

msd METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

1220 S.W. MORRISON, ROOM 300, PORTLAND, OREGON 97205 222-3671

MSD BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 1976 MEETING
S P E C I A L M E E T I N G

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ray Miller, Chairman
Mel Gordon
James Robnett
Connie McCready
Charles Becker
Miller Duris

BOARD MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Robert Schumacher

ADVISORS IN ATTENDANCE

Dean Gisvold, Attorney
John Wight
Patty Pride
John Hankee

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

None

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Charles Kemper
Merle Irvine
Jean Woodman

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
BOARD APPROVAL

NO. 76-704 DATE 12-10-76

	YES	NO	ASST.
BECKER	/		
DURIS	/		
GORDON			
McCREADY			
ROBNETT			
SCHUMACHER	/		
MILLER, CHAIRMAN	/		

Jean Woodman
Clerk of the Board

The clerk called the roll, and there being a quorum present, the Chairman called the special meeting to order to consider the Tri-County Local Government Commission's report on an areawide reorganization plan.

The Board had under consideration a summary of the Tri-County Commission's recommendations dated October 27, 1976, and copies of two proposed legislative drafts number LC 1001 and LC 1002. In reviewing the Tri-County Commission's summary, the Board designated areas of concern they felt should receive further consideration, such as: 1) the number of part-time councilors, directly elected from apportioned single-member districts, and their terms; 2) outlawing directly elected officials from holding the office; 3) use of the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University for determination of the electoral boundaries and the criteria to be used; 4) duties, salary and authority of the proposed Chief Executive Officer; 5) the general program functions and future additions of Tri-Met, Port of Portland and Boundary Commission; and 6) more detailed information on financing of the Metropolitan Service Council.

Mr. Gisvold introduced legislative drafts No. LC1001, an attempt to incorporate the commission's ideas, and No. LC1002, considered to be more in line with the Interim Committee's feelings. In discussion, the Board felt that while some response should be made to the proposed legislation, the better course may be to initiate the Board's own legislation rather than attempt to correct LC1001 and 1002. Staff indicated that any response should be made by November 15 as the Interim Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs was meeting on that day to decide action.

The Board was in consensus that a response to the Tri-County Commission proposal would be made in the form of written questions to be presented to the State Interim Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and that MSD would begin preparation for independent legislation to be submitted for consideration by the Legislature separate from LC1001 and 1002.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 P.M.