

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, December 7, 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 2:01 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, DECEMBER 9, 2004/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the December 9, 2004 Council agenda. Councilor Newman asked Councilor Monroe about Resolution No. 04-3519. Councilor Monroe briefed the Council about Area 93. Multnomah County was supposed to have their planning done by March and they were not doing anything. Multnomah County had indicated that City of Portland was supposed to plan all of Multnomah County's areas. City of Portland indicated that there was some question about jurisdiction so they were hesitant to plan it, so there was a deadlock. He noted some of the suggestions that Multnomah County and City of Portland had concerning the area. He explained what the resolution did. He indicated that Mr. Cooper had instructed him that this was the cleanest way to proceed. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, added that part of the issue was what was the process. The purpose of the resolution was to bring the issue back to Council. Council President Bragdon asked if it was an island. Mr. Cooper said it was not an island but it abutted Multnomah County. Council President Bragdon asked about the industrial land issue. Mr. Cooper said this may not be the proper vehicle but could be evaluated as part of the work plan. Councilor Monroe said if we did nothing then Multnomah County would be in non-compliance. He also talked about the difficulty of getting productivity. Councilor McLain said she didn't think we were being responsible if we did nothing. Metro could take on the planning for it. Councilor Newman asked about a discussion at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) concerning participation if they were out of compliance. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), said they had discussed this at MPAC. They wanted Metro to be nice but there was no enforcement as part of that discussion. Councilor McLain said the discussion depended upon who served on MPAC. She felt the issue would come up again. Councilor Monroe said if the new Council wanted to have an ordinance, which indicated that the City of Portland would do the planning. This resolution just directed staff to get the ball rolling.

Councilor Park asked about Site 37. Mr. Jordan said there was a whole raft of these coming up. Councilor Park asked Andy Cotugno about the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funding and if they had to be in compliance. Mr. Cotugno said they had to be in compliance or make a good faith effort.

Councilor McLain asked about Ordinance No. 04-1067. Council President Bragdon said he had pulled the ordinance until they had discussed the qualification and the process for hire. Council President Bragdon said he wanted to have the discussion as part of the strategic planning process. Councilor McLain said she had a briefing with Mr. Cotugno and she thought they had narrowed it down. Councilor Burkholder suggested having a discussion at a work session. Councilors asked about the position and moving forward with filling the position. Councilor Newman suggested

having a discussion about the work plan concurrently with recruitment of the position. Councilor Park said it still raised the question about Mr. Jordan's role. Council President Bragdon said hiring decisions were Mr. Jordan's and Mr. Cotugno's. Councilor Park asked when it crossed over from policy to management. Mr. Jordan said Council had had discussions about culture change as well as the needs of the program and the agency. Councilor McLain said the dollars were in the budget. Her concern was putting it off too long. She asked if they could have it on next week's work session agenda.

Karen Kane, Public Affairs Department, introduced *Metro Minutes* and shared two examples. They would be used on cable before and after Council meetings. It was a minimal investment to share the work of Metro.

2. REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (RSWMP) PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT RESULTS

Jan O'Dell, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, shared what they had been hearing at the Lets Talk Trash sessions. She reminded Council members about the history of the public involvement process. She spoke to the second phase of the public involvement process. She noted the comment report, which she would provide at the end of the presentation (a copy of which is included in the record).

Ms. O'Dell about the three key issues that they addressed with the public. They had three Metro hosted meetings as well as government sponsored meetings. They also directed people to the website and had discussions with local business groups. Jan said they had 1,300 visits to the website with a number of participants at the focus groups. They received comments throughout the region from a respectable number of people. She summarized what the participants had to say about solid waste and recycling. She spoke to reoccurring themes. Garbage and recycling system – most were satisfied but wanted more information and education. There was some willingness to pay more for more information and education. Resource conservation stood out as to why they recycled. Most participants said they wanted to recycle more. There was strong support to increase education and information on recycling. People were supportive of recycling regulation. They found that sustainability and zero waste were not terms that were understood widely. Many people felt there needed to be less packaging and more "greening". Governments and local schools needed to lead by example. There were some service differences that stood out rural versus urban. She detailed some of the issues in the rural areas.

Ms. O'Dell then provided information about Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) comments. There was a desire to recycle packing. They felt manufacturers should step up and make packaging more recyclable. Councilor McLain said she had heard that the public wanted consistency of services. Councilor Newman said one of the comments that he heard was the issue of capacity for recycling bins. He suggested roll carts with lids on them. Councilor Burkholder asked about the relative amount of interest in this issue. What had been the history of the interest? Councilor McLain shared her history. Ms. O'Dell said she felt the attendance showed that many were satisfied with the services. Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, shared that the last go around had low attendance too. Councilor Burkholder asked about a satisfaction survey and third party data. He said the City of Portland Auditor just finished a survey. Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, talked about the three previous surveys Metro had done. Karen Blaur, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, suggested other ways to survey individuals such as a workshop on composting.

