

**MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL
STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA COMMITTEE MEETING**

Tuesday, June 27, 2000
Council Chamber

Members Present: Susan McLain (Chair), Rod Park (Vice Chair), Bill Atherton

Also Present: Bruce Warner, Chief Operating Officer; Dan Cooper, General Counsel; Karen Withrow, Office of Citizen Involvement; Paul Phillips, Pac/West; Michael Morrissey

Members Absent:

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 4:29 PM.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 13, 2000 STATE & FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA COMMITTEE MEETING

Motion: **Councilor Park** moved to adopt the minutes of the June 13, 2000 State & Federal Legislative Agenda Committee meeting.

Vote: The vote was 3/0 and the motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously. The minutes were adopted without revision.

4. RELATIONSHIP WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES, INTERNAL & EXTERNAL

Dan Cooper, General Counsel, noted that the committee had the *Final Draft of Chapter 2.19 regarding Metro Advisory Committees* as well as the *Final Compare* from the April 5, 2000 Draft included in their agenda packets (see copies of both documents included in the permanent record of this committee.) He said the vehicle that would adopt this code chapter was Ordinance No. 00-860. He felt it was important to note that the ordinance would also repeal all other Metro code sections pertaining to advisory committees currently in the Code. He reviewed the significant differences in the Code chapter. The draft clarified membership of committees in Section 2.19.03, except those established by the Charter and certain positions where elected officials from other jurisdictions were seated. He said the general rule was that all positions on advisory committees were appointed by the Executive Officer or the Council, and were subject to confirmation by the Council. He said there was a removal process where any position could be removed by the appointing authority.

He discussed a new subsection, 2.19.003(c), which would set two-year terms on all advisory committees. He noted that a person could be appointed twice to 2-year terms, and if they had been appointed to finish a vacancy in a 2-year term, they could in theory be on the committee for almost 6 years. He reviewed the significant changes in the subsection regarding the status of committees, 2.19.007(d), which added language to specify budgets for each committee and subcommittee. He pointed out a new provision that clarified previous language regarding the operation of subcommittees.

He felt the document was ready for the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) to review and said that there would undoubtedly be refinements as Council reviewed the document.

Chair McLain reminded staff that there had been a commitment made to MCCI and the other committees that they could review the changes and make suggestions.

Karen Withrow, Office of Citizen Involvement, said she would be meeting with the new chair of MCCI about this issue, and that she and Nancy Goss Duran and Beth Anne Steele were thinking of sending a letter to the other advisory committee chairs regarding the draft.

Chair McLain said she would like that letter to come from the Metro Council State & Federal Agenda Committee and asked that the committee clerk be a part of the group working on the letter as well. She asked for comments from the committee.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Cooper if there were any critical timing issues for the review.

Mr. Cooper said it was a normal internal work process and there were no outside pressures.

Chair McLain responded that there would be a suggested timeline in the letter so there would be action on it as soon in the year as possible.

Michael Morrissey, Senior Council Analyst, asked for clarification regarding whether the document would go to the committee chairs as a draft or an ordinance as Mr. Cooper had suggested.

Chair McLain wanted the letter to give 6-8 weeks before formally putting a resolution or ordinance in front of the Council. She asked Ms. Withrow to figure the date for that. She added that it would be put back on the agenda with Mr. Cooper's accompanying ordinance at the end of that time.

2. METRO LEGISLATIVE TEAM REPORT

Chair McLain said the team had been requested to talk about priorities, process and quick response. She noted a memo in the packet, dated June 22, 2000, to the Chair from Mike Burton which included a proposed timeline for the 2001 State legislative session, a suggested worksheet for issue development, and a list of potential issues. (See copy of the memo included in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Mr. Warner reviewed the memo from Mr. Burton, which came at the request of the committee. He called attention to the second page, the proposed timeline, and said it was the intent of the team to meet once or twice a month to go over the work plan and accomplish the various tasks listed there by month. He said they then intended to start going through the list of items and prioritize them in order to bring some principles to consider when putting together the legislative agenda. They would build from that, and as the session got closer and the election results were known and the direction some of the key issues were taking, they would start preparing the white papers according to the worksheet for legislative issues, if the committee approved that worksheet.

