

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: March 16, 1981

GROUP/SUBJECT: Council Coordinating Committee

PERSONS ATTENDING: Chairman Burton, Couns. Kafoury, Deines, Schedeen, Banzer, Bonner, Kirkpatrick, Etlinger, Oleson

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson

Staff: Denton Kent, Andrew Jordan, Charles Shell, Jim Sitzman, Steve Ames, Isaac Regenstreif, Mike Holstun, Caryl Waters, Sonnie Russell, Marlyn Daniels

Others: Rich Rohde, Jeff Anderson

SUMMARY

After declaration of a quorum, Chairman Burton called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PROCEDURE FOR CONTESTED CASES (TEMPORARY RULE)

Mr. Holstun explained this action would bring Metro into compliance with the 1979 Administrative Procedures Act and would allow the process to work more smoothly.

Coun. Bonner asked if the language in Section 5.02.007, "Rights of Parties", would allow information to be submitted as late as the date of the hearing. He thought this procedure could be cumbersome. Mr. Holstun agreed but said this change was required for Metro to be in compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act.

Coun. Bonner moved, seconded by Coun. Kafoury, that the amendments to the procedure for contested cases be approved for submittal to the Council agenda.

Mr. Kent said the Committee would be adopting a temporary rule, Metro would notify the Secretary of State of the action and at some point in the future the changes must be adopted as a permanent rule.

A vote was taken on the motion. All voting aye, the motion carried.

ESTABLISHING THE POSITION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS COORDINATOR

Ms. Waters said this action would: 1) Change the position title from Public Relations Coordinator/Zoo to Public Relations Coordinator, in keeping with the Council's desire to maintain generic rather than specific classification titles; and 2) provide one additional public relations person to coordinate a unified solid waste public information program.

Coun. Kafoury asked about the feasibility of contracting part of the solid waste public relations work. Ms. Waters said some work had been contracted in the past. However, she felt the advantages of hiring a staff person would be more cost

effective and would ensure the personalized, coordinated and thorough type of effort Metro needs.

Coun. Kirkpatrick said that since some of the zoo and solid waste public relations work is currently contracted, the level of responsibility for these positions does not warrant such a high salary. She suggested that if the salary level were not lowered, more experience and higher qualifications should be required. Ms. Waters responded that the ongoing solid waste contract is no longer in effect. The contract has been temporarily extended solely for implementing a coordinated solid waste program. The proposed position would be required to develop the program. Ms. Waters said the zoo's contract with Ted Hallock is still in force.

Coun. Etlinger was concerned about the quantity of public relations, public information and public involvement staff and about possible criticism from the public because of the number of these and planning positions. He added that the title of "Public Information Coordinator" would be preferred since information should be the major emphasis of Metro. Coun. Kirkpatrick thought the position should be called "Public Information Specialist". Ms. Waters said "coordinator" was most descriptive of the work to be performed since there would be many facets to the solid waste program involving many different methods of communicating a message to the public. Couns. Banzer and Schedeen agreed with Ms. Waters.

Coun. Bonner moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, that the department designation be removed from the existing classification title "060-Public Relations Coordinator/Zoo" and be changed to "060-Public Information Coordinator". A vote was taken on the motion and it carried unanimously.

Chairman Burton said the next decision to be made was whether to create a new solid waste position. Discussion continued regarding an appropriate salary level. Couns. Kirkpatrick and Schedeen said, based on their experiences, the proposed salary was very generous and Metro should have no problems attracting qualified candidates for the position.

Coun. Deines suggested, in view of Metro's unstable financial future, the Committee recommend funding for the solid waste position through January 1, 1982, and that the Committee evaluate the position in November, 1981. He said a determination could then be made about continuing funding.

When questioned by Coun. Kafoury about the need and funding for the position, Mr. Gustafson replied the position was necessary for a number of reasons: 1) Metro would soon be dominated by solid waste issues such as resource recovery, landfill siting, waste reduction and recycling; 2) hiring a full-time staff person would be more cost effective than contracting for the same work; and 3) a dedicated staff person could better coordinate the complexity of the issues involved, plan for effective timing of news releases and coordinate contracts. He thought it appropriate to make a commitment to the position for a limited time period and require a future evaluation.

Couns. Schedeen, Kirkpatrick and Bonner requested staff to perform a survey to determine what salary and qualifications would be appropriate for the solid waste position. Coun. Bonner said this information should be reported to the Committee on April 13, 1981.

Coun. Deines moved to fund the position of solid waste Public Information Coordinator through January 1, 1982, that the Coordinating Committee evaluate the need for this position by November 1, 1981, and that after such evaluation, the Coordinating Committee could opt to extend funding. A vote was taken on the motion and the motion carried.

The discussion regarding appropriate salary and qualifications level for the position continued. Coun. Kafoury moved to amend the main motion by requesting the Committee approve the position of solid waste Public Information Coordinator, to be funded at a 10.5 salary level, but to increase the position qualifications. Chairman Burton thought this type of motion should not be made until staff had performed a survey to determine an acceptable salary and qualification level. The motion was tabled.

