



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT  
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

## A G E N D A

Date: June 5, 1980

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber

### CALL TO ORDER (7:30)

1. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS  
(There will be a limit of 4 minutes for each speaker)
2. CONSENT AGENDA
  - 2.1 A-95 Review, directly related to Metro
  - 2.2 Minutes of Meeting of May 1, 1980
3. ORDINANCES
  - 3.1 Ordinance No. 80-93, Relating to Local Improvement District Procedures, and Amending Ordinance No. 79-78 (Second Reading) (7:35)
  - 3.2 Ordinance No. 80-94, For the Purpose of Transferring Appropriations Within the Solid Waste Operating Fund for the Fiscal Year 1980 Metropolitan Service District Budget (Second Reading) (7:55)
  - 3.3 Ordinance No. 80-97, For the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget of the Metropolitan Service District for Fiscal Year 1981 Making Appropriations from Funds of the District in Accordance with Said Annual Budget and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes (First Reading) (8:15)
4. GENERAL DISCUSSION
  - 4.1 Five-year Operational Plan and Financing Options (8:35)
  - 4.2 Any Other Matters of Council or Executive Officer Concern

ADJOURN



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT  
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

## A G E N D A

Date: June 5, 1980  
Day: Thursday  
Time: 7:30 p.m.  
Place: Council Chamber

### C O N S E N T A G E N D A

The following business items have been reviewed by the staff and an officer of the Council. In my opinion, these items meet the Consent List Criteria established by the Rules and Procedures of the Council.

  
Executive Officer

- 4.1 A-95 Review, Directly Related to Metro  
Action Requested: Concur in staff findings
- 4.2 Minutes of Meeting of April 24, 1980  
Action Requested: Approve minutes as circulated

: cmw

## DIRECTLY RELATED A-95 PROJECT APPLICATIONS UNDER REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FEDERAL \$	STATE \$	LOCAL \$	OTHER \$	TOTAL \$
<p>1. <u>Project Title:</u> State of Oregon 208 Planning Program (#805-10)</p> <p><u>Applicant:</u> State of Oregon - Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</p> <p><u>Project Summary:</u> DEQ is applying for federal funds from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under section 208 of the Clean Water Act. The projects within the grant focus on nonpoint source pollution, including: ground-water monitoring; special nonpoint source water quality studies; and public involvement.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Favorable Action</p>	<p>\$805,832 EPA</p>	<p>\$86,172</p>	<p>\$203,664</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>\$1,095,668</p>
<p>2. <u>Project Title:</u> Proposal to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Vacuum Sweeping of Streets to Control Paved Road Dust (#805-8)</p> <p><u>Applicant:</u> City of Portland</p> <p><u>Project Summary:</u> Resuspended road dust is the single greatest source of particulate air pollution in the Portland metropolitan area. This study is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of high efficiency vacuum sweepers in reducing airborne concentrations of total and respirable particulates.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Favorable Action</p>	<p>\$200,000 EPA</p>	<p>\$ 8,300</p>	<p>\$ 59,642</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>\$ 267,942</p>

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

May 1, 1980

Councilors in Attendance

Presiding Officer Marge Kafoury  
Deputy Presiding Officer Jack Deines  
Coun. Corky Kirkpatrick  
Coun. Jane Rhodes  
Coun. Betty Schedeen  
Coun. Ernie Bonner  
Coun. Cindy Banzer  
Coun. Gene Peterson  
Coun. Mike Burton  
Coun. Donna Stuhr

In Attendance

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson

Staff in Attendance

Mr. Denton U. Kent  
Mr. Andrew Jordan  
Ms. Sonnie Russill  
Ms. Caryl Waters  
Mr. Jim Sitzman  
Mr. Charles Shell  
Ms. Michelle Wilder  
Ms. Judy Bieberle  
Mr. Warren Iliff  
Ms. Priscilla Ditewig

Others in Attendance

Mr. Michael Alesko  
Mr. Phil Adamsak

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

CALL TO ORDER

After declaration of a quorum, the May 1, 1980, meeting of the Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) was called to order by Presiding Officer Marge Kafoury at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 527 S.W. Hall Street, Portland, Oregon 97201.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL

Presiding Officer Marge Kafoury announced that she had received a letter from Portland City Commissioner Mike Lindberg requesting the appointment of Rick Martinez as the city of Portland's representative to Metro's Solid Waste Policy Alternatives Committee (SWPAC). Mr. Martinez is in the Solid Waste Division assigned to Public Works and is designing a Solid Waste Plan for the City of Portland.

