

Metro Charter Committee

PO Box 9236 • Portland, OR 97207 • 273-5570

AGENDA

DATE: August 22, 1991
MEETING: Full Committee
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: Metro, Room 440, 2000 SW 1st Avenue, Portland

- 6:00 Call meeting to order.
- Correct and re-adopt minutes from previous meetings.
- Correct and adopt minutes from August 13 meeting.
- 6:15 Discussion of Metro's future role in the region, particularly in the area of growth management.
1. Former Metro executive officer and councilors.
 2. William Blosser, Chair, State Agency Council for Growth Issues in the Portland area.
 3. Portland Future Focus, review of recommended work plan related to managing regional growth--Steve Schell, Chair, Managing Regional Growth working group.
- 8:45 Adjourn meeting.

MINUTES OF THE CHARTER COMMITTEE
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

August 22, 1991

Metro Center, Room 440

Committee Members Present: Hardy Myers (Chair), Judy Carnahan, Larry Derr, Jon Egge, Frank Josselson, Ned Look, John Meek, Wes Myllenbeck, Ray Phelps, Jr., Isaac Regenstreif, Mimi Urbigkeit

Committee Members Absent: Ron Cease, Charlie Hales, Matt Hennessee, Bob Shoemaker, Mary Tobias

Chair Myers called the regular meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

1. Possible further corrections from previously adopted minutes

Ray Phelps suggested a substantive change in the meeting of May 7, 1991 regarding the hiring of a law student for administrative services. The minutes stated a law student would be hired for legal services.

2. Correction and adoption of the August 13 minutes.

The correction and adoption of the August 13, 1991 minutes were postponed until the next regular meeting of the Metro Charter Committee.

Jon Egge asked about the list of potential people to testify before the committee.

Chair Myers stated that the list is in the stack of information passed out at the beginning of the meeting. He stated that the issue will be taken up as the last issue on tonight's agenda to enable everyone an opportunity to look over the list. The list will cover the next three meetings.

Jon Egge asked if the RUGGO's public hearings were next week.

Betsy Bergstein stated the public hearings on RUGGO's before the Planning and Transportation Committee are scheduled for next week and the week after.

3. Discussion of Metro's future role in the region with former executive officer and councilors.

Rick Gustafson, the first and former executive director of Metro, discussed the beginning of Metro. In 1979, when Rick Gustafson began, the Urban Growth Boundary had not been acknowledged. Metro changed the thinking of regional planning by substituting functional planning for comprehensive planning.

Rick Gustafson believed the role of Metro should be set up in accordance with the Urban Growth Boundary to assure there will always be a regional authority. Metro has a strong role to play in the future role of services. The charter is a significant step to establish Metro as a regional service mechanism.

Chair Myers asked how Metro fits into the growth management plan for the next ten years.

Rick Gustafson felt that Metro should play a significant role and define which land is to be developed for urban purposes in the Urban Growth Boundary. Metro should play a greater role in the annexation policies of cities. The urbanization policy is an important aspect of insuring delivery of services within the areas defined for urban growth. Metro is the only entity that can serve the role of defining which areas can be developed for urban growth, determining when the changes will be made, then dealing with the regional services that are necessary to deliver.

Wes Myllenbeck asked for clarification on designating Metro functions or setting up a minimum level of functions to be provided by all entities within the Urban Growth Boundary for all services.

Rick Gustafson stated, in the definition of urban land, land use cannot be allocated out to the jurisdictions. Items such as sewage and water can serve in that capacity.

Isaac Regenstreif asked about the next logical steps for Metro.

Rick Gustafson declared the next logical step would be to add another service. The county parks systems seems like a prime target since they are poorly supported and left aside. The counties are ready to part with the service. Portland has not been willing to discuss the change in park authority. Another issue critical to the charter is a question of policy. Specifically, whether or not Metro adopts a commission form of government or direct management form of government. The relationship between Metro and Tri-Met could also change. Rick Gustafson believed Tri-Met should be run by a commission appointed by regionally elected officials.

