

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 86-623
FY 1985-86 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET)
AND TRANSMITTING THE APPROVED) Introduced by the
BUDGET TO THE TAX SUPERVISING AND) Executive Officer
CONSERVATION COMMISSION)

WHEREAS, The Council convened as Budget Committee has reviewed the Proposed Supplemental Budget and held a public hearing on the proposed Budget on January 23, 1986, and considered overall issues affecting the FY 1985-86 Supplemental Budget; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Oregon Budget Law, the Council convened as Budget Committee must approve the FY 1985-86 Supplemental Budget and said approved budget must be transmitted to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC) for public hearing and review; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Proposed FY 1985-86 Supplemental Budget as amended by the Council convened as Budget Committee, which is on file at the Metro offices, is hereby approved.

2. That the Executive Officer is hereby directed to submit the Approved FY 1985-86 Supplemental Budget to the TSCC for public hearing and review.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 23rd day of January, 1986.


Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

JS/srs/4761C/435-4
01/14/86

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved to set over consideration of the Ordinance until February 13, 1986, and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried.

9. RESOLUTIONS

9.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-623, for the Purpose of Approving the FY 1985-86 Supplemental Budget and Transmitting the Approved Budget to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC)

9.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-624, for the Purpose of Amending Resolution No. 85-562, Revising Appropriations and Creating a Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fund, an Insurance Fund, and a Convention, Trade, and Spectator Facilities (CTS) Fund (Public Hearing)

Jennifer Sims explained that Resolution No. 86-623, if adopted, would transmit the proposed supplemental budget to the TSCC for a review, public hearing and certification process. When certified by the TSCC, the supplemental budget would be returned and at that time the Council would consider adoption of Resolution No. 86-624.

Ms. Sims then reviewed the changes proposed in the supplemental budget which included: 1) adding \$8,250 to the General Fund for a Regional Parks Study; 2) increasing the Building Management Fund to cover the costs of new fixtures and insurance; 3) increasing the Solid Waste Reduction Program budget; 4) eliminating the Landfill Siting Program and distributing those funds to the Department of Environmental Quality; and 5) establishing a revenue fund for rehabilitation and enhancement of the area around the St. Johns Landfill.

In response to questions about the revenue fund for the St. Johns rehabilitation and enhancement program, Ms. Sims explained Metro would budget this fund on an annual basis.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved to adopt Resolution No. 86-623 and Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick,
Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-623 was adopted.
Resolution No. 86-624 would be considered for adoption some time in
March 1986 after the budget was returned from the TSCC.

9.3 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-622, for the Purpose of
Appointing Citizen Members to the Metropolitan Service
District's Budget Committee

Ray Barker reviewed the process by which Budget Committee candidates were recommended for appointment. He explained two candidates who had served on the FY 1985-86 Committee and were being recommended to serve again in order to provide more continuity. Of the 10 candidates recommended for nomination two were referred by Councilors, two by the Executive Officer, and six responded to a newspaper article soliciting candidates. Mr. Barker said all the candidates were more than qualified to perform budget review activities. The Management Committee had recommended the seven candidates listed in the Resolution be appointed plus one alternate from the East Multnomah County area. Mr. Barker said Ed Wallberg, a CPA from the Gresham area, was recommended as an alternate representing that area.

Motion: Councilor Kelley moved to adopt Resolution No. 86-222, including appointing Ed Wallberg to serve as an alternate from the East Multnomah County area, and Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Councilor Van Bergen questioned the usefulness of involving citizens in the budget review process. Executive Officer Gustafson suggested the Council review the process at the end of this year's budget cycle which could include inviting citizen members of the Budget Committee to the Council meeting when the FY 1986-87 budget was adopted. Presiding Officer Waker requested the Council Assistant remind the Council to take this action at the appropriate time.

Councilor Kirkpatrick favored continuing citizen involvement in the budget review process. She said citizens provided valuable recommendations and the committee process prepared some citizens for Councilor positions.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in: