

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE )  
ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL )  
GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1989-90 )

RESOLUTION NO. 89-1057

Introduced by  
Councilor Gardner

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 84-180 requires the Metro Council to  
seek the advice of the Local Government Advisory Committee regarding  
the assessment of dues as authorized by ORS 268.513 and this condition  
has been fulfilled; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby establishes local  
government dues assessment within the District in the  
amount of \$.51 per capita for FY 1989-90.
2. That notification of the assessment be sent to all cities  
and counties within the District, Tri-Met and the Port of  
Portland prior to March 3, 1989.
3. That the assessment does not take effect unless the  
expiration provision in ORS 268.513 is amended to allow  
for its collection in FY 1989-90.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 23rd day of February, 1989.

  
Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer

JG/SL  
RES1057  
2/13/89

COMMITTEE REPORT

Agenda Item: 9.3

Meeting Date: Feb. 23, 1989

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 89-1057, ASSESSING DUES  
TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1989-90

-----  
Date: February 22, 1989

Presented By: Councilor Gardner

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Councilors present -- Bauer, Collier, DeJardin, Devlin and Gardner -- voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 89-1057.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ISSUES: Planning and Development staff member, Pat Lee reviewed the process for consultation with the Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) as required by ORS 268.513. The LGAC was appointed on December 8, 1988 and held two meetings (December 14, 1988 and January 25, 1989) to review proposed dues-funded planning programs to be provided by the Planning and Development and Transportation Departments. The LGAC did not formulate a recommendation on the level of the dues assessment, but at the last meeting, members were requested to submit any written comments within two weeks to meet the District's budget schedule. Pat Lee reported that no written comments were received regarding the dues level or proposed programs, but that phone calls were received from representatives of the City of Gladstone and Multnomah County indicating support for the dues proposal. The proposed level of the dues assessment is \$.51 per capita for cities and counties and \$.125 of this rate for the Port of Portland and Tri-Met. This rate is consistent with the rate assessed for prior years.

Resolution No. 89-1057 satisfies the Council's statutory obligation to notify cities and counties at least 120 days prior to the start of the fiscal year of its intent to assess the dues at the proposed rate for planning purposes. The Council will not assess the dues at the beginning of the fiscal year unless the "sunset" provision in ORS 268.513 is removed by the 1989 Legislature.

DEC:gpwb  
dues

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 89-1057, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1989-90.

Date: February 13, 1989

Presented by: Andy Cotugno  
Rich Carson

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

### Assessment Authorization and Procedure

ORS 268.513 (Exhibit A) authorizes the Metro 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 follows the recommendation of the Local Government Advisory Committee and determines that it is necessary to charge these local governments, it must establish the total amount to be charged and assess each city and county on the basis of population. The assessment cannot exceed \$.51 per capita per year.

In making the assessment, the Council is required to notify each city, county, Tri-Met and the Port of Portland 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 notification for the FY 1989-90 assessment must be made prior to March 3, 1989. Assessments must be paid before October 1, 1989.

However, the authority granted in ORS 268.513 expires July 1, 1989 unless the Legislature changes the law. The letters of notification will indicate that no payment is expected without legislative action.

### Proposed FY 1989-90 Assessment

The attached (Exhibit B) shows the population figures and proposed assessment schedule. The values 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 and Census using a formula devised by Metro staff (Exhibit C).

### COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Metro Ordinance No. 84-180 and Metro Resolution No. 88-1016 established a Local Government Advisory Committee of local officials (Exhibit D) for the purpose of reviewing Metro's activity and service in dues-funded programs. The committee met (Exhibit E) and formulated a recommendation. Their recommended dues assessment is \$.51 per capita. Tri-Met and the Port of Portland are assessed at .125 of this rate.

### EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution 89-1057.

sl

Attachments  
SR1057  
2/13/89

**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  
POPULATION FIGURES AND PROPOSED  
ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

FINAL FY 89-90 METRO DUES

JURISDICTION	ESTIMATE 7/1/1988	ASSESSMENT AT \$0.51/	IN METRO	TOTAL COUNTY	NOT IN METRO
CLACKAMAS CO. (Unincorp.)	91596	\$46,713.98			
Gladstone	9780	\$4,987.80			
Happy Valley	1505	\$767.55			
Johnson City	425	\$216.75			
Lake Oswego	28360	\$14,463.60			
Milwaukie	19045	\$9,712.95			
Oregon City	15030	\$7,665.30			
Rivergrove	330	\$168.30			
West Linn	14020	\$7,150.20			
Wilsonville	4910	\$2,504.10	185001	262200	77199
MULTNOMAH CO. (Unincorp.)	65412	\$33,360.23			
Fairview	1940	\$989.40			
Gresham	60315	\$30,760.65			
Maywood Park	830	\$423.30			
Portland	429410	\$218,999.10			
Troutdale	7255	\$3,700.05			
Wood Village	2580	\$1,315.80	567742	570500	2758
WASHINGTON CO. (Unincorp.)	125161	\$63,831.89			
Beaverton	40515	\$20,662.65			
Cornelius	5090	\$2,595.90			
Durham	790	\$402.90			
Forest Grove	12120	\$6,181.20			
Hillsboro	32320	\$16,483.20			
King City	2010	\$1,025.10			
Sherwood	2990	\$1,524.90			
Tigard	25510	\$13,010.10			
Tualatin	12160	\$6,201.60	258666	287000	28334
Local Assessment	1011409	\$515,818.50	1011409	1119700	108291
Port of Portland		\$64,477.31			
Tri-Met		\$64,477.31			
TOTAL PROPOSED ASSESSMENT		\$644,773.13			

Population estimates based on PRELIMINARY July 1, 1988 certified estimates of population for Oregon cities and counties prepared by the Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University.

Unincorporated county population estimate inside Metro based upon data provided by 1980 U.S. Census data (for 1980) and by the Center for Population Research and Census (for 1988).

#### CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Step 1 - 1988 Unincorporated population estimate =	151445
1980 Census unincorporated population =	146265
Difference	5180
5180 / 142265 =	0.0354
Step 2 - .0354 X 88143 (1980 unincorporated inside Metro) =	3122
Step 3 - 3122 + 88143 (1988 unincorporated inside Metro) =	91265

#### MULTNOMAH COUNTY

Step 1 - 1988 Unincorporated population estimate =	68170
1980 Census unincorporated population =	150839
Difference	-82669
-82669 / 150839 =	-0.5481
Step 2 - -.5481 X 144790 (1980 unincorporated inside Metro) =	-79354
Step 3 - -79354 + 144790 (1988 unincorporated inside Metro) =	65436

#### WASHINGTON COUNTY

Step 1 - 1988 Unincorporated population estimate =	151365
1980 Census unincorporated population =	141368
Difference	9997
9997 / 141386 =	0.0707
Step 2 - .0707 X 117340 (1980 unincorporated inside Metro) =	8298
Step 3 - 8298 + 117340 (1988 unincorporated inside Metro) =	125638

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSULTATION PROCESS  
FY 89-90 DUES ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED ALLOCATION**

**Chronology and Process**

November 28, 1988	Executive Officer appoints local government officials to the Committee.
November 30, 1988	Letter sent to Committee members and others announcing the December 14, 1988 meeting.
December 8, 1988	Resolution 88-1016 adopted appointing Councilors Gardner and DeJardin and Councilor-elect Bauer to the Local Government Advisory Committee. Councilor Gardner appointed Chair of the Committee.
December 14, 1988	First meeting of the Committee held. Andy Cotugno, Director of Transportation, and Rich Carson, Director of Planning and Development provide overview of Metro's planning programs and progress through December 1, 1988. "Local Government Advisory Committee Program Overview, December 1988" document handed out to all in attendance.
January 4, 1989	Letter sent to Committee members and others announcing the January 25, 1989 meeting. Copies of "Local Government Advisory Committee Program Overview, December 1988" sent to those committee members who did not attend the December 14, 1988 meeting.
January 25, 1989	Second meeting of the Committee held. Andy Cotugno and Rich Carson review planning programs proposed to be funded in whole or in part by local dues and prospective budget and individual program costs. "Department Overviews" including prospective revenue breakdown by program (amount dues funded, amount funded by other sources, and total revenue needed) distributed by Cotugno and Carson. After discussion it was requested that any additional comments on proposed dues assessment and allocation be submitted by Committee members in writing within two weeks. No written comments were submitted.



**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 14, 1988 MEETING SUMMARY**

Members present

Jim Gardner, Chairman  
Larry Bauer  
Sam Cox  
Bruce Harder  
    (for Bob Post)  
Dale Harlan  
Gretchen Kafoury  
Robert Schumacher  
Alan Willis  
    (for Robert Woodell)

Members absent

Earl Blumenauer  
Wade Byers  
Tom DeJardin  
John Meek  
Donald Stephens

Others present

Rena Cusma  
Rich Carson  
Andy Cotugno  
Keith Lawton  
Patrick Lee  
Fred Neal

Chairman Gardner convened the meeting at approximately 5:35 PM. Executive Officer Cusma welcomed the Committee. She indicated that this was to be the first of two meetings. The purpose of the meeting was to bring the Committee up to speed on ongoing planning programs at Metro and the progress that had been made through December 1, 1988 on individual programs. Based on the background information provided at the first meeting it was hoped that members would be able to discuss programs with their organizations as necessary and return to the second meeting with some sense of priorities for expenditure of dues funds. The consensus of the Committee was to schedule the second meeting for January 25, 1989. Rena then turned the meeting over to Metro staff.

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Transportation Department chapter of the "Local Government Advisory Committee Program Overview, December 1988" which was distributed to all attending the meeting. Rich Carson then reviewed the Planning and Development Department chapter. General discussion of program components and objectives ensued.

The following specific requests and comments were recorded:

- o Gretchen Kafoury requested that Metro include a program to respond to the Otto Committee's recommendation that Metro coordinate a regional library system study.
- o Fred Neal requested that Metro prepare a prospective budget for expenditure of dues by program for review by the Committee. Staff indicated that had been its intent and that one would be available for the second meeting.
- o Bob Schumacher commented he was concerned about the scope of the proposed Urban Growth Management Plan and wanted assurance that it not overly encroach on local land use authority. Rich Carson responded that it was Metro's intent to construct the plan through a consensus building process in close cooperation with local jurisdictions.

- o Inclusion of 3.0 FTE temporary staff for data entry and \$18,000 in contractual services for RLIS development.
- o Inclusion of an aerial flight and photography to conduct an employment survey that will coincide with the 1990 census.

Fred Neal stated it would have been helpful if Metro had provided Committee Members with a line item comparison between FY 88-89 expenditures and proposed FY 89-90 expenditures by dues and other funding sources rather than just presenting proposed FY budget and dues allocation data. Committee members concurred with Fred Neal.

General discussion of the proposed transportation budget ensued. Interest focussed around the following two proposed line items:

- o The \$124,261 dues allocation for RLIS (Marge Kafoury).
- o The \$85,215 dues transfer to the General Fund (Fred Neal).

Andy explained the major activities toward which the General Fund transfer is allocated (building and equipment maintenance, overall District administration and management) and indicated that the proposed dues allocation noted in the Transportation budget for general fund is for the general government elements that cannot be charged to grants.

In regard to RLIS, Andy provided Marge Kafoury with a copy of the standard handout explaining its purpose and proposed capabilities. Marge asked how useful the information may be for local jurisdictions. Andy and Rich responded that it could be very useful and that they expected it to be utilized to a similar extent as existing Data Resources Center materials. Marge indicated that to her knowledge the City of Portland was not planning to utilize RLIS. Gretchen Kafoury stated that Multnomah County also was developing its own system and did not expect to utilize RLIS. Fred Neal encouraged Metro to pursue a larger percentage of private sector financing for developing RLIS.