Coun. Rhodes moved, seconded by Coun. Kirkpatrick, to accept the appointment of Rick Martinez as the city of Portland's representative to the SWPAC. Couns. Kirkpatrick, Rhodes, Schedeen, Bonner, Banzer, Peterson, Burton, Stuhr, Kafoury voted aye. Coun. Deines voted nay. The motion carried.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Ken Rose of Rose City River Transit, 5903 S.E. Holgate, Portland, Oregon 97206, spoke to the Council regarding waterborne transportation. He said that Metro Resolution No. 79-59, passed June 28, 1979, stated that the city of Portland had \$5,000 to generate basic information for river transit and that Metro would do alternative analyses or studies and report to the Council on further steps which should be taken to investigate the feasibility of the water transit concept. Mr. Rose said that he would like to know what input Rose City River Transit can provide and asked if there is a possibility of citizen participation in the analysis.

Mr. Kent stated that he would have the appropriate staff check into the matter and contact Mr. Rose.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED BUDGET

The public hearing was opened on this matter.

There being no one who wished to testify, the public hearing was closed.

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson introduced the budget and outlined priorities in each department.

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

Presiding Officer Kafoury stated that the Council's job was to go through the budget, feel comfortable with it and approve the Resolution transmitting it to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC). Changes can still be made after it has been received and reviewed by the TSCC, with final adoption scheduled for June 26.

The Council briefly discussed procedures for further discussion of specific budget items. Mr. Gustafson stated that it would be appropriate to adjust amounts of money that evening, but that approval of a new position or a change in direction of a program should go through the Committees before any expenditure of money.

Coun. Burton brought up the subject of Metro's land use comprehensive plan review process, stating that it is one of Metro's most important functions and questioning whether there is enough depth in the Regional Policy Enforcement division of the Metropolitan Development department for adequate plan review. He stated that Metro must have a very defined and specific role which would provide more capability for reviewing and coordinating comprehensive plans and made a strong recommendation for immediately adding funds from contingency for additional staff or consultants.

Mr. Jim Sitzman, Director of Metropolitan Development, responded that there has been and will continue to be an increasing amount of interest by special interest groups in the review of local plans. That effort and continuing to resolve policy questions outstanding with LCDC, will demand more staff time. He added that, although it was originally thought plans would be in by July, 1980, it is almost certain now that review process will continue until July, 1981.

Coun. Peterson agreed with Coun. Burton regarding the need for additional funding in Regional Policy Enforcement, adding that it is Metro's most important long run role. He stated that Metro must measure the tradeoffs between responsibility for economic development and responsibility for environmental protection. He said that Metro must come up with a regional policy, so that regional policies as we adopt them, can be implemented by making adjustments in the individual comprehensive plans.

Coun. Kirkpatrick suggested that, instead of adding a staff person now, we go to the contingency fund during the year when more specific needs have been identified for adding to staff.

Presiding Officer Kafoury said this matter should be referred to the Regional Planning Committee for further discussion.

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

Coun. Banzer said she supports in theory Coun. Burton's recommendation to bolster the Metropolitan Development department budget; however, she is concerned about the ballot measure in November regarding the tax base. She would like to keep flexibility in the contingency fund in order to make necessary mid-year adjustments to deal with success or lack of success in November. She recommended highly visible, short term, inexpensive projects to show the voters that Metro has accomplished something.

Coun. Deines introduced the subject of per diem and said that Councilors are rapidly depleting their allotments. He added that it should not cost a person money to be a Councilor and that most of the per diem money is gone, whereas only half of the travel money has been spent.

Coun. Deines moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, that the budget be changed to allow six meetings per month at \$35 per meeting, but that travel expense on meeting days be separated.

Coun. Burton asserted that this would be an inappropriate use of public money and suggested that there may be an unequal distribution of Council committee assignments, requiring some Councilors to attend many more meetings than other Councilors.

Coun. Rhodes asked if money can be transferred between the Councilors' travel and per diem accounts.

Presiding Officer Kafoury answered that the two accounts are separate; one is taxable, the other is not. Also, it is adopted Council policy not to transfer funds between the two accounts.

Coun. Bonner stated that the Council should have the option of using the fund however they need to use it and that it ought to be increased as inflation increases. He suggested that the matter be referred to the Council Coordinating Committee for further discussion. The Council agreed with this suggestion.

Discussion of the Solid Waste Operation Fund followed. Coun. Burton said that the Recycling/Source Separation program, which would fund two recycling drop centers for one year, is not sufficient, and suggested that the program be increased by \$50,000 to fund a third recycling center.

Coun. Rhodes responded that she would prefer to stick with the two sites for the present and evaluate their workability before taking on a third site. She added that, rather than Metro doing it all, local governments should be encouraged to become more involved in recycling efforts.

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

Coun. Stuhr said that two recycling center sites had been approved initially for test purposes, so that money would not be invested in an unworkable program.

Coun. Deines indicated that Clackamas County refuse haulers plan to bring a proposal before the Council within the next two or three months for the development of three recycling sites in the County. He said there would be some requests for assistance from Metro in site improvement and employment of part time help.

Coun. Bonner said that if money is going to be transferred from contingency, it should be applied to efforts of groups such as the Clackamas County collectors and the Sunflower Recycling Team, while Metro monitors its two sites.