3. RECYCLING EDUCATION CHALLENGES IN THE REGION

Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, introduced a team of recycling experts. Education was happening but there were a lot of new people to the region. The team would speak to education and how they could be better partners to businesses and haulers. Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers, explained what his company did. They processed 6 to 7 tons a month. He also represented other processors, clean source separating facilities. He talked about commingling and the challenge for Metro as far as education. Metro had a problem giving out a common message. They saw an opportunity for Metro give out a common message to the region. He noted a letter he had shared with the Council (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). It was a call for help. He talked about plastic bags included in newspaper recycling and that these materials caused them a lot of challenge. He talked about subgroup of SWAC on contamination of materials in recycling. One primary recommendation was working with Metro to create an outreach program about this issue. This needed to be a substantial campaign. They had an opportunity to educate the public. They would need this as an ongoing project. Council President Bragdon suggested leaving a note at the curb. Mr. Murray said some haulers didn't pay attention but more haulers just didn't see the mixed recycling. The haulers had a duty to leave a note. It took all of the companies to pay attention. They felt notes were one aspect. Bruce Walker, City of Portland, talked about roll carts for added capacity. They were also meeting with Metro staff. If they were to increase capacity to meet recycling goals, the questions they had about quality of recycling needed to happen now. They had gone to a more simplified message at the curb. They were trying to work in concert with their other partners. People wanted to do the right thing. There was room to improve and they thought now was the time to encourage greater participation and doing reminders to getting it right. Councilor Hosticka said he felt that he had been getting mixed messages. He spoke to co-mingling. He felt the graphic flyer was a good idea.

Andy Rivinus, Weyerhaeuser Corp., said you had to start at the source. He talked about co-mingling and efficiency on the route. There was a gap between what the resident thought was right but not really knowing. He suggested targeting the source, the individual who was putting it into the bin. He suggested invoking multi-media to get a broader spectrum of people. Something had to be done. This was costing millions of dollars. The added volume was a success story but they had to take some of this to the landfill. The message was important to make sure the set out was correct in the first place. He suggested fixing where they were today. Councilor Burkholder asked about pulling the materials out. Mr. Rivinus, Weyerhaeuser Corp., said they had to slow their process down. Councilor Burkholder asked about their technology. Mr. Rivinus said you could do that but at a high cost. Councilor Burkholder wondered if this could be done at the MRFs to allocate the cost back to the consumers. Mr. Rivinus said the message was that the processor installed machinery to process the recyclables. The plastics clogged up the machinery. Mr. Murray talked about glass and plastic bags, which clogged up their system. Councilor McLain said there were two issues: commingling system and the subcommittee from SWAC. She felt Mr. Murray had the best idea. The messages had been very diverse. Simple messages that were regional were a good idea but they had to do something with their whole system. She urged reconvening the subcommittee. Mr. Murray said the haulers had responded positively to the letter. They had to retrain the citizen. Councilor Newman agreed that targeted messages were important. Targeted mailings were a good idea. Printing something on the bin lids. Dave White, Tri-County Haulers, said many issues had been raised today. He shared with Council an email from a hauler on the coast. He spoke to the increase in recycling with commingling. He knew that it was working but there was an increase in residual. They felt the commingling was important. He spoke to the message and that it had to be about what not to put in the bins. He emphasized their support of education at the bin level; when they go to carts, it was harder to catch the stuff. He

said he was a bit frustrated, asking for more evaluation and examination of opportunities to educate more.

Mr. Murray suggested isolating some of the issues like the use of plastic bags. Mr. Hoglund said this conversation had to do with the upcoming budget. He spoke to the appropriate messaging and utilizing existing resources. Councilor Monroe said the biggest source of plastic bags was the newspaper holder and the grocery stores.

4. BREAK

5. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN FINAL CUT LIST

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director explained the process they had gone through to date. They were asking the Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) to suggest emphasis before final consideration occurred. They tried to build off the initial criteria (a copy of this information is included in the meeting record). He suggested a formal motion in January giving direction to staff. Councilor Burkholder talked about Regional Framework compliance and should the Council consider compliance. Mr. Cotugno said when the original criteria were set it was included in there. Councilor Burkholder suggested reinforcing the compliance issue. Councilor Hosticka asked if they were asking Council to respond to opportunities for policy direction. Councilor Newman asked if we gave emphasis to projects that we had already funded? Mr. Cotugno said they get consideration but was not guaranteed total funding. It was a qualitative consideration. Councilor Hosticka asked what they were asking Council to respond to. He asked if Option 1 led them in a different direction than the other options. Which ones were more exclusive than others? Mr. Cotugno said they were just introducing this today and getting some feedback from Council. Ted Leybold, Planning Department, said he would start with #2, emphasizing the mode. They needed more direction on this option. Did they give a higher emphasis that didn't have other dedicated sources of revenue? Did they treat the modes equally? Was there distinction among these priorities? He talked about Option 3 and 4. Mr. Cotugno talked about the JPACT conversation, which was split between two debates. Mr. Leybold explained Option 3. Councilor Newman suggested that economic development needed to be more thoroughly defined. Mr. Cotugno said the criteria adopted now emphasized traded sector employment. Councilors talked about making the final choices.

