

BEFORE THE COUNCIL  
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING )  
A RATE FOR MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT )

RESOLUTION NO. 80-158

Introduced by Council  
Coordinating Committee

WHEREAS, Metro Personnel Rules provide that the Council shall establish a rate of reimbursement for mileage expenses incurred by Metro officials and employees on official business; and

WHEREAS, The Council believes the mileage rate set by the federal government for federal employees to be a fair and representative rate; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That, pursuant to Metro Personnel Rules, the mileage reimbursement rate for Metro officials and employees is hereby established at twenty cents (20¢) per mile effective July 1, 1980.

2. That the rate shall be established and changed according to the rate set by the General Services Administration for federal employees which is consistent with rates established by comparable local jurisdictions in the Metro area.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 26th day of June, 1980.

  
Presiding Officer

AJ/gl  
8322/135

THIS 26<sup>th</sup> DAY OF June 1980Cynthia M. Wickman

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL

## A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Council Coordinating Committee  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Establishing a Rate of Mileage Reimbursement

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of Resolution No. 80-158 to establish a rate of reimbursement for mileage expenses incurred by Metro officials and employees on official business at the rate set by the General Services Administration of the federal government, currently at 20¢ per mile.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: The recommendation is consistent with the Personnel Rules, which require the Council to establish the rate at which mileage will be reimbursed.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The rate increase from 15¢ to 20¢ would cost an additional \$3,000 and would be covered by a transfer from the Contingency fund.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The rate which is recommended (20¢ per mile) is the mileage rate set by the federal government for federal employees. This rate is consistent with what is being reimbursed by other governmental jurisdictions and appears to be a fair and representative rate.
- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: 1) Continue to reimburse at the current rate, which does not appear to be equitable. 2) To adjust the rate to be consistent with other jurisdictions and the federal government.
- C. CONCLUSION: Approve Resolution No. 80-158.

CS:ss  
8386/118

APPROVED BY THE METRO COUNCIL

AGENDA MANAGEMENT ~~THIS 22nd DAY OF May~~ 19~~80~~<sup>80</sup>Cynthia M. Wickham  
CLERK OF THE COUNCIL

TO: Metro Council  
 FROM: Executive Officer  
 SUBJECT: Stating the Council's Intent to Proceed with the Johnson Creek Basin Flood Control and Pollution Abatement Project Local Improvement District

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Res 80-158*
- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt the attached Resolution stating the Council's intention to proceed with the formation of the Proposed Johnson Creek Local Improvement District (LID). The formation of the LID allows Metro to proceed with improvements necessary to correct the drainage problems through assessing affected properties for Phase I construction and planning costs of \$770,000. Phase II costs for construction estimated at \$4,340,000 will be assessed after completion of Phase I. Phase III costs are for annual operation and maintenance and are set at a maximum of \$550,000 per year. Assessments for Phase III will commence 4-5 years after start of construction for Phase I.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will allow Metro to carry through on policy which resulted from declaration of Johnson Creek as an area of Regional Significance at the request of local jurisdictions. Approval of the local improvement district will give Metro the financial resources necessary to act as the local sponsor for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers flood control projects for Johnson Creek. Approval will also enable Metro to develop a comprehensive drainage management plan and provide for drainage management and runoff control projects in the Johnson Creek Basin.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: There has been a special account established in the Metro budget to cover the costs of the LID formation. These funds were provided through loans made to Metro by affected local jurisdictions. The costs of channel improvements will be financed by the federal government, all other costs will be assessed to the properties within the LID boundaries. There is no impact on General fund revenues.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Johnson Creek has a past history of frequent and serious flooding. In March, 1979, the Metro Council declared the Johnson Creek Basin an area of regional concern and appointed a task force to evaluate the flooding and drainage problems on the Johnson Creek Basin

and recommend a combination of options for solving those problems. The recommendation to form the Johnson Creek LID comes after a year of public and local and federal government involvement in studying the Johnson Creek flooding problem and the political and physical alternatives available to solve the problems. The Preliminary Engineering report is now complete and has recommended a three-phase approach to reduce the problem. Metro staff and the Johnson Creek Task Force are now recommending that the LID be formed for the purpose of financing and administering the cost of the capital improvement and drainage/runoff management programs proposed for Johnson Creek Basin.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

- . Do nothing, which would mean a continuance of the current flooding, drainage and pollution problems in the Basin.
- . Formation of a Special District, which would be more costly to create than an LID.
- . Formation of two separate LIDs, one for Phase I and another for Phase II and III. This option was considered early in the planning process and was rejected. The primary reason was that Metro, in order to act as local sponsor of the Corp project, must be capable of implementing all three phases.

