



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308  
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220  
GARY HANSEN • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219  
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217  
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213  
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

## AGENDA

### MEETINGS OF THE MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

#### FOR THE WEEK OF

JUNE 24 - 28, 1991

Tuesday, June 25, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Planning Items . . . .Page 2  
Tuesday, June 25, 1991 - 1:30 PM - Agenda Review. . . .Page 3  
Wednesday, June 26, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Board Briefings. . . .Page 3  
Wednesday, June 26, 1991 - 1:30 PM - Board Briefing . . . .Page 3  
Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Regular Meeting . . . .Page 4  
Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 1:30 PM - Regular Meeting . . . .Page 8

**PLEASE NOTE: DUE TO THE INDEPENDENCE DAY HOLIDAY NEXT WEEK, THE BOARD WILL MEET AT 9:30 AM ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 3, 1991.**

Thursday Meetings of the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners are recorded and can be seen at the following times:

Thursday, 10:00 PM, Channel 11 for East and West side subscribers  
Friday, 6:00 PM, Channel 27 for Paragon Cable (Multnomah East) subscribers  
Saturday 12:00 PM, Channel 21 for East Portland and East County subscribers

Tuesday, June 25, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

PLANNING ITEMS

The Following June 3, 1991 Decisions of the Planning Commission are Reported to the Board for Acceptance and Implementation by Board Order:

1. PR 4-91 DENY Requested Amendment of the Comprehensive Plan Map, Changing the Designation of the Subject Site from Exclusive Farm Use to Multiple Use Forest for the Portion of the Subject Property Lying North and West of NW Germantown Road;  
ZC 4-91 DENY Requested Amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #708, Changing the Subject Property from EFU, Exclusive Farm Use to MUF-19, Multiple Use Forest for that Portion Lying North and West of NW Germantown Road, all for Property Located at 14715 NW Old Germantown Road
- 

The Following June 3, 1991 Decisions of the Planning Commission are Reported to the Board of County Commissioners for Acknowledgement by the Presiding Officer:

2. LD 8-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Three-Lot Land Division;  
CU 11-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Conditional Use Permit for a Two-Acre Mortgage Lot in the MUF-38 Zoning District on Parcel 1 on the Tentative Plan Map;  
CU 12-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Conditional Use Permit for a Two-Acre Mortgage Lot in the MUF-38 Zoning District on Parcel 2 on the Tentative Plan Map, all for Property Located at 19875 NW Logie Trail Road
3. CU 6-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Activity that is in Conjunction with Farm Uses in the EFU Zoning District, for Property Located at 9833 NW Cornelius Pass Road
4. CS 4-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Change in Zone Designation from MUF-19, FF, FW, WRG to MUF, C-S, FF, C-S, WRG, C-S, Community Service for a 37-Space Boat Marina;  
CU 4-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Conditional Use Permit for a 19-Space Houseboat Moorage;  
WRG 1-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Willamette River Greenway Permit, all for Property Located at 14555 NW Larson Road
5. HV 6-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, Requested Rear Yard Setback Variance of 25 Feet to Allow Construction of an Accessory Building (i.e., Residential Garage) to be Located Five Feet from the County Property Line, for Property Located at 17930 NW Chestnut Lane

PLANNING ITEMS - continued

6. LD 1-91 PUBLIC HEARING - ON THE RECORD

Review the Decision of the Planning Commission of May 7, 1991, DENYING REQUESTED APPEAL AND APPROVING, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, the Requested Type III Land Division, a Minor Partition Resulting in Two Lots, Including a Flag Lot, Based on the Findings and Conclusions in the Tentative Plan Decision, Dated January 24, 1991, for Property Located at 6075 SW Mill Street

7. LD 17-89a PUBLIC HEARING - ON THE RECORD  
MC 2-89a

Review the Decision of the Planning Commission of May 7, 1991, APPROVING Modifications of Previous Conditions Regarding Water Supply and Regarding the Private Road Under LD 17-89 and MC 2-89 made on August 14, 1989, for Property Located at 12200 NW Rock Creek Road

---

Tuesday, June 25, 1991 - 1:30 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

AGENDA REVIEW

2. Review of Agenda for Regular Meeting of June 27, 1991

---

Wednesday, June 26, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

BOARD BRIEFINGS

1. Status of City/County Consolidation - as Directed by the Board on Tuesday, May 21, 1991. Presented by Hank Miggins and Carolyn Meeks. TIME CERTAIN 9:30 - 10:30 AM
2. Update on Strategic Planning - as Directed by the Board on Tuesday, May 21, 1991. Presented by Hank Miggins and Carolyn Meeks. TIME CERTAIN 10:30 - 11:30 AM

---

Wednesday, June 26, 1991 - 1:30 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

BOARD BRIEFING

1. Oregon Legislative Session Update. Presented by Fred Neal and Howard Klink. TIME CERTAIN 1:30 - 2:15 PM

Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

REGULAR MEETING

CONSENT CALENDAR

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-1 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement with USAFO for Oregon, for the Rent for the Firing Ranges Located on the Oregon National Guard Base at Camp Withycombe for Fiscal Year 1991-1992

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- C-2 Ratification of Addendum No. 3 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Gresham Authorizing the City to Maintain and Administer Vance Park through June 30, 1991
- C-3 Ratification of Amendment No. 1 to Intergovernmental Agreement No. I91080 Between the Oregon Department of Energy and Multnomah County Extending Participation in the Trojan Ingestion Planning Project through June 30, 1993
- C-4 Ratification of Supplement No. 4 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Fairview Providing Certain Street Maintenance Services through June 30, 1992
- C-5 Ratification of Supplement No. 4 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Troutdale Providing Certain Street Maintenance Services through June 30, 1992
- C-6 Ratification of Supplement No. 4 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Wood Village Providing Certain Street Maintenance Services through June 30, 1992

