

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, January 20, 2004
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 1:06 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JANUARY 22, 2004.

Council President Bragdon reviewed the January 22, 2004 Council Work Session agenda. There will be a discussion on Future Vision project.

2. COORDINATION WITH MARION COUNTY

Lydia Neill, Planning Department, introduced Marion County Commissioners Patti Milne, Samuel Brentano, Janet Carlson and John Brown, City Administrator for Woodburn. Councilors introduced themselves and talked about what areas they represented. Commissioner Carlson, serving as chair this year, said she was here for the industrial lands issue. She spoke to their recent conversations with cities they represented concerning this issues. Citizens had expressed concern about impact of industrial lands south of the Willamette River. They wished to look at the issue from a policy perspective. Commissioner Brentano noted seven points representing Marion County's position. He highlighted the significance of Willamette River between rural and urban. Expanding Metro Boundary south of the Willamette River could have far reaching impacts. He noted that the physical landscape changed, it was a physical boundary that must be maintained. Once there was a decision to cross the river and adjust the boundary they were concerned that this would set the stage for future expansion. He questioned why this kept coming up. What was the real goal to expand south of the river? He said he was opposed to this expansion. He felt Marion County residents were also opposed. He noted his history with Metro and what he knows about Metro. Marion County wanted to plan for their citizens. Councilor Newman asked for clarification. Commissioner Brentano said he wanted to maintain the boundary at the river. He felt the geographic, social, economic perspectives were different south of the river. He urged respecting the boundary at the Willamette River.

Commissioner Carlson said they were primarily looking at Areas E and F. She noted that the area was primarily agricultural. She noted the bedroom community from the region was moving down south from Charbonneau and Woodburn. She also noted the issue with the Aurora Airport. She spoke to the Woodburn industrial areas and the competition for industry. She talked about transportation infrastructure issues and the impacts on industrialization near Wilsonville. Commissioner Milne said they wanted their communities to maintain their own destiny. She spoke to local control, allowing the small communities in Marion County and Marion County government to continue to be supportive of their planning. There was a concern that if Metro came knocking, would Metro's needs overshadow Marion County needs. She reminded Council of the impacts on agriculture. Marion County was number one in the State of Oregon. They continued to rely on the greenhouse and nursery industries. She spoke to Area F issues. There was

high value farmland in the area, if properly cared for they expected to see continue growth in that area. They wanted to make sure that the line was clearly delineated.

Mr. Brown said he was representing the City of Woodburn. Their concern was the competitive disadvantage if Metro expanded south of the river. Woodburn was urbanizing due to location and cheap land. The City Council was attempting to change their urbanization and economy. He felt he represented small communities. He talked about their periodic review process including industrial land expansion. They were targeting industries to raise the standard of living. They were seeking to change the amount of time people had to work so they could stay and invest in their communities. Councilor Burkholder said they should be coordinating their efforts in planning. He talked about transportation issues and the impact from the bedroom communities such as Woodburn. He talked about coordinating growth forecasts. We don't control the growth in the region. Metro responded to the growth. We needed to be talking together so we coordinate growth forecasts. He explained where Metro stood at this point. Commissioner Carlson noted coordination was different than encroachment. Councilor Burkholder noted that each affected the other. Commissioner Milne said the system may not be set up for them to talk with Metro but they recognized the need talk. The only way to come to a decision was to share information so decisions would be coordinated. Their small communities didn't always feel represented in the decision-making. Councilor Park said he was in both camps. Councilor Burkholder summarized the issues. Everyone was required to have a 20-year land supply but there had been no coordination put in place. The State was going to have to make some decisions about this coordination. He said that this was a good beginning dialogue. Councilor Newman said he heard the notion of separation of communities but growth went both ways. They were suggesting a hard edge to Metro. He asked what was the hard edge for Marion County. Commissioner Brentano said he envisioned the river as their edge. Council President Bragdon said he heard don't infringe on us and don't compete with us. Everyone was operating under the State law. Was the State law forcing this growth involuntarily? Commissioner Milne said they might be looking at being forced to go to the legislature to ask for elimination or prevention of this kind of conflict. The law hadn't recognized that they would be competing. These entities shouldn't be competing but complementary to each other. Commissioner Carlson talked about the buildable supply of land. Councilor Monroe said they needed more of this kind of dialogue. This was one state. There needed to be a healthy Metropolitan area. They had had several agreements with small communities such as Canby and Sandy to maintain the mutual separation. Both entities had to protect and guard it. He noted the richness of the farmland in Marion County. Protection of farmland was important to Metro as well. Commissioner Brentano asked about having the land south of the Willamette River be the hard line. Mr. Brown said Woodburn had no intention to move to the north. Their intention was to move south and west. He talked about their industrial areas and the soil classes. He talked about protecting industrial lands as it came in so when the right industry came in, land hadn't been used up. The goal was to increase the living wage for everyone in the region. Councilor Monroe talked about protecting industrial land from commercial development such as big box retail.

