

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1538 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
DATE: April 4, 1996
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 2:00 PM
PLACE: Council Chamber

Approx.
Time*

Presenter

- | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|--|--------|
| 2:00 PM | | CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL | |
| (5 min.) | 1. | INTRODUCTIONS | |
| (5 min.) | 2. | CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS | |
| (5 min.) | 3. | EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS | |
| | 4. | CONSENT AGENDA | |
| 2:15 PM
(5 min) | 4.1 | Consideration of Minutes for the March 7, 1996 Work Session and the March 28, 1996 Metro Council Meeting | |
| | 5. | ORDINANCES - SECOND READING | |
| 2:20 PM
(10 min) | 5.1 | Ordinance No. 96-636 , For the Purpose of Adjusting the Planning Fund Budget to Reflect Unanticipated Program Increases in the Growth Management Services Department, Authorizing Additional FTE; and Declaring an Emergency. | McLain |
| 2:30 PM
(10 min) | 6. | COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS | |
| 2:40 PM | | ADJOURN | |

Agenda Item Number 4.1

Approval of Minutes

*For the March 7, 1996 Council Work Session
For the March 21, 1996 Council Meeting*

**Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, April 4, 1996**

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION

March 7, 1996

Metro Regional Headquarters, Room 501

Councillors Present: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad, Deputy Presiding Officer Susan McLain, Councilor Rod Monroe, Councilor Ed Washington, Councilor Don Morissette, Councilor Ruth McFarland

Councillors Absent: Councilor Patricia McCaig

The Metro Council Work Session of March 7, 1996 was called to order by Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad at 2:30 PM in Room 501 of Metro Regional Headquarters.

1. **2040 Means Business Surveys.** Executive Officer Mike Burton discussed the results of the polls commissioned by the 2040 Means Business group. The 2040 Framework Plan calls for the executive department to do surveys of implementation barriers and attitudes. One of the discoveries, in the transportation area, is that a dichotomy exists between what people want in the level of services and their interest in supporting those levels of services in terms of both taxes and behavior attitudes. The polls revealed that there is a surprising lack of knowledge among the voting public in terms of how roads are financed.

Adam Davis of Davis and Hibbits, 921 SW Morrison, Portland OR 97204 spoke about the results of the two surveys his firm was commissioned to do by Metro. The first was a scientifically-conducted random sample survey of 600 residents of the metropolitan area. This was followed by a second survey employing a scale comparisons technique. In this study, people were given items to trade off against each other. This survey was done to validate some of the findings from the first study. The project is incomplete at this point. The third part of the study will be to conduct focus groups, the purpose of which is to provide some elaboration on the findings from the first two surveys.

Key results from the two surveys were discussed by Mr. Davis. Respondents were queried about population growth. Overwhelmingly respondents felt that population growth in our area is inevitable. In response to a question regarding whether or not population growth could be stopped, 84% of the respondents answered in the negative. Of that 84%, when asked whether population growth could be slowed, 54% of those people answered in the negative and 40% answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Davis stated that he was surprised by the finding that the surveys showed that 67% of respondents believed that economic growth (desirable) can occur without population growth (undesirable).

Respondents were questioned regarding their opinions about housing costs. It would seem that having an Urban Growth Boundary does not, in their opinion, make a difference as to whether or not housing costs are going to escalate. This question was asked of the respondents both negatively and positively and the percentages were demonstrably similar. Respondents were then asked questions about the issue of housing trends. This study demonstrated that the

respondents tend to see future housing units in terms of apartments over garages and multi-family housing dwellings. There seems to be almost an inevitability regarding this finding.

In response to a question from Councilor Rod Monroe, Mr. Davis stated that all respondents were asked the preceding questions but that answers differed most demonstrably by the county in which the respondent lives. Neighborhoods would represent units too small to accurately reflect the sample in this context.

People view as inevitable the concept of living, shopping and working in the same area. When asked about the desirability of this mixed use concept, a majority of respondents found this desirable.

Questions regarding travel and transit elicited a 64% majority who believe that it would be somewhat desirable to very desirable for public transit to replace the automobile as a primary means of transportation. Respondents also stated that this option would be preferable to spending tax dollars on more freeways.

Respondents were given a seven-point scale relating to the orderly management of growth. One end of this scale stated that future growth should be concentrated in already developed areas through infill and other, similar techniques while the other end of the scale stated that growth should be accommodated by building in currently undeveloped areas. The findings in this area reflected a majority (52%) of the respondents who believed that growth should take place in already developed areas and another 14% of the respondents being neutral. 25% of the sample stated took one pole feeling that growth should be concentrated in developed areas and 13% believing growth should go into undeveloped areas.

Councilor Susan McLain asked whether the respondents were thinking about city centers, corridors or light rail lines. Mr. Davis responded that people were given a description of filling vacant lots and high-density developments in already-developed areas but not much more detail was given. He also stated that further analysis would be completed when the focus groups had finished their work.

Mr. Davis concluded his presentation by stating that, from the second survey, respondents were given a number of items to trade off against each other. Some of these items included: historic site preservation, home site with yard and privacy, greater household income, lower property taxes, easy access to the coast and mountains, forest and farmland preservation, neighborhood shopping opportunities, etc. Fourteen specific items were identified. Each respondent got a different listing of trade-offs to make. The top four items were:

- 1) Forest and farmland preservation;
- 2) Lower property taxes;
- 3) Areas protected for wildlife;
- 4) Greater household income;
- 5) Lower cost of housing.

This, more than any other survey question, reveals what the respondents perceive the problem to be. People are definitely looking at livability issues as being as important as economic and financial considerations.

Councilor Susan McLain asked about the usefulness of this survey information. Executive Officer Mike Burton suggested that 2040 Means Business, the very people who are actively involved in building and financing in the Metro region, focused on three areas:

- A) What are the realities of the market in the Metro region;

- B) Government regulations;
- C) Attitudes of people living in the area.

All of the data collected helps answer these three primary questions, according to Executive Officer Burton. The lesson to be learned here is that Metro needs to work closely with the community in order to help change attitudes.

Councilor McLain responded by stating her issue is that helping people understand that they must work within the mandate and, even more importantly, helping constituents realize and understand just what that mandate is.