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

- C-7 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the Oregon Health Sciences University Providing Certain Dental Services at the Russell Street Dental Center through June 30, 1992
- C-8 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the Oregon Health Sciences University Providing Training Chest Fellows to Staff the Tuberculosis Clinic through June 30, 1992

CONSENT CALENDAR - continued

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

- C-9 Ratification of Amendment No. 11 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Oregon Department of Human Resources, State Community Services and Multnomah County Providing Additional Federal Emergency Services and Weatherization Funds for Certain Community Action Services and Weatherization Activities
- C-10 Ratification of Amendment No. 12 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Oregon Department of Human Resources, State Community Services and Multnomah County Providing Additional Federal Community Service and Emergency Shelter Block Grant Funds for Certain Community Action Services and Weatherization Activities
- C-11 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the State Community Services (Omnibus Contract) Providing Funds for Certain Community Action Program Services for the 1991-1993 Biennium
- C-12 Ratification of Amendment No. 3 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the State Department of Human Resources, Senior and Disabled Services Division and Multnomah County, Providing Reduced Title XIX, Oregon Project Independence and Older Americans Act Funds for the Period May 15, 1991 through June 30, 1992
- C-13 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Portland Public School District No. 1J and Multnomah County, Providing Educational Services to High Risk Juvenile Offenders through June 30, 1992
- C-14 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Portland, Water Bureau, Providing Compensation for Microbiology Testing Services through June 30, 1992
- C-15 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and Oregon Mental Health and Developmental Disability Services Division Providing Certain Day Treatment and Mental Health Rehabilitation Services to Children and Adolescents through June 30, 1992
- C-16 Ratification of Amendment No. 2 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and Oregon Health Sciences University Providing Increased Work Activity Center Funding Due to the Transfer of 1 Developmental Disabilities Program Client
- C-17 Ratification of Amendment No. 4 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and Oregon Health Sciences University Reducing Community Support Funds Effective July 1, 1990 through June 30, 1991

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES - continued

- C-18 Ratification of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and Clackamas County Providing Day Treatment Services to Certain Partners Project Team Youth on a Fee for Service Basis through June 30, 1992

REGULAR AGENDA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-1 PUBLIC HEARING and Board Review in the Matter of Order 91-83 Approved by the Board on June 13, 1991 Requesting Approval to Transfer 4 Tax Foreclosed Properties to Homeownership One Street at a Time and a Property to the American Institute of Architects. 9:30 AM TIME CERTAIN
- R-2 Second Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Related to a Change in Fees and Amending Chapter 8.10 of the Multnomah County Code (Animal Control)
- R-3 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Adopting the Beggars-Tick Marsh Management Plan
- R-4 ORDER in the Matter of Declaring Various Tax Foreclosed Properties Abandoned or Subject to Waste and Ordering the Tax Collector to Issue a Deed

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- R-5 First Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Amending Ordinance No. 672 to Change the Definition of Property, for the Purpose of that Ordinance, to Include Only Residential Properties and Residentially and Commercially Zoned Lots, Thereby Excluding Industrially Zoned Properties and Strips of Land that are Undevelopable According to Local Land Use Restrictions, and Declaring an Emergency
- R-6 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Calling for Joint Meetings with the City of Portland to Decide on Local Government Services
- R-7 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Efficiencies in Local Government Support Services
- R-8 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Amending Ordinance No. 683, in Order to Convert the Exempt Salary Range from an Hourly Basis to an Annual Basis Using Fiscal Year 1990-1991 as the Base
- R-9 Second Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Relating to the Business Income Tax; Amending MCC 5.70.045 (Previously Scheduled for September 5, 1991)
- R-10 Second Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Abolishing the Department of General Services, Repealing MCC 2.30.450, Amending MCC 2.30.200, and Assigning Certain Functions to the County Chair's Office

NON-DEPARTMENTAL - continued

- R-11 Budget Modification DGS #6 Authorizing Transfer of Appropriations for Planning and Budget from the Department of General Services to Non-Departmental Appropriations

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- R-12 Budget Modification MCSO #13 Authorizing General Fund Contingency Transfer to Support Activities of the Columbia Villa Safety Action Team
- R-13 Budget Modification MCSO #18 Authorizing the Transfer of Funds from Materials and Services Line Items to Equipment Line Items within Certain MCSO Dedicated Fund Budgets
- R-14 Budget Modification MCSO #20 Authorizing the Transfer of \$19,955 from Contingency to Pay for Deputy Overtime Used to Provide Patrol Service During Movie and Television Production
- R-15 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the Oregon Community Children and Youth Services Commission to Provide Travel Reimbursements to the National Coalition for the Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups Annual Conference

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

- R-16 Budget Modification DCC #9 Authorizing Certain Modifications to Adjust Community Corrections Act Funded Budgets within the Program Services Division

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

- R-17 ORDER in the Matter of the Designation of a Newspaper for Publication of Notice of Foreclosure of Tax Liens as Shown by the Multnomah County 1991 Foreclosure List

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

- R-18 Request for Board Approval of EMS Administrative Rule 6.32-090, Which Specifies User Fee Obligations of Commercial Ambulance Licenses from July 1, 1991 to December 31, 1991
- R-19 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the Oregon Department of Human Services Office of Medical Assistance Programs Providing County On-Line Access to the State's Automated Confirmation of Eligibility System through June 30, 1992
- R-20 Ratification of Amendment No. 1 to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the State Children's Services Division Identifying Children's Services Division as a Qualified Vendor to Accept Partners Project Clients

