

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLANNING

Thursday, September 22, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Rod Park (Excused), Rod Monroe (Excused)

Others Present: Mike Wetter, Paul Couey, Michael Jordan, Doug Anderson, Mike Hogle, Jenny Kirk, Casey Short, Bill Stringer, Reed Wagner, Kathy Rutkowski, Brad Stevens, Jeff Tucker, Dan Cooper

Mike Wetter opened the Metro Council Strategic Planning Meeting at 1:36 p.m.

Mr. Wetter said that we are now at the step of evaluating Metro's and the region's performance. Because of redundancy, the Council President asked staff to simplify the goals and objectives. Council goals were reduced to four goals on the programmatic side and objectives were rephrased as outcomes, not action items. He felt that this is a condensed content of what Councilors expressed in previous meetings. This will provide a clearer communication of the Council goals. Also, the less redundancy that there is, the less program overlap will occur. On the operating side, objectives have not been developed – it is at the level of goals.

From here, we want to get a sense of how the Council thinks we're doing and where Council wants to go in terms of directions and priorities. Staff will then take those and develop department programs to meet those objectives. These are just beginning steps and there will be opportunity to continue reworking this in the future.

Councilor McLain asked what happened to all the ideas relating to facilities. Wetter said that they are included under numerous other areas including service portfolios and financial and operating excellence. Councilor McLain asked for a clarification that this process is only for overall direction but that Council will still have an opportunity to provide input on line items. Councilor Burkholder added that this is an organizing tool from which the budget will be developed. Councilor McLain wanted to make sure that this doesn't become overly complicated – taking five layers to get to details. She wanted to know when we're actually getting to the part of tradeoffs. Mr. Wetter explained that this process is intended to cut out some of the detail. Bill Stringer said that we are currently working top-down from the Council and from the bottom-up simultaneously. Councilor McLain said that this was problematic. Mr. Stringer said that in a few months, department directors will be meeting with the Council to match up programs with goals in a transparent manner.

1. Overall agency funding

Casey Short presented the five-year financial forecast developed in June 2004. The report focuses on the excise tax and how it looks in terms of need and expenditure cap and takes a look at revenue/expenses for the next five years. He reviewed the report. Mr. Short said that revenues will be insufficient in one year for current projected expenses. He reviewed each of the major operations included in the report. The key point for all of them is the fund balance lines – which in general are moving downward. For the OCC, it is due to the additional expenses for operating the expanded convention center and the discontinuation of the Visitor Development Initiative (VDI) fund. Councilor Burkholder asked about the interfund transfer

from the excise tax. Mr. Short said that it does not show on these tables. "Required reserves" is an internal requirement set by Metro.

Expo is doing well and continues to do well; however, this does not include funding for replacing some of the halls in need of replacement. Portland Center for the Performing Arts (PCPA) shows a downward trend, in part due to discontinuation of the VDI fund. The Oregon Zoo table assumes \$.5 million in renewal and replacement, which will move toward an imbalance in 2009. At current service levels, the planning department will not have sufficient funds to operate. Councilor McLain asked whether this was including any new sources of revenue. Mr. Short said that it does not, that it is based on past history. Mr. Stringer said that this is the start of the new five-year budget process. Councilor Hosticka asked how we jumped \$.5 million in enterprise revenue to \$5 million. Mr. Short said that it was primarily due to an accounting change in how they accounted for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) program revenues.

Regional Parks has a fairly flat line, primarily due to the transfer of parks from Multnomah County. This assumes the \$1 excise tax revenue and the associated additional spending. Solid Waste and Recycling shows fiscal health due to its revenue sources.

2. Programmatic Council Status Assessment

Mike Wetter started the discussion of the rating exercise. He noted that the intent is to look at how we're doing as an organization and is not intended to focus on any one individual person or program. The Council reviewed the exercise together and provided input on each line. It was clarified that the program evaluation is intended to focus on how Metro has performed, not the region as a whole. Council President Bragdon asked whether they should grade on just the outcome or the outcome based on revenues available. Councilor McLain said that previous discussions included connecting Metro's efforts with the results. Councilor Newman suggested that it be based on the latter, but include other information in the notes. Councilor Burkholder said that this should be based on how Metro is doing holistically. Mr. Wetter said that an additional set of questions could look separately at the status of the region and how well Metro is fulfilling our role. Council President Bragdon said that he didn't want this exercise to be misunderstood by employees or misused by other organizations. Councilor McLain said that the first column should be how we are doing now, not what we should be doing. Council President Bragdon said that compared to other cities, we may score higher or lower. Councilor Burkholder said that the real question is moving from the first column to the second (05-06 target). Are we happy with how we are doing and what changes do we want to make (redistribute resources)?

