



METRO

**Regional Infrastructure and Public Investment Analysis
Meeting Summary**

February 22, 2008 8:30 – 11:30 a.m.
Council Annex, Metro Regional Center

Executive Summary

- There is interest in what Metro is doing and how it might impact and be of assistance to service providers
- Some issues are unique to particular infrastructure types
- Providers are not looking for help in designing, building and operating systems – but funding is a challenge
- There is agreement that regional or community level solutions are more efficient, sustainable, and cost effective, if local conditions can be met
- More trust needs to be developed among service providers themselves and other governments to move forward with broader solutions
- The public is difficult to engage on issues related to infrastructure; there is a presumption that services will be provided effortlessly

Summary

Over 55 infrastructure service providers and other interested parties attended the second in a series of three workshops for Metro's Regional Infrastructure and Public Investment Analysis. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place and a full transcription is attached.

Metro Council President David Bragdon welcomed those in attendance and described the purpose of the workshop. Arnold Cogan of Cogan Owens Cogan and Todd Chase of FCS Group then gave a presentation on infrastructure needs and gaps that summarized:

- Preliminary results of the service provider questionnaire
- National and regional growth
- Infrastructure demand
- Infrastructure costs

The presentation was followed by two rounds of discussion. In the first round, meeting participants self-selected groups categorized by infrastructure type. Groups were asked two questions: 1) Does the infrastructure atlas provide an adequate snapshot of regional infrastructure needs? 2) What does it tell you about the state of infrastructure in the region? The following is a summary of those discussions. A complete transcription of these discussions is attached.

- **Parks/Civic Buildings/Schools #1:** Having school districts at the table significantly enhanced the conversation. The issues are really all about money and competing interests for it.
- **Parks/Civic Buildings/Schools #2:** Key words – behind, under-appreciated, balkanized, special districts. THPRD is a success story of a district that has grown and marketed itself and is now doing a great job for its jurisdiction.
- **Sewer/Stormwater #1:** We don't know what the problem is for stormwater, let alone how much it would cost to solve it. How all the infrastructure is built makes a big difference – more coordination between infrastructure types at time of construction.
- **Sewer/Stormwater#2:** Stormwater is being dealt with effectively by each jurisdiction – mostly required to be managed on site, regional facilities are not working. Issues related to wastewater management vary widely from Wilsonville – plant is at capacity and they will need new solutions to address growth, Milwaukie – Kellogg treatment plant is over-capacity, and Damascus – which has no sewer and therefore cannot develop at urban levels.
- **Transportation/Energy #1:** Energy – the demand is variable, large-scale transmission is going to be difficult in the future. There are opportunities to link energy and transportation connections, for example on the new Columbia River Crossing.
- **Transportation/Energy #2:** Energy: It's important to think about the ability to place infrastructure in communities. There will need to be a lot more collaboration for energy distribution, especially with more solar panels and wind generation. Transportation: There was a lot of discussion around low cost solutions, the need to re-look at how we do things and not to be afraid to challenge sacred cows.
- **Water #1:** Conservation will be key. The amount of population expected will result in a need for more water supply across the region.
- **Water #2:** The boundaries of existing systems don't really work and don't follow logical service provision. The consortium should be consulted for numbers.

For the second round of discussion, participants formed groups by sub-region (Northeast, Southeast and West). Subregions were created solely for discussion purposes. Groups were asked three questions: 1) Are we adequately planning for projected growth? 2) What are the institutional barriers to meeting infrastructure needs? 3) What are some potential solutions for addressing these barriers? The following is a summary of those discussions. A complete transcription of these discussions is attached.

- **SE Subregion #1:** Great variety in challenges faced by cities, Lake Oswego, established with both maintenance and capacity issues all the way to Damascus with no existing infrastructure. Many different service districts in the area, innovation and cooperation are going to be key to move ahead.
- **SE Subregion #2:** Planning is going well in the area. The issues are really the resources being available to implement the plans. Water resources will be a challenge. Water reuse will be important in the long-term. Energy portion is relatively unknown and not coordinated currently. Need to have more collaboration

and more regionalization. Current budgeting laws and regulations are a barrier. Need a water act so that water is planned comprehensively and not as separate components (drinking, storm, sewer). Lack of public support for infrastructure – we need to do a better job communicating.

- **West Subregion #1:** Future will be different than today. Financing methods need to change. Gap between rich and poor will grow. Urban and rural reserves will really help service providers plan long-term. How will changing personal economics impact the ability to raise money for infrastructure?
- **West Subregion #2:** Washington County has good coordination – planning for growth. Real issue is capability to finance infrastructure. Property tax limitations. May need to come up with new ways to finance infrastructure. Consolidate special districts or at least develop more IGAs between them.
- **NE Subregion:** Basic infrastructure is in place, the governance is in place, but growth isn't happening the way it was expected. Aging water infrastructure. Upgrading the rural areas to meet urban densities is a challenge. There are some parks deficiencies in some locations, and other public facilities are lacking in some areas. Energy: some aging infrastructure, need more coordination – light rail bridge over Columbia should have electric transmission as well. More coordination for funding, especially for upgrades, and in the execution of putting infrastructure in place.

Following the discussions, Ted Kyle of Clackamas County Water Environment Services gave a presentation on addressing sewer needs in Clackamas County. David Bragdon then described the project's next steps and thanked everyone for their participation.