

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL BUDGET BRIEFINGS

Wednesday, March 24, 2004  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Budget Work Session Meeting at 1:31 p.m.

### **Introductory comments:**

Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer, provided introductory comments, saying that last week they presented on Parks and Central Services budgets for 2004-05. He said next week they will discuss the Oregon Zoo and the Metropolitan Exposition and Recreation Commission (MERC). He said they would also discuss Public Employee Retirement System planning. He said this week they are briefing the Council on Planning and Solid Waste.

### **1. PLANNING**

Kathy Rutkowski, Financial Planning Division Budget Coordinator, presented a financial review of the Planning Fund budget, beginning on p. 33 of the Proposed Budget 2004-05 Department Submissions Reviews document previously provided to Councilors (a copy of which is included in the record). The Planning Fund in total is approximately \$18.5 million dollars. Starting with resources, the fund balance is down from the current year. The budget shows a significant reduction in grants, primarily due to a technical change. The money Metro receives from TriMet for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) funds were classified as grants in the current fiscal year, and in next year's budget they are classified as a contract. There is an increase for the Regional Travel Options from Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for approximately \$564,000, and an increase in South Corridor funds for approximately \$421,000. Reductions in other support areas are also included, such as the Damascus area planning program, I-5 Transportation Trade Partnership, and the South Corridor Project. Those three represent a reduction of approximately \$643,000 dollars.

Ms. Rutkowski said interest income shown is from Transit Oriented Development (TOD) funds and should be shown as fund balance, not revenue. The staff plans to do a technical amendment to correct that.

She said the budget shows two interfund transfers:

- 1) Internal Service transfers--Solid Waste is down \$100,000, and is made up by the increase of \$87,000 now coming from Parks.
- 2) The other big transfer is fund equity transfer, which is the transfer of excise tax from the general fund to the planning fund. The base excise tax is actually remaining flat.

She also detailed expenditures. Although resources are remaining flat, some rising costs are rising, particularly in the personal services area. She reviewed the net 6.1 full-time equivalencies (FTE) net Planning reductions from 12 position changes, which she identified (page 34).

Management of the public affairs staff is being transferred to the Public Affairs Director. The budget will remain in the Planning Fund, in order to maintain funding, but the direct responsibility will be in Public Affairs.

Personal Services in the budget does include Public Employee Retirement Services (PERS) reserve, but it is a PERS reserve on non-grant funded positions. Materials and Services is the one area that reflects an increase. Most line items show a reduction, except in Professional Services and Purchased Services. Both areas of increase are due in large part to expanding the Regional Travel Options program. Some increases in Professional Services are attributable to a household survey. Reductions are in areas such as the Comprehensive Plan, Highway 217, Goal 5, Periodic Review and \$100,000 reduction anticipated in the TOD Program purchases.

Councilor McLain asked about budget note number one on page 35 referring to the Travel Options Program. She asked if it retains the opportunity to contract out work, going from in-house to contract work. Council President Bragdon clarified that it represents a new program.

There are reductions in debt service and interfund loan repayment. Both of those are related to the financial computer systems. The debt service is the last year.

Interfund reimbursements and interfund transfers are charges that the planning fund pays for central services, determined by the cost allocation plan. They have had a reduction in allowable charges for grants.

Contingency does appear to be considerably higher this year, but is actually a result of placing fringe costs in a different category.

The Planning fund more than any other budget is really project focused. She cited some of the major changes, including reductions in Goal 5 and Periodic review, and a greatly expanded regional travel options program.

The Council President has included two budget notes in the Planning Budget that refer to the travel options program and the affordable housing program, with some contracts subject to Council approval.

Council President Bragdon asked for a briefing on the revenue implications of the Data Resources Center (DRC). He said if we don't keep it up, it's a matter of losing revenue as well. Ms. Rutkowski explained that the Data Resources Center uses revenues it receives from other departments, so that they can update and maintain data, and in turn sell it to outside sources. If they don't update their data, it is not current and they cannot easily sell it. If revenue from Metro departments is reduced, they are not able to update and maintain the data as current. Council President Bragdon said if we lose internal customers, we also lose external customers. Councilor McLain cited an example of the Regional Water Supply Consortium always needing data more quickly. She feels the DRC storefront will really suffer if we don't put enough money into it.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, presented the Planning Department plans and programs for the next year. The big theme program changes include redirection from Goal 5 development to Goal 5 implementation and the housing issue that has been on the back burner for a few years.

