



METRO

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

Amid
Memorandum

Date: November 26, 1991
To: METRO Council, Executive, Interested Parties
From: Betsy Bergstein *[Signature]*
Regarding: Charter Committee Meeting - November 21, 1991

The Committee continued their discussion on Metro functions using criteria that was developed at their retreat in the Fall (attached) and working from a list of "possible Metro functions" developed by their Committee Administrator (attached).

The discussion began on #2 solid and liquid waste facilities and #13, solid and liquid waste disposal.

The Chair proposed incorporating into the first draft a "renewal of authority of the District with respect to solid and liquid waste disposal, clarifying the lines of demarcation between local and regional."

Mary Tobias raised two issues: (1) language usage of "shall" or "may"; suggested grants of authority outright which may be implemented and (2) the ability to privatize solid waste functions in the future. If language shifts from "may" to "shall" precludes privatization in the future. Leave it a "may" for first draft.

Edge interested in privatization question.

Isaac Regenstreif raised the issue of reducing the waste stream and asked if there should be a regional curbside recycling program---put a standardized policy in place. John Meek felt that limits local opportunity but that someone should set the standard, goals for the region, but don't necessarily have to implement it.

The Committee generally discussed recycling and decided that an authority to include an education function in reducing the waste stream should be included in Metro's authorities.

Frank Josselson made a motion to:

1. Adopt and enforce plans, programs and regulations to promote programs to reduce the solid waste stream including packaging and other areas not being addressed."
2. Continue to provide public information on recycling, reuse and composting;
3. Continue to regulate recycling industries and waste processing industries and encourage waste reduction industries.

(There was no vote taken.)

John Meek stated the charter needs to be clear on the directive; specifically not to give Metro "carte blanche". Metro should accept proposals and write criteria for service providers to meet.

Mary Tobias cautioned care in assigning Metro new functions and reminded the Committee that every function carries a significant price tag. SB 66 set in motion statewide recycling criteria. Encouraged looking towards private sector. Called attention to the institute in Clark County which is creating innovative uses for recycled material.

The Chair asked Frank Josselson for further language on solid waste and recycling. John Meek offered to help draft that language.

Frank Josselson stated that Metro is doing an excellent job. Should have the authority to continue in solid waste --- land fill closures, site new land fills, police all aspects of system. Maintain clean honest system; should not be engaged in environmental regulation of solid waste sites; duplication of what DEQ is required to do.

Ned Look took out a copy of the document that Metro's Government Affairs Committee produced on agency authority and proposed the Committee use it for its discussion. Called current discussion format inefficient. Chair responded that current process might be inefficient but was going to continue. Look proposed using Metro document at same time Committee was referring to Committee Administrator's document which listed Metro's current authorities.

Mary Tobias then asked if recycling meets criteria #1 (Whether performance at regional level is required to carry out function at all.) Chair asked "what role in relation to regional government are you asking about?" Tobias responded that the Committee discussion took Metro beyond the current mandate of public information. Larry Derr then asked "How do we perceive that current list of criteria? Does a function have to meet all, meet one, how many?"

Wes Myllenbeck asked if resource recovery was recycling? John Meek went on to restate his position that locals should not be precluded from recycling. Allow innovation to take place. Didn't believe it was a regional function.

Isaac Regenstreif added that there may be a regional interest to enhance recycling markets. Economic viability of recycling might require a regional approach. Meek stated that there must be a justification to take over the authority.

The Chair stated that further language would be developed; said Committee members should also feel free to develop language. Asked for other points and moved on to the Zoo.

The Committee decided after little discussion to "carry the current authority over to the starting draft." Tobias stated that "may" or "shall" will be determined later.

The Committee then turned to Public Facilities. John Meek asked about satellite facilities, called attention to the Oregon Tourism Alliance, part of D.E.Q., eight northeast counties where their regional strategy is funded out of lottery funds. Egge added "subregional facilities" and cited the "End of the Oregon Trail" project. Derr asked to consider the term major in the statutory provision {"Acquire, construct, alter, maintain, administer and operate major cultural, convention exhibition, sports and entertainment facilities -268.310(6)}; why should this be major and not regional? Tobias stated that the statute also should allow for the disposal of these facilities.

The Chair stated he would draft #5(Zoo) and #6(Public facilities) into a single provision, taking out the reference to financing.

The remainder of the meeting was concentrated on water. The Committee grouped together four authorities, regional sewage facilities, water flow, water supply and water rights acquisition at Wes Myllenbeck's suggestion, for this discussion.

John Meek continued his position that there needs to be a demarcation between setting policy and carrying out the function. Questioned the provision to fund, construct, maintain re water supply. Mary Tobias distinguished between development of new water sources, acquisition of existing water sources, new reservoirs and added conservation as an additional factor. Frank Josselson supported the idea that Metro have the authority to implement plans but not to go as far as distribution or supply of water directly to customers.

The Committee got into a discussion on intergovernmental agreements re water with Frank Egge stating very strongly that he was opposed to Metro's authority to enter into intergovernmental agreements with local governments. He objected to Metro "cherry picking" and stated that the Multnomah County situation was very dangerous. Josselson agreed.

Myllenbeck spoke for flexibility. We don't know about the future --- what innovations are out there; gave example of meter reading.

Meek, supporting Egge and Josselson, stated that charters can change when innovation happens.

Myllenbeck disagreed. Urged Committee to spell out what Metro should do and be quiet on the rest. Charters are hard to change, he stated.

Myers asked for a description of the placement of the line between regional and local.

Josselson responded "at the supply level/source" regional authority ends. Distribution of water left to existing systems.

Myllenbeck stated that major changes need to be made; system is fragmented; 60-70% of the sources is from Bull Run. Need tie in with Trask(?) and Clackamas South.

Egge believes the basin authority comes first; storage a tremendous role for regional government.

Josselson asked about interbasin transfers, cities outside the region, eg. Sandy and Newberg?

Egge stated there was no simple answer.

Myers asked if there was a regional government role in achieving those basin authority formations? Basin authority is a separate state statute, not yet formed, beyond Metro's ability.

Authority to set standards for water supply for the region should rest with Metro but can not force Portland to give up water or take over their authority (Meek).

If there is a vacuum of authority, regional government should fill it. Waiting for the basin authority to come along is not appropriate (Derr).

The charter should be broad enough to incorporate flexibility for supply and storage that Myllenbeck cited (Regenstreif).

Jon Egge strong disagreed. All service delivery, water, police, fire should not be changed. Allow consolidation to happen naturally. Cherry picking on a piece by piece basis no good. Perpetuates local government paranoia, resistance to consolidation.

Both Ned Look and Wes Myllenbeck stressed flexibility. Can not know what the future will bring; should remain flexible. Must be positive; don't cut off things. Hard to change charter, Myllenbeck re-emphasized. There will be places where we just stay quiet.

Local governments need the security of a process (Josselson). Proposed bill of rights for local governments:

Any service, function or operation currently being performed by any unit of local government and not expressly assigned to regional government by the charter, not be assumed by

regional government, without a vote of the people.

Is this a single overarching approach, always supplied? (Myers)
Psychological, symbolic role to the charter. (Josselson)

Regenstreif asked Josselson to clarify the idea that regional government's statute has been an inhibitor to local governments doing their own consolidation efforts.

Josselson responded that the statutory authority given to Metro is overly broad.

Regenstreif asked how has that kept local governments from doing voluntary consolidation?

Josselson responded that Metro identifies an area as of "metropolitan significance" and then steps in to take it over.

Myllenbeck stated he hadn't heard that before.

Regenstreif stated he would be very surprised about that.

John Meek stated that there has not been an ability for local governments to work on consolidation. Gave libraries as an example. Metro stepped in and said maybe we should go regional and that stopped the process.

Myllenbeck said, don't blame Metro for that.

Josselson stated that the Metro Boundary Commission is an inhibiting influence because one needs Boundary Commission approvals (for consolidations).

Regenstreif asked "has that happened?"

Josselson stated no, but in a case he was involved in had to go to extraordinary extents and costs to avoid the Boundary Commission.

Egge questioned the charge of the Boundary Commission. Stated cities are the best provider of service and that Portland controls the Boundary Commission.

