

**METRO
CHARTER
COMMITTEE**

P.O. Box 9236 • Portland • Oregon 97207
Phone 503-273-5570 • Fax 503-273-5554

AGENDA

DATE: December 19, 1991
MEETING: Full Committee
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: Gresham City Hall, Conference Rooms A&B, 1333 NW
Eastman Parkway *

6:00 Call meeting to order.

Correct and adopt minutes from December 5 meeting
(previously distributed).

6:10 Discussion of principles to be used in consideration of
Metro structure.

9:00 Adjourn meeting.

* **Directions:** Going east on Banfield Freeway (I-84), take exit
#13 and go south on 181st Avenue about 1 1/4
miles. Turn left onto Burnside and go east about
1 1/2 miles. Turn right onto Eastman Parkway
(same as 223rd and next to a K-Mart) and go south
about one block. City Hall is on the right, and
the conference rooms are in the annex building
just in front, at the western edge of the parking
lot.

MINUTES OF THE CHARTER COMMITTEE
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

December 19, 1991

Gresham City Hall, Conference Rooms A and B

Committee Members Present: Hardy Myers (Chair), Judy Carnahan, Ron Cease, Larry Derr, Jon Egge, Charlie Hales, Matt Hennessee, Frank Josselson, Ned Look, Wes Myllenbeck, Ray Phelps, Bob Shoemaker, Mary Tobias, Mimi Urbigkeit

Committee Members Absent: John Meek, Isaac Regenstreif

Chair Myers called the regular meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

1. Correction and adoption of minutes.

Chair Myers asked for corrections to the December 5, 1991 minutes.

Motion: Wes Myllenbeck moved, Ray Phelps seconded, to approve the minutes as distributed.

Vote on the Main Motion: All present voted aye. The vote was unanimous and the minutes were approved.

2. Staff update of previously requested information.

Janet Whitfield said that biographies had not been received from Ron Cease, Larry Derr, Charlie Hales, Matt Hennessee, Frank Josselson, and Wes Myllenbeck.

Janet Whitfield said that, at the December 12 meeting, there was a request for copies of model city charters. She said that copies of the University of Oregon Bureau of Governmental Research and Service *Model Charter for Oregon Cities* and *Model Charter for Oregon Counties* is available to the members if they would like a copy. The National Civic League *Model City Charter* costs \$12.00 each. She asked if the Committee wanted her to order copies.

Chair Myers said that she should order 16 copies.

3. Discussion of principles to be used in consideration of Metro structure.

Chair Myers said that the Committee discussed two major alternatives for structure at the last meeting. The first alternative is similar to the current system with administrative authority in a separately elected executive and a legislative body elected by single member districts to exercise the legislative powers of the district. The basic organization of the administration would be left to the council, except where the charter might prescribe the organization. For example, the continuation of the Tri-Met Board of Directors should Tri-Met come under the regional government. The second alternative would be the same but with a manager function in lieu of a separately elected executive. He said that he would like the Committee to continue the discussion to get the major structural

conception before the Committee that the members would like to have as part of the discussion.

Mary Tobias said that she envisions the government structure as an elected body. She said that the Committee needs to define the relationship between the regional governing body and the local governing body and how that relationship occurs. She said that it is the bigger question that must be dealt with before getting down to the smaller issues. She said that there is strong intent in the region for the charter to achieve a partnership between the local and regional governments.

Chair Myers suggested that Mary Tobias' points be returned to later. He said that he understood Mary Tobias as saying that the issue of partnership may have to be considered in terms of the way in which the council is put together---whether all the councilors will be elected versus a partially elected and partially appointed council.

Mary Tobias said that she does not have a set conception of what it should look like. It should, somehow, include the partnership.

Jon Egge asked if Mary Tobias was suggesting that the partnership be the only measurement that the Committee uses.

Mary Tobias said that it should not be the only measure, but it is important.

Bob Shoemaker asked what the partnership would entail.

Mary Tobias said that, from the beginning, members have spoken on the importance of setting up a system in which the roles of the local and regional governments are defined. There needs to be a process for things to transition from local to regional control and back. There needs to be a clear understanding that says that all the governments are in it together for the future of the region. The charter needs to tell the regional government that part of its duty is to ensure that the coordination continues in order to decrease the chances of governments inserting their own agendas.

Jon Egge asked if the current structure accomplishes that.

Mary Tobias said it does off and on. She said that she is not talking about what the Council looks like, but it is more basic than that.

Chair Myers said that apart from trying to build a hybrid body--a body that mingles people elected to other positions with people who are elected as Metro councilors--one approach would be to add provisions which would require the regional government to structurally involve local governments in the decision making process in the way that it now does with JPACT.

Mary Tobias said that the additional provisions would be cleaner than having a hybrid form.

Chair Myers asked if it would be responsive, structurally, to the point Mary Tobias was making.

Mary Tobias said that the debate leading to the decision making needs to be done with the broadest possible local government input.

Matt Hennessee said that when he considers structure in the charter, he thinks of it as what are the branches within the government and what is expected of the various branches. He asked if that was where the Committee was heading.

Chair Myers said that Mary Tobias' point could be an inclusion in the initial piece of the charter that

describes what the objectives are, but it also lends itself to being addressed as a part of the structure that the charter describes.

Matt Hennessee said that he understands Chair Myers as saying that before leaping into all the other things, there should be an understanding of what the objectives of the structure are.

Mary Tobias said that the collaborative model is a good one to be considered in the list of alternatives.

Ron Cease said that it is a perennial problem. Metro is a general government but it is also a device to do a lot of intergovernmental relations for existing units of government. The local governments are part of the constituent body for Metro. He said that some of the major difficulties of having other elected officials on the council is that they do not have time, they do not know what they should be doing, and they have not determined who they are obligated to. He said that the places where they have tried a hybrid mix, it has not worked to well.

Mary Tobias said that the collaborative arrangement that she envisioned would include an elected body and an appointed group--along the lines of JPACT or RPAC--which would involve the local governments in the regional decision making.

Charlie Hales asked for feedback on JPACT from Committee members who have been involved with it. He said that he has heard reports saying that it is a good mechanism and works well and that it has money to hand out so it naturally is going to be great.

Jon Egge said that he served five years on TPAC, which is the technical side of JPACT, and that both statements are correct. They have money so they are successful, but the measure of success is questionable. When money is being split up, a lot of times planning takes the back seat. He said that, in his opinion, it is the quality of Metro staff that makes it work as well as it does.

Bob Shoemaker asked about the procedure, size, and authority of JPACT.

Mary Tobias said that there are 16 people on JPACT.

Jon Egge said that some are elected officials from the counties.

Janet Whitfield said that it is a configuration similar to the way the charter committee was drawn up.

Jon Egge said that Metro has the ability to over-ride JPACT, but has not done that yet. If that happens, then the model may not be so perfect.

Bob Shoemaker asked how many Metro Councilors are on JPACT.

Wes Myllenbeck said that there are two councilors plus the Director of Transportation, the Director of the Port of Portland, the Director of DEQ, Tri-Met, the counties each have one representative, and there is also one representative from the cities in the three counties.

Chair Myers asked how many different committees are in place at Metro that are similar to JPACT.

Betsy Bergstein said that JPACT is the only one. RPAC will be similar. She said that Metro has other committees, such as the rate review committee, but they are not structured like JPACT.

Chair Myers asked if the committees provide an opportunity for collaboration and assistance to Metro

in the decision making.

Betsy Bergstein said yes.

Ken Gervais said that JPACT is unique because it is the metropolitan planning organization designated by the government. Some aspects of JPACT's activities can be rejected by the Metro council but they cannot be amended. There are other activities where JPACT can amend, reject, or accept.

Chair Myers asked how the solid waste rate review committee is composed.

