

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, November 18, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Susan McLain (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 1:13 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 20, 2003.

Council President Bragdon reviewed the November 20, 2003 Council agenda. Councilor Newman asked about Resolution No. 03-3389. This could be done administratively but Council President Bragdon indicated that Council had requested it by resolution. Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling, said the \$300,000 would run out the end of January. They would present scenarios this Thursday. The decision about how the payments would be made in the future would be coming forward. Councilor Monroe suggested that we modify the program in a rational way. The Task Force had recommended that we keep the program but had not yet recommended what changes were necessary. He offered to be involved in the process. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, said they would be examining options and making suggestions as quickly as possible.

2. OREGON SAVINGS GROWTH PLAN

Kerry Gilbreth, Benefits Manager and John Peprick, Local Government Representative from Oregon Savings Growth Plan spoke to the Plan. Ms. Gilbreth said she felt this plan would be a benefit for our employees. This plan would be in addition to the 401K Plan that Metro currently has available. Mr. Peprick outlined the plan for Council. He provided a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). The plan had been available to State employees since 1988. Councilor Monroe asked about the status of the court changes to Public Employees Retirement System (PERS). Ms. Gilbreth said the PERS representative indicated that it could be as long as 18 months. Mr. Peprick spoke to plan features, benefits to participants. Employees can contribute to both the 401K and 457 plan. This allowed additional capacity for investing in their retirement. He spoke to keeping costs as low as possible. He spoke to investment structure and employer benefits. He noted what Metro must do in order enroll in the program. Councilor Burkholder asked about employer costs. Mr. Peprick said it was a little bit of administration. Ms. Gilbreth said it was minimal involvement by the employer. Councilor Hosticka asked about an employee who went on to work for another government entity that offered the same plan. Ms. Gilbreth said they would like to offer the plan to employees January 1, 2004. Councilor Park asked about investment costs. Mr. Peprick responded to his question. Councilor Park asked about participation.

3. BI-STATE COORDINATING COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, spoke to the Bi-State process. He noted the I-5 Trade Corridor process. One of the recommendations was to form a Bi-State committee. This would be organized by all of the member participants. There was no major change for Joint Policy Advisory

Committee on Transportation (JPACT) but it was a change for Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). He reviewed the scope of their agenda. He talked about economic development and environmental justice concerns. Metro was asking everyone else to join this process. Councilor Burkholder said this committee answered the need for reform by discussing issues such as land use, transportation, economic development and environmental justice. The idea was to start out small to ensure that everyone was comfortable with the process. Mr. Cotugno spoke to two issues that came out of JPACT 1) they should refer to jurisdictions and agencies, and 2) to include air and water transportation issues. JPACT has not acted on these issues but would bring them back for discussion in the future. Councilor Park encouraged the need to move on this. Mr. Cotugno said the Washington State Legislature was calling for a congestion study to examine major transit and transportation issues. There were a lot of open questions about how you did the study. This committee helped with unity. Councilor Burkholder said they would have to approve the charter and model letter of participation. They would also have to appoint an official representative to the committee. He talked about additional costs of staffing. Councilor Monroe talked about his experience on the Bi-State Transportation Committee. He noted the relationship between Puget Sound and Clark County.

Council President Bragdon asked about Cascadia Conference. Councilor Monroe said it was a one-day seminar. The thrust was high-speed rail. They also talked about land use and urban development. There was a feeling that Vancouver British Columbia and Portland were doing it right and Puget Sound needed some work. High-speed rail was always an important issue at Cascadia. Councilor Burkholder said he was asked to speak on regional governance. He said in hearing the discussion they felt they might need to put more energy into high-speed rail in Salem. Metro was hosting the Cascadia Forum December 4, 5, and 6. They were hoping for 80 participants. It was by invitation only. Mr. Cotugno said the Cascadia group was a loose affiliation in the northwest. They dealt with a broad range of topics, such as, border issues, marine terminal issue. This forum was aimed strictly at the three metropolitan regions, Vancouver BC, Puget Sound and Metro. He talked about the program for the forum including economic development, transportation, and awards that each entity had received.

