BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING)	Resolution No. 92-1682
THE NEW METRO HEADQUARTERS)	
BUILDING AS "METRO REGIONAL	·)	Introduced by Rena Cusma,
CENTER")	Executive Officer

WHEREAS, the Metro Code does not clearly delineate a procedure for the naming of facilities; and

WHEREAS, naming facilities is a subject in which the Council has in the past exhibited an interest and a desire to participate; and

WHEREAS, the new Metro office facility at 600 NE Grand Avenue has to date been generally referred to as the Metro Headquarters Building; and

WHEREAS, an officially adopted name for the building which identifies Metro and its function is desirable for maximum clarity and public understanding; and

WHEREAS, selecting a formal name at this time facilitates signage design and fabrication for the new building and also benefits the public recognition process; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, that

The Council of the Metropolitan Service District designates the new Metro office facility as "Metro Regional Center".

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 12th day of November , 1992.

Tim Gardner, Presiding Officer

REGIONAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1682, DESIGNATING THE NEW METRO HEADQUARTERS BUILDING AS "METRO REGIONAL CENTER"

Date: October 28, 1992 Presented by: Councilor Washington

<u>COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:</u> At its meeting of October 27, 1992 the Regional Facilities Committee voted 3-0 to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 92-1682. Voting were Councilors Gronke, McFarland, and Washington. Councilors Collier and McLain were absent.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES: Resolution No. 92-1682 was drafted to conform with the Regional Facilities Committee's direction to forward the name "Metro Regional Center" to the full Council. The committee had considered a different resolution naming the new building (No. 92-1690) at its October 13 meeting. That resolution proposed naming the Metro Headquarters the "Metro Center." Don Rocks, Executive Assistant, spoke to that resolution at the earlier meeting. He said the Executive Officer wanted to change the name of the building to delete the word "headquarters," which sounded too military, and give it a name that would be short, recognizable, and reflective of Metro's functions. The name agreed to by the administration was "Metro Regional Center." In proposing to give the building that name, Executive Management staff consulted with Council staff to see whether the Council wanted to consider a resolution naming the building. Council staff discussed the matter with Presiding Officer Gardner, who decided to introduce Resolution No. 92-1690 which would have named the building "Metro Center." The Regional Facilities Committee considered both names on October 13, and preferred "Metro Regional Center." The committee directed staff to draft a resolution giving the building that name, which resulted in Resolution No. 92-1682.

Mr. Rocks presented the staff report on Resolution No. 92-1682 at the October 27 meeting, and there was no committee discussion.

Staff Report

Consideration of Resolution No. 92-1682 for the purpose of designation of the new Metro office building as Metro Regional Center".

Date: October 20, 1992

Presented by: Don Rocks

Background and Analysis

The new Metro offices have been informally called "Metro Headquarters" from the inception of the project. A more appropriate designation should now be formalized as the project nears completion. Formal designation of the facility at this time will also assist in the design and fabrication of signage.

Ordinance 91-440 specifically refers to the "Metro Headquarters Building". However, that precedent does not preclude formally naming the facility differently.

A formal name should:

Identify Metro as the seat of regional government and reduce confusion with other businesses and enterprises that use "Metro" in their names.

A designation of "Metro Regional Center" is recommended as an appropriate and more self-explanatory name that better identifies both the occupant and the jurisdiction of the occupants activities.

<u>Financial Impact</u> None.

Recommendation

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1682