

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, March 1, 2005
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 3, 2005/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Council President Bragdon reviewed the March 3, 2005 Metro Council agenda. The first item discussed was Measure 37 as well as project proposals. Council President Bragdon mentioned that the appointments to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) are all nominees that respective constituencies had passed on.

Councilor Burkholder said that the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program project (MTIP) would be discussed later on. In this discussion the council would be able to lay it all out and ask Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, to also help outline the councilor communication piece. Council President Bragdon said that this discussion would help direct the project participants. Councilor Burkholder added that this would give everyone the background of the issues because the council would be asked for a directive. Councilor Burkholder went on to say that the council needed to make sure that everyone knew what the process was all about, it was more informational for the council.

Council President Bragdon said that the council had been interested in the overall objectives of the project. They preferred projects that fit criteria, but were not as geographically focused, whereas the members of Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT) championed their particular jurisdiction. Councilor Burkholder said that the idea would bring everyone up to speed, because there were the chief pre JPACT members who are sick and tired of the current format. There were four others who also needed to be brought up to speed on the issues. Councilor Liberty said that he had some criteria questions and some project questions. First question was how do you compare things across categories. Some had very different rankings across categories and some types didn't seem to fit on the list.

Councilor Burkholder said what council wanted to do was to be able to answer questions in preparation for direction without going into too much detail. The idea was to get council up to speed and to determine how they arrived to the point where they were now and to hopefully get direction on the finishing process.

Councilor Park stated that the council had endorsed certain parts of the criteria and he thought that the key questions had to do with those criteria. The council members showed interest in the overall policy-making decision on the criterion used in the decision making process. Councilors Park and Liberty asked qualifying questions regarding the criteria used. Questions technical in nature were discussed regarding the sixty-forty split.

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer (COO), reported that the contract with Metro's current daycare provider ended on June 30th of this year. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will be sent out in a few weeks. Detailed information followed regarding the extensive degree of subsidizing done by the agency for the operations of the daycare. Metro provided services such as electricity, water, sewer, garbage, and custodial services, gas and up to and including the bond payments as allocated across the square footage for this building. Mr. Jordan presented an all-inclusive list of potential issues both financially and fiscally.

Staff reported to the council about using the RFP process to address issues with the intent of having a daycare provided within the building. Metro employees were polled in earlier studies and the results confirmed that having a daycare was a valued service. If no proposal came forward that chooses to address these issues, there would be future discussions with the council. What was really an issue in the staff's mind was the balance between the fiscal financial subsidy that was going on with the provider and having the provision in the building. Those were obviously values that the council needed to be informed about.

Councilor McLain expressed interest in the fact that the RFP should require the school be accredited through the National Accreditation Association. She also mentioned the ratio of children to teachers. Councilor McLain went on to say that without adding a couple more students, they would not be able to continue to hold costs down. Increasing cost had been determined by the provider and not by the council. She commented too on the quality and the value of the service received from the daycare provider. Councilor McLain also pointed out that there had been additional RFP's done in the past and that the YWCA had once been considered.

Councilor Burkholder asked two questions, first question: what were the benefits that come to the Metro employee, Councilor McLain commented that no price break was given to employees, but there were some benefits that were unique. One benefit was that the child was close by and another benefit was that employees received some priority in enrollment. Metro employees received no cost breaks. Employees can go down and visit their child during the lunch break and employees were willing to work longer if their child was on site and they could get down to pick the child up, if they happened to work a half-hour to 45 minutes longer, without as much hassle or cost.

Councilor Liberty asked Mr. Jordan if the daycare service benefit had been used in the recruitment of employees. Mr. Jordan replied that he was not aware of any recruitment advantages used in the recruitment process. David Biedermann, IT Director, advised the council of an informal conversation with Human Resources where he was told that they do not indicate this was a benefit to potential employees. Councilor Liberty also asked if under this arrangement there was a benefit for non-Metro employees regarding the distribution benefits for people without families.

