

July 14

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES I WOULD MAKE,
QUESTIONS I WOULD LIKE TO RAISE AND OTHER OBSERVATIONS

Bob Shoemaker
July 4, 1992

Section 7. Regional Planning Functions.

- (1) Future Vision. Leave as is. I believe this to be substantially better than the vision (i.e., non-binding, non-regulatory) aspects of the Region 2040 plan.
- (2) Regional Framework Plan. It would be helpful for our committee to understand how this differs from a comprehensive plan.

Question: If both Future Vision and the Regional Framework Plan are adopted by May 1, 1994, how can the RFP describe its relationship to the Future Vision?

On page 4, (a) local government comprehensive plans should be required to be consistent within three years after adoption of the RFP or periodic review, whichever is shorter. Change from longer.

Section 8. Addition of Other Matters to Regional Framework Plan.

Inclusion of other matters in the RFP should be solely the decision of the Metro council, by a simple majority vote, after receiving the advice of MPAC. I would not quarrel with requiring an absolute majority rather than a majority of a quorum.

Section 9. Assumption or Termination of Additional Functions.

- (2) Assumption of Local Government Services Function. Permit assumption of local functions by intergovernmental agreement, whether or not they are of metropolitan concern. In a case where the local governments, directly affected by an assumption of a function, do not consent, I can live with requiring MPAC or voter approval.

Section 11. Limitation of Taxing Powers.

- (1) Referral of-certain taxation ordinances. I agree with Dan Cooper's comments.

Section 12. Limitations on Authority to Contract.

I favor contracting out, provided that this is not used as a way to avoid certain obligations to employees, such as retirement benefits and health care. It would be instructive to explore legislative history of our legislature on this subject. I recall that it was a significant issue in the 1989 session.

**CHAPTERS III (FORM OF GOVERNMENT)
& IV (COUNCIL)**

I favor a council of seven councilors, elected from districts, and compensated equivalent to state legislators. The president of the council should be selected by the council annual. The president should be full time and compensated accordingly. I do not favor term limits--but could live with a three-term limit.

The executive should be elected at large and compensated equivalent to the president of the council.

We might consider giving the executive a limited veto, as follows:

Budget (recommended by the executive)--veto

Assumption of planning or service functions--no veto

Adoption and amendment of the Regional Framework Plan--no veto

Taxes referred to the voters--no veto

Taxes adopted by ordinance--veto

Service and user fees--veto

Other policy decisions--no veto

The council would be able to override a veto with a 2/3 vote.

CHAPTER V (OFFICERS, COMMISSIONS AND EMPLOYEES)

With the elected executive in charge of administration of METRO, I'm not sure we need to provide for a manager. I expect the executive would hire such a person whether or not it is called for in the charter, and that the council would approve a budget item covering that post. If the elected executive chose to actively manage METRO without a manager, he or she should be allowed to do so, even though chaos might result.

OTHER MATTERS

Elected Auditor

I strongly favor an elected performance auditor with either CPA or CIA credentials. No term limit. This should be a career job, subject to voter approval.

Enterprise Revenues

I think disclosure in the financial audit is an adequate check against abuse, but I could live with a prohibition against service and user fees exceeding the cost of service plus funding a share of METRO overhead and planning expenses. I would disfavor a formula limiting the extent of overhead and planning to be so funded.

Citizen Involvement

I favor this. I do not believe it is redundant of MPAC nor an unacceptable additional burden. Models we could look to include the City of Portland Neighborhood Association and the Washington County Citizen Planning Organization.

This should help to "humanize" METRO and to make it better known to its constituents. Organized citizen involvement also provides useful input to the council—a reality check.

Extra-Territorial Planning Authority

Tricky issue. I'm not sure where I come out on this.

"Willamette County"

I would like METRO to be able to eliminate county governments—with the approval of each county's electorate or by agreement with a county's government. Elimination of less than all three counties should be permitted.