Chair Myers asked if it would be possible to have both forms of government, depending upon each individual service.

Rick Gustafson believed it could be possible and suggested the charter could help draw distinctions between which services would be best served through the commission or by direct operation. The Boundary Commission ought to maintain its functions and be somewhat separate from the elected officials. Some decisions should not be appealable to the elected officials.

Jon Egge asked what services should be set up by Metro and then run independently.

Rick Gustafson suggested that the Metropolitan Exhibition and Recreation Commission should be run by a commission. The elected officials should be responsible for the policy, not the day-to-day management of the services. Tri-Met and the parks systems are two other examples of services that could be run by commission.

Jon Egge said that he was confused by Rick Gustafson's opinion that Metro is a good service provider and should take an increasing role in providing services, yet MERC is run better by commission.

Rick Gustafson explained that elected leadership represents the right kind of responsive role at the policy level. With day-to-day services, democracy often deteriorates down to the districts. The day-to-day services should be handled by a commission.

Jon Egge asked for any thoughts on Metro's ability to take a broader planning role. How would a quest for service delivery hinder the move for a broader planning authority?

Rick Gustafson stated that when the local governments have the money, they control the process. He suggested the greatest mistake made with Metro was not having proper money resources. There is growing recognition and support for planning and the only place to effectively address the issue is at a regional level. Voters may not give up money for planning but there is political support for planning.

John Meek suggested that a key element is delineating the authority. The local governments are required to draft the plans and then pass them on to the regional government. A key task of the Committee is to coordinate local plans but not change them to fit into the role of Metro.

Rick Gustafson expressed surprise that the Committee must deal with the issue. Legally, there is a significant authority both at state and regional level applying to local plans. Regionally elected officials or state commission can reverse local plans.

John Meek gave an example of Forest Grove not receiving adequate regional assistance regarding the Urban Growth Boundary.

Rick Gustafson stated that the Urban Growth Boundary law is a state law and is solid.

Isaac Regenstreif asked about financing of Metro.

Rick Gustafson suggested giving Metro as much taxing authority as imaginable and making it all voted upon. The voters tend to respond positively to ballot measures where one particular service is put before the voters.

Frank Josselson asked if there were land use planning authorities not exercised by CRAG or Metro that Rick Gustafson would have like to exercise or add.

Rick Gustafson felt the opposite was true. There was authority in Metro's law regarding functional planning authority that Metro would have been well served to have had more opportunity to investigate early on as an appropriate planning mechanism. Effort put into better comprehending the importance of functional planning authority given to Metro would have been worthwhile.

Frank Josselson asked if that was an experiment undertaken by the early days of Metro.

Rick Gustafson said that comprehensive planning authority was taken away under Metro but there still was much coordination. Metro became a supporter of individual comprehensive plans rather than an enforcer of state rules.

Frank Josselson stated that many people are uncomfortable with the model of 27 local comprehensive plans. What is Metro's role in the process to improve the current situation without creating a homogenous region?

Rick Gustafson stated that the basis of the problem is fundamental to SB 100 and the whole process, which is building the comprehensive plans from the base up. There are trade offs associated, such as difficulty adding up the plans. There are good regional and state wide standards that are set which are going to improve it even more. If commitment is not created at the local level, chances are it won't be reached.

Frank Josselson gave the example of Happy Valley in respect to housing. He asked Rick Gustafson if that plan was a good idea for the region.

Rick Gustafson did not have a disagreement with the way Happy Valley was treated.

Ned Look asked for specifics in regard to the election of council members on a full time or part time basis, appointed executive director or elected executive director.

Rick Gustafson stated that there was a natural tension between the council and the executive officer. The organization would be well served to have the policy head be the chair of the council not as the executive officer. The region-wide elected official should be the full time chair of the Council. Rick Gustafson suggested cutting down the number of Councilors so they can function. With a large number, there are frustrations with communications and reaching decisions. Rick Gustafson noted he prefers the commission style of government.

Ned Look asked about full time and full pay for the Council.

Rick Gustafson said yes, all the Councilors need to be full time with full pay.

