

COUNCIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of
February 14, 1983

Committee Members Present: Councilors Banzer, Hansen,
Kirkpatrick, and Oleson.

Committee Members Absent: Councilors Bonner and Kafoury.

Other Councilors Present: Councilors Deines, Etlinger, Kelley,
and Waker.

Staff: Donald Carlson, Andrew Jordan, Warren
Iliff, Kay Rich, Dan LaGrande,
Jennifer Sims, Phil Fell, and Mel Huie.

A regular meeting of the Council Coordinating Committee was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chairperson Kirkpatrick.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of December 13, 1982 were approved as submitted.

Contract approval for the construction of the Alaska Tundra Exhibit.

Mr. Warren Iliff, Zoo Director, presented the staff report, attached to the agenda of the meeting.

Mr. Kay Rich, Assistant Zoo Director, reported on the bid review panel meeting held February 12, 1983 (outlined in the staff report attached to the agenda of the meeting). He said a question had been raised regarding RPI being left off a list of interested prime contractors. He explained that RPI had appeared on a list of interested contractors in the Daily Journal of Commerce on January 31, 1983, however when the architect for the project sent a list of the current interested prime contractors he was aware of a few days later to the plan centers, RPI was left off. He said when it was discovered RPI was left off, telephone calls were made to the plan centers on February 7th to inform them of RPI's interest. He said the National Business League was one of the plan centers.

Mr. Iliff noted that attached to the staff report was a memorandum from General Counsel Jordan responding to questions by Mr. Rich regarding MBE Policy requirements. Mr. Jordan reviewed with the Committee members the content of his memorandum to Mr. Rich. He said he saw no legal difficulties with the bidding process or the particular bid.

Councilor Etlinger questioned whether a joint venture needed to be certified as a contractor. Mr. Jordan responded that neither Metro rules nor state law required Metro prequalification of a contractor. He said the joint venture would be required to provide a performance bond in the amount of the contract in order to protect Metro.

Councilor Waker stated he was satisfied that the joint venture was the lowest responsible bidder.

Councilor Hansen stated he was concerned about the timing of the formation of the joint venture and whether they had met all the standards set forth by Metro enough in advance to have MBE input. He said he had been requested to ask a couple of questions: Did a joint venture have to be certified as an MBE before they could bid the job, and did the MBE 10% goal apply to the prime contractor. He said Mr. Jordan's memo responded to the latter question and he was satisfied with the answer, but was still uncertain about the joint venture question. Mr. Jordan responded that a joint venture did not have to be certified as an MBE if they were already certified individually. Councilor Hansen requested that Mr. Jordan put his response in writing before the February 24th Council meeting.

Councilor Banzer stated she had had a conversation with Mr. Crews from the National Business League who had informed her he would be sending a letter to the Council regarding the bid award.

There was no public testimony on this matter.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved that the Committee recommend Council award of contract to RP&I General Contractors and Roberto Robles & Associates, Inc., a joint venture for the Alaska Tundra Exhibit. Councilor Banzer seconded the motion.

Vote: By voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.
(Banzer, Hansen, and Kirkpatrick)

Contract approval for the fabrication and installation of a cast sculpture for the Swigert Fountain at a cost of \$50,564.

Mr. Iliff presented the staff report, as contained in the agenda of the meeting.

There was no Committee comment or public testimony.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved that the Committee recommend Council award of contract for the fabrication and installation of a cast sculpture for the Swigert Fountain. Councilor Banzer seconded the motion.

Vote: By voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.
(Banzer, Hansen, and Kirkpatrick)

Contract approval for the construction of the Swigert Fountain at a cost of \$129,780.

Mr. Iliff presented the staff report, as contained in the agenda of the meeting.

There was no Committee comment or public testimony.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved that the Committee recommend Council award of contract to Bishop Contractors, Inc. for the construction of the Swigert Fountain. Councilor Banzer seconded the motion.

Vote: By voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.
(Banzer, Hansen, and Kirkpatrick)

Contract approval for the development of a Master Plan for the Washington Park Zoo at a cost of \$150,000.

Mr. Iliff presented the staff report, as contained in the agenda of the meeting.

Councilor Waker asked what work product was expected to come out of the contract. Mr. Iliff responded the major work product was a long range plan for the zoo in terms of capital improvements as well as revenue generation potential and operational impacts. A secondary product would be a ten year capital improvement program, looking at what could be done over the next ten years in furthering the renovation of the zoo and any other changes the contractor might suggest in a longer range picture of how the zoo might realize its full potential. A third product would be a model of the Cascades Exhibit which would be used for private fundraising. Mr. Iliff stated it was not an expansion plan and one of the assumptions in the RFP was that the zoo would stay within its 64 acre boundary.

