

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, July 26, 2005  
Metro Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Robert Liberty (excused), Carl Hosticka (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JULY 28, 2005/ ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Council President Bragdon reviewed the July 28, 2005 Metro Council agenda. Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, spoke about the at-will employment agreement with directors, which will be discussed on Thursday. This was the first step in linking pay to performance. They discussed how to introduce the issue for best public understanding.

Council President Bragdon also noted that they would discuss the \$5 million PERS buy-down. Councilor Park asked about buying down PERS. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said that Metro could buy down one year. He explained the bond measure requirements. Councilors asked questions about the reserves. Mr. Cooper and Mr. Jordan responded to their questions.

### **2. CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION CODE CHANGE**

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, and Vickie Schoen, Information Technology Department, talked about the proposed code changes related to charitable contributions. The language was taken from the Benton County code, as a model. Mr. Cooper said that current Metro code required that charities have an office in the Metro area and have the majority of their charitable activities be in the Metro area. This has excluded some charitable agencies that operate elsewhere in the state that employees would like to contribute to. This ordinance would also clean up some administrative requirements related to financial reporting that were inconsistent with how the agencies function.

Councilor Burkholder asked about Metro's interest in limiting the agencies, since it was the employees' money. Mr. Cooper discussed the administrative burden of having too many agencies. He said the proposed changes using the state standards.

Councilor McLain said she didn't see it as a negative to keep the dollars close to home, in the Metro area. It was originally a well thought out policy decision. She said she'd be interested to know which charities were barred because of the requirement.

Ms. Schoen said it seemed logical to allow employees to use payroll deduction for charities they want to give to that were outside the Metro area.

Councilor McLain said she didn't think the giving should be diluted by too many agencies. Having fewer agencies allowed Metro to make a significant difference.

Councilor Burkholder asked if the change would allow giving to agencies in Clark County, Washington.

### **3. REGION 2040 WORK PROGRAM REVIEW**

Councilor McLain said she was not at the June 30 retreat where the Region 2040 discussion had begun. She was very concerned after reading an article in the paper. She said she was concerned about coming out with the 2030 numbers without first having the discussion on making sure that the criteria included all of the necessary assumptions. They have had that kind of discussion at least twice. She felt this was important in light of Measure 37.

Mr. Jordan concurred, that the Council agreed with her concerns about discussion of assumptions. He said it had been discussed at the technical level for several months. He said they have some interesting milestones coming up that would be important for that, which they would discuss more today.

Council President Bragdon said the press would proceed on its own terms, and not Metro's terms. They press would write the story for Metro, if Metro did not. Councilor Newman talked about the public engagement in the Fall.

Robin McArthur, Planning Department, said she felt the stakeholders wanted to also be engaged in the conversation as well.

Councilor McLain recalled a previous process when the Council had the conversation first before they engaged the stakeholder. This ensured that the Council was semi in the same place, on the same path. When they went out and talked to partners, their message was similar.

Councilor Burkholder said none of this information was new to anyone, but rather it was just a matter of putting a date on it.

Mr. Jordan said it was not done in the same context as before. This was done for the Regional Transportation Plan update.

Ms. McArthur said today she was seeking full Council direction on the "how" for the process that allowed Metro to meet various deadlines. There were a lot of policy questions that needed to be addressed. She reviewed a schedule of upcoming deadlines (a copy of which is included in the meeting record).

Councilor Park asked if it was relevant to have Council elections on the schedule of dates. They discussed it and agreed to call it merely "elections," but that it was indeed relevant.

Ms. McArthur posed a series of questions about how Metro would do its 2040 process. She said the 2030 forecast and the allocation maps provide the impetus for discussing the bigger policy questions, which need to be addressed. She reviewed the implications and suggestions outlined in the Council Worksheet (attached) that will affect the process. She noted issues of engaging all of the stakeholders. The Council commented on the question of how was your life different today than it would have been without Region 2040? Ms. McArthur said she had heard many times that they needed to involve stakeholders early in the process and often. She also heard that they needed to define the role of the councilors as well as the stakeholders. She also noted including Clark County and neighboring cities. This was not a linear process but more like an octopus. They also recognized that there were other efforts going on in the state. She was trying to figure

out ways to knit some of those things together. She agreed they had a more sophisticated audience than ever before.

