

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
DATE: November 23, 2004
DAY: Tuesday
TIME: 2:00 PM
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

- 2:00 PM 1. **ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**
- 2:15 PM 2. **DEPARTMENT PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS: Manning/Taylor
MERC AND OREGON ZOO Vecchio/Chisholm**
- 3:15 PM 3. **BREAK**
- 3:20 PM 4. **DEPARTMENT PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS: Cotugno/Kirk
PLANNING**
- 3:50 PM 5. **EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(e).
DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO NEGOTIATE
REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.**
- 4:20 PM 6. **COUNCILOR BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS**

ADJOURN

Agenda Item Number 2.0

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS: MERC

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, November 23, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: Nov. 23, 2004 Time: 2:15 p.m. Length: 30 min.

Presentation Title: MERC Program Budget

Department: MERC

Presenters: Sheryl Manning, Kathy Taylor

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

This continues the series of discussions between Council and the departments on budget issues, including a summary of the 2004-05 budget in program budget format.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION Yes No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED Yes No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____

Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

MERC
FY 2005-06 Program Budget

Revenues & Costs	Programs:	Mission 1: Operate Public Facilities			Mission 2: Build and Maintain Public Facilities						
		Convention & Trade Shows	Arts & Culture	Operation Total	Convention & Trade Shows	Arts & Culture	Building Total			Department Total	
Direct Program Revenue & Costs											
Direct Revenue											
Enterprise (gross)		20,105,895	7,232,269	27,338,164	77%	0		0	0%	27,338,164	73%
Other		141,580	25,588	167,168	0%	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	52%	1,167,168	3%
City of Portland			337,750	337,750	1%	0	337,750	337,750	17%	675,500	2%
Hotel/Motel VDI		6,048,048	1,510,676	7,558,724	21%	0		0	0%	7,558,724	20%
MTOCA				0		595,000		595,000	31%	595,000	2%
		<u>\$26,295,523</u>	<u>\$9,106,283</u>	<u>\$35,401,806</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>\$595,000</u>	<u>\$1,337,750</u>	<u>\$1,932,750</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>\$37,334,556</u>	<u>100%</u>
Direct Costs											
Personal services		0		0		0		0		0	
Materials & Services		10,040,944	4,302,610	14,343,554	41%	65,830	499,031	564,861	29%	14,908,415	40%
Capital Outlay		12,923,152	3,202,095	16,125,247	46%	0		0	0%	16,125,247	43%
		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>365,500</u>	<u>1,078,000</u>	<u>1,443,500</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>1,443,500</u>	<u>4%</u>
		<u>\$22,964,096</u>	<u>\$7,504,705</u>	<u>\$30,468,801</u>	<u>86%</u>	<u>\$431,330</u>	<u>\$1,577,031</u>	<u>\$2,008,361</u>	<u>104%</u>	<u>\$32,477,162</u>	<u>87%</u>
FTE		127.46	22.59	150.05		0.00	0.00	0.00		150.05	
Net Direct Program Revenue / (Cost)		\$3,331,427	\$1,601,578	\$4,933,005	14%	\$163,670	(\$239,281)	(\$75,611)	-4%	\$4,857,394	13%
minus:											
Allocated Costs (Administration & Support)											
Debt Service		1237902		1,237,902	3%	186863		186,863	10%	1,424,765	4%
Intra-Departmental		(473,322)	473,322	0	0%	0		0	0%	0	0%
Excise tax assessed		1,395,132		1,395,132	4%	0		0	0%	1,395,132	4%
Interfund transfers - Metro Support Service		1,293,027	714,091	2,007,118	6%	0		0	0%	2,007,118	5%
Interfund transfers		97,637		97,637	0%	(97,637)		(97,637)	-5%	0	0%
Contingency											
		<u>\$3,550,376</u>	<u>\$1,187,413</u>	<u>\$4,737,789</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>\$89,226</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$89,226</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>\$4,827,015</u>	<u>13%</u>
equals:											
Total Program Revenue / (Cost)		(\$218,949)	\$414,165	\$195,216	1%	\$74,444	(\$239,281)	(\$164,837)	-9%	\$30,379	0%
plus:											
Allocated Revenue											
Fees/charges				0	0%	0		0	0%	0	0%
Grants, transfers, taxes				0	0%	0		0	0%	0	0%
Misc. (interest, etc.)				0		0		0		0	
		<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0%</u>
equals:											
Net resource requirements		(\$218,949)	\$414,165	\$195,216	1%	\$74,444	(\$239,281)	(\$164,837)	-9%	\$30,379	0%
	Excise Tax			\$0				\$0		\$0	
	Property Tax			\$0				\$0		\$0	
	Discretionary			\$0				\$0		\$0	
				\$195,216				(\$164,837)		\$30,379	

