

COMMITTEE III

LAND USE, RECREATIONAL & CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

A G E N D A

SEPTEMBER 20, 1976

NOON

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. REPORT ON LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS STUDY:  
MARY-ELIZABETH BLUNT and CORKY KIRKPATRICK
3. DISCUSSION OF HEALTH SERVICES AGENCY AND  
BOUNDARY COMMISSION
4. ADJOURNMENT

*land use regional concerns : as adopted by the Council  
Boundary Comm - fully funded by state  
appointing power*

els

## MINUTES OF THE LAND USE, RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Held: September 21, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Herrell, Vice-Chairperson; Blunt, Brickley, Bullier, Kirkpatrick and Stevenson.

STAFF: Martin, Rich

Steve Herrell opened the meeting and asked for the report from Beth Blunt and Corky Kirkpatrick on the League of Women Voters study on the Port of Portland.

Blunt covered the first three volumes which basically examined existing conditions, relationships and problems of the Port vis-a-vis other ports on the Columbia River, including the Port of Vancouver, other ports on the Washington side of the river and other ports in Oregon. A basic question addressed was the feasibility of various combinations of these ports for some or all functions. The general feeling of the other ports is that they wish to maintain their autonomy and fear being swallowed up by the Port of Portland under any proposal for joint operations.

Herrell noted that this report seemed to support the notion that the Port of Portland is a regional entity and not a state-wide or bi-state agency.

Mr. Bullier said we would never see a bi-state port authority in our lifetimes but might see one made up of all Oregon ports facing the ocean and the Columbia River as far as Portland.

When Herrell asked Blunt if, from what she read, she felt the Port of Portland should be included under the Tri-County Council, Blunt replied, yes.

Kirkpatrick said the second year of the study (the last two volumes) summarized much of what Blunt had said. In this phase of their study, the League talked to many people involved about the feasibility of a bi-state agency. The report said that, in general, the public did not follow the Port's activities, even though the meetings were open. The pros and cons of an elected board were outlined, but no conclusion was drawn by the League. The report emphasized the Port as a business. The League study commented that if the people in the district want the Port to do what it is doing now, why change to a state-wide or a bi-state format?

Corky said she personally contacted former Port Executive Director, Ed Westerdahl. Westerdahl noted his associations with local government and his support for regional concerns and went on to say that when it comes to the Port, however, it should not be brought under a Tri-County Council authority. He emphasized that it is a business, not a government. He said he would not oppose the Port Commissioners' being appointed from a list submitted by the county commissioners of all three counties. Mr. Westerdahl did support a voluntary joint effort of ports to do some market analysis, etc.

There was general discussion which narrowed to the issue of how the Port Commissioners should be appointed: by the governor, as now, or by the governor from

a list submitted by the Tri-County Council. There was general consensus that the Port should be left 'as is', except for the appointment process.

Bullier moved and Corky seconded, that the Port should not be included under a Tri-County Council umbrella as an agency but that the Tri-County Council should be the appointing authority for the Port Commission, rather than the governor. This was approved unanimously.

Ardis Stevenson reported that the ad hoc committee determined the method for deciding if a matter should be of metropolitan significance, was for the Council to simply identify it as such. Corky asked if that gave enough citizen input. The Committee felt that there was accountability enough, through the elected officials. Also, the courts, the referendum and initiative process act as safeguards.

Ardis then moved that the Committee recommend the appropriate method for determining matters of metropolitan significance be for the Tri-County Council to declare them so. This won unanimous approval.

Alan Brickley presented his view on the structuring for the Tri-County Council. He felt that CRAG and Tri-Met should be left 'as is' statutorily and that the MSD statute should simply be changed to allow that board to be the board for Tri-Met and CRAG as well. Kay Rich said that might be appropriate for Tri-Met but not for CRAG. For CRAG, he felt it would be easier and more politically expedient to repeal the CRAG statute and rewrite that whole function in the MSD statute. There was much additional discussion on this issue. Finally, Steve Herrell said that he could gather four main points on this issue which had been covered at the previous meeting. These were:

1. Repealing of ORS 197 (CRAG statute).
2. Writing the planning function from ORS 197 into the MSD statute with assessment powers, functions and duties of the current CRAG operations passed on to MSD.
3. Planning in MSD would be made mandatory, as it is now under ORS 197, rather than permissive as are other functions under MSD currently.
4. Conforming of the duties and powers of planning under MSD to those suggested in the Land Use Committee's section of the Phase II report.

This was discussed briefly and agreed to by the Committee.

Meeting was adjourned.

els