Councilors agreed that creating a “brand” with very clear and simple messages for the effort was an important goal, especially in the short term. They needed to use the successes of 2040 to tell the story. The Council needed to get their “rap” down early on.

Ms. McArthur said they had also heard that they needed to engage other jurisdictions in the process including neighboring cities.

Council President Bragdon commented on the list and wanted to discuss the questions imbedded in the list that were “either or” issues. Two questions he saw were Metro’s relation with the local governments versus Metro’s relationship with the people. He suggested they wanted to be very conscious of how they chose to define and cast this effort. They spent a lot of time with their colleagues in local government and they were an important constituency but they had also seen that there were limitations to playing only to the local government constituency. There was a regional interest that Council was elected to represent that was different from the sum total of 25 jurisdictional interests. A vote at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) may be a snapshot of a particular allegiance, but it may not really capture the public’s sentiment.

The second question related to the local planning and visioning efforts in each city. He would like to explore how to build on those local planning efforts and thought there was much more compatibility with Metro’s 2040. How could we link those? It could be a real plus for Metro. The role of neighborhood planning with regional planning was key. Neighborhoods were the basis for good community planning. Yet the keys to safe and stable neighborhoods were most often determined by regional issues and planning. How do we make that connection? Who do we relate to?

Councilor McLain said the local visioning was to see what it meant to each community. She related what she heard from Forest Grove, that they were different from Beaverton and other cities. She said Metro needed to reconnect on what we all agreed on. The other part was that there were things that Forest Grove felt were part of the 2040 that they hated, especially density. To Density was the feel of the neighborhood in certain locations. They were okay with row houses in certain locations. They were not opposed to density numbers. They wanted to talk about bad and good density.

Ms. McArthur noted the progress represented by a public that didn’t think row houses could be good.

Councilor Burkholder said he thought the first item on the list relating to information and numbers was the key piece. He wanted to get the information out to the public early. Then the discussion on a range of strategies could follow.

Councilor Newman repeated that he thought the luxury of starting this work in October was gone. He attended another meeting, which indicated that the anxiety was already out there, and Metro needed to figure out the branding and messaging before Labor Day. The root of people’s anxiety was the lack of control that they felt. He thought with this challenge Metro needed to replicate the previous success of giving people the feeling that they had some control of their future. He said it was important to go directly to the people, to go beyond just MPAC and the mayor’s forum.

Councilor Park said the general public was much more sophisticated and the tools we had available were also more sophisticated, especially if we could figure out how to put them on the internet. He also commented on good and bad design, and the challenge of how to legislate good attractive design. He talked about a suggestion to have the counties invite the other mayors in the county to participate in the mayors' forum. He wanted the other cities to be comfortable to come to the table. Metro needed to be proactive, and not just reactive.

Councilor Burkholder asked about what role Metro Committee on Citizen Involvement (MCCI) could play, and what techniques Metro could use. It could engage them and be useful.

Ms. McArthur referred to her handout "Region 2040 Review: Council Work Session" (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). She spoke to the limits of resources and time. She suggested that there was no way to design a process that would evolve and morph over time.

Council President Bragdon said that along with Nature In Neighborhoods (NIN), this was one of the two biggest things that Metro would be known for. The Council all wanted to be involved as a steering committee role, since it was such a big issue. He talked about the need for coordination among the council.

Councilor Newman said he felt the issue would get lost in the regular Council Work Sessions, and that special time may be best to set aside for shepherding this project, perhaps with special Wednesday meetings. He felt the full Council needed to be engaged in this with the whole region. This was the reason all of them ran to be Councilors in the first place.

Councilor Burkholder said he concurred with Councilor Newman. He suggested that the Executive Officer model when Council President Bragdon was the Presiding Officer might be a good model for how to organize the effort.

Councilor Park noted that this effort was even bigger than the 2002 Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) effort, and now with perhaps even fewer staff. He said how to coordinate the overlap and sequencing was important, so that the work progressed logically and at a good pace. It included almost all of what Metro did.

Councilor McLain said she wanted to focus on this work for the rest of her term. She said the "executive officer" approach meant a lot of Council discussion early on, and regular involvement of the Council. She asked about the agricultural report. She said that each Councilor had a responsibility to be accountable for the projects they were assigned as liaisons.

President Bragdon referred to what he had heard from Councilor Liberty and others. In the Presiding Officer model, the Presiding Officer was beholden to the other Councilors. President Bragdon said he would take his role as chair in the same manner as if he worked for the others.

He clarified that this project was a much bigger, broader discussion than just moving the UGB that was done in 2002. Councilor Park concurred, noting that the previous work had taken all the resources of the agency.

Councilor Burkholder talked about the values issues in each part of the project, in a way so Metro didn't have to repeat the values work.

Mr. Jordan said the work could be organized in various ways. He referred to question 3. He thought it would be helpful to talk around what concepts did you organize the work, and not just the list of projects.

President Bragdon summarized that number 1 was closed and skipped number 2 to discuss number 3, "Do these questions adequately frame the policy work?".

Ms. McArthur reviewed the organization of projects under the three questions on her handout.

Councilor Park said 2040 represented a set of values. He referred to the process in Salt Lake City. It was important to communicate in the same language that was understandable to all involved. He felt that each jurisdiction and Metro needed to identify its core values.

Councilor McLain commented on the question: How can we facilitate planning in areas recently brought into the UGB? She said it had to be taken to the public. She said Metro needed to figure that out before they could go forward with anything else. She also referred to Future Vision and the value of that work. She said Metro needed to reconnect with the public on what they still really wanted.

Councilor Burkholder said Metro could use the Future Vision work as a starting place. He said it would be best to translate these questions into simpler language. Do we still want what we said we wanted, given that we have one million more people coming? He suggested focusing instead on the larger questions.

Councilor Newman said if you over simplified the question, it would be where do we put one million people? He asked about how this would fit in with Metro's legislative strategy, noting that there were certain things that Metro could not do, due to state limitations. He said it should be a conscious part of the discussion.

President Bragdon said he thought the questions in number 3 were okay. Some issues were spatial or functional, and others were collaborative or convening issues. He said there needed to be some call to action or convening point to get people involved. He felt that was done with 2040. He said the work needed to be linked to implementation, and a decision point.

Mr. Jordan said that there was one downfall to 2040, it was a planning effort and not an implementation effort. It was not about creating livable communities. He wanted this effort to include actions.

Councilor Park asked for clarification on what was meant by not being "spatial." President Bragdon cited the CEDS as an example.

Councilor Burkholder referred to the provided list of desired outcomes, and suggested adding charter amendments and tools.

Councilor Newman said one scenario for Metro between now and 2006 was to have a preferred vision, not necessarily adopted. It may not happen without changes in the legislature. Then Metro could take that to the legislature as a partner in implementation.

Councilor McLain noted that there were haves and have-nots. She said each group had a way to define a win. She said each question should be tailored for each group providing input.

She also noted that the mayors' forum has taken on a life of its own, and that Metro needed to take its own agenda to that group.

Mr. Jordan said it would be advantageous to think about what Metro wanted at the upcoming Mayors' forum on August 15th.

Councilor Newman commented on number 2 and public involvement tools. He said Metro needed to realize what it would get from each group (jurisdictional interests) and also involve the public directly.

Councilor Burkholder spoke to the question of having a steering committee and the process piece, as a mechanism to help do this. He said we needed to look at how to reach all the different stakeholders (kids, ethnic, aged).

Councilor Park suggested going out to a vote. He said Metro needed a way to legitimize what it was trying to accomplish. He said he was not sure what a vote would entail, but it would be something that would give input to the Council (not a monetary vote).

Council President Bragdon said he was skeptical about the general public being involved in this effort. He felt it would be the same 100 people they all knew usually got involved. He said the test for what audiences to engage was who did we need on our side to be successful? He said Metro would be involved in some other efforts that would involve large numbers of the public (NIN, bond measure), and that Metro enlist these existing groups and mechanisms that already existed. He talked about the collaborative decision-making model and leadership class.

Councilor Park said you couldn't discount the general public. Council President Bragdon said it was very expensive for very little yield. Councilor Newman said it was an open question that can be discussed in more detail later. Mr. Jordan said there were some models for getting people to engage. He referred to the city of Eugene who got scores of percentages of involvement. It still was expensive, but they got response.

Councilor Newman noted that people wanted to talk about this, citing the meeting he just attended.

Mr. Jordan said the mayors were going to meet Sept. 16 and asked what the Council wanted to take to that meeting?