Agenda Item Number 4.0

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS: PLANNING

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, November 23, 2004
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: Nov. 23, 2004 Time: 3:50 p.m. Length: 30 min.

Presentation Title: Planning Program Budget

Department: Planning

Presenters: Andy Cotugno

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

This continues the series of discussions between Council and the departments on budget issues, including a summary of the 2004-05 budget in program budget format. Other materials include a summary of Planning's budget issues and a memo from Andy Cotugno on MPO requirements. Additional material may be distributed at the meeting.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION Yes No

DRAFT IS ATTACHED Yes No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____

Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



METRO

Date: November 17, 2004
To: David Bragdon, Metro Council President
Metro Council
From: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director
Re: *Federal, State, Metro Charter and Metro Code Planning Requirements*

Federal, State, Metro Charter and Metro Code requirements dictate annual reporting, multi-year planning projects and planning process. Federal requirements relate specific to Metro's role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). State requirements reflect Metro's role in the region as manager of the urban growth boundary (UGB) and the regional transportation plan (RTP).

Specific Metro Code requirements reflect monitoring responsibilities related to the Functional Plan and management of the jurisdictional boundary and the UGB. The Charter requirement addresses updating of the Future Vision.

I have listed for your information on the various reporting and planning requirements. Next to a description of the requirement is the legal reference in statute or code.

Federal Requirements

- Update of the RTP every three years to comply with Federal transportation planning regulations and to demonstrate conformity with the Federal Clean Air Act (23 USC Section 134(g) & CFR 450.322).
- Update of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) every two years to program regional transportation funds and demonstrate conformity of the MTIP and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) with the Federal Clean Air Act (23 USC Section 134(h) & CFR 450.324).
- Periodically update public involvement procedures for regional and local transportation planning activities to ensure compliance with Federal statutes prohibiting discrimination base on race, color or national origin (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000d, et seq).
- Lead agency in the NEPA planning process and FTA New Starts programs. Federal regulations prescribe public involvement oversight, management, decision-making structure

and coordination with Federal agencies. State statute has also given Metro the authority to "site" a transit project as a land use action.

State Requirements

- Periodic Review of the UGB - ORS 197.296 thru 197.299
Current review cycles: evaluate UGB capacity every five years (UGB decision by 2007 – planning process takes two years).
- Biennial Performance Measures Report – ORS 197.301 and 197.302. Report on performance measures at least once every two years. "Corrective Action Plan" every two years if indicated by performance.
- Update of the RTP every five to seven years to comply with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements (OAR 660-012-0000).

Metro Charter Requirements

- Review and revise the Future Vision at least every 15 years – section 5 1(d), adopted in 1992, next revision 2010.

Metro Code Requirements

- Processing annual Quasi-Judicial applications – sections 3.01.025 and 3.01.033: includes annexations and quasi-judicial applications to amend the UGB.
- Annual report on Minor Adjustments to the UGB – section 3.01.035(f).
- Annual Compliance Report and Order – section 3.07.880.
- Development Review – Ongoing monitoring – code section 3.07.810 and 820.

