

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, November 16, 2004  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:04 p.m.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 18, 2004/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Council President Bragdon reviewed the November 18, 2004 Council agenda. He noted Council was starting at 4:00 p.m. He also indicated Councilor Burkholder would not be in attendance. Councilor Newman offered to carry the two change orders. He said the AFSCME vote would be occurring today and tomorrow.

### **2. CODE CHANGES TO CHAPTER 2.04, CONTRACT**

David Biedermann, Contract's Manager, explained the contract changes in the Code. This reflected 2003 legislative changes made in State law. He noted that State law had changed the bidding level. He reviewed the list of exemptions that existed currently. There had been continuing discussion concerning project contracting. Councilor Newman asked where Council had concerns. Mr. Biedermann said there were several Councilors who thought contracts should be considered at different levels, from \$50,000 bid limit up to \$150,000. Councilor McLain said the State changed the bidding level to \$150,000. She wasn't sure if we should follow suit. Metro doesn't pre-qualify their businesses like the State did. She felt that we should keep the bid level at \$50,000. She felt this would allow more companies to bid. Mr. Biedermann said if they went to the \$150,000 bid level, there would be about half the companies that would be eligible to bid as compared to current bidding of \$50,000. Councilor Newman suggested \$100,000 as a bidding limit. Councilor Burkholder said bidding was not a cheap process. That was why he supported the higher number. Councilor Monroe said as long as they had the 10-day letter, it gave him comfort to go with the higher bidding levels. Councilor McLain commented on the costs of bidding. She suggested Mr. Biedermann provide more concrete information about the costs of bidding. She felt it was important to have more companies bidding, particularly small companies. She wanted people to believe that Metro was fair. She talked about savings. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, clarified what had been changed in the Code. The change was in the amount of the contract that must be formally bid. There was no change in which contracts would come before Council. This was changing how we would select vendors. Council President Bragdon said he thought there was a broad level of comfort except for the bidding level. He suggested changing the amount to \$100,000. Councilor Hosticka said they still had to get three quotes. He wanted to know what the difference was between quotes and bids. Mr. Biedermann said it was the formality. This raised the threshold to \$150,000. Councilor McLain said the fact that you don't advertise gave her pause because she felt it didn't allow for new companies to bid. Council President Bragdon suggested drafting a new ordinance with \$100,000 as the bidding limit. Councilor McLain said she would like an amendment written up for \$75,000. Mr. Biedermann explained the necessary changes in

the Code concerning Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC) contracting at \$75,000. He said it was being first read on November 18<sup>th</sup> and second read on December 9<sup>th</sup>.

### **3. DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS: PARKS**

Bill Stringer, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), said this was the second round of budget discussions. They planned to discuss goals related to programs. The Parks Department will present their budget today. Councilor Newman asked how this discussion was different from the first round of budget discussions. Mr. Stringer said this presentation nailed down resources.

Councilor Hosticka talked about the increases in Parks funding. Did they want to discuss bonding some of the cash flow to get the parks opened sooner? Mr. Tucker said they looked at it briefly. They didn't have the staff resources or they would have to contract out. Councilor Hosticka talked about Cooper Mountain and the possibility of one of the local providers being a partner.

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, said he had met with Ron Willoughby. They couldn't take Cooper Mountain on for about two years. Council President Bragdon asked about the pacing amounts for opening up the four parks. Mr. Desmond said chronologically going from most to least ready to go, Mt. Talbert was the most ready to go. He provided details as to why it was the best site to open first. They were moving ahead on that project. It was relatively fast tracked. The second most ready to go was Cooper Mountain. They had not completed the master plan. There were significant permitting issues there. Washington County was amending their code to accommodate some of the obstacles. The new parkland permitting did not provide for any environmental education. They would have to pursue permitting for this use. Mr. Desmond said there was a significant amount of restoration on Cooper Mountain. They might be able to accelerate a year. At Wilsonville they were planning to start the restoration this year. There was a master plan in place for Wilsonville. They were not losing a lot of time on that project. Mr. Desmond suggested reexamining the bonding question. Councilor Burkholder asked, if you had money today, would you be saving anything?