The Planning Director position is in contingency tied to the strategic planning process that is just now gearing up. He intends to come back to review staff needs once the planning is completed.

He also referred to the House Subcommittee on Transportation passing a bill today. It is an unsettled issue in Washington, D.C., and Metro won't know about funding until that is settled.

Mr. Cotugno said in yesterday's Prep Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (Prep JPACT) meeting, they discussed rethinking the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) function. They have some work to do to scope out what they need to do. It is not accounted for yet in the proposed budget. At Prep JPACT, they also discussed rethinking whether or not to undertake the update of the RTP, or instead rewrite that resource into transportation-related support functions. They have some more work to do to define what they want to do, but Mr. Cotugno feels that may be a good idea.

Councilor Park asked Councilor Burkholder to clarify the issue. Councilor Burkholder clarified that Metro would like the schedule to be one that makes sense for Metro, and not necessarily one dictated by the state or the federal government. Metro will have to follow the schedule for the federal government. With the state schedule, Metro has more flexibility, and the current idea is to do it within the next couple of years, but 2010-2011. His question is why would we adopt transportation policy update before we look at our land use more thoroughly. We should first look at the land use, and then design the transportation system around that. The RTP on the state level is a land use action. He said it made more sense to adopt the Big Look and then decide about the RTP process, instead of having to adopt a pre-Big Look RTP and then have to come back and do it again after the Big Look. The question is why do we need to do that?

Council President Bragdon concurred that it was a good idea.

Mr. Cotugno, said generally yes it could work, but Metro would have to work it out with the other participants in the RTP process, and make sure no outstanding RTP update issues exist with the jurisdictions.

Councilor Park said he thinks it makes good sense, especially if we go through the Big Look and do a lot of talking with the public about how you service this, and then if we were going to do a transportation investment package, that seems like it would all roll together in the conversation with the general public in such a way that you could educate and support why we're doing it, to support this land use and this transportation package, and this is what it is going to cost.

Council President Bragdon asked if Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) could be integrated with this at all. He said it seems like it should be the same sort of a focus. Mr. Cotugno said we are in an MTIP process now. Councilor Park said it would be too late for the 2005 MTIP, but okay for the 2007 MTIP.

Council President Bragdon asked if the unit of folks who work on the RTP would be able to have the Big Look integration. Mr. Cotugno answered yes.

Councilor McLain asked if there is any way to take the program descriptions and show what the enhancements might be. Mr. Cotugno said the list of enhancements he had previously provided still stand. The base budget essentially funds staff. This would allow transportation staff to be more focused on that activity for planning and research. The consultant support was to provide for things like the Calthorpe support, outreach brochures, etc. Mr. Cotugno agreed to sort out the changes with Councilor McLain later.

Councilor Monroe concurred that doing the Big Look before revising the Regional Transportation Plan makes sense. He continued, saying that Metro does not know what the federal government will do and whether they will support a six-year plan. Or whether they will do a one-year or two-year extension of the current program as they have done. In respect to our ongoing light rail network-building project, funding is pretty close to being in place for 2005, but for phase two Milwaukie, it is not. We will need to be ready and identify local resources if we are going to be going after that funding in 2006-2007, getting ready for starting construction in 2009 when phase one is completed. So the transportation task force is dealing with those issues. All this relates to whether Metro will go for a regional vote in 2006 or 2008. Discussion yesterday indicated that if Metro wants to stay on track, 2008 may be too late, but some people prefer 2008 because it is a presidential year. We will need cooperation with all partners, including the business community to make it all happen in a timely way.

Mr. Cotugno said the Land Conservation Development Commission has announced their intent to award planning grants. They have \$1.5 million available. Planning staff is contemplating now what would be the most competitive application. Council President Bragdon asked what was the state Land Conservation and Development Commission's (LCDC's) source of funds. Mr. Cotugno said it was general fund monies. Historically they have provided grants in the \$35,000 range, but they indicated they might award more this time. Metro will consider what to apply for. Mr. Cotugno thought the Big Look activities should be attractive for that funding.

Mr. Cotugno talked about shifting half of an FTE from the Centers program to the Transportation Oriented Development program.

Councilor McLain asked about connections to Vancouver, and felt that coordination should be reflected in the base work. Mr. Cotugno said that is firmly in the base work.

Council President Bragdon asked Councilor Burkholder to comment on knitting this together with strategic planning. Councilor Burkholder said both the department and Council are interested in doing their own strategic planning, and Councilor Burkholder said they should be coordinated and done in parallel together. He suggested that if they hire outside assistance for that project, it may be good to hire the same person or firm to provide that assistance, so the thinking is the same and understood.