The Chair stated he would produce a first draft converting the discussion to a version for the charter. The next meeting will focus on the District's transportation and transit authorities.

POSSIBLE METRO FUNCTIONS
(not including land use)

1. Regional sewerage facilities

Statutory provision: *Acquire, construct, alter, maintain and operate interceptor, trunk and outfall sewers for treatment and disposal of sewage and engage in local aspects of sewerage transferred to the district by agreement with other public corporations, cities or counties in accordance with this chapter. --268.310(1)*

2. Solid & liquid waste facilities

Statutory provision: *Subject to other statutory requirements dispose and provide facilities for disposal of solid waste and liquid waste. --268.310(2)*

3. Water flow

Statutory provision: *Control the flow, and provide for the drainage, of surface water, by means of dams, dikes, ditches, canals and other necessary improvements or by enlarging, improving, cleaning or maintaining any natural or artificial waterway or by requiring property owners to install and maintain water control or retention systems. --268.310(3)*

4. Mass transportation

Statutory provision: *Provide public transportation and terminal facilities for public transportation, including local aspects thereof transferred to the district by one or more other public corporations, cities or counties through agreements in accordance with this chapter. --268.310(4)*

5. Zoo facilities

Statutory provision: *Acquire, construct, alter, maintain, administer and operate metropolitan zoo facilities. --268.310(5)*

6. Public facilities (with voter approval of financing)

Statutory provision: *Acquire, construct, alter, maintain, administer and operate major cultural, convention, exhibition, sports and entertainment facilities. --268.310(6)*

7. Criminal and juvenile justice

Statutory provision: *Provide planning for metropolitan and local aspects of criminal and juvenile justice. --268.310(7)*

8. Water supply (with voter approval)

Statutory provision: *Acquire, develop, construct, alter, maintain and operate metropolitan aspects of water supply and distribution systems of persons, public corporations, cities or counties transferred to the district by agreement in accordance with this chapter. --268.312(1)(a)*

9. Human services (with voter approval)

Statutory provision: *Plan, coordinate and evaluate the providing of human services, including but not limited to, programs for the aging, health care, manpower, mental health and children and youth. --268.312(1)(b)*

10. Parks and open spaces (with voter approval)

Statutory provision: *Acquire, develop, maintain and operate a system of parks, open space, and recreational facilities of metropolitan significance. --268.312(1)(c)*

11. Criminal and juvenile detention (with voter approval)

Statutory provision: *Provide facilities for metropolitan aspects of criminal and juvenile detention and programs for metropolitan aspects of adult and juvenile justice and, by agreement, local aspects of jails, corrections programs and juvenile justice. --268.312(1)(d)*

12. Library activities (with voter approval)

Statutory provision: *Provide metropolitan aspects of library activities including, but not limited to, book acquisition and technical assistance for local libraries. --268.312(1)(e)*

13. Solid and liquid waste disposal

Statutory provision: *Build, construct, acquire, lease, improve, operate and maintain landfills, transfer facilities, resource recovery facilities and other improvements, facilities or equipment necessary or desirable for the solid and liquid waste disposal system of the district. --268.317(1)*

14. Additional functions

Statutory provision: *The electors of a district may, from time to time, and in exercise of their power of the initiative, or by approving a proposition referred to them by the governing body of the district, authorize the district to assume additional functions and determine the number, qualifications and manner of selecting members of the governing body of the district.* --268.320(1)

15. Additional functions with local aspects

Statutory provision: *Local aspects of the functions authorized may be assumed only on the basis of agreements between the district and other public corporations, cities or counties.* --268.320(2)

16. Boundary commission transfer

Statutory provision: *The electors of a district may, in exercise of their power of initiative, or by approving a proposition referred to them by the governing body of the district, authorize a transfer of all the duties, functions and powers of the boundary commission formed within the metropolitan area.* --268.320(3)

17. Mass transit operation

Statutory provision: *For purposes of public transportation, a district may: Contract with the United States or with any county, city or state, or any of their departments or agencies, for the construction, preservation, improvement, operation or maintenance of any mass transit system.* --268.330(2)(a)

18. Service district establishment

Statutory provision: *A metropolitan service district may establish service districts.* --268.335(1)

19. Acquisition of property

Statutory provision: *To the extent necessary to provide a metropolitan aspect of a public service, a district may acquire by purchase, condemnation, devise, gift or grant, real and person property or any interest therein within and without the district, including property of other public corporations.* --268.340(1)

20. Water rights acquisition

Statutory provision: A district may appropriate and acquire water and water rights within and without the district for the purpose of providing metropolitan aspects of water supply and distribution. --268.342(1)

21. Contracts

Statutory provision: A district may contract with any public or private agency for the agency to operate any facility or perform any function that the district is authorized to operate or perform. By contract the district may assume any function of any public corporation, city or county in the district that the district has power to assume under this chapter. --268.345

22. Marketing of geographic data

Statutory provision: A district may impose and collect reasonable fees based on market prices or competitive bids for geographic data that have commercial value and are an entire formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, process, data base or system developed with a significant expenditure of public funds. A district may enter into agreements with private persons or entities to assist with market such products. --268.357(1)

23. Police authority

Statutory provision: For purposes of its authorized functions a district may exercise police power and in so doing adopt such ordinances as a majority of the members of its governing body considers necessary for the proper functioning of the district. --268.369(1)

24. Transit system acquisition

Statutory provision: When a metropolitan service district functions in a mass transit district the governing body of the metropolitan district may at any time order transfer of the transit system of the transit district to the metropolitan district. --268.370

25. Commission creation

Statutory provision: A metropolitan service district may create by ordinance commissions for all powers or functions of a metropolitan service district....the power to adopt ordinances and all budget, revenue and planning authority remain in the council of the metropolitan service district. --268.395(1)&(2)

CRITERIA FOR POTENTIAL ASSIGNMENT
OF FUNCTIONS TO REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

- I WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL IS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT FUNCTION AT ALL
- II WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL IS REQUIRED BY STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS
- III WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL IS REQUIRED FOR REGIONAL OR LOCAL FUNDING ELIGIBILITY
- IV WHETHER IMPACTS OF THE FUNCTION EXTEND BEYOND ONE JURISDICTION
- V WHETHER BENEFITS OF THE FUNCTION EXTEND BEYOND ONE JURISDICTION
- VI WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL WILL BE MORE COST-EFFICIENT THROUGH (A) ECONOMIES OF SCALE AND (B) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION AND OVERLAP
- VII WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL IS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY BECAUSE OF ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: (A) GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF THE FUNCTION; (B) NEED FOR REGIONAL STANDARDS; (C) NEED FOR REGIONAL CONSISTENCY; (D) NEED FOR REGIONAL GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL, TECHNOLOGICAL OR OTHER CAPACITIES; (E) NEED TO AVOID OR RESOLVE CONFLICTS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS
- VIII WHETHER PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL LEVEL IS NEEDED TO ACHIEVE EQUITABLE FUNDING OF FUNCTION

114

**CRITERIA FOR POTENTIAL ASSIGNMENT
OF FUNCTIONS TO REGIONAL GOVERNMENT**

Regional Governance Committee Suggested Amendments

- I. Whether performance at regional level is required to carry out function at all.
- II. Whether performance at regional level is required by state or federal governments.
- III. Whether performance at regional level is required for ~~regional or local~~ state or federal government funding eligibility.
- IV. ~~Whether impacts of the function extend beyond one jurisdiction.~~
- V. ~~Whether benefits of the function extend beyond one jurisdiction.~~
- VI. Whether *coordination* or performance at regional level ~~will can be documented to~~ be more cost effective and efficient through ~~(A) economies of scale and (B) avoidance of duplication and overlap.~~
- VII. Whether performance at regional level is required to carry out function effectively because of ~~one or more of the following: (A) geographic interest; (B) need for regional standards; (C) need for regional consistency; (D) need for regional government's fiscal, technological or other capacities; (E) need to avoid or resolve conflicts between jurisdictions~~ (A) *the diversity of the region's population* and (B) *the need for government to be accessible and accountable to its constituents.*
- VIII. Whether performance at regional level is needed to achieve ~~equitable funding or function~~ *equitably distribute the costs and benefits of a facility or service.*

**INFORMATION FROM REGIONAL GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
TO CHARTER COMMITTEE
REGARDING STORM DRAINAGE AND SANITARY SEWER ISSUES**

November 20, 1991

The Regional Governance Committee (RGC) appreciates the opportunity to offer the following thoughts regarding storm drainage and sanitary sewer issues for the consideration of the Charter Committee.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
EFFICIENCIES BEING ACHIEVED AT LOCAL LEVEL**

This document includes the following key points:

- The storm and waste water fields are in the midst of major change. This is particularly true in the storm water field. New, integrated planning approaches are being used and local governments are being required to respond to stringent federal and state regulatory initiatives in very short timeframes.
- The efficiencies to be gained through coordination of planning and service delivery functions in the storm and waste water fields currently are being achieved at the local level throughout the region.
- The lead role for planning and service delivery in these fields should remain at the local level. However, Metro staff could provide useful coordination and information gathering services which will facilitate knowledge sharing and cooperation between governments in the three counties. This will also help to enhance the value of the current regional storm and waste documents which Metro files with the federal government to satisfy section 208 requirements of the Clean Water Act.

SUMMARY OF RGC PROCESS

As you know, for each major functional issue the Charter Committee addresses the RGC is using two matrices to organize and summarize our information. The first matrix simply describes the current system as we understand it. The second matrix describes our current thinking on what the future system should be.

Horizontal Axis/ Waste Water/Storm Water Issues: Along the horizontal axis we have organized the two matrices into two primary categories: 1) waste water; and 2) storm water. The first category, waste water, describes the sanitary sewer system in four subcategories: source control (measures which control the quantity and/or quality of sewage on-site before it enters the municipal system); collection; transport; and treatment. The second category, storm water, describes the storm drainage system in three subcategories: 1) source control (on-site quantity and/or quality control); 2) conveyance (transporting the storm water from the source to its destination); and treatment.

RGC has chosen to describe the waste and storm water systems according to their primary physical characteristics. However, it should be noted that these programs are implemented to achieve three fundamental public purposes: protect private property values, protect the public's health and safety, and protect the quality of water resources.

Vertical Axis/functions: Along the vertical axis we have identified a number of types of functions. "Resource quantity issues" and "resource quality issues" identify those entities who have a lead role in dealing with the water quantity and quality impacts respectively of waste and storm water. "Approval authority" means the body or bodies who must approve a plan before it can be implemented. "Funding" is the entity with lead financial responsibility. "Planning lead" means the entity responsible for preparing a long-range plan for approval. "Coordination lead" means the entity responsible for pulling together all of the parties who must prepare a plan. "Information gathering, analysis and support" means the entity responsible for conducting staff functions to support the planning process (e.g. research studies, computer modeling). "Service delivery" means the entity responsible to execute the plan.

The highlights of matrix B describing the recommended future system are briefly described below. We would be happy to provide additional detail or verbal testimony if the opportunity can be provided.

STORM AND WASTE WATER FIELDS UNDERGOING MAJOR CHANGE

It is not an overstatement to say that the storm water field is in the midst of a revolution. More evolutionary, but still significant change is also occurring in the waste water field. Among the most notable trends in these fields in the last few years are the following:

- Beginning to analyze storm and waste water issues in an integrated manner (i.e. overall water resource management);
- Analyzing water resource issues on a basin-wide scope;
- Beginning to identify and plan for the interrelationships between water quantity and water quality issues; and
- The promulgation of federal and state environmental standards which are very stringent and must be implemented by local service providers in very short periods of time.

The need to meet strict new federal and state standards very rapidly is creating severe difficulties for local service providers. There is no prioritized, comprehensive water resource environmental agenda at either the federal or state levels. Despite the new emphasis on integrated water quantity and quality planning the State of Oregon still deals with these issues in two separate agencies (Department of Environment Quality and Water Resources Department), whose programs and approaches are not always coordinated and consistent. Technical knowledge to fully understand how to effectively implement the new comprehensive planning approaches in these fields is badly needed, a comprehensive policy framework has yet to be developed, and institutional structures, particularly at the state level, have not been updated. The result often is standards and requirements which are costly and difficult to implement, yield uncertain results, and impose a cost which in some cases may be much higher than the derived benefits.

