

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, February 8, 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 2:03 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, FEBRUARY 10, 2005/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the agenda for the February 10, 2005 Council meeting at PCC Rock Creek at 5:30.

Councilor Park raised the question if Rock Creek PCC had concerns about Goal 5 and suggested an opportunity to talk about the Goal 5 issues.

Council President Bragdon inquired asked about Housing Task Force resolution, Resolution 05-3545 and asked Councilor Burkholder and Councilor Liberty if it was ripe for resolution at Thursday's Council meeting.

Councilor Liberty said part of his interest in the Housing Task Advisory Force (HTAC) was to see if they could find some communities interested in developing very specific plans and find out what that would be like, in terms of meeting with for profit and non-profit housing providers, local officials, and community leaders to determine what is available and look back to see what was planned and how those plans could be realized, looking into what already existed in order to problem solving and convening together. These types of activities would involve some people in the task force and some people outside of the task force. The end product would be a booklet that gives several alternatives for building or providing the facilities over time like a demonstration project. This work would be in the context of other goals focusing on developing centers. The resolution had been massaged. The other issue they needed to look at is how much it will cost for staff. Councilor Liberty stated he didn't imagine these programs being run by Metro staff but Metro staff will be contributing some technical assistance.

Councilor Burkholder said that the resolution does give the task force the responsibility of looking at the issues as a piece of what they are doing but not the major piece. It is unknown what resources it will take to implement the work of the task force. The staff has been looking into potential work but some of it seemed like there would be too much to add to the task force. The task force would give technical feedback. What needed to be done first is to address the barriers. Other issues needed to be flushed out.

Council President Bragdon suggested Councilor Burkholder re-scope the task force and consider these issues in the budget process.

Mr. Jordan asked if he considered this resolution a substitute for the project definition piece that would come to council. After that format they could put more flesh around what the specifics of the task force would be. Councilor Burkholder stated that that was almost completed but perhaps Councilor Liberty should have come to Mr. Jordan and asked him if he could have given him some staff supplemental.

Mr. Jordan stated that he deferred to the council that that is something that could come out of a subcommittee of the group, depending on how the committee wanted to handle that.

Councilor Liberty reiterated what he was hearing from the feedback, that the committee would have opportunities to look into certain issues and decide what future issues or project to look into to take into consideration what resources each project would require. In one of the past discussions they spoke about doing a pilot of the pilot to try and figure out how it would work then talk about if it should be turned into something larger.

Council President Bragdon stated he felt comfortable with the stage of the resolution.

Councilor McLain updated the councilors on who would be presenting at the council meeting at PCC Rock Creek.

Mr. Jordan asked the council about being a member of a work group regarding industrial lands for Representative Gerard. This work group would deal with an idea of superciting authority for industrial uses and this idea had been bubbling in the background for a while. He got a call that someone from Metro should really be on that group and Mr. Jordan agreed in order to be able to help work through the issues.

Councilor Hostika suggested that somebody from Metro needs to be there but they needed to investigate if the work of the committee will actually see the light of day.

Mr. Jordan continued by talking about the opportunity of Metro to be a partner of a Washington County grant looking at the interface between urban uses and agricultural uses. A very brief cooperative agreement existed in the form of a draft. Councilors Park and McLain expressed interest in being the lead councilors and Mr. Jordan wanted to ask the council if it was okay for staff the interact directly with Councilor Park and Councilor McLain on how Metro would interface with Washington County. Washington County was on a time line for their work, the grant expires June 30, 2005 so it would be a pretty quick turnaround.

Councilor McLain clarified that Metro would get a chance to suggest participants on the group and she suggested it would be very important for Metro to ensure a balance group.

Mr. Jordan stated that Mary Weber, Project Manager, had done an excellent job of ensuring that Metro had a say in who was at the table and the scope of the process and that nothing could happen with the process unless the council was okay with everything.

Councilor McLain added that Washington County had seen this as a second chapter with what they started with the Wilsonville discussion. She did have a question about product and interested in finding out what Washington County was hoping to produce and what the grant language said they would accomplish.

Mr. Jordan stated that he hoped to begin interfacing with Councilor Park and Councilor McLain and he wanted to bring to the council what they were doing.

Councilor Park asked how much the grant was.

Ms. Weber said \$75,000 but it would be possible to spread that out and that the work would be in the first phase and carried out next fiscal year.

2. REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN VISION AND VALUES

Janet Matthews, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, delivered a shortened update on the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) vision and values.

Mr. Hoglund, Director of the Solid Waste and Recycling Department, stated that they would come back to the RSWP at the first meeting in March along with the second piece of the disposal system planning.

Janet Matthews directed the councilors to the first attachment “Work Session Worksheet” (Attachment A) to familiarize them with the proposed updated RSWMP plan and identify key changes. Ms. Matthews noted after few significant changes, chapters were rearranged to ensure a better flow, Chapter 3 - the vision, the values, the regional policies. Chapter 4 and 5 would be covered in more detail because that establishes work plans for the future regional partners. Ms. Matthews stated that she would bring back Chapters 3,4, and 5 for ongoing discussion. The second thing she discussed was the Regional Solid Waste Plan Update Vision Statement/Key Concepts and stated that the handout would help to focus the discussion better than the attachment entitled “VISION – A long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration”. She stated that they planned to keep an updated vision for the RSWMP. She stated that for her a planned vision was a very far off idea and the only thing that would go beyond the 10-year planning period for the updated plan. This vision was not to be realized in the 10-year time frame of the plan. She referred to the handout (attachment 020805c-02) to focus the discussion. She outlined the proposed vision statements and the feedback she has gotten from staff and Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC). From those who were in the business favored the current vision statement because it mentioned solid waste and had some language about economic prosperity and regional cooperation. Those in the local government and some of the citizens wanted the vision statement to push the bar, looking 10 years ahead and beyond and the current vision statement didn't go far enough into the future. Vision statements #1 and 2 stated shared responsibility as a new concept and waste as a sign as inefficiency. These statements were trying to present the idea of sustainability and that government should not bear the sole burden for the costs associated with managing waste and that it should be shared among producers, users and government. She asked for feedback from the councilors about which of the concepts they felt should be in a vision statement and if there were any missing.