Mr. Jordan answered that it may have happened historically, but there had been no discussion by the council about what families who didn't have children associated with daycare receive. People who didn't currently utilize the daycare were surveyed, who said they planned to use the service in the future because it would be valuable to them. Councilor Park went back to a question asked earlier by Councilor Burkholder regarding the benefit to Metro employees versus non-Metro employees. 60% of the population of the care center were non-Metro employees who were provided this subsidy to, what was the policy behind this and why wasn't there potentially a differential in pricing? He felt the Council needed a policy on this. Mr. Jordan introduced Bill Jemison, Risk Manager for Metro, as having been associated with this process over the years. Mr. Jemison clarified the question that Councilor Park asked regarding why there wasn't a

difference in price. Councilor Park restated that he wanted to know what was the benefit to the Metro employee. Council President Bragdon asked a similar question, if Metro was spending \$150,000 to subsidize daycare services, then 60% of this benefit was going to people who didn't work for Metro, and he did not understand why Metro would do that. It would be like giving everyone a discount at Big Town Hero restaurant if they happened to work in the neighborhood. Mr. Jemison stated that the percentage of Metro employees had stayed pretty constant. This building did not have a large enough population to fill-out a daycare. If Metro wanted to have a daycare on site, we would need to have similar numbers or we could choose not to have a daycare on site. Mr. Jordan added that was where we were with the RFP. He further stated that the process had been constructed to get proposals that would that would address some of these cost issues, but we were not sure that we would get any proposals that would address these issues and the bottom line was that if you wanted a daycare on site and you felt that was a benefit to make it competitive and for them to be able to compete and provide this service on this site, then Metro was likely to have to subsidize and you were likely not going to be able to have a rate differential that exceeded what the market would bare and that the analysis of other daycares, in downtown types of settings, was that (A) they were subsidized like Metro and (B) the competitive price range was about the same. We were not sure that we will get anyone who will purpose what we were hoping for regarding the subsidy issue. If we didn't, we would be back before the council to talk about these value issues and see how the council wanted to proceed, because you were weighing the financial burden and the value to the employees and what that meant to the agency.

Council President Bragdon stated that Metro had hundreds of employees who did not work in this building who were not able to utilize the benefit. Mr. Jordan replied that there were a number of different models the council could look at. Councilor McLain added that the council at the time that they decided to do this felt that there was also a value in being part of the community. Their number one goal was to serve the families in the building that needed a daycare center and the second value was to try and make sure that the community had open access to this daycare too so that it wouldn't be an elite group, but that it would be part of an integrated community group. The council saw this as being part of being a good steward. The other reason was that the City of Portland also asked Metro to have different types of retail in the building and at the time we had the police department downstairs and we also were able to count the retail in helping a certain percentage, a certain footage, be a different type of service to the community. It was also for the City of Portland requirements. We could not find other vendors or other people to come in and take part of our spots so we created a spot and brought in a vendor too.

Councilor Hosticka said that the question that he was asking was what was the total budget of this operation because that amount was not in the handout, and what percentage of it was subsidized. Councilor Hosticka went on to estimate what that cost might be. It was approximately \$200 per kid that Metro was the subsidizing. So if that amount was unsubsidized then the prices would be up \$1100 for an infant toddler. What was the market price, was that going to price that place out of the market? Mr. Jemison said that the \$200 would place Metro at the higher end. When he did the survey and had Metro kids as a cost comparison and added \$200 onto the current rate, he indicated we would be at the high end of the high-end daycare. Councilor Hosticka said that amount was higher than most people mortgage payments. Council Liberty stated there were two issues about policy recognition, which were those who worked at Metro and those who didn't. So he wanted to make sure that they tracked those pieces. He appreciated Councilor McLain's review of the history. Things had changed in the district and maybe we can find more partners. The other part that Councilor Liberty wanted to address was that if we were going to have a benefit like this we ought to be open about it and say we were providing this benefit and we cared about it. Council McLain explained that Mr. Jemison has had to answer the very same questions of her that had been brought up today. In fact Councilor McLain was asked to serve on a panel

that looked at the last proposal. It was not that the council has never looked at these issues, or cared about the issues, it was just that it had been a while since the last proposal was reviewed. Every time the council had tried to make sure that we got our fair share and that we still had the same goals. So it was not that Mr. Jemison hadn't been managing the contract quite well.

2. EVENTS UPDATE

Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director, opened by saying that the Oregon Zoo had been trying to parallel the council's strategic planning process, but they lagged behind as they developed their strategic plan and kept in mind the goals as the council came up with their plan. One of the items was they were close to carrying capacity in the summertime. They were at or near capacity in their ability to park cars at the Zoo, so if they were going to generate more attendance and thus more revenue, they need to find ways to get people to the Zoo in the shoulder months, the off season or at times that they didn't normally come. One of the ways that they had been able to do that very successfully in the past was through special events.

A couple of years ago the Oregon Zoo had an organizational analysis done and one of the criticisms was that the only time that he appeared before the council was with bad news and problems needing to be solved. So he needed to do more in sharing the good news and introducing Council to some of the many really great employees they had at the Zoo. He was thrilled to introduce a couple of our real super stars Krista Swan, who managed special events, and Cynthia Thompson from the Oregon Zoo Foundation. Ms. Thompson was in charge of corporate relations. They worked very closely together to get events sponsored. Ms. Swan was going to tell Council a little bit about some of last year's successes and their plans for this year in regards to just a few of our special events and Ms. Thompson would talk a little bit about sponsoring those events.

Ms. Swan informed the council that last year was a really great year for vents at the Zoo. It seemed like the stars were well aligned for the Zoo. She spoke to the new Spring Break promotion that they did last year. They came up with the idea at the very last minute because they were wanting to build-up attendance and since it was a last minute decision, they needed to utilize their existing resources so they decided to expand on something they had been doing which was publicizing our enrichment activities that they did with the animals. The animal keepers and volunteers did a variety of enrichment activities with the animals to keep them engaged and active and it was really delightful for a visitor when they happened to come along and see the water being filled into the pool for the elephants or similar activities So they scheduled those events and published them so that people would know when to come up to the Zoo. The marketing manager had to come up with a catchy title and a theme. It was a tropical theme and the title was The Zoo had Gone Wild. They were able to get radio stations to give free publicity and public affairs department had also contributed. The result was they had 15,000 more visitors during that one-week period than normal. It was such a great success that now the volunteers and keepers had just taken the ball and run with it and this year they had quite a bit more. The volunteers had been working for months already building things out of paper masay and creating ice treats and things. This year's Spring Break would be even better than last year's. The following had been planned this year: Predator Ponce, swamp monkeys would be getting shells on Head for the beach day and coconut for the monkeys and polar bears, beach blanket parties for the Orangutans, Demolition Derby Day where they were going to just give big things to animals that they liked to destroy them. Concerts last year were also really successful. But the year before was a little bit of a down year. And there were so many group packages to go into whether you have a good year or a bad year, but they decided to be really be strategic about trying to increase numbers. We did some research and found out that the more you spend on an artist the

more you make. The Zoo had nine concerts last year instead of twelve and spent the same amount of money that they had spent on twelve and they made so much more money on just the nine, then they did when they had more concerts. In the previous year 2002, they had 72,000 people come to concerts and last year, they only had 63,000 and they made \$15,000 more per concert. Their total revenues were up over 100,000. Even though they had less people attending, they made more on the concerts. They had a great season last year and so they were looking to having another great year. Handouts were passed out for the lineup of concerts for this year.

Zoo lights staff reviewed the five radio sponsor contacts and changed the agreement from three years to one year. The reason being was the attendance numbers at this event were very low in previous years. More focus was given to the print advertising in the Oregonian, The Tribune and the Willamette Week newspapers for the Metro region for announcing upcoming events. A Media Appreciation Day was planned to get people to come up and enjoy the Zoo Lights and then go back and do stories on it.

The Public Relations group made announcements that said it was not too late to enjoy Zoo Lights after Christmas was over. There were 101,000 people attended this year, which was an all-time record, the previous record was 84,000 and what it had been for two years prior was 71,000 and 74,000. In 1998 it was all the way down to 46,000. The marketing department of the Zoo kept the buzz and momentum going by using various time lines for the different upcoming events. Councilor McLain reported on complaints during Zoo lights from injuries to people who were not paying attention to where they were walking. With more people attending the event, more accidents were reported; the Zoo was not built with nighttime events in mind. Special lighting had to be brought in for night lighting and sometimes some areas were missed that could really use night lighting. They didn't always know that an area was a problem until something happened because of the lighting situation.

