

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL RETREAT MEETING

Wednesday, February 23, 2005
Room 501

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

Councilors Absent:

Council President David Bragdon convened the Metro Council Retreat Meeting at 1:09 p.m. He reviewed the process he wanted to follow for the reviewing the projects.

1. Review project proposals for key work projects.

Mike Wetter, Assistant to Council President, said that the level of detail varied greatly between the projects, as this was the first attempt to put together the proposals. He said he was looking for agreement from the Councilors on the scope of work and resources.

Councilor Burkholder reviewed the proposal for “Housing Choice for all” as he was listed as the Lead Councilor for this project. That proposal was attached and forms part of the record. Mike Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, asked if this proposal fulfilled the commitment to reconvene the housing issue. He wanted to be sure that they would not be forming another task force. Councilor Burkholder said it did fulfill that requirement and that they would not be forming another task force. Councilor Liberty asked about the project run dates. Council President Bragdon said it was tied to the budget. The councilors discussed the FTE resources for this project as tied to the budget for this fiscal year and for the next fiscal year. There was general discussion on how to format the budget proposal for the entire life of the project. Councilor McLain emphasized her desire to see this project fulfill the Metro goal of making the agency a catalyst for affordable housing in the region. Councilor Burkholder reviewed his hopes for the project outcome.

There was general discussion among the Councilors regarding the process of what would happen with the proposals presented once they reached agreement on them. Councilor Liberty suggested doing the work as an administrative directive – then if there were good results take action to make things happen if didn’t need more development.

Councilor Hosticka reviewed his proposal for the “Nature in the Neighborhoods – Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program Implementation” project for the rest of this year and for the next fiscal year. Those proposals were attached and form part of the record. The Councilors reviewed the timeline for this project. It was agreed that there would be a staff proposal to Council that Councilor Hosticka would carry. Councilor Liberty wanted to have budget numbers for this year and next year. Councilor McLain asked to have the preparation of outreach and related strategies along with budget attached. The Councilors agreed that was a good idea. Councilor Hosticka suggested that they had a meeting to discuss the outreach strategy before the Bond Measure was up for vote. Councilor McLain said she was very committed to the May 19th adoption date. The Councilors committed to the schedule outlined in the proposal.

Councilor Hosticka spoke to Nature in the Neighborhoods. He said they had to get through Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). He talked about the relation with the Clean Water Act. That was the government side. They also had to establish a green development. There would be an ongoing process on monitoring and reporting. He also felt that

the parks bond measure was a part of this proposal was part of this program. He then addressed the outreach part of the project, which would be an on going effort. He asked at what point did we do the regulatory part and implement the communications strategy. Kate Marx, Public Affairs Director, spoke of the rebranding of the Goal 5 program and suggested taking a look at how we manage the moving parts temporally in the right sequence with all the right points. She said if we wanted to start a movement, how did we categorize it? She talked about the current tools in place, natural gardening, watershed restoration, acquisition program, restoration program, green streets, technical expertise, Salmon Festival, and mapping. She talked about the regulation component of Nature in the Neighborhoods: Title 3, Goal 5, Land Use and federal regulations. Then there were future plans such as the bond measure. How did we continue to talk about the regulatory aspects that didn't wholly define the non-regulatory aspects? How did we leverage all of this to optimize the bond measure? Councilor Hosticka said they all generally agreed if they were going to have Nature in the Neighborhoods, it had to be a collective effort or movement. Councilor Newman asked if they would have an interdepartmental team or was it about the brochures that were produced. Councilor Hosticka said they were talking about being out there. Councilor Liberty said all that was on the board was internal. He was hopeful that there were also external components. Councilor McLain said she was all for the movement of getting people to understand what we had done. How were we trying to impact those that were in favor and those that were not? What was the strategy for not losing the base we had and adding others to the movement. Ms. Marx spoke to the project manager role. Council President Bragdon said today they didn't have to discuss the details of the outreach campaign. Councilor Newman said he felt they were on the right track. He spoke to current programs at the Zoo, the Greenscene, and the Centers program. He felt the interdepartmental team approach was effective. Council President Bragdon asked, were they on the right track? Councilor Liberty said the bond measure was one way to implementation depending upon what was in the measure. He spoke to outcomes that were measurable. He asked were there other institutions that could help with that? Councilor Hosticka said one way to think about this was to give people something to think about, the ballot measure was one of those things. Councilor McLain said the branding part was the first step. Get people to think where the connections were. Council President Bragdon said what they were doing today was asking for a license to go forward. Councilor Park said one thing that would help was what role Metro played. Metro was the catalyst in this project.

