



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

*Jennifer Sims*  
**Memorandum**

Date: September 5, 1991  
To: Metro Council  
From: Betsy Bergstein  
Regarding: Attached Summary of Timothy Lake Retreat

---

Attached is a summary of the recent (August, 1991) Timothy Lake retreat for Clackamas county local government representatives from cities, special districts and County government.

Council DeJardin attended the retreat and has provided this summary.

## TIMOTHY LAKE 1991

1. Retreat of local government representatives from cities, special districts and County government within Clackamas County (see attached registration list).
2. Major themes discussed:
  - Shaping a Vision and Leadership for Effective and Coordinated Delivery of Public Services within Clackamas County.
  - Shaping a Vision and Leadership for a Strong and Heeded Voice from Clackamas County on Regional Issues.

### 8/1 P.M. Small-Group Discussions

The retreat began with an exercise for all participants, who were asked to assign lead responsibility for delivery of various public services, as they would see it within Clackamas County by the year 2000. The results of this informal survey appear in Attachment A.

### Discussion Topics:

- What are the current service delivery issues?
- Are the current roles for the County, cities, special districts in the delivery of public services clear and appropriate? If not, how should responsibilities be modified? What are possible uses of special district authority under ORS 450?
- What are the fiscal implications for modifying service roles, responsibilities?
- Is there a communications issue: If so, how can the communications lines be improved? Is there a trust issue? If so, how does the environment for trust get improved?

### Group 1

#### Important Topics:

- Law enforcement
- Libraries\*\*
- Water and sewer: storm\*/\*\*, drainage\*/\*\*; watershed\*\*
- Emergency communications\*/\*\*
- Parks and recreation
- Open space\*\*
- Transportation
- Planning housing

#### Issues:

- Equity
- Duplication
- Coordination
- Financing
- Future growth
- Efficiency
- Quality
- Logical provider
- Standards

\* especially within the County

\*\* especially regionally

#### Roles/ Clear and Appropriate?

- Law enforcement: Clearing; in evolution
- Sewer: Countywide clear; regionwide NO
- Library: Cities, County clear; regionwide NO
- Water: Supply, storm drainage, watershed. NO on both countywide and regionwide
- Emergency communications. NO on both countywide and regionwide
- Parks/ recreation: Okay
- Open space: NO on countywide and regionwide.
- Transportation: in evolution toward clarity though some question on appropriateness of roles.
- Planning: clear countywide, NO regionwide
- Housing: NO on countywide and regionwide.

#### Communications/Trust Questions

Countywide, local governments are not sharing information adequately, are protective about info, timeliness of communications is a problem, there's no followup that can be relied on. Trustwise, there are perception problems, a sense of hidden agendas.

Solutions: Slow down the process, concentrate on communicating more effectively. State objectives openly and clearly; assure follow through on process.

Group 2

Important Topics:

- Libraries
- RUGGO's (planning issues)
- Growth (planning)
- Water supply and delivery
- Transportation (roads and transit)
- Drainage (stormwater, wetlands)
- Housing (planning)

Important Issues:

- Definition of lead roles and responsibilities for delivery of service among levels of government
- It's among Metro, the County and special districts where ambiguity primarily lies.
- Local control is a consideration; responsibility for service delivery should be placed closest as possible to the citizen to enhance accountability.
- Cost effectiveness
- Expertise
- Physical considerations: topography, geography

Communications

- Know your peers, counterparts in other governments
- Emphasize decisionmaking by consensus, not by dictating

Trust

- Emphasis on open government: accessible, accountable

Group 3

Important Topics:

- Storm water
- Water quality
- Recycling

- Planning
- Water supply
- Transportation
- Parks and recreation/open space
- Housing
- Emergency services
- Ambulance service
- Urban growth boundary (land use)
- Arts and culture
- Regional facilities
- Land development
- Tourism
- Air quality
- Social services
- Pathways/trails
- Libraries

**Important Issues:**

- Funding
- Service delivery in Hoodland corridor
- Lack of storm drainage authority, now and future
- Administration of plans without adequate funding; lack of grant funding

**Communications:**

- System of notification no longer functions
- Communications in general seem to be better, however
- City-county communications, okay; city-special district communications, not so good

**Trust:**

- Frequency of contact builds trust
- Trust not the issue; turf may be the issue
- Concern over whether another jurisdiction may be able to deliver service as competently as the current deliverer.

**Key Criteria for examining how well a public service is being delivered:**

- **NEED/ Given:** There is a NEED for the service, and that need is best met by the public sector
- **ROLES/** The roles for delivery (lead, support) are clear and understood by all players
- **RESOURCES/** The resources are adequate to provide the service effectively. Resources include funding, personnel, technical resources
- **STANDARDS/** Standards are set to evaluate effectiveness of delivery
- **COMMUNICATIONS/** Communications among public providers of the service is efficient, follow through occurs; trust level is high that service will be effectively delivered.

