

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL RETREAT

Wednesday, June 22, 2005
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Rod Park

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 1:08 p.m.

1. DISCUSSION ON PARKS BOND MEASURE

1.1 Survey Results

Jim Desmond, Regional Parks & Greenspaces Director, introduced two new Metro staff people: Chris Carlson and Stacy Triplett. He said that Metro staff had been charged to get some work done regarding a survey for open spaces and water quality. He introduced Patricia McCaig of McCaig Communications who had won the contract.

Patricia McCaig, McCaig Communications, and Tim Raphael, Trust for Public Lands, gave an overview of how the survey was conducted and the context of the work done. She reviewed the Ballot Titles handout, which outlined the ballot measure titles and summaries.

There was discussion about how to have the brief measure summaries legally encompass all those goals that Metro had for the bond measures. Dan Cooper explained the parameters of the controlling document for each bond measure and the need to make sure those documents encompassed those items.

Ms. McCaig gave a PowerPoint presentation on Open Spaces, Water Quality and Zoo, Quantitative Research for Metro and the Trust for Public Lands. Handouts that pertain to that presentation are attached and form part of the record. Ms. McCaig distributed a handout titled "Observations" which she reviewed and which is attached and forms part of the record. This sheet summarizes where the council should focus efforts for a future ballot measure. Ms. McCaig said the local share formula should be part of the bond measure – perhaps outlining the criteria for this formula.

Tony Vecchio, Oregon Zoo Director, said that from the McCaig Communications presentation it appeared that this was not the time to include the zoo on a ballot measure. He said that the zoo needed to do some more polling and analysis before they could go out for a bond measure. He said that the zoo had recently had the greatest attendance in their history, so he was surprised that the poll came out so weak for the zoo. He said that based on the high attendance in recent months it was obvious that the support in the community was strong. He asked the Councilors to try to find a way to make the ballot language include some money to go to the zoo hospital replacement, as it was very needed and if not addressed could cause the zoo to lose its accreditation. It would cost about \$8-10 million to replace. He said that to lose the accreditation would mean they would lose many conservation programs and all the hard work and dollars they had put into those conservation programs. To lose accreditation would also be very devastating to their mission on conservation. There was discussion about the animal rights movement, which seemed to be on the rise, and how it might affect the zoo. Councilor Brian Newman suggested

that if the zoo created a plan that showed improvement to the zoo habitats for the benefit and welfare of the animals, that might help with the animal rights folks and public support. He said that they would be having a joint OZF and Metro meeting on August 1st to discuss some of those issues. Tony Vecchio said that the zoo volunteers (1500 volunteers) could help with any potential ballot measure, and that they would be a great resource.

Mr. Desmond asked the Councilors for an overview of the process for a 2006 ballot measure. He said it would be helpful to direct staff and that the sooner they could come to some conclusions about the local share formula, the better.

1.2 Discussion on Local Share Formula

Mr. Desmond said that the Metro Council could settle on a percentage or they could zero in on a dollar amount. Councilor Susan McLain said that the local share allocations were a hot button. She said that the council would have to be strong so that staff could present to public around a set formula or percentage. Council President Bragdon said that Metro served people, not the counties.

Mr. Desmond gave a brief summary of what had been done in the past. He wondered if the Council members were planning to use per capita per person instead of calculating per county. Councilor Rex Burkholder said that the world was different today and he thought they should step back and assess whether local share was the way to go. He also suggested that there were other partners in the community that Metro could cooperate with – not just parks departments. Councilor Newman said that local share was very important to jurisdictions as well as political, and he said he suspected that they would have to consider this issue due to equity concerns. It was agreed that politics and getting support for a bond measure was key to success of the bond measure. It was generally agreed that the local share formula was a component that they would use to develop the bond measure.

Council President Bragdon ran down a list of topics that they needed to address by the end of the meeting: 1) local share, 2) challenge grant, 3) target areas/process, and if they had time then they would also discuss 4) o & m. He said that he thought that the council had already agreed that they wanted to have local share.

Councilor McLain agreed that they should have a local share, and she also said she supported having challenge grants. There was discussion on how both of those could be part of the process. They also discussed double dipping, reaching consensus, defining criteria, and how all these things were addressed in the previous bond measure. Council President Bragdon said that they needed to lock in the local share within six months so that the local jurisdictions could know where their money from the bond measure would go. The council discussed the potential timeline for the bond measure, and whether to format the bond measure as they had done in the past or to go with a new approach. They agreed to utilize the per capita process and distribute to local jurisdictions. Jeff Tucker, Regional Parks & Greenspaces Finance Manager, said that some cities didn't provide for parks. After some discussion about this issue, it was agreed that those jurisdictions could use the money towards water quality matters.

