

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, October 28, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: David Bragdon (excused)

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

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, OCTOBER 30, 2003.

Deputy Council President Park reviewed the upcoming agenda for October 30, 2003. Councilor McLain suggested a brief orientation to Ordinance No. 03-1021 & 1022. She suggested Andy Cotugno do this presentation. Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, said they had gone through the comments and created an "A" version of the resolution, which included technical changes. Second, they took comments from advisory committees, and identified possible amendments to respond to those comments. Third, they have summarized the other comments that had come in since last Thursday. Deputy Council President Park suggested beginning with the 12 possible policy amendments. Ms. Deffebach said in the staff report they identified which committees recommended which policy amendments. Deputy Council President Park questioned if these changes were significant and we adopted them, should they consider holding the resolution over until November 13, 2003 Council meeting. Councilor McLain said if they were going to a "B" version, the resolution should be considered on the 13th not November 6th. Councilor Monroe clarified the process. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said Council could vote on amendments today but not on the final resolution. He spoke to past practices. Councilor Monroe suggested that if today it was clear by consensus which amendments were supported, Council could consider the "B" version on October 30th. Councilor McLain spoke to Work Session format versus committee format and the ability to act.

Ms. Deffebach reviewed the proposed 12 amendments (a copy of the amendments are included in the meeting record). She also passed out a copy of Exhibit B as amended (a copy of which is found in the meeting record). Deputy Council President Park spoke to consistency for the new expansion areas. Mr. Cotugno said in the new expansion areas, the two areas, industrial and town centers, would be impacted by the options. Councilor Newman spoke to Option 4 as baseline versus an option. Deputy Council President Park asked, at what stage were we legally safe to drop options? Paul Garrahan, Assistant Metro Attorney, said you wanted to keep your study options open. Regardless of what you called Option 4, you would still be able to make the balancing decision later. On the other end in terms of how protective the other bookend was, they were comfortable with the current recommendation but could be more protective. Deputy Council President Park asked about prematurely eliminating options. When were you allowed to start dropping things? Councilor Hosticka said does the way we frame the questions, limit our program options. Mr. Garrahan said they had done the first level Economic Social Environmental and Energy (ESEE) analysis to set up bookends. If you didn't collect baseline data, you would be limiting yourself in the future. He talked about findings, balancing and narrowing. Deputy Council President Park said in order to maintain our options, we shouldn't eliminate the baseline option. Mr. Garrahan concurred. He spoke to future flexibility. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), said the Council needed to consider that any time you make a decision to

eliminate something, have a good reason as to why you eliminated. Councilor Monroe spoke to the baseline option.

Ms. Deffebach said there were several other suggestions that had come in after these amendments were developed (a copy of which is included in the meeting record).

Deputy Council President Park suggested beginning with Amendment #1. Ms. Deffebach clarified this amendment. Deputy Council President Park said we were still gathering information, if you eliminate these options would that limit us in the future? Councilor McLain suggested dealing with it as one impact zone. She suggested simplify options to four. She suggested allowing more simplicity. Mr. Cotugno disagreed. He explained that there were more specifics in each option. Councilor McLain said many of the comments had suggested simplifying. Councilor Hosticka said he thought that you could combine the impact areas but the rest of #1 could be done by this Thursday. Councilor Newman said he wasn't sure whether we should get rid of site specific. Councilor Burkholder asked about the legal issue. Councilor Newman suggested that this discussion should occur at the program stage. Deputy Council President Park asked if we have prejudice the decision at the end by limiting options now. Councilor Burkholder suggested dropping the box because it was confusing. Councilor McLain said she wanted to see the amendment that would allow dropping the box as well. Amendment #1 would collapse impact areas. Council addressed Amendment #3. Councilor McLain said she thought this was a can of worms. Councilor Hosticka said it seemed that the two bullets were direction to staff. He asked if it required an amendment or was it direction to staff? Councilors suggested considering Amendments #4-6. They were all connected. He suggested considering Amendment #9. He suggested dropping Option 1 and replacing it with #2AA. Councilor Burkholder said #2 integrated economic values, Option 1 approaches only habitat without considering economic value. Councilor McLain said this suggestion still gave you bookends and simplified. She supported Councilor Burkholder's amendment. Councilor Hosticka suggested moving Amendment #6 on Thursday, and if it didn't pass, consider Amendments 4& 5. Deputy Council President Park asked if we were eliminating things too soon. Mr. Garrahan said it was the Council's call. In some ways, Option 2AA was more protective than Option 1A. Council would be narrowing the field of study. Deputy Council President Park said it feels as if they were making a program decision before they finished studying it. Councilor Newman suggested combining the two into one amendment, substituting 2AA for Option 1.

Councilor McLain addressed Amendment #7. Deputy Council President Park suggested adding another category, regional public service facilities such as universities and colleges. Councilor McLain said she would rather have a category rather than an exception. Councilor Burkholder said he disagreed with Amendment #7. Councilor Newman said he would like some distinction between regionally significant versus other industrial areas. Mr. Cotugno spoke to a practical consideration on industrial versus regionally significant industrial. Councilor Newman said they could have the amendment available for discussion. Mr. Garrahan said the bookends were more important as long as you have enough data around the decision. Councilors supported Amendment #8. Deputy President Council President said Amendments #10 and #11 were self-explanatory. He suggested preparing an amendment for #12 as well to make people area.

2. DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) DISCUSSION

Kim Ellis and Tom Kloster, Planning Department, reviewed the draft RTP and the upcoming timeline.

3. REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (RSWMP) UPDATE AND SCOPING SESSION

Mike Hoglund said they would be talking about RSWMP update today. They would be talking about the scope of work. Many of the components were in good shape. There were some items that needed to be updated. He passed out the Councilor Value for Solid Waste System (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He talked about the schedule for the update. He talked about the additional issues that needed to be discussed. This was a major activity for Solid Waste and Recycling. Councilor McLain noted that DEQ was expecting Metro to get this done. Mr. Hoglund said it was a major component of the FY 04-05 budget. Outreach would be a major component of the plan. With the public, they may need to be focus groups and other forums. Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, said there were two plans that guide Solid Waste, RSWMP and Solid Waste Strategic Plan. She spoke to the differences in each plan. They were mutually supportive but different. She had taken the Councilor Values and gone through RSWMP. With the exception of #6, all of the other values were covered in the RSWMP. They needed Councilors thoughts about the scope. She noted the purpose for RSWMP was included in the Work Session document (part of the meeting packet). This plan met the State requirement. Councilor Newman asked about state requirements of the 62% goal, was that on us or on the region? Ms. Matthews said it was Metro's responsibility for achieving that goal. Councilor Monroe asked about the Task Force on the Credits. Mr. Hoglund said they would be reporting to Council next week. They were struggling with what else was out there. They were looking at getting more recovery as less cost.

Councilor McLain suggested making a personal invitation to industry when we are considering Solid Waste issues. She talked about the general public outreach. They had done small group activities as well as the chamber for the big group. The question they asked was what did you want out of your solid waste system. Ms. Matthews passed out a gant chart on Phases and Major tasks for the RSWMP Update project. She reviewed the Phases 1 through 6. She said they had check in points with the Council at 1.1, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5. They had a formal approval process required by Environmental Quality Commission (EQC). Councilor McLain asked about the disaster debris management plan. Ms. Matthews said there had been some discussion as to whether the plan should be included in the RSWMP. Councilor McLain said why they put it in the first time was they were looking for money for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). She suggested more discussion. Councilor McLain felt that the Executive Summary was valuable and helpful to the public. She talked about formatting and detail. She felt it was important to have enough detail in the plan. She felt that the performance measures needed to be more thorough. Ms. Matthews said they had identified the project scope. Councilor Burkholder suggested talking more in detail about the philosophical underpinning of the current plan. Deputy Council President Park asked them to include defining success. Ms. Matthews said she would define it as having a document that had been fully vetted and supported. Deputy Council President Park said Metro Council needed to define the success as well. Mr. Jordan talked about success of the plan. Ms. Matthews said they were looking for a plan that was doable. Deputy Council President Park said they were looking to get to a result. Councilor Burkholder said he thought they should talk about council values and outcomes. Councilor McLain raised the issue of equity. There was an issue concerning philosophy on what counties did differently concerning the dumping. Ms. Mathews suggested Council review Chapters 4, 5, 7, and 8. Councilor McLain suggested Council be involved in public outreach.

Deputy Council President Park asked where were the economics in this. Will it pass the test? He talked about the organics program. Was there an economics piece? Ms. Matthews said there was chapter on the economics. Councilor Burkholder suggested discussing economic development and possible urban investments. Councilor Newman asked about the organics program and the

Metro Council Meeting

10/28/03

Page 4

City of Portland partnership. Mr. Hoglund explained the program and the farm worker organizing issue.

4. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Mary Sue Gillaway, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Manager, said DEQ had issued the permit from Three Mile Canyon farm.

5. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

Mr. Jordan reminded Council of their retreat next Wednesday. Senior Staff will also have a day-long retreat on November 12th. He also noted the Council Office was in the middle of budget preparation.

6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

There were none.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Deputy Council President Park adjourned the meeting at 3: 45 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 28,
2003

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	10/30/03	Metro Council Agenda for October 30, 2003	102803c-01
1	Exhibit	10/25/03	To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Exhibit B to Resolution No. 03-3376A, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration Program Options	102803c-02
1	Issues of Council Consideration	10/28/03	To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Issue for Council Consideration concerning Resolution No. 03-3376A, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection	102803c-03
1	Public Comments	10/23/03	To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach Re: Goal 5 Public Comments Received on or after 10/23/03	102803c-04
2	Postcard	Oct 31, 2003	To: Metro Council From: Tom Kloster, Planning Department Re: Transportation Plan Update begins	102803c-05
2	Policy Packet	10/28/03	To: Metro Council From: Tom Kloster, Planning Department Re: 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Packet	102803c-06
2	Guidelines	10/28/03	To: Metro Council From: Tom Kloster, Planning Department Re: Guidelines for Developing the 2025 Financially Constrained System	102803c-07
2	Memo	10/28/03	To: Metro Council and Interested Parties From: Tom Kloster, Planning Department Re: Regional Transportation Plan Update	102803c-08
3	Councilor Values	10/28/03	To: Metro Council From: Janet Matthews, Solid Waste & Recycling Re: Councilor Values for the Solid Waste System	102803c-09
3	Gant Chart	10/28/03	To: Metro Council From: Janet Matthews, SWR Re: RSWMP Update Project Phases and Major Tasks	102803c-10