Ray Phelps said that most advisory committees spin off of the JPACT model which is a federal process for the distribution of money. Membership varies depending on the issue. The size and constituency tend to determine one another.

Chair Myers suggested leaving the specifics of the collaboration to the regional government and not trying to define, in the charter, the composition of the different bodies that might be formed for the collaboration.

Mary Tobias said that if the partnership concept is supported enough to call out a process, such as a continuation of the RPAC concept, in the regional governance structure, then when discussing what the council will look like, the insurance for broad base input will already be there. A large technical advisory process built into the structure will help to build regional consensus and direction. When talking about the council, some of the issues fall away because there is a good strong foundation under the elected body. It can also begin to get at the issues that go across state lines and issues that cannot be grasped in any other way.

Matt Hennessee asked if the group or groups, underneath and advisory to the regional council, would be wrestling with issues and raising them up.

Mary Tobias said that is true in part. She said that it would be up to the regional government.

Ray Phelps asked why there needs to be a clause for advisory committees in the charter. He said that Oregonians have a strong tradition of creating advisory processes. Institutionalizing advisory committees creates a monster because it is a mandate that may not be needed.

Chair Myers said that the conception would go as far as, but no further than, a direction to the regional government to utilize advisory committees. If there is a distinction between the regional government and the local governments, it is that the regional government has a hierarchical arrangement and a regional coordinating function that is not matched in terms of other local governments. The discussion was suggesting one way in which the charter would spell out a requirement addressing the issue of cooperation while leaving the specifics to the regional government.

Ray Phelps said that the only government bigger than the regional government is the state government and it does not have a mandate either. He said that he did not understand why it needs to be in the charter.

Chair Myers said that it is a fair debate point--whether or not there will be a provision in the charter regarding advisory committees.

Charlie Hales said that he would like to hear more about the divergence over the elected executive versus council president issue. He said that one of the measurements ought to be what is working well and what is not working well in the current Metro structure.

Chair Myers said that the discussion that Charlie Hales is suggesting is an issue that could lead to the discussion around the organization of the government. He said that he would like to discuss the commission organization first.

Jon Egge said that the diagram that was done early on in the process is not close to a final concept for a commission organization. The concept is that the service delivery, of groups such as the MERC, Tri-Met if part of Metro, and the solid waste commission, would be handled through commissions. Any function worthy of service delivery directly to the public ought to have the services delivered through commissions. He said that the theory relates to all of what the regional government would do. He said that the biggest need is in the planning area. He said that there are a couple of ways to approach the planning process. He said that the typical city model could be used where the planning function is handed off to a planning commission and the planning commission does most of the planning. He said that it is his opinion that the government ought to do the planning in a pure environment. The service delivery function is not the need of the public. The pure environment concept brings up the question of whether or not it should be a general purpose government. He said that most of what the regional government will be doing in service delivery in the next ten years is already being done by the regional government now. He said that they have barely begun the planning function.

Chair Myers asked if there would be an executive officer under Jon Egge's conception.

Jon Egge said that his preference is that there would be an appointed executive officer. He said that there could either be an appointed or elected officer. It is not crucial to the commission form that it is one way or another.

Chair Myers asked how planning would be organized.

Jon Egge said that the planning would be done by an elected governing body, with its own staff, in a visible and accountable manner. The elected body would have complete financial control of the commissions. They would have appointment and removal authority. He said that it is important that the commissions be maintained in the purest form possible.

Ron Cease said that there needs to be highly qualified people in the planning process. They do need to be separated in part from the political process, recognizing that the elected body has to be responsible for it. Frequently, the planners believe that if the politicians were taken out of the process, the planners could do a better job. They might be able to do a better job but it would be divorced from the political process. He said that the Boundary Commission has had the most difficulties in very large political arenas where they did not have adequate political responsibility. He said that at no time a government is created from scratch. In building on what is there, the various pieces need to be looked at. He said that the reason the Committee accepted the notion that Tri-Met would remain a commission if it became a part of Metro because it currently operates under a commission form and is successful. It does not make sense to require a commission in all cases. Each commission needs to be looked at separately. In most instances, that decision would be left up to the elected process. He said that it is a public responsibility and must be accountable to the larger public. If there is going to be an elected body, then it needs to have the final responsibility for the running of the organization. There needs to be an accountability between it and the public for everything that the organization does.