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES - continued

for Day Treatment Services Effective January 1, 1991 through June 30, 1991

- R-21 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and Portland Public Schools Identifying Portland Public Schools as a Qualified Vendor to Accept Partners Project Clients for Day Treatment Services Effective January 1, 1991 through June 30, 1991
- R-22 Budget Modification DHS #48 Decreasing the Aging Services Division/Community Action Program Budget by \$105,856 and Adjusting Revenue Sources and Line Items to Reflect Actual Contracted Revenues
- R-23 Budget Modification DHS #49 Decreasing the Social Services Division Budget by \$347,451 Appropriating Funding Adjustments from the State Mental Health Division through Amendment No. 58

---

Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 1:30 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

REGULAR MEETING

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- R-24 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Levying Ad Valorem Property Taxes for Multnomah County, Oregon for Fiscal Year 1991-92

SERVICE DISTRICTS

(Recess as the Board of County Commissioners and convene as the Governing Body of Central County Sanitary Sewer Service District No. 3

- R-25 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of the 1991-92 Budget for Central County Sanitary Sewer Service District No. 3, the for Fiscal Year July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 and Making the Appropriations Thereunder, Pursuant to ORS 294.435

(Recess as the Governing Body of Central County Sanitary Sewer Service District No. 3 and convene as the Governing Body of Mid County Street Lighting Service District No. 14)

- R-26 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of the 1991-92 Budget for Mid County Street Lighting Service District No. 14, the for Fiscal Year July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 and Making the Appropriations Thereunder, Pursuant to ORS 294.435

(Recess as the Governing Body of Mid County Street Lighting Service District No. 14 and convene as the Governing Body of Dunthorpe Riverdale Sanitary Service District No. 1)

SERVICE DISTRICTS - continued

R-27 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of the 1991-92 Budget for Dunthorpe Riverdale Sanitary Service District No. 1, the for Fiscal Year July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 and Making the Appropriations Thereunder, Pursuant to ORS 294.435

(Recess as the Governing Body of Dunthorpe Riverdale Sanitary Service District No. 1 and convene as the Governing Body of West Hills Service District No. 2)

R-28 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of the 1991-92 Budget for West Hills Service District No. 2, the for Fiscal Year July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 and Making the Appropriations Thereunder, Pursuant to ORS 294.435

R-29 ORDER in the Matter of Setting a Date for Election to Consider the Dissolution of West Hills Service District No. 2

(Recess as the Governing Body of West Hills Service District No. 2 and reconvene as the Board of County Commissioners)

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

R-30 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of the 1991-92 Budget for Multnomah County, Oregon, for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 and Making the Appropriations Thereunder, Pursuant to ORS 294.435

JUSTICE SERVICES

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

R-31 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Oregon Department of Community Corrections and Multnomah County to Transfer State Correctional Field Officers, Immediate Supervisors and Supporting Clerical Personnel within Parole and Probation Services to Multnomah County Employment Pursuant to ORS 423.550(2)(b)



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308  
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220  
GARY HANSEN • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219  
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217  
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213  
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

### NOTICE OF BOARD BRIEFING CANCELLATION

Wednesday, June 26, 1991 - 1:30 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

1. OREGON LEGISLATIVE SESSION UPDATE. PRESENTED BY FRED NEAL AND HOWARD KLINK. CANCELLED.

Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

### NOTICE OF CORRECTION TO AGENDA TITLE

- R-8 IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTINUED FIRST READING OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE BUSINESS INCOME TAX; AMENDING MCC 5.70.045

Thursday, June 27, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

### UNANIMOUS CONSENT ITEM

- UC-1 ORDER in the Matter of the Cancellation of Certain Warrants Heretofore Issued by Multnomah County more that Seven (7) Years Prior to July 1, 1991, and not Heretofore Presented for Payment

0103C/dr/65



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308  
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220  
GARY HANSEN • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219  
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217  
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213  
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

### NOTICE OF BOARD BRIEFING

Friday, June 28, 1991 - 8:45 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

1. Briefing on Childrens Justice Task Force Issues. Presented by Elaine Cogan and Rich Gable, consultant from the Center for Juvenile Justice.

0103C/66  
cap

Meeting Date: JUN 26 1991

Agenda No.: B-1

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM  
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: Briefing - City/County Consolidation

AGENDA REVIEW/  
BOARD BRIEFING \*\* 6/26/91 REGULAR MEETING \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT Nondepartmental DIVISION Chair's Office

CONTACT H. Miggins/C. Meeks TELEPHONE 248-3308

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION H. Miggins, C. Meeks

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATIONAL ONLY     POLICY DIRECTION     APPROVAL

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 1 hour

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION: \_\_\_\_\_

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):

Briefing on the Status of City/County Consolidation - as Directed by the Board on Tuesday May 21, 1991

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL *Maedep McCoy*

or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER \_\_\_\_\_

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
MULTI-COUNTY  
OREGON  
1991 JUN 19 AM 11:02

KB  
JM  
JK

ANALYSIS OF CITY/COUNTY SERVICES  
STATUS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FEBRUARY, 1991 JOINT  
REPORTS

Participating managers were directed to pursue the joint recom-  
mendations listed below, including development of work plan when  
appropriate.

CABLE REGULATION - *K. Bussell, J. Murray*

RECOMMENDATION Joint agreement not reached. Follow-up dis-  
cussions arranged by Hank Miggins.

STATUS The two cable offices have met to explore  
cost savings; e.g., a joint RFQ for a finan-  
cial consultant and coordinated subscriptions  
to trade and legal periodicals.

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT *John Leguy*

RECOMMENDATION #1 The City's Office of Neighborhood Associa-  
tions (ONA) and the County's Citizen Involvement  
Committee (CIC) jointly recruit and  
train citizens for the Bureau Advisory  
Committee program at the City and the Citizen  
Budget Advisory Committee program at the  
County.

STATUS #1 No action has yet been taken on this.

RECOMMENDATION #2 The CIC and ONA perform joint neighborhood  
needs assessments, combining the City's  
Neighborhood Needs process and the work of  
the CIC's new Area Teams Project.

STATUS #2 No action has been taken to date.

RECOMMENDATION #3 Study, with appropriate individuals, the pos-  
sibility of combining CIC, ONA, and other  
city and county information and referral  
functions. Provide a proposal for this con-  
solidation, if feasible, to elected officials  
during FY 1991-92.

STATUS#3 No action has been taken to date.

P4  
TG

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) AND HOUSING

*Paul Sparborough*

RECOMMENDATION      The combined Multnomah County/Gresham and City of Portland CDBG/Housing programs should develop of the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (due 10-31-91) as required by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development using existing mechanisms.

During this process, identification of opportunities for more efficient/effective delivery of these services should be sought. Any identified strategies should be provided to appropriate elected officials for consideration.

STATUS

*Having on-going disc. 1<sup>st</sup> product due this wk.*

ELECTRONIC SERVICES

*Tom Sullivan*

RECOMMENDATION #1      Continue to share existing radio equipment sites and microwave communication system.

STATUS #1      This sharing programs continues to operate effectively.

RECOMMENDATION #2      Initiate joint preventive maintenance work at Council Crest and Rocky Butte radio sites.

STATUS #2      A schedule for this joint work should be developed by July 30, 1991. Joint work will begin as outlined in the established schedule.

RECOMMENDATION #3      Initiated use of a joint City/County technician team for high tower work at Kelly butte, Council Crest, and Rocky Butte.

STATUS #3      High tower work during FY 1991-92 will be jointly identified and scheduled by July 30, 1991.

RECOMMENDATION #4      Initiate City-provided preventive maintenance of County equipment at Kelly Butte.

STATUS #4      The preventive maintenance tasks and frequencies will be identified by July 30, 1991. The work will begin after that date.

RECOMMENDATION #5 Initiated County-provided preventive maintenance of City equipment at Biddle Butte.

STATUS #5 The preventive maintenance tasks and frequencies will be identified by July 30, 1991. The work will begin after that date.

RECOMMENDATION #6 Initiate City/County staff study of radio equipment relocations to improve services or reduce leased telephone line costs.

STATUS #6 This study will begin by September 1, 1991.

RECOMMENDATION #7 Initiate quarterly meetings between City and County maintenance shop supervisors to review and coordinate upcoming projects where possible.

STATUS #7 The first joint quarterly meeting occurred on April 1, 1991. these are expected to continue.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

*Paul Garbarough*

RECOMMENDATION Joint agreement not reached. Follow-up discussions arranged by Hank Miggins..

STATUS

*shifting make toward a regional issue. all agents owning EM function have been contacted. Hope to have further discussions in July.*

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

*Wynne George*

RECOMMENDATION #1 Consolidation of: custodial contracts by geographical location; elevator maintenance, pest control, landscape, and nuisance/property cleanup contracts into one contract for each area.

STATUS:  
CUSTODIAL

*Bob Kieta (MC)  
led Parent (City)*

Justice Center uses a mix of county custodians in county-owned spaces and contract custodians in the City-owned Portland Police Bureau. Negotiations are continuing between City and County to resolve the most prudent and cost effective method in cleaning the entire building regardless of which agency owns the space.

Contract Custodial Maintenance is a function performed by the City for many of their facilities. Due to the differences between County and City purchasing, accounting

P4  
WG

*Thank to Wayne George -  
they have a bid thresh.  
\$30,000, ours is \$10,000  
Finance system - allocation  
of [costs?] -- city has  
cost accty. / chargeback  
system, we don't*

systems, and bidding rules, it does not appear to be feasible for either agency to become the sole provider for custodial services. Custodial contractors are generally able to give the most competitive prices when bidding on the largest jobs. Since service levels between City/County vary this year due to budget reductions, merging specifications for all custodial services is not recommended at this time.

However, where services are similar and City and County contracts are up for renewal at the same time, or are cancelled, bid packages can be consolidated to enlarge the size of the contract. We recommend new language be added to bid specifications to indicate that all buildings in the package be considered together for the process of awarding and terminating contracts.

The County will begin awarding custodial contracts using the above process beginning July 1, 1991.

PEST CONTROL

These can be handled in much the same way as above. Lowest fixed prices should be the basis for awarding the contract, with the City and County using a single contractor. The contractor would bill the appropriate agency for the work performed.

LANDSCAPE

Due to budget constraints, contracted landscape maintenance has been almost eliminated from the County's 1991-92 budget. The County may have to rely solely on an Inverness Jail work crew or find funds to partially fund limited landscape maintenance. The County should try to piggy-back on the City's contract due to the economy of scale principle.

ELEVATOR

The County's elevator maintenance contract expires in October, 1993, and provides for the maintenance of 32 elevators. It also has a proprietary contract with one vendor for eight elevators at the Justice Center.

The respective City/County personnel are exploring the possibility of jointly bidding, although separately managing, all elevator maintenance under one contract, in hopes of receiving this service at a reduced cost.

PY  
WG

The work plan calls for reviewing and standardizing contract language and services, then jointly bidding before the expiration of the City's contract in 1992.

RECOMMENDATION #2 Consolidation of recycling programs.

STATUS #2

The County's recycling program will be modified by July 1, 1991 to reflect additional service. We found the previous recycling contractor whom the City also uses was providing unsatisfactory service by not collecting all recyclables and not maintaining an acceptable schedule. The new recycling contractor will remove all recyclables at more locations with reduced cost (about \$12,000 savings annually) to the County. Therefore, a consolidation of recycling programs with the City will actually result in less service at an increased cost and is not recommended.

*Bob Keta (MC)*

RECOMMENDATION #3 Work with the City's Energy Office to establish energy conservation programs in City and County buildings with the use of City and County Facilities Project Management staff.