Coun. Burton responded that, as a regional agency, Metro should be as involved as possible in the recycling effort in order to educate the public and that a program should be developed with funds available this year for legitimate recycling efforts.

Coun. Bonner suggested that a body of money be set aside for a loan and grant program to fund recycling projects with specific criteria for allocation.

Coun. Burton said he would be very happy with that suggestion.

Presiding Officer Kafoury referred this matter to the Regional Services Committee.

Coun. Rhodes moved, seconded by Coun. Bonner, to extend a vote of appreciation to Charlie Shell and his staff for producing a readable and understandable budget document. All Councilors present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Coun. Kirkpatrick moved, seconded by Coun. Rhodes, for adoption of Resolution No. 80-146, transmitting the approved FY 1981 budget to the TSCC. All Councilors present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Coun. Kirkpatrick, Chairman of the Waste Reduction Task Force, asked the Council for approval of two additional members. They are: Jim Andrews, architect and former Chairman of the Buckman Community Association, and Margaret Horning, a librarian at David Douglas High School.

Coun. Peterson asked what sort of regionwide balance these appointments would provide.

Coun. Kirkpatrick responded that, with only nine members on the Task Force, each district can not be represented; however, the two additions would provide a better geographic distribution.



Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

Coun. Bonner moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, for ratification of the two appointments. All Councilors present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

UPDATE ON ZOO CAMPAIGN

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson gave an update on the Zoo Campaign, which has picked up substantially and has received much publicity recently. He credited staff at Metro and the Zoo for their efforts in the campaign and noted the upcoming appearances on behalf of the Zoo of Jane Goodall, Governor Atiyeh and the President of the American Zoological Society.

SIX MONTH DECISION SCHEDULE

Mr. Gustafson briefly discussed the Six Month Decision Schedule - major projects requiring Council decisions within the next six months.

In the Solid Waste department, the establishment of an emergency routing plan in Fall, 1980, is important because of the change in the St. Johns Landfill operation and because of the prospect of only one landfill in the metropolitan area.

Any delay in the adoption of a Uniform Disposal Rate would mean that the Solid Waste fund would be absorbing a loss at the St. Johns landfill for that period due to the higher rates at St. Johns.

The Housing Goals and Policies draft report recommended by HPAC has been issued and is being reviewed.

Coun. Peterson stated that ad hoc goals and policies are necessary, but it should be indicated that they are temporary and that there will be adjustments made when other policies are completed.

Coun. Banzer added that housing is a critical area and that the Council should have enough time to become involved in the shaping of Metro's housing policy.

Presiding Officer Kafoury said the Council has the option of not adopting the policy and that anything adopted by the Council is subject to change at a later date.

The Preliminary Report Phase I for the Johnson Creek Local Improvement District will come before the Regional Services Committee on May 13. On May 22, the Council will be asked to approve the Resolution to Proceed with the LID. There will be a public hearing for citizen testimony before the full Council on June 16, with second reading and final adoption of the Ordinance set for the regular Council meeting on June 26.

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

FIVE YEAR OPERATING PLAN AND NOVEMBER ELECTION

Executive Officer Gustafson discussed the Operating Plan and Finance Strategy timeline, highlighting the major dates.

The format of the Five Year Operating Plan will be presented at a Special Council meeting on May 22 at 3 p.m. Discussion will focus on the outcome of the May primary and impacts of that on the general election in November.

On May 28 at 7:15 p.m., there will be a meeting with survey participants, which will require participation by Councilors in leading discussions about results of the survey. The complete draft of the Five Year Operating Plan will be presented at this time.

The first meeting of the Finance Task Force, to look at taxing possibilities and make recommendations on finance strategy and alternatives, is scheduled for June 2.

The rest of the schedule is as follows:

- June 5 - Council meeting - work session on Operating Plan
- June 9 and 10 - Details of Operating Plan within specific functional areas go to Regional Planning and Regional Services Committees
- June 19 - Second draft of Operating Plan will be issued
- June 23 - Finance Task Force will meet to further discuss finance options
- June 26 - Council meeting - review of second draft of Operating Plan and finance options
- July 3 - Final draft of Operating Plan will be issued
- July 14 - Finance Task Force will review Operating Plan
- July 24 - Public hearing and first reading of Plan Ordinance
- August 4 - Finance Task Force will make final recommendation on finance strategy
- August 7 - Second reading and adoption of Plan Ordinance and finance strategy

Mr. Gustafson stressed that this is a highly charged issued and that, while the final dollar amount and actual approach will not be decided until August, Metro needs a sense of direction very soon.

Metro Council  
Minutes of May 1, 1980

Coun. Burton stated that the Council should reach a consensus on which direction to take as soon as possible.

Mr. Kent said the Council could begin focusing on one or two options now, and if they do not agree with the direction of the Finance Task Force, make their views known to the Task Force.