Councilor Kirkpatrick asked when the Master Plan work would be complete. Mr. Iliff responded that it looked like it would take six to

eight months to complete. Councilor Kirkpatrick suggested that the financial portion of the planning be completed first.

Councilor Etlinger asked if an aviary was still being considered. Mr. Iliff responded that an aviary would be looked at, both on and off site.

There was no public testimony.

Motion: Councilor Banzer moved that the Committee recommend Council award of contract to Guthrie/Slusarenko/Leeb for the development of a Master Plan for the Washington Park Zoo at a cost of \$150,000. Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Vote: By voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.
(Banzer, Hansen, and Kirkpatrick)

MBE Policy.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated that a memorandum from the Presiding Officer was before them regarding a misunderstanding of the motion carried at the February 3rd meeting (copy attached to the agenda of the meeting).

Donald Carlson, Deputy Executive Officer, stated that also before the Committee was a memorandum from Sue Klobertanz indicating staff's understanding of the motion would require a review of the MBE policy prior to the approval of any contract. He said a strict interpretation of the motion raised two concerns: 1) that no new contracts, regardless of size or type could be awarded until the MBE policy review was complete, and 2) a review of the policy could take weeks or months and if begun immediately would occur during the budget cycle, impacting the same staff working on both the budget and the MBE policy.

Mr. Carlson stated he was recommending that the Committee delete the last paragraph of the motion carried by the Council on February 3, 1983 and that the review of the policy take place once the budget process was completed. He said attached to his memorandum was a six month record, in response to Councilor Etlinger's request, which indicated that the MBE goal was being attained.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated that as the person who seconded the motion, it was her understanding that the intent of the motion was that it applied only to new construction contracts.

Councilor Hansen asked Mr. Carlson what he wanted the Committee to do since the motion was a motion of the full Council. Mr. Carlson responded that if the Committee felt that that portion of the motion should be deleted, that they make that recommendation to the Council, or at least clarify the intent of the motion.

General Counsel Jordan stated that one of the functions of the Committees was to interpret the acts of the Council. He said the Committee could take it upon itself to interpret the Council motion if it wished.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved that the Committee interpret the Council's motion to apply only to new construction contracts after the Alaska Tundra Exhibit contract award. Councilor Banzer seconded the motion.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated that hearing no dissention, she would report to the Council the Committee's interpretation. She said she would also report to the Council the percentage of MBE participation which had been accomplished, and that the Coordinating Committee would direct the staff to do a major study on the MBE program as soon as the budget process was complete.

Councilor Kirkpatrick suggested that Mr. Barker pull together information and data which would be helpful to the review, with the understanding that the bulk of the work would have to take place after the budget process.

Councilor Banzer suggested that she and Councilor Kirkpatrick work together to develop a scope of work for Mr. Barker.

At this time, the Committee recessed for five minutes.

Public Affairs Update. (Informational)

Mr. Dan LaGrande, Public Affairs Director, stated he had previously sent a memo to the Council summarizing the department's activities for the last six months. He then reviewed the department's work program for the remainder of the fiscal year.

He indicated he would like the Committee's guidance on the direction of Metro's Annual Spring Conference to be held in May. He said they were proposing a conference which would center around the theme of alternatives for providing local government service. He said they had tentatively invited the author of the book, Megatrends, to be a speaker and had also been working with the Arthur Young Company who

would provide at no cost to Metro some of their consultants on local government. He said they were proposing to set up a steering committee comprised of representatives from local governments in the Tri-County area and Metro Councilors.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated the steering committee was a good idea and named herself and Councilor Etlinger to the the committee.

Councilor Etlinger stated part of the idea for the conference developed from a resolution he had drafted, but never introduced, regarding local government restructuring. He said he hoped they could bring speakers in from different parts of the country to talk about what government systems seemed to work in the country. Councilor Kirkpatrick suggested that details of the conference would need to be worked out with the steering committee.

Councilor Kelley suggested that the League of Oregon Cities could be involved. Councilor Waker commented that local governments were very interested in hearing about new funding mechanisms and might be something which could be discussed at the conference.

Mr. LaGrande then distributed to the Committee a memorandum regarding the Local Government Program (a copy is attached to the agenda of the meeting).

Southern Pacific Property Purchase (Informational)

This item was deferred to the March meeting of the committee.

Monthly Expenditure Report for Legislative Liaison.