Mr. Desmond said they tried to follow the budget format that was set by Solid Waste and Recycling Department. He spoke to basic assumptions. He highlighted that they were proposing no new Full Time Equivalent (FTE) for this upcoming year. In the first year they believed they could get done what needed to be done with the current level FTE. He felt they were presenting a lean budget. They had not taken the new money as an opportunity to reverse the lean budget. He talked about what they would be spending the new excise tax money on. He spoke to the progress at Willamette Cove. Most of the new excise tax money wouldn't be spent and would be carried over. Council President Bragdon applauded them on holding the FTE constant. He asked about their reorganization. Mr. Desmond responded that Jim Morgan had been managing the open space properties. Most of his staff was rangers. They would be set up as a science team for the entire department. He wanted to utilize Mr. Morgan for our natural resource activities and to pursue grants. They would shift some of the ranger responsibilities. They could do these without new FTEs. He was dividing his department up by function. He explained some of the specifics of the changes. Council President Bragdon asked when this went into effect. Mr. Desmond said January 1, 2005. He thought the reorganization would allow them to take on some additional tasks. He provided an overview of current FTE and programs. The only real change would be to add in the new excise tax. Otherwise this was a status quo budget.

Councilor Hosticka said they were losing money on the cemeteries. Mr. Desmond said it was not as bad as it appeared. They contracted with a company who did burials. Councilor Hosticka asked if they wanted to become self-supporting in the cemeteries? Mr. Desmond talked about operating

the cemeteries. They were trying to get it be as self-supporting as possible. Councilor McLain said she felt they were being creative in the cemeteries area. Mr. Desmond noted that the deficit had been cut over the past three years.

Councilor Park asked about the reserves for the cemeteries. Mr. Desmond said they had just started about two years ago. Those accounts were behind but they were moving in the right direction. Councilor Park asked if there would be at a breakeven point? Mr. Tucker said they weren't quite at the breakeven point yet. Council President Bragdon asked about Glendoveer revenue. Mr. Desmond responded to his question. He then spoke to the possibility of being on the ballot by 2006. He spoke to what the preparatory costs would be. He urged that Nancy Chase take up this charge. Mr. Tucker said some of the expenses would be reimbursable under the bond. Council President Bragdon suggested options that would be visible and attractive. Mr. Desmond said some of these were in existing target areas. He talked about the success of the 1995 measure. The specificity of the sites was important to the success of the bond measure. Mr. Desmond said the earlier they got going the better the chance of having a successful measure. Process was sometimes more important than product.

They wanted to move forward on the golf proposal at Blue Lake. He didn't think it would require any budget adjustments. They thought it would be a good revenue generator in the future. It wouldn't effect the current development. Councilor Newman asked about the marketing plan for this proposal. Mr. Desmond said they had been working closely with the Planning staff with incentive based programs. He gave three suggestions: the building green liaison, challenge grants, and watershed council technical support. He talked about how Metro could spend a bit of money to leverage money. He talked about a pilot project and gave an example of Damascus. He suggested Metro fund a half of an FTE and another group funding the other half FTE and take it out to homebuilders to promote building green. He then talked about restoration partnerships to raise money. This fund could meet specific fish and wildlife goals. The third concept was helping watershed councils to further the restoration vision. They wanted to collaborate and leverage money. Councilor McLain said she felt the basic concepts were fine. The one element she hoped they would get into was what was in it for Metro. There needed to be credit given to Metro. It needed to have a Metro seal. Mr. Desmond said when good activities were happening on the ground there was enough credit to look good.

The Parks Department had an ability to help with this collaborative project. Councilor Hosticka suggested getting these proposals fleshed out. Councilor Burkholder asked if all of the funds were shown. Mr. Tucker said they had six months of activity.

Councilor Park talked about moving Nancy Chase's position. If they decided to do a Goal 5 bond, would those positions be reimbursed? Mr. Tucker said they must pass a resolution laying out what was covered. Councilor Park talked about reimbursable positions. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), explained some of the specifics of a property tax measure. Councilor McLain asked what would they be doing with this information. Mr. Stringer said the next step was to clearly identify the program, dollar amounts and FTE and the Council objective that it related to. Mr. Stringer said the Council President's budget was due April 1<sup>st</sup>. They would have further discussion between now and April 1<sup>st</sup>.. Council President Bragdon said these discussions were to allow him to determine the budget. Councilor Burkholder concurred with Mr. Stringer's suggestion to tie objectives to dollars and FTE. Mike Wetter, Assistant to the Council President, said they had talked about some kind of meeting to wrap up after these presentations where the Council would get a chance to talk about their specific priorities. They didn't have this scheduled yet. He said the Strategic Planning Team would be talking about how to role this out. Mr. Stringer said they had heard good things from the various departments. He felt they were making progress.

**4. BREAK**

**5. HIGHWAY (HWY) 217 PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Richard Brandman, Deputy Planning Director, said they were wrapping up the first phase of the Hwy 217 Corridor Study. He gave details of the process. He talked about the overview report included in the packet. He noted the goals and objectives, which has been agreed to and adopted by the policy advisory committee. He noted Kristin Hull's outreach efforts. He gave more specifics about the study and its objectives. Councilor Burkholder asked how you measured Objective 5. Mr. Brandman said they had census track data. The main goal was to make sure that you were not having a disproportionate impact. Councilor Burkholder talked about accessibility for low income. Which option provided better transit movement? Mr. Brandman said they would look at both road way and transit modes. Councilor Burkholder asked about what else was going on such as commuter rail. How did we integrate all of the pieces to measure 2040? Councilor Monroe wondered about a specific width of the corridor. Mr. Brandman said they were looking at a half a mile on both sides. Ms. Hull said they did the analysis by neighborhood boundary.

Bridget Weighart, Planning Department, reviewed the options (a copy of which is included in the meeting packet). There were six options: 1) arterial, transit and interchange improvements, 2) six lane without interchange improvements, 3) six lane plus interchange improvements, 4) six lane with carpool lanes, 5) six lane with rush-hour toll lanes and 6) six lane with tolled ramp meter bypasses. She spoke to the benefits of and key findings for each option. She also noted which were the most expensive options. Councilor Monroe asked about the enhanced transit option. Ms. Weighart said they hadn't talked about this in detail. Councilor Hosticka said commuter rail hadn't been discussed. Councilor Newman said if they were looking at a commuter rail they wouldn't consider frequent bus service. Councilor Monroe said the base commuter rail was three hours in the morning and three hours in the evening with a half hour service. Less commuter time would require additional infrastructure. Councilor Monroe said the assumption was that you started out with the base with possible adjustments in the future.

Ms. Weighart talked about Option 2. This option didn't score well but it was cheaper. The policy advisory committee suggested dropping Option 2. She then detailed Option 3, which didn't provide an express trip, so the committee suggesting setting this aside. Councilor Hosticka explained why this was pulled out. Councilor McLain asked if the committee gave any prioritizing. Ms. Hull said no. She funding gaps were a big focus for all of the options. She noted environmental impacts for this option. She then talked Option 4, which included a carpool lane. This didn't score well because it was a short corridor. Councilor Monroe talked about the carpool lane in Vancouver, which was marginally successful. Ms. Weighart then spoke to Option 5. It provided some level of overall congestion but not as much as other options. It also had the smallest funding gap. Councilor McLain said they knew that use of surface streets was an issue. Ms. Weighart said she was correct. She then detailed Option 6. It had some attractiveness for the general-purpose travelers. It provided significantly less revenues than the toll lanes option.

Councilor Hosticka said people keep talking about tolls. The advisory committee was open enough to consider them. Council President Bragdon asked if there was anything they wanted to convey to the policy advisory committee? Councilor McLain asked if Washington County had given their input? Councilor Hosticka talked about improving one area but creating a problem some place else. Were you moving some of the effects down stream? Councilor McLain said she was still hearing comments about the other ramifications and impacts. Councilor Burkholder said were they doing a Metroscope run to see what the land use implications were? Was this helping

or hurting the other goals. Ms. Weighart said the Metroscope analysis assumed an improvement on Hwy 217. Councilor Park said he didn't think Metroscope runs would help on this issue. It didn't create enough impact. Councilor Hosticka wanted to know if we had modeled the impact of putting an expansion on Damascus and industrial expansion in Hillsboro. Ms. Weighart said they had developed a base. She noted the public comment summary. Mr. Brandman said this refinement work would go on for the next six months.