Council President Bragdon asked Mr. Jordan about timing. Ms. Deffebach said what they were proposing described the whole movement, not just Goal 5. Councilor Hosticka said if we get the Functional Plan behind us, then we could move forward. Council President Bragdon said part of this was a celebration of the 10-year bond measure. Councilor Hosticka talked about the proposed Functional Plan language. Ms. Deffebach said they would be bringing forward program objectives. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on the outcome measures. Councilor Hosticka said these were considered the outcome measures that would be adopted on May 19, 2005. Mr. Jordan said the geneses of these were articulated in the resolution that was adopted last December. Councilor Liberty asked for clarification on the outcome measures. He asked what the total costs was for the program? Council President Bragdon said the proposed planning budget was \$750,000. The parks department had requested fund as well for the program. There were other projects within the agency, which tied into this as well. Councilor Liberty asked about the cost. He would like to see the total budget. Councilor Burkholder said they were still trying to figure out the total budget for this program. He thought the level of discussion was good. He liked the language. He would like to have language added about economic development supporting green development. Councilor Park suggested the potential for other excise tax restructuring. Councilor McLain said it helped give them something that people could be for. Councilor Newman said he got excited about the narrative on the white board. He wanted a way to describe it. Janice Larson, Creative Design Manager, said words come first. They collectively took a look

at who they were talking to, position statement, and the research. There needed to be discipline on how they communicated to the public. The Nature in the Neighborhoods worked nicely into a theme for the parks bond measure. "Thank you for protecting nature in the neighborhoods". She spoke to developing a logo that kept the theme. She shared what they had produced already. Councilor McLain said Councilor Newman's suggested having a tree in the logo. She thought that input was really good. She shared other pieces they had produced for the project. Councilor Park asked about the narrative. He raised the concern, as you were moving into one piece, was the whole concept tainted with the word regulation? Councilor McLain didn't think so. Councilor Park suggested that they needed to have a discussion about what went out to the public within a week. Council President Bragdon asked about the Measure 56 notice, which would go out next week. Ms. Deffebach said they felt the need to notice widely. Council President Bragdon suggested that staff meet with all councilors about what was being sent out. Councilor Park said he was opposed to sending a notice on Measure 56 in a broader context of the Nature in the Neighborhood.

Councilor McLain addressed the Neighboring Cities project. They had been trying to do a better job with their bi-state neighbors and those who were outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). She and Councilor Park said they supported determining what these groups concerns were. They would be looking at the different communities that surrounded our area. She talked about the outcome for the scoping phase. They would then make recommendations about how they would work with these partners. Councilor Park said it went back to the sphere of influence issue. They didn't know if there was a problem. He said they wanted to talk with them about what their concerns were. He then talked about the second phase, the greater regional economy. They were trying to get the real sphere of influence. He talked about partnership agreements. He felt they needed to be talking about the greater region. He thought we needed to figure out how we work with Portland Development Association (PDA). He spoke to sub-regional issues. They would take the olive branch out. Then, engage in discussion, to see if there were common themes and interest in the next phase. They needed to engage the outer cities to support the Centers program. Councilor McLain said they would be utilizing Council Support staff for scheduling and using Date Resource Center (DRC) for some of the materials they wanted to take out with them. Councilor Newman suggested the urban edge discussion occur. Councilor McLain said he was hopeful that this would be addressed in the agriculture.

Councilor Burkholder suggested that the message was consistent: Sphere of Influence. He said it would be useful for bi-state to have that as well to make sure that issues were framed correctly. Councilor McLain said they needed to coordinate the effort. Councilor Park said the one piece he didn't have was the affordable housing piece. Councilor Liberty said they have a huge commuting relationship with Salem. Councilor McLain said the future vision included Canby to Salem. She said they could include Salem in the second stage. Councilor Liberty said it might be harder to establish a working relationship with Salem if they were excluded in Phase 1. He thought Salem and Keiser might share some of the concerns. He talked about the 25000 commuters daily. Councilor Park said the point was well taken but it would require more study. Council President Bragdon asked if Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) needed to be a party to this? Councilor Park said he had been trying to have a discussion with ODOT. Councilor McLain said she felt in the scoping that ODOT would not want to come with them at this point but maybe in the second phase. Mr. Jordan asked about the Oregon Department of Agriculture. Councilor McLain said they were included. Councilor Newman said good work. Councilor Burkholder said framing the issue would be helpful. Councilor Park said he would take Tim O'Brien, Planning Department, with him. Councilor Hosticka concurred with Councilor Newman's comments. Councilor Liberty felt it was great.

Councilor Liberty talked about the Measure 37 project proposal (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He quoted the resolution that was adopted in December. 90% of the work was adopted by the Measure 37 resolution. He spoke to the four differences from the resolution including the chair, outreach, and fairness issues. The outcomes and products went back to the adopted resolution. He then spoke to options for the budget. He talked about a proposed public symposium, which could run from \$300 to \$28500. He then addressed possible members of the proposed task force. Councilor Liberty suggested several financial options. Councilor Newman asked about #4 was that Randy Tucker. Metro Lobbyist? Councilor Liberty responded that Mr. Cooper was already involved in the meetings. Mr. Cooper talked about recent discussions in Salem. There may be movement in Salem so he cautioned what we did here shouldn't rise to the attention of the legislature.

Councilor Newman asked if there was anyone on the committee that supported Measure 37? He felt it would be helpful to get more than a symbolic representation of those who supported Measure 37. He also asked about the public database? Councilor Liberty explained how claims were submitted to the State. He thought that Metro would end up with the better database. Councilor Hosticka raised the issue of Mr. Tucker's and Mr. Cooper's role. Council President Bragdon said his take was to have them reporting to Council directly. Councilor Hosticka said he didn't see this task force doing anything that the legislature would be surprised about. Mr. Cooper responded to his concern. Councilor Liberty said his expectation about the legislature doing anything wasn't high. Mr. Cotugno said there ought to be more clear direction about legislative proposal. He asked what Council wanted concerning legislation.

Councilor Park talked about asking the COO to convene a group. He thought this would be an informational piece. He wanted to figure out how far this went from the original resolution. He asked Mr. Jordan what he had put together. Mr. Jordan said he had let Councilors take the lead but felt he would have done similarly. He did raise concerns about how far this group should go. Councilor Park asked if we were the catalyst? He thought he was voting on being a catalyst. If we were actively engaged and going to be the driver, he wasn't sure that was where we wanted to put Metro. Council President Bragdon said he felt this exceeded what his intent was. He felt it might be detrimental. He thought they had asked Mr. Jordan to put together a technical work group. He also felt that Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) needed help with consistency issues. Instead what we had, overstepped this intent. He felt these goals of the task force might be counterproductive. He did see compiling information and having a dialogue with local governments. This seemed like an advocacy group of people who opposed the measure. Councilor Burkholder expressed concern about the timing issue. Did we know what was going to happen? He felt some of these things were premature. He felt this was beyond the scope of Metro and could be a dangerous thing to do. In order for us to be effective he thought we were asking how could we help? He didn't think we had the resources to find the solution. He was more comfortable with the original idea. It was more consistent with Metro's role. Councilor Park talked about transportation and that no one on the list was from the transportation arena. That was one of the biggest pieces for Metro. He suggested making sure that they had a representative from transportation, sewer and water. He wanted to make sure we were covering issues that related to Metro.

Councilor Hosticka defended the project. He said it was trying to understand the implication of Measure 37. He felt their task on page 5 focused on impacts on 2040 growth concept and other planning objectives and alternatives. Councilor McLain said she appreciated the changes that had been made since their discussion at the Work Session. She thought the first task was good. She also thought there should be pro-Measure 37 participants on the committee. She then spoke to Phase 2 and what components should be included. Councilor Newman said he had a similar

reaction two weeks ago to Councilors Bragdon, Burkholder and Park. He felt they were reacting to the previous version. He had a hard time disagreeing with the outcomes and products. He wanted more assistance from other organizations such as Portland State University. He talked about page 4 and 5, which was the budget. He wasn't sure identifying sources for funding made sense and he was OK with the MPAC discussion but not a large symposium. He wanted to have more of a discussion with the Councilors concerns. Were they concerned about how high the profile was? Councilor Liberty talked about the differences between the proposals. He thought that eliminating the symposium and the funding conversation would be fine. Councilor Hosticka talked about the significance of the work. Councilor Liberty spoke to those who had asked to be involved in the group. He thought people were hungry to find a third way between doing nothing and having landscapes destroyed. He felt there was a vacuum. Councilor Burkholder said he thought we should have sideboards on how far we go. He asked what was Metro's role? If we adopted a base program we were going to have budget impacts. We were at the beginning of the era. He reminded this was excise-funded activity. He suggested starting small and seeing what comes out of it. This would be a budget amendment and he didn't know where the money was coming from.

Councilor Park said he main concern was perception. Whatever this group came up with they wanted it to be perceived that the Council convened it. He gave an example of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) summit. He said they approached them to help with the sideboards. He was concerned about unintended consequences. They were trying to be more of a convener. Councilor Newman asked Councilor Park what he envisioned. Councilor Park said he thought that Metro's role as a convener was the role they needed to take. Council President Bragdon said a lot of this was valuable. His concern was mission and appearance. He felt this proposal was far better. His concern still remained, mission creep in terms of where they want to be. The public might question what Metro true role was? Councilor McLain said they would have a budget discussion. They might have to pair down the project or phase it. Councilor Liberty said if they decided to move forward, they would have to appoint the membership. He suggested identifying the chair at that point. He felt that people wanted leadership on this issue. Councilor Park said he didn't vote for Metro to take the lead. Leadership was there. Councilor Hosticka suggested rebranding this. He didn't see this as a Measure 37 fight. He shared what he felt we should lead on. Council President Bragdon said the question was what type of leadership should Metro have. Councilor McLain said you could tailor the intent of the committee. Councilor Liberty said he would like to see something about the status of the project. Councilor Burkholder said they had to be very careful. He wanted to make sure that we were providing a service. Councilor Liberty asked about resources. Councilor Park wanted to see what the package was?

Council President Bragdon explained the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC) project proposal. They had talked about this yesterday. Councilor Liberty said there were three who wanted to have a broader discussion about what should be included in the bond measure. Councilor Park asked about broader elements. Councilor Burkholder said based on the history, Metro had an opportunity about once a decade to obtain a bond measure. Could this bond measure package include other things with this bond measure? Councilor Liberty asked if they could get something that passed that could cover more? Councilor Burkholder asked about the public opinion work and the budget. Councilor Park said he felt they had a public opinion poll, people should be asked what they were willing to pass. We have to ask the broad questions to figure out what we could pass? Jim Desmond, Director of Regional Parks and Greenspaces, said the intent was they would do two surveys. Councilor Park asked if they could marriage this proposal with other survey questions? Councilor Burkholder suggested going to the Zoo Foundation to see if they wanted to devote money to a poll? Councilor Park asked about the polling. Councilor McLain responded to his question about the polling previously. Councilor

Burkholder suggested having Mr. Jordan poll other departments about funding and polling. Councilor Newman reminded that this was an internal discussion. Councilor Burkholder reiterated this was our agency, what did they need to do? Councilor Burkholder asked what the deadline was for the first survey. Mr. Desmond said one would be in the next three to four months. Then another survey would be once they had done the survey, probably in March 2006.

Councilor Park introduced the Disposal System Planning project proposal. Councilor Hosticka asked if the plan was to get rid of the transfer station. Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, responded to his question. Mr. Anderson said if they were divested of the transfer stations we would still maintain some regulatory oversight.

Councilor Park asked about owning or not owning transfer stations and how that affects other decisions.

Councilor McLain said she thought there were two direct requests for products; it was not a chicken and egg situation. She noted that the difference between the two sets of goals. She said the main concern should be integrating the two. She later added that the Disposal System Planning was only a piece of the pie. Rather, the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update was more comprehensive.

Councilor Newman asked for clarification of Councilor Park's position. He said he was wrestling with the RSWMP update and the disposal system planning.

Councilor Hosticka said the RSWMP was more of a regional plan for dealing with solid waste. After determining the policy, then the Council could determine the activities to implement those policies.

Councilor Burkholder asked about what would happen if the Council changed what it had been doing with solid waste.

Councilor Hosticka asked why the Council would want to do something different other than what would fulfill the goals of RSWMP.

Councilor Liberty said he did not understand why there were two proposals instead of integrated into one proposal. He noted that it costs \$500-600,000 dollars to update a plan. He reviewed how he tallied that number from the FTEs and costs listed in the proposal.

Mr. Hogle responded to his comments, saying the actual costs may actually be even higher. He detailed some of the resources that would be needed to review plans and deal with outside vendors and contractors. With the RSWMP update, he said it is spread over 12 FTE, and they have been asked to do better analysis this time. The RSWMP was done every 10 years. It was a complicated issue. If the Council wanted the thorough analysis, it was going to take a lot of work. He agreed that they needed a good policy direction for the system, at the same time as they were looking at the value of the transfer stations.

Councilor Park asked if the land use drove the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the RTP drives the land use.

Councilor Park said he supported the RSWMP, but he did not support spending a lot of time and money on finding out what the transfer stations were worth. He said there were so many ways they could value industrial property that they may not be able to come to a conclusion.

Councilor McLain said she wanted to answer Councilor Park's question, but she did agree with Councilor Hosticka that they could not do the kind of analysis needed now.

Councilor Liberty said he was concerned about the amount of money needed for the proposed work. He said it seemed odd to have two projects.

Councilor Newman said he could not answer the question about whether Metro should be in the business. Especially realizing that the issue hinged on when the bonds come due and that they would need to make decisions about it.

President Bragdon said he would rather emphasize other work than the updates, if Metro were going to sell the stations.

Mr. Burkholder said he felt that the RSWMP was a key. He asked how much people would pay to handle their garbage. The question was how did we handle the disposal of the region's waste, and manage the system. He said the disposal piece of the RSWMP should wait. There were other parts of the RSWMP that needed to be done.

Councilor McLain said she thought the Council needed to talk about it more at the Tuesday Work Session. She said Metro had a responsibility to the region.

President Bragdon summarized that the Council agreed to spend 10 minutes more on the Oregon Convention Center (OCC) topic.

Councilor Park introduced the project proposal (included in the record) dealing with the Oregon Convention Center Subsidy Gap. The Marketing contract with POVA was up with Metro and the City of Portland. Metro had a responsibility to the OCC building. Was excise tax the right way for Metro to be getting its piece out of the OCC? Was there another way? The shortfall was \$1.5 million per year, not including some particular contracts that could make a big difference. With those included, the difference was closer to \$300,000.

Councilor Liberty asked if this proposed fix was structural or only for this year. This proposal was only for this year.

Council President Bragdon said that if Metro did not set up a plan, someone else would do it for Metro.

Councilor Park said it was important to first know the amount of the gap. It depended if it was \$3 million or \$300,000 gap.

Councilor McLain said Metro Council and Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC) needed to sit down and discuss the issue together, soon. President Bragdon said they were working to set that up.

Councilor Burkholder said he was interested in a trigger

Mr. Cooper explained the budget and tax process with MERC

Councilor Park said he wanted to first get a solid number for the gap before getting other jurisdictions involved in resolving the issue.

Metro Council Retreat Meeting

02/23/05

Page 8

Mr. Cooper reminded the Council of its previous agreements on keeping support services and noted that the Council has done what it promised.

The Council agreed to have Councilor Park proceed to work with MERC staff on their behalf on the OCC subsidy gap issue.

Councilor McLain asked councilors about they supported for System Development Charges for schools, and all agreed to support it.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 23,
2005**

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1	Agenda	2/23/05	Retreat Timeline, Topic, Lead Councilor and staff	022305c-01
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Disposal System Planning	022305c-02
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update	022305c-03
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Measure 37 Task Force	022305c-04
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Fish and Wildlife Bond Measure November 2006	022305c-05
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Oregon Convention Center Subsidy Gap	022305c-06
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Housing Choice for All	022305c-07
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Nature in the Neighborhoods – Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program Implementation	022305c-08
1	Project Proposal	2/23/05	Neighbor Cities	022305c-09