Councilor Liberty asked Ms. Matthews how much the vision statement would affect what went into the plan and how much did the vision statement affected what went into the plan as opposed to an expression of what was in the plan and the philosophy behind the system? Ms. Matthews responded by stating that she saw the goals and objectives and policies as slowly steering the solid waste system towards sustainability – baby steps towards the vision. There should be some connections between the goals and objectives and certain things that were mentioned in the vision statement.

Councilor Liberty had seen that these statements could shape what follows because they were very clear and concise and could be used by decision makers to figure out what was missing or to

put new emphasis on something. Some of the things reflected what is emerging and also thinking this would influence what happened in the details.

Ms. Matthews suggested there should be some level of influence but again it was a guess to figure out how strong that connection would be.

Councilor McLain said that the vision statement should demonstrate the values and goals. She didn't have any problem with the 3 paragraphs emphasizing different things or creating goal themes. The first time they did this was not for a general strategy, it was being done with targets, strategies, with tools, and with connections with how they did things and what they did with resources or money. She felt like she was told by the staff that this was to update the master plan and not to create a completely different master plan. She was comfortable with that being taken out to the public to figure out what should be done to update it. As far as the connections, there was a lot of work done by industry and government to try and figure out how to work together. She didn't understand "We don't know what that means yet?" comment because they did know what that meant because they had a master plan that was very specific. In addition, this plan was reviewed by the Department of Environmental Quality who will tell Metro if they had met muster with the responsibilities given to Metro to control and/or manage.

Ms. Matthews said that what she meant were that the goals and objectives of both toxicity, waste reduction and facilities and services would come before the Metro Council and SWAC and there would be revisions to them and they would be aligned to the vision and the values and regional policies. But the Metro Council would play a big role in determining the changes and updates to the plan. Changes would be made but the whole plan would not be thrown away.

Councilor Park said he recalled from the meeting that staff was going to take another shot at redrafting the vision. He asked if that was coming.

Ms. Matthews responded yes and that it would probably be coming by the next SWAC meeting on February 24, 2005. She hadn't done anything because she wanted to come to the Metro Council first with the same thing that was talked about at SWAC. She knew of one other effort at revision that was in process. Ray Phelps, SWAC member, was circulating a revised statement. She stated that they would probably be in front of Metro Council again with another vision statement. At the meeting she was interested in the concepts and whether the new direction of the vision, such as a shared responsibility to reduce and prevent waste, resonated with the Metro Council.

Councilor Burkholder said it was helpful because it looked like it was hard to determine what they are trying to achieve. The key concepts were shared responsibility. This concept needed to be defined. Would it be raising the cost to the consumers comparable to the replacement costs of the goods they would throw away? He stated that to him it meant to have a connection to the actions of the plan. The vision should not be so far out that it would not mean anything. He stated he preferred "waste as a sign of inefficiency" over "waste as a resource to be managed." That statement related to the idea of sustainability. They don't have to say "Let's be sustainable" but say "Waste is a waste and we want to reduce it." Those concepts were useful. Also, the connection must be made that by reducing waste it would not be a burden on the economy and that sustainability would benefit to the economy. They needed to determine how to turn the concepts into action. Councilor Burkholder gave the example of that construction demolition debris was a major part of waste. He asked if Metro should get involved in green building movement involving actions that are outside of the solid waste system. The vision would get

Metro to promote more sustainable activities, which was different than the role of waste disposal. Metro should play a role in waste reduction and the vision should reflect that.

Council President Bragdon stated what he liked about the 2cd proposed new vision was that it assigned responsibility and it was not something else that everyone else had to do and that everybody had a piece of the answer. He liked the new vision up to the end until the part about inefficiency. The cost-benefit discussion came up and he was not sure if efficiency or inefficiency was the right word in the sense that solid waste could be eliminated but at an enormous cost. He stated that the first proposed revision was more suitable, with less detail. Less detail would be fine for a vision statement but it still had that concept of shared responsibility.

Councilor Newman said that none were as clear as he would like them to have been. Number 1 was closest to being more understandable than the others. He stated that he agreed with Council President Bragdon and Councilor Burkholder that the focus on sustainability and shared responsibility and broadening it to address a beginning of a life style and consumption. He liked the concept that was in the 2cd proposed vision but it wasn't clear enough to understand what was meant by consumers and whether producers were different than businesses and nonprofits. He stated it was a little too wordy and complex than it needed to be.

Councilor Hostika agreed with Councilor Newman. He stated that he liked the way # 2 was worded better than #3, or the one that is in the middle.

Councilor McLain stated that she liked #1 versus # 2 of the revised ones. She stated that there was a lot in #2 that was not defined. She liked the addition of shared responsibility. She continued by stating that she thought that if the vision was going to have a connection to the rest of the document that somewhere, in the second paragraph if the vision would be the 1st, that there would be some connections stated in the Table of Contents. There needed to be a connection of the vision statement to the topics that would be covered in the document.

Councilor Liberty said that shared responsibility was laid out so general that he was not sure it captured the idea of waste prevention and didn't capture the idea that consumers can make choices to recycle or not consume certain products and can affect the waste level. At the end of number 2, "government curtailing it's role in disposal" looked like the goal was just in reducing the role of government but really the point should be in increased efficiency in materials consumption. He stated he liked the efficiency idea and that was implicit in other things which goes back to an economy that is sustainable. He would second the comments about clarity especially as they related to consumer responsibility and waste prevention should be added. He also suggested using bullets.

Ms. Matthews said that she hoped that at the end of the update process they would have vision statement that would be understood by the average layperson. The comments on clarity and language were particularly helpful.

Councilor Park brought up the issue of understanding the term toxicity. He pointed out that toxicity was a dosage. He understood the concept but when talking about eliminating waste the elimination of toxicity was an absolute but he suggested getting to the absolute zero level would be hard to achieve.

Councilor Burkholder said that he felt the notion of the statement was to make sure people are disposing of things safely.

Councilor Park added that it was also an issue of input and output and empowering people to make choices about what they would buy according to what it would cost them. He continued by saying that the concept was there but the wording needed to be clearer.

Councilor Liberty suggested not using the word sustainability because he didn't think people would know what that is.

3. DISPOSAL SYSTEM PLANNING

Mike Hogle, Solid Waste and Recycling Director, presented on disposal system planning. He asked Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, to bring the council a draft of an outline. A lot of details needed to be developed but he wanted to present some options, implications and questions to receive council input on.