Presiding Officer Kafoury urged each Councilor to read the survey results, discuss them with their constituents, and be prepared for the June 5 Council meeting with their options.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Priscilla Ditewig*

ORDINANCE NO. 80-93

TITLE RELATING TO LOCAL IMPROVEMENT  
DISTRICT PROCEDURES, AND AMENDING  
ORDINANCE NO. 79-78

DATE INTRODUCED \_\_\_\_\_

FIRST READING \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND READING \_\_\_\_\_

DATE ADOPTED \_\_\_\_\_

DATE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_

ROLLCALL

	Yes	No	Abst.
Burton			
Stuhr			
Williams			
Berkman			
Kirkpatrick			
Deines			
Rhodes			
Schedeen			
Miller			
Banzer			
Peterson			
Kafoury			

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

RELATING TO LOCAL IMPROVEMENT )  
DISTRICT PROCEDURES, AND AMENDING )  
ORDINANCE NO. 79-78 )

ORDINANCE NO. 80-93

Introduced by the  
Regional Services Committee

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Section 9 (a) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby  
amended to read as follows:

"(a) No sooner than twenty (20) days after the  
first publication of the resolution notice  
required by Section 7 the Council shall hold a  
public hearing on the proposed improvement. At  
such hearing, persons wishing to object and  
persons favoring the improvement shall be  
entitled to be heard."

Section 2. Section 9 (f) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby  
amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Council may, if a combined hearing as  
provided in Section 9(b) is held, adopt an  
Ordinance apportioning and levying the assess-  
ment with the Ordinance creating the Local  
Improvement District and adopting the total  
proposed assessment. The apportionment and levy  
Ordinance shall specify the method of collection  
of the assessment as provided for in Section  
13(e), herein."

Section 3. Section 11 (a) (1) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby  
amended to read as follows:

"(1) Assessments may be levied against benefited  
property for the purpose of defraying the costs  
of public improvements within the Local Improve-  
ment District including but not limited to  
administration, assessment, bonding costs,  
planning, engineering, purchase, construction,  
supervision, reconstruction and repair."

Section 4. Section 13 (e) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby  
amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Council may pass an Ordinance apportioning and levying assessments against the affected properties. Said Ordinance shall specify the method of collection to be used, either by directing the recording of assessment liens and lien docket as provided by Section 13 (f) through (h), below, or by directing the certification of assessments to the appropriate county tax assessor as provided by Section 17 (a), below. An assessment Ordinance may be amended by subsequent Ordinance specifying an alternative method of collection, consistent with this subsection."

Section 5. Section 12 (a) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Promptly after passage of the Ordinance levying the assessment, the Executive Officer shall cause to be published, in a newspaper of general circulation within the district, a notice that such an Ordinance has been passed specifying the whole cost or estimated cost of the improvement, a general description of the boundaries of the district assessed, or an illustration thereof, the number and title of the assessment Ordinance, and that the assessments are due and payable, the time when the same shall be delinquent and the charges and penalties related thereto."

Section 6. Section 14 (b) of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) The Executive Officer shall also mail notice to each affected landowner of the assessment upon the property, and landowner's right to deferred payment under Section 18 of this Ordinance and all of the information specified in paragraph (a) above. The notice shall specify that the assessments are due and payable, to whom they are payable, the time when the same shall be delinquent and the charges and penalties related thereto."

Section 7. Section 17 of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Consistent with the requirements of Section 13 (e) and notwithstanding the provisions of Section 13 (f) through (h), the Council may

direct the Executive Officer to certify the assessments for a Local Improvement District to the county assessor of the county in which the assessed lands are located. Said certification shall be accomplished by written contract, agreement or other lawful means with the county assessor(s) to provide that any assessments certified shall be placed on the tax rolls, collected, and paid over by the county assessor or tax collector, whoever has possession of the roll, as other taxes and assessments are certified, assessed, collected, and paid over."

"(b) The Executive Officer, in his discretion, may contract with local public or private agencies to provide the district with services to meet the requirements of this Ordinance."

"(c) Such services may include engineering, surveying, recording of assessments, billing and collection of assessments, the keeping of a Lien docket, notice to property owners and other related assessment functions."

Section 8. Section 19 of Ordinance No. 79-78 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"A property owner who qualifies for an elderly homestead deferral under ORS 311.666 through ORS 311.700, or ORS 311.706 through ORS 311.735, may claim the deferral by submitting the form required by ORS 311.668, or ORS 311.708."

Section 9. The following Sections are hereby amended in part as follows:

Section 5 (c) is amended to read in part, "...as provided in Section 9 (b)...."

Section 7 (b) is amended to read in part, "...indicated in Section 6,...."

Section 9 (b) is amended to read in part, "...under Section 9 and the assessment and apportionment hearing under Section 13."

Section 10 (b) is amended to read in part, "...adopted

under Section 9 of this Ordinance...."

Section 10 (c) is amended to read in part, "...adopted under Section 9 of this Ordinance...."

Section 18 (d) (2) is amended to read in part, "...with interest as set by ORS 288.510 on all assessments...."

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

TM/gl  
8061/118



TITLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRANSFERRING  
APPROPRIATIONS WITHIN THE SOLID WASTE  
OPERATING FUND FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1980  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT BUDGET

DATE INTRODUCED \_\_\_\_\_

FIRST READING \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND READING \_\_\_\_\_

DATE ADOPTED \_\_\_\_\_

DATE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_

ROLLCALL

Please note that in the materials for the first reading of this Ordinance on May 22, 1980, the fiscal year was incorrectly stated as 1981.

	Yes	No	Abst.
Burton			
Stuhr			
Williams			
Berkman			
Kirkpatrick			
Deines			
Rhodes			
Schedeen			
Miller			
Banzer			
Peterson			
Kafoury			

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRANSFERRING	)	ORDINANCE NO. 80-94
APPROPRIATIONS WITHIN THE SOLID	)	
WASTE OPERATING FUND FOR THE	)	Introduced by the Council
FISCAL YEAR 1980 METROPOLITAN	)	Coordinating Committee
SERVICE DISTRICT BUDGET	)	

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1.

That the following transfers of appropriations be adopted:

a. Solid Waste Operating

\$15,000 from Contingency to Capital Outlay to cover the expense of office equipment and machines required to support the gate operations at the St. Johns Landfill.

\$209,000 from Contingency to Materials and Services to cover the increased expenditures for contractual services for the operation of the St. Johns Landfill.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 5th day of June, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

CS:bk  
8088/118

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council  
 FROM: Executive Officer  
 SUBJECT: Adopting the FY 1981 Budget

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: First reading of Ordinance No. 80-97 adopting the FY 1981 Metro budget.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: The Metro budget is a key document setting the policy direction for the organization for the next fiscal year. The policy alternatives have been reviewed by a citizen Task Force, Council Committees and the full Council.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The Metro budget, adopted in accordance with State law, establishes the legal authorization to expend public funds.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The Metro budget has been prepared after a long series of review meetings with the Council and Council Committees stretching back to last November, and reviewed by a special Task Force with citizen representatives. In accordance with State budget law, the Metro budget has been submitted to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC) for review. That Commission will hold public hearings on June 18, 1980, and return the budget to the Council for final adoption on June 26, 1980.

The Council will be able to make adjustments in the final budget after the hearings before the TSCC when final action is taken adopting the budget on June 26.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The following issues were discussed by the Council at the hearing on the proposed budget. Action may be taken on these items when the budget is adopted.

1. General Fund

- a. Add a Planner III to the Policy Enforcement Program in the Metropolitan Development Department

Cost:

Salary, including Fringes	\$23,800
Support Costs	<u>1,500</u>
	\$25,300

- b. The Council Coordinating Committee recommended increasing the number of meetings at which per diem can be paid from five to six meetings a month and keeping the rate at \$30 per day.

Cost: \$4,320

- c. The Committee also recommended indexing the mileage rate paid for use of personal car on official business to the rate paid by the federal government. This would increase the rate from 17¢ per mile to 20¢.

Total Cost: \$3,000

Total General Fund Contingency	\$689,941
Total Transfers	<u>32,620</u>
New Contingency Balance	\$657,321

2. Solid Waste Fund

Add additional funds to the Recycling Program in Solid Waste to establish a grant assistance fund to support proposed recycling efforts in addition to the two Metro operating sites.

Cost: \$50,000

Total Solid Waste Operating Contingency	\$519,460
Transfers	<u>50,000</u>
New Contingency Balance	\$469,460

3. Johnson Creek LID

The staff will recommend making a transfer in the Johnson Creek Local Improvement District fund shifting \$23,730 from Personnel Services to Material and Services. This change anticipates that the right-of-way acquisition work will be done on contract rather than by a Metro staff member.

There is no net change in this fund.

- C. CONCLUSION: First reading of Ordinance No. 80-97 adopting the FY 1981 Budget.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE )  
ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE METROPOLITAN )  
SERVICE DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEAR )  
1981 MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FROM )  
FUNDS OF THE DISTRICT IN ACCORD- )  
ANCE WITH SAID ANNUAL BUDGET AND )  
LEVYING AD VALOREM TAXES )

ORDINANCE NO. 80-97  
Introduced by the Council  
Coordinating Committee

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) finds that the Multnomah County Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission held its public hearing June 18, 1980, on the annual budget of Metro for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1980, and ending June 30, 1981.

SECTION 2. Recommendations from the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission have been received by Metro and have been acted upon, as reflected in the Budget and in the Schedule of Appropriations.

SECTION 3. The "FY 1981 Budget of the Metropolitan Service District" as attached hereto as Exhibit A to this ordinance and amended by the Council, is hereby adopted.