Councilors asked to separate their evaluations of the region and of Metro. The column was split. Councilors wrote their "grades" and notes on the wall chart. The exercise results are summarized in the attachment.

Mr. Wetter led a discussion of the evaluations. Sections 1 and 2 - Councilor McLain felt that one issue that was missing from the chart was the issue of safety. Councilor Burkholder commented on 1.4 that he is withholding evaluation until further discussion of the Housing Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC). Councilor Hosticka said that on 2.3 he distinguishes between water waste (poor) and solid waste (relatively good). Councilor Burkholder is concerned about upstream impacts, the reduce and reuse components. On 2.4, Councilor Burkholder feels that Metro does a good job in green business practices but is not necessarily a model for the region. Mr. Wetter noted that overall the grades in section 2 environmental health are relatively good.

Section 3 – Economic Vitality. On 3.2, Councilor McLain said that we haven't talked about what Metro's role should be. Council President Bragdon said that on 3.1, there isn't an infrastructure currently to deal with this. Councilor McLain noted on 3.6 that urban actions affect the rural economy and we need to make sure that we're not putting roadblocks in the way of our rural neighbors. We haven't dealt with infrastructure sharing. Councilors Burkholder and Newman said that they didn't see a direct connection for Metro to 3.6. Councilor McLain said she doesn't understand 3.4. Mr. Wetter said that the region is adaptable to different energy sources and less energy-reliant. Discussion followed about the intent of this objective. Councilor Newman asked about the intent of 3.5. Mr. Wetter said that this was included because it's the focus of the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) facilities. Councilor Burkholder said that an outcome that is missing is that of prosperity, seeing people's incomes rise. Discussion followed about income prosperity versus other measurements of people's quality of life and satisfaction. Councilor Hosticka said he noted on 3.2 that many national or international events affect our economy that we can't control.

Section 4 – Smart Government. 4.1 showed very low scores. Councilor Burkholder said on 4.2 that the standard of what is equitable is low. On 4.3, Councilor Hosticka said that there are other regional services that Metro doesn't provide – but whether or not those are feasible is another issue. On 4.5 there were questions about Metro's role. Councilor McLain said she gave Metro a good grade because of acknowledging the subregional tool. Councilor Newman said that Metro hasn't utilized that tool.

Section 1 – Financial and Operational Excellence. Councilor McLain said that Metro has received numerous awards for our practices. Councilor Burkholder focused on the transparency of our processes, but felt that we are doing a good job of fiscal prudence. He feels that training is needed to meet some of these goals of improving business processes. Councilor McLain said that there is a direct connection between 1.1 and 1.3, that you can't do one without the other. Councilor Newman said that he would have given Metro staff high grades in all areas but scored lower for Metro as a whole, including Council.

Section 2 – Workforce Excellence. Council President Bragdon said that Metro's culture is still bureaucratic, hierarchical, and not flexible like a Wyden & Kennedy or Nike example. Council President Bragdon clarified that Metro has *people* who are creative and excel, but that the culture does not foster that. Councilor Newman felt that the area that needs the most improvement is problem solving. Councilor McLain said that this section is more of a Council report card, not an agency report card – that it is up to Council to come up with more innovative tools and this Council has the capability to do that. We need to give ourselves an opportunity to develop this area.

Section 3 – Communications and Leadership Excellence. Councilor Hosticka said that 3.3 is getting better in recent years, although the last year has been bumpy partly due to difficult issues (Goal 5, industrial lands). Council President Bragdon said that the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) outcomes are getting better and local jurisdictions are engaged in the process, which is good. Councilor Burkholder said that the inputs are getting better.

The group took a 10-minute break.

3. Improvement Targets

Councilor Burkholder clarified the grading on this next exercise: It's a budget issue and the point is to indicate the priorities for doing better. Mr. Wetter said it is budget issues, as well as a structure and operation issue. Councilor McLain used an example related to health. Councilor Hosticka asked if they should use points or grades; he prefers using points.