Councilor Park talked about the money Councilor Burkholder was referring to. The original agreement put together with Metro and the industry has a baseline of \$5.7 million. All the estimates were that it would never drop below this particular line. There was approximately one quarter million dollars that were under-collected in the first year from what was supposed to be collected. It was possible to take it back last year, except for the fact that Metro had to use that money for the recycling program instead. So the Council has let it carry ahead, and he doesn't know where it is at now. It appears it is still short.

Mr. Cotugno said he is interested in tackling with the strategic planning process the roles and responsibilities of the department, as well as the coordination with outside agencies and their work programs. Council President Bragdon clarified that it is on the calendar and that it would be good to get it jump-started this spring.

Councilor McLain asked about the cost allocation plan and will get clarification later.

Councilor Park asked about reconciling the changes, and asked if another briefing paper would be provided. Mr. Cotugno agreed to meet with Councilor Park later.

## **2. SOLID WASTE**

Karen Feher, Financial Planning Division CIP Coordinator, presented the Solid Waste budget highlights. She provided a replacement chart for page 54 to the Proposed Budget Fiscal Year 2004-05 Department Submission Reviews document previously submitted by the Finance Department (copies of which are included in the record) that shows potential and actual cuts. Councilor Susan McLain asked if it was what Council President Bragdon had chosen, and Chief Financial Officer Bill Stringer clarified that it was.

Ms. Feher summarized her report. Solid Waste Enterprise Revenue is expected to decline approximately 1.5% from the current year. This is from the continued shift in Metro tonnage to other facilities and a reduction in the transaction related to that shift in tonnage. Overall regional tonnage is expected to increase approximately 19,000 tons, but Metro tonnage will be dropping about 16,000 tons, and other facilities will be going up approximately 35,000 tons. The Metro facilities transactions related to this drop or shift in tonnage is about a decrease of 7,000 tons

Expenditures are expected to drop approximately \$2.9 million. This change is partially the result of disposal costs affected by the shift in tonnage, but also the austere emissions that have been implemented in this budget and last year's budget.

The department was instructed to identify 15% savings from their current budget, and they reached that task. They went over their budget with the values statement direction from Council last year. The end result was identification of approximately \$2.7 million of potential cuts, of which \$1.5 million were implemented. Overall changes from those implementations were the elimination of the home compost bin program (page 56) and 1.0 associated FTE.

Councilor Hosticka asked for clarification of the language, since he understood that nothing had had actually been implemented. Ms. Feher clarified that she is referring to the proposed budget, that nothing has been implemented, and it will not happen until the Council approves it.

Councilor McLain asked for clarification that the compost bin program was proposed to be cut, and Ms. Feher confirmed that it was.

Ms. Feher said the proposed budget has no money for the food waste recovery program with the exception of the existing funding for the organic food waste infrastructure grant program.

They proposed a one hour delayed opening at Metro Central so that they could cut one FTE, with the new opening time at 8 a.m. Councilor McLain clarified that it would still be seven days a week. Commercial haulers could still get through earlier on the automated system; just the public would have to wait until the 8 a.m. opening.

Ms. Feher cited reductions in the administration FTE and consultants to the department, including a transfer to the Finance and Administration Department for the use of the construction manager. That is included in the half FTE in the reduction.

Councilor McLain asked about that FTE and centralizing or decentralizing the contract function.

Mr. Stringer clarified that the position would be contingent on the excise tax increase. If the excise tax increase is approved, the FTE would be transferred to Parks. Councilor McLain asked if it could be used by all the departments with the cost allocation system. Ms. Feher indicated that in the last couple of years, Solid Waste and Parks have each paid for half of this FTE. She said that at one time, the Oregon Zoo paid for all of this person. It is not cost allocated in the same way. Instead they usually find dedicated projects before they commit to the FTE. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, said it is a bill-for-service issue. He said Parks feels comfortable picking up this cost because they expect this person to be busy. He said they could have a logistical problem with Solid Waste being unable to get any of their time on a bill-for-service basis.

Council President Bragdon said Solid Waste's need for these services has diminished because of completion of the work. Councilor McLain they have always looked to see which department has the biggest workload, and that FTE usually gets put in that department. She is okay with that as long as they have made realistic estimates of what some of those other departments need. She asked for more narration from the departments. Ms. Feher clarified that the Oregon Zoo has a full-time construction manager. Councilor McLain clarified that the FTE is going to Parks this time, and she agreed to look at it more later with Ms. Feher's assistance.