SECTION 4. The Council of the Metropolitan Service District does hereby levy ad valorem taxes for the Zoo fund as provided in the budget adopted by Section 2 of this Ordinance in the amount of two million dollars (\$2,000,000), said levy being a five-year serial levy outside the six percent constitutional limit approved by district voters on May 25, 1976 (Exhibit B), said that these taxes be, and hereby are, levied and assessed on those taxable properties within the taxing district.

SECTION 5. The Council hereby authorizes expenditures and positions in accordance with the annual budget adopted by Section 2 of this Ordinance, and hereby appropriates funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1980, from the funds and for the purposes listed in the Schedule of Appropriations, Exhibit A, attached hereto and by reference made a part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 6. The Executive Officer shall make the following filings as provided by ORS 294.555 and ORS 310.060:

1. Multnomah County Assessor
  - 1.1 An original and one copy of the Notice of Levy marked Exhibit B, attached hereto and made a part of this Ordinance.
  - 1.2 Two copies of the budget document adopted by Section 2 of this Ordinance.
  - 1.3 A copy of the Notice of Publication provided for by ORS 294.421.
2. Clackamas and Washington County Assessor and Clerk
  - 2.1 A copy of the Notice of Levy, marked Exhibit B.
  - 2.2 A copy of the budget document adopted by Section 2 of this Ordinance.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

CS:bk/8265/118

Ord. No. 80-97  
Page 2 of 2



E X H I B I T A

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

BUDGET FY 1981  
SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATIONS

General Fund

Personal Services	\$ 2,095,623
Materials and Services	1,159,936
Capital Outlay	12,830
Transfers to Other Funds	689,941
Contingency	150,000
<b>Total General Fund</b>	<b>\$ 4,108,330</b>

Zoo Fund

Personal Services	\$ 1,816,324
Materials and Services	1,311,245
Capital Outlay	216,124
General Capital Improvements	275,610
Transfers to Other Funds	487,322
Contingency	100,000
Unappropriated Balance	2,177,507
<b>Total Zoo Fund</b>	<b>\$ 6,384,132</b>

Solid Waste Operations Fund

Personal Services	\$ 601,237
Materials and Services	5,028,180
Capital Outlay	17,110
Transfers to Other Funds	1,125,893
Contingency	519,460
Unappropriated Balance	0
<b>Total Solid Waste Operations</b>	<b>\$ 7,291,880</b>

Solid Waste Debt Service Fund

Debt Service	\$ 398,060
-Unappropriated Balance	0
<b>Total Solid Waste Debt Service Fund</b>	<b>\$ 398,060</b>

Solid Waste Capital Improvement Fund

Project	\$ 4,077,119
Contingency	
<b>Total Solid Waste Capital Improvement Fund</b>	<b>\$ 4,077,119</b>

Criminal Justice Assistance Fund

Materials and Services	\$ 1,651,000
<b>Total Criminal Justice Assistance Fund</b>	<b>\$ 1,651,000</b>

Transportation Assistance Fund

Materials and Services	\$ 569,500
Total Transportation Assistance Fund	<u>\$ 569,500</u>

Johnson Creek LID

Personal Services	\$ 48,689
Materials and Services	300,000
Capital Outlay	1,600
Capital Projects	250,000
Transfers	48,384
Contingency	121,327
Total Johnson Creek LID	<u>\$ 770,000</u>

Drainage Fund

Materials and Services	\$ 8,741
Total Drainage Fund	<u>\$ 8,741</u>

TOTAL ALL FUNDS

\$25,258,762

CS:bk  
8266/118



NOTICE OF PROPERTY TAX LEVY
Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington
To the Assessor of \_\_\_\_\_ County

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE SIDE

Part I: TOTAL PROPERTY TAX LEVY

On June 26, 1980, the Council (Governing Body) of the Metropolitan Service District, Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington County, Oregon, levied a tax as follows:

Table with 5 rows and 3 columns: Description, Funded Partially By State of Oregon, Funded Totally By Local Taxpayers. Includes entries for levy within tax base, special levies, bonded indebtedness, and total amount raised.

Part II: TAX BASE WORKSHEET

ATTENTION: Action by the 1979 Legislature requires that a new tax base be voted on at the next General or Primary Election if the taxing unit has levied outside its tax base.

7. VOTED TAX BASE, IF ANY—On \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_, a majority of the voters approved a tax base in the amount of \_\_\_\_\_

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION

Tax Base Portion of Preceding Three Levies

Three empty boxes for tax base portions of preceding levies.

