

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLANNING

Thursday, July 29, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Others Present: Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer; Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer; Mike Wetter, Senior Policy Advisor; Dan Cooper, Senior Metro Attorney; Paul Couey, Data Resource Center; Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director; Teri Dresler, Oregon Zoo Guest Services Manager; Casey Short, Financial Planning Division Manager; Andy Cotugno, Planning Director; Jenny Kirk, Planning Admin/Finance Manager; Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling Financial Analyst Manager; Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Program and Policy Manager; Mike Hogle, Solid Waste and Recycling Director; Jim Desmond, Parks and Greenspaces Director; Kate Marx, Public Affairs and Government Relations Director; Randy Tucker, Legislative Affairs Manager; Financial planning staff

Mike Wetter convened the Metro Council Strategic Planning Meeting at 1:14 p.m.

Mr. Wetter said that today they will look at “how” Metro will achieve its goals. Today’s goals are more related to the natural resource area. The following goals and objectives were developed by Council on July 13.

Develop Objectives Related to Program Goals (Continued)

1. Review, add, and edit objectives related to the following goals

- **Protect and restore the natural environment, and integrate the natural and urban landscapes.**
 1. Increase the populations of desired species in an appropriate balance
 2. Reduce pollution of air, water and soil
 3. Increase the acreage of open spaces and fish and wildlife habitat that is protected from development
 4. Increase the acreage of open spaces and fish and wildlife habitat that has been restored
 5. Increase the acreage of natural areas and open spaces that Metro manages

Discussion followed about the first objective. Mr. Vecchio pointed out that merely increasing species may not be the desired effect, but the goal should be an appropriate balance. Mr. Wetter asked Mr. Vecchio to edit and create an appropriately worded objective.

Councilor Burkholder spoke to the overlapping nature of many of these objectives and suggested adding a 6th bullet: *Green the urban environment (tree canopy, etc.)*

Councilor Monroe disagreed with Objective #5 – it’s often more effective to develop partnerships with other agencies to manage properties.

Councilor Hosticka said that the outcome that we want is properly functioning habitat – some of it by protecting and some by restoring – combine #3 and 4. Mr. Desmond said that habitat could be protected through a variety of tools - acquisition, private ownership, etc.

Mr. Cooper said the when we talked about the economy, we didn't mention maintaining proper air, water, and soil quality, which are economic as well as environmental concerns. This needs to be revisited in terms of economic development.

Mr. Vecchio was concerned about the danger of separating habitat from the rest of our world. He recommended using words like integration, balance, connection, planning to help people realize that it's all connected. We need a more encompassing view of the natural world. He asked for further explanation of the goal.

Councilor Burkholder said it was important to mention access to nature, relating to the integration piece, how nature fits into people's lives. Mr. Wetter asked if the desired outcome was access for people or integration between people and nature (proximity). Discussion followed. An objective was added:

6. Available, equitable, close to live & work, proximity

Councilor Monroe said that what we're looking for is people-friendly kinds of development and access to and increase in open spaces, an integration of development and natural areas.

Councilor Hosticka said the real test will be the implementation of the Tualatin Basin plan.

Mr. Vecchio said that some of the things he said would make more sense in an educational goal.

Mr. Short asked if we wanted to build something in regarding improving the development part. Discussion followed of the need to promote eco-friendly building and development.

Regarding #5, discussion followed about whether it referred to publicly owned property, Metro-owned, or simply public access. General agreement occurred that ownership isn't as important as public access. Mr. Wetter summarized that what we're after is protecting, restoring, and maintaining public access. #5 becomes "Increase the acreage and opportunity for public access to natural areas"

- **Inspire the region to create a better future for wildlife.**
 1. Raise awareness of fish, wildlife and natural areas and the ways in which residents can help protect and restore them
 2. Increase opportunities for resident support of and participation in environmental stewardship activities.