Over the Spring Break, they were expanding Packy's birthday, to a two-day event at the request of the Keepers. It's a week long celebration will be called Elephantastic.

Ms. Thompson spoke to the council regarding the fact that the Oregon Zoo received support from quite a few corporate donors. There were 150 active corporate donors last calendar year. The Zoo's events were the prime vehicle for attracting those corporate sponsors. The Foundation got lots of calls every week from local, regional and national companies that were looking for these sponsorship opportunities. What they wanted to do was reach out to the Zoo's demographics and audience to get exposure and visibility for their company within the Portland community. A list was made available to the council as to who some of these sponsors were. The total event sponsorship in 2004 brought in \$273,500. The Foundation was on tract for increasing this figure in 2005 and especially in 2006 where they had been approved to get a co-sponsor for the Summer Concert Series. In the past it had been Wells Fargo and the Oregonian, but they realized that the Foundations costs were increasing and that they needed more funds to get greater Artists. The Foundation was also breaking records for longevity of sponsors, the ones they had were really staying with them over time. She spoke to why they were successful with corporate sponsors (1) there was a wide variety of one-day to one month to several months event, they had a lot of different opportunities and they were expanding this all the time. They did exceed sponsor expectations when they delivered the benefits and that was do in great part to the great marketing department. Their advertising budget was intimately tied into how they could get sponsors. When companies were looking to cut their budgets, they were looking to the Foundation to have that advertising that they could tie into. Both the Oregon Zoo and the Oregon Zoo Foundation had very dedicated staff who made the sponsors happy, and that was their job. Here lies a very

good partnership. Council President Bragdon asked was the ZooLaLa event this year. It would be held on Saturday, July 16th and Spirit Mountain Casino was the presenting sponsor.

3. FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT PROGRAM UPDATE (tape malfunction during this segment of the work session, a brief summary of the discussion follows).

Chris Deffebach, Planning Department, gave updates on the nature in neighborhoods program. The benefit was that if any changes were made one could argue that this was a program that was affecting all programs. Council President Bragdon spoke to Randy Tucker's involvement at the legislative level. Councilor Liberty talked about integrating Ballot Measure 37. Paul Garrahan, Metro Attorney's Office, talked about rezoning, changes in requirements and fair market value. Councilor Liberty wanted to asked questions of property owners. Mr. Garrahan said a post card would go into the record reflecting the notification. Councilor Hosticka asked about how the language was worded in the notice, he suggested that the language may be out of the statute, not to have new regulations but to expand Title 3. Councilor Park said there should be a requirement of something that wouldn't reduce their value such as requiring nature friendly development. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, and Mr. Garrahan clarified the removal of barrier issues before the Goal 5 property notification, the post card. There were not many reductions in the numbers for the mailing list. Councilors suggested that the message should carefully describe the process in people friendly methods. They should make sure that the wording was positive. There was no need to apologize for taking care of environmental issues. Make sure that the amendments were actually what they heard such as the mapping issue. The majority of the Council was more comfortable with the smaller mailing list. The Council suggested not spending so much time talking about the notice and talked more about the format. Councilor Liberty talked about notice requirements. If in fact a local government took Metro's information with changes, did they have to send out another announcement? Mr. Jordan said yes, they would need to hold a public hearing.

Councilor McLain summarized program. Councilor Liberty talked about the financial impacts of notification. Councilors discussed additional distribution issues and talked about goals of the notification. They talked about a longer versus shorter version of the notice. They suggested a softer message about nature in neighborhoods. Councilors asked about a mock up of the notice they could look at. Kate Marx, Public Affairs Director, said they could provide that information today. Mr. Garrahan raised the issue of how to approach Measure 37 issues in the notice. He added that they had been working on a draft plan.

Council President Bragdon wanted to look at how the group could better manage their time on the project. Councilor Liberty suggested that there were some additional policy discussions for councilors to discuss. Councilor Hosticka's chart had never been decided on (the watersheds). He suggested using the chart and breaking it into pictures. Councilor Hosticka suggested that they needed to know what Councilors' questions were. He suggested meeting next week to review handouts. Councilors talked about walking through the plan. Councilor Hosticka raised the issue of future urban areas. Councilors also spoke to permitting, restoration efforts, timelines for decisions, and the need for additional work sessions to discuss some of these issues. Councilor Liberty suggested coming up with a list of issues that the Councilors needed and wanted to talk about and developing a timeline for those discussions. Council President Bragdon concurred with that suggested and noted that they would plan for additional Council work session to discuss policy issues and the plan.