Programmatic Goals and Objectives

Councilors graded Metro and indicated on the posted lists of objectives where they wanted to see improvement. They were asked to allocate 5 points among the 21 programmatic objectives and 3 points among the 11 operational objectives. They could also downgrade an existing grade and re-allocate the point to another objective.

Programmatic Goal 1: Great Places

The Councilors discussed their rationale for their scoring. Councilor McLain said she wants to make sure Metro has enough money for the Big Look work.

Objective 1.1 (Natural areas, parkland and outdoor recreation infrastructure are available near housing and employment.) Councilor Burkholder said he would like to emphasize delivery of service of parks, as a policy, and how Metro can do it. He referred to a regional bank of parks technical assistance, especially to the urban areas brought into the urban growth boundary, and regulatory actions. He feels Metro has not explored all possibilities. He would like to look at the desired outcome and look at all the different ways to achieve that outcome. One way is money, but there are also other ways to get there. Councilor Newman said parks are always a priority for him because it is one of the few tools Metro has to promote positive things.

Councilor McLain said she does not necessarily see parks as the only good thing Metro can do. She said she did not vote for parks because she feels Metro is already doing a lot to provide services. She said region-wide they have already had the service-provision conversation, and folks were not willing to see service provisions as a Metro responsibility. She does not think it is the only way Metro can do good things. She does not want parks to be the only thing Metro does. She feels people will also care about such things as affordable housing and where they live. She's advocating for more balance.

Council President Bragdon ranked objective 1.1 and **objective 1.2** (The region's centers and corridors are distinctive, attractive and efficient.) high because he thinks they both relate to fulfillment of the 2040 vision. He wants to have some successes with 2040 coming to life, and those are two of the hallmarks of it. He wants to pick some winners and have some success in terms of centers and implementation. He noted that we have a philosophical foundation, broad consensus 10 to 12 years ago around those things being important, so there is more readiness to move to implementation. He said he wants to be able to point to some "wins" as successes. He referred to the Barcelona lecture and experience where they picked 10 projects and did those to make a success, rather than 35 projects that don't happen. He said that the 2040 concept is already a statement of commitment to that. You may have to refresh people's memory, but you don't have to persuade them of something entirely new.

He sees the 1.1 work as more regional, and not just Metro. Councilor Burkholder said this is a guidance for staff about what is important. He hopes that the staff will brainstorm about all the different ways to get the outcome. He wants them to look not just at what Metro does, but look at all the different tools available. After that, they can come back and look at which tools might work, how comfortable are we with them, etc.

Regarding objective 1.2 on centers and corridors, Councilor Burkholder said he agrees with Council President Bragdon. Councilor Burkholder is interested in more open-ended brainstorming about centers, corridors and making some areas more attractive. He said it relates to affordable housing and energy efficiency. He noted that recently he viewed a photograph of Hawthorne Boulevard, and realized how

ugly it appears with all the telephone and utility poles. He would like to see more attractive centers and corridors. Council President Bragdon said that centers serve multiple purposes, in that a landscape like that is more adaptable in terms of the energy requirements that it imposes on people. He noted that the more that is done in centers, the less land is “needed” available. He said brainstorming would help flush out some of the connections among these things.

Councilor McLain said they have some guidance already in documents as far as how to improve delivery of parks services or what is Metro’s role, or is there a role for Metro in the services of parks, even in the Regional Framework Plan. She said they have let that sit on the sideboard for a few years. They have interested partners who have come in and tried to get the Metro Council engaged on that again. She thinks that you might want to have staff brainstorm through a review and then go forward, because we do have some things that are already listed.

Mr. Wetter said he feels that they can arrange exactly what the Council is asking for, and have the staff come back to the Council with their ideas of what would best get us here, and engage in a discussion around those things.

Councilor McLain said there is a role for a regional clearing house, or a role for a regional emphasis on trying to figure out what more tools are. Affordable housing is one example. She said they have started talking about a committee, and whether it’s time for that committee, and whether it’s time for that committee to be actually put together or not, it would seem like they would want to put some emphasis in that area.

Mr. Wetter noted that Councilor Burkholder was conspicuously absent in putting his marks for affordable housing. Councilor Burkholder said it should be part of the discussion about centers, the economy. He went on to clarify that this exercise was not voting. Rather he feels marking a number on an objective indicates that some work needs to be done in that area. He said it is a relative scale effort, which does not exclude talking about areas that did not get marked.