The issue of two LIDs was considered again by the Task Force and was rejected in approving the draft Preliminary Engineering report. Notice forms have been ordered and any change at this point would delay the hearing process and necessitate postponing the initiation of the project by approximately one year.

- C. CONCLUSION: The LID process is a traditional means of financing, and distributing to affected parties, the cost of capital improvements which directly benefit an area. It is necessary that some action be taken to reduce the severity and public costs of flooding in the Johnson Creek Basin. Staff analysis indicates that the proposed program will achieve the desired goals. Metro staff recommends the approval of the attached Resolution.



**METRO**

**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

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

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: May 9, 1980

To: Metro Council

From: Executive Officer

Regarding: Preliminary Engineering Report - Johnson  
Creek Basin Flood Control and Pollution Abatement  
Project

A draft of the above report along with a summary of changes recommended by the Johnson Creek Task Force has been distributed to the entire Council.

On May 13, 1980, the Regional Services Committee will review the report and make a recommendation to the Council. Any changes recommended by this committee will be incorporated along with the Task Force changes into the final report. Because the Regional Services Committee will not meet until the 13th, the final report will not be available before the May 22, 1980, Council meeting.

RG:JL:pj



METRO

**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

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

**M E M O R A N D U M**

Date: May 12, 1980

To: Metro Council

From: Public Facilities

Regarding: Preliminary Engineering Report - Johnson Creek  
Basin Flood Control and Pollution Abatement Project

On May 8, 1980, the Johnson Creek Task Force approved the above report with the following changes:

Page 2, paragraph 3, sentence 3. Delete "major".

Page 2, paragraph 4, sentence 1. Substitute : "May" for "should" and add after the word "accomplished" - "pending adoption of a comprehensive Drainage/Runoff Management Plan":

1. Substitute "will" for "should"
2. Substitute "will" for "should"
3. Change to read - "Easements for channel construction, retention/detention structures and maintenance may be acquired."
4. Substitute "may" for "should"
5. No change
6. Substitute "may" for "should" and "required" for "constructed"

Page 3, paragraph 2, line 3. Change to read as follows:  
"Maintenance of any regional retention/detention structures required by the Drainage/Runoff Management Plan"

Page 4, paragraph 1, line 1: delete "major"

Page 4, paragraph 1, line 6: insert "monitor" before "enforcement"

Page 5, See attached revision.

Page 6, paragraph 1, sentence 2: Substitute "may" for "would" and insert "or a special" before "meeting of the Committee".

May 12, 1980  
Metro Council  
Page 2

Page 10, paragraph B, sentence 2: Substitute "may" for "would"  
and insert "or a special" before "meeting of the  
Committee".

Several non-substantive corrections were made to Exhibit IV  
where several pages were left out of the draft report.

JL:pj

ESTIMATE OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

<u>Phase I (1-2 years)</u>	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>LID Share</u>	<u>Total</u>
Drainage/Runoff Plan		250,000	250,000
Loan Repayment		50,000	50,000
Easement Aquisition		250,000	250,000
Channel Improvements	522,000*		522,000
Administration			
Personal Services		97,000	97,000
Phase II Assessment			
Notices		40,000	40,000
Contingencies (15%)		83,000	83,000
Subtotal	522,000	770,000	1,292,000
 <u>Phase II (4-6 years)</u>			
Easement Acquisition		750,000	750,000
Channel Improvements	3,800,000*		3,800,000
Construct Roads & Bridges		850,000*	850,000*
Erosion Control		100,000	100,000
Runoff Detention/Retention Facilities		1,500,000	1,500,000
Utility Relocation		190,000*	190,000*
Administration			
Personal Services		250,000	250,000
Assessment Notices		100,000	100,000
Legal Costs		50,000	50,000
Contract Services		41,000	41,000
Contingencies (15%)		509,000	509,000
Subtotal	3,800,000	4,340,000	8,140,000
Total	4,322,000	5,110,000	9,432,000
 <u>Phase III (ongoing)</u>			
Operations and Maintenance		500,000/year**	500,000/year**
Administration		50,000/year**	50,000/year**
Total		550,000/year**	550,000/year**

\*Estimates based on costs contained in 1975 Corps of Engineer Design Memorandum (9) and adjusted for inflation.

\*\*The maximum annual costs of operations and maintenance is estimated at \$550,000. The estimate for operations and maintenance during the fourth year of the project is \$150,000. The fourth year will be first year for this annual operations and maintenance charge.