## **6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES REPORT**

Gerry Uba, Planning Department, passed out the Draft 2004 Performance Measures and staff report. He presented the second performance measures report. He gave them a history of where they had come from. The adopted performance measure report was based on the 2040 Fundamentals. They had reduced the number of indicators as directed by the Council as well as send the report to the State Department of Land Conservation and Development (LCDC). They had worked with Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) to reduce the number of indicators. All of the indicators they had identified in the prior year were found to be useful. For each performance measures there was a set of data factors. He spoke to the methodology they used. He then spoke to the report itself. They had presented this information to MPAC. MPAC had reworded four of the Fundamentals. If Council accepted the rewording, they would have to change Title 9 of the Functional Plan. Second, in the report staff was able to collect data for about 24 of the 32 indicators they had now. They didn't measure the indicators completely. They still needed a lot of data to measure the 2040 Growth Concept adequately. Indicators that needed to be measured were transportation, housing types, redevelopment potentials, centers, etc. He then spoke to benchmarks. They weren't able to do these. It was a very involved process. It would require looking into the vision and mission of this agency in order to come up with benchmarks. They recommended that Council direct them to collect data and start comparing data they already had so they could bring benchmarks in the next report. Councilor Burkholder asked about the purpose of the benchmarks, was it to set targets? Mr. Uba said it would allow them to compare themselves to other areas of the country. Once Council had this information they could decide to adopt the national existing standards. Mr. Uba said they recommended Council adopt the report so they could send it to DLCD. The next report would be in 2006. Finally, they would take this to Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), MPAC, and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC). Councilor Park commented about the rate of change. Mr. Jordan said there was some indirect ways to get at job growth such as commute time. Councilor McLain said this took care of our State requirements and our self-imposed requirements. This was 1/16<sup>th</sup> of what they said what they wanted to do. We wanted to do this smoothly and carefully. She suggested reviewing the performance measure process. Was there a way to get outside funding? They should be trying to continue to finesse this too.

## **7. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660 (1) (d) FOR THE PURPOSE OF DELIBERATING WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO CONDUCT LABOR NEGOTIATIONS.**

Time began: 4:18 p.m.

Time Ended: 4:27 pm

Members Present: Kevin Dull, Ruth Scott, Kerry Gilbreth, Bill Stringer, Brad Stevens

## **8. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS**

Councilor Hosticka said the Tualatin Basin Coordinating Group met and Councilors Bragdon and Newman presented their resolution. He suggested having a discussion about the impact of Measure 37. Councilor Monroe suggested having Mr. Cooper speak to this and how he saw these measures would impact. Councilor Newman said he would also like to talk about his Goal 5 resolution. Councilor Hosticka detailed some of what he would like to discuss about Measure 37. Councilor Park asked if they were going to have some indication from the State about how they would be handling this issue. Dick Benner, Senior Attorney would be providing detail to the Council about the State's stance. Councilor Park suggested having someone from the State provide information. Councilor Park wanted to know what this did to our Functional Plan? Councilor Burkholder talked about some things that we might want to put in our plan. He introduced a draft letter about global warming that was Metro's comments to the State on that issue. He wanted to get this out very soon. JPACT and MPAC would see it tomorrow. Councilor Burkholder said one of their recommendations was to plant trees.

There were none.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER  
16, 2004**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	11/18/04	Metro Council Agenda for November 18, 2004	111604c-01
3	Budget Agenda	11/16/04	To: Metro Council From: Jim Desmond and Jeff Tucker, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department Re: FY 2005-06 Regional Parks and Greenspaces Budget information and issues	111604c-02
6	Draft Report	November 2004	To: Metro Council From: Gerry Uba, Planning Department Re: 2004 Performance Measures Report	111604c-03
6	Draft staff report	11/16/04	To: Metro Council From: Gerry Uba, Planning Department Re: Resolution No. 04-3513 staff report	111604c-04
7	Draft Letter	11/18/04	To: Jane Lubchenco, Mark Dodson Co-chairs, Governors Advisory Group on Global Warming, Oregon Department of Energy From: David Bragdon, Council President, Rod Park, JPACT Chair and Charles Becker, MPAC Chair	111604c-05