STATUS #3

Joint meetings have confirmed that both agencies have implemented energy saving programs when possible. The City is currently assisting the County in a Request for Proposals evaluation of an Energy Management and Control System. This RFP is not specific to any one building but rather asks for a unit price agreement for engineering and energy management control components. The City may find it cost effective to purchase through this agreement. The two agencies will continue to share expertise and work jointly when advantageous.

*Craig Calkins (MC)  
Mary Huff (City)*

RECOMMENDATION #4 Multnomah County assume all Facilities Maintenance of the Justice Center.

STATUS #4

The County will provide a full range of maintenance services to City owned and occupied space in this building. Financial accountability and documentation will be as it has been in the past with the County budgeting for full operations and maintenance and charging back to the City and the retail space owners their appropriate share based on

*Walter Neil Jr. (MC)  
Bill Young (City)*

P4  
WG

square footage occupied. The County will also manage any contracted building maintenance services requested by the City.

RECOMMENDATION #5 City of Portland assume all Facilities Maintenance of the Penumbra Kelly Building and the Portland Building.

*Craig Calkins  
Walter Hall (MC)  
Bill Young (City)*

STATUS #5 Virtually the same agreement described for #4 has been agreed upon for the Portland Building where the City is primarily responsible for all maintenance. Effective July 1, 1991 the City Facilities Management Division will address maintenance issues on County-owned floors (floors 14 and 15). Cost not already built in to the lease purchase agreement will be billed to the County either directly or through a reciprocal agreement.

Negotiations for maintenance on the Penumbra-Kelly Building have not been completed. Talks will continue on this subject and implementation will begin as soon as all negotiations and other management obligations are complete.

RECOMMENDATION #6 Share Project Management staff talents where most needed (space planning, mechanical engineer, architecture and project supervision).

*John Stephenson (City)  
Jim Emerson (MC)*

STATUS #6 Major differences exist in budgeting, accounting, project timing requirements, and bidding rules between the Capital Improvements Projects sections of the City and County. During FY 1991-92 the two organizations will consider each other for engineering or project management services when the project in question could benefit by such action and when other projects will not be negatively affected.

An intergovernmental agreement will be prepared to support provision of services without an RFP. This will be presented to the Board/Council for approval, ~~if necessary~~. Neither agency has a specific project appropriate for interagency cooperation at this time. Any new projects will be developed using the intergovernmental agreement after it has been approved.

*mentioned red Veneski (City Fac. Mgr.) & his staff along w/ MC & City Mgmt staff*

FLEET SERVICES

*Tom Lunnery*

- RECOMMENDATION #1 Continue to purchase fuel from a joint contract.
- STATUS #1 This ongoing program continues.
- RECOMMENDATION #2 Initiate shared use of fueling stations.
- STATUS #2 The Portland vehicles and people that will use the County stations will be identified by July 15. The Gasboy Cards will be made and distributed to the identified individuals by July 30. Prices, billing, and allocation procedures will be agreed on by July 30. An intergovernmental agreement, if needed, will be initiated by August 15.
- RECOMMENDATION #3 Combine purchase of vehicles, when advantageous.
- STATUS #3 The City and County fleet staff have met to determine potential combined purchases for FY 1991-92. The two Purchasing Divisions will meet to work out the process and any needed language changes by July 15. Standard vehicle specifications will be developed by July 15. Bidding, reviewing bid results and comparing with State price agreement, and issuing purchase orders will happen through FY 1991-92.
- RECOMMENDATION #4 Provide preventive maintenance and other minor services for each other when geographically advantageous.
- STATUS #4 Vehicles that would benefit from being services by the other jurisdiction based on geography will be identified by July 15. Appropriate pricing and billing procedures will be established by July 30. Procedures for scheduling, delivering, and picking up vehicles from other's shops will also be developed by July 30. If needed, an intergovernmental agreement will be developed by August 15. Procedures will be communicated to affected parties by August 30. Cooperative maintenance services will begin by September 3, 1991.

PY  
KB

PARKS/RECREATION

*Paul Farborough*

RECOMMENDATION Discuss cooperative or coordinated park maintenance opportunities during the fiscal year.

STATUS *No meeting have occurred to date*

*Strategic  
plng. discussion*

PURCHASING/STORES SERVICES

*K. Bussie*

RECOMMENDATION #1 Continue participating in long-term supply and service contracts with other public agencies in the area.

STATUS #1 FY 1991-92 opportunities for cooperatively purchasing contracts have been reviewed. They are: gasoline; oil and lubricants; automobiles and other vehicles; and paper supplies.

RECOMMENDATION #2 County contract with the City to handle surplus property.

STATUS #2 Discussions are progressing on the quality of surplus property the City will accept for disposal.

RECOMMENDATION #3 City contract with the County for stationery stores operations.

STATUS #3 The County has presented an offer for a handling charge to the City to use the County Central Stores for office supplies. As of June 10, 1991, the City had not yet accepted the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION #4 Continue to explore methods of greater efficiency, economy, and effectiveness.

STATUS #4 The City and County purchasing managers have met several times to explore other opportunities for additional cost savings.

RECORDS MANAGEMENT

*K. Bussie*

RECOMMENDATION A joint report was not developed for this area. Responsible City and County managers should meet to develop agreement on a joint report.

STATUS The County has recommended that we secure the services of an independent auditor to perform

KB  
JM

a cost comparison of the two operations. We have had difficulty arriving at a common data base for determining unit costs. As of June 10, 1991, the City has not yet replied to the recommendation.

