of lumping and splitting was important. Metro was basing their hierarchy on 2040 concepts. Mr. Curtis said their course of action allowed for change in judgments. This was a work in progress. He said they were just starting in on the sites ESEEs. He noted the Metro's staff involvement. They had provided constructive input.

3. THE NATURAL STEP

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, introduced Steve Apotheker, Solid Waste and Recycling Department and Duke Castle, Oregon Natural Step Network. Mr. Jordan said Metro was focused on sustainability. Mr. Apotheker said Metro was looking at embedding sustainability in its operation. Mr. Castle talked about sustainability and allowing the system to go on. Sustainability required that you step back and look at overall sustainability. He explained what the Natural Step was trying to do was to provide a scientific basis for sustainability. He gave a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the meeting packet) on The Natural Step. This program had the support of the business community. He detailed some of the companies that participate in The Natural Step. He talked about the basic science of sustainability. He then detailed the natural cycle. The Natural Step four system conditions. Councilor Burkholder asked about going beyond Metro and how we can impact those areas.

Mr. Castle talked about dealing with the issue before you hit the wall. He gave examples of organizations that were attempting to implement the Natural Step. Senior Management must buy

into the concept. Board of Directors can't tell an organization how to implement the program. The line workers have to give examples. All employees' suggestions were valuable. You had to have a vision of the future. He felt Metro's Environmental Action Team (ENACT) group met sustainability goals better than most organizations. For the program to work, it took a commitment on all parts. He spoke to lessons learned. Councilor McLain said she felt the concept was simple but the implementations could feel overwhelming. You had to take a look at your goals and to take small steps to achieve the goals.

Mr. Apotheker talked about the ENACT work plan. They were continuing their grant program. They were also looking at Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC) facilities and Metro Parks. Their third project was their e-paper project. Their fourth project was to look at Metro's chemical use and determine toxicity. An annual bi-recycle report was another project they were doing this year. Finally, they wanted to institutionalize or imbed sustainability practices at Metro.

Mr. Jordan talked about what was currently budgeted for ENACT. They had a lot of work to get to sustainability. He talked about the sustainability community model and the balance between economic, social and environmental. As the Council was looking at long range planning, he asked, how far reaching did this Council wish to go to create sustainable communities? Councilor Newman said it seemed that the Natural Step focused on organizations. He wondered about focusing on individuals. Mr. Castle talked about their historical roots and that they dealt with both. Councilor Burkholder suggested that funds were limited. How did they fit these concepts into planning? They would have to devote some funds to this idea. Councilor Park asked about the value of the ENACT programs and asked about the current funding source. Mr. Apotheker spoke to added value. He explained the chemical toxicity program. The added value would allow them to focus on alternatives to the toxic chemicals. Councilor McLain suggested two steps, a short-term budget step. The second step was the long-term step. They had to decide what this meant, where did they start, and where could they get a good result. Mr. Jordan said they had been given a charge. He had asked the ENACT group to examine all of the business practices and recommend restructuring of those practices. The next leap was in the Council's discussion on strategic planning.

4. TITLE 4 REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INDUSTRIAL AREAS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the past and current process. Mary Weber, Planning Department, talked about the current version dated October 13, 2003 of accounting for Title 4 and the efficiency gained in the industrial land supply (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). She spoke to the foundation and the reason to project and maintain the supply of industrial land for future industrial uses. She talked about lands inside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The land supply was much smaller. She talked about the approach they took and the assumptions they made. There was no hard and fast science. They had used a logical approach. She talked about savings in buildable acres. Councilor McLain said the idea was to demonstrate what we knew we had on the books. The chart added all of those acres up. Ms. Weber was giving reasoning for why we were counting the acreage in the UGB. Regionally they knew that 20% of the land in the industrial area was retail or non-industrial uses. The Code was designed to limit the amount of non-industrial uses in industrial areas. Dick Benner, Regional Planning Division Director, talked about residential uses and the changes over time. The industrial lands issue was similar. Councilor McLain explained that Table 1 spoke to estimate of acres gained for industrial development through new Title 4 policies. Ms. Weber talked about the map that she passed out, Regional Significant Industrial Areas (a copy of which is included in the

meeting record). She noted that the map was illustrative. Councilor Park asked about Table 3. Ms. Weber said the analysis was on buildable vacant land. Councilor Park suggested converting that to acreage.

Councilor Newman asked about the Title 4 map and the Port of Portland area. Ms. Weber said they were considered current industrial areas. They were not exempted from Title 4. Councilor Newman asked about buildable vacant areas. Councilor Burkholder explained that the map was what local jurisdictions suggested as Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIA). Councilor Park asked if the Port was still considered a RSIA? Ms. Weber said yes.