Mr. Carlson stated the expenditure report was contained in the agenda of the meeting and that the reports would continue to come to the Committee on a monthly basis.

There was no Committee action.

Consideration of FY 84 Local Government Dues Assessment.

Jennifer Sims, Budget and Administrative Services Manager, presented the staff report, as contained in the agenda of the meeting. She said it was recommended that the assessment remain at 50¢ per capita. She said the recommendation was based in part on feedback received from the local governments and their reaction to an increase in the assessment to the 51¢ level.

Councilor Oleson stated he was supportive of increasing the assessment to the 51¢ level.

Councilor Etlinger suggested that the Council should present its budget to the local governments which would provide the forum for discussing what the assessment was being used for. He asked how long the assessment had been at 50¢. Ms. Sims responded that the assessment had been at 50¢ for as long as Metro had been in existence.

Mr. LaGrande stated the feedback his office had received when they had contacted local governments was that it may be difficult for Metro, given its problems of the last year, to go to the local governments when many of them are cutting back basic services, and ask for an increase in dues. He said the money was not the only issue--that the principle and perception were also issues.

Councilor Deines stated agreed that local governments were having a difficult time, facing the possibility of cutting personnel and services, and it was not appropriate to ask for an increase.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated it was important that the Councilors go out to their districts and inform them how the money was being spent, but didn't think there was justification for increasing the assessment.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved the Committee recommend that the Council maintain the current level of dues assessment at 50¢ per capita.

Vote: The voice vote on the motion resulted in: Ayes: Councilors Hansen and Kirkpatrick. Nays: Councilors Banzer and Oleson.

Motion failed.

Chairperson Kirkpatrick stated the report would be forwarded to the Council with no recommendation.

Second Quarter Financial Report.

Mr. Carlson distributed to the Committee members copies of the Second Quarter Financial Report (a copy of the report is attached to the agenda of the meeting). He briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Annual Review of Resolution No. 82-308 (Budget Control Procedures).

Mr. Carlson presented the staff report (attached to the agenda of the meeting). He said annual review of Resolution 82-308 was required by the Council Coordinating Committee to determine the effectiveness and necessity for continuing the provisions of the resolution. He said it was the Executive Officer's recommendation that the Coordinating Committee continue the provisions of the resolution with another review of financial management progress at the same time next year.

Councilor Banzer stated she concurred with the Executive Officer's recommendation that the requirements of the resolution remain in effect.

Motion: Councilor Banzer moved that the Committee recommend Council approval of retaining the requirements of Resolution No. 82-308. Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Vote: By voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Councilor Banzer commented that one of the recommendations made by the fiscal task force was that they look at management performance. She said it was something they had not addressed and thought it might be appropriate to have Mr. Barker to look at how the Council could most expeditiously monitor the implementation of policy to assure that Council adopted policies were being implemented. She said if the other members of the Committee had no objection, she would like to work with Chairperson Kirkpatrick and Mr. Barker to accomplish a study of management performance.

Mr. Carlson commented that during the FY 83-84 budget process specific information from the departments in terms of their programs, with performance measurements, would be required so that there was an understanding of what could be expected as a result of the allocation of the dollars.

Discussion of Proposed Council Expenditure for Supplies.

Councilor Banzer explained that the appropriation for supplies for 1982-83 had been decreased during the 1982-83 budget process and there was insufficient funds remaining to support the Council's needs through the end of the fiscal year. She said, in addition, there were other unanticipated needs--redoing the Councilor's nameplates and establishing a gallery of past Councilors' portraits--for

which there were insufficient funds to cover the costs. She suggested that because of savings in Personal Services that some of those funds could be moved to Materials and Services. She said it would take Council action to move the funds from Personal Services to Materials and Services. She said in addition, some of the savings could be used for Council workshops, but because it was unknown how much was needed, that could be taken care of later. She said the supplies problem needed to be attended to as soon as possible.

There was then discussion of other options the committee could take: waiting until all costs were known and making one transfer, waiting until the end of the year and do a budget adjustment, or investigating whether the funds should be moved from one of the other Council accounts instead of from Personal Services savings.

Councilor Kirkpatrick suggested that the issue be brought back to the Committee at their March meeting with an estimate of what was needed in the way of dollars and that staff provide information on whether the expenditures could be accomplished within the category of Materials and Services without a transfer.

Committee Work Plan.

Councilor Kirkpatrick asked the Committee members to submit suggestions on what they would like to see accomplished by the Committee during the year. She said she would talk to each member before the March meeting so they could have a discussion at that time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Written by Everlee Flanigan

7994B/313
3/22/83