



METRO

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT  
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

## MEMORANDUM

Date: June 10, 1980  
To: Chairman, Council Coordinating Committee  
From: Mike Burton, Councilor *MS*  
Regarding: Subject: Metro "Five Year Operational Plan"

Metro's direction over the next few years will, as with any government, be determined by a number of factors ranging from availability of funds and, therefore, to save the economy, through the political acceptability by the public for what the government is doing. These factors are such that no accurate prediction can be made as to their status in the future and designing an Operational Plan to attempt to forecast policy direction is unique among legislative bodies in this country. In fact, the process of designing an extended Operational Plan is usually reserved for administrative agencies for which policy has already been established. To undertake policy forecasting and to combine that factor with operational procedures can be risky. A legislative body today cannot or should not bind what a legislative body might wish or need to do a year or five years from now. In spite of some reservations about this process, I feel it is well worth a try and it could prove, if carried out properly, to be a pioneering effort that other governmental bodies may wish to emulate. I offer the comments below as a reaction to a paper the Council was given on June 5, "Proposed Metro Operational Plan and Finance Strategy." I am assuming that this is a "talking paper" rather than an actual proposed plan and is to be used to build a plan on input from the Council. I believe it is a good start, but requires significant input and work from the Council.

### Mission Statement

I concur with Coun. Bonner's concern over the use of the word "coordinate" and suggest an additional statement: "Coordinate plans as required by law and provide regional services." I feel we should delete "a few limited" since it is meaningless. If we are to be a legitimate regional government, and are accepted by the voters to perform regional services, then we should state that as our purpose.

### Finance Strategy

I realize that there is no way to honestly discuss operational

Memorandum  
June 10, 1980  
Page 2

policy without a concurrent discussion of fiscal policy. I will simply reiterate my belief that we should decide direction and scope, and then determine funding possibilities rather than vice versa.

### Operational Policies

While it is difficult to separate or isolate issues, for example, transportation decisions affect land use decisions affect air quality decisions affect economic decisions, etc., and is even more difficult to prioritize those items, I am going to stick my neck out and take a position on several issues where I think we should take a priority stand:

#### Land Use

A basic question exists about how to achieve a regional overview of land uses and development. Under our current processes each jurisdiction devises its own plan which will require it to meet certain State and regional standards. These may not meet the test of being consistent with adjacent jurisdictional plans, let alone those jurisdictions in further out areas. I believe it is too late at this juncture to impose regional goals and expect cities and counties to, perhaps, redefine their comprehensive plans. However, we must at some point begin to test each plan against broader regional considerations to ensure consistency, economy and efficiency of uses in planned and needed services. Housing, transportation, solid waste, water and air quality are all integral parts of proper land use planning and it is imperative that Metro devise a means, and pursue as its primary objective an integrated planning process, that will allow development to occur which is consistent with the quality of living presently available to people in this region. This must occur within the next year.

#### Transportation

The "proposed" plan calls for a "study" on the "merger" of Tri-Met with Metro to begin in 1984. I feel this is putting off the inevitable to too distant a future. Metro has the lead responsibility for much of the transit planning for the region and should assume a greater role. Tri-Met is presently studying its own role and operational plans for the future. To wait until 1984, to begin discussions on what the relationship between Metro and Tri-Met ought to be, would be to let critical time pass, time when integrated planning should be occurring. Our survey indicates a public response which wants a more accountable Tri-Met Board. These factors lead me to believe that we should undertake discussions with the Tri-Met Board

immediately on what our relationship should be. These discussions should not exclude the possibility of Metro assuming direct operational control of Tri-Met, but should also include exploring other types of relationships such as Metro assuming only the planning and budget authority with the Tri-Met Board controlling the operational aspects. In any case, this decision is the Council's and should not be lost to some other decision-making body for lack of action on our own part.

### Economic Development

To-date Metro's involvement in economic development has been peripheral. It is time we took the lead in this area. Presently in the Metro area no one agency has the responsibility for overall economic development planning or project encouragement. The Port of Portland has made some attempts, but their role properly belongs in marine-related or airport development. Individual cities and counties have undertaken economic development efforts; some with success, but just as often with less than desirable results. Taking the initiative to fill a large vacuum in this area is a role which should necessarily fall to Metro. A concerted effort to identify industrial and commercial growth areas, areas available for redevelopment, regulatory issues, environmental concerns, capital availability and interest should be carried out on a regionwide basis, thus making it easier for potential new development to find their way in and for existing companies to shift or rebuild within the region. Metro should not just plan in this area, but should act as an advocate for approved projects that are consistent with growth factors and regional goals. Metro might also staff a regional economic development council made up of representatives of local governments, labor and industry. To fund this we would ask local governments to share in the cost of staffing and operations. I feel we should undertake this larger effort during this fiscal year with plans to become the lead agency by next fiscal year.

In sum, I feel we should maintain our present level of operations, but seriously increase our role in integrating the various jurisdictional comprehensive plans with regional goals and our regional economic development. In addition to this, I believe we should immediately undertake discussions on the future relationships between Metro and Tri-Met. The increased activity in looking at our relationship with Tri-Met, and within the land use coordination area, should not add additional dollars to our budget; we will have to, however, ask local jurisdictions to assist in enlarging our role in economic development.

Memorandum  
June 10, 1980  
Page 3

immediately on what our relationship should be. These discussions should not exclude the possibility of Metro assuming direct operational control of Tri-Met, but should also include exploring other types of relationships such as Metro assuming only the planning and budget authority with the Tri-Met Board controlling the operational aspects. In any case, this decision is the Council's and should not be lost to some other decision-making body for lack of action on our own part.

### Economic Development

To-date Metro's involvement in economic development has been peripheral. It is time we took the lead in this area. Presently in the Metro area no one agency has the responsibility for overall economic development planning or project encouragement. The Port of Portland has made some attempts, but their role properly belongs in marine-related or airport development. Individual cities and counties have undertaken economic development efforts; some with success, but just as often with less than desirable results. Taking the initiative to fill a large vacuum in this area is a role which should necessarily fall to Metro. A concerted effort to identify industrial and commercial growth areas, areas available for redevelopment, regulatory issues, environmental concerns, capital availability and interest should be carried out on a regionwide basis, thus making it easier for potential new development to find their way in and for existing companies to shift or rebuild within the region. Metro should not just plan in this area, but should act as an advocate for approved projects that are consistent with growth factors and regional goals. Metro might also staff a regional economic development council made up of representatives of local governments, labor and industry. To fund this we would ask local governments to share in the cost of staffing and operations. I feel we should undertake this larger effort during this fiscal year with plans to become the lead agency by next fiscal year.

In sum, I feel we should maintain our present level of operations, but seriously increase our role in integrating the various jurisdictional comprehensive plans with regional goals and our regional economic development. In addition to this, I believe we should immediately undertake discussions on the future relationships between Metro and Tri-Met. The increased activity in looking at our relationship with Tri-Met, and within the land use coordination area, should not add additional dollars to our budget; we will have to, however, ask local jurisdictions to assist in enlarging our role in economic development.

MB/gl/8443/D2

cc: Metro Councilors

bc: Mike Alesko, The Oregonian; Phil Adamsak, Oregon Journal