7-1-19 \_\_\_\_\_ 7-1-19 \_\_\_\_\_ 7-1-19 \_\_\_\_\_

7. Largest of above: 7a \_\_\_\_\_ multiplied by 1.06 = \_\_\_\_\_ 7b \_\_\_\_\_

ADJUSTMENT FOR ANNEXATION INCREASES DURING PRECEDING FISCAL YEAR

8. True Cash Value of area annexed on \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_ (attach list of annexation dates and valuations) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Tax Base Rate per \$1,000 True Cash Value of annexing entity \_\_\_\_\_

10. Annexation Increase: (line 8 times line 9) = 10a \_\_\_\_\_ multiplied by 1.06 = \_\_\_\_\_ 10b \_\_\_\_\_

ADJUSTED TAX BASE

11. Largest of (Line 7b plus Line 10b) or (Line 6 plus Line 10b) \_\_\_\_\_

Part III: LIMITATIONS PER OREGON REVISED STATUTES (Does Not Apply To All Municipal Corporations)

12. The TOTAL amount of Line 5 levied within the statutory limitation \_\_\_\_\_

13. The TOTAL amount of Line 5 levied outside the statutory limitation \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Bus. Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ (Signature of Authorized Official)

**PART IV SCHEDULE OF SPECIAL LEVIES**

**FORM LB-60 AND SAMPLE BALLOTS FOR LEVY ELECTIONS APPROVED IN CALENDAR YEARS 1979 AND 1980 FOR THE 1980-81 FISCAL YEAR MUST BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM.**

Purpose of Levy	Date Approved	Are taxes inside Adjusted Levy? Yes or No	CONTINUING LEVY (see note below this schedule.)	First Year Levied	Final Year To Be Levied	Continuing Tax Authorized Each Year	Total Tax Authorized	Tax Levied This Year
One-year Special Levy Outside Tax Base								
Zoo	May 25, 1976			1970	1981	\$2,000,000	\$10,000	\$2,000,000
<b>TOTAL SPECIAL LEVIES: (This amount should equal total of Lines 2 and 3 Part I of this form) .....</b>								

NOTE: If approved prior to July 21, 1953 enter as mills. If approved September 13, 1967 to January 1, 1972 enter tax rate.

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

The Notice of Property Tax Levy is used to certify the property tax levy of your district to the county assessor.

The Notice is to be completed after the public hearing(s) has been held, the proper ordinance or resolution enacted, the appropriations made and the property tax levy determined. The Notice and other required documents are to be submitted on or before July 15. Should circumstances exist that prevent these items from being filed by July 15, AN EXTENSION OF TIME MUST BE REQUESTED FROM THE COUNTY ASSESSOR.

The Notice of Property Tax Levy, a true and complete copy of the adopted budget document, the resolution or ordinance adopting and appropriating the budget, Form LB-60 (Levy Computation Worksheet), sample ballots of any levy elections approved for the ensuing fiscal year, and either a newspaper clipping; or, if posted or mailed, a copy of the financial summary (from Publication Packet) are to be distributed as follows:

- One copy to the county clerk.
- Two copies to the assessor of each county in which the district is located.
- One copy to the county treasurer if the district's bonded indebtedness is paid by that office. School districts are also required to send one copy to the ESD Superintendent, and one copy to the Oregon Department of Education, School Finance Section, Salem, OR 97310.

**SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS:**

**PART I**—Enter the date, name of governing body, name of municipal corporation, and county in the appropriate spaces.

Line 1—Enter the portion of the tax levy that is within your tax base as computed in Part II.

Line 2—Enter the total of those special levies for operating purposes (one year, serial, millage, or fixed) that were approved by the voters within the limitation determined on Form LB-60, line 17, and minus the tax based on line 1 of this form (and scheduled above under Special Levies).

Line 3—Enter the total of tax levies approved by the voters in excess of the amount shown on Form LB-60, Line 17, minus Line 4 on this form (and scheduled above under Special Levies).

Line 4—Enter the portion of that tax levy necessary for the payment of bonded indebtedness.

Line 5—The total tax levy must be equal to or less than the amount published in the newspaper. If the total tax levy is greater than that amount published, the municipal corporation must republish the entire budget summary with revisions and hold another public hearing.

**PART II**—Enter the municipal corporation's voted tax base, if any, in the space provided.

Enter the tax base portion of the preceding three levies in the boxes provided and indicate the year of the levy.

Line 7(a & b)—Multiply the largest of the three levies by 1.06 and enter the amount.

Line 8—If the municipal corporation has annexed adjoining property during the last fiscal year ending June 30, enter the date of annexation and the true cash value of the annexed property during the last fiscal year. If more than one annexation, please attach an additional schedule listing separately the date of annexation and true cash value of the annexed property during the last fiscal year.

Line 9—Enter last year's tax base rate per \$1,000 of assessed value for the annexing entity.

Line 10(a & b)—Multiply the amount entered on line 8 by line 9. Multiply the answer by 1.06 to determine the annexation increase to the tax base.

Line 11—Determine the Adjusted Tax Base by entering the largest figure of (Line 7b plus Line 10b) or (Voted Tax Base plus Line 10b).