It was concluded that the bond would provide a per capita by cities and counties, and that those local entities could then pro-rate that so that they did not double dip. If for some reason they could not figure out the pro-rate figures, then Metro would have to judicate. They also agreed that they would have challenge grants. They agreed that the proportion would be 18 or 19 percent.

Mr. Desmond reviewed the Local Share Direct Passthrough, Exhibit B handout, which is attached and forms part of the record. It was agreed that the criteria outlined in the previous bond measure formed a good base and that they should ramp up those criteria and add water quality to the list. There was more discussion on local share and challenge percentages, and it was suggested that those percentages should be equal.

1.3 Challenge Grants

Mr. Desmond reviewed the challenge grant program, a handout on this was distributed and is attached and forms part of the record. It was suggested that the criteria should include something on partnerships with the jurisdictions and counties. It was agreed that the bond must include language on compliance with the regional framework plan in order to get a challenge grant. It was concluded that the council needed to include in both local share and challenge grant components of the bond measure items a, b, c of the handout from McCaig Communications, titled Projects, Programs, & Services [Q6].

There was discussion about what to include in the criteria and Nancy Chase, Regional Parks & Greenspaces Senior Real Estate Negotiator, discussed a proposal on the back of the grant handout to provide help to groups to apply and execute programs.

It was agreed that there should be a match requirement included in the bond measure language. Other conclusions were that the combined local share and challenge grants should not be less than the amount allowed in the last bond measure. The council wanted to, with the help of staff, think more on how to appropriately word that decision before passing it along park directors in the region. The local share, it was decided, would be made up of entitlements and challenge grants.

Council President Bragdon said that they should create a process for picking target areas and that they should garner input from the science community. It was agreed that the science community should provide a rough-cut list of target areas. One resource to keep in mind while conferring with the scientific community was the currently updated natural resources/habitat inventory.

Councilors directed staff to look at restoration/protection/capital needs on Metro properties that could be accurately portrayed to fit the themes presented by McCaig Communications while working on the bond measure language.

Mr. Desmond said that in the last bond measure there was language that said that the Metro council would make general funds available to cover the land-banking clause of whatever land Metro bought. He said that Metro had followed through with that promise, there was adequate money, they had planted vast numbers of trees, and every site owned by Metro looks better now than when it was bought. He said that the Metro Council at the time did make that commitment up front and as a result nipped the o & m question in the bud. He said that he felt certain that the question would come up again for a new bond measure. He said that they needed to consider how they would handle that issue for this bond measure.

In order to ascertain the numbers it was agreed that staff should start with the habitat inventory and build up to the number from there. Council President Bragdon thanked staff for their work on the bond issue.

Mr. Desmond suggested that the parks staff could attend every other week at the work sessions with one question/resolution that the council could mull over regarding the bond measure until they finished or made major progress. Council President Bragdon agreed and said that they would set aside some more retreat time for discussion on this in August.

1.4 Regional Project List

The staff was not ready to present to council regarding this discussion.

2. REGIONAL/LOCAL DISCUSSION

This was deferred to the next meeting on the bond measure.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Prepared by,



Kim Bardes
Executive Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 22, 2005

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Ballot Titles for possible bond measure	062205cretreat-01
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Projects, Programs & Services (Q6)	062205cretreat-02
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Provisions that could be included (Q7)	062205cretreat-03
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Statements For the Measure (Q8)	062205cretreat-04
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Statements Against the Measure (Q9)	062205cretreat-05
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Observations	062205cretreat-06
1.2	Discussion Local Share Formula	June 2005	Council Retreat Outline	062250cretreat-07
1.2	Discussion Local Share Formula	June 2005	Local Share: Direct Pass Through	062205cretreat-08
1.2	Discussion Local Share Formula	June 2005	Local Share Allocations	062205cretreat-09
1.3	Challenge Grants	June 2005	Challenge Grant	062205cretreat-10
Misc.	Timeline: Ballot Measure	June 2005	Rough Timeline for November 2006 Ballot Measure	062205cretreat-11
Misc.	Mileage	June 2005	Estimate of Mileage Rate on various bond amounts	062205cretreat-12
Misc.	Process	June 2005	Process for the 2006 Ballot Measure	062205cretreat-13
1.1	Survey Results	June 2005	Received copy of PowerPoint presentation several weeks after the meeting	062205cretreat-14