RGC RECOMMENDATIONS

RGC believes that at this point in time local governments are best equipped to continue in the lead role of planning for and delivering storm and waste water services. In many cases there are efficiencies and planning and financial capabilities which can be gained from coordinating the waste and storm water programs of various local entities in geographic proximity to each other. This coordinating is occurring at the local level. Storm and sanitary sewer services for nearly all of the urbanized population of Washington County is now provided by the Unified Sewerage Agency. Most of Multnomah County's urbanized population is served by an integrated system, and Clackamas County is beginning this process as well.

There are some benefits to coordinating storm and sanitary systems between the three counties, but these benefits are much less significant than those achieved by coordination within each county. Metro currently prepares regionwide sanitary and storm sewer plans which comply with Section 208 of the federal Clean Water Act. To date these documents have been prepared primarily for the purpose of complying with a federal requirement; they are mainly a compilation of local plans and not true regional planning documents. This is particularly true of the storm water 208 plan, which has not been updated since 1982.

RGC recommends that Metro staff play an enhanced role in providing coordination and information gathering and support services for the local governments. While there is no advantage to be gained from shifting the planning or service delivery lead from the local level at this time, Metro could help to provide a forum for local governments to communicate, share information, and develop common approaches to solving problems when appropriate. This would be particularly useful for adjacent areas of the service territories of the three counties. This enhanced staff role for Metro would also help to build in-house capability and improve the quality of the largely perfunctory section 208 plans which are filed by Metro now.

RGC strongly believes that it would be a mistake to attempt to shift planning or service delivery in the waste and storm water fields to Metro in today's regulatory environment. There are no identifiable benefits to doing this, and the extremely short regulatory timeframes governments are responding to would be even more difficult to meet if a major structural reorganization in these fields occurred. An already difficult situation would be made much worse.

RGC appreciates the opportunity to offer these comments and would be happy to provide additional information on request of the Charter Committee.

Storm Sewer and Sanitation Drainage Subcommittee
MATRIX A: SUMMARY OF CURRENT SYSTEM

	RESOURCE QUANTITY ISS.	RESOURCE QUALITY ISS.	FUNDING	PLANNING LEAD	COORDINATION LEAD	INFO. GATHERI SUPPORT	SERVICE DEL LEAD
WASTE WATER							
• Source Control	Local	Fed/State/ Local	Private/ Local	Fed/State/ Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
• Collection	Local	Local	Local/private	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
• Transport	Local/State	Local/State	Local	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
• Treatment	State	Federal/State/ Local	Local	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
STORM WATER							
• Source Control	Local/Federal	Federal/State Local	Local/private	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
• Conveyance	Local/Federal	Fed/State/ Local	Local	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local
• Treatment	Fed/State/ Local	Fed/State/ Local	Local/Metro	Local/Metro*	Local	Local	Local

Local= cities, counties, special districts or combinations thereof
 Private= individual property owners involved in new development projects
 Metro= Metropolitan Service District
 State= State of Oregon
 Federal= Federal Government

* Note: Metro's role is through Section 208 Clean Water Act plans

Storm Sewer and Sanitation Drainage Subcommittee
MATRIX B: SUMMARY OF PREFERRED SYSTEM

	RESOURCE QUANTITY ISS.	RESOURCE QUALITY ISS.	FUNDING	PLANNING LEAD	COORDINATION LEAD	INFO. GATHERI SUPPORT	SERVICE DEL LEAD
WASTE WATER							
• Source Control	Local	Fed/State/ Local	Private/ Local	Fed/State/ Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
• Collection	Local	Local	Local/private	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
• Transport	Local/State	Local/State	Local	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
• Treatment	State	Federal/State/ Local	Local	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
STORM WATER							
• Source Control	Local/Federal	Federal/State Local	Local/private	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
• Conveyance	Local/Federal	Fed/State/ Local	Local	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local
• Treatment	Fed/State/ Local	Fed/State/ Local	Local/Metro	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro*	Local/Metro	Local

Local=cities, counties, special districts or combination thereof

Private= individual property owners involved in new development properties

Metro= Metropolitan Service District

State= State of Oregon

Federal= Federal Government

*Note: Metro's role is through Section 208 Clean Water Act plans