Jon Egge asked if Rick Gustafson had any specific number recommendation.

Rick Gustafson suggested an odd number, under nine members.

Sharron Kelley, past Metro Councilor and current Multnomah County Commissioner, distributed the written testimony of Gary Hansen who was also a Metro Councilor and is currently a Multnomah County Commissioner. Sharron Kelley read Commissioner Hansen's testimony to the Committee. Commissioner Hansen believed that the charter must be flexible and should give Metro sweeping power to define and solve regional problems as they occur.

Sharron Kelley continued by distributing her written testimony. Commissioner Kelley believed that the region and Multnomah County would benefit if Metro would expand its role as a community development provider. In addition to its current responsibilities, Metro should take on the following related roles: the funding and development of a regional park system; the funding and enhancement of the three-county library system; region-wide emergency planning; the funding of the arts; and land use planning responsibilities outside the urban growth boundary.

Corky Kirkpatrick, former Metro Councilor, agreed with the comments of Sharron Kelley and Rick Gustafson. She suggested being visionary and flexible to allow for expansion as additional services are needed but for Metro not to impose things on the region before the region is ready. Corky Kirkpatrick asked the committee to look at the Minnesota taxing plan where new industries pay part of a tax to the region and part to the jurisdiction in which it is located. The executive officer position should be eliminated and the chair of the council should be a regionally elected policy official. Size does not really

matter. A smaller, full time council will make it more political and not as many people will run.

Charlie Williamson, former Metro Councilor, agreed that there should be broad taxing power authority but there should be a consensus for a desire for Metro to use its taxing authority. The role of Metro Councilor is difficult: there is too much to do for a part-time Councilor. As the number of functions increase, so does the job. The Councilors should all be equal. By having one full time Councilor, it would be easy for the Council to be bulldozed. Charlie Williamson suggested looking at a City Manager form of government with possibly a five member, full time council and an appointed city manager. He also expressed concern that Metro not take over Tri-Met at this time.

Richard Waker, former Metro Councilor from 1982-1988, urged the Committee to wear their "regional hats" during the formation of the charter. Any authority Metro receives gets taken away from someone. Regional issues are driven by local issues: the local governments decide what they want and need and the regional government finds the time and money to work with the regional planning.

Ernie Bonner, former Metro Councilor, suggested that Metro have the widest possible authority. He noted that a full time Council is not needed nor is an executive officer. A simple body of part time Councilors to establish the policy and commissions doing the day to day work would be better because it would eliminate the politics and the bickering between the executive officer and council. The St. Paul/Minneapolis area is a good model for the Committee to follow. He suggested that the next services of Metro will be related to the growth problem, such as the financing of pipes to control the growth.

Jane Rhodes, former Metro Councilor, asked the Committee to keep in mind cost efficiency and the efficiency of service being formed through the Charter. The voters will not support another level of bureaucracy.

Elsa Coleman, former Metro Councilor, suggested that growth management is managing what exists to its highest and best use and making sure that new developments contribute to the community rather than distract from it. Growth management is also managing the manifestation of growth. With transportation demand management, Metro's role is to bring the state plan and the local governments together and blend in the transportation management plan.

Isaac Regenstreif asked for suggestions from the former Councilors on how to craft something that is plausible for a highly suspect and hostile voting public.

Jane Rhodes suggested that volunteers sound better than full paid people. 'Politician' is not a bad word but the voters may not agree.

Charlie Williamson stated that Metro has a lot of authority on the books right now so the voters really do not need to approve it all over again. Allow for future authority growth by voter consent later.

Corky Kirkpatrick asked the Committee to take its time with the Charter process.

Elsa Coleman said the people need to understand the incentive for a Charter. People do not understand the idea of a Charter.