Councilor Monroe said the battle was whether you fund roads or fund projects that couldn't be funded with road money. He urged Council adopt the 2A approach. He was troubled by 2B. If you stick with the 2A list, as direction from the Council, they had drawn a line. Council President Bragdon concurred with Councilor Monroe. Councilor Burkholder said economic development was in their regional policy direction already. The other approach was on 2B, requiring two or more of the criteria. Mr. Leybold explained Option 3. The fourth policy question was did they want to emphasize project development in anticipation of a regional or state funding measure or project construction? Councilor Burkholder said you could spend all of your money on planning and never get anything built. Councilor Park said it came down to what projects were ready to go. Councilor Hosticka said his question was how many project did we already have in the pipeline. Mr. Cotugno said there were a lot of projects in the plan. Councilors talked about OTIA funding and getting projects ready. There needed to be a balance. Councilor Newman made suggestions on project development. Councilor Burkholder said it came down to the emphasis. Mr. Leybold spoke to Option 5, which had to do with emphasizing protection of fish and wildlife habitat and green streets.

Mr. Cotugno said the default option was what had been done in the past. They would be back in January before JPACT takes action.

6. REVIEW FRAMEWORK FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT PROGRAM

Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, updated the Council on what staff had been working on with the working group. She noted that in the packet there was a flow chart. It illustrated the vision statement and the objectives. They had developed indicators that measured progress. They would like to have a policy discussion with Council about what targets they expected. Mr. Cotugno said they were envisioning those indicators to be done on the watersheds. Ms. Deffebach said they had the indicators. She spoke to the tools they had been working with. They had been using the work group to better understand the pitfalls. Staff had developed short descriptions and the positives and negatives for each area. She provided an update of where they were going with the work group. She spoke to the continuing monitoring work and figuring out how they would keep track of the data for things they cared about. She said the next attachment was an illustration of the tools. Councilor Burkholder asked about what was going on in the rest of the country. Ms. Deffebach said they had utilized a book of what was going on around the rest of the country. They had examples around the country.

7. REVIEW PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM FOR NATURAL RESOURCES IMPLEMENTATION.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, introduced the subject by indicating the Mr. Jordan had asked departments to consider cross-departmental efforts. The first had to do with natural resource protection and restoration. Planning and Parks had the biggest role but Solid Waste and the Zoo were all participants. He spoke to the principles (a copy of the proposed program was included in the meeting record). Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director, talked about different venues for presenting and education the public. Mr. Cotugno continued to explain the program. Councilor Hosticka asked about green development. Mr. Cotugno said there was a significant national movement with a fairly rigorous scoring process that constitute being labeled "green". Most emphasis was on how they built it not where they built it. The industry had recognized their need to expand their own evaluation process. Mr. Desmond said there were specific developers doing this but a lot of developers were saying there was no one bringing it to them. Councilor Hosticka said the reason they started on this was to preserving natural areas. He was concerned that we were shaping the program in a different direction. Mr. Cotugno said they tried to recognize those areas around the agency that were making their own connections to the green building industry. Councilor Hosticka suggested doing this but not as a substitute. Mr. Cotugno said Metro was well represented in that industry. He continued to talk about the regional restoration and the watershed approach. Mr. Desmond said in many cities public ownership played a large role. City of Portland played a large role because they were the largest landowner in the city. This wasn't necessarily true in all jurisdictions but in some. Mr. Cotugno talked about keeping the map up. Mr. Desmond explained the bond measure proposal. Councilor Burkholder asked about the FTE and the "X"s. Ms. Deffebach explained the difference. Mr. Desmond said they were giving Council a snap shot of what they could do. Mr. Jordan said there was an active discussion in the context of the strategic plan, the budget preparation and Goal 5. They had looked at a collaborative effort. Ms. Deffebach said they had submitted a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) grant to help jurisdictions meet Clean Water Act TDMLs. They were actively pursuing opportunities to move this forward. Councilors felt this idea was great.

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(D) FOR THE PURPOSE OF DELIBERATING WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO CONDUCT LABOR NEGOTIATIONS

Time Began: 4:44pm

Time Ended: 5:05pm

Members present: Kerry Gilbreth, Ruth Scott, Brad Stevens, Kevin Dull and Lisa Collings

9. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 2004

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	12/9/04	Metro Council Agenda for December 9, 2004	120704c-01
3	Letter and flyers	6/21/04	To: Our Valued Suppliers From: Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers Inc Re: contaminated materials in recycling and two different flyers on curbside recycling	120704c-02
2	Summary Report	December 2004	To: Metro Council From: Jan O'Dell, Solid Waste and Recycling Dept. Re: Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update Summary Report of Public Outreach Phase Two	120704c-03
6	Draft Flowchart	11/9/04	To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration program flowchart and protection tools (Goal 5)	120704c-04
5	MTIP emphasis	12/7/04	To: Metro Council From: Ted Leybold, Planning Dept., Re: MTIP narrowing criteria	120704c-05