Mary Tobias asked if the commission members would serve as volunteers.

Jon Egge said that it is his vision that they not be paid although it is not crucial.

Mary Tobias asked if she was correct in her thinking that the regional government would control the allotment of money to the commission and approve the budget. She asked if the commission would

actually manage the budget and the funds.

Jon Egge said that was correct. The commissions would also handle the day to day operations of the function. He said that there needs to be a tightly controlled mechanism for appeal. He said that the commission actions would be appealable to the regional body to ensure accountability.

Mary Tobias said that there would have to be a professional staff under each commission responsible for the work of the commission. She said that she has a problem with that. She said that she is convinced that the electorate does not want proliferation. She said that the stand alone commissions will grow over time and more of what there is now will be created.

Jon Egge said that it is his opinion that the reverse will happen. It is insurance that Metro itself will not in fact grow because the commissions are the intervening step. Power in government is represented by employees. The employees will be a part of the regional government but they will be intervened by the commissions. The commissions do not expand and proliferate government but control it. He said that there is currently a council that is overworked and a staff that does as it pleases. Currently, there are three levels of government--the elected executive, the staff, and the elected council. He said that there is no rationale that tells him that the council matches either one of the other two power structures of the regional government. The commission form is more public intervention in the process. It creates no more cost than there currently is.

Mary Tobias said that a commission requires staff because information has to be developed for that body. Because the commissioners are volunteers, they have limited amounts of time to put in. Many commission decisions are made by people who have had no time to analyze what they are deciding on. She said that she believes it will lead to a proliferation of government rather than the creation of efficiency.

Jon Egge said that there is currently a volunteer council which handles all of the functions. The volunteer council has been overloaded with all of the service delivery functions.

Charlie Hales said that the existing Metro council spends very little time on issues of regional planning. He said that they will occasionally do quasi-judicial appeals of Urban Growth Boundary decisions. They have also done very little oversight of local government comprehensive planning. He said that he would like to equip the regional government with the ability to spend a substantial amount of time on regional planning.

Jon Egge said that there has been very little policy work done at the Metro level because it is busy with other things.

Frank Josselson said that Mary Tobias' statements regarding commissions are also his statements about a part time council. He said that the important function of regional government is policy making--growth management and policy making for the services that the regional government will deliver. The day to day operations of the functions ought not be carried out by the policy makers because there is not enough time. He said that he is worried about a staff-driven, policy-making body because it is inconsistent with his view of good regional government. One of the important purposes of the commission form of government is to provide an insulating layer of citizens between a paid staff and regional policy makers. The purpose of the commission would be to run the day to day policy making and to make sure that it conforms to the major policies established by the elected government. He said that a commission does not mean that there will need to be significantly more staff because departments are needed now to run the different functions. He said that there is not a function performed by the regional government now, or that would be performed in the future, that could not be better performed in a commission form. He said that it is possible in the future for the people to

decide that they would like the regional government to take on a function that is not adaptable to a commission form. At that time, the people can determine what structure they want.

Chair Myers asked what the commission would do that the council is now doing.

Frank Josselson said that the commission would act as the executive in charge of the service delivery, subject to oversight of the elected governing body. He said that the commission could take many months to hear testimony and make an initial decision, on a controversy, subject to a review by the regional governing body that does not take many months.

Chair Myers asked if there would be a chief administrative officer under each of the commissions.

Frank Josselson said yes.

Larry Derr said that the explicit link between the commission and council is in the planning area. There are three control links that are important--the appointment and removal of the members, budget oversight, and the broad-gauge planning level.

Bob Shoemaker said that it would be helpful to know how Metro operates now regarding the various functions. He asked what the extent is of the council's involvement.

Betsy Bergstein said that there is a subcommittee structure in the council that takes care of various functions.

Charlie Hales asked how the council's time is allocated.

Ray Phelps said that the council functioned as a committee of a whole under Mike Ragsdale. In 1987, Mike Ragsdale created the Oregon legislative model which created subcommittees with the same power as the subcommittees in the state legislature. Any item coming to the council had a first reading, then was referred to a subcommittee. The subcommittee then deals with the issue and passes it back to council for a vote if it has merit. The budget process includes a citizen committee although it is not required to.

Bob Shoemaker asked how often the subcommittees meet.

Ray Phelps said that he asked Tanya Collier how much time she spends on Metro and she replied 30-40 hours a week. He said that it also depends on the action of the subcommittee. He said that the councilors could meet once or twice during the week in addition to the regular council meetings.

Bob Shoemaker asked if the council was overloaded.

Ray Phelps said that it is a value judgement and suggested that Bob Shoemaker look at the council and subcommittee agendas and determine whether or not he would want to deal with the issues, as a policy person, that are on a typical agenda.

Bob Shoemaker asked if it would be possible to get copies of past agendas.

Ron Cease said that boards and commissions are created because there is too much volume for the legislative branch to handle or there is a hot potato that the legislative branch wants off their hands. He said that he appreciates the idea of having an insulating layer between the staff and the elected body. If there is concern about the staff controlling the government, then an insulating layer between the staff and the elected body would be the wrong move because the elected officials would not be

responsible. He said that there are times when a commission would work, but in most cases it is illegitimate to create a commission because one does not want that part of the organization responsible to the larger system.

Charlie Hales asked how to solve the problem of the current, overburdened, part-time council in order for them to spend more time on various planning issues.

Ron Cease said that the issue of a full time or part time council should be separated for the moment. If there is a department, the department head can be held responsible to the council more than a commission would be.

Ray Phelps said that Charlie Hales is assuming that the council workload is a legitimate work load. He suggested that Charlie Hales go through the agendas and decide if the policy body is overactive and is doing things besides pure policy.

Ron Cease said that if there is a commission in addition to the already existing problem, the problem is more complicated and bigger. It has become almost impossible for the council to control anything. He said that sometimes commissions are needed for different reasons. One must recognize that when commissions are used, there is the danger of losing control to another body with a built-in relationship with the staff of that department and the commission.

Mary Tobias said that there are two models for consideration. She asked if the model being suggested is the governmental model that already exists in local governments for the use of advisory boards or if it the corporate model. She said that the governmental model is one where there are functions where the governmental body wants citizen oversight and citizen input to help shape and direct policy that the governing body will ultimately use. The citizens on governmental advisory boards act in a policy shaping, advisory capacity to the staff. She gave the example of General Motors with Chevrolet, Buick, Cadillac, and Oldsmobile divisions as free standing companies run by boards of directors who are responsible for the operations of the companies as the corporate model.

Jon Egge said that it is the government hybrid of the corporate model. He said that he would not want to mandate the other types of advisory boards nor would he want to preclude the regional government from having them because they are a valuable tool that any government should use. It is service delivery where there would be commission intervention.

Frank Josselson said that there is not any feature of Oregon government that is more characteristically Oregon than the board and commission form of government. The insulating levels of citizens help to steer the professional bureaucracy in healthy ways and keeps it free of corruption. He said that the bureaucrat manager form of government is characteristically un-Oregonian.

Ron Cease said that the use of commissions is not being argued. There can be advisory boards, policy boards, functioning boards, and operating boards and commissions. He said that he is talking about operating boards and commissions--such as the MERC. Commissions should not be used, in most instances, to run and operate the function. At the state level, most boards and commissions are policy boards or advisory boards which are needed. When there is a board that is invested by law with the actual operation of the function, then it is totally different.

Jon Egge said that insulating is a bad word and that intervening is a more accurate description of what the commission would do. The commission would intervene on behalf of the public because it is a representation of the public. He said that with the SAIF board, the legislature is ill prepared to do what the board is doing. He said that it is a similar example to the commission form. He said that the rot of the whole philosophy is making enough time for policy.

Matt Hennessee said that the Committee is trying to put together what they consider to be the perfect system, but no matter how well the lines are defined, it still is a matter of people. One group of people may believe that they are policy makers and others may come in feeling as if they cannot trust the staff and end up with items on the agenda which should not be there. As the Committee tries to answer the question of trying to get them out of being overburdened, it gets back to the group needing to remind themselves time and time again what their role is.

Jon Egge said that he agrees. The mission of the government needs to be defined before the Committee can determine what the people should do.

Ray Phelps said that he agrees with Ron Cease on his views of commissions. He said that one of the problems he has with the concept of commissions as opposed to advisory groups not being part of the charter is if there is a desire to create more interaction between and among local government persons and the regional government, then the windows and doors need to be left open. Commissions tend to close both. They take a proprietary interest in it and they become creatures of staff. He said that commissions are more vulnerable to being products of staff agenda than elected officials because of the reliance. It insulates to the degree that people would rather have anarchy than elected government because they cannot get at the people that they thought they voted for to do the job. People need to talk to the people they elected. Commissions start out with the best intentions, but tend to drive the citizenry away from the process.

Frank Josselson said that if the mission of the government is to be planning and policy making, then it is only human nature to select those items on an agenda that can be accomplished in a meeting and produce a result. The planning process is not one of those because it is a process that has a beginning and no end. The tendency is to avoid planning when given the choice between planning and doing. People would rather do things that produce more satisfying and visible results.

Mary Tobias said that almost all elected officials have a sense of responsibility and that staff tries to do the best professional job in its profession that it can do. She said that there is no such thing as a perfect planning body. She said that she cannot see the justification for a commission form of government because it does nothing more than make it more difficult for the public to know where to go for the last word on issues. The public will get frustrated.

Mimi Urbigkeit said that if the council has the power of appointment and removal, then they can mix in new people who would guard against people getting entrenched and protecting their own special interests.

Jon Egge said that his concern is not with local government, although local government does generally spend too much time on the details and often does not get to the policy issues until late in the meeting. The commission form is not going to preclude the elected officials from getting citizen input. It will make them more available to receive public input. He said that if he were elected, he would go to every employee and tell them that he wants to hear the complaints because that is the only way the organization will get better. If the people do not want to hear the complaints, then it is up to the voters to get rid of them.

Mary Tobias asked if Jon Egge was the president of Chevrolet, would he want the chair of the board of General Motors going to the employees telling them that he would want to hear the complaints.

Jon Egge said that is a different model because the employees do not elect the chair of General Motors. He said that the corporate model insulates itself too much from reality as it goes up the ladder which is a problem. The commission form is not the pure corporate model.

Mary Tobias asked if, as the head of the commission overseeing solid waste, Jon Egge would want the presiding officer of the Metro Council going to staff telling them that he wants to hear the complaints.

Jon Egge said that if he is elected, he would want the voters to get in touch with him directly. He said that it would not matter if the commission does not want him to hear from the voters.

Mary Tobias asked how the commission can do its job of running solid waste if their clients do not come to them with the complaints, but goes from them to the council.

Jon Egge said that the excellent companies generally try to circumvent the layers of management when it comes to complaints. All complaints are not legitimate, but they deserve a hearing at the elected level.

Ron Cease said that the concerns of Frank Josselson and Jon Egge are valid. He said that he agrees that Metro needs to do more planning and needs to have a vision, but it will be difficult to sell. He said that it would be a disaster if an elected governing board did the planning, unrelated to the functions. Planning has to be related to the functions and the operations of what the government does. He said that if there is a body that does planning and commissions that do operational functions, then they will not have any clout or authority to do anything. He said that Tom Walsh, Director of Tri-Met, said that Portland is further along than other areas such as Seattle. No other area has the mix of Metro, LCDC, and Tri-Met that Portland does. It needs to be improved upon and not thrown away, which is what the commission form would do.