Coun. Deines moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, to amend the main motion and to fund the solid waste position of Public Information Coordinator at a 7.0 salary level. Coun. Bonner was reluctant to make such a recommendation until a survey had been submitted to the Committee. A vote was taken on the motion and the motion failed.

Chairman Burton recommended that the Committee draft a second resolution to Council, provide Councilors with the staff's salary and qualifications survey, and request Council to recommend the appropriate salary level and authorize the position. Coun. Kafoury so moved, seconded by Schedeen.

Coun. Banzer said she could not support the motion because of Metro's unstable financial status and that no financial reports had been submitted to Council since September 30, 1981. She also felt that funding should not be provided for additional support services staff.

A vote was taken on the motion and the motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Regenstreif distributed a report to the Committee entitled "Status Update of the Legislation Affecting the Metropolitan Service District", dated March 16, 1981. He discussed in detail House Bills 2864 and 2552 explaining that both bills would amend the procedures for forming local improvement districts (LID's). He reported that HB 2864 calls for the majority of property owners to respond favorably to the formation of a LID via a mailed ballot in order for a LID to be formed. The same procedure would apply for tax assessment. Strict timelines are outlined in the legislation for notification of residents and public hearings.

HB 2552, however, would require a remonstrance procedure on a sliding scale, Mr. Regenstreif said. For example, on larger projects, if 25 percent of the property owners responding indicated a negative response, the project could not proceed. The percentage of remonstrances would decrease for smaller projects.

Both Mr. Regenstreif and Mr. Jordan felt HB 2864 was the better of the two options. Mr. Jordan provided some possible amendments to HB 2864 to make it more workable:

1. Strike Section 3(c) and substitute with provisions for "equalization" function. Amend Section 4(1) accordingly.

2. Reinstate ORS 268.510(3) into Section 5 of the bill to restrict Bancroft Bonds under \$100.00.
3. Add provision allowing/requiring collection by tax assessor.
4. Add following language to Section 2(4) and Section 3(1)(a) after the word "property owner": "at the owner's address as indicated in county tax assessor's files."
5. Delete Section 2(6) and substitute sliding scale for remonstrance such as HB 2552, Section 4.

Councilors then asked questions of Mr. Regenstreif and Mr. Jordan regarding the relative merits of the proposed bills and the amendments to HB 2864. After extensive discussion, the Committee generally agreed that HB 2864 was more workable than HB 2552 but both bills would render the process of forming LID's very difficult, especially larger districts. The process would be costly and cumbersome and the likelihood of obtaining enough position responses would be doubtful.

Coun. Bonner moved, seconded by Coun. Etlinger, that the Committee endorse HB 2864 plus Mr. Jordan's amendments 2) and 4). Coun. Bonner explained Council should support any LID legislation which would give Metro residents a vote on these issues. Coun. Banzer, however, said she could not support the motion and that if Metro's ability to form LID's was eliminated, the effect would be negligible since the expense of forming LID's would be prohibitive. It would be cheaper to form service districts, she said. Couns. Kafoury and Schedeen felt both bills were contrary to the original concept of LID's. Chairman Burton and Coun. Schedeen thought Metro's position on these issues should be one of neutrality since opposing legislation would have no benefit.

Coun. Banzer moved to table Coun. Bonner's motion, seconded by Coun. Schedeen. Chairman Burton ruled this second motion out of order. Coun. Banzer challenged the ruling of the chair. The challenge was overruled.

A vote was taken on the original motion. The motion failed. Coun. Oleson then moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, that the Committee endorse HB 2864 to include Mr. Jordan's amendments 1), 2) and 4). A vote was taken on the motion. The motion failed.

Mr. Rohde and Mr. Anderson, representatives of Oregon Fare Share, reported they were comfortable with HB 2864 unamended. If Council chose to propose amendments to the legislation, they could enthusiastically support Mr. Jordan's amendment 3).

Coun. Deines moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, that the Committee recommend a neutral position on both House Bills 2552 and 2864. A vote was taken on the motion and the motion carried.

A discussion followed regarding the merits of asking the legislature to remove Metro's powers of forming LID's since Metro currently has limited powers and any opposition could cause public concern. Coun. Oleson then moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, that Councilors discuss with legislators in their respective districts the options presented in HB 2864 in an effort to protect Metro's interests. A vote was taken on the motion and the motion carried.

DUES ASSESSMENT LEGISLATION

Couns. Bonner and Banzer expressed their concern about whether dues assessment legislation would be passed by the State Legislature. Both Councilors said they had received negative feedback from local governments on this issue. Mr. Regenstreif said he was confident the legislature would extend dues assessment authority to Metro for next year but said it would require some effort to get the legislation passed. Coun. Kafoury said she had confidence in Mr. Regenstreif's judgment and ability to accurately assess the legislative climate. Coun. Banzer, however, said Metro has taken a passive role on too many issues and now is the time to take a more aggressive stance. She suggested Councilors meet with legislators from their districts immediately. Coun. Oleson asked Mr. Regenstreif if he could arrange these meetings. Mr. Regenstreif said meetings will be arranged in two to three weeks.