Mr. Anderson said that this was a kick off to what they call the Disposal System Planning which would look at the regional disposal system both public and private to set direction for the next 10 years. He added that a major element of this project was looking at Metro's ownership and direct service provision. The project was looking into the advantages and disadvantages of having a public player in the system, for example looking into the sale of the transfer stations. He asked the council to comment on a draft of a general work plan and schedule. He told the council they would come back in March to get future direction from the Council. The project they proposed has two major tracks. The first track was addressing the disposal system in general, asking what the region needs from the disposal system and the best way to get it. They proposed a multi stakeholder approach to examine services, costs, regulatory scope, public and private roles, etc. within the system and to identify what would benefit from change and the role that Metro will play with that change. He continued by presenting the second track, which was very specific to Metro ownership and direct service question. There was the point of view of the system and having a public player in that. Another point of view was that of Metro's portfolio of assets and whether Metro's ownership was best in line with the strategic direction. Mr. Anderson presented a draft work plan and pointed out the options. He asked the council to give them feedback in terms of how they should proceed. Either the council could allow them to proceed with the work plan as proposed, or modify the work plan in scope or method, or pare down the plan. In particular, one of the hot button issues was with the wet waste system, such as allocation and tonnage.

Councilor Liberty asked for a clarification between wet and dry waste.

Mr. Anderson explained that wet waste can rapidly decompose and cause odors. Dry waste were things such as construction debris and office waste.

Councilor Newman suggested the first step should have been a policy discussion. He stated that he would have liked an outline describing the value of maintaining ownership or the policy justification for investigating divestiture. He said that would have made more sense for that to happen before talking about the financials. He suggested having a policy discussion about the historical reason Metro has owned transfer stations, were those reasons still true today? Identify what was changing in the marketplace and the system and the justifications for owning.

Mr. Hogle said that they could do that but the reason they did it in the order they did was because October 2004 the questions were more oriented towards the asset value of the facility and whether it was something that could be used to finance Metro programs. What they were trying to

do was to lay out go – no-go decisions so that if the council would rather default to the current system with modifications then a whole lot of time wouldn't be spent on other questions.

Councilor Newman said that he did want the council to have a conversation about the future of the transfer stations and Metro's appropriate role. But either as a pre-step or concurrent step, should have a policy conversation about Metro's role, historically, current, what the options would be.

Councilor McLain said that the council asked for a pro-con list at the meeting in October 2004 that would have given them that bigger policy discussion. There was a pro-con list that deals with the ownership of the transfer stations but also some issues related to what was the type of products and services the public used. She stated she is uncomfortable with the order because there was no policy discussion.

Councilor Burkholder stated they needed to look at more than just the ownership of the transfer station. He said they needed to talk about the best management of the system. Need to look at what business model works best for the area and whether Metro should be a part of that model. He was unaware of the different types of business models out there and would like to find out more about the various business models.

Councilor Newman stated that they are talking about the same thing, Councilor Burkholder called it model discussion, he called it policy discussion.

Councilor McLain said she liked the model discussion because there were discussions about the fact that Metro is a player because of the services and regulatory responsibilities.

Councilor Liberty said looking at the information in the worksheet he felt less comfortable making a decision. The information giving him the context was just as important to him as the discussion on divestiture.

Councilor Park said they needed to look at the whole picture and needed to look at the economic piece. He had been really struggling with the economic piece because if they were to look at the transfer stations as separate components in terms of land and building and not typically the way a business person would look at it. Metro didn't manage assets that way. The decisions Metro made in relation to solid waste are much different if they were to think of it as separate components. They don't think of the Oregon Zoo or the Oregon Convention Center that way. It was still a struggle to figure out what is the value of the system, there was no analysis of the value.

Councilor Burkholder said they needed to determine was the asset the transfer station or just the garbage generated by the public. At one time it was all Metro but then it changed to a mix. He asked if that was the asset and was that what they should be focusing on first. Maybe Metro's role would be to just get out of the way as long as they made sure to take care of the hazardous waste collection. The council needed to figure out what the obligation was, in relation to the financial piece.

Councilor Newman said if they were starting from scratch, what would the model look like taking into consideration the policy objectives and contractual obligations? If the model would look like what the current system looked like then they wouldn't need to do the calculations. If the model didn't then they can begin. He didn't know if this discussion needed to happen before or after the financial discussion.

Councilor Park said Metro got into the solid waste system because a private sector company didn't have the ability to run it. He stated that should be asking whether Metro should be in the transfer station business and do the same assumptions made 20 years ago hold true today?

Mr. Hogle said a number of things had been discussed such as the question of whether Metro should own the transfer stations as related to Metro's role in the system and how to provide services and whether these services are necessary. They still need to come back to the economics of the system and the value of the transfer station. Back in October 2004 they discussed looking into the information in a phased matter to get a handle on the different issues. He said that the Solid Waste and Recycling staff could begin looking into the value of the transfer stations and for example could they franchise tonnage? He stated they could come back in a few months with some of the economics of the system. Then the staff could look into determining the different models and what impact would those models have on the services delivered. This would take between 4 to 6 months.

Councilor Hostika said that the major questions they were discussing was is this decision a policy or financial decision. They could find an answer by asking what reasons would there be to stay in the business even if it wasn't financially attractive. He suggested getting staff to work on that question. Once that question was answered they could proceed to the financial analysis if needed.

Mr. Hogle expressed concern of having the questions becoming more complex.

Councilor Hostika said that he was thinking about it in terms of cost benefit analysis and trying to determine what were the threshold values they need to consider in order to make a decision.

Mr. Hogle said that in their field, hazardous waste disposal had a high cost, the benefit may be high as well, but it wasn't something that was readily picked up by the private sector so they would set that aside and go to the next level of service and look at the range to see if there is an overlapping between public and private provision.

Councilor McLain said that Metro got involved in the solid waste system because there were things that others didn't want to do. Nobody could close the St. John's landfill or cite a landfill and no one was willing to pick up the bill for hazardous waste. She asked Mr. Hogle what he meant by splitting up the system.

Mr. Hogle responded that they would always collect the fees and taxes.

Councilor McLain said Mr. Hogle wasn't wrong that there are complications when considering these issues. Metro has had a financial relationship with the waste industry. She stated that there had to be an analysis that looked at more than what was the X value of the transfer station under two or three scenarios. She suggested that it had to take an integrated viewpoint.

Councilor Hostika said that he would like to specify what were those viewpoints.

Council President Bragdon said they would also look at the benefits of the public of having access to being able to dispose of hazardous waste.

Councilor McLain said she realized they were all saying the same thing.

Councilor Hostika stated that they had to figure out whether there was any values that they cared enough about that would override the money values.

Mr. Anderson summarized that it would be important to establish need for the region. The discussion on the best business model to get there was a discussion the Solid Waste and Recycling Department was getting ready to flush out. He heard an important add to this and that was that with the transfer stations, the solid waste staff had proposed to look at the financial feasibility, a "Go-No Go." He heard from the Council a strong request to look at the policy aspects and cost benefit analysis. This would remind the council where they were and could update the new council members on the issues. The financial feasibility should be done at the same time as the policy check in order to establish what would be needed out of the system. They could come back in early June to have this discussion.

Mr. Hoglund said that would mean that the first "Go and No-Go discussion would happen in the summer.

Council President Bragdon added having a historical background would be helpful.

Mr. Anderson said they would do the policy and historical piece and come back in the same time frame.

Councilor Liberty asked Mr. Anderson if he thought there were places that have successful solid waste system that they could learn from.

Mr. Anderson answered there were a couple he had in mind in Maryland and the Twin Cities.

Councilor Park asked how Metro values the transfer station? This will affect the policy decisions they would make later. If the value was based on tonnage you would make one type of policy decision, but if the value was based on the buildings and location and the amount that goes through wouldn't matter that would lead to different policy decisions. Depending on what they were to pick would affect future decisions.

Mr. Anderson clarified by saying that if they were to sell the transfer stations to the highest bidder and they were converted into shopping centers when Metro would need to make sure that the disposal capacity was provided elsewhere.

Councilor Park said that if it was to be bought and kept going what would the buyer be willing to pay for based upon the amount of money that could be made over time.

Mr. Anderson said that those were issues they would outline in the first high-level financial feasibility.

Council President Bragdon thanked them for their time and clarified with them when they will report back.

Mr. Anderson said they would like to come back in March to make sure they had the work plan right.

Mr. Hoglund said he also wouldn't mind presenting to timeline to the council to let them know what their time constraints were and to present the other components of the disposal system planning.

4. BREAK

5. REGIONAL HABITAT AND ACQUISITION PROGRAM

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director presented on the Regional Habitat and Acquisition Program. He covered what they learned about during the last bond measure and what they knew what worked and didn't work past on the past 10 year experience. He outlined possible components of a bond measure that would help them achieve Nature in the Neighborhoods. They also presented some questions that came out of the December action as part of the adoption of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan, which included language about the bond measure. They then presented a rough timeline about how they could help the Metro Council put together a good bond measure. He continued by telling the council they learned things from the last bond measure that worked and they planned on building on that success but would also plan on doing some things differently. He stated that regional scale acquisition from a centralized regional agency worked. The second thing they learned was that the local concept of delivering money to localities was very successful. When public officials were polled they stated that regional acquisitions worked.

Councilor Newman asked what percentage of the total 135 million was local share?

Mr. Desmond stated it was 25 million out of 135 million, 18 ½ percent. He continued by stating that the third universal truth was that the target area concept gave the voters specificity about the measure and made it about place. In addition, it also prevented the measure from becoming all things to all people. The second broad thing they learned was that it didn't encourage as much leverage as they thought it could. They found that if Metro didn't have money available, not much else happened. There was a perception that Metro was taking care of the acquisition. He suggested that there might be a way to set up the next bond measure to encourage greater leverage from both local and private sources.

Ms. Chase, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, added that Metro went out for additional city and state grants and they all felt Metro had too much money and felt that Metro could fund any land acquisition project and they were reluctant to give to the local governments.

Councilor Park asked if there were outside competitive forces that created additional issues?

Mr. Desmond answered no and said that Metro competed very effectively in the market. There were a relatively small number that got away. He made a final point that there was a lot of overlap between the updated Greenspaces concept plan inventory and the high priority properties designated by the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan. Metro bought 2,000 acres of Class 1 and 2 properties, more than 4,000 acres in the Goal 5 classes, and the rest of the property was outside of the study areas but were higher quality habitat lands. What they bought in the last measure was fish and wildlife habitat land. He stated that they have built a model that would help the Council meet their goals. He stated that the program created projects that educated the public about fish and wildlife habitat or the importance of having access and protecting and greenspaces.

Councilor McLain suggested that they needed to have higher standards for the local share. Not all of the acquisitions were important to Goal 5 program. The local share was a good element but she suggested having higher standards.

Mr. Desmond stated that the goal was to try to buy high quality lands and 388 of the acquisitions are inside the urban growth boundary. He stated that he thought buying high quality spaces spur

smart growth around it and Copper Mountain and Mt. Talbert were examples. The model they had worked well. One possible bond measure component included regional acquisition and restoration, which came out of the action in December 2004. In addition, a second component would have been to pick new target areas.

Councilor Burkholder asked for clarification on what was meant by restoration effort and how it would be funded.

Mr. Desmond responded by saying that was an issue that the Regional Parks and Greenspaces department needed direction from the council on what the language in the resolution meant. Specifically they needed direction on whether they would be allowed to use public funds to do restoration on private land and Daniel Cooper's, Metro Attorney, office was looking into this.

Paul Garrahan, Assistant Metro Attorney, stated that Mr. Cooper had been looking into it and stated that for private lands it might be required to obtain a conservation easement or a deed restriction on the property in order to protect it. He continued by stating that the attorney staff felt that this would be considered a capital investment to invest that on public property – property that Metro owns.

Councilor Burkholder brought up the question of whether Metro needed different sources of revenue and if they would need some source of ongoing operating revenue, for example for education and restoration of non-public lands.

Councilor Hostika stated that the discussion was predicated on the theory that restoring natural vegetation increases the value of people's property. The question he raised was would Metro go in to spend money to destroy value?

Councilor Newman asked about purchasing easements. He asked if there was a way to make their dollars go further by doing a mixture of acquisitions and habitat easement purchases which would be cheaper but bring the same results.

Mr. Desmond answered by stating that he would be presenting the council with a stream protection easement line.

Council President Bragdon stated that Metro has used some of the excise tax revenue for capital projects. Those capital projects were eligible for the proceed of a bond measure. He asked if they shifted those projects onto a bond measure, the excise tax could be shifted to operating?

Mr. Desmond answered yes and stated that local jurisdictions would have the same option. He stated that there were certain things they knew they could do such as buying easements, plant trees but it got murky with private land and the department would look into that.

Council President Bragdon asked about buying out tax abatements on private property. That was something that would also have to be looked into.

Councilor Liberty raised an issue with easements; there were costs and monitoring and enforcement, etc. and those could be pretty substantial.

Mr. Desmond stated that Metro would have to be in a long-term partnership with the owner and it was easier to do on paper than in actuality but still a tool to have included in the tool box. He reminded the council that they focused on 14 out of 57 regional target areas. He stated there was a

lot of high quality habitat land out there and new opportunities for example the Big Park Concept outside of Damascus and Bethany provided good opportunities. They had a list and were getting feedback from interest groups. The most difficult thing was saying no to what didn't meet the parameters.

Council President Bragdon pointed out that was a part of the success – the fact that they remained focus. What Metro did do they did well in terms of the integrity of sites.

Mr. Desmond continued by stating that in spite of the acreage goals being met in most target areas there were a handful that got away. He suggested that Metro should have considered them in the new round to be able to finish what they almost finished last time around. The Refinement plans held up well over time in most of target areas. He stated that there was still a lot of high quality work to be done in the existing target areas. He continued by stating there was still a lot of unmet opportunities with regards to the regional trail corridors. He went on to cover the local share component. He stated that it worked really well. Last time there were strict parameters about what local funds could be used for. Park operators didn't see the word Parks in the action in December 2004, it was all Fish and Wildlife habitat. They were asking about local parks so direction from the Council was needed. They also wanted to find out if there was money for parks could they spend it on ball fields or priorities for their communities or was it limited to certain types of spending. Last time there was a no ball field rule.

Councilor McLain clarified that it was active recreation vs. passive/nature based recreation. Mr. Desmond stated that was a discussion they needed direction from the council on that. He introduced a challenge grant for an idea of a leverage fund. He stated they could set aside a portion of the bond that local governments or nonprofits would be eligible to apply for and fund a portion of the acquisition and they would have to come up with the remaining portion. He stated this would be a way to spur leverage and cease opportunities when they arose. He stated that those funds would probably be spent closer to town in the neighborhoods. He stated that they could set up criteria to ensure the money would go to high quality habitat lands. It would be a way to be responsive to the community.

Council President Bragdon expressed a concern for lower income neighborhoods that couldn't raise money and that there needed to be a measure of economic equity.

Mr. Desmond stated that it would spur other types of funding from the state and those lower income jurisdictions a chance to utilize those funds. This idea was different than last time. He introduced another idea about a revolving acquisition fund. He spoke about an easement fund, particularly for streamside properties. He said that the goal was to increase the habitat quality in the riparian. This plan called for buying the property, put an easement on it and then resell it. This plan allowed for the acquisition fund to be replenished. They toyed with this idea in 1996-97 and got a moderate response from the Council. The second was a revolving loan fund where there was a future urban area and an entity knew they would have future funding but there was a current land acquisition need, they would be able to buy the land using Metro grants and repay later.

Councilor Burkholder asked which of these strategies would target the areas that were already developed? The acquisitions were out on the edge already.

Ms. Chase responded that the stream habitat easement fund that was revolving would be perfect for small properties. She stated that they could work with people to buy easements or they could purchase property when it came up for sale, restore it, and then resell it and recapture most of the money.

Councilor Burkholder said that they needed to pay attention to improvements further inside the Urban Growth Boundaries so people wouldn't think the bond only paid for land and improvements further out. Some of the land didn't show up on the map. He hoped that the trail studies would help acquire more land and help people realize what land was acquired.

Mr. Desmond noted that they had been discussing the need to connect trails to already existing parks and he commented there was opportunities to do this in the future and it would be great value to look into connecting these. He continued by saying that the several Council members had asked him in the past if the bond measure could be used for other things related to the goals, such as centers, plazas, and affordable housing and suggested it was a policy decision that would have to be discussed.

Councilor Liberty stated that the Council had not determined what type of bond measure was feasible to the voters. He stated that he would have to look into broader issues relating to "People, places, and open spaces" He stated that he thought it wasn't the amount of money but rather what the program meant. If they were excited about it they would fund it. He had been pushing for this and his next step was to see if that was of interest and what the trade-offs were.

Councilor Burkholder stated that if they were considering expanding the bond measure to other issues, did Mr. Desmond need some expertise from other staff?

Mr. Desmond stated they have had a lot of consultation with other departments. He then covered several questions. One was on the on the acquisition piece, the term the council used was "greatest ecological importance", he asked if the council meant those with the highest ranking or was it targeting rare habitat types. Also, he asked for clarification about whether there would be a regional or local lens? He suggested at some point this would have to be run through a political filter to make sure the distribution of projects were relevant.

Councilor Newman stated that the Goal 5 resolution became a tool. His preference was focusing on habitat and natural areas, not active recreation with the exception of trails. It became a slippery slope when affordable housing is included. He suggested focusing it on natural areas and habitat, putting a filter on the land to distinguish the land that was most threatened.

Mr. Desmond responded by saying they could do that and had started those discussion with the Goal 5 staff already.

Councilor McLain wanted to make sure Metro was not redundant of other responsibilities. Last time there wasn't anybody working on trails so Metro stepped in because they had jurisdiction over different cities and counties. She asked how would they master plan the acquisitions they already had? She contributed the idea about establishing grants for park managers to manage the master planning of the acquisitions.

Councilor Liberty asked that if part of the motivation of the resolution in November 2004 was for acquisition and regulation wasn't going to be used, and they were going to have a regulatory program for Class 1 and 2 streams, why would Metro target acquisitions where there weren't any regulations?

Mr. Desmond stated that is what his department needed direction on.

Councilor Newman stated that was why he wanted to include all classes, not just class 1 and class 2.

Councilor Liberty asked Mr. Desmond what was the reaction when people noticed parks wasn't mentioned as one of the topics?

Mr. Desmond stated that people thought the local share worked and had a lot of support from the local parks departments that the local share would have some component for their capital needs. He suggested to the Council that they could target specific habitat types or areas with pilot programs or disperse funds all over the region. These were the decisions they would have to make in the next 8-12 months. He presented the timeline. He stated that if they were going to be working outside the existing target areas, there were some issues related to payment of Metro staff and not going outside the terms of the original bond. The Council would need to do a budget authorization to move the work off the 1995 bond and onto the general fund. In addition, he mentioned expenses for polling and consultation with bond council. He suggested a next step would be to introduce a more detailed resolution announcing their intention to go to the ballot with an acquisition measure in November 2006. That would build momentum and let other jurisdictions know that they were serious. He suggested sometime before June 30, 2005. He also mentioned they would need to have conversations with stakeholders in the community and he asked for general direction from the Council. He thought they would be getting a lot of questions about the local share piece. He told the council that the last measure's success was based on having options that were heavily publicized. It took money to run that program and they would need authorization from the council to run that program again.

Councilor Newman stated that he was happy that Mr. Desmond's department was working with Goal 5 staff. And he stated that he thought the presentation made by Mr. Desmond and the discussion was very important because it allowed the Council to have a role in developing the bond measure.

Mr. Desmond asked the council to let them know when they had questions or needed specific data so they would be able to give his department the answers to the questions he outlined at the meeting.

Councilor McLain stated that she was supportive of the local share but it was important to have standards and it needed to be focused. She stated that it was important that they would get the best of the best.

President Bragdon told Mr. Desmond that he had gotten some advice from several people who had ran the last bond measure. He also stated that Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC) had been working on the overall vision and the bond measure was a component of that. He told the council about the idea of using that group, some who are community members, to team up with the councilors as a speaker's bureau to talk about the success of the bond measure.

6. DAMASCUS CONCEPT PLANNING UPDATE

Ray Valone, Planning Department, made introductions. Mr. Valone set some context before continuing. He stated he updated the Council on this project in December 2004. The purpose of this update was to ask the council for some guidance on job acreage numbers for the study area. Mr. Valone recognized that this was a quick lead time so the Councilors may not had a chance to read the material that he sent out. He walked through the work study narrative and then wait for some questions.

Council President Bragdon stated that the meeting was the first time they had seen the material Mr. Valone was referring to.

Mr. Valone continued by walking the councilors through the narrative and asked the councilors to let him know if he was getting bogged down in details. He set the stage for the discussion going about the job acreage numbers and whether it was a requirement or not. After the workshop in October the Advisory Committee (AC), a steering committee to the Damascus/Boring Concept plan process, narrowed the alternatives to four. Staff went in to digitize the projects and did calculations on the number given the land use types they inserted. What they found was that the numbers, in particular the number of 10 dwelling units per acre required by code, were short. The other number that was short of a job acreage number that has been thought of as a benchmark in this process, has been 1657 net acres of jobs. This number, over a year ago, he derived from the council's decision based on their looking at the "Community Planning Committee Action Worksheet for UGB Expansion" during its December 2002 deliberations. Based on this Mr. Valone came up with 1657 net acre of jobs. When the council made their ordinance decision, they had adopted the Title 4 map that showed the job/land. While the acreage was short for jobs, what they came up with for a number of jobs was 23,000-37,000. The project management team asked Mr. Valone if that was equal to 1657 or not? Mr. Valone wrote a memo to the project management committee explaining a methodology of how they derived a number equivalent to 1657 acres and come up with 63,000 jobs. The methodology used was consistent with the urban growth report that was used for the expansion. The memo also recommended that at least one of the alternatives have 1657 acres. At the end of the process, if the final plan had showed something significantly less than 1657 then the case had to be made to Metro Council showing why. Because of the memo the project staff said that the numbers were real low, let's revise them and the staff revised them upwards. One of the attachments showed the revision upwards of jobs and dwelling units. The density was raised as well. The middle of the first solid block that said "Total Net Buildable Jobs Land", going down to the middle block that says employee that says "Employees (includes school employees and home)", that was the job numbers they calculated from that acreage. So the job numbers then ranged from 35,000-76,000 on the given acreage. When the project management team met with a subcommittee of the AC to go over the refinements there was concern by subcommittee members who serve on MPAC that was anything less than 1657 was going to be okay with the Metro Council and Land Conservation and Development (LCDC). The group met to get some guidance from the Metro Council before they started the analysis, which numbers depended on transportation, on other factors, were the numbers they presented close enough or did they achieve something higher?

Councilor Liberty asked where was the study area.

Mr. Valone answered the study area went a little bit beyond Damascus. The city limits were 80% of the expanded area, and Happy Valley was the other 20%.

Councilor Liberty asked where were the other 7,000 acres? The study area was 12,215, there was 5,145 total net buildable land.

Ms. Buehrig, Clackamas County, stated that the difference would be submitted land, land that was already built, and it would have been areas they considered unbuildable due natural resource protection such as steep slopes areas that were protected by Title 3 regulations and areas that would be protected because they were Class 1 or Class 2 as identified by Goal 5.

Councilor Liberty stated that the reason he asked was that the organization, 1000 Friends of Oregon project had much higher totals for development and really emphasized protecting streams. But he thought maybe they made fundamentally different assumptions about what happened with the lands that were in the accepted areas. What percentage of the accepted areas were taken out and why? He asked for clarification with what Ms. Buehrig said about the difference between 12,215 and 5,145 for example, trumped that as committed lands. Committed lands could also be a technical term for areas of partial development with exceptions to areas outside of the boundaries. What was the redevelopment assumption?

Ms. Buehrig stated that they did make a redevelopment assumption. They started off with the Metro vacant land supply so that meant a committed property would have been a house as well as up to a half acre around it. So if there were 10 acres of property with a house on it only a half acre would have been considered committed and the remaining nine and a half acres would have been considered buildable.

Councilor Liberty said that he was concerned about having made assumptions about lands not buildable but would in fact have been built on when it came to natural resource protections. What share of the 7,000 acres were unbuildable because of Title 3 or slopes?

Ms. Buehrig answered she didn't know the percentage.

Councilor Liberty continued by stating that it was a massive reduction in the inventory there. He stated that it seemed high to him.

Meg Fernekes, LCDC staff, stated that the methodology was similar to the one used in the Metro urban growth reports – they followed the Metro methodology.

Mr. Valone stated that the other takeout was that there were 15 subdivisions built out there that would take up a lot of decent land. There was quite a bit of land taken up by subdivisions.

Councilor Liberty said that he was less surprised at employment figures than the dwelling unit. The dwelling unit seemed dramatically lower than he expected.

Mr. Valone stated that when they looked at the urban growth report and when they looked at the dwelling unit in a similar way than the net acreage deducted out came to 25,600 dwelling units. That was a number that was out there that they looked at when they did a study analysis at high level. That came to 10 dwelling units or more an acre. What had happened is that 10 dwellings units or more was sending the number up. But they had assumed about 25,000.