4. BREAK

5. URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN 2004 COMPLIANCE UPDATE AND TITLE 11 PLANNING FOR NEW URBAN AREAS

Sherry Oeser and Ray Valone, Planning Department, talked about the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Annual Report. Ms. Oeser reminded Council that Metro Code requirement a public hearing on the compliance report every year. She noted that the report included where jurisdictions were in compliance with Title 11.

Ray Valone talked about the status of Title 11. He noted the updates he had provided to council previously. There were twelve study areas that would not make the deadline, which was within a couple of week. He thought it was nine jurisdictions that were not in compliance. They were asking Council for direction on how to proceed in completing new area urban planning meeting conditions under the ordinances that were adopted in December 2002. Dick Benner, Metro Attorney's Office, has worked up some options

Mr. Benner said the options were covered in the staff report. He reviewed those options and added an option that they were not aware of when they put this together last year. It did not help Council deal with the non-compliance question. It rather goes to the question of how to get planning done. There was a provision in Oregon statutes that allowed the establishment of county planning district for the purpose of doing comprehensive planning in treating it as a service district. There financing methods available to the county to raise the money to do the planning. This would be a way of doing Title 11 planning if it were a county doing the planning. This was one more tool. He spoke to disadvantages such as financing by ad valorem property taxes. Mr. Jordan talked about establishment of ad valorem property taxes. Councilor Hosticka asked if you could form a district if you used some other kind of financing. Mr. Jordon thought you could but wasn't sure how this was done. Mr. Benner talked about an authorization called services charges and fees, which would be another way to pay for planning. Mr. Benner said the larger question was how to do planning for areas that were brought into the boundary specifically local jurisdictions that were responsible for planning areas that were added in December 2002. When territory was brought into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), Council provides a deadline for the completion of Title 11 planning and the default deadline is two years after the land is brought into the boundary. Council could specific a longer time. The two years was now upon us and a number of local governments were not in compliance. He addressed the options as to what happens now? If a local government did not complete the planning by the time the Council had declared, that local government was out of compliance – there was no immediate consequence. Councilor Burkholder noted that the MTIP funding required compliance with the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Mr. Benner said he was thinking about enforcement. Council had the authority under Title 8 to take action. Council could hold a hearing and asked the government to explain why it had not fulfilled the requirement. Council could impose a requirement of some kind. Also under Title 8 an extension of time could be granted which was done case by case. Two extension of time were allowed.

Councilor Hosticka talked about Sherwood's compliance issues. Mr. Benner said the local government needed to demonstrate to the Council that there was a good reason why they hadn't complied and that they were making progress towards compliance. Council could also go back to the ordinance and amend the ordinance to extend the time to comply.

Councilor Liberty talked about financial issues. He asked about compromises. Mr. Benner responded that if the planning wasn't done in the areas that were not being urbanized, then the next time the Council goes through a UGB expansion cycle, it became more difficult to estimate capacity of land, he gave an example of Pleasant Valley. The longer the planning is put off in the future, the more difficulty in determining UGB capacity. Councilors asked questions about Title 11 and things not getting done.

Councilor Hosticka said in case where there was unwillingness to plan, was there any opportunity for a third party to seek enforcement of the Functional Plan? Mr. Benner responded yes, action could be initiated by a Councilor, the COO or by a citizen could come before Council, explain the situation and asked Council for action. Councilor Hosticka asked if a citizen could compel the local jurisdiction to do the planning? Mr. Benner said possibility. Councilor McLain said there were three issues: 1) the Functional Plan means nothing if they let people get beyond the extension dates and do nothing, - what do they want to do, 2) they should not do away with planning requirements, she spoke to lost opportunities and poor planning. Council President Bragdon asked questions about citizen requests for planning. Mr. Benner responded to his question and talked about rural zoning versus urban use. He noted the limits of citizen requests. Councilor Hosticka asked how long would it take before Metro could legally say, we were going to do the planning. What were the procedures? Mr. Benner explained the procedure set forth in Title 8, which included notice, a public hearing, and an order indicating what was going to happen. That decision could be challenged. Mr. Cotugno said the responsibility to implement the concept plan still rests with the jurisdiction. Councilor Burkholder asked if there was way to recover the costs? Mr. Benner said there was no provision for that.