ATTACHMENT FY 2005-06 Budget Policy Issues

Planning Programmatic Issues Needing Direction from Council: (Issues derived from strategic budget program discussion. For full explanation of issues see 38 page document dated October 25, 2004)

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
1.	Periodic Review Cycle for Urban Growth Boundary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a budget issue but a legislative question of whether the cycle is five years or seven years. 							
2.	Big Look, to what extent should Metro's 2040 review be shaped by statewide planning issues/programs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The answer to this question affects the timing of a Big Look kickoff and level of coordination with the state program. The program for the state review is not drafted. 							
3.	Big Look Outreach effort? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific activities and timing of events will be shaped by the Council roll out strategy. Base effort includes: \$100,000 Contract services for focus groups/ survey/testing messages \$80,000 for printing and postage \$25,000 ads and legal notices \$16,000 for meetings and support • Base proposal includes 1.0 FTE in Public Affairs for coordination, support and planning 	1.0 FTE Public Affairs		\$100,000	\$121,000		✓	
4.	New Urban Area Planning, shall Metro take a more active role in planning and protecting new urban areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current land use changes likely will limit local governments' ability to initiate concept planning. No new staff is recommended at this time. • Should Metro fund a grant program to provide resources to local governments to plan the new urban areas. 	1.2 FTE		\$50,000 to \$1.5M			✓	✓

		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Funding		
						Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
5.	<p>Does Metro want to take an active role in the ongoing land use and transportation planning for the 2040 mixed-use areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are ongoing land use and transportation planning activities in 2040 centers, corridors and main streets. Metro is regularly asked to provide technical assistance. • Should Metro continue to provide technical resources in areas that still need 2040 planning, such as Raleigh Hills? – If yes, proposal is to add 0.5 FTE (Associate Regional Planner). 		0.5 FTE \$45,000				✓	
6.	<p>What level of involvement does the Metro Council want staff to take in annexation of lands to the jurisdictional boundary?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 1,500 tax lots in the Urban Growth Boundary, but outside of Metro's jurisdictional boundary. Metro could choose to contract for services to gather signatures and process applications. 			\$375,000 to \$1M			✓	
7.	<p>Does Metro want to reconsider its role in the regional water supply consortium?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Level: Participate at the technical and policy levels with the Regional Water Supply Consortium, use the supply plan the Consortium develops to meet framework plan requirements. Provide additional technical support for forecasting demand on a time and materials basis. Funding: 0.05 FTE; No change in staffing or investment levels. 	0.05 FTE			\$15,000 annual dues in Council Budget			
8.	<p>What level of participation does Metro want to have in the Regional Emergency Management Group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Level: Meets coordination requirements. Participate at the technical and policy level. Funding: No change in staffing levels but remain flexible to expand resources if new regional opportunities arise as a result of changing federal or state policies on emergency management. 	0.05 FTE						

		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Funding		
						Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
9.	<p>Issues related to potential strategies for the priorities of 2006-09 MTIP update.</p> <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue with existing funding criteria • Expand criteria to better reflect Council strategic planning goals • Develop a long-term funding strategy for Metro activities currently reliant on MTIP funds to allow for the evolution and growth of individual programs <p>Funding: Uses existing staff resources.</p>							
10.	<p>Federal Certification Corrective Actions, add new staff using increased federal planning funds?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy: Expand existing staff allocations (1.0 FTE Assistant Transportation Planner and 1.0 FTE Associate Transportation Planner) and dedicate new staff resources to the following activities that are subject to corrective actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Complete an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) before January 2007 that meets federal planning regulations. – Expand Metro's role in the region's Intelligent Transportation System (ITS). – Reach compliance with federal regulations for developing and maintaining an ongoing Congestion Management System (CMS) that guides the need and development of transportation system expansion. – Develop an agency Title VI plan for Metro that prohibits discrimination in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance <p>Funding: Contingent on new federal planning grants possible in upcoming federal reauthorization.</p>		2.0 FTE \$138,000					✓
11.	<p>Expanded role in statewide planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy 1: Continue to participate at a minimal level with existing staff resources. Funding: No change in staffing levels • Strategy 2: Incorporate expanded participation in statewide activities with expanded resources dedicated to federal compliance. Funding: Contingent on new federal planning grants possible in upcoming federal reauthorization. 		0.4 FTE \$45,000					✓