4. RATE REVIEW PROCESS

Doug Anderson, Solid Waste & Recycling Department, introduced the topic with a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He talked about the role of the Rate Review Committee. Every year the Council sets rates, which were normally guided by the Rate Review Committee. There are seven members on the committee. The primary purpose of the committee was set out in Code. The charge was also set out in Code. Council President Bragdon asked about the rate-setting expert. Mr. Anderson said the expert would typically be an economist with a background in utilities. He explained the process for establishing the rate each year. He talked about the task this year. The Committee provided a technical foundation for the rates and rate review process. The Committee had undertaken a review of allocations, disposal charges and regional system fee. He detailed the allocation issue. Councilor Park asked about rate setting and when it started drifting into policy and council policy direction. Mr. Anderson said the reason that a Councilor chaired the Committee was to provide that link back to Council. He continued by talking about the Rate Review Committee. They had had two learning sessions. There had been no major decisions yet. Administration, support services, interfund transfers, and debt services were areas they would like to investigate more in depth. All of these costs were entirely in the system fee. Councilor Park asked about how much were we collecting in the regional system fee. He spoke to under-collecting the regional system fee. The tonnage charge was exacting where it should be. The transaction fee was being over collected slightly. One of the main issues was over collection at the transfer station side rather than the non-system side. They were targeting mid to

late February to have a Council discussion. The rate had to be adopted by April 7th. Councilor Burkholder asked how could we be as fair as possible to all of the players. They now were examining fairness for the public. Was there a way to recover some of that market share that we had given away in the past? Was the Rate Review Committee the appropriate forum to have that discussion? Could they get some expert advice? Mr. Anderson said this was policy discussion. Councilor Park said the issue was the business we were giving away. He spoke to the public benefit. Metro Stations were the lowest in the region. What were other public policies being served by this? He wasn't sure the public benefit was that great. Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, said they would be discussing this in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update. The Rate Review Committee was also interested in this issue. Councilor Burkholder talked about the public investment. The Committee would meet again December 1st. He asked what kind of information would Council like. Council President Bragdon said Council would like regular updates. Councilor Park asked about the organics issue. Mr. Hoglund said they had some preliminary answers to some of Council's questions.

5. PERIODIC REVIEW – LAND REDUCTION AND DRAFT ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Councilor Newman asked for a map with three criteria, slope, distance to transportation facilities and proximity to other industrial areas. Lydia Neill, Planning Department, talked about the map. She spoke to application of the three factors and what that did to the map. They were cutting out a lot of exception lands. She felt doing this now might be too soon. There was about 12,000 acres. Councilor Newman said the map tended to focus the mind on all three factors. There were one or two chunks that fell off that he wanted to see studied. Councilor Burkholder asked about justification of using Hwy 8. Ms. Neill said they were trying to be more inclusive rather than less inclusive such as with St. Mary's. Councilor Burkholder said he wanted something more quantitative. Was there a factor that could be added that would refine the transportation piece versus interchange? Tim O'Brien, Planning Department, said he had asked the modeling group to do modeling to the airport and the nearest interchange. The quickest one was area D. He found that there were no huge differences.

Dick Benner, Associate Metro Attorney, talked about the constants. He talked about the Council's decision to use slope criteria and one of the other two, accessibility or proximity to other industry. He said they could further refine later on. Councilor Monroe asked about the Stafford Industrial area and why it dropped off. Ms. Neill said it dropped off because there was no proximity to other industry. Ms. Neill walked back through the proposed industrial map. She spoke to factors that they took off the map such as slope or residential areas. Councilor Burkholder asked about neighborhood impacts. Ms. Neill said Mr. O'Brien's analysis would address impacts on issues such as neighborhoods or natural area impacts. She spoke to the map attached to the ordinance. They would move this through the MPAC and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) process. It was approximately 20,000 acres. Ms. Neill said they had a narrative that walked through why they eliminated certain areas. Councilor Hosticka talked about areas that were islands. What were the implications of creating islands? Ms. Neill said they would be addressing this issue with Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). Councilor Newman asked about the future process. Ms. Neill said she was asking for guidance from Council because they had to do a notice to property owners. Mr. Benner talked about the findings. Some lands were exception lands and some farmlands. They would have to look at the 8000 acres of exception lands first in reducing lands. There was only a need for 2700 acres needed for industrial lands. Councilor Park said there was one other piece, such as Springwater. Some areas may make sense for industrial but when you factor in future housing needs some of these areas may be better for housing. He talked about the issue of impact on farmlands and residential or industrial impacts

and interface. Councilor Newman suggested keeping the map simple. Councilor Burkholder said for MPAC and MTAC, it was helpful to have the first map presented along with the current proposed map. Ms. Neill said they had seen the progression of maps. Ms. Neill said MPAC would review the draft tomorrow night. Councilor Park suggested adding the industrial lands along the edge. Mr. O'Brien provided a copy of 2003 Industrial Lands Alternatives Analysis (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He said this analysis related to 9054 total acres. He talked about factors they took out. He introduced the analysis. Councilor Park talked about the level of protection for new areas such as Damascus. He had some level of discomfort. He felt that the data was incomplete. Councilor Burkholder talked about the issue of jobs housing balance. He thought it was a factor that came in later. Were they exacerbating a lopsided problem? Ms. Neill said he was talking about policy issues. Councilor Park said he was concerned about the disconnection between the two decisions, Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion and industrial lands.