**EXAMPLE FOR PART II**

Assessed Value of Annexing Entity—Last Year .....	\$400 Million
Tax Base of Annexing Entity—Last Year .....	\$2 Million
Tax Base Rate (2,000,000 ÷ 400,000,000 = .005) .....	\$5 per \$1,000
Assessed Value of Annexed Area—Last Year .....	\$100 Million
Annexation Increase (\$100,000,000 × .005 × 1.06) .....	\$530,000

**PART III**—All municipal corporations are subject to a 6% levy limitation imposed by the Oregon Constitution, and some are further limited by statutory provisions. For those districts that are subject to statutory limitations such as hospital districts, road districts, vector control districts, etc., complete items 12 and 13 by inserting the dollar amount the district can levy within and outside those statutory limitations. The percentage limitation imposed by the statute and the assessed valuation of the taxing unit from the most recent taxroll are used to compute this limitation.

**PART IV**—Enter all special levies on the schedule. Do NOT enter levies for bonded indebtedness or tax base levies.

**NOTE:** If you require assistance in completing this form, please contact your county assessor or the Oregon Department of Revenue, Local Budget Unit, Salem (Phone: 378-3749).

A G E N D A   M A N A G E M E N T   S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Operational Plan Work Session

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: This meeting has been scheduled as a work session on the Operational Plan. The Council is requested to review the potential areas of involvement described in the attached charts and to provide policy direction to the formulation of Metro's Five Year Operational Plan. Additional information will be presented at the June 5 meeting. If the Council wishes, items may be referred to Committees for further consideration.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: The Operational Plan will establish policies for the operation of Metro for the next five years. It is intended to include policy statements on level of activity, budget needs and timing of involvement for all areas of Metro involvement. The Plan, which will be adopted by ordinance, is proposed for adoption in August.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The Plan is being prepared with existing funds. Through the formulation of this plan, revenue needs to cover the loss of local dues and additional costs of new programs will be calculated. In future years this effort should facilitate the preparation of the annual budget.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The preparation of the Operational Plan was initiated in January, 1980 on the recommendation of the Finance Task Force and at the direction of the Council. A detailed two-part survey has been conducted to aid in drafting the Plan. Over 300 local elected officials, business representatives, planning professionals and other community leaders were involved in selecting preferred areas of involvement and indicating five year priorities. Based on survey results, internal discussions and budget constraints, a working draft of the Plan has been laid out.
- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: All existing and authorized areas of involvement have been analyzed. Other functions, which have been suggested for Metro responsibility or are now provided on a regional basis in other parts of the country, were also considered.
- C. CONCLUSIONS: Council comments and direction from this working session and input, if any, from committee review will be used to prepare a full draft of the Plan. The next draft will be available June 19 for further review at the next Council meeting.

OPERATIONAL PLAN SUMMARY OF METRO'S EXISTING AND POTENTIAL AREAS OF INVOLVEMENT

	NOW DOING		FOR CONSIDERATION			NOT IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS
	Required by Statute	FY 81 Budget And Work Program	Now Authorized By Statutes	Authorized But Funding Approval Required	Legislative Change Required	Withdrawn From Consideration
Air Quality	Plan	Planning	Technical assist.			
Transportation	Plan	Planning, distribute funding, technical assistance	Operations	Fund projects		
Goals & Objectives	Adopt	Develop approach	Enforce			
Land Use	Urban Growth Boundary	Planning, regulation				
Plan Review/Coord.	Review/coordination	Review/coordination				
Public Involvement	Program	Program		Fund projects		
Drainage		Planning, construction operations		Fund projects		
Sewers (Water Qual.)	Plan	Planning		Fund projects	Collection franchise regulation	Operations, const.
Solid Waste		Planning, construction operations, regulation				
Zoo		Planning, operations, construction			Plan review	Conduct programs
Criminal Justice		Planning, distribute funding				Construct, operate facilities
Economic Development		Planning	Regulate, develop projects, tech. assistance			
Housing		Planning	Regulate, technical assistance	Finance program		
Water Supply		Planning				Construct, operate facilities
Energy		Planning	Technical assist., regulate			
Cultural/Entertainment Facilities				Plan, construct, operate, finance facilities		
Parks & Recreation				Plan		Conduct programs, construct, operate facilities
Boundaries			Regulate*			Deliver services
Disaster Preparedness					Coordinate & review plans	Conduct programs
Public Safety					Coordinate & review plans	construct, operate facilities
911 System					Review & coord. plans	Operations
Aging				Coordinate programs		Plan
Children/Youth Svcs.				Coordinate programs		Plan
Human Services				Coordinate programs		Plan
Health Care				Coordinate programs		Plan
Manpower				Coordinate programs		Plan
Mental Health				Coordinate programs		Plan
Historic Preservation						Plan, conduct prog.
Libraries						Acquisitions, tech. assist., construct/operate facilities
Marine Trades						Construct/operate facilities
Human Rights						Plan, coordinate programs
Airports						Plan, construct/operate facilities
Arts						Plan, conduct programs
Cable TV						Plan, franchise
Data Processing						Service delivery
Purchasing						Service delivery

\*Voter approval required