RISK MANAGEMENT/INSURANCE

*Jan Wiley*

- RECOMMENDATION #1 Continue to look for ways to coordinate delivery of services.
- STATUS #1 The loss control officers of both jurisdictions have met several times to discuss service delivery and opportunities for coordination. There has been coordination of training and use of equipment as noted below, but other specific plans have not yet been developed.
- RECOMMENDATION #2 Explore development of joint loss control services for efficiency, increased scope of services, and cost savings.
- STATUS #2 There has been discussion of possible joint loss control services with the City. The County has given the City several free slots in training which the County was providing to its employees in the areas of lockout/tagout and office/VDT training. The City has made their library of safety-related videos available to use and we have used some of the City's noise level equipment for testing in County facilities. We have also shared training materials on hand tools. We will continue discussions about shared loss control services with the City as we continue our program development.
- RECOMMENDATION #3 Explore joint purchases of services and insurance where possible and where there is a cost savings.
- STATUS #3 Our preliminary investigation showed that joint purchases of insurance would likely not be possible, given that the assets of the two entities are separately owned. However, when we begin the renewal process for our property insurance coverage in September, we will more fully explore this option.

JM  
JM

RECOMMENDATION #4 City bid for County services as third-party claims administration.

STATUS #4 The County went out to bid for liability and workers' compensation claims administration in early May. Requests for proposals in both areas were sent to the City; no proposals were received from the City. The County is completing its evaluation process on the proposals that were received and plans to have successful respondent(s) identified soon.

RECOMMENDATION #5 Each entity look at the innovation of the other for possible sharing or replication.

STATUS #5 Because the County staff has been so busy with the RFP process and several other projects, the progress on this item has been delayed, except for the work done by the two loss control officers (previously described).

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

*Jim Murray*

RECOMMENDATION #1 City provide the County with an intergovernmental agreement for cellular phone service.

STATUS #1 The County telecommunications section prototyped the transfer of its Cellular One services to the City contract by transferring four cellular phones to the City agreement. This transfer went smoothly with no interruption in service. Subsequent to the evaluation, the County requested an intergovernmental service from the City to transfer the remaining County cellular phones to the City Cellular One contract. We anticipate that the agreement should be approved by both the County and City by the end of June. The County will enjoy an approximate \$5,000 annual savings by participating with the City in their Cellular One agreement next fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATION #2 City/County joint contracting for pager services.

STATUS #2 The City has decided to defer transferring their pagers to the County contract. The transfer of the City pagers would require that all of the City users exchange pagers for new ~~pag~~ers with different phone numbers.

JM

The City does not feel that the dollar savings is worth the conversion at this time. It is their intent to review their decision on expiration of their existing contract in 1993.

RECOMMENDATION #3 County helps City evaluate using county inventory and billing systems.

STATUS #3 The telecommunications section met with the City telecommunications manager on April 19 and spent 3 hours briefing him on the County's automated inventory and billing systems. The City indicated that they need to evaluation their requirements to see if they were met by the County's systems. There have been no subsequent discussions with the City concerning the systems and we are unsure of the City's plans for automating telecommunications administrative functions.

RECOMMENDATION #4 County investigates using the City's new microwave system for voice and data transport.

STATUS #4 Telecommunications managers from both the City and County met on May 16 to discuss our mutual requirements and how they might be addressed with a network owned and operated by the City of Portland. The City was provided with documentation of the County's requirements with assurances that the County would work with the City in building a network which the County could use. No conversations have occurred since May 16. This is a long-term project and it appears that the City will require several years of planning.

RECOMMENDATION #5 Both agencies investigate moving toward a common telecommunication architecture. Joint report due by May 30, 1992.

STATUS #5 The City indicates that the idea has merit and would like to discuss this further at a later date. Current contracts prevent them from making any decisions for the next three to five years.

REPORTS DUE SEPTEMBER 1

EMPLOYEE SERVICES

*Curtis Smith*

STATUS

Employee Services Division has had frequent meetings with the Personnel Manager and Training Manager of the Portland Bureau of Personnel. A joint report will be ready by September 1. We are discussing possible cooperation in the areas of recruitment, training, and benefits. One fruitful area of cooperation appears to be training. The County and City are already developing a Management Learning Needs Survey. This is the first step in identifying curricular needs for possible implementation of a comprehensive management training program. Analysis of the Management Learning Needs Survey results will include a decision as to whether the identified needs in both agencies are similar enough to justify cooperative in-house delivery of such training.

DATA PROCESSING

*Jim Murray*

STATUS

*Project on hold. Mtgs held to define nature & scope of project. (invest. costs/benefits of consolidating DP svc. delivery).*

*=*

Meeting Date: JUN 26 1991

Agenda No.: B-2

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM  
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: Briefing - Strategic Planning Update

AGENDA REVIEW/  
BOARD BRIEFING \*\* 6/26/91 REGULAR MEETING \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT Nondepartmental DIVISION Chair's Office

CONTACT H. Miggins/C. Meeks TELEPHONE 248-3308

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION H. Miggins, C. Meeks

ACTION REQUESTED:

XX INFORMATIONAL ONLY \_\_\_\_\_ POLICY DIRECTION \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 1 hour

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION: \_\_\_\_\_

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):

Update on Strategic Planning - as Directed by the Board on Tuesday May 21, 1991

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL *Glady McCreight*

or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER \_\_\_\_\_

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

CLERK OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
1991 JUN 19 AM 11:02  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
OREGON

## STRATEGIC PLANNING

Multnomah County has now had some experience with a formal planning process. The process used did not quickly provide the results anticipated by some participants. As a result, there is some resistance to planning. We'd like to convince people that the process is necessary, can be simple, and need not be an extended one. With some very intense effort, it can be accomplished in a relatively short period of time.

### STRATEGIC PLANNING DEFINED

Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to provide policy, decisions, and actions that shape and guide an organization - what it is, what it does, and why it does it. Strategic planning must address four fundamental questions:

1. Where are we going?
2. How do we get there? What policy and management level actions are required to get us where we're going?
3. What is our detailed blue print for action? What tasks and steps are required?
4. How do we know if we are on track?

