ALBANY CITY COUNCIL

# AGENDA

## Monday, July 20, 2020

This meeting will be conducted virtually. At 4:00 p.m., join the meeting at:
https://www.gotomeet.me/cityofalbany/ccm
You can use your built-in microphone or dial in using your phone.
Call: 1-646-749-3129
Access code: 491-970-829

Microphones will be muted and webcams will be turned off for presenters and members of the public unless called upon to speak.

Requests for information to be shared on screen must be submitted before noon on the day of the meeting.

If participant(s) disrupt the meeting, the participant(s) microphone and webcam will be turned off.

If disruption continues, the participant(s) will be removed from the meeting.

4:00 p.m. Call to order and roll call

4:05 p.m. Business from the public
*Persons wanting to provide comment to the council during "business from the public" must send their written comments by email to cityclerk@cityofalbany.net* ***before noon*** *on the day of the meeting in order to be included in the public record. Please limit comments to one page and include your name and address.*

4:10 p.m. Parks and Recreation fees for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 – Kim Lyddane. [Pages 2-9]
*Action Requested:* Information, discussion, direction.

4:30 p.m. Projected budget impacts for BN 2021-23 – Peter Troedsson. [Presentation]
*Action Requested:* Information, discussion.

5:30 p.m. League of Oregon Cities 2021 legislative priorities – Peter Troedsson. [Pages 10-23]
*Action Requested:* Information, discussion, direction.

5:40 p.m. Business from the council

5:45 p.m. City manager report

5:50 p.m. Adjournment

Due to Governor Brown's Executive Orders limiting public gatherings during the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting is accessible to the public via phone and video connection.

# MEMO

TO: Albany City Council

VIA: Peter Troedsson, City Manager 7/14

FROM: Kim Lyddane, Parks & Recreation Director

DATE: July 14, 2020, for the July 20, 2020, City Council Meeting

**SUBJECT:** Adoption of Parks & Recreation Fees for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

## Action Requested:

The City Council is asked to adopt the attached resolution, repealing Resolution No. 6719 and establishing Parks & Recreation fees and charges for Fiscal Year 2020-2021. The resolution will be on the July 22, 2020, city council agenda for adoption.

## Discussion:

The Parks & Recreation Department annually reviews the costs of delivering our services, as well as the revenues used to pay for them. Prices are adjusted as necessary to cover expenses and meet our financial objectives. The Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget incorporates these price changes into the anticipated revenues for next year.

For Fiscal Year 2020-2021, adjustments have been made to fees for the Frequent Customer Card, Aquatics programming, and rentals. These fees were last increased for BN 2019-2021. Due to the budget situation, fees need to be modified before the end of the biennium to keep up with rising costs and address the anticipated shortfall.

Regarding rental pricing, two options have been developed based on the feedback from the July 6 city council work session. Option A is the staff recommendation based on experience with groups renting spaces and industry standards. Option A provides for a non-profit rate, a private resident and non-resident rates, and a commercial rate. Option B provides a basic resident and non-resident rate.

Staff recommend Option A for multiple reasons. In reviewing past rentals, the non-profits used spaces for meetings and fundraising activities. The commercial organizations used spaces to directly sell products, travel, and services to seniors and community members. Commercial organizations may charge a fee to attend activities or use their services while on City property. If a commercial business would like to rent a space for an internal staff event, they are charged the private resident rate. In reviewing the rates of our local competitors who operate senior/community centers, 90 percent have a non-profit rate and 80 percent have a commercial rate. In order to stay competitive, Option A is recommended.

Exhibit A shows the proposed fees for Fiscal Year 2020-2021. These fees and charges will be set through June 30, 2021.

## Budget Impact:

The proposed Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget for the Parks & Recreation Fund (202500) is in flux due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Currently, revenues generated through program fees, rentals, and sponsorship are forecasted at 50 percent reduction for Fiscal Year 2020-2021. While the increase in fees will not offset the estimated shortfall in the next biennium, they will help to reduce the gap.

KL
Attachment: Resolution
Attachment: Exhibit A, Schedule of Fees and Charges

# RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 6718 (A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING FEES AND CHARGES FOR PARKS & RECREATION SERVICES) AND REVISING FEES AND CHARGES FOR PARKS & RECREATION SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022.

WHEREAS, THE City of Albany is dedicated to delivering the services that Albany's citizens need, want, and are willing to support; and

WHEREAS, the City of Albany has duly adopted Resolution No. 6718, establishing fees and charges for parks and recreation services for Fiscal Year 2020-2021.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Albany City Council that the fees and charges listed in "Exhibit A" (attached) be established for Parks & Recreation Department programs and services, effective August 1, 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution No. 6718 is hereby repealed.

DATED AND EFFECTIVE THIS 22ND DAY OF JULY 2020.

_____
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
City Clerk

# EXHIBIT A

## Albany Parks and Recreation Schedule of Fees and Charges
## FY21

### RECREATION PROGRAMS

Recreation fees are intended to recover the following expenses: all direct costs as well as marketing costs associated with programs. These include (as appropriate): facility expenses, transportation, instruction, equipment, supplies and materials. Charges may vary according to location, instructor wages, and contracted services rates. All direct costs are divided proportionately among the participants.

ALBANY RESIDENT DISCOUNT

For most services, Albany residents receive a discount of 30%. Non-residents typically pay full price. However, frequent non-resident customers may elect to purchase a Frequent Customer Card (FCC), which covers any non-resident surcharges for one full year.

| Frequent Customer Card | FY20 | FY21 |
|---|---|---|
| Individual | $40.00/year | $50/year |
| Family | $80.00/year | $100/year |

SPORTS PROGRAMS

| Team Fees | FY20 | FY21 |
|---|---|---|
| Volleyball | $28.00/game | $29/game |
| Men's League Softball | $55.00/game | $56/game |
| Women's League Softball | $55.00/game | $56/game |
| Co-ed League Softball | $55.00/game | $56/game |

Fees include costs for staffing, officials, facilities, capital enhancement fees, marketing costs associated with programs, field maintenance and awards. Prices may be adjusted to reflect unanticipated increases in gym rental prices. Number of games offered may be affected by gym availability.

**AQUATICS PROGRAM**

COOL! SWANSON PARK ACTION CENTER

| Admission | Daily | | 10-Visit | | Season Pass | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resident/Non-Resident | | Resident/Non-Resident | | Resident/Non-Resident | |
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Adults/Senior | $5/6 | $5.25/$6.75 | $45/$54 | $47.25/$60/75 | $150/$180 | $157.50/$202.50 |
| Tots (0-5 years) | $3.25/$3.75 | $3.50/$4.50 | $29.25/$35 | $31.50/$40.50 | $97.50/$117 | $105/$135 |
| Youth (6-17 years) | $4.50/$5.50 | $4.75/$6.25 | $40/$50 | $42.75/$56.25 | $135/$162 | $142.50/$187.50 |
| Adults/Senior | $5/6 | $5/6 | $45/$54 | $45/$54 | $150/$180 | $150/$180 |
| Family (up to 4 people) | | | | | $350/$420 | $375/$450 |
| Observers | $2 | $2 | | | | |

# EXHIBIT A

COOL! POOL RENTALS

| Pool/Deck | Hourly Resident/Non-Resident | |
|---|---|---|
| | FY20 | FY21 |
| 1-50 | $160.00/$185.00 | $170/$220 |
| 51-100 | $195.00/$220.00 | $205/$255 |
| 101-150 | $230.00/$255.00 | $240/$290 |
| 151-200 | $265.00/$290.00 | $275/$325 |
| 201-250 | $300.00/$325.00 | $310/$360 |
| 251-300 | $335.00/ $360.00 | $345/$395 |
| Refundable Damage Deposit | $100 | $100 |

For each additional 50 persons, add $35.00

COOL! FACILITY RENTALS

| Room | Hourly Resident/Non-Resident | |
|---|---|---|
| | FY20 | FY21 |
| Community Room Rental | $35.00/$40.00 | $40/$50 |
| Refundable Damage Deposit | $100.00 | $100 |

Maximum 15 persons in Community Room

ALBANY COMMUNITY POOL (ACP)

FY20-21 will be the first year where Albany Community Pool has a Resident/Non-Resident rate.

| General Admission | Individual | | Annual Pass | | 20-Visit Cards | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resident/Non-Resident | | Resident/Non-Resident | | Resident/Non-Resident | |
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Youth | $4.25 | $4.50/$6 | $275 | $292.50/$390 | $81 | $85.50/$114 |
| Adult | $4.50 | $4.75/$6.25 | $290 | $308.75/$406.25 | $85.50 | $90.25/$118.75 |
| Seniors (55+) | $4.25 | $4.50/46 | $275 | $292.50/$390 | $81 | $85.50/$114 |
| Family (up to 6, $2/each after) | $14 | $15/$19.50 | $475 | $525/$680 | | |
| Family Plus Sports Pass | | | $600 | $780 | | |
| Sports Pass | | | $275 | $292.50/$390 | | |
| | | | | | **10- Visit Cards** | |
| Parent/Child | $5 | | | | $45 | $47.25/$60.75 |
| Adult Fitness | $5 | | | | $45 | $47/$60.75 |

ACP FACILITY RENTAL

| Pool Rental | Hourly Resident/Non-Resident | |
|---|---|---|
| | FY20 | FY21 |
| Entire Pool (up to 40 persons) | $110.00/hour | $125/$162.50 |
| Half pool (up to 40 persons) | $65.00/hour | $70/$91 |
| Refundable Damage Deposit | $40 | $40 |

# EXHIBIT A

## FIELD RENTALS

| Softball/Baseball Fields Rentals | Field/Hour |
|---|---|
| 90-Minute Usage | $50 |
| Light Usage | $35 |
| Pitching Mound/Rubber Install | $30 |
| Damage Deposit | $150.00 |

New this year: due to COVID-19, we are altering use of our fields in the summer months to maximize play outside of adult league times.

## PARK, SHELTER, SENIOR CETNTER RENTALS

Option A: Staff Recommendation

| Picnic Shelters and Stages** | Weekday (M-TH) All Day | | Weekend/Holiday All Day | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resident/Non-Resident/Non-Profit | | Resident/Non-Resident/Non-Profit | |
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Bryant #1 or #2 | $90/$115/ $75 | $95/$120/$85 | $110/ $145/ $90 | $115/$150/$95 |
| Grand Prairie | $90/ $115/ $75 | $95/$120/$85 | $120/ $160/ $110 | $125/$165/$115 |
| Monteith Shelter | $90/ $115/ $75 | $100/$125/$95 | $135/ $175/ $110 | $140/$180/$120 |
| Monteith Stage/Shelter | $165/ $220/ $125 | $175/$230/$135 | $350/ $465/ $280 | $355/$470/$290 |
| Timber Linn #1 or #2 | $100/ $130/ $70 | $110/$140/$80 | $230/ $310/ $190 | $235/$315/$200 |
| Timber Linn Amphitheater | $495 | $500 | $660 | $675 |
| Non-Shelter Areas | Rates Negotiable | | Rates Negotiable | |
| Refundable Damage Deposit – $100 | | | | |

Or 15% of gross ticket sales, whichever is greater, not to exceed $5,000

* * $ 50.00 vendor fee or 15% of gross sales, whichever is greater for commercial sales.

SENIOR CENTER ROOM RENTALS

| Room | Non-Profit Per Hour | | Private Resident Per Hour | | Private Non-Resident Per Hour | | Commercial Per Hour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY0 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| 1 Bay | $30 | $35 | $40 | $45 | | $55 | $60 | $65 |
| 2 Bays | $40 | $45 | $50 | $55 | | $65 | $70 | $75 |
| 3 Bays | $50 | $55 | $60 | $65 | | $75 | $80 | $85 |
| Activity Room | $35 | $40 | $50 | $55 | | $65 | $65 | $70 |
| Meeting Room | $25 | $30 | $35 | $40 | | $50 | $40 | $45 |
| Kitchen | $40 | $45 | $55 | $60 | | $70 | $90 | $95 |

# EXHIBIT A

| Room | Non-Profit Per Hour | | Private Resident Per Hour | | Private Non-Resident Per Hour | | Commercial Per Hour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY0 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Rec. Room | $50 | $55 | $60 | $65 | | $75 | $80 | $85 |
| Entire Facility | $100 | $140 | $150 | $185 | | | $175 | $215 |
| Refundable Security Deposit | | $100 | | | | | | |
| Refundable Alcohol Deposit | | $50 | | | | | | |

Option B:

| Picnic Shelters and Stages** | Weekday (M-TH) All Day | | Weekend/Holiday All Day | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resident/Non-Resident | | Resident/Non-Resident | |
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Bryant #1 or #2 | $90/$115 | $95/$120 | $110/ $145 | $115/$150 |
| Grand Prairie | $90/ $115 | $95/$120 | $120/ $160 | $125/$165 |
| Monteith Shelter | $90/ $115 | $100/$125 | $135/ $175/ $110 | $140/$180/$120 |
| Monteith Stage/Shelter | $165/ $220 | $175/$230 | $350/ $465 | $355/$470 |
| Timber Linn #1 or #2 | $100/ $130 | $110/$140 | $230/ $310 | $235/$315/ |
| Timber Linn Amphitheater | $495 | $500 | $660 | $675 |
| Non-Shelter Areas | Rates Negotiable | | Rates Negotiable | |
| Refundable Damage Deposit – $100 | | | | |

** Or 15% of gross ticket sales, whichever is greater, not to exceed $5,000

* * $50.00 vendor fee or 15% of gross sales, whichever is greater for commercial sales.

| Room | Resident Per Hour | | Non-Resident Per Hour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| 1 Bay | $40 | $45 | $60 | $65 |
| 2 Bays | $50 | $55 | $70 | $75 |
| 3 Bays | $60 | $65 | $80 | $85 |
| Activity Room | $50 | $55 | $65 | $70 |
| Meeting Room | $35 | $40 | $40 | $45 |
| Kitchen | $55 | $60 | $90 | $95 |
| Rec. Room | $60 | $65 | $80 | $85 |
| Entire Facility | $150 | $185 | $175 | $215 |

# EXHIBIT A

| Room | Resident Per Hour | | Non-Resident Per Hour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY20 | FY21 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Refundable Security Deposit | $100 | | | |
| Refundable Alcohol Deposit | $50 | | | |

League of Oregon Cities

June 5, 2020

Dear Chief Administrative Official:

For the past three months, seven policy committees have been working to identify and propose specific actions as part of the LOC's effort to develop a pro-active legislative agenda for the 2021 session. They have identified legislative objectives as set forth in the enclosed ballot and legislative recommendation materials. These objectives span a variety of issues and differ in the potential resources required to seek their achievement. Therefore, it is desirable to prioritize them in order to ensure that efforts are focused where they are most needed.

While the attached ballot reflects the top policies developed in each of the policy committees, each undertook a broad look at a range of issues impacting cities. Many issues reflect the LOC's ongoing mission to support cities' work and their home rule authority to develop and use a variety of tools to meet the needs of residents. Each city is being asked to review the recommendations of the policy committees and provide input to the LOC Board of Directors as it prepares to adopt the LOC's 2021 legislative agenda. After your city council has had the opportunity to review the proposals and discuss them with your staff, please return the enclosed ballot indicating the top four issues that your city council would like to see the LOC focus on during the 2021 session. **The deadline for response is August 7, 2020.** The board of directors will then review the results of this survey of member cities, along with the recommendations of the policy committees, and determine the LOC's 2021 legislative agenda.

Your city's participation and input will assist the board in creating a focused set of specific legislative targets that reflect the issues of greatest importance to cities. If you have individual questions about the ballot topics do not hesitate to reach out to committee members who serve on the seven policy committees. Thank you for your involvement, and thanks to those among you who gave many hours of time and expertise in developing these proposals.

Do not hesitate to contact me or Jim McCauley, Legislative Director, with additional questions.

Sincerely,

Mike Cully
Executive Director

Jim McCauley
Legislative Director

1201 Court St. NE, Suite 200, Salem, OR 97301-4194 • 503-588-6550 • 800-452-0338 • fax: 503-399-4863 • www.orcities.org

City of: _____

Please mark 4 boxes with an X or check mark that reflects the top 4 issues that your city recommends be added to the priorities for the LOC's 2021 legislative agenda.

## Legislation

| | |
|---|---|
| **A. Beer and Cider Tax Increase** | |
| **B. Broadband Infrastructure and Technical Assistance Funding** | |
| **C. Building (Reach) Code – Energy Efficiency Local Option** | |
| **D. COVID-19 Economic Recovery Investments** | |
| **E. Digital Equity and Inclusion** | |
| **F. Expedited Siting for Shelter and Affordable Housing** | |
| **G. Green Energy/Renewables – Expanded Local Option** | |
| **H. Housing and Services Investment** | |
| **I. Increased Budgetary Flexibility During Budgetary Emergency** | |
| **J. Infrastructure Financing and Resilience** | |
| **K. Local Climate Action Planning Resources** | |
| **L. Local Energy Generation Project Support** | |
| **M. Local Speed Setting Authority** | |
| **N. Long Term Transportation Infrastructure Funding** | |
| **O. Low-Income Energy Efficiency and Affordability Programs** | |
| **P. Marijuana Tax Local Rate Limitation Increase** | |
| **Q. Mental Health Service Delivery** | |
| **R. Municipal Broadband and Municipal Pole Protection** | |
| **S. New Mobility Services** | |
| **T. Photo Enforcement Safety Cameras** | |
| **U. Property Tax Reform** | |
| **V. Reducing Wastewater Impacts from Wipes and Other "Non-Flushables"** | |
| **W. Right-of-way/Franchise Fees Authority Preservation** | |
| **X. State Highway Funds Formula** | |
| **Y. Tort Liability Reform** | |
| **Z. Water Utility Rate and Fund Assistance** | |

**In addition to your ranking of the priorities shown above, please use this space to provide us with any comments (supportive or critical) you may have on these issues, or thoughts on issues or potential legislative initiatives that have been overlooked during the committee process.):**

**You are reviewing the hard copy of the ballot. There are hyperlinks in the digital copy that may provide more background information. You can find the digital version with hyperlinks by going to this web address: https://www.orcities.org/download_file/1038/0. It is best opened in Google Chrome.**

## A. Beer and Cider Tax Increase

**Legislation:**
The League proposes increasing the state taxes on beer and cider to assist with rising public safety costs, improve public health, reduce alcohol consumption by minors, and provide alcohol tax equity with wine and liquor.

**Background:**
Oregon's tax has not been increased since 1978 and is currently $2.60 per barrel which equates to about 8 cents on a gallon of beer. The tax is by volume and not on the sales price, meaning the tax is less than 5 cents on a six-pack. Oregon has the lowest beer tax in the country, and to get to the middle of the states Oregon would need to raise the tax to $30.00 per barrel or 54 cents per six pack (a more than 10-fold increase). Given recent challenges to the craft brewing industry tied to bar and restaurant closures it may be appropriate to delay or phase-in the increase. Cities are preempted from imposing alcohol taxes. In exchange, cities receive approximately 34% of the state alcohol revenues, but the state takes 50% of beer and wine taxes off the top prior to this distribution. Cities have significant public safety costs related to alcohol consumption, and the beer tax does not come close to covering its fair share of these costs.

*Presented by the Finance and Taxation Committee*

## B. Broadband Infrastructure and Technical Assistance Funding

**Legislation:**
Seek additional state support and funding for increased broadband infrastructure deployment and technical assistance.

**Background:**
The deployment of broadband and telecommunications networks and services (public and/or private) throughout Oregon is critical to economic development, education, health and safety and the ability of residents to be linked to their governments. Research shows areas of the state either not served or underserved by competitive broadband technology. A significant barrier to the deployment of broadband infrastructure is funding. Cities need additional funding and support from various sources, including the state and federal government, allocated for increased or new, reliable, low latency broadband infrastructure that reaches speeds of at least 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload or any updated speed standards as adopted by the FCC. Many federal grant programs require localities to have a broadband strategic plan in place before they are eligible for funds. Therefore, there is a need for funding sources to help cities with technical assistance as well as infrastructure.

*Presented by the Telecom, Broadband & Cable Committee*

## C. Building (Reach) Code – Energy Efficiency Local Option

**Legislation:**
The LOC will pursue/support legislation to allow communities to adopt the Reach Code as the mandatory residential or commercial building code within the city's jurisdictional boundaries. The Reach Code would represent a building energy code that would be at least 10 percent more efficient than the statewide building code. Under this proposal, cities would be able to adopt the more efficient Reach Code or would continue to use the standard statewide building code as the base code.

**Background:**
Under current state law, cities are preempted from adopting local building codes. Instead, development is subject to statewide codes, including for new residential and commercial development. In 2009, legislation was passed to implement a new, optional code (Reach Code) that would allow developers to exceed statewide codes and streamline the construction of higher-performance buildings through efficiencies gained in the building exterior envelope as well as heating, ventilation, air conditioning, piping insulation and lighting. The Reach Code is optional for builders to use, but a local government can't mandate a builder to use it. This legislative recommendation would allow a city to adopt the Reach Code within their jurisdiction in order to promote additional energy efficiency for new residential and commercial structures. If a city does not wish to adopt the Reach Code, the statewide code would remain in place. The LOC Energy & Environment Committee discussed whether this recommendation would impact housing costs and believes that long-term cost savings may be gained through increased energy efficiency in newly built units. Ultimately, the decision on whether to utilize the standard code or the enhanced (Reach) code would be at the discretion of the city.

*Presented by the Energy and Environment Committee*

## D. COVID-10 Economic Recovery Investments

**Legislation:**
The League will advocate for continued economic recovery strategies and investments for small business and workforce assistance in response to the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Background:**
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a devastating impact on Oregon's small businesses and workforce. While the federal government and the state have made recent investments to support small business, these resources have yet to meet current needs and more resources will be needed to support long term economic recovery for Oregon's communities. The League will work in coordination with economic development partners to advocate for continued investments to support long-term recovery and economic development.

*Presented by the Community Development Committee*

## E. Digital Equity and Inclusion

**Legislation:**
Support legislation and policies that are inclusive and equitable to all, individuals and communities, so that they have the information technology capacity needed for full participation in our society, democracy and economy.

**Background:**
Connectivity is crucial to modern life. It is being relied on more for how people do business, learn, and receive important services like healthcare. As technology has evolved, the digital divide has become more complex and nuanced. It is no longer about the existence of technology in certain places. Now, the discussion of the digital divide is framed in terms of whether a population has access to hardware, to the Internet, to viable connection speeds and to the skills and training they need to effectively use it. The LOC will partner with schools, healthcare, and other stakeholders to ensure technologies are relevant, available, affordable, and accessible to the diverse populous and communities of Oregon. Additionally, the LOC will advocate for digital literacy programs to help learn these new technologies.

*Presented by the Telecom, Broadband & Cable Committee*

## F. Expedited Siting for Shelter and Affordable Housing

**Legislation:**
The League will pursue legislation to expedite the siting of emergency shelter and other affordable housing that follows the intent of the 2020 shelter siting bill (HB 4001) but retains more local decision making in the process. The League will pursue this priority in coordination with affordable housing partners and other land use stakeholders.

**Background:**
The League worked closely with city and county partners during the 2020 session to gain improvements to HB 4001, which sought to preempt all local siting and zoning regulations and the land use appeals process, for approving the siting of emergency shelters for a one-year period. HB 4001 received strong legislative support in 2020. Draft omnibus legislation for a potential future special session has included the text of HB 4001 and the League expects to see HB 4001 reintroduced in the 2021 session.

This priority will empower cities and counties to proactively introduce alternative legislation, similar to existing statute in California, which requires jurisdictions to identify places where shelters can locate instead of mandating that jurisdictions allow shelters to be sited anywhere. The California model requires cities and counties to accommodate their need for emergency shelters on sites where the use is allowed without a conditional use permit and requires cities and counties to treat transitional and supportive housing projects as a residential use of property.

*Presented by the Community Development Committee*

## G. Green Energy/Renewables – Expanded Local Option

**Legislation:**
The LOC will pursue/support policies that increase local control opportunities for cities that want to establish a community-scale green energy program. This program would be optional for cities that choose to pursue it. Cities who choose to, would be allowed to adopt resolutions that would opt-in residential, commercial, and industrial customers to a voluntary renewable energy option if it is provided by an investor owned utility that serves the city and its electric customers. Under this proposed program, a city would be able to pursue a more aggressive green energy portfolio and would better position cities to meet local climate action goals.

**Background:**
Under current law, customers of investor-owned utilities can opt-in to voluntary renewable energy options for their customers. These options allow customers to invest in additional green energy generation. In 2019, the state of Utah passed legislation (SB 411) that allows cities and counties to opt-in to programs on a community-scale basis, while still allowing individual customers to opt-out. Under this proposal, any city within the territory of an investor-owned utility, would be able to pursue this option for community-scale renewable energy (net-100% renewable).

*Presented by the Energy and Environment Committee*

## H. Housing and Services Investment

**Legislation:**
The League will support increased investments for affordable housing, homeless assistance, and related services including funding for: shelter, homeless services, case management, rent assistance, the development and preservation of affordable housing, and permanent supportive housing.

**Background:**
Cities large and small were facing escalating homelessness rates before the COVID-19 pandemic and the current economic downturn will only increase the number of Oregonians facing eviction or experiencing homelessness. State general fund programs like the Emergency Housing Assistance (EHA) and State Homeless Assistance Program (SHAP) have seen record investments in previous legislative sessions. The legislative emergency board also voted recently to dedicate $12M in general funds to support rent assistance and safe shelter in response to COVID-19.

Oregon's lack of available housing, high rents and high home prices are causing housing instability and homelessness to increase. The Legislature has made record investments in recent years to fund the LIFT affordable housing program and preserve Oregon's existing affordable housing infrastructure. These programs are funded through general obligation bonds and lottery backed bonds.

Permanent Supportive Housing is a key strategy for ending chronic homelessness that reduces downstream costs to public systems like public safety, emergency health care and corrections. The 2019 Legislature invested over $50M to stand up a three-pronged permanent supportive housing program that includes 1) development costs to build, 2) rent assistance to keep units deeply affordable, and 3) wrap around services that are key to ensuring residents' long-term stability. The state should continue investing in this model to bring more Permanent Supportive Housing across the state and ensure that the housing developed with the original $50M continues receive the necessary ongoing funding for rent assistance and supportive services.

*Presented by the Community Development Committee*

## I. Increased Budgetary Flexibility During Budgetary Emergency

**Legislation:**
The League proposes relaxing budgetary constraints in state law so that cities may better be able to withstand revenue losses related to natural disasters and public health emergencies. These losses will inevitably force many cities to cut services and lay off staff, the legislature can reduce the effect of losses by increasing flexibility for use of funds during and after a declared emergency.

**Background:**
Cities anticipate a tremendous loss in revenue due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Reduced revenues already include losses to lodging taxes, gas taxes, park fees, development fees, parking fees, utility charges, and so on. Further out, there is widespread concern that there will be impacts to the real estate market going into 2021, and by extension a reduction in 2021-22 property tax revenues. Cities want maximum flexibility in using funds that are subject to statutory limitations but will negotiate terms on individual funding sources including payback requirements if necessary. This flexibility should apply during and after declared emergencies, including both the current pandemic and future natural disasters.

*Presented by the Finance and Taxation Committee*

## J. Infrastructure Financing and Resilience

**Legislation:**
The League will advocate for an increase in the state's investment in key infrastructure funding sources, including, but not limited to, the Special Public Works Fund (SPWF), Brownfield Redevelopment Fund, and Regionally Significant Industrial Site loan program. The advocacy will include seeking an investment and set aside through the SPWF for seismic resilience planning and related infrastructure improvements to make Oregon water and wastewater systems more resilient.

**Background:**
Cities continue to face the challenge of how to fund infrastructure improvements (both to maintain current and to build new). Increasing state resources in programs that provide access to lower rate loans and grants will assist cities in investing in vital infrastructure. Infrastructure development impacts economic development, housing, and livability. The level of funding for these programs has been inadequate compared to the needs over the last few biennia and the funds are depleting and unsustainable without significant program modifications and reinvestments. This priority will focus on maximizing both the amount of funding and the flexibility of the funds to meet the needs of more cities across the state to ensure long-term infrastructure investment.

*Presented by the Community Development Committee*

## K. Local Climate Action Planning Resources

**Legislation:**
The LOC will seek grant funding and technical assistance resources for cities to pursue, adopt or expand local climate action plans. In addition, the LOC will pursue opportunities to work with the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute (through Oregon State University) to provide cities and counties with local/regional data that can better inform the adoption and implementation of climate adaptation and mitigation at the local level.

**Background:**
According to the Oregon Department of Energy's 2018 Biennial Energy Report (BER), since the early 1990s, major international and U.S. scientific assessments have concluded that both climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts are necessary in response to climate change. The BER goes on to explain that adaptation is often thought of as actions "to prepare for and adjust to new conditions, thereby reducing harm or taking advantage of new opportunities or simply to reduce society's vulnerability to climate change impacts." Local climate action plans, adopted by cities or counties, can help communities better understand how climate change will impact their communities, and can provide localized solutions to help mitigate against the impacts of climate change. The LOC is aware of fourteen cities that have adopted local climate action plans. There are other cities that are interested in doing the same but that do not have the financial and/or staffing resources that are necessary.

*Presented by the Energy and Environment Committee*

## L. Local Energy Generation Project Support

**Legislation:**
The LOC will support/pursue funding, technical assistance and other tools that make local energy generation more feasible for cities to pursue.

**Background:**
Local energy generation projects can better position cities to pursue and achieve local climate action goals, address capacity constraints of existing electric transmission lines, and can help cities respond to individual businesses that may be seeking green energy options. The types of local energy generation projects discussed by the committee include, but are not limited to, small-scale hydropower, in-conduit hydropower, methane capture, biomass and solar. Such projects are not intended to conflict with existing low-carbon power purchase agreements but can position cities to pursue local climate action goals and supplement energy needs through renewable generation. Under this recommendation, the LOC will work to identify barriers and potential solutions to local energy generation and will pursue funding assistance for feasibility studies and project implementation.

*Presented by the Energy and Environment Committee*

## M. Local Speed Setting Authority

**Legislation:**
Support legislation that provides legislative authority for ODOT to delegate local speed setting authority to Oregon cities that meet state criteria. I Improve safety and speed limit consistency in Oregon cities by establishing a clear delegation process that is consistent with recently adopted statewide speed zone rules. (OAR 734-020-0014, 734-020-0015, and 734-020-0016). This will be permissive legislation allowing cities to opt-in and thus will not be a mandate.

**Background**:
The state of Oregon and cities across the state are all committed to improving safety on our streets. National and international research has shown that setting appropriate speed limits on city streets is a critical tool for improving safety and saving lives. During the 2020 legislative session, HB 4103 gained widespread support for setting up a collaborative process with ODOT and cities that opt into a process for gaining local speed setting authority. Despite strong support, HB 4103 did not pass due to the legislative clock running out. Going forward, LOC will work with safety advocates and cities and use HB 4103 from the 2020 session as a template for legislation in 2021. Delegated authority should be made available to all cities that meet ODOT's criteria; participation by cities is permissive (not required). Cities should be able to determine speeds that are adequate and safe for their communities, working within the OAR speed zone framework. This will improve safety and make speed setting more consistent across local government jurisdictions.

*Presented by the Transportation Committee*

## N. Long Term Transportation Infrastructure Funding

**Legislation:**
Support expansion and consideration of revenue-generating options to fund multimodal transportation infrastructure, which includes state and local facilities. Support state and local projects that are part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

**Background**:
Oregon has made two significant state-wide transportation investments in the last 15 years. In 2009 the Jobs and Transportation Act (JTA). This was a successful effort from local governments and the business community to invest in maintenance and capacity building projects state-wide. In 2017, HB 2017 established Oregon's first ever comprehensive, multimodal, transportation investment with what is known as "Keep Oregon Moving," which was a $5.3 billion package. Although HB 2017 will not have its full funding until 2024 LOC and other transportation advocates will need to constantly explore other sources of revenue including a possible future replacement of Oregon's gas tax with a road user charge system. Oregon has been pioneering a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) tax within the MyOReGo pilot program. The program is voluntary and can provide several benefits to users. Ultimately the long-term structure for transportation investment may well take on a similar structure.