Councilor McLain said local jurisdictions make a plan with the developer and indicate that they want to recover a certain cost. Metro could do that. Mr. Jordan said you would have to go through procedures as to how you were going to recover those costs? Councilor Liberty said not all of those who are out of compliance were there for the same reason so he would not want to do a uniform consequence. Second, was part of the delay that they didn't want to meet capacity targets? Mr. Benner said generally not.

Council President Bragdon asked if we could have a contract with property owners just to pay us to do this? Mr. Jordan said where this had been done it had been very volatile politically. Councilor McLain said they would be developing a Metro plan where there would be developers helping pay for it because they want it done. She talked about the Bethany planning and government reimbursements. Councilor Liberty said we might have to show that we were willing to go down that road.

Mr. Jordan said Council had an immediate issue about how Council was going to deal with this. There was gridlock if the boundary moved and nothing happened. The question was, what does this really mean? There may be some opportunities to move this forward regarding funding and building capacity for local governments to do their work on a broader systemic basis. That would beget the Council making some kind of decision about an extension to allow time to provide a more systemic solution to this question. For the most part, the issue was capacity, they didn't have the funding and the capacity to go do this. They needed to think about a systemic solution. Mr. Benner said a fair argument by the local governments was they were not going to invest money in the planning until litigation is resolved. There was a legitimate reason for local governments to say they didn't want to make the investment until there was resolve. There should be a ruling by the end of summer. Councilor Burkholder commented that this was not our problem, but the region's problem. The value of having a hearing where each of the jurisdictions come in and lay out why they were not making progress on this in front of MPAC and Council would be fruitful. He recommended writing each jurisdiction a letter and let them know they were out of compliance and invite them to a hearing to explain why, what were the issues and the remedies. Councilor McLain liked the joint meeting idea of a Council/MPAC meeting. She reminded that it was our responsibility not MPAC's. Councilor Liberty suggested making it less of a discussion and more what the consequences for the region were as well as needing a discussion about resources.

Councilor Hosticka raised the issue of a planning fee and that he was interested in hearing what the results of those discussion were. Mr. Jordan said they had been having further discussion in the context of how to pay for concept planning and how do we management the interface between urban and rural development. He would provide an update on those discussion and possible solutions. He assumed that the approach to this would be some kind of public hearing, which allowed jurisdictions to come and talk about their individual situations as well as a joint session so MPAC can hear those things as well. From that point, Council would have an opportunity to move forward. Councilors talked about the hearing process. Mr. Cotugno suggested doing everything in a single hearing. Mr. Jordan said it was the hearing from compliance. Council President Bragdon indicated they may take action as a result of their response. Mr. Cotugno reminded that MPAC had talked about this already in response to the Council President's letter. MPAC's basic message was they didn't have the money. He suggested the hearing first and then a joint meeting. Councilor McLain concurred with that suggestion. Councilor Liberty talked about the budgeting process. He agreed that we shouldn't say, we were thinking about enforcement action but were aware that jurisdictions had no money to do it. He felt this might be a matter of priorities. Council President Bragdon reminded that we have other priorities too and felt it was a philosophical matter to take excise tax and transfer that to concept planning at the edge. Councilor Liberty said if we were going to scare them a bit, we should offer some options as well. Councilor Hosticka shared his opinion that they were trying to figure out how to get the planning done. Council President Bragdon said he supported #3 and #4. Gil Kelley, City of Portland, talked about those jurisdictions that did comply. Councilors continued to talk about compliance and the MTIP process.

6. PROJECT PROPOSALS CONTINUED DISCUSSION

Council President Bragdon said they needed to finish up on the project proposal discussion, Measure 37, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and Disposal System Planning. Councilor Liberty talked about the Measure 37 Task Force goals and discussion. Councilor Park shared some of his concerns about parcelization. Councilor Liberty said he thought the areas of analysis would be the three counties. Councilor Park said the nexus for Metro was the Metro jurisdictional boundary.