Ms. Feher reviewed the department issues (page 56). She referred to the changes the Rate Review Committee may propose. If adopted, it will shift cost recovery from the Regional System Fee to the Metro Transaction Fee or the tip fee (Metro Disposal Fee). The Committee's proposal may also introduce a new third fee, to be implemented in a year, aimed at capturing the costs to Metro of privately owned facilities.

Councilor McLain indicated that she understood that you cannot do one of their recommendations without the other. If you take something out from one place, then someone has to pay for it. Councilor McLain asked if Ms. Feher was saying that this budget was assuming that both of those elements would be displayed, not just 50% of it. Ms. Feher said no, and clarified that she is saying it is an issue in passing the proposed budget, and the budget assumes the status quo, just like they have always done it.

Council President Bragdon said it is why they want to synchronize up the revenue rate-making piece chronologically with this, because it is so interdependent.

Councilor Hosticka said he has trouble understanding the overall philosophy of this budget. He sees that the bulk of what is being cut is outreach programs, that is activities that Metro does that impacts people in their communities. But when he looks at personal services on page 53, it says personal services are going up. If he is characterizing it accurately, he said it causes him heartburn with the messages Metro seems to be sending with this, and the type of policy they seem to be setting in this. He cited the home composting program being gone, general outreach reduced, technical consulting, etc. He said he didn't know what it is we are doing in this budget. He asked to know from a policy perspective what is involved.

Councilor Park also asked for clarification on the FTE reduction. Councilor Hosticka clarified that although the FTE are reduced, he was asking about how much money the proposed budget has Metro spending on personal services on page 53. He noted that that total number has actually gone up about 3%.

Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste Director, responded. He provided a color handout, a copy of which is included in the record, and reviewed the graphs. He agreed with Councilor Hosticka that the

personnel services are up approximately \$300,000. That reflects that personnel step and merit increases are represented in the budget, and would have been higher if they had not reduced the FTE. Health care and other costs incorporated in personal services have also caused it to rise. He detailed the various proposed FTE cuts.

Councilor Burkholder referred to page 58 of the budget department summaries. He noted that President Bragdon had asked the department to look at programs and question whether Metro is still getting results from programs they are putting money into. He noted the home composting program came out under cost-effectiveness criteria (#2), that if this program was continued or stopped, there wouldn't be a change in people's behavior. This indicates that the program is mature; it is established in people's minds, and Metro does not need to continue putting money into it.

Mr. Hoglund agreed that page 58 lays out the criteria used in looking at the reductions they were asked to make. These included how critical something was to the Solid Waste and Recycling mission, its cost-effectiveness, whether it was reducible, and how does the priority rank within the mission. He cited the home billboard program that could have fewer billboards. Each tier had its own theme. Tier 1 cuts had the theme of eliminating non-core program and reduce administration and overhead. Tier 2 looked at mature programs that could survive on their own or had reached the milestone for accepting them. He cited the example of the home composting program with which they wanted a penetration of 15% of the households in the region, and this spring they estimate they will reach that. They also looked at eliminating early development programs that they think they have spent a lot of time on and have not gotten a lot of results. He sees that this could be controversial. He noted the stewardship program and some involvement in the electronics areas where they have spent a lot of time and money, and do not have a scale yet for determining the benefit of our participation in the program. It is something they want to monitor and look at for future budgets. They also looked at cost-benefits in Tier 2. In Tier 3 they looked at reducing some elements of programs and in Tier 4 they looked at wholesale reductions of programs.

Councilor Burkholder agreed with Councilor Hosticka that the appearance of the proposed budget and cuts is of concern. He thought it was best to show the analysis strategy for making the proposed cuts, to explain the cuts. He felt like this does explain that. Councilor Hosticka said it would be helpful to know the other great programs Metro is not cutting, so that people don't focus strictly on the cuts.

Council President Bragdon said that Councilor Hosticka had identified a question that is true agency-wide about personal services going up, even as output and FTE goes down. He said it is the same answer as for Planning, because of the insurance and PERS.