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
12.	<p>What is Metro's role in Natural Resource Implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base Level: The base funding assumptions include completing DLCD acknowledgement of the Goal 5 Program and providing technical assistance to jurisdictions to implement Goal 5 recommendations, assisting to identify barriers in local codes that limit green development practices, and responding to requests for information about the habitat areas and restoration opportunities. 	1.45 FTE						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy 1: Establish a Green Development Practices Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate fish and wildlife education messages into ongoing Metro program areas, particularly targeting homeowners Coordinate with Centers Program to offer financial incentives for specific building projects in habitat areas Provide technical assistance to the development community, primarily targeting new residential development through partnerships Develop seminars, recognition programs and other special efforts to increase awareness of green development practices <p>Funding: Shift 1.05 FTE from the FY 2004-05 budget to this effort, seek grant or other partnerships for promoting green building practices, and contribute \$10,000 to \$30,000 excise tax into expanding Parks and Solid Waste's existing education and awareness efforts.</p>	1.05 FTE			<p>Seek grant funding in FY 2004-05, partnerships and redirect other FTE, plus \$10,000 to \$30,000 excise funds for expanded messages</p>		✓	

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy 2: Establish a Regional Habitat Restoration Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Convene a multi-disciplinary team to support watershed-based restoration activities – Offer donations and in kind support to increase the productivity and capacity of existing watershed councils for restoration projects – Coordinate with Soil and Water Conservation Districts, watershed councils and others to identify regional restoration pilot priorities – Seek interagency and non-profit support for federal and state grant funding for additional activities – Increase funding for grant program for restoration activities (NFWF) in coordination with the Parks Department <p>Funding: Shifts 1.25 from FY 2004-05 Goal 5 resources to restoration efforts; seeks \$100,000 excise funds or other grants to increase NFWF grant funding for local restoration efforts.</p>		1.25 FTE 0.05 FTE DRC			\$100,000 for NFWF grants	✓	✓	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy 3: Establish a Regional Monitor and Research Program: <p>Improve baseline data for existing conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Coordinate with other departments and agencies collecting data to improve exchange of information and consistency – Participate on state and local task forces to share information on restoration and monitoring results – Refine estimates of effects on development capacity <p>Adjust course of best practices as necessary.</p> <p>Funding: Shifts 0.25 FTE from FY 2004-05 Goal 5 resources and allocates \$15,000 for interns to support research and monitoring. Would also seek grant funding in FY 2005-06.</p>		0.25 FTE 0.15 FTE DRC	Intern \$15,000			✓	✓	

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
13.	<p>What is Metro's role in Stormwater Management?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Level: Nothing committed beyond a short white paper and discussion in 2005. • Strategy 1: Define policies and financially support green buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Work with WRPAC to identify better stormwater management opportunities and policies that Metro can support – Participate with CWS, BES, WES, DEQ and others to meet Clean Water Act obligations – Expand Green development practices throughout the watershed, not just in habitat areas and centers <p>Funding: Shift 0.5 FTE from 2005 Goal 5 Program. Would require new funding source for financial incentives for green buildings and new remote sensing data for measuring surface water quality.</p>	0.5 FTE 0.1 FTE DRC			New funding needed for green building incentives and remote sensing data	✓		
14.	<p>What is Metro's role in supporting Affordable Housing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Complete HTAC process and carry recommendations through Council process, conducting additional research as requested – Coordinating with Centers Program, Housing Authorities and others, implement recommendations through technical assistance and financial incentives <p>Funding: DRC 0.25; Add \$25,000 excise tax to address additional HTAC issues. Assumes continuation of FY 2004-05 staffing for additional six months.</p>	1.05 FTE 0.25 FTE DRC 0.1 FTE Public Affairs	0.5 FTE \$42,000		\$25,000		✓	

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
15.	Performance Measure reports direction? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Level: FY 2005-06 is for research, primarily by DRC and Travel Forecasting (0.4FTE LRP and 1.5 FTE DRC/Travel Forecasting with coordination from LRP) for publication in FY 2006-07 • Strategy 1: Decentralize to departments and support "Big Look": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Measure performance for planning department functions and shift responsibilities for other measures to solid waste and parks – Seek editing support from central staff – Link "Big Look" research and GIS analysis to performance measures – Leverage the research done outside of Metro to be relevant to the performance measures. Funding: Add 0.5 FTE for additional research using performance measures to support "Big Look"; seek \$15,000 for intern assistance in updating measures.	0.40 FTE						
		1.0 FTE TF	0.5 FTE \$42,000				✓	
		0.5 FTE DRC	Intern \$15,000					
		0.1 FTE Public Affairs						
16.	HCT, Need for a rail system plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One new FTE would be required to assist with the HCT Plan and to free up staff already assigned to projects. 	1.4 FTE \$110,000	1.0 FTE \$85,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	✓		
17.	What is Metro's role in Streetcar projects? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy issue that requires no additional budget to resolve. 	3.575 FTE						✓
18.	Milwaukie LRT project funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project's SDEIS is a budget item for FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. No additional budget would be required to develop a finance plan. 	1.775 FTE						✓
19.	Define appropriate Metro role in Highway Environmental Impact Statements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy issue that requires no additional budget to resolve. 							✓
20.	Revisit Corridor priorities and identify the Next Priority Corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an issue for FY 2005-06, will be completed in FY 2004-05. 							

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
21.	Need to secure a stable funding source for project development activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current dependence on grant funding for the project development division limits Metro's role in "pre-project" efforts and makes it more dependent on the initiative of local jurisdictions, TriMet and ODOT. Does the Council want to explore creating a stable funding floor for the division in order to allow the agency more strategically address Council project priorities? This not a request for additional FTE.						✓	✓
22.	Ballot measure for Transit and Highway projects? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If election is held in Spring 2006 - \$50,000 direct election costs - .50 FTE staff senior planner level or consultant. 		0.50 FTE \$45,000	or \$45,000	\$50,000		✓	
23.	Better align freight program with the Council's economic development goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a policy discussion, not a budget issue for FY 2005-06. 							
24.	Implement the Regional Travel Options Strategic Plan including adding staff and contracts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTE and M&S will need to be adjusted as the work plan evolves and revenue is solidified. 	1.4 FTE	3.0 FTE \$270,000	\$900,000	\$14,500			✓
25.	Improve implementation of Livable Streets Program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy: Expand the program to include more visible design advocacy and direct support for selected local partners in project development in designing street improvements. Funding: Requires addition of 1.0 FTE 		1.0 FTE \$85,000 Intern \$2,500		\$5,000			✓
26.	Expansion of TOD/Centers Implementation Program activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and recommend potential sources to secure \$10M implementation funds annually. Implement existing expanded TODs/Centers Program (current MTIP funding has allowed projects to increase from 13 to 23 which requires addition of 1.5 FTE at the Associate Regional Planner level). Future Budget Issue: Double MTIP funding (Priorities 2008-11) for Centers Implementation from \$1M per year to \$2M per year. 	2.8 FTE	1.5 FTE \$110,000 1.0 FTE \$85,000	\$40,000 \$25,000 \$50,000	\$500 \$4,000,000 (includes land) \$2,000,000 (includes land)		✓ local match local match	✓ ✓