Council President Bragdon introduced the topic, the future of the transfer stations was an threshold issue, which should be settled before the system wide issues. The system wide plan should help inform the decision about the transfer stations. Separate from that issue was the question of how big is the RSWMP. What were they required to do, what did it take to do it. Mike Hoglund, Director of the Solid Waste and Recycling, reported on Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) project proposal. Mr. Hoglund said they were focusing on this project between now and summer. Councilor McLain said they had asked to figure out how these should be integrated or ordered. This was the map to give them an indication of how these might be ordered when they were parallel and when there were decision points. Mr. Hoglund said how the two projects related was a matter of sequencing. It was really one project, the RSWMP update. One of the components of the RSWMP update was what do we do with the disposal system planning. He noted questions that had come up in the last year concerning role, licensing, etc. A question was raised as what you get out of the RSWMP concerning the disposal system planning and visa versa. They wanted to focus on what was happening over the next three to four months. He provided an update of what they were doing on the RSWMP project. Disposal system policies would be integrated into the planning activities, which would provide the analysis. He would be providing the historical background as to how did we get here. He further detailed the timeline, which included developing the goals for the disposal system planning. He spoke to questions that needed to be answered. They would then develop disposal system policies in

conjunction with the RSWMP. He pointed out that Councilor Liberty had said it was odd to have two projects going at once. The disposal system planning was a big part of the RSWMP. He also talked about other issues that needed to be updated in the RSWMP such as sustainability. Councilor Park said one piece they hadn't talked about was the task force's recommendation that was headed by Ted Kyle. He wondered where that piece got addressed. Mr. Hoglund said the target for recycling was part of the RSWMP. Concerning the recycling credit program there were some goals and policies Council might want to talk about. Councilor Park asked about the dry waste recycling and how the economics worked within this. He asked what were the reasons Metro should be in the transfer station business. The original reason why we had the transfer stations may no longer exist, but there may be other reasons for maintaining transfer stations. Doug Anderson, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, said once they had some of the questions answered about the disposal system, Council might want to go back and revisit the question of transfer stations. Councilor Liberty wondered if there were other things that we should be doing that we weren't currently doing. Council President Bragdon thought that the disposal system planning was a large enough issue that it could be a stand-alone but he understood the reason for parallel tracks. Councilor Hosticka added his thoughts about which directions they wanted to evaluate. He didn't think we ought to spend a lot of time about the financial value of our facilities, a ballpark would give them a range. Councilor McLain said she had always felt that these two programs were interconnected. There was a lot of stuff that had to be dealt with. She reminded that we were public private system. She said they had to be realistic about the time we spend on these issues. She thought it would help staff and Council if they were given early ideas on dates. Councilors indicated they were comfortable with the projects as laid out by the department. Mr. Hoglund said there were a lot of pieces that had to connect.

7. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

They're being no further business to come before the Metro Council; Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

BeeJaye Jones
Administrative Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 1, 2005

| Item | Topic | Doc Date | Document Description | Doc. Number |
|------|------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Agenda | 3/3/05 | Metro Council Agenda for March 3, 2005 | 030105c-01 |
| 5 | Timeline | Feb 2005 | To: Metro Council From: Ray Valone, Planning Dept. Re: Title 11 New Area Planning | 030105c-02 |
| 6 | Timeline | 3/1/05 | To: Metro Council From: Mike Hogle, Director Solid Waste & Recycling Department Re: RSWMP Timing of Milestones and Policy Development Coordination | 030105c-03 |
| 2 | Event sponsorship | 3/1/05 | To: Metro Council From: Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director Re: Event Sponsorship at the Oregon Zoo | 030105c-04 |
| 2 | Event Timeline | March 20 to 25, 2005 | To: Metro Council From: Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director Re: March Events | 030105c-05 |
| 2 | 2004 Events | 2004 | To: Metro Council From: Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director Re: 2004 Zoo events, attendance and planned concerts | 030105C-06 |
| 3 | Key Policy Issues | 3/1/05 | To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Nature in Neighborhoods Functional Plan Key Policy Issues | 030105c-07 |
| 3 | Program Report Outline | 3/1/05 | To: Metro Council From: Chris Deffebach, Planning Department Re: Nature in Neighborhoods Program Report Outline | 030105c-08 |