Executive Officer Burton stated that the data would be most useful in helping people understand what the barriers are and to make recommendations on what can be done to overcome them. Many developers can, for example, outline steps that can be taken in order to help moderate the population's attitudes and help encourage the successful adoption of the mandates.

Councilor Don Morissette stated this study represented, to him, some of the diverse dynamics that he continually hears from his constituents. Councilor Morissette believes that the difficult part is how to equate 500,000 projected new residents and project that into the number of new housing units needed. Within this contingency, he cited the example of SE Portland, an area whose residents have stated that they don't want to move the Urban Growth Boundary but would rather contribute to infill density. There are approximately 1000 lots yielding a total of approximately 5500 square feet according to his best estimate and, short of a large group of so-called 'granny flats,' that would amount to approximately three months' inventory of buildable land. Most of his constituents would opt to preserve the Urban Growth Boundary as it currently stands and take a little more density. He fears that 500,000 people and 224,000 housing units of a mixed range amounts to a great deal more density. The sheer volume of 224,000 housing units with 30% to 45% in multi-family units and considering the topography constraints, is going to make the matter of fulfilling this increase exceedingly difficult. This is contrary to what the press has been saying.

- Executive Officer Mike Burton responded that local jurisdictions have been sent the predictions and targets and have been asked what *they* wish to accomplish under these guidelines. This kind of data should be returned by the local jurisdictions by April 4, 1996. The tools and good will are presently in place, stated the Executive Officer.

Mr. Davis told Councilor Morissette that David Bell, Chair of the Community/Public Acceptance Subcommittee, stated that it is necessary to take the kind of information the surveys produced visually to people and give them a true idea of what kind of degrees could be involved in terms of densities and see how they react. Mr. Bell's recommendation was that the focus groups take on the task of what could be done in their individual neighborhoods to accommodate some of the things necessary to take on such a population increase. Additionally, it is necessary to give these focus groups some examples.

Councilor Morissette stated that some of the area's most attractive neighborhoods come at a very high price to taxpayers. Murray Hills, for example, developed by PGE, lost millions of dollars. Additionally the Waterhouse Project as well as Water Front Project in downtown Portland also lost millions of dollars. Executive Officer Mike Burton stated that no public groups or large private utilities are doing any land assembly which is a key factor. Without a tax base to pay back these losses, they would not survive. Nearly all of the high-profile projects cost millions.

2. **Multnomah County Transfer Negotiations.** Executive Officer Mike Burton and Councilor Ruth McFarland have been involved closely in most of the direct negotiations. This

sessions work was noted to be for informational purposes only stated Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad.

Executive Officer Mike Burton brought the Metro Council to speed regarding the facilities transfer negotiations with Multnomah County. The major issue raised to date has involved the identification of some means of sharing responsibilities as two public bodies.

Councilor McFarland had questions regarding Phase I of the agreement. It is true that even in Phase I, Metro agreed that Multnomah County would be held responsible for any pollution related expenses only during the time it was actually owned by Multnomah County?

Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel responded to Councilor McFarland's question by stating that the Phase I agreement, approved by Metro Council in December, 1993, required Multnomah County to indemnify Metro for any environmental pollution that occurred before January 1, 1994 or resultant from something that done before January 1, 1994. Multnomah County agreed in the Phase I agreement to protect Metro from any liability no matter whose fault it was so long as it arose from something that happened prior to Metro's taking over the property.

Councilor McFarland stated her concern that \$50,000 is but 'an eyedropper-full' compared to what it would cost to clean up some major source of pollution from that property. The decision at this point, according to Councilor McFarland, is whether or not for Metro to accept the responsibility that goes along with the decision to take over the property. Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel pointed out that the County has agreed to protect Metro in this case. Executive Officer Mike Burton read from a letter the environmental consultants for the Expo site. PDS read the DEQ record to show that it does not appear that these sites pose a significant threat to the environmental condition of the Expo Center property.

Executive Officer Mike Burton suggested that Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel, draft an amendment which would deal specifically with the indemnification question. Especially important are things that might be discovered that are of an unknown quality relating to sources of pollution.

Councilor McLain stated that she has become involved specifically because of the amount of 'hullabaloo' that has been centered around this controversy recently. She stated that the facilities under question are really no longer Multnomah County facilities but are rather the very cornerstone of Metro's Green Spaces Program. Blue Lake and Oxbow Park are truly regional facilities and meet Metro's definition of what constitutes 'regionally significant' as defined in Ordinance 93-520, copies of which were obtained for her by Council Recorder David Aeschliman. Councilor McLain stated that she did not vote for this Ordinance because she thought Metro would do a nice thing for Multnomah County but rather because significant regional resources were included in that package insofar as the Green Spaces program.

According to Councilor McLain, the philosophical question is when, in the process of transfer of facilities between Multnomah County, does the responsibility for management become Metro's and how much of the responsibility is Metro's? This question must be answered before any of Metro's staff begins work on language drafts or possible amendment drafts.

Executive Officer Mike Burton replied that he had engaged in a dialogue with Commissioner Sharon Kelly who informed him that she was insulted by the fact that Metro would be asking the kinds of questions we have been asking. Executive Officer Burton pointed out to her that Metro is a governmental agency without a general fund. There is no doubt that these are regional facilities and must be operated in the public's best interests. They belong under the aegis of Metro secondary to the fact that Multnomah County, as a government, chose to get out of the business. Another question that must be answered is what kind of resources do we have over the next several years and what is the manageability of these facilities in real time.

Councilor McLain stated that Metro Council has definitely not yet reached consensus on what the answers to these questions might be.

Councilor Morissette asked how Metro would pay for an environmental clean up should one be required with the transfer of these facilities. Executive Officer Mike Burton stated that should Metro scratch the surface out at the Expo site and find a great cesspool of unclean stuff, a number of options would be available to Metro in order to get funds to effect a cleanup. Councilor Morissette stated that Metro would not be required to assume liability if we do not wish to assume this liability. He continued that the reason he had not supported this transfer throughout the process is that he believes that regional facilities should be in each and every one of Metro's districts. Councilor Morissette suggested that if there is some regionality to the package, it would probably be the Exposition Center. He stated his concern that regional moneys be spent regionally for facilities that are truly regional.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad suggested that each councilor, in turn, respond to the following questions:

- 1) Does Metro wish to proceed with the parks acquisition?
 - A) Councilor McFarland stated that unless Metro acts with a certain amount of haste, the region stands to lose the Smithsonian Exhibition.
 - B) Councilor McLain stated that she wished to progress in a forward direction regarding the acquisition.
 - C) Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad stated that he is in favor of forward motion regarding the acquisition issue.
 - D) Councilor Washington stated that he gives his approval to moving ahead with the acquisition. He also stated that he feels that the process has been moving ahead under the direction of Councilor McFarland and Executive Officer Mike Burton.
 - E) Councilor Monroe stated that the Smithsonian project is a marvelous opportunity for the region. We need to do everything with reason to ensure its display in Portland.
 - F) Councilor McCaig stated that she was interested in why this discussion was not held earlier in the publicized meeting earlier this afternoon. She stated that it would have been more appropriate to have the meeting in the public setting.
- 2) In the negotiations, what are the specifics Metro ought to deal with?
 - A) Councilor McFarland felt that both Multnomah County and Metro should work out a shared responsibility in financial matters dealing with the Expo Center.
 - B) Regarding the indemnification issue, Councilor McLain stated that we need to work together with Multnomah County regarding this issue. She believes that responsibilities lie on both sides of this matter.

- C) Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad stated that his opinion regarding the liability issue needs to be worked out in partnership with Multnomah County; that it should be shared and that it can be terribly expensive.
- D) Councilor Washington stated that the liability issues should be shared.
- E) Councilor Monroe stated that the indemnification issue on unknown "bad stuff" that might be in the ground at the Expo Center. The most rational way to deal with that issue is to tell Multnomah County - if you'll accept liability for any spills that occurred on that land during the time you had ownership, then we will accept liability for any other spills - and if it didn't happen on our watch, we will go after the City of Portland or private individuals or companies and try to get them to pay for the clean up efforts.

Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel stated that some holes had been drilled at the site of the Expo Center and mostly had turned up sawdust and manure from the years of its use as a stockyard, etc. Perhaps a level II study should be done later on in the negotiation process.

Executive Officer Mike Burton stated that the Level II study would need to be completed and the indemnification issue along with the property ownership questions settled before the Smithsonian exhibition issue could be settled.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad summarized the discussion by stating that this issue needed to go to Regional Facilities Committee but since Regional Facilities did not meet next week, it could be discussed instead at the Full Council meeting. He instructed Councilor McFarland, Executive Officer Burton and Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel look over the documents and report at that Council meeting with points of agreement and disagreements.

Councilor Morissette stated that Executive Officer Burton should hold firm to the original language that Multnomah County is responsible for the period of their ownership of the site. Councilor McLain stated that she felt that, with regard to the indemnification issues, Metro still had responsibilities in this area. Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad asserted that Metro should not become too superficial about the indemnification issue.

Dan Cooper, Chief Counsel reported that there could possibly several levels of contaminants that would need to be cleaned up. For example, if someone drained the oil of an automobile crankcase, that could be cleaned for significantly fewer dollars than, say, a situation in which a solvent-based product that has seeped into the water table.

3. Expo: The Development Of The Project To Date: Doug Butler, Director of Administrative Services brought the Council members up to speed in terms of physical development and physical construction at the Expo site. Architects have been hired and are going full speed and have the basic design in place. Applications for conditional use permits are about ready to be submitted for approval. Interviews will be conducted tomorrow for contractors. There are no major problem that have surfaced at this point. Financing is moving ahead very well. The County will need to approve the transfer of \$9 million from the Convention Center reserves for use. The other would be the use of a \$1 million from the Expo reserves. Good progress is being made in the finalization of the details of a revenue bond which would be privately for an additional \$2.5 million. Interim financing with a bank line of credit is presently being negotiated. This was handled yesterday by Finance Committee. Cash flow has been researched. The Smithsonian has en route to Metro a draft letter of commitment that is much more than any previous communications. Smithsonian personnel are aware of the risks involved

in coming to Portland. The Los Angeles Smithsonian exhibit had only one problem: It was much more successful than they had ever imagined and consequently long lines for tickets, etc. contributed some problematic situations. Intel is going to be a major national sponsor of this event. They are shaping up to be influential local players as well.

4. **Greenspaces:** Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad stated that he had had many telephone calls regarding the Green Spaces Acquisition Program. Numerous questions he had fielded dealt with the policy specifics of how Greenspaces are targeted in terms of site selection and also questions on siting of such within and without the Urban Growth Boundary. Members of the Greenspaces Acquisition Team discussed these matters as well as general policy matters.

The Greenspaces Masterplan created the foundation from which the bond measure was derived. The public process was multi-faceted. The Team evaluated and selected what everyone believed to be the most important projects to be included in the bond measure. The bond measure identified fourteen specific regional target areas and five regional trail areas. There are a number of ways properties could be acquired based on the work plan:

A) **Early acquisition opportunities.** The early acquisition process could take place in situations where refinement has not been completed and adopted by Metro Council. An acquisition committee would have to determine that the property met certain criteria before coming to Council and presenting a staff report and recommendation. An example of this process is the Clear Creek Canyon parcel which came to the Council as an early acquisition opportunity and the Council agreed and went forward with negotiations. Location within or without the Urban Growth Boundary is not a criteria that is considered in the refinement process.

Councilor McCaig stated her concern that perhaps Metro would be unable, because of escalating land prices, to deliver the 6000 acres promised voters when they approved the bond issue, particular if such lands were located inside the current Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Ciecko stated that it would most likely be possible to do so secondary to increased interest on the funds available and some low-cost land acquisitions. He agreed with Councilor McCaig that should the lands fall within the current Urban Growth Boundary, the 6000 acres probably would not be possible.

Councilor McCaig maintained that Metro needs to keep in mind, with the land acquisitions, the proposals that the voters accepted when they approved the bond measure: Public access, connected trails, and connected systems.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad stated that this was a good time, since Metro is now several months into acquisitions, to discuss where Metro is in the process and where the Council would like Metro to go in the future in this process.

Mr. Ciecko explained in some detail the process through Metro and the property owner must process when acquiring land for the Green Spaces program. He stressed that the land owner is usually urged to sell at the appraised value as set by an outside appraiser and as reviewed and approved by Metro's review appraisers.

With no further business to come before the Metro Council Work Session on this date, the meeting was adjourned by Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad at 4:32 PM.

Prepared by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Aeschliman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David Aeschliman
Clerk

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, March 28, 1996

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain (Deputy Presiding Officer), Patricia McCaig, Ruth McFarland, Rod Monroe, Ed Washington

Councilors Absent: Don Morissette

Presiding Officer Kvistad called the meeting to order at 2:02 PM.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

2.1 Metro Watch Presentation by Craig Berkman

Craig Berkman, Metro Watch, appeared before the council to speak on behalf of Metro Watch. He described Metro Watch as a non-partisan organization of citizens with differing views and perspectives who have expressed an interest in some of the agenda items before the council. He said Metro Watch was created in the context of the preamble to the Metro charter, which he read into the record.

Mr. Berkman commented on a memorandum from Mike Burton, Executive Officer, to the council regarding Metro Watch. He said he had called Executive Officer Burton's office four times and, to-date, had not received a return call. He said Executive Officer Burton, in his memorandum, made the assertion that Metro Watch is funded by A.C. Trucking. Mr. Berkman responded that Metro Watch has not received any checks from A.C. Trucking. He went on to state that several of Metro's elected officials had received campaign donations from A.C. Trucking, which he acknowledged was permissible by law.

Mr. Berkman spoke about the request for proposal (RFP) for the ten percent of the total waste that is not being handled by Oregon Waste [Systems] (OWS); and about Executive Officer Burton's assertion that OWS's bid was the most competitive. Mr. Berkman said that Metro's outside audit findings were in agreement with his that the OWS bid was not the most competitive because it did not include a \$1.24 DEQ fee that other bidders included in their bids.

He gave the rationale for the creation of Metro Watch. He said a number of people in the private sector believe that there were decisions made that pre-date the election of many on the council, as well as the executive officer, that were not in the best interest of the region's taxpayers. He said Metro Watch has specifically focused on the fact that the solid waste collection rate in this region is 28% higher than any other region in the western United States. He said that \$52 million will be spent in the acquisition of the landfill at Arlington and in maintenance of the trucks; and that at the end of the contract, the taxpayers of the region will own nothing. He referred briefly to a lawsuit filed by Sanifill with respect to "Option 4."

Councilor McFarland said the \$1.24 DEQ fee is a state law, and is a pass through. She said this fact is mentioned twice in the RFP, and was mentioned once verbally when potential proposers were told how to handle the proposal. She said no one who read the RFP was confused about how to address the DEQ fee.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 28, 1996

page 2

Councilor McFarland went on to report that tip fees at the Columbia County transfer station, the North Marion transfer station, the Salem-Keizer transfer station, were all higher than Metro's tip fee according to the solid waste price index in the January issue of *Solid Waste Digest*. In Washington, tip fees are higher in Centralia, Everett, and the Island County transfer stations. She said Metro's tip fee is considered in the middle of the range of transfer stations of equivalent size. She disagreed with Mr. Berkman's statement that the Metro's Regional Environmental Management department could be run with one person and a computer. She said that even with a 20% cut in essential Metro REM staff only a \$.05 monthly savings would be realized "at the can."

Mr. Berkman responded that there were proposers who responded to the RFP who included the \$1.24 DEQ fee. He said OWS did not include this fee, and that is why they were the low bidder. With respect to staff cuts, he indicated he had said that he could monitor the two or three contracts the REM department monitors with two knowledgeable contract administrators and a computer, walking blindfolded. He said he questioned whether Metro needed more than 100 full time staff in the REM department.

Councilor McLain thanked Mr. Berkman for his comments. She said these are matters that the council has spent many hours and years discussing. She said that councilors have made observations similar to Mr. Berkman's with regard to the contract, however, the contract is a legally binding document, and it must be dealt with in a legally binding way. She said the council has tried to give the fairest rate to taxpayers and rate payers, and to not only stabilize the rate but reduce it. She pointed out that the council brought a lawsuit against the former executive officer dealing with this issue, because the council felt it was a very important issue. With regard to the landfill at Arlington, Councilor McLain said that no other local jurisdiction or private corporation was willing to find a landfill site. It was left to the Metro council to do so. She also made comments clarifying the hours of operation of Metro's various hot lines. She said that the recycling rate goals, challenge grants, and other issues affect the REM budget and tip fees. She also stated that suggestions Mr. Berkman made with regard to free market competition were already in place in Metro's bidding process.

2.2 Envirocorps Presentation by Jennifer Thompson

Jennifer Thompson, program coordinator for Envirocorps, appeared to give an update of the activities and accomplishments of the Envirocorps program during the past year. A copy of the report from which Ms. Thompson reported was distributed to councilors and is included as part of the meeting record.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Consideration of Minutes for the March 21, 1996 Metro Council Meeting

Motion: Councilor Washington moved, seconded by Councilor McLain for adoption of the minutes of March 21, 1996 Metro Council Meeting.

Vote: Councilors McCaig, Washington, McLain, McFarland, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors Monroe and Morissette were absent. The vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 28, 1996

page 3

5. ORDINANCES -- FIRST READING

5.1 Ordinance No. 96-640, For the Purpose of Amending the FY 1995-96 Budget and Appropriations Schedule Transferring \$10,655 From the General Fund Contingency to Personal Services; and Declaring an Emergency

The clerk read the ordinance for the first time by title only.

6. ORDINANCES -- SECOND READING

6.1 Ordinance No. 96-638, To Adopt the Hearings Officer Findings, Conclusions and Final Order: Denying Urban Growth Boundary Contested Case 95-2: Knox Ridge

The clerk read the ordinance for the second time by title only.

Motion: Councilor McLain moved, seconded by Councilor Washington for adoption of Ordinance No. 96-638.

Councilor McLain gave a report on Ordinance No. 96-638, which would adopt the hearings officer findings, conclusions and final order denying the Urban Growth Boundary contested case 95-2, Knox Ridge. She reminded the council that they had heard this matter once before in a report by hearings officer Larry Epstein and Stuart Todd, Growth Management Associate Regional Planner. Background information is included in the staff report to the resolution which is included as part of the meeting record.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing. No one appeared to speak with regard to Ordinance No. 96-638. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Vote: Councilors Monroe, Washington, McLain, McFarland, and McCaig voted aye. Councilor Kvistad voted nay. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 5/1 in favor and the motion passed.

7. RESOLUTIONS

7.1 Resolution No. 96-2303, For the Purpose of Submitting to the Voters a General Obligation Bond Indebtedness in the Amount of \$28.8 Million for the Oregon Exhibit and New Entrance at the Metro Washington Park Zoo

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor Washington moved, seconded by Councilor McCaig for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2303.

Councilor Washington reported on Resolution No. 96-2303, which would authorize a general obligation bond indebtedness in the amount of \$28.8 million to be submitted to voters for the Oregon Exhibit and new entrance at the Metro Washington Park Zoo. He said this resolution is the culmination of more than five years efforts. He urged full support and immediate adoption of the resolution. Sherry Sheng, Metro Washington Park Zoo Director, distributed letters of support for the project from a number of individuals and organizations. Copies of these letters are included as part of the meeting record. Executive Officer Burton appeared briefly before the council to recommend adoption.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 28, 1996

page 4

Vote: Councilors Washington, McLain, McFarland, McCaig, Monroe, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

7.2 Resolution No. 96-2291. For the Purpose of Exempting a Housing Affordability Contract to Lennertz & Coyle From Competitive Bid

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor Washington moved, seconded by Councilor McLain for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2291.

Councilor Washington addressed Resolution No. 96-2291 which would exempt from competitive bid, a contract with Lennertz & Coyle to hold a housing affordability charette. The \$9,000 contract represents Metro's 50% contribution to the conference.

Councilor McCaig reported she voted against the resolution in committee because she believes exemptions from competitive bid should be pretty apparent. She said it would require only a small effort to solicit three bids for the project. She said she sees no good reason to exempt the contract in question from competitive bid.

Vote: Councilors McLain, Monroe, Washington, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilors McFarland and Councilor McCaig voted nay. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 4/2 in favor and the motion passed.

7.3 Résolution No. 96-2281. For the Purpose of Approving the FY 1997 Unified Work Program

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor Monroe moved, seconded by Councilor McLain for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2281.

Councilor Monroe gave a report on Resolution No. 96-2281 which would approve the FY 1997 Unified Work Program. He reported the work program is required under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). The work plan sets out transportation projects and planning for the fiscal year 1997, and includes commitments to a congestion pricing pilot project, urban growth management, transit oriented development, the Westside corridor project, and South/North light rail line analysis.

Vote: Councilors McFarland, McCaig, Monroe, Washington, McLain, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

7.4 Resolution No. 96-2286. For the Purpose of Authorizing the Release of a Request for Proposals for a Regional Waste Prevention Education Program for Businesses, and Authorizing the Executive Officer to Enter Into a Multi-Year Contract

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor McLain moved, seconded by Councilor Monroe for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2286.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 28, 1996

page 5

Councilor McLain gave a report on Resolution No. 96-2286, which would authorize issuance of an RFP for a regional waste prevention education program for businesses, and would authorize the executive officer to enter into a multi-year contract. She said the purpose of the program is to carry out some of the goals of the Metro regional solid waste management plan. One goal is to recover 52% of waste generated by the region by the year 2000. She said there has to be a good effort in waste reduction in the commercial sector. The educational programs have been defined as being key management practices to help reduce commercial waste. According to Councilor McLain the RFP combines two smaller contracts, with no budget impact. The funds for the project are allocated in the FY 95-96 Waste Reduction and Planning Division budget. The money will be carried over into the next fiscal year in order to allow sufficient time to complete the project.

Vote: Councilors McCaig, Monroe, Washington, McLain, McFarland, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

7.5 Resolution No. 96-2293. For the Purpose of Authorizing Change Order No. 17 to the Contract for Operating Metro Central Station

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor McCaig moved, seconded by Councilor McLain for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2293.

Councilor McCaig introduced Ray Barker, Environmental Services Management Assistant, who reported on Resolution No. 96-2293, which would authorize Change Order No. 17 to the contract for operating Metro Central Station. Mr. Barker reported that the contract is for Metro to keep roads leading to the transfer station clean. Trans Industries worked with the Boys Club to pick up the litter surrounding the station from 1991 through July 1995. Trans Industries used the Boys Club until July 1995. Now, the station uses the services of Multnomah County through a payback/restitution program for youth. The youth pick up the litter twice weekly. Multnomah County legal counsel has advised Trans Industries that the county cannot enter into an agreement with them because Trans Industries is a for-profit organization.

According to Mr. Barker, the county is approaching Metro to enter into an intergovernmental agreement which is the subject of the next agenda item, Resolution No. 96-2294. Resolution No. 96-2293 would authorize a change order to facilitate the IGA by giving credit to Metro for \$1,900 a month, which is the amount of the payment that would be made to Multnomah County, plus 10% to Metro for administrative costs. There will be no cost to Metro for this program.

Vote: Councilors Monroe, Washington, McLain, McFarland, McCaig, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

7.6 Resolution No. 96-2294. For the Purpose of Authorizing an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County to Provide Litter Collection Services

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor McCaig moved, seconded by Councilor McFarland for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2294.

Councilor McCaig asked Mr. Barker to report on Resolution No. 96-2294, which is a companion piece to the previously passed Resolution No. 96-2293.

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

March 28, 1996

page 6

Vote: Councilors Washington, McLain, McFarland, McCaig, Monroe, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

7.7 Resolution No. 96-2302. For the Purpose of Approving the FY 1995-96 Supplemental Budget to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission

The clerk read the resolution by title only.

Motion: Councilor McFarland moved, seconded by Councilor Washington for adoption of Resolution No. 96-2302.

Councilor McFarland reported on Resolution No. 96-2302, which would approve the FY 95-96 supplemental budget to the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission. She said the resolution attests to the continued success as Portland Center for the Performing Arts (PCPA). This resolution must go for approval to the tax commission before the budget ordinance can be acted upon. According to Councilor McFarland the budget request is due to increased expenses brought about by increased business revenues at the PCPA. The difference between increased expenses and increased revenues will result in an unanticipated profit of \$100,000.

Vote: Councilors McLain, McFarland, McCaig, Monroe, Washington, and Kvistad voted aye. Councilor Morissette was absent. The vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor McLain presented a letter from the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) requesting a return to a standing fourth week 7:00 PM council meeting.


Councilor McCaig said a component of the council's organization resolution left it to the presiding officer's discretion to schedule 7:00 PM council meetings. She said she supports one regularly scheduled 7:00 PM council meeting per month, and that was one of the reasons she voted against the organizing resolution.

Robert Maestre, MCCI, appeared before the council at the request of Councilor McLain to speak in favor of a regularly scheduled 7:00 PM council meeting. He suggested the development of a mechanism to allow a citizen group to establish guidelines to determine which agenda items are important enough to the public to be considered at a 7:00 PM meeting. Councilor McLain asked the council to reconsider having a 7:00 PM meeting every fourth Thursday.

Councilor Washington reported on his conference on urban parks which took place in Austin, Texas. He will be distributing materials to councilors in the near future. He said Metro has a good reputation throughout the nation with regard to parks and green spaces.

There being no further business before the Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 3:15 PM.

Prepared by


Lindsey Ray
Council Assistant

c:\r\vegcncl\032896mn

Agenda Item 5.1

Ordinance No. 96-636

*For the Purpose of Adjusting the Planning Fund Budget to Reflect
Unanticipated Program Increases in the Growth Management Services
Department, Authorizing Additional FTE; and Declaring an Emergency*

**Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, April 4, 1996**

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 96-636 AMENDING THE FY 1995-96 BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS SCHEDULE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTING THE PLANNING FUND BUDGET TO REFLECT UNANTICIPATED PROGRAM INCREASES IN THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT, AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL FTE; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Date: February 14, 1996

Presented by: John Fregonese

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

During the current 1995-96 fiscal year, the Growth Management Services Department has experienced an increase in workload which was not anticipated at the time the FY 1995-96 budget was prepared. The Council has designated additional acres as urban reserve study areas and has requested additional information concerning the capacity of the UGB to absorb growth. In addition, requests for information from our regional partners and from the public have increased more rapidly than expected. Past history indicates that as the department completes and releases current work products -- the housing need analysis, buildable lands inventory, and functional plan tasks -- requests for information dramatically increase from local governments, interest groups, and the public. For these reasons, the department is requesting changes to the FY 1995-96 budget. The personnel requests included in this action were coordinated with the preparation of the FY 1996-97 budget. The actions for FY 1995-96 were delayed until this time to allow for a longer term analysis and perspective of department staffing needs and the resulting financial impacts. The final staffing proposal presented in this ordinance provides for the maximum use and efficiency of existing staff, and recognizes the project orientation of the department.

Public Involvement

Due to greater demand from the public for publications and information regarding growth management issues, particularly urban reserve study areas, we propose adding an office assistant to assist in handling the increased work load. Currently, the Growth Management Services Department has only 3.0 FTE support staff -- 2.0 FTE Administrative Secretary and 1.0 FTE Program Assistant for 33 department staff. Since September 1995, the department has used a temporary employment agency to fill this need. However, it is less expensive to hire a staff person. The office assistant is an entry level position and will answer the phone, direct callers to appropriate staff, fill requests for information, distribute mail, and prepare mailings. The position will be full time in the Growth Management Services Department for the last quarter of FY 1995-96 (.25 FTE). In the FY 1996-97 budget proposal, the office assistant will be shared with the Metro Policy Advisory Committee Support Section of the Office of Citizen Involvement. The department is requesting that \$6,482 be moved from contingency to personal services to fund this position for FY 1995-96.

In April, the department will be implementing a public involvement plan for Phase 1 of the Regional Framework Plan (early implementation) and urban reserve study areas. In addition, Growth Management staff will be working with Transportation Department staff on public outreach for the regional transportation plan. To assist in implementing these public involvement efforts, the department is requesting to add an associate public involvement specialist (.25 FTE, full time position to be hired for three months of current fiscal year). This is a limited duration position to June 30, 1997. The department is requesting that \$11,184 be moved from contingency to personal services to fund this position during FY 1995-96.

2040 Implementation

The Community Development Division of the department is responsible for assisting local governments in 2040 implementation. Many local jurisdictions are currently undergoing periodic review of their comprehensive plans. It is important that Metro be a participant in this process. The department is requesting to hire an Associate Regional Planner immediately to assist with local government implementation of the 2040 growth concept during periodic review. The department is requesting moving \$11,184 from contingency to personal services to fund this position during FY 1995-96.

Additional Research

On February 8, 1996, the Metro Council designated approximately 5,000 acres as Urban Reserve Study Areas which have not previously been studied. These additional areas include land in the Stafford triangle, northwest Portland, Oregon City and Hillsboro. The department proposes to move \$10,000 from contingency to materials and services to pay for a study to determine the feasibility and cost of extending basic urban services -- water, sanitary sewers, and storm drainage -- to these newly added study areas. The department has an existing contract with KCM, the firm that conducted the earlier feasibility study of urban reserve study areas. The contract can be amended to include this additional work.

The Growth Management Services Department has entered into a contract with ECONorthwest for market and regulatory research using funds in the department's FY 1995-96 budget. The Port of Portland and the Portland Development Commission would like to join in this project. Each agency would supply \$10,000 in revenue to Metro for research on vacant and redevelopable land for industrial expansion. Metro would benefit from this additional research. Intergovernmental agreements will be entered into with each of the agencies and an amendment to the existing contract to change the scope of work will be made. The department is requesting authority to receive these funds totaling \$20,000 and receive an additional \$20,000 in miscellaneous professional services expenditure authority.

Recently Metro received an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant to coordinate a technical project in the Clackamas River watershed to assess data available from different sources in the watershed, produce maps from available data, identify a rapid assessment methodology for use in sub-basins, and identify current citizen activities and technical needs

of local citizens. In October, 1995, department staff made an informational presentation to the Metro Council's Growth Management Committee regarding this award. The Executive Officer made a presentation to the full Metro Council about the grant, its work plan and contract with EPA on December 14, 1995. Resolution No. 96-2284 for the purpose of approving several contracts under the EPA grant will be heard by the Council's Growth Management Committee the week of February 19, 1996.

The work program for the EPA grant includes a temporary position. The temporary position will terminate in FY 1996-97 when the grant funds are exhausted. The FY 1995-96 budget anticipated up to \$200,000 of grant funds for the Regional Water Quality Program. The entire amount was budgeted as contractual services under materials and services. This action requests the transfer of \$14,452 from materials and services to personal services to fund this temporary position for the last five months of this fiscal year.