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
27.	<p>Include a Centers Implementation program with an education, advocacy and technical assistance campaign.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internally designed, managed and staffed Lively Centers Education, Advocacy & Technical Assistance Campaign. Consultant managed and staffed Urban Centers strategies (\$40K-\$75K each) (0.5 FTE Principal Regional Planner level). 	0.7 FTE			\$10,000		✓	
			0.5 FTE \$50,000	\$200,000		✓		
28.	<p>Metro's role in a Regional Green Building Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund project-based green building program with Business Energy Tax Credits (BETC). 0.5 FTE included in existing 2.8 FTE listed above. TOD/Centers Projects and internal coordination with existing Metro programs relating to green buildings in Parks, Planning and Solid Waste (0.1 FTE included in existing 2.8 FTE listed above). Projects, internal coordination and regional education, advocacy & technical assistance program (addition of 1.0 FTE Program Manager I level). 							✓ (BETC)
			1.0 FTE \$115,000	\$300,000	\$50,000		✓	✓ (apply to Energy Trust)
29.	<p>What is Metro's role in Regional Economic Development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status Quo: support Regional Economic Development partners including \$5,000 annual dues. Larger role in the development and implementation of a regional economic strategy (addition of 0.5 FTE Principal Regional Planner level). Initiate a centers economic development program (addition of 0.5 FTE Principal Regional Planner level). Ensure policy, budget and program decisions throughout Planning Department support regional economic strategies. 	0.15 FTE			\$5,000		✓	
			0.5 FTE \$50,000		\$5,000			
			0.5 FTE \$50,000	\$100,000	\$5,000		✓	
							✓	
30.	<p>Travel Forecasting's Household survey and funding issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey will likely require 8 to 10 years of continuous funding. First year funding is \$250,000. Subsequent years would be approximately \$150,000 to \$175,000. Survey would be administered jointly with the other MPOs in the Willamette Valley and ODOT. The M&S funds represent Metro's share to survey this metropolitan area. Funding source needs to be identified. 	0.1 FTE			\$250,000			✓

						Funding		
		Existing FTE	Proposed FTE/Salary	Consultant	Miscellaneous Materials & Services	Not Identified	Excise Tax	Grant/Contract
31.	<p>Model Development & Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of travel demand models are subject to federal mandates and guidelines. Research and development work is required to meet this requirement. Council acknowledgement is required to ensure that the current level of effort is not reduced. 	2.4 FTE						✓
32.	<p>Client Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modeling services are provided for transportation project analysis. Current staffing is sufficient for the present workload. However, if a substantial increase in corridor work, transit analysis, EIS work or other endeavors that require demand modeling emerge, then an increase in modeling staff is needed to maintain the current service standards. 	6.5 FTE						✓
33.	<p>Performance measures related to data collection and analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current FTE is dedicated to the collection of data that is useful for assessing travel trends and performance. The program would be restructured to more directly collect, analyze, and document performance measures that relate to the RTP Congestion Management System and the Council Performance Measures report. 	1.0 FTE						✓
34.	<p>Technical Assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metro serves as the central transportation modeling agency for the region. As such, Metro staff provides modeling assistance and software training to regional partners. It is important that the Council endorse this role. It is essential that a single agency serves as the source for centralized modeling data and forecasting techniques. This ensures consistency in regional analysis. 	0.5 FTE						✓
35.	<p>MetroScope enhancements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of model automation project and satellite imagery for expansion of RLIS geographic coverage for the Big Look. 			\$20,000	\$40,000		✓	✓
36.	<p>Budget developed annually dependent upon DRC storefront sales revenues of 25%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds for marketing products & services. 			\$6,500	\$3,500		✓	

FY 2005-2006 Oregon Zoo Budget Council Worksession November 23, 2004

I. Beginning Assumptions

FY 2004-2005 Budget in program format

Revenue Expectations 2005-2006:

- Low growth rate in enterprise revenue expected
 - Attendance forecast 1,305,000
 - No gate increase proposed
 - Food Concessions flat, Catering lower
 - Butterflies return summer 2005 and 2006
 - Continuation of simulator ride
 - Full year parking revenue and transit incentive
- Property tax revenue expected to grow at or below 3%

Expenditure Challenges 2005-2006:

- Personal Services increase on existing staff \$919,171 (+7%)
- Utilities increase expected at \$137,398 (+6.8%)
- Central Service increase \$196,394 (+8.3%)
- No funding available for Renewal and Replacement reserve

II. Issues, Opportunities, Priorities

New programs 2005-2006:

- Regional Conservation Planning Initiative
- Family Farm Program (Grant funded - IMLS)
- UNO staffing (Grant funded - BLM)

Overriding Issues:

- Sustainable Business Model (Attendance/Revenue/Expenditure)
 - Operating expenses continue to outpace revenue growth
 - Operating costs of new exhibits (Stellar Cove, Eagle Canyon, Family Farm, Intro to the Forest, Condors)
 - Attendance increases constrained by parking lot capacity
 - Personnel costs and utilities continue to rise
 - Fund balance:
 - Establish cash flow reserve (\$2.26M) and counter-cyclical reserve (\$1.85M) in Operating Fund
 - Capital Fund commitments
- Permanent parking solution

**Oregon Zoo Operating Fund
FY 2004-05 Program Budget**

Revenues & Costs	Mission:	Conservation		Services to the Community	Operations Total	Services to the Community	Capital Total	Department Total
	Programs:	Conservation	Conservation Education	Community and Guest Services		Capital Investment		
Direct Program Revenue & Costs								
Direct Revenue								
Enterprise (gross)		0	914,453	14,109,246	15,023,699	0	0	15,023,699
Other		0	0	0	0	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Subtotal		\$0	\$914,453	\$14,109,246	\$15,023,699	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$16,123,699
Direct Costs								
Personal services		672,733	1,403,558	9,619,021	11,695,311	73,647	73,647	11,768,958
Materials & Services		128,080	193,922	7,971,480	8,293,482	0	0	8,293,482
Capital Outlay		0	0	85,700	85,700	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,085,700
Subtotal		\$800,813	\$1,597,480	\$17,676,201	\$20,074,493	\$3,073,647	\$3,073,647	\$23,148,140
Net Direct Program Revenue / (Cost)		(\$800,813)	(\$683,027)	(\$3,566,955)	(\$5,050,794)	(\$1,973,647)	(\$1,973,647)	(\$7,024,441)
minus:								
Allocated Costs (Administration & Support)								
Debt Service		16,764	33,442	370,036	420,242	0	0	420,242
Intra-Departmental		26,586	53,033	586,818	666,437	0	0	666,437
Excise tax Assessed		0	63,799	984,366	1,048,165	0	0	1,048,165
Central Services Costs		94,549	188,609	2,086,966	2,370,124	0	0	2,370,124
Contingency (FY 05 PERS Reserve only)		19,172	38,245	423,178	480,595	0	0	480,595
Subtotal		\$157,071	\$377,128	\$4,451,364	\$4,985,563	\$0	\$0	\$4,985,563
equals:								
Total Program Revenue / (Cost)		(\$957,883)	(\$1,060,154)	(\$8,018,319)	(\$10,036,357)	(\$1,973,647)	(\$1,973,647)	(\$12,010,004)
plus:								
Allocated Revenue								
Fees/charges		36,401	72,615	803,484	912,500	0	0	912,500
Grants, transfers, taxes		0	32,400	44,600	77,000	0	0	77,000
Property Tax Levy		915,898	944,000	7,074,006	8,933,904	0	0	8,933,904
Misc. (interest,etc.)		5,584	11,140	123,259	139,983	55,441	55,441	195,424
Subtotal		\$957,884	\$1,060,154	\$8,045,349	\$10,063,387	\$55,441	\$55,441	\$10,118,828
equals:								
Net resource requirements		\$0	(\$0)	\$27,030	\$27,030	(\$1,918,206)	(\$1,918,206)	(\$1,891,176)
				Excise Tax	\$0		\$0	\$0
				Other Discretionary Source	\$0		\$0	\$0
				*** Net Contribution to (draw from) Fund Balance	\$27,030		(\$1,918,206)	(\$1,891,176)
Program FTE		8.91	15.86	118.16	142.92	1.00	1.00	143.92
*** DOES NOT SHOW CONTINGENCY, FUND BALANCE, OR PRIOR YEAR PERS RESERVE							Office of the Director	2.15
*** Ballot Measure 50 (1997) consolidated ALL dedicated tax bases and operating serial levies that were then in effect into the tax base of the parent government, but the 1990 Zoo tax base was specifically dedicated to the Zoo by the voters. (37.2% of FY 05 Operating Revenue)							General Administration	4.58
							Budget and Finance	1.20
							Total Department FTE	151.85