Programmatic Goal 2: Environmental Health

Objective 2.1 (Natural areas are large enough, have the appropriate balance of species, and are interconnected with other natural areas so that normal ecological processes are maintained.) Councilor Newman said he was thinking of objective 1.1 as being more “parksish” and objective 2.1 as being more “Goal 5ish,” but that maybe that was not the assumption. Council President Bragdon viewed it differently. Councilor Hosticka said there is a lot more Metro could do in the way of acquisition, restoration and technical assistance—all the things that require positive effort on Metro’s part. So that’s why he put his two points there, because even though Metro has been working hard on the program, there’s a whole lot more that it can do. He thinks Metro should put its emphasis in doing those things. He sees it as part of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection program (he calls it that instead of “Goal 5.”) But it is outside of regulatory action and land-use regulations. Council President Bragdon said he agrees with Councilor Hosticka. He sees 1.1 and 2.1 both dealing primarily with public land. He saw 1.1 as a provision and 2.1 as more programmatic. He did not see 2.1 as a surrogate for Goal 5.

Councilor McLain explained why she did not give any points to objective 2.1. She said they are having to think about budget, and 2.1 is related in a lot of ways to acquisition programs. Because of that and the fact that they have transportation, centers and infrastructure goals likely for the next year where there might also be a ballot measure, she wanted to focus on the next fiscal year, and wondered whether they could really do both. Councilor Newman said responded that he was thinking of the election calendar and there are too many variables and unknowns. Councilor McLain requested that they make a note about focusing

on the next fiscal year and ballot measures for funding. She feels it makes a difference about where they spend it in Metro's budget.

Councilor Burkholder asked about the interconnection piece, about how transportation investments and policies fit into this. He mentioned street trees and green streets integration. Mr. Wetter clarified that objective 2.1 is phrased as an outcome. It does not necessarily mean public acquisition, but it does not rule out acquisition. It lists the outcome, the result out there, but not necessarily saying the means. When Mr. Wetter asked if the Councilors who had marked 2.1 were thinking of acquisition, Council President Bragdon responded that no, he was thinking of it as more programmatic. Councilor Hosticka said nonregulatory things require some sort of commitment and effort, whatever they are. Councilor Hosticka said he is referring to nonregulatory outcomes for 2.1. Council President Bragdon said he thought it also covered public lands, in addition to private lands. He said 2.1 is a functional objective, with regard to the function of those natural areas, whereas 1.1 is simply their provision and their geographic dispersal. Councilor Burkholder said he could see a transfer of development rights that would be a way to achieve those goals, which does not preclude regulation. It is part of the menu.

Objective 2.3 (The region's waste stream has a minimal impact on the environment.) Councilor McLain said that because of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update and the DEQ requirements, she felt this was the budget year to do at least some work on 2.3. Councilor Burkholder said in future years (2009), this will be a big area of effort. Council President Bragdon said he feels that Metro has made a more than sufficient effort in that area and has been successful. In terms of making choices, he feels it's time to emphasize other things. Councilor McLain noted that not all money can be used for just anything; there are certain budget pots of money. She wondered when they would have a conversation about that. Mr. Wetter clarified that the current discussion was to look at what they want to see more of, and they would get to the money discussion, at least two steps later in the process. The next step is for staff to come back and say how they think they can get you more of what you want. The other three councilors think the waste stream work is just fine now, and did not mark it for more emphasis. Councilor McLain asked about the process and what that means, and Mr. Wetter clarified it.

Objective 2.5 (Urban land is used efficiently and resource land is protected from urban encroachment.) Councilor Newman said he was focused on efficient use of land inside the urban growth boundary (UGB). He gave a point to Objective 2.5 (in addition to the two points he marked for Centers) because less than 30 percent of the land in the region is in a center or corridor. Metro needs to keep its eye on efficient use of land in the other areas as well. He felt like 2.5 was broader. Councilor McLain referred to the design review and models for land use (she mentioned GreenStreets) that Metro has done in the past and the mileage they have gotten out of it. She said it is important to look at the strategies for creating centers and great places, if the Council is really going to care about that. She feels 2.5 is about the way you use land.