Councilor Newman asked how fast Donald was growing. Councilor Hosticka said they needed to coordinate. He felt they represented the same people. They were one community but separate governments. He urged continued conversation. Councilor Park asked what the driver of the policies? Was it fiscal? Commissioner Milne said they hadn't had a policy discussion. Commissioner Brentano said his issue was livability. Councilor Park talked about his experience in Gresham and how population was a driver for fiscal stability. Commissioner Milne asked what kind of a process would they be looking at? Council President Bragdon said they must satisfy the need for industrial land by the end of June. They were still working at the number of acres needed for jobs. They still had to study like situated lands. Councilor Burkholder said the Governor had

made land use issues a top priority. Fiscal issues were a big driver for communities. They needed to look at changes to drive policies. Councilor Hosticka talked about satellite cities and how you adopt policies.

3. GOAL 5 REGULATORY DISCUSSION

Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, updated the Council on where they were with the evaluation with the options. She noted the information in the packet (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). She spoke to the three regulatory options and gave examples of each option through six maps. Councilor Newman asked about the inclusion of colleges and Port of Portland changes. Ms. Deffebach said the maps reflected the Councilors requests to include these entities. They could present these options visually and how they stack up acreage wise. She talked about the baseline as defined by Title 3. The purpose of this was to establish a base to compare options to. Lands covered by Title 3 covered 30% of the wildlife and habitat inventory. She spoke to the need to include upland areas, which were not covered by Title 3. She then spoke to the flood management areas. Councilor Burkholder asked how these applied to protection. Ms. Deffebach talked about Class 3. She noted that the consequences were different between developed land and undeveloped land. When they did the ESEE analysis they were looking at marginal effects and incremental effects. She talked about Habitat and Urban Development Value Distribution and what it showed. She talked about the high urban development value, which was really a small part of the land. She noted that the "other land" and the "low land" area had impact across the region. Councilor Hosticka suggested cross correlations with high value land. Ms. Deffebach spoke to the next chart, which had to do with the acreage being protected. She talked about the options and that they were still completing their assessment.

The purpose for presenting this work session was to show Council the progress. She spoke to the assumptions for allow, limit and prohibit on vacant and developed lands. She noted future work sessions. Councilor Newman asked about how assumptions were developed? Ms. Deffebach said they had looked at what others were doing and the research that was out there. Assumption would get worked at in the program phases. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said Council would have a decision to make in May 2004. They were trying to make it feasible for Council to make a decision in May. Ms. Deffebach said they were still moving forward on the property owner notice. She asked for feedback from Council.

