

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR ) RESOLUTION NO. 86-628  
THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL )  
GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1986-87 ) Introduced by the  
 ) Executive Officer

WHEREAS, ORS 268.513 authorizes the Council of the  
Metropolitan Service District (Metro) to:

"charge the cities and counties within  
the District for the services and  
activities carried out under ORS 268.380  
and 268.390."; and

WHEREAS, Metro Ordinance No. 84-180 requires that the Metro  
Council seek the advice of local government officials regarding dues  
level through the Intergovernmental Resource Committee and this  
condition has been fulfilled; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby establishes local govern-  
ment dues assessments within the District in the amount of \$.51 per  
capita for FY 1986-87.

2. That notification of the assessment be sent to all  
cities and counties within the District prior to March 2, 1986.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 27th day of February, 1986.



Deputy Presiding Officer

AN/srs  
0781C/373  
02/19/86

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 86-628 FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES  
TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1986-87

---

Date: February 27, 1986

Presented by: Keith Lawton

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Assessment Authorization and Procedure

ORS 268.513 authorizes the Council to:

"charge the cities and counties within the  
district for the services and activities  
carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390."

If the Council determines that it is necessary to charge these local governments, it must determine the total amount to be charged and assess each city and county on a population basis. The population of the county cannot include the population of any city within that county. The Council's assessment cannot exceed \$.51 per capita per year. The Council has the ability to determine the population of each city and county.

In making the assessment, the Council is required to notify each city and county of its intent to assess and the amount of the assessment at least 120 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the charge will be made. The Council must make the notification for the FY 1986-87 assessment prior to March 2, 1986. Assessments charged to cities and counties are mandatory and they must pay them before October 1, 1986.

A copy of ORS 268.513 is attached as Exhibit A.

Metro Ordinance No. 84-180 established a local officials advisory committee for the purpose of recommending an Intergovernmental Resource Center work program and related dues level. This advisory committee has met to review the related material and formulate a recommendation. Their recommended dues assessment is \$.51 per capita. Tri-Met and the Port of Portland are assessed at .125 of this rate.

Proposed FY 1986-87 Assessment

Exhibit B attached shows the proposed assessments for  
FY 1986-87.

The proposed assessments are based upon the latest certified population figures from the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University. Each county's unincorporated population estimate is based upon data provided by the Center for Population Research using a formula devised by Metro staff.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends that the Council establish a FY 1986-87 dues assessment at \$.51 per capita.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

On February 7, 1986, the Intergovernmental Resource Committee unanimously recommended Council adoption of a FY 1986-87 Local Government Dues Assessment of \$.51 per capita.

SS/srs  
7575B/327  
02/19/86

**268.513 Service charge for planning functions of district.** (1) The council shall consult with the advisory committee appointed under ORS 268.170 before determining whether it is necessary to charge the cities and counties within the district for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. If the council determines that it is necessary to charge cities and counties within the district for any fiscal year, it shall determine the total amount to be charged and shall assess each city and county with the portion of the total amount as the population of the portion of the city or county within the district bears to the total population of the district provided, however, that the service charge shall not exceed the rate of 51 cents per capita per year. For the purposes of this subsection the population of a county does not include the population of any city situated within the boundaries of that county. The population of each city and county shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the council.

(2) The council shall notify each city and county of its intent to assess and the amount it proposes to assess each city and county at least 120 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the charge will be made.

(3) The decision of the council to charge the cities and counties within the district, and the amount of the charge upon each, shall be binding upon those cities and counties. Cities and counties shall pay their charge on or before October 1 of the fiscal year for which the charge has been made.

(4) When the council determines that it is necessary to impose the service charges authorized under subsection (1) of this section for any fiscal year, each mass transit district organized under ORS chapter 267 and port located wholly or partly within the district shall also pay a service charge to the district for that fiscal year for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. The charge for a mass transit district or port shall be the amount obtained by applying, for the population of the mass transit district or port within the boundaries of the district, a per capita charge that is 12-1/2 percent of the per capita rate established for cities and counties for the same fiscal year.

Subsections (2) and (3) of this section apply to charges assessed under this subsection.

(5) This section shall not apply to a fiscal year that ends later than June 30, 1989. [1977 c.665 §16; 1979 c.804 §10; 1981 c.353 §5; 1985 c.210 §1]

## EXHIBIT B

## PROPOSED LOCAL GOVERNMENT DUES

UNIT	Pop. Est. <sup>1</sup> 1985	Proposed Dues FY 1986-87 \$0.51/
Clackamas Co. (unincorp.)	89,158	\$ 45,470.58
Gladstone	9,570	4,880.70
Happy Valley	1,465	747.15
Johnson City	390	198.90
Lake Oswego	24,200	12,342.00
Milwaukie	17,375	8,861.25
Oregon City	14,500	7,395.00
Rivergrove	310	158.10
West Linn	12,950	6,604.50
Wilsonville	3,700	1,887.00
Multnomah Co. (unincorp.)	127,907	65,232.57
Fairview	1,850	943.50
Gresham	37,480	19,114.80
Maywood Park	825	420.75
Portland	379,000	193,290.00
Troutdale	6,890	3,513.90
Wood Village	2,595	1,323.45
Washington Co. (unincorp.)	123,223	62,843.73
Beaverton	33,950	17,314.50
Cornelius	5,050	2,575.50
Durham	720	367.20
Forest Grove	11,750	5,992.50
Hillsboro	30,270	15,437.70
King City	1,830	933.30
Sherwood	2,685	1,369.35
Tigard	20,250	10,327.50
Tualatin	<u>10,350</u>	<u>5,278.50</u>
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSESSMENT	970,243	\$494,823.93
Port of Portland		61,852.99
Tri-Met		61,852.99
TOTAL PROPOSED ASSESSMENT		<u>\$618,529.91</u>

<sup>1</sup>Population estimate based upon July 1, 1985, certified estimates or population for Oregon cities and counties prepared by the Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University.

7575B/327  
02/19/86

Councilor Kelley pointed out that in case of a fire at the church, the well might not be useful because the electric well pump could stop working. She also said a fire truck carrying 250 gallons of water might not be sufficient to stop a fire at the church. She explained her home was destroyed by fire because 250 gallons of water carried in the fire truck tank was not enough water to put out the fire.

Ms. Mason again pointed out even if a hydrant was currently located within a quarter mile of the church, the city of Tualatin would not permit its use because the church was outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Loren Doty, 10600 S.W. Evergreen Avenue, Apartment 2, Wilsonville, Minister of Tualatin Hills Christian Church, testified he agreed with the Hearings Officer's recommendations. He also said he did not think Mr. Moore's comments had addressed the criteria for amending the Urban Growth Boundary.

In response to Mr. Moore's earlier comments, Ms. Mason said she had visited the site but as was her policy, she had not talked to anyone about the case during the visit.

There was no further public testimony and Presiding Officer Waker closed the public hearing.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved Ordinance No. 86-197 be adopted and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

The Presiding Officer announced the second hearing would occur March 13, 1986.

## 9. RESOLUTIONS

### 9.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-628, for the Purpose of Providing for the Assessment of Dues to Local Governments for FY 1986-87

Keith Lawton reported that in compliance with Metro ordinance, the Intergovernmental Resource Committee (IRC) recommended a 51¢ per capita dues level, the same as for FY 1985-86, for the next fiscal year.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved Resolution No. 86-628 be adopted and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Councilor Kirkpatrick, Chair of the IRC, noted the Committee conducted meetings in each county to give local representatives more voice on the dues matter.



Councilor DeJardin said he had attended some of the local government meetings. He noted no suggestions were made to reduce IRC services. Rather, he noted supportive and positive comments were received and some local government representatives recommended expanding IRC services.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

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

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-628 was adopted.

9.2 Resolution No. 86-629, for the Purpose of Recommending to the Oregon Transportation Commission Regional Priority Projects for Inclusion in the Oregon Department of Transportation Six-Year Highway Improvement Program

Andy Cotugno explained Attachments A, B and C of the Resolution listed recommended priorities for projects proposed to be funded by the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program. TPAC and JPACT had reviewed those priority projects, he said, and had recommended adoption of the Resolution.

Presiding Officer Waker, Chair of JPACT, commended the committee's consensus building process and recommended adoption of the Resolution.

Motion: Councilor Van Bergen moved Resolution No. 86-629 be adopted and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

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

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-629 was adopted.

The Presiding Officer noted the Resolution would be presented at a Transportation Commission hearing later in the evening which he would attend.