The criteria were applied to water resources (supply, quality, drainage) within Clackamas County, and produced these findings:

- Water services are needed and should be delivered as a matter of public responsibility.
- There are minimum standards for water quality, but not quantity or efficiency of delivery. There is a wide variance on the level of effectiveness of delivery among jurisdictions in the county.
- It's the role of the water producer to have responsibility for (and rights to) water supply within the county. Cities and special districts share the role for delivery of water. The County has no responsibility except for coordination during crisis periods.
- Clackamas County jurisdictions are in a deficient position regarding water resources, dependent heavily on outside resources such as Bull Run. The Clackamas River as a source might be sufficient, but there's question about that.

Other questions impacting adequacy of resources: water quality, regulation of water supply, variety of competing uses of water supply.

- Ratepayers largely pay for and fund delivery of water in Clackamas County, though there are other sources of funding. Who funds efforts to preserve the water supply is not clear.
- Communications links among cities and special districts on water delivery within the urban growth boundary (UGB) are okay, but there's a lack of clarity in communications among providers within the county outside the UGB. Turf problems restrict open communications.

The question of LEADERSHIP to resolve issues impacting water resources within Clackamas County was posed.

The County was seen as the natural leader, needing to assume responsibility for long-term planning of water resources, and for coordinating the current water supply/rights among various producers.

The County's leadership might be transitional on the way to the development of a regional (multi-county) water authority, it was suggested.

**8/1 Evening Session**

**REGIONAL ISSUES PREVIEW**

Remarks on the Metro Charter review, now getting underway, and the positioning of Clackamas County jurisdictions in a regional context were made by Tom DeJardin, Metro Councillor representing a portion of Clackamas County; Jon Egge and Frank Josselson, members of the Metro Charter Committee, both representing Clackamas County.

Key points from their remarks included:

1. (DeJardin) Metro can move a regional agenda, but it often takes strong initiative and a common purpose from the local level to set the agenda.
2. (Egge, Josselson) For the Metro Charter review, there are two key areas deserving close scrutiny: structure (form) and authority (function). A third area also of importance is funding.

The current structure produces inadequate accountability and a process that's not open.

The current authority is wide-ranging on paper, potentially massive if put into practice.

Charter review is a real opportunity to reshape regional government.

Local government should be a strong voice, a leader in the Charter review process.

3. (By implication) To be an effective voice in the Charter review process, local government(s) should decide and articulate what they want (and don't want) from their regional government.

**8/2 A.M. Session**

**Small-group Discussion**

**Key Questions:**

- **What are the appropriate functions of a regional authority over the next 5-10 years, regarding:**
  - **Coordination**
  - **Funding**
  - **Lead role or responsibility**
- **How should the regional government be changed in form, or structure, to carry out those functions effectively?**
- **What steps need to be taken within Clackamas County, and with others in the region, to establish the leadership for change?**

**APPROPRIATE FUTURE REGIONAL AUTHORITY (Within next 5-10 years)**

**A. Function**

**Group 1**

- **Transportation (planning, coordination, funding)**
- **Drinking water (planning, coordination)**
- **Affordable housing (planning, coordination, funding)**
- **Libraries (coordination)**
- **Open space (planning, coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Growth management (planning, coordination)**
- **Solid waste (planning, coordination)**
- **Recycling (planning, coordination)**
- **Air quality (planning, coordination)**
- **Stormwater (planning, coordination)**
- **Regional facilities (planning, coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Urban growth boundary (planning, coordination, lead role, funding)**

**Group 2**

- **Solid waste disposal (coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Zoo (coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Regional facilities (coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Transportation (coordination; maybe funding in future)**
- **Regional data base (coordination, lead role, funding)**
- **Transit/Tri-Met (coordination)**
- **Libraries (coordination)**

Group 3

- Solid waste management (coordination, funding, lead role)
- Intra-jurisdictional land use disputes (coordination)
- Affordable housing (coordination)
- Transportation (coordination, funding)
- Urban legislative agenda (coordination)
- Human services (coordination)
- Law enforcement (coordination)
- Emergency communications (coordination)
- Zoo (funding, lead role)
- Libraries (funding)
- Open space (funding)
- Water storage (funding)
- Storm drainage (funding, lead role)
- Arts and culture (funding, lead role)
- Education (funding)
- Jurisdictional boundaries (lead role)
- Port facilities (lead role)
- Mass transit (lead role)
- Air quality/environmental issues (lead role)
- Medical examiner (lead role)

**B. Form (Structure) Modifications to Metro**

Group 1

- Five elected Councilors from districts; full-time, paid, non-partisan
- Appointed Executive Officer
- Presiding Officer selected from within Councillor group
- Proportional urban/suburban representation by Councilors
- Boundaries reviewed

Group 2

- Appointed Executive Officer
- Single elected legislative body (not bicameral)
- Representation on legislative body: both district reps and at-large reps; each member represents population of 40-50,000
- Part-time representation with some pay
- All appointed committee structures must include a mixture of citizens and local government representatives
- All rulemakings must include findings that respond to public comment
- District boundaries should be set to cover area of resources as well as service

Group 3

- Appointed Executive officer
- Five-member legislative body with hire/fire authority, including over Executive Officer
- Six-year terms for elected legislators; paid on full-time basis
- At least one elected legislator basically be tied in representation to one of the three counties in the district
- Use existing county boundaries to form the district

**C. Leadership development in Clackamas County to achieve proposed regional changes**

Group 1

- Establish a suburban jurisdictions association to work together on regional and other issues. Association should represent cities, counties and special districts and should have own staff.

Group 2

- Create a formal association within Clackamas County of cities, special districts and the County , with a budget and staff
- Form a formal association of suburban jurisdictions
- Form an alliance with Washington County jurisdictions

Group 3

- In Clackamas County, local governments should help elect future officeholders
- Expand cooperation and cohesion among cities, County and special districts with the following agenda:
  - Review Metro charter issues
  - Decide on Clackamas County ("our") regional agenda
  - Make a commitment to speak out on issues.

**C. Leadership development in Clackamas County to achieve proposed regional changes**

Group 1

- Establish a suburban jurisdictions association to work together on regional and other issues. Association should represent cities, counties and special districts and should have own staff.

Group 2

- Create a formal association within Clackamas County of cities, special districts and the County , with a budget and staff
- Form a formal association of suburban jurisdictions
- Form an alliance with Washington County jurisdictions

Group 3

- In Clackamas County, local governments should help elect future officeholders
- Expand cooperation and cohesion among cities, County and special districts with the following agenda:
  - Review Metro charter issues
  - Decide on Clackamas County ("our") regional agenda
  - Make a commitment to speak out on issues.

## CONSENSUS

### 1. **FUNCTION: Regional Role/Responsibilities**

A beginning point of agreement about the appropriate function of a revised Metro after Charter review centered around these points:

- **Lead role:** At least in solid waste management and the Zoo operations
- **Funding:** Solid waste and Zoo, plus at least storm drainage and some transportation
- **Coordination:** A lengthy list of candidates for regional services coordination emerged

### 2. **FORM**

Several points of agreement and one clear area of disagreement arose from the discussion of an appropriate form of a revised Metro after Charter review:

Areas of agreement:

- **Appointed executive officer**
- **Paid elected Council, or legislative body, members.**
- **Non-partisan elected positions**
- **Representation on legislative body tied as closely as possible to individual county boundaries**
- **Boundaries of the district cover resource as well as service area to the fullest extent possible.**

Areas of disagreement:

- **Two small groups called for limited legislative body of no more than five members, paid full time**
- **One small group called for expanded legislative body of 20-25 members, paid part-time**

**3. LEADERSHIP**

Consensus was reached on steps to be taken to assure that Clackamas County jurisdictions develop a common agenda and have a clear voice in the Metro Charter review process. These steps included:

**A. Countywide association.**

- Develop a formal association of cities, special districts and the County within Clackamas County to craft a common agenda and articulate the view of these jurisdictions on Charter review.

Begin with consideration of the existing Mayors/managers monthly meeting with Council members as base for this association, adding special districts and County representatives among others.

- Commit a staff and budget to this association.
- Initially seek funding from Metro to support this association. If not fully successful, self-assess to meet budget needs.
- Establish an agenda that includes Metro Charter review and regional issues beyond the Metro questions.
- Develop the research necessary to support association positions.
- Start the process of organizing the association with a meeting convened by the Clackamas County Commission (Commissioner Hammersted volunteered).

**B. Suburban association.**

Form an association of suburban jurisdictions in the Portland metropolitan area, including Washington County and east Multnomah County entities, along similar lines as described above for a countywide association, with similar but expanded agendas covering public service issues.

ATTACHMENT A

SERVICE	CITIES	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	COUNTY	TRI-COUNTY	OTHER
Water Supply	14	13	3	5	
Code Enforcement	14		18		
Corrections	1		13	7	State (2)
Economic Devel.	10	2	18	8	State (1)
Emergency Comms.	5	1	20	10	State (1)
Fiscal	26	8	15	5	
Housing	6	2	22	4	
Human Services	1	1	29	2	
Law Enforcement	18	4	16		
Libraries	7	9	12	10	
Parks/Recreation	14	11	12	4	
Planning	23	4	18	5	
Property Mgmt.	20	4	9		Owner
Roads	15	1	17	6	State (1)
Sanitary Sewers	18	10	9	3	
Waste Collection	5	2	6	17	Private (2)
Storm Drainage	9	13	9	9	

**C. Charter Committee cooperation.**

Form a close working relationship between local jurisdictions in Clackamas County and the members of the Metro Charter Committee representing the county area. Meet regularly with these members, especially in the next 6-8 weeks as the committee makes key decisions on Charter review.

**D. Revisit the council of governments approach to regional government.**