Councilor Burkholder asked if these were goals for the Zoo or for Metro in general. Mr. Vecchio said that raising awareness isn't enough – it should inspire action or involvement. Councilor Hosticka said that it shouldn't refer only to the Zoo because it gives Metro the opportunity to integrate these goals elsewhere. Discussion followed about whether to make the goal increasing volunteer participation or increasing the opportunity for involvement.

The group discussed the definition of “region”. Mr. Vecchio clarified that “region” is geography, “community” is the people.

Mr. Wetter made the following change to the Goals and objective list: ***Increase resident support of and participation in environmental stewardship activities.***

Inspire our community to create a better future for wildlife.

Councilor Burkholder said that we should discuss raising people’s awareness of their impact on wildlife and the environment. Mr. Wetter added the following objective: ***Changing daily behavior, impact of behavior, reducing the footprint***

Councilor Hosticka asked to flag the concept of “reducing the footprint” and add it to other agency goals. Councilor Burkholder talked about the use of the word “inspire”, that it imposes an incredible challenge.

Councilor Newman talked about somewhere including the fun and entertaining part of visiting the Zoo, not just the educational goals. Don’t create an institution that is boring – “all broccoli and no dessert”. Ms. Marx suggested adding a multi-generational target to the objectives. Mr. Wetter said that a lot of this could be accomplished at the program level.

Councilor Burkholder said that a lot of this discussion relates to the operational goal of communicating with area residents.

Ms. Dresler changed the following objective to read: ***Raise awareness of the natural world and the ways in which residents can help protect and restore them.***

Ms. Marx asked about the global vs. local aspect. Mr. Vecchio said that Zoos have missed the point in the past by focusing only on exotic species. You need to help people make the connection to nature and the local by including local species.

- **Ensure an effective, economical, and environmentally sound solid waste system.**
 1. Minimize the impact of the region’s waste stream on the environment
 2. Minimize rates
 3. Reduce regulatory redundancy with other governments.

Councilor Hosticka disagreed that minimizing rates was a Metro objective. Mr. Wetter included it as a measure of value. Mr. Hoglund said that it was a value, just not one of the highest priority. The goal is to maintain reasonable rates and an adequate and stable revenue. Discussion followed around the term “reasonable” – is it too subjective? Councilor Hosticka said that our goal should be to charge as much as we can in order to maintain services in other areas.

Mr. Anderson said that we can’t minimize rates in a vacuum, but must be related to maintaining a high service level. Councilor Hosticka said we should be thinking like a business and charge as much as the market allows. Mr. Anderson asked the question of whether the rate includes the excise tax.

Councilor Monroe added that it is often cheaper to bury waste instead of recycling, so perhaps keeping rates low isn’t an objective. Mr. Hoglund suggested including mention of

maintaining predictable rates. Councilor Burkholder said to stress optimizing the value of the system.

Ms. Matthews said that they also covered this goal in the discussion and set of goals for solid waste on Tuesday, so there is a redundancy. Changed goal to read *Ensure an effective, efficient and environmentally sound solid waste disposal system*. Discussion followed on whether Metro goal should be related to disposal or waste management. Mr. Wetter pointed out that we don't have goals specifically for other departments – do we need this goal? Mr. Anderson said that it relates to previous goals and provides system coherence. SW&R directly affects disposal and indirectly affects waste reduction through education.

Councilor Hosticka applied the term “footprint” to this goal as well. He asked about the terms applied to our solid waste system – “social service” or “enterprise” – because our goals would change depending on the view of the function of the solid waste department, providing a service or making money. Mr. Jordan asked whether the utility model would apply to this.

Councilor Burkholder suggested switching the goal and the first objective – that minimizing the impact is actually the goal. The real goal is not to run a good solid waste system but to minimize the waste stream. Councilor Hosticka asked whether we are trying to minimize costs or maximize benefits.