He pointed out the list of current issues, broken down into 3 areas. First, where Metro should be supportive of the efforts of others if needed, second, where monitoring was necessary

and where to seek opportunities if desired, and finally, and third, a possible Metro agenda item dealing with jurisdictional authority on openspaces property acquired outside of Metro's jurisdiction. There was also a list of federal monitoring issues listed.

Chair McLain said everything was there except a little more description on the quick response and how it would be handled. And she had asked for the Council to be surveyed on issues they wanted to get involved with as far as presentations.

Mr. Warner said they had not identified the survey questions yet. He said they should add it to the August work task for the team.

Chair McLain said they might ask about scheduling and what kind of turn around time was needed for the Councilor to go to Salem, and which parts of day were easier than others for them to go.

Mr. Cooper said once the legislature was organized, and there was a sense of which committees were meeting when, and we knew when each councilor would be available to go, that would be really relevant. He mentioned that it may mean a Councilor would have to clear their schedule for that time so they could go when the team called for help.

Councilor Atherton said the big issue was a strategy for their effort in Salem and in Washington DC. He saw the options as being either a fairly large retainer to cover a whole bunch of issues including bill tracking, or a smaller retainer for bill tracking, and go at specific projects as needed for a targeted effort.

Mr. Cooper commented that Councilor Atherton was right on with strategy. He said they had tried to be more than just bill tracking last session, and felt their success, though small, was significant. He said the work done in the interim was toward Metro being seen as a resource for the state and an entity that was trying to do more than that. He said focusing in on issues and key areas was, in fact, part of what they were looking for in the RFP response. He said bill tracking could be done pretty cleanly on the internet in-house now so there was no need for someone to be in Salem to keep track of where the bills were. He said the important thing was to come up with principles about what they wanted and start building toward that. They needed to work on what they wanted to support or were adamantly opposed to, then they would have the ability to work ahead of time to communicate with key legislators. That way, when a stray bill popped up that somehow looked terrible, they would be able to deal with it in a more organized fashion instead of just reacting to bills or hearings on bills. There would be a more cohesive strategy.

Councilor Atherton asked for an example of a principle.

Mr. Cooper said for instance, the Executive Officer and more than one member of the Council was concerned about how local governments were going to be able to pay for the cost of growth given the limitations. He said they wanted to focus on the big stuff.

Mr. Warner, following up on Councilor Atherton's question, said according to the work program, one of the first things they were looking to bring back to the committee in July was a review and update of the principles from last session. He said there would be an opportunity to provide input at that time. He commented that if there was something missing in the process, the committee should please get ahold of one of the team as quickly as possible to let them know what that would be.

Chair McLain was comfortable with the presentation and accompanying documents. She remembered that she had wanted to use the flowchart with the public so she wanted a paragraph on the backside to describe it as a legislative process. She asked Mr. Morrissey and Ms. Grant to work on that paragraph.

3. METRO LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES & KEEPING THE COUNCIL INFORMED

Tom Cusack, Director for the Oregon HUD office, residence address 4055 SW Jefferson Pkwy, Lake Oswego, OR, said he had testified at the council meeting last Thursday. He distributed handouts to the committee (see *HUD Recommendations for Metro Legislative Committee Attention and Related Exhibits on Immediate Federal Funding Decisions* included in the permanent record of this meeting.) Today, he said, he wanted to focus on some immediate issues. He felt there was a clear indication at the Council hearing last week that in order to accomplish the production goals, additional resources would be necessary. He said there was certainly some conflict about the real estate transfer tax in the report. He felt that issue came up because there were no other resources identified. He wanted to bring some other resources to the committee's attention so they could decide whether to help local governments get those resources to accomplish those goals. He said they were separated into two categories, the immediate kinds of things and those that could take a little longer. He focused on the immediate things. He expected the budgets to be adopted fairly soon, probably in the next 60-90 days, for next fiscal year because of it being a campaign year.

He said the H-TAC report indicated where the Metro area's resources for affordable housing came from. He noted that one of the attachments to his handout showed that breakout; 97% of the resources for affordable housing were federal. He felt, given that magnitude and the on-going discussions in the house and the senate, that it was important for the committee know there were items in the HUD budget that could be useful to accomplish production goals established by the report adopted by the Council last week. He guessed that there were about \$18 million still undecided in the HUD budget. About \$12 million of that was for housing vouchers, a program that had been around for 25 years and had been used extensively throughout Oregon. He said that probably translated to 750 to 1,000 additional affordable rental vouchers for the Portland metropolitan area. He said currently there were 9200 families on the Clackamas and Washington County housing authority voucher waiting lists. He mentioned another key federal program still being decided was additional low income housing tax credits. He said low-income housing tax credits were being used to build projects and to rehab projects across the country. He noted the average household income of families he served was \$10,000 a year. By coupling the tax credit program with the voucher program you could help accomplish the most expensive goals found in the regional housing affordability strategy.

Mr. Morrissey asked if any of Metro's local jurisdictions were more actively participating than others.

Mr. Cusack said historically, the City of Portland would have been much more aware of some of these issues. He has worked in the HUD office in Portland for 20 years, and one of the difficulties was that all of the individual interest groups that received HUD dollars tended to lobby for their own programs, and there was no umbrella effort to address overall issues

Chair McLain referred to the last page in Mr. Cusack's handout and asked who had submitted for the 906 rural Oregon vouchers.

Mr. Cusack said the chart was an attempt on a national level to break out where the vouchers may go. He said in his experience, the reality was more often than not, these programs were competitive. He said the numbers included were more than likely conservative because historically, if there was competition, Oregon applicants competed very well nationally.

Chair McLain thought Metro's lobbyists were well aware of some of these issues, and would continue with them next year, but she did not see what Metro could do for Mr. Cusack. She tried to remember if they had ever been involved in housing issues in the past.

Mr. Cooper said now that the affordable housing strategy was in front of the council, it called for funding. He thought Mr. Cusack was asking the committee to see what lobbying efforts we might make to support increases in the budget even though the money doesn't come here.

Chair McLain said it was obvious to her that the committee did have a commitment to put it on the lobbyist list. She said if that was what Mr. Cusack was asking for, it was simple.

Mr. Cusack commented that when he looked at the federal monitoring, he saw affordable housing in the state legislative side of things he did not see it at the federal level, though that did not mean it would not happen.

Chair McLain appreciated that and said it was a good comment.

Paul Phillips Pac/West, said it was not on the agenda because it was a work in progress. He said Mr. Riggs was on his way to Washington DC at this moment, with meetings this whole week with the congressional and senatorial delegations. He said the HUD funding passed the house. He said there was an opportunity, and Mr. Riggs was meeting with Senators Wyden and Smith staff tomorrow and Thursday. He said they could easily bring this up to see if there is a role we can play. He thought Mr. Riggs was meeting with Congressman Walden specifically to talk about urban-rural issues. At the minimum, he said they could monitor it to see if there was something they could do on the senate side. He said the tax credits might be more complicated because it had not passed either body at this time. He said they could report back if the committee wanted, because it was clearly a direction you have identified as a priority at both state and federal levels.

Chair McLain said with passing task force recommendations, it seemed to her that a letter would be appropriate to remind others that this region had indicated a support for looking for financial strategies. She felt the letter would be consistent with what the Council did last week.

Mr. Morrissey suggested if the committee was interested, she might instruct the legislative team to work with the lobbyist to figure out the best way to get involved in this issue and report back.

Mr. Phillips said he would do some research to figure out what they could do on a short turn around. He said the timeline was complicated because of the political season.

Chair McLain said she did want the team to look at the issue since the testimony they heard today was valid and went along with policy established last week with the vote on the

affordable housing task force report. She asked Mr. Cooper for a report back on the next agenda.

