

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, January 11, 2005
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Robert Liberty, 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, JANUARY 13, 2005/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the upcoming agenda for January 13, 2005. He asked Councilor Liberty if he was comfortable carrying the Forest Park resolution, Resolution No. 05-3528. Council President Bragdon noted that he had been assured that Ordinance No. 04-1067 was a necessity so he would be supporting the budget amendment.

Councilor McLain asked that Resolution No. 05-3521, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Issue a non-system license to Safeway, Inc. for delivery of source separated pre-consumer food waste to the Nature's Needs Facility for Composting should be pulled from the consent agenda. She would be willing to carry it for discussion purposes. She also asked for a briefing on Resolution No. 05-3522. Councilor McLain suggested some recommendations on Resolution No. 05-3521 to include comments from Washington County.

Councilor Burkholder commented about the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) compliance and the tie into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funding. The jurisdiction must be in compliance with UGMFP in order to receive consideration for funding. The Council had adopted some ways to apply for funding if the jurisdictions were making progress towards compliance. He spoke to the reporting requirements for the UGMFP. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), asked if Councilor Liberty had received a briefing on Title 7, Housing? Councilor Liberty said he wasn't sure.

2. REVIEWING AND ACTIVATING THE METRO 2040 GROWTH CONCEPT

Mr. Jordan said before the holidays they had the final meeting regarding strategic planning. One issue was where were we going with the land use system? Early in 2005 staff had committed to bringing something back to Council that conceptually laid out the "Big Look". They had heard Councilors' concepts of what they called the Big Look project. He suggested thinking about how did this Council at this point in time in this region chose to exercise its leadership? What kind of mechanisms and timelines did it want to set as regional leaders? The timeline had no reality. One issue they had faced in this agency was that it was difficult to hold the community's attention on specific issues. If Council were to engage the community in a broad based discussion about where Council was going, they should start with the broad discussion and then narrow the discussion. He noted how Metro normally did this was to bring to Council fairly narrow issues and discussions. He gave example of industrial lands issue. One of the questions they had in this building was how do you move from the narrow politics to the politics of engagement, informed consent. Around complex problems how do you engage the stakeholders? There was a lot of good

that came out of engaging the stakeholders on the broader issues. They had several opportunities to engage the stakeholders, such as, Regional Partners for Economic Development. He gave examples of partners that were included in the group such as the Westside Economic Alliance. Councilor Liberty asked about the Regional Partners goals and processes. Council President Bragdon said the group was in need of policy direction. There was no policy level attached to the group. The group tended to equate land development with economic development. Mr. Jordan spoke to the components of the grant that funded this group. Metro was a member of the group. Council President Bragdon said the group was narrowly focused and we had the opportunity to bring broadness to the group. Mr. Jordan then talked about Portland Business Alliance (PBA), which was another opportunity to have a broader based discussion. It encompassed more aspects of a broader vision. These opportunities were before Metro right now. Metro may have to be more proactive. Councilor Newman asked if these two groups worked in concert with each other? Mr. Jordan said they weren't currently coordinating their efforts. The third opportunity was, Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). He said he wasn't sure we would have to revisit the vision. Reaffirming that vision may be accomplished through MPAC. He spoke to balancing values differently, for example, the agriculture industry versus the urban industry. There were multiple opportunities to engage the citizens.

Mr. Jordan talked about the toolbox that we used to manage growth. The state agency was another place where Metro could exercise impact. If we moved from one kind of politics to another, it may help stakeholder realize their opportunities. He noted the struggles to implement without local tools. For Metro it was going to boil down to how and where do we invest (time, effort, money). How did we make strategic public investments? If Council didn't bring the big picture discussion to the table it probably wouldn't happen. Councilor Newman asked about discussions around economic development and why Measure 37 wasn't included. He saw Measure 37 as an opportunity. We should be providing leadership. It was an opportunity to bring our values to the table. Councilor McLain said she thought that some of those discussions had occurred but the question was what were the future opportunities. Council had to talk about the options. She also raised the issue of how Metro reconnected with the general public. It wouldn't be found in the two groups mentioned before. This Council had to figure out where we played those two games, the broad interaction with public and the specific interactions with specific groups.