4. ORGANICS DISCUSSION

Mike Hogle and Lee Barrett, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, talked about future issues and how they interrelated. Mr. Hogle talked about the timeline for the organics. He spoke to their goals. He talked about the environmental benefits of organics. He spoke to the amount that they could recycle and the impacts on the environment. He talked about the goals for the program. He noted impacts of food waste on water quality, sewer systems and the costs. It was more cost effective to take it out of the liquid system. The idea was to get it out of the liquid waste system into the solid waste system. He noted that Food Waste Recovery, Economics and Fiscal (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Councilor Park asked about costs per household. Mr. Barrett said he wasn't sure but thought it was about 900 tons per year. Councilor Monroe talked about the need for a campaign to get rid of garbage disposals. Judy Crockett, City of Portland Office of Sustainable Development, said the waste treatment people were concerned about garbage disposals. The larger industries were being targeted first. They were close to starting outreach to the largest commercial users. Councilor Monroe suggested builders be discouraged from putting garbage disposals in new units. Mr. Hogle talked about the economic and fiscal impacts of organics. He spoke to market, Metro costs: food waste tip fee, generator

costs, and fiscal: two effects – program cost and tonnage diversion. Council President Bragdon asked about generator and collection costs. Mr. Hogle said there would be more miles traveled to pick up the food waste to get a ton of waste. They wouldn't be able to put as much waste in a container because it weighed more than other waste. The cost was higher. Councilor Newman asked what the threshold was where it began to make sense. Mr. Hogle talked about the size of the generator and the savings depended upon size. Councilor Newman asked about how big a generator must you be for them to save. Mr. Hogle said he thought the working answer was 700 lbs per ton. Ms. Crockett said they had looked at it for several years and tried to get a handle on this issue. They felt that it was about 2.5 containers week. She felt when they begin this they would have good participation. The cost of service study will determine the participants. Councilor Hosticka asked about increased management costs. Ms. Crockett felt that the training would be an important component to the program. Councilor Burkholder asked what percent of the market were the small restaurants? Ms. Crockett said they were not targeting small entities at this point.

Mr. Hogle talked about calculation of Metro Food Waste Tip Fee. He then spoke to fiscal impacts including program costs, solid waste fee changes. Ad costs recovered from fee changes. Councilor Newman asked about transport disposal fees. Mr. Barrett said it would be from Metro Central and they would move the material as often as they filled the containers. Councilor Newman suggested that they didn't want to repeat the lentil experience. He was concerned about smell impact. Councilor Park asked about credits and disposal costs. Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling, explained the assumptions. Councilors talked about source-separated issues. Councilor Newman asked about what point was the decision as to when you called it organic. Mr. Barrett indicated that it would be when it was tipped on the floor. Most of the contamination would be seen when it was dumped on the floor.

Mr. Hogle said there would be three pieces of legislation coming forward. Mr. Barrett explained further the legislation. Councilor Park asked about comparison of other recovery. Mr. Hogle said they had a draft. Councilor Park felt this would be helpful information. Councilor Newman asked about contingencies if the waste was too contaminated. Mr. Barrett responded to his question.

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(D) FOR THE PURPOSE OF DELIBERATING WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO CONDUCT LABOR NEGOTIATIONS.

Time Began: 3:34

Members Present: Ruth Scott, Kevin Dull, Laura Oppenheimer, Metro Councilors, Dan Cooper

Time Ended: 4:05

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

There were none.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Metro Council Meeting

01/20/04

Page 5

Councilor Hosticka said he participated in a panel concerning Goal 5, which had been video taped. The tape would be available for other Councilors use.

Councilor Burkholder said he was doing a presentation at SMART Growth Conference. He also talked about the enhancement grant program. They did not have to do a resolution. The committee went ahead with approval.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 20,
2004**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
2	Letters	12/9/03	Letters and Table To: Metro Council From: Marion County Commissioners, City of Woodburn, City of Donald, City of Wilsonville, and 2003 Industrial Land Goal 14 Analysis Summary Re: Industrial Lands issue	012004c-01
3	Power Point	1/20/04	To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach Re: Goal 5 Preliminary Regulatory Options Description	012004c-02
4	Organics Information	1/20/04	To: Metro Council From: Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Department Re: Food Waste Recovery: Economic and Fiscal	012004c-03