Mr. Phillips said there were two more legislative tours coming up. He felt the tours had been effective in moving Metro from being seen as the big bad thug in the process to one that actually had a lot of good information. He suggested, regarding the 4(d) rules, that perhaps in August there should be an informal session, a seminar perhaps. He encouraged that because the timing for Metro to exercise some coordinated leadership was, in his opinion, perfect.

Councilor Atherton asked if they were still working on a summit on an urban agenda, or had they given up on that

Chair McLain said she and Councilors Park and Bragdon had talked about it with Mr. Riggs and there had been some issues about agenda. She did not think any decisions had been made on what the summit might entail.

Mr. Phillips said the agenda was something they could advise on but it was really up to the Council to decide.

Chair McLain said she had told Councilor Bragdon and Mr. Riggs that if they did not pick a date and work toward the opportunity for some kind of a summit, the chance would pass them by. She said it was important to come up with a strategy.

Mr. Phillips said he had suggested to Mr. Riggs that the normal political cut-off date was the filing day of voter's pamphlet, August 29. He felt it would be best to do it in advance of that date. He considered the first 3 weeks in August to be the target date.

Chair McLain said they would have to work pretty hard to pull that off.

Councilor Park thought it would be more after November so you would know who would be there.

Mr. Phillips responded that there were two schools of thought here. The first suggestion was an informal summit subject on a topic that linked urban and rural issues. That was up to council to choose the topic. It made sense for incumbents and candidates and key decision makers in the August period of time. A more formal summit on wider variety of issues would be between Thanksgiving and the New Year holiday season when caucuses had already met and elected leaderships, agendas had been developed but not formalized. He said timeliness played a big part and the 4(d) rules were a timely hook.

Councilor Park said, for instance, if they were trying to revamp where dollars went from capital gains on newly annexed land, it would be a fairly concentrated effort, but it would be very focused. He assumed it would be more of a November issue except between now and that date they would be working the probable leadership.

Mr. Phillips said he had met with Senator Derfler about pre-session filing as many of Metro's bills as they could so they would be ready on first day of session. He said if they waited until November and asked for drafts to be put together, it would not happen until February or March. Depending on what happened at the ballot box, it could be an exceedingly short session.

Chair McLain said it seemed there had been two ideas all along which caused some of the confusion. They thought both ideas had merit and nobody had said do one or the other, or both. She thought they needed to talk to Presiding Officer Bragdon and the council to see where they wanted to be. She also wanted that passed on to the legislative team. She felt there was merit for both.

Mr. Phillips said all of the legislators had been invited to the July 8th Zoo event. He said there were informal casual event and formal events. He said the likelihood of their involvement increased if it was a topic they cared about. If it was multiple topics, while interesting, they probably would not come.

Chair McLain said the next agenda would continue with the legislative team as far as the priorities and principles. She asked Mr. Morrissey to make sure the Presiding Officer and Councilor Park and she got together to discuss and bring back some ideas.

ADJOURN

There being no further business before the committee, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting at 5:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Grant
Council Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 27, 2000

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

Document Number	Document Date	Document Description	TO/FROM
062700leg-01	6/27/2000	Chapter 2.19 Metro Advisory Committees Final Draft	Committee/Dan Mr. Cooper
062700leg-02	6/27/2000	Chapter 2.19 Metro Advisory Committees Final Compare from 4/05/2000 Draft	Committee/Dan Mr. Cooper
062700leg-03	June 22, 2000	Letter RE: requests from June 13 committee meeting, includes proposed timeline for 2001 State legislative session, sample worksheet for issue development, list of potential issues	Susan McLain/Mike Burton
062700leg-04	Undated	HUD Recommendations for Metro Legislative Committee Attention and Related Exhibits on Immediate Federal Funding Decisions	Committee/Tom Cusack, HUD Director
062700leg-05	6/27/2000	Fax letter RE: Pac/West update	Committee/Doug Riggs