RLIS Workstation - Capital Outlay

Because of an increased workload due to passage of the open spaces bond measure, an additional RLIS workstation and printer, and ArcView licensing fees were necessary in the Data Resource Center to produce information and maps for target areas identified in the bond measure. The equipment and fees were initially paid by the Open Spaces Program with bond proceeds. However, subsequent discussions with bond and legal counsel determined that capital equipment costs may only be charged to bond proceeds in proportion to the use of the equipment towards the bond program. Since the equipment will be used by the Data Resource Center and will have a useful life past the bond program's need, it was determined the Data Resource Center should be charged for the full cost of the purchase of this equipment and license fees. The Open Spaces Program will be allocated and charged its share of the costs associated with the equipment based on the program's use, similar to other Metro departments. The Growth Management Services department proposes to move \$52,975 from Contingency to Capital Outlay to pay for this workstation, printer and associated license fees.

Other Staff

Due to an error in compiling the FY 1995-96 budget, an existing assistant regional planner position was omitted from the budget. This request would reinstate the position. A current employee occupies this position. Because of vacancies during the current fiscal year, the department has sufficient funds in its personal services budget to pay for this position. The department is only requesting the reinstatement of the position FTE authority.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Resources:

	<u>Amount</u>
Portland Development Commission	\$10,000
Port of Portland	<u>10,000</u>
Total Additional Resources	\$20,000

Expenditures:

	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Personal Services		
Office Assistant (full time, last quarter of fiscal year)	.25	\$4,986
Associate Regional Planner (full time, last quarter)	.25	8,603
Associate Public Involvement Spec. (limited duration)	.25	8,603
Assistant Regional Planner (reinstate FTE only)	1.00	0
Temporary Associate Mgmt Analyst (grant funded)	.42	13,020
Fringe		8,090
Materials & Services		
Misc. Professional Services, Urban Reserve Study		10,000
Misc. Professional Services, ECONorthwest		20,000
Misc. Professional Services, Water Quality		(14,452)
Capital Outlay		
RLIS Workstation, printer and license fees		52,975
Contingency		<u>(91,825)</u>
Total Additional Expenditures		\$20,000

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Ordinance 96-636.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FY 1995-96)	ORDINANCE NO. 96-636
BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS)	
SCHEDULE FOR THE PURPOSE OF)	Introduced by Mike Burton
ADJUSTING THE PLANNING FUND BUDGET)	Executive Officer
TO REFLECT UNANTICIPATED PROGRAM)	
INCREASES IN THE GROWTH)	
MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT,)	
AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL FTE; AND)	
DECLARING AN EMERGENCY)	

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has reviewed and considered the need to transfer appropriations with the FY 1995-96 Budget; and

WHEREAS, Oregon Budget Law ORS 294.326(2) allows the recognition and expenditure of certain grant funds in the year of receipt of said funds; and

WHEREAS, The need for a transfer of appropriation has been justified; and

WHEREAS, Adequate funds exist for other identified needs; now, therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS;

1. That the FY 1995-96 Budget and Schedule of Appropriations are hereby amended as shown in the column titled "Revision". of Exhibits A and B to this Ordinance for the purposes of modifying the Planning Fund budget to recognize \$20,000 in new grants, transfer \$91,825 from contingency to various expenditure categories, and authorize additional positions.

2. This Ordinance being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety or welfare of the Metro area in order to meet obligations and comply with Oregon Budget Law, an emergency is declared to exist, and this Ordinance takes effect upon passage.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____ day of _____, 1996.

Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Approved as to Form:

Recording Secretary

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

KR:\budget\fy95-96\budord\growth1\ORD.DOC
2/16/96 9:34 AM

**Exhibit A
Ordinance No. 96-636**

FISCAL YEAR 1995-96		CURRENT BUDGET		REVISION		PROPOSED BUDGET	
ACCT #	DESCRIPTION	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT
Planning Fund							
<u>Resources</u>							
305000	Fund Balance		33,420		0		33,420
331110	Federal Grants-Operating-Categorical-Direct						
	FY 95 103 e(4) (OR-26-9006)		5,436,491		0		5,436,491
	FY 94 FTA S/N AA/DEIS (OR-29-9021)		500,000		0		500,000
	FY 94 FTA S/N AA/DEIS (OR-29-9022)		1,600,000		0		1,600,000
	FEMA (OEM)		542,500		0		542,500
331120	Federal Grants-Operating-Categorical Indirect						
	FY 96 Congestion Pricing - FHWA		157,694		0		157,694
	FY 96 Congestion Pricing - ODOT		15,375		0		15,375
	FY 96 PL/ODOT		767,885		0		767,885
	FY 96 Sec 8 - ODOT		208,415		0		208,415
	FY 96 STP		779,000		0		779,000
	FY 96 STP/ODOT Mtc		26,897		0		26,897
	FY 96 Metro STP Dues Replacement		100,600		0		100,600
	FY 93 FHWA (Trans/Land Use Model)		50,000		0		50,000
	FY 93 STP		478,450		0		478,450
	FY 96 Other Federal Grants		542,000		0		542,000
	FHWA 1000 Friends Grant		50,000		0		50,000
334110	State Grants-Operating-Categorical-Direct						
	FY 96 ODOT Supplemental		534,000		0		534,000
	FY 96 DEQ Grants		105,000		0		105,000
334120	State Grants-Operating-Categorical-Indirect						
	ODOT S/N Lottery		2,235,658		0		2,235,658
334210	State Grants-Operating-Non-Categorical-Direct						
	C-TRAN S/N AA/DEIS/PE (WSDOT)		3,757,710		0		3,757,710
337110	Local Grants-Operating-Categorical-Direct						
	FY 96 Congestion Pricing - Port match		5,914		0		5,914
	FY 96 Congestion Pricing - local match		5,519		0		5,519
	FY 96 TM		684,000		0		684,000
	FY 95 Tri-Met - Westside LRT		70,000		0		70,000
	FY 96 Tri-Met TSAP		40,000		0		40,000
	PDOT Contract		120,300		0		120,300
	Port of Portland		0		10,000		10,000
	Portland Development Commission		0		10,000		10,000
339200	Contract Services		131,500		0		131,500
	DRC Subscriptions		100,000		0		100,000
	Travel Forecasting Sales		5,000		0		5,000
	Misc. DRC Sales - Maps & Data		50,000		0		50,000
	Various Jurisdictions - Technical Asst.		73,000		0		73,000
341310	UGB Fees		1,400		0		1,400
341500	Documents & Publications		18,000		0		18,000
341600	Conferences & Workshops		20,000		0		20,000
365100	Donations and Bequests		50,000		0		50,000
391010	Trans. Resources from Gen'l Fund-Excise Tax		3,427,684		0		3,427,684
391160	Trans. Resources from Reg. Parks/Expo Fund		14,900		0		14,900
391530	Trans. Resources from S.W. Revenue Fund		355,063		0		355,063
TOTAL RESOURCES			23,093,375		20,000		23,113,375

**Exhibit A
Ordinance No. 96-636**

FISCAL YEAR 1995-96		CURRENT BUDGET		REVISION		PROPOSED BUDGET	
ACCT #	DESCRIPTION	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT
Planning Fund							
<u>Personal Services</u>							
511121	SALARIES-REGULAR EMPLOYEES (full time)						
	Senior Director	1.00	89,143	0	0	1.00	89,143
	Assistant Director	2.00	154,433	0	0	2.00	154,433
	Senior Manager	1.00	75,177	0	0	1.00	75,177
	Manager	4.00	268,694	0	0	4.00	268,694
	Senior Program Supervisor	7.00	395,238	0	0	7.00	395,238
	Program Supervisor	1.50	77,873	0	0	1.50	77,873
	Assoc. Management Analyst	3.00	147,565	0	0	3.00	147,565
	Senior Public Affairs Specialist	1.00	54,992	0	0	1.00	54,992
	Senior Regional Planner	5.00	252,372	0	0	5.00	252,372
	Senior Accountant	1.00	49,873	0	0	1.00	49,873
	Senior Management Analyst	3.00	166,665	0	0	3.00	166,665
	Senior Trans. Planner	12.00	606,277	0	0	12.00	606,277
	Assoc Public Affairs Specialist	4.50	187,111	0.25	8,603	4.75	195,714
	DP Operations Analyst	1.00	49,483	0	0	1.00	49,483
	Assoc. Trans. Planner	9.00	391,045	0	0	9.00	391,045
	Assoc. Regional Planner	4.00	166,608	0.25	8,603	4.25	175,211
	Asst. Trans. Planner	6.00	206,994	0	0	6.00	206,994
	Asst. Regional Planner	9.00	314,234	1.00	0	10.00	314,234
511221	WAGES-REGULAR EMPLOYEES (full time)						
	Administrative Secretary	3.00	100,444	0	0	3.00	100,444
	Secretary	3.00	86,766	0	0	3.00	86,766
	Office Assistant	0	0	0.25	4,986	0.25	4,986
	Program Assistant 1	1.00	26,324	0	0	1.00	26,324
511231	WAGES - TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES (Full-time)						
	Temporary Assistance	1.90	38,140	0.42	13,020	2.32	51,160
511400	OVERTIME		1,200		0		1,200
512000	FRINGE		1,152,462		8,090		1,160,552
Total Personal Services		83.90	5,059,113	2.17	43,302	86.07	5,102,415
<u>Materials & Services</u>							
521100	Office Supplies		49,644		0		49,644
521110	Computer Software		70,300		0		70,300
521111	Computer Supplies		9,000		0		9,000
521240	Graphics/Reprographic Supplies		39,200		0		39,200
521260	Printing Supplies		2,000		0		2,000
521310	Subscriptions		5,539		0		5,539
521320	Dues		8,946		0		8,946
524110	Accounting & Auditing Services		5,000		0		5,000
524190	Misc. Professional Services		2,717,488		15,548		2,733,036
525640	Maint. & Repairs Services-Equipment		82,800		0		82,800
525710	Equipment Rental		11,000		0		11,000
525740	Capital Leases (FY 92)		276,750		0		276,750
526200	Ads & Legal Notices		39,300		0		39,300
526310	Printing Services		278,200		0		278,200
526320	Typesetting & Reprographics Services		64,000		0		64,000
526410	Telephone		19,500		0		19,500
526420	Postage		161,689		0		161,689
526440	Delivery Services		11,300		0		11,300
526500	Travel		51,760		0		51,760
526510	Mileage Reimbursement		2,900		0		2,900
526700	Temporary Help Services		28,800		0		28,800
526800	Training, Tuition, Conferences		52,620		0		52,620
528100	License, Permits, Payments to Other Agencies		11,333,261		0		11,333,261
529500	Meetings		34,211		0		34,211
529800	Miscellaneous		750		0		750
Total Materials & Services			15,355,958		15,548		15,371,506

**Exhibit A
Ordinance No. 96-636**

FISCAL YEAR 1995-96		CURRENT BUDGET		REVISION		PROPOSED BUDGET	
ACCT #	DESCRIPTION	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT	FTE	AMOUNT
Planning Fund							
<u>Capital Outlay</u>							
571500	Purchases-Office Furniture & Equipment		83,300		52,975		136,275
Total Capital Outlay			83,300		52,975		136,275
<u>Interfund Transfers</u>							
581513	Trans. Indirect Costs to Bldg. Fund-Regional Center		422,451		0		422,451
581610	Trans. Indirect Costs to Support Svcs. Fund		1,435,684		0		1,435,684
581615	Trans. Indirect Costs to Risk Mgmt. Fund-Gen1		11,255		0		11,255
581615	Trans. Indirect Costs to Risk Mgmt. Fund-Workers' Comp		14,197		0		14,197
Total Interfund Transfers			1,883,587		0		1,883,587
<u>Contingency and Unappropriated Balance</u>							
599999	Contingency		711,417		(91,825)		619,592
Total Contingency and Unappropriated Balance			711,417		(91,825)		619,592
TOTAL REQUIREMENTS		83.90	23,093,375	2.17	20,000	86.07	23,113,375

Exhibit B
Ordinance No. 96-636
FY 1995-96 SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATIONS

	Current Appropriation	Revision	Proposed Appropriation
PLANNING FUND			
Personal Services	5,059,113	43,302	5,102,415
Materials & Services	15,355,958	15,548	15,371,506
Capital Outlay	83,300	52,975	136,275
Interfund Transfers	1,883,587	0	1,883,587
Contingency	711,417	(91,825)	619,592
Total Fund Requirements	\$23,093,375	\$20,000	\$23,113,375

All Other Appropriations Remain As Previously Adopted