*Presented by the Transportation Committee, endorsed by the Community Development Committee*

## O. Low-Income Energy Efficiency and Affordability Programs

**Legislation:**
The LOC will provide support for programs that seek to expand upon low-income energy and heating assistance programs, including programs targeted to make energy more affordable for rental properties. In addition, the LOC will work to support programs that provide for energy bill payment assistance and expand opportunities for low-income Oregonians to access resources for home weatherization.

**Background:**
According to Oregon Housing & Community Services, approximately 396,182, or about 25 percent of all households, are considered energy-burdened because of their energy-related expenditures (as of 2018). A household is considered energy burdened if six percent or more of its gross income is consumed by energy-related expenses. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Oregon that would have provided additional assistance to low-income homeowners and renters that struggle with energy affordability. Unfortunately, legislation did not pass. The need for such assistance has increased as a result of the economic hardships resulting from COVID-19. In addition to bill payment assistance, there is a need for programs that will support low-income home weatherization in order to make energy bills more affordable in the long-term.

*Presented by the Energy and Environment Committee*

## P. Marijuana Tax Local Rate Limitation Increase

**Legislation:**
The League proposes increasing the current 3% cap on local marijuana taxes. This would give local voters greater choice in choosing a rate that reflects their needs or their community.

**Background:**
Retailers licensed by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) are required to charge a state-imposed retail sales tax of 17 percent for all recreational marijuana sold. Cities and counties (unincorporated areas only) may also impose a local retail sales tax of up to 3%, subject to voter approval. Tax rates for recreational marijuana vary widely across the states, but the total Oregon tax burden at a maximum of 20% is the lowest of West Coast states. Washington imposes a 37% state excise tax, but with a state sales tax of 6.5% and local rates of up to 1.9% the total rate can reach over 45%. California has a retail tax of only 15%, but with a state sales tax of 7.5% and local taxes up to 15.25% the total rate can reach up to 37.75%. Oregon consistently ranks among the lowest of the states for marijuana prices. Cities are sensitive to the desire to not push consumers to the black market and will work with the legislature on an increased cap that balances that concern with local revenue needs.

*Presented the Finance and Tax Committee*

## Q. Mental Health Service Delivery

**Legislation:**
Support the delivery of mental health services in order to reduce negative police interactions and ensure that those in need receive the help they require.

**Background:**
The Committee and the LOC membership have prioritized the delivery of mental health services periodically over the last 5 years. Items contained in this priority have included crisis intervention training for police officer, mobile police and social worker teams to proactively work with people in danger of going into crisis, jail diversion, mental health courts and greater access to care. In the immediate past short session, the LOC worked with its coalition partners to obtain $9 million in additional funding for aid-and-assist, community care and jail diversion but was unsuccessful due to a lack of quorum.

While the measurements are subjective and not in general agreement, most surveys of behavioral health and alcohol and drug addiction service availability place Oregon near or at the bottom of state rankings. As a result, Oregon ranks third in the nation for alcohol related deaths, and above the national average in suicides. Anecdotally, most police chiefs that have participated in LOC conversations on this topic report a growing number of calls for service stemming from people in mental health crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated some of these issues with Portland Police Bureau reporting a 41% increase in suicide related calls (including attempts and threats) over this time last year. This priority would include but not be limited to:

Investment: The stark truth is that Oregon has never financially supported mental health services at a level commensurate with need. More beds and more capacity will allow for greater delivery. The spending plan may be complicated but many advocates bristle at the idea of "mental health reform" when it's never been funded as a priority. The League does not have a specific number at this time but is in conversation with partners to develop one.

Decimalization of Mental Illness: People suffering from mental illness that interact with the criminal justice system typically spend more time incarcerated and suffer a disruption in treatment. Jail diversion has been something the League has advocated for in previous sessions and but will require changes in law, training and investments.

Workgroups Outcomes: There are currently several workgroups developing behavioral health reform plans that have yet to be completed, much of that work has been interrupted by COVID 19. LOC staff can update the Committee on these their work continues but cannot make recommendations on them now.

Alcohol Availability: The prevalence of cheap and potent alcoholic beverages that are produced and sold for the express purpose of achieving rapid intoxication has been a concern for Oregon Recovers, an advocacy group for those recovering from addiction. OLCC sells several 750 ml bottles for under $10 and some as low as $5. Creating a minimum price per international unit of alcohol has had an impact on consumption of cheap, potent beverages in Scotland and is believed to have had an impact on consumption there. Raising the price of low cost but high-volume products would also increase city shared revenue and provide additional funding for behavioral health services.

Mental Health Parity: Oregon and the federal government have enacted statutes to ensure that mental health services are treated as a health issues in a manner identical to physical health by health insurers. The legislative intent behind these laws has not been met as evidence by reports of denied coverage. Ensuring effective parity would increase treatment an access.

*Presented by the General Government/Human Resources Committee, endorsed by the Community Development Committee*

## R. Municipal Broadband and Pole Protection

**Legislation:**
Oppose legislative efforts to restrict existing municipal authority to provide broadband services, and own and operate poles in the rights-of-way.

**Background:**
As the public grows more dependent on the Internet for expanding parts of their lives, community choices for gaining access at a reasonable price, for both consumers and producers, are dwindling. Some municipalities choose to become service providers themselves. Municipal broadband is sometimes the only way to bring high speed internet to a community and it can serve as an access point to neighboring communities. Additionally, municipal broadband adds competition to the market and can help lower prices for community members. As there is a push for more connectivity and bridging the digital the divide, the LOC will protect localities rights to be internet service providers for their own communities. Additionally, as more and more small cell and 5G technology is deployed in the rights-of-way, the LOC will protect the right of municipalities to own, operate and regulate attachments that are allowed on their poles.