Councilor Monroe said our goal should be maximizing recycling and reducing the amount of waste. Councilor Newman said the larger term of sustainability could be used in this goal. Mr. Short asked if the ultimate goal wasn't to get rid of the need for the solid waste department? Mr. Wetter suggested that they move on and get back to this goal and objectives. There seemed to be very different views of the goals. Councilor Burkholder said that setting a goal could guide the development of the solid waste management plan. Councilor Park said if Metro focuses on reduce and reuse, there won't be anything to recycle and we won't make it to the 62% recycle rate. Are we measuring the right things?

Mr. Hogle suggested taking minimizing the impact as the goal, but work in the efficiency and effectiveness factors, but add raising awareness about recycling. Councilor Park said that we need to look at the impact on the economy. Mr. Hogle was concerned about the goals of the solid waste department being split apart in two separate areas.

Councilor Burkholder said Metro is known for being a pioneer in waste reduction, and suggested adding something about innovation. Councilor Newman said we could add the goal of making Metro the most sustainable region in the nation. Mr. Wetter will work with Mr. Hogle and come back to the larger group with some revisions.

- **Ensure artistic, cultural and recreational opportunities for the region's residents.**
 1. Increase the acreage of parkland available for public enjoyment.
 2. Increase trails, restrooms, boat ramps, and other recreational infrastructure
 3. Maintain the number and diversity of performing arts, convention, trade and exhibition events

Discussion followed about the meaning of parkland. Mr. Cooper said that so far Metro has not had a role in “active parks” – e.g., soccer fields, swimming pools, etc. We should clarify if the goal is to develop and manage these “active parks” or the greenspaces, trails and boat ramps that Metro has traditionally managed. Mr. Desmond said that the term ensure could mean that local partners could be the ones implementing the goals and managing community

centers, neighborhood parks, etc. Mr. Vecchio said that it is going to be increasingly important to work with local partners.

Mr. Hoglund suggested deleting “restroom” from second objective. Discussion followed about the issue of access. Mr. Cooper said that the Title 12 language referred to parks being accessible, and interspersed in neighborhoods. There is no clear direction to what local governments should do. Councilor Park suggested including the accessibility and proximity issue in the goal. Mr. Desmond said reference to parkland is ambiguous – could refer just to neighborhood parks. Council President Bragdon said that the goal should include the range of recreational opportunities in the region, not just those within Metro’s portfolio. Councilor Park said that natural spaces and recreational parks are distinct issues and should be separated. Council President Bragdon said that we should leave it general to allow the range of activities and flexibility.

Objective was changed to include the following concepts: ***Increase the acreage of parkland, opportunities, availability, proximity available for public enjoyment***

Council President Bragdon said that it is difficult to measure level of service. Mr. Desmond said that several years ago a TAC tried to define that, but it varied by makeup of community, and they dropped the attempt. Mr. Wetter and Mr. Desmond will continue to work on the language.

Mr. Cooper talked about the third objective – by mentioning the word “events” we’re taking on new responsibilities. Council President Bragdon said we need to distinguish between content and venue. Objective was changed to read ***Maintain the number and diversity of regional performing arts, convention, trade and exhibition venues.*** Council President Bragdon said that we need to include reference to providing opportunities for the spectators, not the artists.

An objective was added to include: ***Provide opportunities to experience artistic and cultural expression ...*** and the objective referring to venues was moved to the next goal.

Mr. Vecchio said that this Zoo has more other experiences than just animals (e.g., plants, geography, history, art, etc.) woven into the experience than any other Zoo in the nation – and they want to continue to do more. It is included in another goal. That objective will be added to the current goal as well. Mr. Vecchio said to add another objective relating to accessibility and equity.

- **Lead in public facility management in the region.**
 1. Maintain asset value of facilities through preventative maintenance, monitoring, and fully funding R&R reserve
 2. Increase the facilities portfolio

Mr. Wetter said the discussion today needs to focus on facilities other than MERC. Councilor Newman objected to the goal of increasing facilities, rather than being open to new opportunities.