Council President Bragdon spoke to the economic grant and that there was a downside to us not being involved. The upside was Metro could infuse it with something broader based. Metro's role should be a regional role. Metro was not giving up any authority but trying to gain more influence. You gave up something but you ended up giving up something more. He felt Mr. Jordan was light on the State influence. The State looked to Metro to play a leadership role at the State. We were by far the most sophisticated agency of its type. Councilor McLain said there were other layers too; one of the other layers was the neighboring cities. There might be opportunities to engage the neighboring cities on our own or through the State.

Councilor Liberty said looking at the plan for the whole State (he reviewed the history of the plans), it had a long lead-time. Steadiness was important. He thought the work should focus on follow through. The State was going to grow, there was less money for infrastructure as well as Measure 37 issues, and active involvement with the State and economic development was an area where Metro could engage. Mr. Jordan said one of the issues that Councilor Liberty touched on was equity. We didn't even have a common language for this discussion. Councilor Hosticka said he agreed once we go through the process we will come back to where we were. It was a long lead-time and we were carrying through. There had been huge turnover in population. What would give us strength as leaders? He felt that Measure 37 passed because much of the land use

planning we had in Oregon people took for granted. He suggested a revival of the commitment of the values and vision. Mr. Cotugno said it was easy to have a values discussion because it didn't mean anything. It was important that there was a discussion about impact. We needed to elicit the anecdotal accusations. He didn't think that revisiting the values was bad but we needed to elicit input as to where there was disagreement.

Councilor Burkholder felt that we must do this process well. There needed to be a discussion on the goal for the economy. It could be a threat if you only talked about economic development, you might lose the other pieces. Councilor Hosticka said those levels of discussion don't engage the public. Councilor McLain suggested looking at the results of our planning. She felt this was valuable. Metro wasn't afraid to review what we valued. She was leaning towards Mr. Cotugno's comments. There were two elements that must come through strongly, the right groups and picking a general public forum. She felt we had to have both of those groups to reengage. Mr. Jordan said it was all talk unless you could implement. We had to figure out how we change the paradigm so we could execute. We had to revamp the tools.

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, added that values and visions and the toolbox were Metro efforts. Metro was going in between the vision and the tools such as in the Functional Plan. They were going down the middle and picking up more people. Council President Bragdon said implementation was the application on specific choices. Where were we going to put resources? It needed to be more provocative to engage people. Councilor Liberty expressed concern that when you talk about vision and values you didn't engage the public. He wasn't comfortable rethinking the decision that was just now being implemented. Councilor Burkholder said he felt it was refinement based on the knowledge of the world we had today. He gave an example, transportation funding. He felt we weren't going to get very far, statewide, regionally or federally with transportation funding. He said this exercise was to refine the 2040 vision. Councilor Liberty said we were refining and implementing. Councilor Newman said his interest was to refine the 2040 process in such a way that it could work better. Councilor Hosticka agreed with Councilor Liberty that people were going to react to controversy. Measure 37 had created chaos. If we were good at this, we could take controversy to engage the public.

Mr. Cotugno explained the chart (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He spoke to the three streams. He talked about the top stream, economic development strategy and the possible opportunities for small successes. Mr. Jordan asked who should be the driving force? Mr. Cotugno explained the middle and bottom sequences. We ought to be pursuing these on parallel paths. Councilor Newman clarified the chart. Mr. Cotugno explained the character of the activities for economic development, which needed to include Metro. He noted the missing part in this pie was Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF). Councilor Burkholder talked about the scenario work that Metro did. He felt that a critical role Metro played was to look at ideas over time. Councilor Liberty suggested something narrower than going back and reviewing 10 years of work. Mr. Jordan said they would have this issue on the Council agenda on January 26th. Managing community expectations – did we have the competency and capacities to manage processes and get the region engaged? Councilor Newman added do we have the credibility and trust. Mr. Jordan said you wouldn't get to this without being criticized. They needed to talk about managing those expectations. They needed adoptability. How much was Council willing to spend to do this process? How many fronts could you engage on to keep the region's attention? Councilor Newman talked about the capacity of this Council. He gave examples of what Metro Council had to do beyond planning. Council President Bragdon said they would begin this discussion at the retreat. He asked had this discussion been fruitful? Councilor McLain asked what and how were they going to achieve this? Council President Bragdon said it was important to have some victories. Councilor Hosticka said they had to be flexible enough to take advantage

of opportunities that came along. He gave an example of the hard edge discussion. Council President Bragdon thought this discussion had been very fruitful. Councilor Newman said he was having a hard time conceptualizing. He wanted this to be translated into budget issues and ability to accomplish. Mr. Jordan asked how did we provoke engagement? He also wanted to know if the Council wanted to engage in specific issues? The last question was if you chose to engage the community under the auspices of Metro how did you do this? Councilor Burkholder said this was a unique opportunity that Metro offered. Metro was the only one that did this kind of engagement. This kind of work changed the future. This was a unique piece that only Metro did. Mr. Jordan said he would be painting some of the context of where we had capacity.

Mr. Cotugno said a very specific issue was Goal 9. They had been working with Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) about some of the details of the Goal 9 rule making. An issue was Metro's role. What did Council want to say? He passed out a hand out of Goal 9 (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He noted that page 2 of the document addressed a possibility for Metro's role.

3. BREAK

5. DISPOSAL SYSTEM PLANNING

Mike Hoglund, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, said when they met last there had been a discussion about selling the transfer stations. At the conclusion of the discussion, they said they would bring back policies from Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP).

Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, said the message was that they wanted to construct a draft update for this plan which was largely status quo. They didn't want to start from scratch on the RSWMP. There were a lot of good things. She noted the worksheet and the proposed regional policies related to the Regional Disposal System (a copy of which is in the work session packet). She then passed out the Council values (a copy of which is in the meeting record). Councilor Burkholder asked how would this effect the scale and scope of the RSWMP update. Would it create less work? Ms. Matthews said these policies just addressed the disposal system. She saw a lot of work being done in this calendar and next calendar year, which would be tied into future amendments to the RSWMP. Mr. Hoglund said at the next meeting they were going to start to bring the Council pieces of the RSWMP update. Councilor McLain said anything that was in the RSWMP update wasn't going to be a barrier to changes in the next few years or any future action the Council wanted to take.

Ms. Matthews talked about current policies in RSWMP: system performance, which was part of the current plan. She noted Council values and how these were addressed in system performance. It was relatively stationary. They thought these were good goals that would guide the system. Regulatory framework addressed regulation of private facility and our own market plan. She then addressed the public and private facility roles. Were roles different? They thought there were different roles. She provided the difference (noted in the proposed regional policies in the work session packet). The previous role did not address these differences. They thought this clarification was important. Councilor Newman asked if there was any plan to expand public access whether they were regional or public or private. He was curious about public access to remote areas of the region. Councilor McLain said they had tried to balance the public private service by having neighborhood events. She said what Ms. Matthews was asking was, did this look reasonable? The private owner had different responsibilities than public owners. Councilor Burkholder asked about the appropriate way to look at the public interests. Private system allowed for competition. The public facility was there to provide the market price. Was that the

appropriate role? Metro could just regulate. There were unspoken comments that vertical integration was bad. Ms. Matthews said at the time the RSWMP was written there seemed to be a view that vertical integration wasn't good. Councilor Newman talked about the issues around vertical integration. Councilor Burkholder asked should we be interfering with the market? Mr. Hوجلund said there was a necessity to come up with new criteria for transfer stations once the moratorium was no longer in place. They recognized that our facilities provided for public services. How would we regulate or accommodate that in the private sector. Councilor Liberty wondered if Measure 37 would influence solid waste issues. Mr. Hوجلund said they needed to have a discussion about vertical integration. Councilor Burkholder said there were a variety of models around the country. We shouldn't just assume vertical integration was good or bad. Councilor McLain said the reason they were doing an update was because conditions were very different from when they did the first RSWMP. She spoke to the history of the last 10 years and the changes that had occurred in the solid waste system. Ms. Matthews asked if Council felt it was good to clarify the different roles between public and private. Council supported this clarification.

Ms. Matthews then spoke to how much regulation would government have over private facility. She talked about the public service provision and what needed to be addressed. System capacity included current language. Facility siting language was already in the plan. She addressed host community benefits. The language indicated in the RSWMP was that there would be host community fees. Councilor McLain said Metro said they were going to do this but it had been a non-action. Councilor Newman raised the issue about enhancement fees and suggested they have a discussion during the budget process. Ms. Matthews spoke to user charges related the Council's second value. She talked about current language. Councilor Burkholder commented that raising the cost of disposal encouraged recycling. Ms. Matthews said what was intended was the application at the back door instead of the front door. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification. Ms. Matthews responded to his question. Councilor Burkholder talked about raising the fees. He felt there was necessity for discussion. Ms. Matthews talked about whether rates mattered. They wanted to make sure there was a guiding policy statement for this area. Their next step was to go to Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) to get their comments. They would then be back to Council in February with a work plan for the analytical work on disposal system planning. Councilor McLain talked about the other parts of the update such as education and wanted to make sure they were addressed. Ms. Matthews said yes it was clearly addressed.