Charlie Hales said that there are regional coordinating bodies all over the map, but not regional planning bodies. The regional planning bodies do not have the power that Metro has already been invested with in the statutes but has never been used. He said that Tri-Met is run by a commission and it is run well, so not all commissions are bad. He said that the Portland Chamber's proposal and Jon Egge's proposal are two different proposals which are not the same.

Chair Myers said that there is not a disagreement on the committee that commissions may well be appropriate in certain situations. He said that the issue will come down to whether the charter will completely mandate organization and operation of all service functions under commissions, as opposed to selectively doing that or allowing it.

Frank Josselson said that he is getting painted into a position of someone who wants to limit the power of regional government. He said that he rejects that assertion because in areas where he has proposed regional government powers, they have been given responsibilities and mandates where the existing model gives them authority only. He said that he has not suggested that any function that Metro is now undertaking be eliminated from regional government or that the regional role should be limiting. He said that he is suggesting that the role and structure of regional government be clarified. He said that the important mission for the Committee is to get people to know what the regional government is and what it does.

Chair Myers said that he did not interpret anything as a statement to weaken regional government. He said that the debate might center around whether or not a proposed step will have an effect of doing something.

Ned Look said that Committee members are polarized as to where they stand. He said that he is concerned that a commission form will be too rigid. He said that there is a place for commissions, but it should not be written into the charter and it should be left to the council to decide.

Chair Myers said that he hopes that members will not get themselves polarized. He said that it is

necessary to air out the concerns. The issue of how to organize the delivery of the service responsibility may be the most difficult issue.

Ned Look said that he would like to discuss that question at the hearing on January 18.

Frank Josselson said that he is not saying that regional government ought to be straight jacketed into a commission form for every function that will be undertaken by the regional government. He said that he does believe that the functions that the Committee has discussed and decided to delegate to the regional government would best be handled by the commissions. He said that a more productive discussion would be to decide which functions are more suitable to a commission form of government and which are less.

Ned Look said that he would like that decision to be made by the elected officials.

4. Other business

Chair Myers said that the Committee will get a refined and elaborated description of the Committee work on the functions area before the next meeting. He suggested that the document be the focus of the next meeting. It will need to be reviewed to make sure that it accurately explains the work of the Committee. That document will be made available for public reaction and comment at the hearings.

Chair Myers said that the next meeting would be on January 2, 1992.

Chair Myers said that he would like to draw comments around the structure for the January 18, 1992 hearing. He suggested that the Committee generate a document that would summarize the major alternate structural approaches that the Committee is considering and try to organize comment around the conceptions. The Committee could then return to the issues as a Committee and make a preliminary round of decisions for purposes of the charter drafting. He said that it will be a better use of time if there is a pending initial product that people can react to, rather than an open ended function and structure discussion.

Mary Tobias said that it is important that everyone understands that the Committee has not adopted the outlines as policy.

Chair Myers said that an explanation of what the product represents will accompany the outline.

Chair Myers said that there are two dates when space is reserved at Metro for the second hearing. Those dates are January 27 and January 29.

Janet Whitfield said that there was previous Committee discussion regarding hearing from the boundary commission at the hearing on January 18. She asked if the boundary commission should be added to the list.

Chair Myers said that the Committee had decided that it would be better if the Committee heard from the boundary commission at the second hearing.

There was Committee consensus that the January 18 meeting would begin at 9:00 a.m. and end at 4:00 p.m. There was Committee discussion as to an appropriate location for the hearings. Metro was determined to not be appropriate because it could be seen as symbolic.

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimi Iboshi
Committee Clerk

Reviewed by,



Janet Whitfield
Committee Administrator