

MINUTES OF THE LONG RANGE OPTIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

Held: December 9, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brickley, Chairperson; Schedeen, Vice-Chairperson;
Jaeger, Jordan, Kirkpatrick, Landauer, Lang, McGilvra,
Snedecor, Russell, Stuhr

EXCUSED: Keller, Roberts

STAFF: Macpherson, Mitchell, Rich, Garbutt

BUEST: McKillip, Commissioner Jordan's office

Macpherson, responding to the request of the committee, gave a brief presentation which showed the metropolitan area map with overlays showing developed land, city boundaries and sewerage and water districts.

Liz Mitchell, staff resource consultant for the City-County-Special Districts Committee, was invited to report on the topics of similarity between these two committees. The major items of concern are tax inequities, duplication of services and annexation.

STRUCTURAL QUESTIONS DISCUSSION - (LR-10 mailed 12/2/76)

The Tri-County area population is 942,000; consisting of 3,080 square miles. Boundary changes are the ideal or long range solution, and that goal is not realistic at this time. The committee felt it should confine its efforts to the "ideal" separately rather than try to incorporate this with the system we have now. It was suggested that population districts be used as a guideline for providing urban services. Water services could be provided in different categories at different levels: supply, transmission, and distribution.

Rich described Toronto, Canada as an example of a two-tier system which is operating successfully. The boroughs have responsibility for water distribution, sewage collection, residential streets, garbage collection, fire service, etc. The city is considered one of the boroughs. The metro unit took over the responsibility of overall planning of development of the area and is in charge of water supply, sewage treatment, freeways, welfare, etc. If your goal is the two-tier system, the upper and lower levels are both multi-purpose, he said.

Another approach would be to strengthen the neighborhood organizations without creating a third tier.

Jordan pointed out that the City of Portland relies on revenue from the sale of water to do other things in the city.

Jaeger said although we are studying the possibilities for consolidation to save money, in some areas, they would be willing to spend more for better and more responsive services.

It was suggested that the present geographical districts of the city of Portland could be designated as urban services districts, e.g. southwest, southeast, northeast and northwest.

It was determined the committee would not meet again until January 6. Meanwhile, they are to receive specific information regarding operating two-tier systems in Toronto, London and also how Dade County, Florida is structured.

Staff and the chairman of the committee will meet prior to January 6 to review questions for the committee to consider.

els

LONG RANGE OPTIONS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION TOPICS

A. STRUCTURAL QUESTIONS:

1. Should the physical structure of existing cities be preserved at the time when consolidation takes place? Would the preservation of existing cities minimize resistance to reform?
2. What is the optimum size of the lower-tier units? Would the creation of a large number of lower-tier units cause coordination and service delivery problems? Can tasks of significance be effectively carried out with small lower-tier units?

How can the conflict between participation and efficiency (participation calls for small units; efficiency demands largeness) be resolved?

3. What is the distinction between rural communities, urban communities and cities? Do densities vary? Do they vary on the basis of population and/or land area? How should federal lands be handled? Can a rural corporate community be changed to an urban corporate community? Under what circumstances? Who institutes boundary changes?
4. Should the formulation of cities be encouraged (required) in urbanized; incorporated areas? Should annexation be encouraged (required)? If annexation or incorporation is required, should a time-frame be recommended for phasing it in?
5. How does an urban corporate community differ from a city?
6. Within the fabric of a city, can neighborhoods be strengthened as instruments for participation without creating a third tier?
7. Should the existing county boundaries be changed? retained? modified?
8. What methodologies, if any, should be recommended for staging the proposals? Should an annotated outline of a charter be prepared which divides the upper- and lower-tier responsibilities? (Can the Metropolitan Study Commission's charter, establishing a municipality and providing for its corporate communities, be utilized, in part, as an example?)

B. CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY CHANGES NECESSARY FOR LONG-TERM STRUCTURAL REORGANIZATION:

Statutory Change -- providing for a consolidation of counties and a charter commission. (The charter commission would not define lower-tier relationships.)

Constitutional Amendment -- providing for a charter commission which would define the relationship between upper- and lower-tiers (hence requiring answers to the Structural Questions above).