

METRO

Memorandum

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

Date:

December 6, 1991

To:

METRO Council, Executive, Interested Parties

From:

Betsy Bergstein

Regarding:

Charter Committee Meeting - December 6, 1991

The Charter Committee continued reviewing Metro functions. In the course of their meeting, they reached agreement in several areas. The first three points of Committee discussion will have near term implications and are worth your attention:

1. The Committee will have another round of public comment on their "work to date" on a Saturday early in 1992. The proposal was advanced by Ned Look and the date he suggested was Saturday January 11, 1991. He wanted to invite people, who have commented previously and spent time monitoring the Committee, to provide comments on the Committee's draft and allow the Committee to ask them questions. The groups he mentioned were the Portland Chamber, Regional Governance Committee, League of Women Voters, Common Ground, Tri-Met and Metro. The idea was that the Committee "not go public", until testimony was received from these particular groups.

[A little background....at a meeting with Western Advocates that same morning, Noel Kline told Ken Gervais that the RGC proposed joining with Metro to have another round of input from invited interests before releasing the draft to the public. Ken responded no, he didn't think it would be appropriate. Before the Charter meeting started that evening, Ned Look approached Ken Gervais with the same idea, and again Ken responded in the negative, stating that he thought it would pose some difficulties for Metro, not the least being getting an official Metro response on such a short time line.]

The Committee generally agreed to the idea of having another round of invited testimony with various members suggesting "invited dialogue" not "invited testimony" (Egge) as the format. The exact date and format still have to be worked out, but please be advised that it looks like this will occur early in 1992.

<u>Library activities (with voter approval)</u>. There was quite a bit of discussion here with the final decision to delete with Wes Myllenbeck objecting and Mary Tobias abstaining.

Boundary commission transfer. Again there was quite a bit of discussion ranging from "a carry over from a time where there was no elected regional government" (Phelps) to Metro serving as the "court of last resort." There was a motion that "the function of the boundary commission is one of metropolitan significance and declares that the region will not exercise that function." It failed seven to four (Voting <u>yes</u>: Derr, Josselson, Meek, Phelps, Tobias, Look, Urbigkeit; voting <u>no:</u> Egge, Myllenbeck, Shoemaker, Myers).

The Committee approved a statement that the "exercise of any function presently performed by the Boundary Commission is a metropolitan concern", leaving open the question of whether the charter assigns those responsibilities to the regional government.