4. GOLF LEARNING CENTER AT BLUE LAKE PARK

Jim Desmond, Parks and Greenspaces Director, said they were giving a preliminary briefing on the possibility of a partnership with the City of Portland for a Golf Learning Center at Blue Lake Park. He wanted to get feedback that the basic concept was acceptable. He shared where the Golf Learning Center would be in the Park. He gave an overview of the Park for Councilor Liberty's benefit. The Learning Center would be on undeveloped land that was part of the Park. Mr. Desmond said there was master plan adopted in 2001 where the Learning Center was included. Some of the neighbors objected to the Learning Center. Councilor Liberty asked where the Learning Center was included in the goals of the Parks and Openspaces. Councilor McLain provided a history to Councilor Liberty about the bond measure.

Mr. Desmond provided a history of this issue after the adoption of the Blue Lake master plan. They had done a feasibility study. The conclusion was that a Golf Learning Center was recommended not a full-blown golf course. There was currently only one Learning Center in the region. The study concluded that this was ready for marketing. The golf community supported the idea. He noted that this would allow new revenue. He spoke to the lack of revenue generation for

the Park. The City of Portland was a large municipal golf operator. They had approached Metro about exploring developing this kind of facility. The City of Portland could do this whole development. They had staff that would support the project. They had suggested that Portland would be the designer construction agent in exchange for operating the facility down the road. They were very confident that there was outside money to develop the course. The cost was \$2 million. He reminded the Council that the Parks Department had \$1 million that was passed over from Multnomah County to provide incentive to make the Parks Department more efficient. Councilor Burkholder said one of the big objections was traffic. Would the cost include altering the parking? Jeff Tucker, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, talked about the parking access plan. They had yet to design the facility. Mr. Desmond said impact of traffic for the facility was minimal.

Councilor McLain said she thought they needed to make some decisions about the possibility of the partnership. She thought they needed to be careful about tying the management to the design and construction process. Mr. Desmond said this project might be able to be done with no Metro money. Councilor McLain reminded them of the policing issue and Fairview as a jurisdiction in this area. Mr. Desmond explained the policing issue and Metro's costs. Mr. Tucker said one of the advantages to having this Learning Center was that it put it back on the tax rolls, which would benefit Fairview. Councilor Liberty asked what the fees would be? Mr. Desmond said once you paid off the debt services, they anticipated about \$400,000 profit annually. Councilor Liberty asked if there were other conditions that would impact this plan? Were there any other restrictions? Mr. Tucker said there were only restrictions on open space bond measure purchases. Councilor Liberty asked what the loss for the facility was? Mr. Tucker said about \$240,000. It was a very high cost park for them. Councilor Newman asked about the City of Fairview position. Mr. Tucker said City of Fairview did not take a position. Mr. Desmond said this was a complex deal that they would bring back to Council regularly. They wanted to know if Council would allow this discussion to begin. Councilors wanted more information. They wanted to make sure it was worth it to Metro.

5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Newman asked about the Partnership Matters events? Councilor Burkholder said that Get Centered was starting up. Councilor McLain said she had started to meet with people in her district primarily on agriculture and Goal 5 issues. Councilor Newman asked when we would have a work session on the remand. Mr. Jordan explained where they were. He talked about revenue sharing and some of the discussions around the region. Councilors suggested continuing this discussion.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 11,
2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	January 13, 2005	Metro Council Agenda for January 13, 2005	011105c-01
2	Revision document	1/8/05	To: Metro Council From: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director Re: Revision 2005-Integrated Decision- Making Process chart	011105c-02
2	Memorandum	1/11/05	To: Metro Council From: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director Re: LCDC Rulemaking for Goal 9-Economic Development	011105c-03
4	Values	7/2/03	To: Metro Council From: Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Department Re: Councilor Values for the Solid Waste System	011105c-04