Mr. Kent, reflecting the opinion of Mr. Gustafson, said perhaps contacts with legislators at this time would appear self-serving. He thought it more appropriate for Councilors to ask community leaders to write their legislators and request more effective means of Metro support. Councilors' meetings with legislators could then take place according to Mr. Regenstreif's schedule.

Coun. Oleson requested Mr. Regenstreif to inform Councilors in writing regarding with whom, when and where such meetings would take place.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Coun. Kafoury, Chairperson of the Goals and Objectives Task Force introduced Mr. Ames to the Committee. Mr. Ames has been working since September on a six-month work plan to prepare a proposed work program and budget for a futurist project for the Metro region. A draft of the report was distributed to the Committee. Coun. Kafoury said no formal action was being requested at this time.

Mr. Ames proceeded to review the draft report. He said the legislature had mandated Metro to establish goals and objectives. During this formation process, staff became aware that anticipating all the emerging issues was difficult and that citizens of the Metro region needed to be involved in identifying those issues. Mr. Ames reported he had met with representatives from the Metropolitan Citizens' League and the League has expressed interest in providing the leadership for this project if Metro can provide office space. The task to be accomplished would be called Goals and Objectives, Phase II. This task would involve identifying the preferred social and physical environment for the year 2000 and would require broad-based citizen involvement. To accomplish the task, it is important that citizens develop their own ideas and not be biased by staff in understanding what Metro's long range goals should be and where efforts should be expended, Mr. Ames said.

Coun. Bonner asked if a decision about project funding was eminent. Mr. Sitzman said funding has been authorized through the end of March, 1981. Coun. Bonner supported the Metropolitan Citizens' League coordinating the project and asked if the project proposal could be made to them directly rather than going through the Council. Coun. Kafoury thought it wise to seek Council endorsement before the project proceeds further.

There being no objections, Chairman Burton directed Mr. Ames and the Goals and Objectives Task Force to provide further definition for the project, to propose a budget and to prepare a recommendation for Council action. This would be reviewed at the April 13, 1981, Coordinating Committee, he said.

BUDGET UPDATE AND STATUS REPORT

Mr. Shell reported that all departments have submitted their 1981-82 budget drafts, they have been consolidated into one document and that major budget reductions are being made in Metro's planning functions.

Coun. Banzer asked what action would take place if the State Legislature does not extend Metro's dues assessment authority. Mr. Kent replied the current budget draft anticipates dues revenue. If dues cannot be collected, he said approximately five staff positions would be cut from the budget. This, he said, would be in addition to the 12 to 14 positions already scheduled to be eliminated.

Chairman Burton requested an organization chart be made available to all Councilors showing each current position and the level at which it is funded.

Coun. Banzer asked when budget reports would be available so that Councilors could compare present and future budgets. Mr. Shell said reports would be distributed in one week. She also asked if monies not spent this fiscal year from Environmental Services and Metro Development budgets could be carried over for projects next year. Mr. Kent said this would most likely occur and that funds would probably be used for drainage programs.

Mr. Kent reported both he and Mr. Gustafson have reviewed the zoo and solid waste budget requests. Both departments will request rate increases to offset increased costs. Couns. Burton and Banzer expressed concern about these increases and felt every effort should be made to reduce costs rather than increase fees.

COUNCIL PER DIEM AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES

Coun. Bonner proposed the expense allotment for the Presiding Officer be doubled and the expense allotment be increased by 50 percent for Committee chairpersons. He said these increases were necessary because of extra mileage and additional meetings and estimated the additional cost to Metro would be approximately \$4,500 per year.

Mr. Kent said he would investigate the matter to determine how such increases should be proposed for approval.

Coun. Bonner also proposed that Councilors be able to spend per diem money for expenses. He cited that some Councilors incur more meeting expenses than others and perhaps the per diem and expense funds could be combined into one fund. Chairman Burton and Coun. Banzer suggested that Coun. Bonner address this issue to Presiding Officer Deines and the Presiding Officer could recommend a solution on a case-by-case basis. It was also determined that at this time, additional expenses for the Presiding Officer and Committee Chairpersons be authorized out of the Council General Expense Account by the Presiding Officer.

URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS

Mr. Kent reported the Development Committee had submitted a report on the issue of establishing fees for processing urban growth boundary amendments. He said the report is ready for Council review and approval. The Development Committee has made a unanimous recommendation that the proposed fee structure be adopted. This would require developers to pay a base fee of \$500 plus \$20 for additional acres up to 20 and \$10 for acres over 20. Mr. Kent said the Coordinating Committee needs to endorse the proposal since it is a revenue matter. Mr. Kent thought the proposal sound.

Coun. Bonner requested Coun. Bonner to prepare specific recommendations for Committee action.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE AND VOTING

Coun. Bonner raised the issue of poor attendance at some committee meetings and whether non-committee members should be allowed to vote. The Committee recommended: 1) all Councilors be encouraged to attend all committee meetings; 2) no meetings proceed unless a quorum of regular members are present; and 3) only assigned committee members be allowed to vote at meetings.

There being no further business, Chairman Burton adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson