

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

RESOLUTION NO. 01-142

Adopting Financial and Budget Policies for Multnomah County, Oregon

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners Finds:

- a. The Board is the fiscal authority for Multnomah County government.
- b. The Department of Support Services is responsible under MCC 7.001 for the budget and fiscal operations of the County.
- c. The Director of Support Services is responsible for the preparation and management of the budget and for the management of the financial operations of the County.
- d. A financial and budget policy will provide for prudent financial practices.

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners Resolves:

1. The Financial and Budget Policies set forth in Exhibit A are the policies of Multnomah County.
2. The Director of Support Services is directed to administer these Financial and Budget Policies.
3. The Director of Support Services is directed to review and update these policies as needed but not less than annually.
4. The Director of Support Services is directed to inform the Board on the status of these policies annually.

This Resolution replaces Resolution No. 99-144.

ADOPTED this day 25th of October, 2001.



REVIEWED:

THOMAS SPONSLE, COUNTY ATTORNEY
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By Thomas Sponsler
Thomas Sponsler, County Attorney

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

Diane M. Linn
Diane M. Linn, Chair

EXHIBIT A



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002

Prepared by: Department of Support Services; Finance Program Area

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Goals	1
Tax Revenues	3
Short Term Local Revenues	6
Transportation Financing	7
Federal/State Grant and Foundation Revenues	8
Indirect Cost Allocation	9
Recurring Costs and One Time Only Revenue	10
User Fees, Sales and Intergovernmental Revenues	11
Entrepreneurial Activities	12
Reserves	13
General Fund Emergency Contingency	15
Compensation	16
Allocations for Facilities Maintenance and Repair (Being reviewed)	17
Sale of Unrestricted County Property (Being reviewed)	18
Capital Improvement Financial Plan (Being reviewed)	19
Long Term Liabilities	20
Accounting and Audits	21
Fund Accounting Structure	22
Internal Service Funds	24
Liquidity and and Accounts Payable	26
Banking, Cash Management and Investments	27
Short-Term and Long-Term Debt Financings	28

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

GOALS

The goals of this financial policy are:

1. To preserve capital through prudent budgeting and financial management.
2. To achieve the most productive use of County funds that meets the goals of the Board of County Commissioners.
3. To ensure that all finance-related activities meet generally accepted accounting principles.
4. To achieve a stable balance between the County's ongoing financial commitments and the continuing revenues available to the County.
5. Leverage the maximum amount of local dollars with federal and state funding/grants.
6. To provide an accountable form of Government to the citizens of Multnomah County.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

TAX REVENUES

BACKGROUND:

During the past decade Multnomah County has faced major decisions about the level and kind of taxation it should or could impose.

The 1990 passage of Measure 5 presented all local governments with a different kind of taxation problem: an increase in property tax levies by any government had the potential of reducing the property tax receipts of all other local governments-better known as compression.

To avoid this possibility, Multnomah County and the cities of Portland, Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village agreed not to propose levies that would change their relative 1992-93 shares of the \$10 constitutional cap.

In 1991, following passage of the Measure 5, the Board considered, but did not pass, a Business Income Tax rate to offset some of the lost property tax revenue.

In response to a proposal of the Library Board (which had been tasked with recommending a long-term dedicated revenue source to replace property tax support of the Library system) the Board passed a utility excise tax in 1992, then rescinded the tax in 1993 before it took effect.

In November 1996, the voters of the State of Oregon approved a constitutional amendment, Ballot Measure 47, further limiting property taxes. In May 1997, the voters approved Ballot Measure 50 and repealed Measure 47. For Fiscal Year 1998, Measure 50 reduced the amount of property taxes imposed statewide by 17% from authorized levels (except taxes to pay exempt bonded indebtedness or Local Option levies approved by voters). Measure 50 limited the growth in taxable property value to 3% per year, with the exception on new construction. It also required that general obligation bonds and local option taxes must be approved by a majority of the voters at general election in even numbered years or at any other election in which not less than 50% of eligible registered voters cast a ballot-the double majority.

In November 1997, Multnomah County voters approved a five year Library Local Option Levy. The levy costs property owners 59 cents per thousand of assessed value per year.

In March 1998, Multnomah County voters imposed a temporary 0.5% Business Income Tax surcharge for tax year 1998 – one year only. The revenue generated from this surcharge was dedicated to supplement the various school districts within Multnomah County. It is expected that this temporary increase generated approximately \$10.4 million.

In 1999 the County was approached with a proposal to increase the rates of both the Transient Lodging Tax and Motor vehicle Rental Tax and dedicate the proceeds to Metro and City of Portland for funding an expanded Convention Center, renovating Civic Stadium and renovating Portland Center for Performing Arts. The Board approved these increases in February 2000.

All of these tax decisions were made in an atmosphere of intense public and internal debate. Those debates consistently referred to these common factors: the progressivity of the tax, its administrative costs, its impact on the economy of the region, its effect on other local governments, and the degree to which the tax might be acceptable to the public.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

TAX REVENUE POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board recognizes that taxation is necessary to provide public services to the citizens of the county. When considering changes to the County's tax structure, the Board will consider the following:

1. The ability of taxpayers to pay the taxes.
2. The impact of the taxes imposed by the County on other local governments.
3. The effect of taxes on the economy in the county.
4. Administration and collection costs of the taxes.
5. The ease of understanding the taxes by the taxpayers.

STATUS:

The County has several sources of tax revenue. These sources include property taxes, which are paid based on an established assessed value of real, personal and utility property. Except for general obligation bond levies and local option taxes, County property taxes increase with the growth in assessed value. That assessed value growth is limited to 3% per year plus changes as a result of annexation, rezoning, and new construction. The County collects property taxes in three ways.

- a "permanent tax rate," the reduced combination of the County's "tax base" and two serial levies in effect when Measure 50 was approved.
- property taxes for the retirement of voter approved general obligation bonds.
- a local option levy for Library services.


Business entities doing business in Multnomah County pay business income taxes (BIT) based on their net income.

The County has two excise taxes, a Motor Vehicle Rental Tax and a Transient Lodging Tax. Motor vehicle rental taxes are assessed on the gross income generated from short-term vehicle rentals. Transient lodging taxes are imposed on room rental rates at hotels/motels. The Transient Lodging Taxes collected are (with minor exceptions) passed through to Metro for Convention Center operations, funding of the operations of the Performing Arts Center and Regional Art and Culture Council, funding bonds issued by the City of Portland to expand the Oregon Convention Center, renovate Civic Stadium and renovate the Performing Arts Center and to provide monies for a Visitors Development Fund. A portion of the Motor Vehicle Rental Taxes also support these programs.

The County also imposes a gasoline tax that is dedicated to roads.

The County's tax revenues represent about 45% of the total Governmental Fund Type revenues (General and Special Revenue Funds). The following graph depicts the actual tax revenue by source since FY 1998. (FYs 2001 & 2002 are budget figures).