Council President Bragdon asked what was the estimated need in December 2002?

Mr. Valone answered 25,0000 new.

Councilor Newman stated that they were over that target with all four alternatives.

Mr. Valone stated that the stage they were in they were over that.

Councilor Newman asked if that was because the AC wanted to commit more land to residential purposes?

Mr. Valone answered that everyone understood that it would be a trade off of being more dense in urban areas to work around an extensive creek system and buttes, and other constraints. The urban areas were more focused on higher density.

Andy Cotungo, Planning Director, added that another factor in the employment discussion was that the map was built off of Clackamas County studies of the need for industrial land from several years prior and a clear objective on the county's part to overcome what they viewed as a shortfall as the availability of industrial land. What was a county shortfall became a concentrated expansion in one particular area which was where the UGB expansion was. So that was introduced into Damascus planning process. But did the community view as it's own objective? Did it want to oversupply employment for the county or did it want a level of employment that was more appropriate and comparable to its level as a size of the city? That question was still on the table. That question had been an open question from the beginning and the group thought that the range of alternatives facilitated that type of debate.

Mr. John Hartsock, Damascus City Council, stated that they were committed to the jobs/housing balance. In fact they ended up with more residential land from the way the maps got digitized and that was really the level they were trying to work through. What was the right balance? Was it purely the number of jobs, which they think they would meet differently in Damascus because of the terrain and the type of industry they would attract versus the acres, but they knew that the acres were a very sensitive point.

Councilor McLain said that they had quite a range. There was also the idea of the balance being subregional versus being just individual cities. Where she lived they had Forest Grove, Cornelius, Beaverton, Hillsboro. Those people were intermingling their jobs, housing and recreation. She asked if they have had a conversation of the subregion versus the city as far as creating that balance.

Mr. Valone answered that when the discussion of the jobs came up a number could not be arrived at because of different views. But the range was at least wanting to help with the county-wide shortage as well as fulfilling what the county considered their overall deficits. But it was a range because it was consistent approach with what they were doing with all other characteristics of the four plans. They were trying to evaluate for ranges of the characteristics so they would get feedback on outcomes that would help inform them on the hybrid plan.

Councilor Park stated that when the numbers swung, it was a huge difference in terms of the housing. He asked Mr. Valone if they were still figuring 2.5 per household.

Mr. Valone answered it was about 2.5.

Councilor Park continued by stating that if that stayed the same, there was more capacity for housing than originally thought about which makes that 666 number that they were arguing over for a couple of days pretty stupid when you were talking over 10,000 in oversupply. In terms of the employment number, which is 63,000, and then look at housing and figure 1.6 employees per household, they were still in an oversupply of about 10,000 for jobs.

Council President Bragdon stated that 63,000 was a lot of jobs for that area.

Mr. Jordan added that the alternatives were significantly below that.

Councilor Park stated that he was looking at the information in the context of housing questions versus looking at perhaps 300 acres of industrial shortage. The number spread was so wide that he began to wonder about the accuracy of how much could they take down and state with some absurdity. He stated that he was buying into Councilor Hostika's arguments.

Mr. Valone stated that when he was going through the exercise he was educated. There was a difference between a forecast based on demand than what could be accommodated. There was a regional forecast that when it was disaggregated and tried to make sense of it went back into the acreage. But the expansion was in acreage.

Councilor Burkholder asked the question why were they here?

Councilor Hartsock stated that their concern was they take a plan forward that made the job numbers but say half of the acreage and the citizens liked that. They now came through the review and approval process and that made them short on job acres but not jobs. But he said to remember that they headed down the road of acres.

Councilor Newman made the comment that Metro's goal was the same as theirs, to create a great place and it got frustrating when they got into this bean counting role, although they were all responsible for how State of Oregon would react and what kind of requirement the next time they had to go through expansion. He stated that if the number of jobs were the same he didn't care, as long as it was a reasonable scenario it didn't matter to him. He just wanted to make sure that the general share of employment and residences was addressed, not where they were put or what the assumptions were in terms of lot size or building size. He asked that if they accepted the jobs numbers but not acreage numbers what kind of position would that put them in with the State as it related to the next time they would have to go through review? Or on the remand?

Mr. Jordan said that the forecast was based on jobs emanating from population forecasts. The acres were more tied to the types of job that generate certain acreage requirements to meet those job numbers. This whole discussion was good for the community process purpose in keeping good faith with the community. He went back to the long and intense discussions he had with Mr. Benner over the difference between trying to count the number of angels on the head of a pin when you move the boundary and then create a great community inside that boundary when you got to concept planning and then comprehensive planning. He took one lesson away, that you should always reserve the right to get smarter which meant as a community went through concept planning, you'll learn things that you didn't when the boundary was moved. It would be a more intense effort to really try and figure out what it would take to make a great community. Under current law, this would be done every five years. Maybe it would be changed to every ten. They could always come back and always reevaluate. They would reevaluate on 20-year projections that were going to reevaluate on a shorter time frame. They would get a chance to adjust and think about it again and think about what they learned and didn't learn the last time. He appreciated the process and getting feedback from the group, that as long as the plan was within some reason and it was a reasonable plan that would accomplish some goals, the community would have the opportunity to build the place they would like to live in.

Councilor Park stated that they were looking at a potential reduction of land but they hadn't specified which land. If it would cut into the number of parcels for large industrial purposes that they turned into the State, then they would have a concern unless the State decided to change the requirement of Metro. With the last expansion Metro was short on a number of those pieces. He asked what type of land would be converted from industrial to housing? Metro would have more of a stake in that.

Mr. Valone said that that it was more important to Metro that when they would look at Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA), mixed use and employment aspect, that the reason it had been identified was that they could change locations but it would be a problem if its reduced.

Mr. Cotugno said to remember that the light blue was the employment designations and it's in the employment designations where they would expect to see more of an office and retail type function. Metro's goal should have been to see those kinds of functions in more of a mixed used kind of development pattern rather than an office style development pattern, which would inherently be higher density in town centers and corridors rather than large swaths in employment areas. For that type of that employment function he expected all the light blue areas to shrink. These were the plans that had been developed and that meant the more limited concern of the RSIA was in a more limited territory.