### STRATEGIC PLANNING PARTICIPANTS

There is a different kind of involvement in planning by the different levels of the organization.

- o The policy level (Chair and Board of County Commissioners) primarily develops county-wide policies.<sup>1</sup> They have the overall organizational view. They are responsive to external threats and opportunities. They also distribute resources based on planning needs.χ
- o The management team (generally department and division managers) translates policy decisions into programs and operational plans.
- o The service core (those who actually provide services to County staff and residents) ensures that decisions and operational plans are implemented through their specific, technical knowledge and ability to operate at the service delivery level. They assure the cooperation essential to the success of the planning effort.

---

1 A policy is a rule that governs decision-making -- it is not a decision in the ordinary sense. For example, the policy level might establish a policy of promotion from within, but the decision to promote a particular individual remains the responsibility of the individual managers.

1991 AUG - 2 AM 10 22  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
OREGON  
BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

**STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS**

These three levels participate in the strategic planning process in different ways. The questions addressed by strategic are stated again below. The participation by the various levels is also shown.

1. Where are we going?

- a. Policy - What functions and services should we be providing? The policy makers have the overall organizational view. They state clearly and frequently that this IS what the County is going to be doing, this IS what we are going to do, and this IS the future of the County.
- b. Management team - What programs will be needed to provide the defined functions and services?

2. How do we get there? What policy and management level actions are required to get us where we're going?

(This part of the planning process is where reorganization changes, among other planning activities, would take place. After the functions and services we ought to be providing have been identified and agreed one, decisions regarding organizational structure can be logically made.)

- a. Management team - Does our current organizational structure seem appropriate for the defined strategic goals? If not, what structure should be recommended to the policy level?

What are the goals and objectives for each of our programs?

- b. Policy - Does the proposed organizational structure make sense?

What specifically defines the need to transfer functions and services? Who do we need to negotiate with? What information do we need for the negotiations?

3. What is our detailed blue print for action? What tasks and steps are required?
  - a. Service core:
    - o What tasks are required to accomplish the goals and objectives? What steps are needed to accomplish the tasks? What are the costs associated with accomplishing the tasks?
    - o Are there problems that will make accomplishment hard? Can we solve them or do we need to let management know?
    - o What opportunities do we see that could enhance our operations?
  - b. Management team:
    - o How can we solve the problems of the service core organizations? Do we need to develop information then refer them to the policy level?
    - o Do the opportunities identified fit within the County's current functions and services? If not, will they enhance them?
  - c. Policy:
    - o How should we address the referred problems?
    - o Do the identified opportunities enhance our current functions and services? If so, how do the current functions and services need to be changed to include them?
4. How do we know if we are on track?
  - a. Service core - What detailed information do we need to ensure that our tasks are being accomplished? What needs to be reported to the management team? How can we gather the information and ensure its accuracy and quality?
  - b. Management team - What information do we need to monitor progress toward accomplishing our program goals and objectives? How often do we need the information? How can we ensure the quality of the information?
  - c. Policy - What information do we need to monitor development and delivery of services and functions? How do we ensure accuracy and quality of the information? Are policy decisions needed to keep our work on course?

SUMMARY  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY PLANNING CALENDAR

June 24, 1991

- 6/18/91 - BCC REVIEWS PLANNING PROCESS PROPOSAL AND AGREE  
6/25/91 IN PRINCIPLE
- 6/25/91 BCC AGREES TO DO STRATEGIC PLANNING AND SET UP  
MEETING DATE, PLACE, AND TIME (ASSUME AUGUST).
- 7/26/91 BUDGET & PLANNING FURNISH BCC WITH SUMMARY OF  
8/08/91 STRATEGIC GOALS ALREADY IDENTIFIED. BCC AND  
STAFF REVIEW STRATEGIC GOALS AND IDENTIFY THOSE  
THEY BELIEVE THE COUNTY BE WORKING TOWARD IN THE  
FUTURE.
- 8/08/91 - BCC MEETS (WITH FACILITATOR) TO AGREE ON THE  
8/09/91 COUNTY'S STRATEGIC GOALS
- 8/22/91 BCC ADOPTS STRATEGIC GOALS DURING REGULAR BOARD  
MEETING.
- 8/22/91 MANAGEMENT TEAM BEGINS WORK ON PROGRAM/  
OPERATIONAL PLANS BASED ON BCC DECISIONS.
- 10/18/91 PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS COMPLETED AND REVIEWED  
WITH CBACs.
- 11/07/91 PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS PRESENTED TO BCC FOR  
REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
- 11/14/91 BCC APPROVAL FOR PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS  
SECURED.
- BUDGET/PLANS ("This year we will do ... to  
support this program/operational plan goal) TO  
SUPPORT PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLAN ACCOMPLISHMENT  
BEGINS.

## STRATEGIC PLANNING

Multnomah County has now had some experience with a formal planning process. The process used did not quickly provide the results anticipated by some participants. As a result, there is some resistance to planning. We'd like to convince people that the process is necessary, can be simple, and need not be an extended one. With some very intense effort, it can be accomplished in a relatively short period of time.

### STRATEGIC PLANNING DEFINED

Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to provide policy, decisions, and actions that shape and guide an organization - what it is, what it does, and why it does it. Strategic planning must address four fundamental questions:

1. Where are we going?
2. How do we get there? What policy and management level actions are required to get us where we're going?
3. What is our detailed blue print for action? What tasks and steps are required?
4. How do we know if we are on track?

### STRATEGIC PLANNING PARTICIPANTS

There is a different kind of involvement in planning by the different levels of the organization.