Councilor Park asked about the Mayors' audience, and whether it would include outside-Metro Mayors. He said it was different than Metro inviting them and having the organizers invite them.

Councilor Newman said they needed a strong facilitator to talk about the process, and not jump to the outcomes (where to expand the boundary), that they really wanted to talk about.

Councilor Burkholder said that since city councils turned over so quickly, if you wanted a lasting result, then Metro may look at how to reach deeper. He suggested broaden the group and utilize them as collaborative partners in engaging the public. Stay away from content questions.

Council President Bragdon noted that mayors' citizens were the same voters that elected Metro.

Councilor Newman summarized the key issues.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, asked that the Council give more thought to the question of appointing a steering committee to develop and oversee the Region 2040 review process. President Bragdon said they would continue that discussion.

#### **4. BREAK**

President Bragdon and Councilor McLain departed for the Centers event in Beaverton, and Councilor Burkholder took over chairing the meeting.

#### **5. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN FOR DISPOSAL SYSTEM PLANNING**

Mike Hoglund and Paul Ehinger, Solid Waste and Recycling Department, reviewed the Disposal System Planning Outreach and Communications Plan handout (attached), including the goal, constituent groups and roles. The Councilor liaison was Councilor Park. He noted that he saw a role for Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). The department had taken several issues to MPAC before.

Councilor Newman said he didn't see that this would have a role for MPAC. Councilor Park explained that he did see a role for MPAC.

Mr. Hoglund said they could also ask MPAC how much they wanted to get involved.

Councilor Newman said the process for Oregon City and Portland needed to be unique, since Metro had facilities in each of these cities.

Mr. Hoglund referred to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, and getting input from them. He anticipated ongoing communication with the six core constituents groups listed. He reviewed the list of other stakeholders.

Councilor Burkholder noted that the re-use businesses (e.g., Free Geek, Rebuilding Center, etc.) were not included in the other stakeholders list.

Mr. Hoglund continued. A list of questions would be tailored to each group. He also noted that the general public was not listed, as well as the media. He said they needed to have a media plan prepared and added. He had not reviewed this general approach yet with Kate Marx, Metro Public Affairs and Government Relations Director. He outlined the proposed methodology for outreach.

Councilor Newman said he wanted to participate in a special meeting with Oregon City. He wondered if the outreach was too ambitious, but deferred to Councilor Park's judgment as the lead Councilor on the project.

Mr. Jordan said the scenario of purely public to purely private broadens the scope of stakeholders.

Councilor Park talked about the range of public and private ownership scenarios.

Councilor Burkholder said he wants to see clear bookends.

Mr. Hoglund said he wanted to show public and private models.

Councilor Burkholder asked if on Metro's website, there was a way to give comments back to Metro, such as an interactive form. Mr. Hoglund said the department had used the Survey Monkey tool to get responses and automatically summarize the results. Councilor Burkholder wanted it to be easy for random individuals to respond to Metro on solid waste issues, with a response from Metro so that they knew they have been heard.

Councilor Burkholder asked if the plan had been reviewed by Metro Committee on Citizen Involvement (MCCI) yet and asked that this group review it. Mr. Hoglund said that they would do so.

Mr. Hoglund said he felt the scope of work was manageable.

## 6. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park said he attended the City of Gresham forum. They had a steady stream of people for two hours reviewing the NIN plans.

Mr. Jordan said the Council was going to need any extra money it saved by doing the early incentive and business design teamwork, because this new 2040 project was going to be a big cost. He and Councilor Burkholder agreed that five-year budgeting would help.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:17 p.m.

Prepared by



Linnea Nelson  
Council Support Specialist



**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 26, 2005**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>
1	Agenda	7/28/05	Metro Council Agenda for July 28, 2005	072605c-01
3	Region 2040 Review	7/26/05	To: Metro Council From: Robin McArthur, Planning Department Re: Region 2040 Review: Council Work Session	072605c-02
3	Timeline	7/26/05	To: Metro Council From: Robin McArthur, Planning Department Re: Schedule of Upcoming Deadlines	072605c-03
5	Outreach and Communication Plan	7/26/05	To: Metro Council From: Mike Hogle, Solid Waste and Recycling Director Re: Disposal System Planning	072605c-04