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY



FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

SHORT TERM LOCAL REVENUES

BACKGROUND:

Short-term revenues are sources of limited duration. The main source of these revenues has been serial levies for jail and library services and since the passage of Measure 50, a five-year local option levy for Library services. Continued use of short-term revenues for ongoing programs places these programs or other programs at risk if the voters fail to approve subsequent limited term levies.

In Fiscal Year 1998, the dollar amounts of existing library and public safety serial levies were combined with the County's general fund tax base amount to establish the permanent property tax rate per \$1,000 of assessed value. The expired serial levies, which were merged with the tax base into a permanent tax rate, are no longer dedicated revenues.


Measure 50 requires that any property tax measure needs both a majority vote and a 50% voter turnout unless it is voted on at a general election. Because of this requirement, it will be more difficult to obtain voter approval for short-term property tax revenues. Perhaps more important, the Constitution makes no provision for a government to change its permanent tax rate.

SHORT TERM LOCAL REVENUE POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the intent of the Board to use short term revenue sources to fund priority service programs only after all other sources of revenue have been analyzed and have been determined not to be feasible for funding the service.

STATUS:

On November 4, 1997, the voters approved a five year local option levy for library services. This levy costs property owners 59 cents per thousand of assessed value per year. The following graph reflects the use of actual short term revenues since FY 1998 (FYs 2001 and 2002 reflect budgeted figures).



FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

TRANSPORTATION FINANCING

BACKGROUND:

Transportation infrastructure, roads and bridges, has not been funded adequately for either ongoing maintenance or capital improvements. In the Portland metropolitan area, growth is placing additional demands on the transportation system. Ongoing maintenance and improvements to this system are needed to continue economic growth, to alleviate existing transportation problems and to maintain the livability of the region.

Multnomah County's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) has identified \$14.4 million in transportation projects for the road system in Fiscal Year 2002 and anticipated revenues of only \$6.2 million over the same period. Cities in Multnomah County are experiencing similar shortfalls in meeting the demand on their local systems.

Multnomah County also maintains and operates the Willamette River Bridges. These bridges are a critical link in a highly integrated transportation system. Regional growth makes it increasingly essential to keep all bridges in good working order with a minimum of downtime. The CIP identified a need for construction and maintenance on the Willamette River Bridges that will cost \$46.7 million and an estimated \$42.9 million of revenues available to address the costs. Most of the current capital projects are financed with federal funds. The Fiscal Year 2002 budget includes approximately \$3 million of County funding to match \$19.3 million in federal funding. The County expects a shortfall of \$4.1 to \$4.5 million in matching funds over the next couple of years.

TRANSPORTATION FINANCING POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the policy of the Board to support statewide and regional funding for transportation related needs. However, if statewide and regional funding packages fail the County will work with jurisdictions within the County boundaries to address the transportation funding needs of local governments located in Multnomah County.

STATUS:

The 2001 Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2142 to raise car title fees from \$17 to \$30 and truck title fees from \$30 to \$90. This increase would raise about \$39.5 million per biennium. The legislature also passed HB 2139 to increase DMV fees. The total increases would amount to about \$81 million. The State would be required to issue \$400 million in transportation bonds. Revenues generated in excess of the amount needed to repay the bonds would be allocated, 50% to the State, 30% to Counties and 20% to cities.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

FEDERAL/STATE GRANT AND FOUNDATION REVENUES

BACKGROUND:

Federal and State grant funds have increased significantly over the last ten years. Most of these revenues are restricted to a specific purpose such as mental health or community correction programs. Grants and Foundation funds are used for an array of County services and may offer an opportunity to assist the County in leveraging other funds. This policy statement is not intended to apply to Federal and State shared revenues, entitlements or fees for services.

FEDERAL/STATE GRANT AND FOUNDATION REVENUE POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board understands that grants from other governments and private sources represent both opportunities and risks. Grants allow the County to provide basic or enhanced levels of service and to cover gaps in the array of services the County otherwise offers. Grants may also commit the County to serve larger or different groups of clients and put pressure on County-generated revenues if the dedicated revenue source is withdrawn. When applying for a grant, the Board will consider:

1. The opportunities for leveraging other funds for continuing the grant/foundation related program.
2. How much locally generated revenue will be required to supplement the grant/foundation revenue source.
3. Whether the grant/foundation source will cover the full cost of the proposed program, or whether the County is expected to provide support and overhead functions to the program. It is the intent of the County to recover all overhead costs associated with the grant/foundation.
4. The degree of stability of the funding source.
5. Whether decline or withdrawal of the grant/foundation revenue source creates a budgetary expectation that the County will continue the program.
6. If the grant/foundation funds used for pilot or model programs will result in a more efficient way of doing business.
7. If the grant/foundation is aligned with the County's mission and goals.

STATUS:

The fiscal Year 2002 Federal State Budget has grant revenue sources of about \$256,255,000. The County General Fund matches these programs with another \$63,607,000 and service charges and other revenues account for about \$10,070,000.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION

BACKGROUND:

The Federal and State Governments recognize that the cost of providing services includes the overhead cost of support services. Generally, federal and state grantors allow programs to recover overhead charges based on an indirect cost allocation plan. The County prepares an indirect cost allocation plan in accordance with federal guidelines. This plan determines the indirect cost rate charged to all operations funded with dedicated revenues. The central services in the Cost Allocation Plan include, but are not limited to: the County Auditor, County Counsel, Employee Services, Equipment Use, Finance, Insurance, Labor Relations, Budget and Quality, Purchasing, Radio, and Records. Overhead rates vary depending on the use of support service functions and departmental administrative costs that are not charged directly to the program. A flow-through rate is also charged against funds that are received by the County and passed through to other entities at the discretion of the funding provider. In Fiscal Year 2001, the Health Department began allocating departmental overhead costs directly to all programs. Therefore the Health Department rate is for central services only.

INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION POLICY STATEMENT:

Generally it is the policy of the Board to recover from dedicated revenue sources the full cost of programs supported by those sources. The full cost includes the appropriate proportionate share of the cost of County overhead functions, both central and departmental, that is attributable to programs funded with dedicated revenues.

The exception to the above policy is when the grantor agency does not allow the grantee to charge indirect costs or only allows a set indirect cost rate. The Board will have the final authority to accept a grant that does not allow the recovery of all or part of the indirect charge. In that event, the General Fund will pay the indirect cost allocated to the program.

The Finance Program Area is responsible for preparing an Indirect Cost Allocation Plan that meets the requirements of the Office of Management and Budget (Federal Government Agency) Circular A-87. Central service and departmental administrative support provided to non- General Fund programs, activities, and or functions that are not recovered by internal service charges or billed directly to dedicated revenues will be recovered through an indirect cost based on the approved Indirect Cost Allocation Plan. The plan will be updated annually.

STATUS:

The County is in compliance with this policy. The overhead rates for Fiscal Year 2002 are as follows:

Department/Office	% Rate
Community and Family Services	15.88%
Aging Services	3.53%
Juvenile & Adult Community Justice Services	5.08%
Health Services	1.74%
District Attorney	5.49%
Sheriff's Office	8.91%
Environmental Services	4.07%
Other County	2.40%
Library Services	4.26%
Flow Through Funds	.70%

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

RECURRING COSTS AND ONE-TIME-ONLY REVENUES

BACKGROUND:

Unrestricted one-time-only revenues present organizations with temptations that are hard to resist. In the short run it appears more beneficial to allocate such resources to the highest priority public service that would otherwise be unfunded than to restrict their spending to cover costs that will not recur in following years. However, the result of this practice is to expand operational levels and public expectations beyond the capacity of the organization to generate continuing funding. This inevitably produces shortfalls and crisis.

Sustaining an ongoing program level by deferring necessary expenditures or by incurring future obligations also inevitably produces shortfalls and crisis.

RECURRING COSTS AND ONE-TIME-ONLY REVENUE POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the policy of the Board that the County will fund ongoing programs with ongoing revenues.

When the County receives unrestricted one-time-only revenue, the Board will consider setting these funds aside for reserves or allocating them to projects or programs that will not require future financial commitments. The Board will use the following criteria when allocating these one-time-only receipts:

1. The level of reserves set aside as established by this policy.
2. The County's capital needs set out in the five year Capital Improvement Plan or Information Systems Development Plan.
3. One-time only spending proposals for projects or pilot programs, particularly investments that may result in long-term efficiencies or savings that do not require additional ongoing costs.
4. Bridge or gap financing of programs that will not require additional ongoing funds.
5. One-time only dollars that encourage innovative ideas or technology.

STATUS:

During budget deliberations the Budget and Quality Manager is responsible for providing a list of sources and uses of one-time only funds and informing the Chair and the Board on the recommended use of the funds received. During the Fiscal Year 2002 budget hearings, the Capital Improvement Financial Plan Committee recommended to the Board on the use of one-time only funds. The Board authorized the use of one-time only funds to be used for migration off the mainframe computer and to use a portion of the funds to pay down debt, which freed up General Fund revenues to be placed in reserve as a hedge against revenue assumptions.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

USER FEES, SALES and INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES

BACKGROUND:

User fees are generally intended to cover all the costs or an agreed upon portion of the costs for providing services. Inflation or increased service delivery can erode the established user fees if the cost of service increases faster than revenue from the fee increases.

USER FEES, SALES and INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the general policy of the Board that user fees and service charges will be established at a level to recover the costs to provide services. Exceptions to this policy will be made depending on the benefit to the user of the service, ability of the user to pay for the service, benefit to County citizens, and the type of service provided.

As part of budget deliberations and during negotiations of Intergovernmental Agreements, Departments will be responsible for informing the Chair of a fully loaded cost analysis presenting the fee structure necessary to recover 100% of the cost of providing the service. Departments will also recommend whether fees or charges in each area should be set to recover 100% of the costs or be set at a lower rate such as sliding scale fees. The recommendation to the Chair will consider the benefits to an individual or agency, benefits to the citizens of the County, and the financial capacity of the users to pay for the service. The Budget and Quality Division is responsible for ensuring that departments are including all the costs associated with providing the service.

User fees and service charges collected by County agencies will be periodically reviewed. All fees and service charges will be reviewed each four years with approximately 25% of the fees and charges reviewed each fiscal year. Based on this review, the Chair will make recommendations to the Board regarding proposed changes, additions or deletions to current fee or service charge schedules.

Revenues generated from sales and commissions on sales of goods and services sold in County owned or leased facilities are to be credited to the County's General Fund unless the revenues are:

1. Generated for inmate welfare commissary operations.
2. Generated in Library facilities used for Library operations.
3. The Board grants an exception.

STATUS:

Departments are generally responsible for reviewing the fees and charges associated with their operations on an annual basis. Budget and Quality requires departments to complete information on those revenues during preparation of the annual budget. There are four County departments which generate the majority of fee revenue – Sustainable and Community Development, Health, Sheriff's Office and Community Justice. A complete review of the fees charged for services provided by the Health Department was conducted during Fiscal Year 1999. Planning fees were reviewed and increased during Fiscal Year 2000.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITIES

BACKGROUND:

As a consequence of carrying out duties or mandated functions, County programs and employees develop or acquire specialized skills, assemble information, and create educational and/or operational systems. Business, other governments or clients, who are not the primary focus of the County operation, may find these products or services economically valuable and are willing to pay for the specialized skills or products that relate to their business. In addition, County owned land or buildings may be strategically located or suitable for certain entrepreneurial activities.

Multnomah County will actively seek opportunities to sell a product or a service. When an opportunity does occur, County managers and policy makers face a complex decision about whether the activity will produce revenue; whether the revenue would benefit taxpayers who indirectly supported the development of the product or service; how the County should conduct itself in the marketplace consistent with the purposes for which the product or services was developed; and the use of the net revenue.

ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITIES POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board wishes to reduce the cost of services to taxpayers as much as possible consistent with fairness, common sense and ethical consideration.

The primary purpose of the County engaging in any entrepreneurial activity will be that the dissemination of the product itself serves a public interest (broadly defined) independent of the net revenue obtained and the County will conduct itself in the marketplace accordingly. The Board recognizes that the decision to engage in entrepreneurial activities requires consideration of economic and public policy factors. In deciding whether to market County services and/or products the Board will consider the following:

1. Any legal restrictions that would prevent the action.
2. The ability of a County program to provide the service or product without allowing the marketing to interfere with its primary purpose.
3. Whether the product or service is superior, unique or benefits the taxpayers in the market, which may include location considerations.
4. The appropriateness of the product as it relates to a public agency.
5. The impact of marketing the particular service on the private sector providers of the same or related services. In general, the County should not compete with its taxpayers except where clearly justified under criterion 3 above.
6. The potential return compared to development or marketing cost associated with the proposed action.
7. Whether the County will subsidize its costs for providing the product or service.
8. In general, net revenues from entrepreneurial activity will be used to support or enhance the services linked to or used in the development of the product. The Board may make exceptions from time to time and use the revenues to fund other County priority services.

STATUS:

The County continues to explore entrepreneurial opportunities.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

RESERVES

BACKGROUND:

Annually using all available ongoing revenue to pay for ongoing programs can result in fluctuations in program levels as revenues vary from one year to the next. Programs added in one year based on positive short term receipts can cause programs of equivalent cost being cut in the next year if economic factors cause those revenues not to grow as fast as costs. This has a detrimental effect on service delivery over time. It reduces efficiency. It also sets up difficult budget problems that could be avoided if program decisions were made in the context of the County's long-term financial capacity rather than on the basis of revenue available from one year to the next.

Maintaining an appropriate reserve assists the County in maintaining its favorable bond rating, which is currently Aa1 from Moody's Investors Service. Moody's generally established benchmark for the General Fund Balance or reserve is a dollar amount equal to at least 1010% of actual General Fund revenues.