4. Discussion of Metro's future role in the region with the State Agency Council for Growth Issue in the Portland Area.

William Blosser, Chair of the State Agency Council for Growth Issues in the Portland Area and LCDC Chair, distributed a packet of information including Executive Order No. - 91 - 07 which created the State Agency Council for Growth Issues in the Portland Area. He also distributed the 1990 report of the State Agency Council. Bill Blosser outlined the State Agency Council roles and responsibilities: to identify and articulate the state's interest in the Portland metropolitan area; to coordinate and cooperate with local and regional governments to identify and address growth related issues; to foster coordination among state agencies to ensure that the state's regulatory, programmatic, and capital investment decisions in the region are consistent with both the state's interest and regional and local growth management objectives; and to serve as a forum for problem solving where proposed actions by one state agency may conflict with the goals of another with respect to growth in the region. Bill Blosser explained that the State Agency Council was established by Governor Goldschmidt for two reasons: the three state agency representatives on JPACT were not always voting together and there is a vital state interest that the metropolitan government succeed. The State Agency Council believes there is a need for Metro or a similar agency taking the role to resolve growth-related issues in the Metropolitan area. From the State Agency's Point of view, if a weak Metro is created, many issues will be tossed into the lap of state agencies. The issues will need to be solved and the state will have to reluctantly step in. Bill Blosser suggested that the Committee look at the writing of a Charter as a long term issue with an outlook for the next 50 years rather than the next five to ten years. He also brought attention to the State Agency Council work program in the back of the executive order packet.

Frank Josselson asked if the State Agency Council has identified and articulated the State's interest in the Metropolitan area.

Bill Blosser explained that the State Agency Council has not articulated an independent vision of the state's interest because everything that has been going on does not seem to violate the state interest, so it should be supported.

Frank Josselson asked if the state's interest is consistent with the regional interest.

Bill Blosser agreed that is true.

Frank Josselson wondered if the voters would appreciate eliminating a level of government by turning the issues over to the State Agency Council.

Bill Blosser stated that, since the Council has not discussed the issue, the comments are his own. The argument can be made for all levels of government. People like better what they create and are more willing to accept it. Those at a higher level do not necessarily have any more insight than regional government. It would be better not to substitute regional concerns with state values.

Frank Josselson said he understood the premise of the State Agency Council to be that the state knows what is better for the region. He asked if the region is entitled to the perception that it is doing its best.

Bill Blosser said that is not exactly what he meant. Governor Goldschmidt's motivation to begin the State Agency Council was because of the appearance and concern that Metro was going to explode. The Governor was concerned the Metro process was falling apart and the state would have to play a bigger role in the process. The state agencies were not of one mind regarding what should happen in the metropolitan area.

Frank Josselson asked about the decisions that the region was not making, which it should have been making, that created the urgency to form the State Agency Council.

Bill Blosser stated that the state was making decisions without consulting the regional people. The State Agency Council is a group that the Governor felt should get together and talk about the issues in the Portland area so that they could agree on the stand. The state is concerned with the success of the regional programs.

Frank Josselson asked if the State Agency Council felt more comfortable with RUGGO's than it did before.

Bill Blosser said the process was good but since RUGGO's isn't adopted, anything can happen.

Frank Josselson asked if Bill Blosser would come back during the RUGGO's discussion to present the State Agency Council's opinion.

Bill Blosser said he would.

Wes Myllenbeck noted that Clark County is really part of the Metro region and asked if the State is looking for any way to make the bi-state relationship more formal before the federal government comes in and forces the states to work together on certain issues.

Bill Blosser stated that Governor Roberts and past Governor Goldschmidt have both looked at ways to have a bi-state relationship with Clark County. There are a number of informal bi-state relations currently. Governor Roberts is considering putting an ex officio member on the State Agency Council from Washington. Metro is also being asked if it would like to participate in the planning process Clark County is currently going through. Clark County is going through the same planning process that Oregon started 20 years ago.

Wes Myllenbeck noted that if the Committee is to look 50 to a 100 years in the future, Clark County has to be an integral part of it. Possibly places further up Cowlitz County should also be looked at.

Bill Blosser said that those who have a history of working with Clark County have said that Clark County have not been interested in talking in a cooperative way. Clark County believed that they wanted all the boundless growth they could have. They viewed Portland as a threat to that desire. Now, they seem open and desirous to work together with Portland.

Ray Phelps asked if Clark County and Metro were working together on transportation data.

Bill Blosser said that is true.

Chair Myers asked if there were any other growth issues that have not been mentioned.

Bill Blosser stated that one issue for the State Agency Council is how would the state know if something happening in Metro was in the state's interest? Many of the issues are value judgements, not measurable. The State Agency Council is beginning to look at the specific cost issues relating to the decision making. For example, rather than looking simply at the building costs, a comparison would be made to project what the construction would bring into the area.

Ned Look asked for Bill Blosser's thoughts on how the head of Tri-Met should be appointed.

Bill Blosser stated that he has not thought about it and does not feel qualified to answer, but the same question could also be asked for the Port of Portland.

5. Discussion of Metro's future role in the region with Portland Future Focus

Steve Schell, chair of the Growth Management Task Force, stated that the Portland Future Focus viewpoint is from the Portland base out to the whole region. The perspective taken by Portland Future Focus dealt with what is good for Portland, but at the same time, what is good for the region. Portland must be an integral part of the region and responsive to the region's needs for the community to remain healthy.

Steve Schell explained the concerns from the Portland Future Focus environmental scan. First, within the next 20 years, 500,000 more people are expected to enter the region. How can the region absorb these people without losing its livability? Second, the consequences of Ballot Measure Five probably will result in more reliance on user fees. How will this impact the lower, middle, and upper classes? The goal of Portland Future Focus is to manage regional growth to provide effective public services at the lowest possible cost to improve environmental quality and enhance the quality of life.

Steve Schell outlined the programs of Portland Future Focus. First, a shift of transportation investment criteria should give more emphasis to natural resources consumption factors. Transportation planning has been responsive to the regional growth planning. The planning needs to be more basic. Second, revisions need to be made in the state constitutional structure and state legislation to provide a special vehicle registration fee in the Metro area to update air quality transportation systems and improve street and transportation systems. Third, toll highways are needed to provide a disincentive to use busy roads during peak periods. Fourth, in addition to the Max lines to Gresham, 185th, and Hillsboro, the lines to Vancouver and Oregon City need to be finished as soon as possible. Fifth, linked natural areas and the open space program should be extended to include all areas of the region. A key to livability is open space. Sixth, Metro should take the lead for zoning and mixed uses along light rail corridors. Seventh, the Urban Growth Boundary should be recognized and the relationship between the Urban Growth Boundary to the outlying area needs to be determined. A broader perspective for the Urban Growth Boundary should include Yamhill County, Scappose, Hood River, and St. Helens.

Steve Schell stated that planning needs to be futurist, beyond the next 50 years, to maintain the open spaces and farmlands, and it will justifiably allow a shift in growth to the outlying area

because they will have the services they need. With greater density comes better land use. The area will be served better by the present transportation system if there are higher concentrated areas. Portland Future Focus would like to see Washington County, Multnomah County, and Clackamas County combine and become one county under Metro. Affordable housing needs to be in various parts of the area. Interspersing low, middle, and high income housing areas would cut down on the amount of transportation by eliminating commutes across town for work. This would increase livability by cutting down the amount of time spent on the road. Metro needs to take a role in a regional housing plan especially, but not limited to, low incoming housing.

Frank Josselson asked if the group does not recommend changing the Metro boundary for now.

Steve Schell stated that is correct for three reasons: Portland Future Focus recognizes the function of the Urban Growth Boundary, there needs to be a 50-year vision to take a look at the area, and the presumption of no change.

Chair Myers asked if it that was for Metro Boundary.

Steve Schell said no, those reasons were for the Urban Growth Boundary. The group did not specifically discuss the Metro Boundary.

Frank Josselson asked if Newberg was mentioned as part of the region.

Steve Schell stated that Newberg would be considered part of the region in the 50-year vision.

Frank Josselson asked if Sandy and Canby would also be included.

Steve Schell answered yes.

Frank Josselson asked how to consolidate the three counties to make them one under Metro without changing the Urban Growth Boundary or the Metro boundary.