One final question that Marge Kafoury and Fred Neal asked was whether there were many "discretionary" programs in Transportation's budget where the dues burden could be reduced other than RLIS and the General Fund Transfer. Andy indicated that most other programs were heavily leveraged with dues being utilized as local matches for federal grants.

Rich Carson presented the Planning and Development Department program and budget overview, again requesting attendees to focus on program priority for dues funding. Wade Byers objected to the budget approach indicating that it was not his job nor that of the cities in Clackamas County to balance a Metro budget that is 45 percent over balance. Rich responded that ultimately there would be a balanced budget proposed by the Executive Officer to the Council but that any direction that the Committee could provide would be helpful in discussing strategies to balance the budget.

- o Larry Bauer suggested that a valuable service Metro could provide would be to standardize regional data bases and mapping programs throughout the metropolitan area. Andy Cotugno responded that most jurisdictions in the region already utilize the demographic data generated by Metro's Data Resources Center for their comprehensive planning programs. Further, the Regional Land Information System (RLIS) that Metro proposes to develop provides the capability to standardize mapping programs across the region, although use of RLIS is a voluntary choice of local jurisdictions.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:55 PM.

with the Executive Officer.

Gretchen Kafoury asked which programs were mandatory and which were optional. Rich again reviewed the Department Overview handout indicating which were mandated programs. He concluded by cautioning the Committee members that even if a program is mandated, there is some flexibility in allocating resources to respond to the mandates so that should not be the major factor in establishing program preferences and funding priorities.

A lengthy discussion ensued on a number of the programs. The following specifics were noted:

- o Fred Neal inquired as to the scope of the business license program and its potential as a revenue generator.
- o Sam Cox indicated that there was an enforcement problem with the program in that the complaint calls regarding shoddy workmanship and the like are received and investigated by the local jurisdictions, not Metro.
- o Wade Byers stated that as long as the budget were balanced the cities of Clackamas County had no strong feelings on Metro's use of dues funds.
- o Marge Kafoury stated she needed to consult with City of Portland officials in order to firm up any recommendations on Metro's priorities for the use of dues. She also stated the City would like to see a one or two cent reduction in the per capita dues assessment or, at a minimum, to hold the line on current assessments.
- o Gretchen Kafoury stated that Metro should be concentrating on regional planning issues and regional systems coordination. She felt that the Local Government Coordination program, particularly staffing of meetings such as the Bi-State Committee, ORCA, and others was most expendable. Conducting various workshops should also be a low priority. Although personally a strong proponent of a regional library system, Gretchen stated that there may not yet be a compelling regional consensus for Metro to allocate resources to that effort. She stated that she was also very supportive of Metro's Parks and Natural Areas program but that it may also have to be scaled back to fit within budget constraints.

Rich requested that any written comments be forwarded within two weeks so that they may be considered within Metro's budget cycle. The current schedule calls for the Executive Officer to submit the FY 89-90 budget to the Council on or about March 1, 1989.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 PM.

EXHIBIT D  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The Honorable Dale Harlan  
Clackamas County Board of  
Commissioners

The Honorable John Meek  
Washington County Board of  
Commissioners

Mr. Robert Woodell, Executive Director  
Port of Portland

The Honorable H. Wade Byers, Jr.  
Mayor of Gladstone (cities of Clackamas County)

The Honorable Gretchen Kafoury  
Multnomah County Board of  
Commissioners

The Honorable Earl Blumenauer  
City of Portland Commissioner

Mr. Bob Post, Assistant General Manager  
Tri-Met

The Honorable Sam Cox  
Mayor of Troutdale (cities of Multnomah County)

The Honorable Donald Stephens  
Mayor of Durham (cities of Washington County)

The Honorable Tom DeJardin  
Metro Councilor

The Honorable Jim Gardner  
Metro Councilor

The Honorable Larry Bauer  
Metro Councilor-Elect

Mr. Bob Schumacher, Administrator  
State Intergovernmental Relations Division