Councilor McLain said she appreciated the comments from Councilors Hosticka and Burkholder. She asked the Council to remember that this is the department's look at it. She said she will be asking, when she reviews it herself, how did the department come to understand it as being cost-effective reductions or how did the department make the cost reduction choices with the criteria listed. She cited the home compost bin sale and the success of that program, and how people still buy almost all the stock Metro has each year. She said it appears that the need and desire for those bins is still out there, otherwise Metro would have more excess bins. She said Metro has few left and they had to recently hunt to find one to contribute to an auction. Council President Bragdon suggested that this means Metro is not charging enough. Councilor McLain indicated that studies

had been done on the price, and although they may hit 15% penetration, food composting is still the in the top three waste streams that Metro still has to control.

She also referred to the school billboard program, that schools like. She asked how many other programs does Metro have with 600 to 1,500 young people participating in it? She asked where are the other programs for youngsters, other than the puppet show. She said there are questions to be asked.

She also referred to the Environmental Action Team (ENACT) program and that Metro is not completely sustainable yet and has many areas where it can work on its own sustainability. She referred to the proposed cuts to ENACT, putting less Solid Waste money into it and more from other departments (although she has not found those additions yet). She asked if Metro is truly going to follow the resolution the Council approved, then why are they cutting the ENACT program? She wants to make sure that what is being cut are the best programs to cut. She said that the Council needs to analyze whether or not those 15 programs that were cut by the department were the best 15 to cut.

Councilor Hosticka suggested that it might be helpful to know what other programs Metro is doing.

Mr. Hogle listed the other Solid Waste and Recycling programs that will remain.

Councilor Hosticka again referred to the budget document and tried to see how his constituents would come in contact with Metro's Solid Waste department. When people take out their trash, they don't know that that includes Metro. But they can see billboards when they are driving, they can see the composting program, the hazardous waste round-up program, etc. He wanted a description of those types of programs. He said the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update is not going to turn on any of his constituents when they ask him where Metro is spending its money. Mr. Hogle noted that the Recycling Information Center and the hazardous waste facilities, although some are contracted out, they provide direct contacts of Metro facility personnel with the public. Council President Bragdon said that Councilor Hosticka would not find such references in the budget document they are currently reviewing, but rather in the larger budget book. Mr. Hogle also cited the construction toolbox kit program to cut construction waste. He clarified that that program was in Tier 2, but that it had not been cut. Councilor McLain agreed with Councilor Hosticka that the hands-on programs with the general public are very important. She does not think that the general public is going to think that some things like the illegal dumping program is important. Washington County, for example, does not even allow Metro to have that program in its county. It does not deal with children, schools or the general public. The general public goes by the billboards and sees them. She is concerned that we've cut the programs that are most visible to the public and most liked. Council President Bragdon and Mr. Hogle said those outreach programs are in the big budget book. Mr. Hogle said he would get an itemized list of outreach program and billboard reduction numbers. Council President Bragdon also said that Clear Channel is donating some of the billboards that made up part of the difference.

Councilor Park asked about whether any documentation was done on the cost effectiveness in the first hour of operation at the transfer stations. Mr. Hogle answered that it was three customers per hour. It goes up after the first hour. Councilor Park wanted to make sure it was documented. He suggested that some of the programs have gone through a whole generation of people who had seen it. He suggested that maybe it should be reviewed in four or five years to see if there is



another generation that we can help educate and bring along. With people moving in and out of the area, some of the programs may be cyclical. For example, a quarter of the population that is here now, was here in 1973. It may be best to bring some programs up in cycles.

Mr. Hoglund said they wanted to see how the bin sales go this year, and some cut programs may be reincarnated in a different form in later years.

Councilor Burkholder asked about the enhancement grants. He was approached by the group that runs the speedway and asked about disbursing the grant funds. Mr. Hoglund said they have considered different management models of the enhancement grant program. Councilor McLain said that the Central Transfer Station grant program has been the most well run, professional group, and she wanted to see Forest Grove and Oregon City sites run more like Central. She wanted everyone to understand that that one had been successful. She said Metro gets many complaints from citizens in Forest Grove and Oregon City that those sites do not have enough oversight and are not being used for the purpose that Metro set them out to be used for. She wants to make sure we don't take away what is running well. Councilor Burkholder suggested that it was an idea to review the grants programs in general and make some recommendations. Councilor McLain said they had asked for that about two years ago, and had been told that Karen Blauer coming from Public Affairs to Solid Waste would be helping to provide those services. Mr. Hoglund said they could provide follow-up materials for the Council on this issue.

Councilor Hosticka said he thinks we need regional equity on the enhancement grants. Councilor McLain said they would need to talk to the private owners.

Mike Hoglund said they looked at the ENACT budget and programs, and that it was not Solid Waste's recommendation that ENACT would go away. The Solid Waste and Recycling department would provide its share for waste-related programs, but for other ENACT programs, other departments should kick in their share. Councilor McLain said they money budgeted for ENACT last year was not enough for the Solid Waste programs, let alone transportation, parks, facilities, etc. She agrees with the philosophy that every department should be doing some ENACT too, but we don't have enough in the Solid Waste budget to really do ENACT. She feels Metro is just pacing itself.

Council President Bragdon asked if Mr. Hoglund wanted to address the Data Resources Center (DRC) allocation question. He understood that Mr. Hoglund's department felt that they were overpaying and that they didn't feel like they needed as many services as they buy. Mr. Hoglund said they had been subsidizing the DRC by \$100,000 per year. Council President Bragdon noted that a change from that is what created the need to get more funds from Parks and elsewhere.

Councilor Burkholder said departmental cost allocations should be part of the strategic planning discussion.

Mr. Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, responded to Councilor Hosticka's question and said that in the existing budget, it is difficult to tell the remaining programs and level of service. He said he felt that Councilor Hosticka had picked up on something they need to work hard on. It is not currently presented in a programmatic format. They can do a better job of showing the Council what programs will be left after the cuts. Council President Bragdon agreed.

Councilor Monroe said he continues to be concerned about the regional system fee credit. He said the Council has been wrestling with it for a year. He wants to make sure the dollars meet a policy

objective. He said that looking at this budget, it doesn't look like we've learned anything this last year.

Mr. Hogle said the policy is to maintain and increase the overall tonnage collected at covered facilities, but to understand that there is a shift in rates, affect of changes in the tipping fee, and would provide more details at an upcoming session. Councilor Monroe said he noticed the number \$450,000, which is the number they started with last year.

Councilor McLain referred to page 55 and said she had seen another document previously provided by Karen Blauer of Solid Waste and Recycling that showed the 2001 and 2002 program actual spending on a program level. She said it was helpful.

Mr. Jordan said the material presented today was during the process of generation and was very detailed. It talked about criteria and impacts and gave explanations for every number that was in the chart. He said that should be in the Councilors' summary booklet. Council President Bragdon said that was basically pages 62 through 71. Mr. Jordan said he feels it is still difficult to discern out of that what programs are remaining. Mr. Stringer said that they need to update that chart.

Mr. Hogle referred to page 64, Tier One Reduction Package Details. It described the area of reduction, the program purpose, the constituent and the consequences of the reduction. He said they could do that in reverse and say what is remaining, who is the constituent and what is the benefit of that program. Council President Bragdon agreed that that would be helpful.

Councilor Park asked about the regional system credit fee question that Councilor Monroe brought up. He asked if the session on April 2 would connect the dots with other programs. Mr. Hogle listed some of the items that will be covered.

Councilor Park asked if they had identified any holes left in the system, in terms of where we use the recycling credits to track something and where it goes. Mr. Jordan said they are trying to figure out the behavioral tendencies.

Council President Bragdon said he feels Solid Waste and Recycling did a good job in the rigors, filters and values they went through to prepare the budget.

Mr. Stringer said they would cover the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the Oregon Zoo next week.

### **3. GENERAL COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Councilor Park asked about the federal bill mark up. He said it is \$275 billion, six years and Earl got his \$45 million. Council President Bragdon said it sounded like really good news. Councilor Monroe said it was Senate Bill 318.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m.

Metro Council Budget Briefing

03/24/04

Page 11

Prepared by,

Linnea Nelson

Council Support Specialist

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 24,  
2004**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1. and 2.	Budget Summary	Fiscal Year 2004-05	Proposed Budget Fiscal Year 2004-05 Department Submission Reviews	032404cbudget-01
2.	Budget Summary	03-24-2004	Summary – Cut Packages based on Council President’s Direction, Solid Waste and Recycling Department	0324094cbudget-02
2.	Budget Summary chart correction (page 54)	No date	No title. Two charts provided as a replacement for the charts listed on page 54 of the Proposed Budget Fiscal Year 2004-05 Department Submission Reviews booklet. The charts list Solid Waste and Recycling resources and the Metro Tip Fee for various fiscal years.	0324094cbudget-03
2.	Budget graphs	03-24-2004	Solid Waste and Recycling 5-year Budget Graphs: REM Adopted Opg Budget & Requested '04-05, 2 charts; Budgeted FTE by Location chart.	0324094cbudget-04