Ms. Weber talked about what was on the map and what was not (a set of maps concerning Lots 50 Acres or Larger was included in the record). She made some recommendations for industrial lands to be considered that were greater than 50 acres. Councilor Burkholder reminded that development was overtime, over the next 20 years. She asked Council what the map should have on it. Council President Bragdon summarized that local jurisdiction nominations and land that was brought in, in 2002 should be on the Title 4 map. Councilor McLain suggested putting on all of the acreage that Ms. Weber proposed. Councilor Newman said he understood that the first use was critical. Councilor Burkholder said he saw this designation as a long-term designation over time. Councilor Park suggested a three hundred acre parcel be added. Councilor McLain suggested providing more material on the proposed sites. Councilor Hosticka asked if these were all the parcels that were over 50 acres. He asked about Map 3, there were 69-acres and half was green. Ms. Weber talked about Title 3 restrictions on that parcel. Councilor Hosticka suggested that there might be a similar problem on Map 4. Council President Bragdon said Council was asking for more information about these sites. He suggested not bringing an ordinance forward until Council had received additional information.

5. GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Jim Desmond, Parks and Greenspaces Director, talked about the history of the two Park's committees, Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC) and Regional Parks and Greenspaces Citizens Advisory Committee (RPGCAC). He then talked about a recommendation from Mike Houck to provide an avenue to prioritize sites. The proposal suggested having a single committee that would include citizens and Parks Providers that could take up larger issues such as financing, resource sharing, and user issues. Mr. Desmond said they had let both previous committees know that this proposal was on the table. Both committees concurred. He spoke to the size of the committee, a 9 versus a 15-member committee. He noted that Mr. Cooper said anything that was related to the Functional Plan or Regional Framework Plan must go through Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

Councilor Newman asked about motivation behind the committee proposal. Mr. Desmond talked about the need for the committee. The idea was to having leading park directors and individuals who cared about these issues, such as, Jim Zehren. Councilor McLain said she felt the 15-member committee should be considered. Councilor Burkholder said they wanted to elevate the bigger issues. Councilor Park asked about the rationale between a nine-member versus a 15-member group. Mr. Desmond passed out a proposal for each size committee (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Councilor Hosticka suggested having a Councilor Chair the committee rather than the Department Director. You needed to have enough people to have a mix between technical and policy. Councilor Monroe said he felt 15 was an OK number. He agreed with Councilor Hosticka about having a Councilor Chair the committee. Councilor McLain said she felt it was important that there was a councilor at the table either as a liaison or a chair. It helped create a two-way conversation. Council President Bragdon said we needed advocates and

Metro Council Meeting

10/14/03

Page 5

providers. How we used the committee was the important piece. He suggested including people who were generalists. He suggested having one of the committee member chair the committee.

6. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

There were none.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Burkholder asked about Resolution No. 03-3375 and the relationship with the consortium. Mr. Jordan said he would get the information requested.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 14,
2003**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	10/16/03	Metro Council Agenda for October 16, 2003 Council meeting	101403c-01
2	ESEE Report	8/11/03	To: Metro Council From: Brent Curtis, Tualatin Basin Committee Re: Tualatin Basin Goal 5 ESEE Report Methodology Draft	101403c-02
2	Environmental Health Report Chapter 2	8/20/03	To: Metro Council From: Brent Curtis, Tualatin Basin Committee Re: Tualatin Basin Goal 5 Existing Environmental Health Report Chapter 2 – Approach and Methodology	101403c-03
2	Environmental Health Report Chapter 4	9/5/03	To: Metro Council From: Brent Curtis, Tualatin Basin Group, Re: Tualatin Basin Goal 5 Existing Environmental Health Report Chapter 4 Individual Regional Site Report – Site 13	101403c-04
2	Fall 2003 Newsletter	Fall 2003	To: Metro Council From: Brent Curtis, Tualatin Basin Committee Re: Partners for Natural Places newsletter	101403c-05
4	Memo	10/13/2003	To Richard Benner, Interim Director Regional Planning Division From: Mary Weber, Community Development Section Re: Accounting for Title 4 and the Efficiency Gained in the Industrial Land Supply	101403c-06
4	Map	10/13/2003	To: Metro Council From: Mary Weber, Planning Department Re: Regionally Significant Industrial Areas Draft Map	101403c-07
4	7 Aerial Maps	10/3/2003	To: Metro Council From: Mary Weber, Planning Department Re: Lots 50 Acres or Large Maps 1-7	101403c-08
5	Committee Membership proposal	10/13/03	To: Metro Council From: Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director Re: Proposed 9 and 15 member Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee	101403c-09