Councilor Park suggested striking the word “public” in the goal, setting the goal of leading for all facilities. Councilor Burkholder suggested conferring with MERC before making changes.

Mr. Cooper said that the narrow reading was how to manage the facilities that we have, not how to acquire or manage new facilities. Mr. Anderson said that on Tuesday we talked about maintaining the flexibility. Councilor Park clarified that he would like to see Metro be the best in managing facilities that the public uses, as good or better than the private side. Mr. Vecchio suggested changing the wording to read, "facilities open to the public".

Councilor Burkholder said to add a customer satisfaction objective. The objective of increasing the facility portfolio was deleted. Councilor McLain agreed that the measure should relate to the kind of experience that the public has at our facilities. Mr. Vecchio added "guest services" to the customer satisfaction objective.

Mr. Wetter suggested that the goal, "Lead in public facility management in the region," will be addressed separately, in partnership with the MERC Commission and that the results will be brought back to the management team.

The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.

2. The Big Look

The meeting resumed at 3:23, with a focus on the Big Look. Mr. Wetter thanked everyone for their hard work.

Mr. Cotugno distributed three documents: 2040 Refinement "The Big Look" Council Goals and Issues Revised May 26, 2004; Shaping the Big Look Councilor Comments July 2004; and July 28, 2004 Shaping the Big Look Council's Program Directions; copies of which are included as part of this record.

He spoke to the July 28, 2004 Shaping the Big Look Council's Program Directions document. He said most of the Work Program focused on Phase I of the activity to build the base for phase 2. He spoke to the program tasks for Phase I, beginning on page 4 of the document. He spoke to the Phase II activities. He said the key issue was timing. He said the 2007 deadline would require dropping this program by January 2006, unless there was an extension.

Councilor Monroe said the council would know by summer 2005. Mr. Cotugno said they had the ability to move forward until that time.

Council President Bragdon said the major question was the scope of the hard edges question.

Mr. Cotugno asked how much outreach would the Big Look entail. Weber said there were also questions about general approach in terms of involving other programs.

Councilor Park spoke to UGB timelines.

Councilor McLain said the immediate point was the 5-7 years 2007-2009, and that the timing for it would be stopped, as well as the coalition that was building. She compared it to the deflation of the subregional conversation. She spoke to staff resources and timing. She said there was an expectation by the public that there would be a hard edges conversation.

Councilor Hosticka spoke to the hard edge question on Option 1 or Option 2. He asked if they could proceed with Option 1 and then decide about Option 2. Mr. Cotugno and Mr. Jordan said yes.

Councilor Burkholder asked about major trends and demographics. He spoke to the question of what kind of economy was desired as opposed to what an economic forecast predicted.

Council President Bragdon said the region had received a grant through PDC, who had tapped Joe Cortright to talk about clusters. He said Metro could insert itself into the conversation. He and Mr. Wetter had met with Duncan Wyse to see how to get Metro a seat at that table to help define a regional strategy. He said there was receptiveness to Metro's participation. He said Metro wanted a broader dialogue, and that it was not all about land supply. He said recent conversations with Portland Business Alliance (PBA) President McDonough indicated receptiveness on the Alliance's part. He said that on November 18, PBA, along with John Fregonese, would convene the business community for a panel to talk about regionalism and that Metro was invited to participate. Councilor Newman said there would be an implicit critique of 2040 at that panel.

Councilor McLain said the economic big picture was important because it was the connection to the community. She said hard edges provided an opportunity to start that conversation, because it stirred a passionate dynamic. She said it could be built into workplan and budget for Mr. Cotugno and his staff to have an opportunity for that conversation.

Council President Bragdon asked how Greater Metropolitan Employment Land Study (GMELS) fit into the Big Look. Mr. Cotugno spoke to how GMELS fit into the Big Look.

Mr. Cotugno said that a regional forecast was based on comparative parameters to national and local. He wanted to take the extrapolation and dissect each piece. He said Phase I activity could involve the economy as a whole. Then Phase II could build scenarios and assess what land use forms would best support them.

Councilor Monroe said it was important to be aware that once the hard edge lines were drawn, that beyond that hard edge was a rural reserve and that inside that hard edge was an urban reserve and that eventually it would be urbanized. He said hard edges wouldn't mean anything if satellite edges grew towards the UGB.

Councilor McLain said that neighboring city relationships were extremely important and she said she didn't see that in the comments in the distributed documents. She said the discussion needed to be about hard edges, separation of community, rural and urban reserves and how to coordinate with jurisdictions outside the Metro boundary.

Councilor Burkholder spoke to options 1 and 2 from the political perspective. He said he wanted an open public process to allow people to see what the choices were.

Councilor Park said that rural reserves were a topic that needed to be addressed cautiously.

Councilor Burkholder said the other issue was whether Metro could be successful at taking it on or whether it should be the state to establish agricultural protections.

Councilor Newman said he preferred to do Option 1, reserving the opportunity to decide on Option 2 later on. He would like to complete something by Spring 2005, assess what was learned from the experience and then enter the larger discussion.

Council President Bragdon said a very limited Option 1, with good analysis, was most realistic and useful. He said although they wanted to get away from the UGB discussion, 90% of this hour had been about UGB. He said they already knew what was important already for the agricultural industry because of the Johnson report and what was proposed as a symbolic statement of intent, and he was wary about investing a lot of resources into it. He acknowledged that it was controversial, and asked why they would want to stir up a lot of controversy.

Councilor Hosticka said that good analysis could decide what obviously fell within the set and out of the set. Another alternative was that a lot of criteria could be developed and see what fell into it.

Councilor Park said he wouldn't mind a limited Option 1 as long as he knew the bigger piece would be addressed.

Councilor McLain said she agreed Option 1 would be Step 1. She was concerned with the definition of what was obvious. She said if people thought Metro wouldn't do Option 2, it would set a different standard.

Councilor Burkholder clarified that either they should not start Option 2 or they should do the whole thing. He said that also applied to Option 1. He didn't know if they were the right group to do it. He said that by Spring 2005, once research had been done, this might not be the best approach to take, and that another entity might be better identified to do the work.

Council President Bragdon asked for agreement that Option 1 was the one to flesh out and get started on. Councilor McLain asked for a caveat that Option 1 be done in such a way that it didn't preempt the decision or set up an expectation. The Council agreed. Council President Bragdon said the remaining outstanding question was on the character of outreach.

Councilor McLain said that it was nice to have a closed grouping of experts for a brainstorm, but that public couldn't be excluded if the landscape was changed. She said without a full-blown discussion, nothing would change. Mr. Cotugno clarified that this applied to the whole of the program, not just hard edges. Councilor McLain said the general public needed to be consulted.

Councilor Hosticka left at this time.

Councilor Newman said there was an enormous repository on opinions about growth and 2040, and that the first three tasks didn't call for an enormous outreach effort. The area that did call for such an effort was the hard edges question.

Councilor Park asked how MetroScope would fit in. Ms. Weber spoke to how MetroScope would fit in.

Council President Bragdon spoke to how this project would be affected if Measure 37 were to pass.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:35p.m.

Prepared by,

Patty Unfred Montgomery
Council Support Specialist

Cary Stacey
Executive Assistant to the Council President

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 29, 2004

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Strategic Plan	N/A	Metro Strategic Plan	072904csp-01
1	Goals & Objectives	N/A	Metro Council Goals and Objectives for discussion July 29th	072904csp-02
1	Goals & Objectives	N/A	Metro Strategic Planning Goals and Objectives	072904csp-03
2	Big Look	5/26/04	2040 Refinement "The Big Look" Council Goals and Issues Revised May 26, 2004	072904csp-04
2	Big Look	July 2004	Shaping the Big Look Councilor Comments	072904csp-05
2	Big Look	July 28, 2004	Shaping the Big Look Council's Program Directions	072904csp-06