Steve Schell said that is an implementation question. It is more a question of services than boundaries.

Frank Josselson stated that Metro's jurisdiction does not extend beyond the Metro boundaries. He asked who would serve the unincorporated areas outside the Metro boundary.

Steve Schell said Metro could play a role in the unincorporated areas.

Frank Josselson asked how that was possible if the boundaries did not extend to cover the unincorporated areas.

Steve Schell thought it would be a statutory change. The Portland Future Focus chose not to be restricted by boundaries when it was making its recommendations.

Frank Josselson asked if the Charter should propose the elimination of the three counties and the merging of them with Metro.

Steve Schell stated he has not reviewed the enabling legislation to know if the Committee has the authority to make that change. If the Committee has the authority, it should move ahead with the change.

Chair Myers stated that the issue of rearranging governmental units is a legislative issue.

Frank Josselson explained that his question was whether or not the Committee has the power to make that type of change.

Steve Schell stated his impression is that the Committee would not have the power.

Frank Josselson asked what the Committee should work on during the interim.

Steve Schell suggested working on functions. The Committee could have a great impact deciding what functions were properly local or regional functions.

Ned Look felt that Steve Schell linked Metro very closely with Tri-Met. He asked if Metro should accelerate its vision to take over Tri-Met.

Steve Schell stated that Portland Future Focus did not discuss the issue but his personal opinion is that Metro ought to take over Tri-Met and there should be an elected board responsible for Tri-Met.

Chair Myers stated that it will be arranged for the committee to receive the section of the Portland Future Focus report that Steve Schell discussed.

6. Review of the Potential Testimony List

Chair Myers asked the Committee to review the potential testimony list which will be the components of the next three meetings. The RUGGO's presentation will be September 12, 1991.

Ray Phelps stated that he and John Meek both believe input from Washington County and Clackamas County Chambers of Commerce should be heard from. Also, public utilities such as PP&L, PGE, and NW Natural Gas should be heard from as well as telephone companies.

Ned Look suggested adding Senator Glenn Otto who chaired the regional task force on METRO.

Isaac Regenstreif noted he would like to hear from citizen groups with a broad regional perspective such as the League of Women Voters, 1000 Friends, and Oregonians in Action.

Jon Egge expressed concern about not hearing from small businesses and groups with interests outside of the Metro or the Urban Growth Boundary. He stated that he would like the Chambers of Commerce from Clackamas and Washington Counties and the citizens groups to specifically address these issues.

Ray Phelps suggested the Farm Bureau.

Wes Myllenbeck added the Portland Water Bureau.

Larry Derr would like to hear from the special districts although he realizes they are very large.

Chair Myers stated that, due to the large number of special districts, the Special District Association will be asked to testify.

Jon Egge asked if that means one person will come in to testify.

Chair Myers expressed his desire for more than one person to represent the special districts and noted that individual districts could be notified at a later date to testify.

Isaac Regenstreif expressed interest to hear from the City Club of Portland and Washington County Forum.

Chair Myers noted the meetings will need to be lengthened in order to hear all the testimony. The meetings will begin at 5:30 p.m. for the next few weeks.

Frank Josselson asked to be informed as soon as possible of the testimony for the next meeting.

7. Facilitator discussion

Chair Myers mentioned the names of facilitators to be considered. Those names are: Don Barney, Elaine Cogan, Kathleen Dotten, Frank Elardo, and Sandra Saran. Chair Myers proposed naming a subcommittee of three, one from each county, to help with the

selection of the facilitator. If there are any additions, talk to Janet Whitfield to add them to the list.

Isaac Regenstreif suggested adding Lenny Borer.

Ned Look asked if the meetings of September 19 and September 26 will begin at 5:30 p.m.

Jon Egge stated that the calendar still shows Metro Powers and Functions for August 29 and September 12. He asked if that is what the Committee will be discussing.

Chair Myers stated that those dates will be invited testimony.

Jon Egge asked if RUGGO's was set for September 12 because the majority of the Council and Committee members could meet that day.