6. SOUTH CORRIDOR AND LAND USE FINAL ORDER (LUFO)

Ross Roberts, Planning Department, said they would be talking about the South Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) recommendation. He talked about where the recommendation would come from and why Council needed a briefing. Councilor Monroe asked what if the South Corridor group disagreed with the Mayor's committee. Mr. Roberts said there was a clear message that the Mayor wanted to make their recommendation first. He felt that they would probably be in agreement. Councilor Monroe said he didn't think that auto, bus and trains worked together. You lose pedestrian access. Councilor Hosticka asked what was in play and what was being decided. Mr. Roberts walked Council through the process on page 4 of a memo document concerning South Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative Revision and Land Use Final Order (LUFO)(a copy of which is included in the meeting record). This decision was a final decision on the South Corridor Environmental Impact Statement. This was confirming an existing action. Richard Brandman, Deputy Planning Director, said the LPA would be subject to financing. To get the light rail all the way to Portland State University (PSU) would require \$60 million. Portland State University supported the concept but they were not yet at the \$60 million. Mr. Roberts said the earlier April LPA decision was to get to PSU. Council President Bragdon asked that they flesh out what decision would be made in December. Mr. Robert said the current decision was mode, terminus and stations. He explained the proposed station areas. Council President Bragdon spoke to the regional impact and the regional decision. Councilor Burkholder asked about additional stations that had been added after construction. Mr. Brandman said current Council would have to the responsibility for LUFO where we did not have that previously. There were more safeguards now. Councilor Park talked about access management. Council President Bragdon said Council would decide both the LUFO and LPA on January 8, 2004. Mr. Roberts talked about amending the LUFO. The LUFO had its basis in state statute. This action would be an amendment to the LUFO; adding in the alignment from Gateway to I-205, revising downtown to add in the piece south of PSU and change stations, amending the Milwaukie LUFO, and amending the interstate MAX LUFO to reflect the stations on the ground. At the meeting on January 8th, Council would have the decision on the LPA. The LUFO would be a separate action. Councilor Burkholder spoke to the Springwater Bridge, the three bridges project. Dave Unsworth, Planning Department, talked about the Milwaukie alignment and the future process.

7. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

8. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

Michael Jordan, COO, reminded the Council of retreat dates on 12/15 and 12/17.

9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Newman asked about the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) ordinance. He suggested acting on this before the holidays. Council President Bragdon said they had underestimated the opposition. He suggested addressing the issue of what you were trying to fix. He spoke to financial problems and the need for management guidance under the COO. Council talked about the appointment process. Councilor Burkholder said on the government side, there was an understanding that there was need for more managerial control. Industry wasn't supporting the change. Councilor Newman talked about timing and strategic planning. He felt doing it earlier rather than later was better. Councilor Burkholder said before they take the next step, they would bring people together and discuss the issue.

Councilor Burkholder said he and Councilor Park had been in Salem and testified before the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The Special Transportation Areas (STAs) piece was moving forward. They were continuing the discussion with Oregon Department Of Transportation (ODOT) about the ACTs.

Council President Bragdon discussed a proposed resolution concerning Councilor newsletters.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER
18, 2003**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	11/20/03	Metro Council Regular Meeting Agenda for 11/20/03	111803c-01
2	Power Point Presentation	11/18/03	To: Metro Council From: Kerry Gilbreth, Benefits Manager Re: Oregon Savings Growth Plan	111803c-02
5	Work Session sheet	11/18/03	To: Metro Council From: Tim O'Brien, Planning Department Re: 2003 Industrial Lands Alternative Analysis Study	111803c-03
5	2003 Industrial Land Alternative Analysis Study Draft	November 2003	To: Metro Council From: Tim O'Brien, Planning Dept. Re: 2003 Industrial Land Alternative Analysis Study Draft	111803c-04
4	Power Point Presentation	11/18/03	To: Metro Council From: Doug Anderson, Solid Waste & Recycling Dept., Re: Solid Waste Rate Issues	111803c-05
6	Memo	11/18/03	To: Metro Council From: Richard Brandman, Planning Department Re: South Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative Revision and Land Use Final Order	111803c-06