Programmatic Goal 3: Economic Vitality

Objective 3.1 (Land is available to meet the need for housing and employment.) Councilor Hosticka said he thinks they recognize that they have to do UGB work, but thinks the Council overdoes it, even when they do it, and should spend less effort doing it. That's why he gave it a minus one. He feels it is over-analyzed, over-complicated, over-done for the kind of decisions the Metro Council is actually making. Even though they are required to do it, he feels they could spend less effort in doing it. Councilor McLain also gave it a minus one because she feels Metro needs to do other work before it does UGB work again and a full-blown review of the UGB. The other work would be Big Look, connections neighboring cities outside the UGB, and discussions on to better reach Centers, including redevelopment opportunities like those in the TOD Program. Councilor Newman noted that 2005-06 and is the low point for UGB work,

which is cyclical in nature. Council President Bragdon concurred with Councilor Hosticka about not overdoing the UGB work, even if it were to be part of the cycle for 2005-06. Councilor Burkholder asked if that meant that Metro should not be involved in concept planning in areas along the river. Council President Bragdon answered no. Councilor Burkholder pointed out that if they want to cut back on 2.5, then they still have those other concept planning issues they want to do. Councilor Newman said that they are distinguishing between the UGB extension and the readiness question and work referred to earlier. Mr. Wetter clarified that Councilor Newman saw 3.1 as focused on UGB expansion. Councilor Burkholder said one other strategy to do this may be to spend more resources on lobbying to try to change the law. The strategy may be to spend more resources to change the regulatory structure.

Objective 3.2 (Industry clusters thrive.) Councilor McLain said Metro needs to grow industry clusters (even though she didn't have a point to put there). She thinks Metro needs to continue to try to figure out what the region wants in the way of different types of clusters and how to grow them different places. She asked if there is there a way for people who don't have clusters to start them? Councilor Newman said it is important for the agency to have an economic development message, because if they don't, then someone else will fill that vacuum. Now with a lot of momentum out there already with regard to this whole issue of industry clusters, Metro can participate in a leadership role. Council President Bragdon said he felt the discussion over the last two years got hijacked by the cliché and emphasis on "shovel-ready" industrial land, which always just meant expanding the UGB. He feels Metro has to have an alternative to that, or Metro gets made the scapegoat for economic conditions. Councilor Burkholder noted that something that they don't talk about but that is critical to the economy is how prepared people are to participate, which is education and training. Although education is not really Metro's area, it needs to be part of the discussion to support economic development. He asked if people could afford to go to school (i.e., engineering school). He asked what Metro's role is in economic development. Metro should at least be involved in the discussion.

Objective 3.3 (Access to jobs, services, centers and industrial areas is efficient.) Council President Bragdon asked if objective 3.3 is a surrogate for transportation funding per se, or the task force package per se? Mr. Wetter responded that it is about transportation. He said they had included one on efficient freight movement. Councilor Newman said he sees 3.3 as about transportation and geographic disbursement or some equity in jobs. Councilor Burkholder listed some of the references falling underneath 3.3, including freight mobility, transportation, jobs-housing balance. (They were not detailed to keep the list clean.) Councilor McLain noted that "transportation" was not listed anywhere. She thought the wording of 3.3 could be improved. She did not think enough infrastructure language was included there (e.g., mobility, access, etc.). She thought an outcome should be included. Mr. Wetter recalled that they had had that conversation on a couple occasions before. They had discussed whether mobility itself is an outcome. The feedback they had gotten from Councilors who were present at that time was that transportation is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. Mobility is not an end that they want to put up on objectives list as an outcome. He said they could change that if the Councilors decided otherwise. The objectives are stated more as an outcome, and not a means to it. Councilor McLain was concerned that if this list was sent outside the building, it would look like they had not done an outcome for transportation. She sees transportation as a means to an end, and that they should include transportation as an outcome. Councilor Hosticka referred to a survey that said a large number of people in this state drive around as a recreational activity. To that extent, mobility is an end in itself. (That would make the roads a part of the recreational infrastructure.) Councilor Hosticka said he does not favor that as a goal for Metro.

Mr. Wetter noted that in section 1 on Great Places, the goal includes "accessible," but it is not reflected in any of the section one objectives. Council President Bragdon said access is a big part of making all those things function well; they have adopted the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is important to try

to fulfill. The ability to get around is a critical component of 2040, just as natural areas and centers. He noted that the ability to get around was in one where they, being the region, were under investing. It does not necessarily mean a particular set of projects.