- o The policy level (Chair and Board of County Commissioners) primarily develops county-wide policies.<sup>1</sup> They have the overall organizational view. They are responsive to external threats and opportunities. They also distribute resources based on planning needs..
  - o The management team (generally department and division managers) translates policy decisions into programs and operational plans.
  - o The service core (those who actually provide services to County staff and residents) ensures that decisions and operational plans are implemented through their specific,
- 
- 1 A policy is a rule that governs decision-making -- it is not a decision in the ordinary sense. For example, the policy level might establish a policy of promotion from within, but the decision to promote a particular individual remains the responsibility of the individual managers.

technical knowledge and ability to operate at the service delivery level. They assure the cooperation essential to the success of the planning effort.

### STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

These three levels participate in the strategic planning process in different ways. The questions addressed by strategic are stated again below. The participation by the various levels is also shown.

1. Where are we going? *who are we serving?*
  - a. Policy - What functions and services should we be providing? The policy makers have the overall organizational view. They state clearly and frequently that this IS what the County is going to be doing, this IS what we are going to do, and this IS the future of the County.
  - b. Management team - What programs will be needed to provide the defined functions and services?
2. How do we get there? What policy and management level actions are required to get us where we're going?

(This part of the planning process is where reorganization changes, among other planning activities, would take place. After the functions and services we ought to be providing have been identified and agreed on, decisions regarding organizational structure can be logically made.)

- a. Management team - Does our current organizational structure seem appropriate for the defined strategic goals? If not, what structure should be recommended to the policy level?  
*Are others performing this function?*  
What are the goals and objectives for each of our programs?
- b. Policy - Does the proposed organizational structure make sense?

What specifically defines the need to transfer functions and services? Who do we need to negotiate with? What information do we need for the negotiations?

3. What is our detailed blue print for action? What tasks and steps are required?
  - a. Service core:
    - o What tasks are required to accomplish the goals and objectives? What steps are needed to accomplish the tasks? What are the costs associated with accomplishing the tasks?
    - o Are there problems that will make accomplishment hard? Can we solve them or do we need to let management know?
    - o What opportunities do we see that could enhance our operations?
  - b. Management team:
    - o How can we solve the problems of the service core organizations? Do we need to develop information then refer them to the policy level?
    - o Do the opportunities identified fit within the County's current functions and services? If not, will they enhance them?
  - c. Policy:
    - o How should we address the referred problems?
    - o Do the identified opportunities enhance our current functions and services? If so, how do the current functions and services need to be changed to include them?
4. How do we know if we are on track?
  - a. Service core - What detailed information do we need to ensure that our tasks are being accomplished? What needs to be reported to the management team? How can we gather the information and ensure its accuracy and quality?
  - b. Management team - What information do we need to monitor progress toward accomplishing our program goals and objectives? How often do we need the information? How can we ensure the quality of the information?
  - c. Policy - What information do we need to monitor development and delivery of services and functions? How do we ensure accuracy and quality of the information? Are policy decisions needed to keep our work on course?

SUMMARY  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY PLANNING CALENDAR

June 24, 1991

- 6/18/91 - BCC REVIEWS PLANNING PROCESS PROPOSAL AND AGREE  
6/25/91 IN PRINCIPLE
- 6/25/91 BCC AGREES TO DO STRATEGIC PLANNING AND SET UP  
MEETING DATE, PLACE, AND TIME (ASSUME AUGUST).
- 7/26/91 BUDGET & PLANNING FURNISH BCC WITH SUMMARY OF  
8/08/91 STRATEGIC GOALS ALREADY IDENTIFIED. BCC AND  
STAFF REVIEW STRATEGIC GOALS AND IDENTIFY THOSE  
THEY BELIEVE THE COUNTY BE WORKING TOWARD IN THE  
FUTURE.
- 8/08/91 - BCC MEETS (WITH FACILITATOR) TO AGREE ON THE  
8/09/91 COUNTY'S STRATEGIC GOALS *CJC observes*
- 8/22/91 BCC ADOPTS STRATEGIC GOALS DURING REGULAR BOARD  
MEETING.
- 8/22/91 MANAGEMENT TEAM BEGINS WORK ON PROGRAM/  
OPERATIONAL PLANS BASED ON BCC DECISIONS.
- 10/18/91 PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS COMPLETED AND REVIEWED  
WITH CBACs.
- 11/07/91 PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS PRESENTED TO BCC FOR  
REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
- 11/14/91 BCC APPROVAL FOR PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLANS  
SECURED.
- BUDGET/PLANS ("This year we will do ... to  
support this program/operational plan goal) TO  
SUPPORT PROGRAM/OPERATIONAL PLAN ACCOMPLISHMENT  
BEGINS.



# GLADYS McCOY, Multnomah County Chair

Room 134, County Courthouse  
1021 S.W. Fourth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
(503) 248-3308

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Office of the Board Clerk

FROM: Gladys McCoy  
Multnomah County Chair

DATE: 6/25/91

RE: Legislative Briefing

Because of Fred Neal and Howard Klink's obligations in Salem, the legislative briefing scheduled for 1:30 PM Wednesday June 26, 1991 is cancelled.

DDF

RECEIVED BY  
CLERK OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
1991 JUN 25 AM 9:13  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
OREGON

JUN 26 1991

Meeting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Agenda No.: 1:30pm

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM  
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: Legislative Update

AGENDA REVIEW/ 6/26/91  
BOARD BRIEFING 6/25/91 REGULAR MEETING \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT Nondepartmental DIVISION Chair's Office

CONTACT F. Neal TELEPHONE 248-3308

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION F. Neal

ACTION REQUESTED:

\_\_\_\_ INFORMATIONAL ONLY \_\_\_\_\_ POLICY DIRECTION XX APPROVAL

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 45 Minutes

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION: \_\_\_\_\_

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):

Briefing - Update on Oregon Legislative Session

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL *Gladys McLaughlin*

or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER \_\_\_\_\_

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
1991 JUN 19 AM 11:02  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
OREGON