Councilor Liberty said that he would rather see communities struggle with addressing the regional share issue in Clackamas County. It was a balance issue and he appreciated that. He stated that there wasn't going to be another opportunity in along time. He noted that there was a different landscape there and the possibility of creating intense urbanizism surrounded among things that were natural and pastoral and he hoped that didn't get lost. He looked at the distribution of employment lands accompanied by what Mr. Cotugno said. He stated that he didn't want Metro to set up another round of discussion with Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) on land need. So they needed to figure out some way to connect Damascus with LCDC.

Councilor McLain stated that she appreciated the conversation and that it showed they cared about what each other were doing and the process both ways. She stated that she agreed with everyone else before that they have been given enough information and she felt comfortable with the information and that the basic concept was being followed of getting more jobs into Clackamas County and making sure it would developed into a community that people would want to live in. She felt it was important to update the LCDC's understanding of what was difficult in the process that caused them to be asking the questions asked at the meeting. They needed to develop a process that was clear and concise and understandable by all citizens. It was important to talk about what they would be doing in the 5, 7, 10 year process of looking at need assessment and trying to create a 20 year supply of anything. She wanted those discussions because she was worried about if they don't do anything what would happen the next time through.

Mr. Valone stated that what he heard given these last numbers that this range looked like a good range to go into the evaluation with and if they would come back with something less than the 1637, if the jobs looked pretty high at this level, the Council would be okay with that.

Ms. Fernekees, State of Oregon, Department of Land Conservation & Development stated that they were interested in preserving employment capacity and they would rather have expressed it in acres because it was the common measurement tool that Metro had been using in their UGB expansions. LSDC had some concerns and reservations about deviating from the 1650 acres in any great substantial way. Alternative F, which had the 1650 acres, was the least acceptable alternative to community because it involved the Sunrise Corridor alignment, which could have been a strawman alternative. They didn't want to see that go off the board because of the fact that it was unpopular. If employment capacity were to be translated into jobs per acre or total number of jobs...

Councilor Liberty interrupted to get clarification on Sunrise corridor.

Ms. Fernekees responded that there was an alternative that preserves the alignment of the Sunrise Corridor that was proposed in an environmental impact study work and it cut right through the community so it was not a popular alternative. She continued that if employment capacity were to be translated into jobs per acre or total number of jobs, she asked that it would be documented with some authority as to how that number would be arrived at. She looked at some of the job capacity numbers and felt that some may be aspirational.

Councilor Liberty asked Ms. Fernekees what she didn't want the Sunrise Corridor to be?

Ms. Fernekees responded the strawman alternative, in other words easily dismissed because it was unpopular to the community.

Councilor Liberty responded that he understood that but wanted clarification on whether she wanted the LCDC saying that the alignment would be considered.

Councilor Newman clarified by saying that he heard Ms. Fernekees say that she didn't want to reject it because of the unpopularity of the Sunrise Corridor and then lose because it was attached to those acres.

Mr. Valone stated that is what Ms. Fernekees was saying but he added that they were not attaching an either or. What they were looking at was a range for evaluation purposes. If the F was not chosen whatever got chosen could have 1600 acres of job land. They were going to do a hybrid and mix the best characteristics that work together and if there was more jobs, they could easily make it on any of the other alternatives.

Councilor Hostika went back to the discussion they had a number years ago where he thought the Council unanimously said they wanted local control over the planning to the extent feasible. He stated he hadn't seen the plan yet – all he saw was a table of numbers. He said he was having a hard time and would have rather looked at the plan first and then would have made the numbers work later. If they started with a table of numbers the local control aspect would start to dissipate.

Councilor Burkholder stated that they did have local control of the plan because they had seen the plan but the council hadn't.

Councilor Hostika stated that he didn't want to quote Ms. Fernekees if she was poorly quoted. But he stated that if he were a local reporter he would say that the LCDC said "Do it even though the people don't want it."

Ms. Fernekees responded that the reason why they were going through acres was to keep some land base there. It was always a question of land supply. It was important to keep the land base there so that 4 years from now when the city of Damascus came to the State and did a periodic review it can show that it had selected a range of employment that have higher employment densities. It was important in the interim to preserve that land base. The LCDC was amendable, they just needed to look at the figures and make sure they actually added up. The commission may have been confused because they were used to acres and she hoped this wouldn't have any implications for the remand work because they wouldn't want to have any one testify and say they "We're lost 800 acres in Damascus."

Councilor McLain asked what about that comment. She stated that was the one part that they needed more discussion on. What about losing 800 acres? Was it really lost if they got more jobs

in a smaller space? It looked to her that there would be more available resources later. She started that it wasn't a done deal that they had lost capacity.

Ms. Fernekees said that as long as that case could be made.

Councilor Newman stated that if that case was being made it needed to be made within a reasonable scenario.

Councilor McLain stated that they had a commitment.

Councilor Park said that from reading the tables, that they hadn't lost housing or job capacity. So he asked where was the bad news? Other than the fact that the community was trying to figure out what to do with it.

Mr. Cotugno said that community process was very heavily locally driven. They were trying to say they didn't want to have a gotcha when they got to the end of the process.

Council President Bragdon said he appreciated that.

Mr. Cotugno continued by asking if the area was being developed efficiently and were they getting what they could out of the space. That was a good rule of thumb they should be measure. Whether they were getting sufficient use out of the land was a good measure.

Council President Bragdon thanked them for their time.

7. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Kate Marx, director of Public Affairs and Government Relations Department, briefed the council on the Partnership Matters event. Agendas for the events were handed out. There was a discussion about what types of information should be distributed as well as what should be discussed and presented. It was suggested to do a Metro 101 presentation and then what Metro was working on. Councilors discussed who would be attending and what type of information was needed to present to them and what type of information attendees would receive. They felt it was important for the attendees to come away with knowledge about what Metro could for them.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Kathryn Schutte
Acting Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 8, 2005

| Item | Topic | Doc Date | Document Description | Doc. Number |
|------|--|------------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Agenda | February 8, 2005 | Metro Council Agenda for February 8, 2005 | 020805c-01 |
| 2 | Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Vision and Values | February 8, 2005 | Vision Statements/Key Concepts for Discussion | 020805c-02 |
| 3 | Disposal System Planning | February 8, 2005 | Draft Work Plan at Council Work Session | 020805c-03 |
| 4 | Damascus Concept Planning update | February 8, 2005 | Work Session Worksheet, Presenters Ray Valone, Planning Department | 020805c-04 |
| 5 | Council Briefings/Communication | February 8, 2005 | Partnerships Matter packet | 020805c-05 |