Objective 3.4 (Energy options position the region for sustained economic growth and stability.)

Councilor Newman said he agrees with Councilor Burkholder that they are being over-consumptive of energy.

Programmatic Goal 4: Smart Government

Objective 4.1 (Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.) Council President Bragdon said it is not necessarily speaking to the *level*, but to the *appropriateness*. Mr. Wetter referred to the Convention Center issue where someone else gets to have room tax. Councilor Burkholder mentioned their discussion on all the other jurisdictions as well, in terms of, for example, who is paying for the bridges? Councilor Newman said he was the one who gave 4.1 an "F." He was thinking of the financial challenges, and they need to figure out a way, whether creative or traditional, to address it. Councilor McLain said she would like to see revenue sharing included somewhere, and asked if it should be part of 4.1. She wanted to see a note added about revenue sharing, because she did not want to see it die. Council President Bragdon said he agreed. Councilor Hosticka suggested that it go in objective 4.5 (The tax system in the region does not have inadvertent effects on land use.) Councilor Newman said they cannot continue to go to the solid waste excise tax for achieving other goals. He suggested they be more creative about other sources, whether that's value capture, or other mechanisms.

Objective 4.3 (Metro's service portfolio includes those functions that fit Metro's distinct competency or regional scope.) Councilor McLain put a plus one on 4.3 because she thought they wanted to give fair balance to both the facilities that Metro manages and also to the planning activities they do. She mentioned the Convention Center and that they need to figure out what they are going to do with the balance on some of the accounts that will get to dangerous levels in the next two to four years. Council President Bragdon said he felt that 4.3 is about opportunistic functions or work that has fallen through the cracks (such as the Regional Emergency Management, water supply, bridges) or that could be done more effectively regionally. He also cited the Sellwood Bridge dilemma as an example, that it is used primarily by people who live in a county that doesn't own it. So therefore, nobody has an interest in fixing it. Councilor Hosticka said he put a plus one because it is like what is called research and development (R and B) in a manufacturing operation. He said it looks at what issues are out there that Metro should be involved in. Council President Bragdon noted that Metro is the place that people come to solve their problems. Councilor Hosticka said he feels we need some organizational response to that, rather than just saying think harder and smarter. Councilors Newman and Council President Bragdon agreed. Councilor Burkholder sees this as a direction for Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) to go look at Portland General Electric (PGE) Stadium. Councilor Hosticka clarified that there is a suite of activities. Councilor Burkholder said it is so much related to the state legislature and future changes. Mr. Wetter noted that it is probably a long-term endeavor. Councilor McLain said even working 12 to 15 years on some of these issues as long-term endeavors, and they haven't solved them yet, including the transportation package.

Operating Goals

The Council decided to start at the bottom of this section, and work up.

Operating Goal 1: Communications and Leadership Excellence

Objective 3.1 (Lead regional problem solving and regional initiatives.) Councilor Newman said they won't succeed at objective 3.1 until they have succeeded at 3.3 (Maintain open working relationships with other governments and organizations and provide a venue for regional collaboration.) So they want the staff to help with more connection between 3.1 and 3.3. Councilor McLain said they had talked about Council process and structure and it got stuck under objective 3.2 (Foster a collaborative relationship between a council, focused on policy questions, and staff, focused on providing objective policy and program options and rigorous analysis.). She said a few of them had made comments that for the Council do a better job on 3.1 or 3.3, they think their process and structure need to be working effectively and efficiently. The process has to work well internally to make our other relationships externally work. Council President Bragdon said all those listed under objective 3.2 are instrumental to be successful at 3.1, as well. He said they cannot lead regional problem solving and regional initiatives unless they have credibility with all the stakeholders. Metro won't have credibility if others don't feel welcome, and then Metro cannot provide regional problem solving. Councilor Burkholder asked about to whom as the staff do they give this work and how is it handled. He suggested that one of the potential solutions is to have training assistants helping the Councilors work more effectively. Also, to learn to go out and be stronger advocates for some of the pieces. He felt to whom it is given is critical. Mr. Wetter said it is almost Council staff, Council Clerk, Public Affairs and Councilors. Councilor McLain said she thinks they should have a work session or retreat just on this topic. She thought a back-and-forth with staff would be helpful, especially on this topic. Mr. Wetter said he thought that could be possible.

Objective 3.4 (Communicate effectively and develop constructive relationships with both internal (staff) and external (citizens) audiences). Councilor Hosticka said it relates primarily to the external audiences, but also the internally. He said there's still gaps inconsistent communication internally about the what the Council wants and its policies. And as a Councilor, he does not always know what the staff is doing, even though they have had discussions about it and said they would work on it, he has not always seen a product. He said staff does not always know what the Council wants. It may be unclear for staff, either because they are getting mixed messages or unclear messages. Externally, Metro seems to be continuously behind the eight ball on communications. It will take a lot of work for Metro get ahead of the issues, which is what he would like to see. Councilor McLain noted that the loop is not always completed. Completing the loop relates to 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4. If you had the loop completed, all of those would have a better chance of communication, leadership and strategies.

Operating Goal 2: Workforce Excellence

Councilor Burkholder said we need to put more effort into diversity work. Council President Bragdon said he thinks it is about creating a buzz in the building, a culture to reward behaviors. Councilor Burkholder asked about to whom on the staff they would give the Workforce Excellence objectives work. Mr. Jordan said it would start with Human Resources, particularly 2.1 (Recruit, train and retain an exceptionally competent productive and motivated workforce.) and 2.2 (Provide leadership in our community through our diversity practices.), and then leak out to the senior management team and others. They discussed 2.3 (Create and sustain a creative, flexible, entrepreneurial culture that incorporates fresh ideas and supports reasonable risk.) and how to get good advice on how to do better at it. Mr. Jordan said it usually includes allowing failure and not hammering people for that, but to use them as a learning experience. He said that is a long-time cultural change, but he thinks Metro is on its way to doing those kinds of things. He noted that the budget work being done by the FAST team Mr. Stringer is leading is a good example. He said they plan to take the Council's Strategic Planning work away with the senior management group in October and actually look at the organization and look at the opportunities and issues that they need to look at in a different way, outside of the box of organizational development transaction. Certainly there will be hundreds of questions that will come up from these numbers that they want to feed back to the Council. The Council will form their opinion after they hear management's

interpretation and perspective of what the objectives mean. He cited objective 3.1 (Lead regional problem solving and regional initiative) as an example of where clarification will be likely needed. He said he doesn't really think the Council means for the Planning department to drastically reduce its planning work. He said he thinks most of it is cross-pollination, and getting people to think differently.

Mr. Wetter said Councilors Monroe and Park will do the exercise before they see the Council's discussion. It will then go to staff who will interpret the objectives, line programs up with the objectives, and take a look at how they think they can better achieve these outcomes. They will then come back to the Council with their ideas. Councilor McLain referred to a previous sidebar list. She felt that maybe there should be some more work before the staff goes on a retreat to work on it. They agreed that the Council should see the list again, perhaps briefly at the work session next week.

Councilor Hosticka clarified that when he marked 3.1 with minuses, he *did* mean that, as one Councilor, if for some employees 3.1 is their whole work program or a huge amount of their work program, it may mean that they ought to be doing less of that. Council President Bragdon said he meant that too. Mr. Jordan said the Council should get some feedback from Mr. Andy Cotugno and staff about what that means. Mr. Wetter said he felt they heard the Council saying two things: Some councilors think they do too much planning generally, and others think it is cyclical schedule with less in some years. Councilor McLain said there are certain things they want to do with land use that are different than what they did last year. It's not that they don't want to work on land use.

Council President Bragdon asked when the Council would get together again on this work. Mr. Wetter answered that they think it will take the staff most of October to work on this, before coming back to the Council with how they think they can do better. He said the Council will likely start seeing staff presentations in late October and early November with info about how we can better do these things. That is a rough schedule estimate. Councilor Burkholder said the Council needs to talk more about the leadership piece and how to do that better. It relates to the Council, and not so much to the staff. He wondered if the Council should get some outside assistance in looking at it.

4. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Mr. Wetter adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m.

Prepared by,

Patty Montgomery and Linnea Nelson
Council Support Specialists

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2004

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
Report	Budget	June 2004	Excise Tax Projection and Department Five-Year Financial Forecasts	092204csp-1
Assessment and priority-setting exercise	Program assessment	September 2004	Metro Council Programmatic Council Status Assessment and 05-06 Priorities	092204csp-2
Table	Program assessment	Sept. 22, 2004	Council performance evaluation of goals and objectives	092204csp-3