Chair Myers said that was correct as well as fit Mary Tobias' schedule since she had the initial inquiry.

Frank Josselson asked if the last public hearing of RUGGO's is September 10th.

Betsy Bergstein stated that the public hearings are before the Planning and Transportation Committee. It goes before the Metro Council at the end of September.

Chair Myers stated that the Committee's concern was that it be taken up before the Council takes action on RUGGO's. As Chair Myers understands it, action does not occur until the end of September.

Frank Josselson asked if the Metro Council hearing will take place at the end of September.

Ned Look stated there will be a hearing on September 26.

Frank Josselson expressed concern that the calendar lists public hearing comments and Metro Council hearing. He understood a hearing to be where things are adopted sometimes without testimony.

Betsy Bergstein explained that the Council will hear testimony in the beginning before adopting anything.

Frank Josselson asked if everything before September 26 is before the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Metro Council hearing and possible action is September 26.

Chair Myers reworded the statement to say the first date possible for action by the Metro Council is September 26.

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimi Iboshi

Kimi Iboshi

Reviewed by,

Janet Whitfield

Janet Whitfield

approved 9/26/91

Materials following this page represent
Public Testimony



Testimony of Sharron Kelley

Metro Charter Committee

August 22, 1991

I would like to share with you some principles which I believe should guide your view of how Metro fits into the arrangement of local governance and some examples of how these general principles apply to the division of services.

It is useful to divide local public services into two primary categories. The first category consists of those services which address public safety and social problems: this category includes police, fire, jails, community corrections, prosecution, juvenile detention and probation, health services, and social services such as alcohol and drug treatment, mental health, and aging services.

The second category consists of those services which maintain and enhance the quality of life or development of the community: this category includes economic development, the zoo, the library, the arts, parks, open space, land use planning, transportation, water, sewers, and solid waste.

This division of services represents a useful approach to some of the issues this committee faces because there is a compelling logic to segregating at an organizational level the local public agencies which focus on the public safety package from the local public agencies which focus on community development and quality of life services. Such a division promotes organizational unity of purpose - which would be either community development or public safety. It also permits the resources set aside for each purpose to be focused on the steps which will best advance the objective.

The problems of the absence of such an organizational division include some very difficult apples versus oranges decisions that local elected officials face, and the risk faced by certain services such as parks and libraries, as they must compete at the city level with police and fire, and at the county level with jails and human services.

The current array of services that Metro provides -- the zoo, spectator facilities, growth management and solid waste -- identify Metro as an agency of the second category, providing

services directed primarily at quality of life and community development.

My experience with Multnomah County, a county with a disproportionate share of the social service and public safety burden within the region, has led me to the firm conclusion that the region and the county with both benefit if Metro expands its role as a community development provider, allowing the county to focus its resources on addressing social problems.

Under such an approach, Metro should maintain its current responsibilities and take on the following related roles: first, the funding and development of a regional park system; second, the funding and enhancement of the three-county library system; third, regionwide emergency planning; fourth, the funding of the arts; and fifth, land use planning responsibilities outside the urban growth boundary. This would give Metro an array of services consisting of growth management planning, emergency planning, transportation planning, land use planning, solid waste, the zoo, regional parks, open space, libraries, the arts, spectator facilities, and the Convention Center.

The recommendation that Metro play a role in land use planning within the three counties outside the urban growth boundary is not commonly made and merits further justification here. In Multnomah County, its department of land use planning is very small and this has inspired suggestions that it merge into that of a city. The primary function for the land use planning department at Multnomah County is the maintenance of resource lands outside the urban growth boundary, a function which is not a primary purpose of city or urban land use planning agencies. This is a function which matches the land use planning activities of the other two counties outside the urban growth boundary, and fits well with the role of Metro in setting the urban growth boundary. The responsibility of Metro for growth management and the protection of open spaces can logically extend to include the preservation of farm and forest uses. Further, Metro can provide direct, elected representation for the affected rural areas, which would prevent the disenfranchisement that would occur if the counties contracted with the cities for land use planning. One interim approach to such a role for Metro would be to consolidate staffing for these land use approvals while initially leaving the actual land use decisions to the counties.