RESERVES POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board understands that to avoid financial instability, continuing requirements should be insulated from temporary fluctuations in revenues.

It is the goal of the Board to fund and fund and maintain two General Fund Reserves designated as unappropriated fund balance, funded at approximately 5% each of the total budgeted revenues of the General Fund. The Public Safety Fund is primarily supported by the General Fund and for purposes of calculating these reserves, revenues and actual ending fund balances reported in the Public Safety Fund will be included.

The first 5% is a reserve account in the General Fund, designated as unappropriated fund balance. This reserve account is to be used when basic revenue growth falls below the rate of basic revenue change achieved during the prior ten years.* In years when basic revenue growth falls below long term average growth, the Board will reduce the unappropriated fund balance to continue high priority services that could not otherwise be funded by current revenues. If the reserve account is so used, to maintain fiscal integrity, the Board will seek to restore the account as soon as possible.

The second 5% is a reserve maintained separate from the General Fund in the General Reserve Fund. This reserve fund is to be used for non-reoccurring extreme emergencies. Extreme Emergencies is defined as uses for disaster relief, expenditures related to essential services or expenditures that are related to public life and safety issues. If the reserve account is so used, to maintain fiscal integrity, the Board will seek to restore the account as soon as possible.

STATUS:


In Fiscal Year 2002 the basic revenue growth fell below the long term average growth. To

* "Basic revenue" is defined as the sum of General Fund property tax, business income tax, motor vehicle rental tax, cigarette tax, liquor tax and interest income. "Growth" is defined as total increase in fiscal year compared to the amount in the prior fiscal year, adjusted for changes in collection method, accrual method, or legislation defining the rate or terms under which the revenue is to be collected.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

continue funding priority services, the Board used \$5.7million of the reserve account. In Fiscal Year 2002 the Board will establish the General Reserve Fund and fund it with approximately \$8.5 million from General Funded vacation liabilities that are not required to be recorded in the governmental funds of Multnomah County (see discussion in Long-Term Liabilities section).

The following graph shows the reserve goal, budget and actual reserve since FY 1998. The budgeted reserves do not include funds budgeted in contingency. (Graph includes vacation account prior to the establishment of the General Reserve Fund) Actual for 2002 not available.



FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

GENERAL FUND EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY

BACKGROUND:

General Fund contingency transfers have a significant effect on the annual budget process by reducing the amount of ending working capital that is carried over to the subsequent fiscal year. Contingency transfers should be reviewed in the context of other budget decisions so that higher priority projects are not jeopardized.

GENERAL FUND EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board understands that in order to avoid financial instability, continuing requirements cannot increase faster than continuing revenues.

It is the policy of the Board to establish an emergency contingency account in the General Fund, as authorized by ORS 294.352, each fiscal year during the budget process. The account will be funded at a level consistent with actual use of transfers from contingency during the prior ten years.

To achieve financial stability, the following are guidelines to be used by the Board in considering requests for transfers from the General Fund Contingency Account:

1. Approve no contingency requests for purposes other than "one-time only" allocations.
2. Limit contingency funding to the following:
 - a) Emergency situations which, if left unattended, will jeopardize the health and safety of the community.
 - b) Unanticipated expenditures that are necessary to keep previous public commitment, or fulfill a legislative or contractual mandate, or can be demonstrated to result in significant administrative or programmatic efficiencies that cannot be covered by existing appropriations.
3. The Board may, when it adopts the budget for a fiscal year, specify programs which it wishes to review during the year and increase the Contingency account to provide financial capacity to support those programs if it chooses. Contingency funding of such programs complies with this policy.

STATUS:

The Budget and Quality Manager is responsible for informing the Board if contingency requests submitted for Board approval meet the criteria of this policy. In addition, each year the Board will receive a report on the prior year contingency actions. This report will include the total dollar amount of contingency requests, dollar amount approved and dollar amount that did not meet the criteria of this policy.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

COMPENSATION

BACKGROUND:

Wage and benefit increases are negotiated between collective bargaining units and the County. In addition the Board authorizes wage and benefit increases to exempt employees by ordinance.

COMPENSATION POLICY STATEMENT:

When any wage or benefit increase is authorized in an amount exceeding budgeted setasides for such wage and benefit increases, the alternatives considered for funding such increases shall include:

1. A budget reduction in the affected department or elsewhere in the County; or
2. An additional draw on contingency; or,
3. A combination of the above.

All tentative approved labor agreements or proposed exempt compensation packages presented to the Board for final approval shall contain, in writing, the following specific costing:

1. Estimates in percentage increases of the wage benefit and package as a whole for all years of the agreement or ordinance, as well as the absolute dollar amount of such increases; and
2. A specific narrative remark, if possible, of any future fiscal impacts of the contract or ordinance and financial impact on any language changes in the contract or ordinance. Such remarks shall address any estimated effects on the unfunded liability of the pension fund, any other fund or any other funded or unfunded liability.

STATUS:

This policy has been complied with throughout the prior fiscal year.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

ALLOCATIONS FOR FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

BACKGROUND:

Multnomah County owns in excess of 50 buildings at a historical cost of about \$280 million. In Fiscal Year 2002 the County will spend approximately \$7 million on major maintenance and improvements to those buildings. The \$7 million excludes specific facilities that are being funded by bonds and State certificates of participation funds. In Fiscal Year 2000 the County also sold bonds in the amount of \$15 million reduced our deferred maintenance backlog.

The structural maintenance of the County's capital plant is largely a non-discretionary activity. That is, the question is not whether such expenditures are necessary but in what year to schedule the expenditure on particular projects. Deferral of spending on capital projects builds an unfunded liability that there is no way to avoid sooner or later.

ALLOCATIONS FOR FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR POLICY STATEMENT:

Policy statement under review by the Board.

STATUS:

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

SALE OF UNRESTRICTED COUNTY PROPERTY

BACKGROUND:

On April 19, 1990, the Board adopted Resolution 90-57 creating the Capital Improvement Fund and Natural Areas Acquisition Fund. These funds were created to restrict the use of proceeds received from the sale of unrestricted County property for future capital requirements and the acquisition, protection and management of natural areas. On October 7, 1993, the Board adopted Resolution 93-338 amending Resolution 90-57 to clarify that the funds deposited in the Natural Areas Acquisition Fund were to be 50% of the proceeds from the sale of undeveloped unrestricted property only.

Over the last several years the County has been presented with several opportunities to improve efficiencies by acquiring equipment and/or by redirecting building rental payments to pay for the acquisition of a facility. The Capital Improvement Fund paid for these investments initially and the annual savings or the redirected expenditure was repaid to the Capital Improvement Fund. In response to this the Board adopted Resolution 96-138 repealing Resolutions 90-57 and 93-338 and directing the proceeds from the sale of unrestricted County property to the Capital Improvement Fund and Capital Acquisitions Fund. In April 2000 the Board adopted Resolution 00-048 amending this policy as follows.

SALE OF UNRESTRICTED COUNTY PROPERTY POLICY STATEMENT:

Policy statement under review by the Board.

STATUS:

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FINANCIAL PLAN

BACKGROUND:

Multnomah County's Capital Improvement Program was last updated in 1995 and projects reviewed in 1998. In 1998 the Strategic Space Plan contemplated innovative development offerings and public partnerships for mixed-use facilities and the County has taken steps toward the realization of such innovations. Multnomah County's capital improvement project list and space utilization has significantly changed since it was last updated and the Board of County Commissioners wishes to review these lists on an annual basis. The Board of County Commissioners may authorize the sale, long-term lease, or development of property and/or improvements and may authorize full faith and credit financing obligations. It is financially prudent to adequately plan for capital projects and the unfunded needs for capital improvements so that decisions about the use of revenues and financing may be made in an orderly manner. In April 2000 the Board adopted Resolution 00-048 amending this policy.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FINANCIAL PLAN POLICY:

Policy statement under review by the Board.

STATUS:

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

LONG-TERM LIABILITIES

BACKGROUND:

The Financial Accounting Standards Board has issued various statements which require private sector organizations to record long-term liabilities in their financial records. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board has been moving towards private sector accounting standards and is requiring governmental organizations to either record long-term liabilities in the financial records of the organization or disclose the liabilities in the notes to the financial statements. To avoid having the Board or future Boards face huge unfunded liabilities, beginning in the mid 1980's, the County began funding many of its unfunded liabilities. By funding these liabilities over time the County will not be faced with liabilities without the resources to fund them. The practice of funding long-term liabilities has a favorable impact on our bond rating. The following is quoted from our most recent credit report: "The County's historically strong financial management is underscored by its response to revenue limitations imposed by Measure 5 beginning in Fiscal Year 1992. In addition to making dramatic program cuts and organizational changes, the County nevertheless continued its policy on funding long-term liabilities. The County's high credit rating is supported by the strong economy, sound financial management, high level of cooperation with underlying jurisdictions and moderate debt position."

LONG-TERM LIABILITIES POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the goal of the Board to fund 100% of all long term liabilities that are required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) to be disclosed or accounted for in the County's comprehensive annual financial report. GASB 34 states that vacation liabilities do not need to be reported in the governmental fund types until they are paid. Vacation liabilities in the proprietary funds will be recognized on the full accrual basis of accounting. These liabilities include, but are not limited to; medical & dental incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims, workers compensation IBNR claims, liability IBNR claims, post retirement benefits, and Library Retirement Plan benefits. The Finance Director is responsible for ensuring that these liabilities are funded according to the actual liability or the actuarially determined liability.

STATUS:

The following is the June 30, 2001 funding level of each liability (\$ in thousands):

Type of Liability	Total Liability	Amount Funded	Percent Funded
Self Insurance (1)	\$ 8,712	\$ 8,712	100.00%
Post Retirement (2)	10,788	9,423	87.35%
Library Retirement (3)	6,504	5,901	90.73%
Total	<u>\$ 39,167</u>	<u>\$ 35,092</u>	<u>89.60%</u>

(1) GASB requires self-insurance claims be recorded as a liability in the financial statements.

(2) GASB requires employer paid benefits extended to retirees be disclosed in the financial statements.

(3) The Library Retirement Funds are required to be disclosed. Funds are dedicated to former employees of the Library Association of Portland.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

ACCOUNTING AND AUDITS

BACKGROUND:

Under ORS 294 the County is required to have the County's financial records audited by an independent accounting firm annually.

ACCOUNTING AND AUDITS POLICY STATEMENT:

The Board understands that the County's accounting system and financial records are required by State law to be maintained according to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), standards of the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) and the principles established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), including all effective pronouncements.

Multnomah County's Ordinance No. 660 as amended, which established an Audit Committee, audit procedures and audit rules, will apply to all financial audits. The basic duties of the Audit Committee are:

1. Review the scope and general extent of the external auditor's planned examination.
2. Review with management and the external auditor the financial results of the audit.
3. Review with the external auditor the performance of the County's financial and accounting personnel.
4. Review written responses of management letter comments and single audit comments.
5. Present the Audit, Single Audit and Report to Management to the Board.
6. Select the external auditor.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) shall be sent to grantor agencies and rating agencies on a regular basis and at such other times as may be deemed appropriate in order to maintain effective relations.

It is the goal of the Board to maintain a fully integrated automated financial system that meets the needs of the County. This financial system is to include; general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable, purchasing, payroll and cost accounting for all applicable operations. The financial system will be maintained on a monthly basis to monitor expenditures and revenues, budget and actual.

STATUS:

In compliance.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

FUND ACCOUNTING STRUCTURE

BACKGROUND:

According to local budget law and generally accepted accounting principles the County is required to establish and maintain various funds. To ensure that the Board is informed of the various funds Finance has historically presented to the Board the County's fund structure each year.

FUND ACCOUNTING STRUCTURE POLICY STATEMENT:

The Finance Director is responsible for preparing and presenting a resolution defining the various County funds to the Board each fiscal year.

The County will follow generally accepted accounting principles number three and number four when creating a fund and determining if the fund is to be a dedicated fund.

PRINCIPLE 3 TYPES OF FUNDS: The following types of funds should be used by state and local governments:

GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS

General Fund - to account for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund.

Special Revenue Funds - to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources (other than expendable trusts or for major capital projects) that are legally restricted to expenditure for specified purposes.

Capital Projects Funds - to account for financial resources to be used for the acquisition or construction of major facilities (other than those financed by proprietary funds and trust funds).

Debt Service Funds - to account for the accumulation of resources for, and the payment of, general long-term debt principal and interest.

PROPRIETARY FUNDS

Enterprise Funds - to account for operations (a) that are financed and operated in a manner similar to private business enterprises-where the intent of the governing body is that costs (expenses, including depreciation) of providing goods or services to the general public on a continuing basis be financed or recovered primarily through user charges; or (b) where the governing body has decided that periodic determination of revenue earned, expenses incurred, and/or net income is appropriate for capital maintenance, public policy, management control, or accountability.

Internal Service Funds - to account for the financing of goods or services provided by one department or agency to other departments or agencies of the governmental unit, or to other governmental units, on a cost-reimbursement basis.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

FIDUCIARY FUNDS

Trust and Agency Funds - to account for assets held by a governmental unit in a trustee capacity or as an agent for individuals, private organizations, governmental units, and/or other funds. These include (a) Expendable Trust Funds, (b) Nonexpendable Trust Funds, (c) Pension Trust Funds, and (d) Agency Funds.

PRINCIPLE 4 NUMBER OF FUNDS: Governmental units should establish and maintain those funds required by law and sound financial administration. Only the minimum number of funds consistent with legal and operating requirements should be established, however, since unnecessary funds result in inflexibility, undue complexity, and inefficient financial administration.