Let me conclude by noting that our land use patterns have created a single Portland metropolitan region whose borders are of far more significance than those which divide the cities and

the counties. The future of this region will be promoted best by a government, Metro, whose boundaries reflect the region.

The need for a regional government is more clear and immediate in Multnomah County than in Clackamas or Washington counties; this factor has always posed a significant barrier to some who say that, at least initially, the distribution of the services mentioned in my testimony would be inequitable. But I would not let such arguments derail you; figure out the services that it makes sense for the region for Metro to provide, and in the long run, the distribution of these services within the region will be equitable, as Metro responds to the needs.

1615L - 38

GARY HANSEN
Multnomah County Commissioner
District 2



605 County Courthouse
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 248-5219

August, 1991

METRO'S FUTURE

Thank you, Chair Myers, for inviting me to discuss Metro's future with you and your colleagues.

As a former Metro councilor, and currently a commissioner for Multnomah County, I have participated in the workings of regional political systems for ten years. The only conclusion a thinking person can make, if they have been directly involved in regional problem solving, is that the current system is slow, expensive, and incapable of dealing with the explosive growth facing the metropolitan area.

My best advice to you is give Metro sweeping power to define and solve regional problems. Trust the voters to elect wise people with regional vision and empower them to find regional solutions. To do less, is to invite disaster.

Why Metro? Only Metro speaks for every voter in the region. And, Metro executives and most councilors quickly develop a sense of responsibility for the entire region. Simply put, it is their job to do so and most rise to it. Local officials have a completely different job, and that is to address local problems and concerns in a cost effective, timely manner. To expect them to expend time, effort and treasure SOLVING REGIONAL ISSUES that are of a low PRIORITY IN THEIR LOCALITY, IS NAIVE and UNREALISTIC.

The nature of regional problems is that they seldom impact the whole region at the same time, or to the same degree. Transportation issues are currently critical in Washington County, but are minor in North Portland. On the other hand, crime and gang violence are major concerns in city neighborhoods. Both problems have, however, serious regional implications. But, local officials are reluctant to deal with "other peoples' problems" until there is enormous impact across the region. By then, the issues are much more expensive to handle, or worse -- unsolvable.

The new Metro Charter must be flexible so Metro can define regional problems and issues as they occur. No one, at this

time, is advocating that Metro play a major role in the field of public health. However, AIDS may necessitate a regional strategy. Could Metro save lives by working with local health agencies to create a functional plan for AIDS prevention? Are other approaches viable? Perhaps -- but don't preclude Metro as the possible agency for solution to any problem.

Would Metro abuse its authority? Why? If local government can solve a problem, it will. Metro will and should have plenty to do. But let Metro with its regional vision and responsibility judge what is truly of regional import, rather than local officials who are charged to look only within their limited boundaries and budgets.

My great-grandparents arrived in Washington County one hundred, twenty years ago. My grandfather helped dig Lake Oswego. As a boy, my father delivered The Sunday Oregonian by pony cart from Hillsdale to Scholls -- he had twenty-seven customers. The Tigard Grade School District had to add a second school bus the year that I started first grade. Just thirty years ago, Tigard, Beaverton, Gresham were very separate entities; Portland had defined limits. This is no more. From Forest Grove to Troutdale, from Orchards to Oregon City, one entity has emerged ... One economy ... One set of problems, albeit in differing degrees ... One set of common resources.

Metro, and only Metro, can bring together all the region's resources and focus them on COMMON PROBLEMS. This REGION WILL GROW, and if HISTORY REFLECTS the future, the growth will be unimaginable. The PROBLEMS, TOO. But, IF YOU CREATE A STRONG METRO, WE CAN BRING ABOUT THE CREATIVE ENERGY OF THE ENTIRE REGION TO MANAGE OUR INEVITABLE GROWTH, AND TO SOLVE URBAN PROBLEMS WHILE THEY ARE STILL SOLVABLE.