STATUS:

In compliance.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS

BACKGROUND:

It is often advantageous to centralize the provision of certain goods and services within Multnomah County by establishing internal service funds. Internal service funds provide a useful means of accounting for such centralized intra governmental activities.

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board's (GASB) Codification of Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards (Codification) states that internal service funds may be used "to account for the financing of goods or services provided by one department or agency to other departments or agencies of the governmental unit on a cost-reimbursement basis. The purpose of the internal service funds is that they use the flow of economic resources measurement focus and the full accrual basis of accounting, thus allowing them to measure and recover the full cost of providing goods and services to departments and agencies (including depreciation on fixed assets). Other governmental funds do not provide cost data, but instead focus on flows of financial resources.

GASB also directs governments to use either the general fund or an internal service fund if they wish to use a single fund to account for all of their risk financing activities of a given type.

If a government chooses to use an internal service fund to account for its risk-financing activities, interfund premiums are treated as quasi-external transactions (similar to external insurance premiums), rather than as reimbursements. Because interfund premiums paid to internal service funds are treated as quasi-external transactions rather than as reimbursements, their amount is not limited by the amount recognized as expense in the internal service fund, provided that the excess represents a reasonable provision for anticipated catastrophe losses or the excess is the result of a systematic funding method designed to match revenues and expenses over a reasonable period of time (e. g., an actuarial funding method, a funding method based upon historical cost data).

GASB indicates that internal service funds may be used for services provided on a cost-reimbursement basis to other governments, nonprofits and quasi-governmental entities.

Most transactions between internal service funds and other funds take the form of quasi-external transactions. That is to say, the funds receiving goods or services report an expense or expenditure, while the internal service fund reports revenue. The practical consequence of this approach is that expenses/expenditures are duplicated within the financial reporting entity.

The duplication resulting from the use of internal service funds is preferable to the duplication that sometimes occurs when internal service funds are not used. Under current Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, GAAP, quasi external transactions may occur between departments within the same fund.' (e.g., general fund) or between funds within the same fund type (e.g." special revenue funds). Consequently, if an internal service fund is used, duplication could occur within the same fund or fund type. The internal service fund has the advantage of isolating such duplicate transactions within a separate fund type, where their special character is clearer to users of the financial statements.

Internal service funds are used to account for services provided on a cost reimbursement basis without profit or loss.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

Surpluses and deficits in internal service funds may be an indication that other funds were not charged properly for the goods or services they received.

The principle that internal service funds should operate on a cost reimbursement basis applies to the operations of these funds over time. It is only when internal service funds consistently report significant deficits or surpluses that the adequacy or inadequacy of charges made to other funds must be reassessed. If it is determined that the charges made to other funds are either more or less than is needed to recover cost over a reasonable period, the excess or deficiency should be charged back to the participating individual funds. In particular, it is not appropriate to report a material deficit in internal service fund without the demonstrable intent and ability to recover that amount through future charges to other funds over a reasonable period.

Often internal service funds charge for asset use in excess of historical cost depreciation to ensure that adequate funds will be available to purchase replacement assets (whose cost is likely to be higher because of inflation). The systematic recovery of the replacement cost of fixed assets is not a violation of the cost allocation principle because the surpluses are only temporary (i.e., they will disappear when the higher priced assets are, in fact acquired).

In recent years, federal grantors have become increasingly sensitive to the potential for overcharges connected with internal service funds. Accordingly, high levels of retained earnings in internal service funds (as defined by federal cost allocation principles) may lead to the disallowance of some costs charged out to other funds.

The main purpose of establishing separate internal service funds is to identify and allocate costs related to the provision of specific goods and services within Multnomah County

INTERNAL SERVICE FUND POLICY STATEMENT:

Multnomah County will establish internal service funds for the following services:

1. Risk Management
2. Facilities and Property Management
3. Motor pool and electronics
4. Mail distribution
5. Telephone
6. Data processing.

Services provided by internal service funds will be defined and put in writing.

The internal service funds will charge for services to account for the financing of the goods or services provided to other departments or agencies on a cost-reimbursement basis.

The internal service fund charges will include asset replacement charges (depreciation) to ensure that adequate funds will be available to purchase replacement assets.

The internal service fund charges will include charges to maintain a 5% contingency or reserve requirement to ensure that service reimbursements charged to other departments are maintained at a relatively constant level.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

The internal service charges billed to other departments or agencies will be reviewed annually by budget and finance to ensure they are meeting this policy.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

LIQUIDITY AND ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

BACKGROUND:


Liquidity is the ratio of cash and short-term investments to current liabilities including amounts held in trust. It reflects the County's ability to pay its short-term debts and accounts payable. Cash and Investments in the capital projects funds and debt retirement funds are long-term cash and investments. The credit rating industry considers a liquidity ratio of \$1 of cash to \$1 of debt as an acceptable liquidity ratio. Generally the County has maintained about \$2 of available cash to every \$1 of current liabilities.

LIQUIDITY AND ACCOUNTS PAYABLE POLICY STATEMENT:


The County will strive to maintain a liquidity ratio of at least \$1 dollar of cash and short-term investments to each \$1 dollar of current liabilities. The County will also strive to maintain year end accounts payable equal to or less than 5% of operating revenues as recorded in the County's Governmental Fund Types.

STATUS:

The County is in compliance. The following graphs depict the comparison of cash and investments to current liabilities and accounts payable to revenues for fiscal years 1996 to 2000.



FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY



FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

BANKING, CASH MANAGEMENT AND INVESTMENTS

BACKGROUND:

Multnomah County maintains an active investment program. An investment policy was first formalized in 1982 and has been revised several times since. These policies incorporate various Oregon Revised Statute Codes which specify the types and maturity restrictions that local governments may purchase. The County's Investment Policy also contains self-imposed constraints in order to effectively safeguard the public funds involved.

BANKING, CASH MANAGEMENT AND INVESTMENT POLICY STATEMENT:

Banking services shall be solicited at least every five years on a competitive basis. The Finance Director is authorized to act as "Custodial Officer" of Multnomah County and is responsible for performing the treasury functions of the County under ORS 208, 287, 294 and 295 and the County's Home Rule Charter. In carrying out these duties and functions, the Finance Director is authorized to establish internal Finance Program Area policy that meets generally accepted auditing standards relating to cash management.

In accordance with ORS 294.135, Multnomah County's investment transactions shall be governed by a written investment policy, which will be reviewed and adopted annually by the Board of County Commissioners. The investment policy will include the investment objectives, diversification, limitations and reporting requirements. In accordance with MCC 2.60.305 through 2.60.315 the County will utilize an independent Investment Advisory Board to review the County's investment plan and investment performance. Unrecognized gains or losses on investments will be recorded in the County's financial report.

STATUS:

The County is in compliance with this policy. Banking services were put out to bid in the Spring of 1997 and the services are to be re-bid in 2002. The following is the County's June 30, 2001 investment portfolio summary (\$ in thousands):

Description	Market Value	Cost Basis
U.S. Government Securities	\$159,817	\$ 160,413
U.S. Government Agencies	0	0
Repurchase Agreements	0	0
Commercial Paper	48,817	48,871
Bankers' Acceptances	7,030	7,035
LGIP	19,007	19,007
Library Pension	10,975	10,975
Cash Deposits	3,758	3,758
Total	<u>\$ 249,404</u>	<u>\$ 250,059</u>

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM DEBT FINANCINGS

BACKGROUND:

Prior to 1988, the County had maintained a pay-as-you-go philosophy for financing capital projects. The philosophy of pay-as-you-go may be costly in some ways due to cost acceleration in inflationary periods. Over-utilized facilities generate higher operation and maintenance costs and the citizens are not served well by over-utilized or nonexistent facilities. An alternative is to issue debt which is sometimes referred to as pay-as-you-use. The philosophy of issuing debt for public projects is to have the citizens benefiting from the project pay for the debt retirement costs.

SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM DEBT FINANCING POLICY STATEMENT:

All financings are to be issued in accordance with the County's Home Rule Charter and applicable State and Federal Laws.

1. **Short-Term Debt.** If it is determined by the Finance Program Area that the General Fund cash flow requirements will be in a deficit position prior to receiving property tax revenues in November, the County will issue short-term debt to meet the anticipated cash flow requirements. When financing a capital project, Bond Anticipation Notes or a Line of Credit may be issued if such financings will result in a financial benefit to the County. Before issuing short-term debt the Board must authorize the financing by adopting a resolution.
2. **Bonds and Other Long-Term Obligations.** It is the policy of the Board that the County will attempt to meet its capital maintenance, replacement or acquisition requirements on a pay as you go basis. If the dollar amount of the capital requirement cannot be met on a pay as you go basis, if it is financially beneficial to issue bonds or COPs, and if the project has been determined to benefit future citizens, the County will evaluate the feasibility of issuing a long-term debt financing instrument.
3. **Uses.** All long-term financings must provide the County with an economic gain or be as a result of a mandate by the Federal or State Government or court. Under no circumstances will current operations be funded from the proceeds of long-term borrowing.
4. **Purchase/Leasing Facilities.** It is also the policy of the Board to purchase or lease/purchase facilities, instead of renting, when the programs or agencies being housed in the facility are performing essential governmental functions.
5. **Debt.** When issuing debt, the County will follow the Government Finance Officers Association recommended practice of selecting and managing the method of sale of State and Local Government Bonds.
6. **Capital Expenditures.** If capital expenditures are anticipated to be incurred prior to the issuance of the debt, the Board authorizes the Finance Director to execute a declaration of official intent "DOI" with regard to such expenditure. The DOI must express the County's reasonable expectations that it will issue debt to reimburse the described expenditures. It must contain a general description of the project and state the estimated principal amount of obligations expected to be issued to finance the project. A copy of the DOI shall be sent to the Board.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

7. **Financing Mechanisms.** The following are the different types of financings the County may use to fund its major capital acquisitions or improvements.

a) **Revenue Bonds** may be used whenever possible to finance public improvements which can be shown to be self-supported by dedicated revenue sources, needed for infrastructure or economic development or approved by the Board for specific purposes.

i) Revenue supported bonds are to be used to limit the dependency on property taxes for those projects with available revenue sources, whether self-generated or dedicated from other sources.

ii) Adequate financial feasibility studies are to be performed for each project to determine the adequacy of the dedicated revenue source.

b) **General Obligation Bonds** (G.O. bonding) will be used to finance capital projects that have been determined to be essential to the maintenance or development of the County.

i) Capital improvement projects will be analyzed, prioritized and designated as to essential characteristics through the CIP committee process.

ii) Use of G.O. bonding will only be considered after exploring alternative funding sources such as Federal and State grants and project revenues.

c) **Full Faith and Credit or Limited Tax Bonds** will be considered as a financing method if Revenue bonding or G.O. bonding is not feasible.

d) **Lease-Purchases or Certificate of Participation** (COP) will be considered as a financing method if Revenue bonding or G.O. bonding is not feasible.

e) **Leases and limited tax bonds** as reported in the County's comprehensive annual financial report will be limited as follows:

i) Annual lease-purchase payments or limited tax bond payments recorded in the respective Funds, except proprietary funds, will be limited to 5% of the total revenues of the fund supporting the lease payment.

ii) All acquisitions will be limited to the economic life of the capital acquisition or improvement and in no cases shall exceed 20 years.

iii) All acquisitions must fit within the County's mission, goals & objectives or governmental role.

iv) All annual lease-purchase or bond payments must be included in the originating Departments' adopted budget or in the facilities management's building service reimbursement.

f) **Refundings or Advance Refundings** will be done if there is a present value savings of 3% or more or if the restructuring of the financing will benefit the County.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

- g) **Intergovernmental Agreements** with the State of Oregon for Energy Loans.
 - h) **Local Improvement Districts.** It is the policy of the Board not to form Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) for purposes of issuing debt to finance LID improvements unless specifically required by Oregon Revised Statutes. The reasoning for not forming LIDs is because of the added costs of administering the LIDs, the small number of citizens served, and the potential risk that in the event of default by the property owners, the County's General Fund will have to provide funds to retire any outstanding obligations.
 - i) **Conduit Financings.** It is the policy of the Board to act as an "Issuer" of conduit financing for any private college, university, hospital, or non-profit organization that is located in Multnomah County and is eligible to use this type of financing. The County will charge a fee of \$1.00 per \$1,000 of bonds issued or \$10,000, whichever is greater, to act as an issuer for the organization. The maximum fee to be collected will not exceed \$50,000. This fee is to offset any administrative costs that may be incurred by the County when acting as an issuer. The County will retain bond counsel to represent the County on any legal issues including any risks associated with the conduit financing. The university or college will be assessed an additional fee to cover any bond counsel expenses incurred by the County. In addition to the fees established above, the organization must have a Moody's rating of Baa or better or BBB rating from Standard and Poor's and must not condone any discriminatory practices or policies. The Board of County Commissioners must approve each conduit financing issue.
 - j) **External financial advisors, underwriters and bond counsel** will be selected in accordance with the County's Administrative Procedures.
8. **Revenue Bonds in Partnership with Nonprofit Agencies.**
- a) The County may issue tax exempt revenue bonds in partnership with a 501(c)(3) non-profit agency. The non-profit agency is responsible for 100% of the capital project costs, all of the debt financing issue costs, any debt reserve requirements and will be responsible for the ongoing annual debt payments and other related costs. The County will issue debt not to exceed 60% of the total capital costs of the project.
 - b) The County enjoys a very good credit rating and does not wish this rating to be negatively impacted. Before the County considers a proposal to assist a 501(c)(3) non-profit agency by issuing tax exempt revenue bonds to finance a capital project, the agency and the County must comply with the following. The conditions listed below are in addition to the applicable requirements contained in this section of the County's Financial and Budget Policies.
 - c) **Preconditions:**
 - i) The agency must be an IRS 501(c)(3) organization and must demonstrate that it cannot obtain conventional financing at a reasonable cost.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

- ii) In general, it is intended that the County will be assisting small to medium size agencies that have total annual revenues from all sources of at least \$1,000,000 but not greater than \$10,000,000
- iii) The planned use of the revenue bond proceeds must be consistent with County policy priorities or benchmarks.
- iv) The agency must provide the County with five years of historical financial information and operational trends.
- v) The agency must provide the County with a capital and business expansion plan including a five year revenue and expenditure forecast.
- vi) The agency must demonstrate its ability to conduct a capital fund raising campaign.
- vii) The agency must be non-discriminatory in providing access to its services and in its employment practices.

d) Cost Responsibilities:

- i) The agency is responsible for 100% of the capital project costs. The County will assist the agency by issuing tax exempt revenue bonds to finance no more than 60% of the capital project and related allowable debt issuance costs. The agency is responsible for raising the remaining project funds.
- ii) The agency is responsible for all bond issuance costs.
- iii) Unless granted an exception by the Chair, County administrative costs are to be reimbursed by the agency or capitalized as part of the debt to be repaid by the agency.
- iv) The agency is responsible for all ongoing costs related to the financing. These include annual debt payments, paying agent costs, or other related costs. The agency is obligated for the term of the financing and may not have the option of a "nonappropriation" clause.
- v) Before the County issues the debt, the agency must have raised 75% of the project funds for which it is responsible; with the County's administrative agreement, a portion of those funds may be in the form of well- secured promissory notes from grantors or private contributors; the remaining agency contributions must be deposited before matching debt funds are released, on a schedule negotiated in the contract for each project.
- vi) It is expected that all private funds will be collected within one year of the County's approval of the bond financing partnership. If the private funds are not collected within two years of the County's approval of bond financing, the County shall no longer be considered as committed to the revenue bond financing partnership.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

e) Other Conditions:

- i) The County must have title, or first lien rights if the escrow agent holds title on behalf of the lender, to the property while debt is outstanding.
- ii) The agency must provide the County an unencumbered cash reserve in the amount equal to at least six monthly payments or make monthly installment payments equal to 1/12 of the annual debt service requirement. Any interest earned on these funds remains the property of the County and will be used to offset administration costs. Payments are to begin upon the issuance of the debt. This reserve is in addition to any reserves required by the financing.
- iii) The County will conduct a risk analysis and fully disclose this information to the Board prior to approval of the debt. The County reserves the right to have a third party perform a credit analysis.
- iv) The Board must approve of the financing by resolution
- v) Contractual language must be in place to protect the County in case of late payments or default by the agency.
- vi) The agency must provide an annual, independently audited financial report to the County.

f) Non-Profit Revenue Bond Limits:

- i) In general, the County will not provide revenue bond financing for a non-profit agency for any project that is under \$1,000,000 or over \$4,000,000. in bonded indebtedness.
- ii) The issuance of revenue bonds in partnership with non-profit agencies shall not be greater than \$8,500,000 of principal outstanding.
- iii) The maximum term of revenue bonds issued under this policy will not exceed 15 years.

g) Administration of this Policy Section:

- i) The Finance Program Area is responsible for coordinating the overall process of accepting and reviewing proposals by non-profits to enter into partnership with the County for revenue bond financing and for making recommendations to the Chair in considering these requests.
- ii) County operating department(s) with related programs are responsible for analyzing proposals for conformity with related program policy guidelines
- iii) The Finance Program Area is responsible for analyzing proposals for conformity with these financial policy guidelines and for implementing revenue bond financing partnerships, as approved.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET POLICY

9. **Hospital Authority:** It is the policy of the Board to issue revenue bonds for hospital facilities as authorized by Resolution 98-1 adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, acting as Hospital Authority, on December 3, 1998.

STATUS:

The following shows the County's outstanding obligations as of July 1, 2001: (\$ in thousands)

Description	Moody's Rating	Dated	Maturity Date	Amount Issued	Principal Outstanding	2001/2002 Prin & Int Payment
Short Term Notes "TRANS" Planned	MIG 1	7/1/01	6/30/02	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,900
General Obligation Bonds	Aa1	10/1/96	10/1/16	\$ 79,700	\$26,520	\$ 5,413
	Aa1	10/1/96	10/1/16	29,000	7,340	4,116
	Aa1	3/1/94	10/1/13	\$ 22,000	5,120	1,150
	Aa1	9/1/94	10/1/14	9,000	1,510	422
	Aa1	2/1/99	10/1/16	66,115	65,770	3,213
				<u>\$205,815</u>	<u>\$ 115,555</u>	<u>\$ 14,314</u>
Revenue Bonds						
RCC Series 1998	A3	10/1/98	10/1/14	\$3,155	\$3,000	\$ 289
Motor Vehicle Revenue Bonds 2000	A3	11/01/00	11/01/15	5,500	5,500	265
				<u>\$8,655</u>	<u>\$8,500</u>	<u>\$554</u>
Pension Obligation Revenue bonds	Aa2	12/1/99	6/1/30	<u>\$184,548</u>	<u>\$184,548</u>	<u>\$ 8,923</u>
Full Faith and Credit Obligations						
Series 1999A Multnomah Building	Aa2	4/1/99	8/1/19	\$ 36,125	\$ 34,960	\$ 2,745
Series 2000A Full Faith	Aa2	4/1/00	4/1/20	61,215	58,205	6,149
				<u>\$ 97,340</u>	<u>\$ 93,165</u>	<u>\$ 8,894</u>
Certificates of Participation						
1998 JJC Refunding & New	Aa3	2/1/98	8/1/17	48,615	\$ 33,590	\$ 5,374
1993 A & B Health Facilities	Aa3	5/1/93	7/1/13	19,890	11,515	1,650
				<u>\$ 68,505</u>	<u>\$ 45,105</u>	<u>\$ 7,024</u>
Leases and Contracts						
Portland Building	N/A	1/22/81	1/22/08	\$ 3,475	\$ 1,694	\$ 332
Xerox Computer Leases	N/A	9/1/97	9/1/02	249	9	9
IBM Computer Lease	N/A	3/10/99	4/1/02	1,657	432	432
				<u>\$ 5,381</u>	<u>\$ 2,136</u>	<u>\$ 773</u>
			Sub total			\$16,691
			Deduct:			
			Road Fund			(288)
			ISD Leases			(2,540)
			Xerox Lease			(9)
Governmental Fund Type Supported Debt Payment						<u>\$13,854</u>

REMAINING BORROWING CAPACITY	
Debt Capacity (Supported by General Government Fund Types Only)	
2001-2002 General Fund Revenues	\$ 297,186
5 % limitation	0.05
5% Limitation Dollar Amount	\$ 14,859
Lease/Debt Capacity Used	\$ (13,854)
Annual Payment Available	\$ 1,005
Estimate Principal Value Available	<u>\$ 13,000</u>