*Presented by the Telecom, Broadband & Cable Committee*

## S. New Mobility Services

**Legislation:**
Support for a variety of new mobility services that promote a safe, sustainable, and equitable multimodal transportation system, while preserving local government's authority to regulate services and ensure they best serve the local context.

**Background:**
Transportation mobility has been rapidly changing over the last few years. The emergence of ridesharing services such as Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) now provide the public with more options to get from point "a" to point "b." New platforms continue to emerge such as scooters, shared bikes, electric delivery tricycles for package delivery and the possibility of future driverless delivery and vehicle fleets. Cities must have the flexibility to address the impacts of emerging technologies on their communities such as increased congestion and air pollution while protecting consumers and maintaining a safe transportation network that recognizes the unique needs of individual communities.

*Presented by the Transportation Committee*

## T. Photo Enforcement Safety Cameras

**Legislation:**
Support continuation and expansion of fixed speed and red-light cameras and mobile speed radar state-wide to improve public safety in high-crash corridors. Explore changes that enable more streamlined processing of citations. Allow for local governments to form IGA's with other local governments to facilitate the use of safety cameras and mobile radar in their communities.

**Background:**
The Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan sets a goal of no deaths or life-changing injuries on Oregon's transportation system by 2035. In 2015, the Oregon Legislature granted the city of Portland the authority to implement a fixed speed safety camera program (HB 2621). Portland's fixed speed camera systems have been operating on "urban high crash corridors" for the past several years. Data collected at these locations shows a distinct change in driver behavior that has reduced the risk of collisions (See PBOT Report). Under existing statutes, photo radar is allowed in the cities of Albany, Beaverton, Bend, Eugene, Gladstone, Medford, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Portland and Tigard. LOC's goal is to bring this authority state-wide providing all cities with the choice of operating speed radar in their communities to improve safety and reduce the risk of high-speed crashes.

*Presented by the Transportation Committee*

## U. Property Tax Reform

**Legislation:**
The League of Oregon Cities proposes that the Legislature refer a constitutional measure and take statutory action to reform the property tax system as part of the 2021 session. With the passage of the Corporate Activities Tax Oregon has taken a step towards long term financial stability at the state and school district level, but local budgetary challenges persist and the legislature must take action to allow cities and other local governments to adequately fund the services that residents demand.

**Background:**
The property tax system is broken and in need of repair due to Measures 5 and 50, which are both now over 20 years old. The current system is inequitable to property owners and jurisdictions alike, is often inadequate to allow jurisdictions to provide critical services, removes all local choice, and is incomprehensible to the majority of taxpayers. Local governments and schools rely heavily on property tax revenues to pay for services and capital expenses. Therefore, the League will take a leadership role in forming coalitions to help draft and advocate for

both comprehensive and incremental property tax reform option packages. The League will remain flexible to support all legislation that improves the system, with a focus on a property tax package that includes, but may not be limited to these elements:

- To restore local choice, a system that allows voters to adopt tax levies and establish tax rates outside of current limits and not subject to compression (requires constitutional referral).
- To achieve equity, a system that has taxpayers' relative share tied to the value of their property, rather than the complex and increasingly arbitrary valuation system based on assessed value from Measure 50 (requires constitutional referral).
- To enhance fairness and adequacy, a system that makes various statutory changes, some of which would adjust the impact of the above changes. For example, as a part of comprehensive reform the League supports a new reasonable homestead exemption (percentage of RMV with a cap) but also supports limiting or repealing various property tax exemptions that do not have a reasonable return on investment.

*Presented by the Finance and Tax Committee, endorsed by the Community Development Committee*

## V. Reducing Wastewater Impacts from Wipes and Other "Non-Flushables"

**Legislation:**
The LOC will work with other stakeholders, including the Oregon Association of Clean Water Agencies address challenges resulting from wipes and other non-flushable items. Legislation pursued will likely focus on requirements for manufacturers to clearly label product packaging to indicate that the product should not be flushed, however, the LOC will additionally explore other viable opportunities to address the public health, environmental and economic challenges resulting from improper disposal of these products.

**Background:**
In recent years, public wastewater systems have experienced significant increases in sewer line clogs, environmental impacts, infrastructure impacts and costs associated with wipes being flushed down toilets. Most wipes don't break down when flushed, and even wipes that are labeled as "flushable" can clog pipelines and pumps and can cause sewage overflows in residences and the environment. The COVID-19 pandemic has made this challenge even worse due to shortages of toilet paper and increased use of disinfecting wipes. The EPA and other national organizations, as well as statewide and local wastewater agencies, are working to get the message out to avoid costly as well as environmental impacts of wipes in our sewer and treatment systems. In March of 2020, the state of Washington passed legislation requiring manufacturers to label products with a "do not flush" logo if the product does not meet national "flushability" standards (i.e. breaking down in the sewer system).

*Presented by the Water/Wastewater Committee*

## W. Right-of-Way/Franchise Fees Authority Preservation

**Legislation:**
Oppose legislation that, in any way, preempts local authority to manage public rights-of-way and cities' ability to set the rate of compensation for the use of such rights-of-way.

**Background:**
In its commitment to the protection of Home Rule and local control, the LOC consistently opposes restrictions on the rights of cities to manage their own affairs. From time to time, in the context of public rights-of-way management authority discussions, legislative proposals to restrict this authority arise. Efforts to restrict local authority often include proposals for a statewide right-of-way access policy and compensation system as well as limiting the ability of cities to charge fees of other government entities. This is contrary to local government management authority; the ability to enter into agreements with users of the right-of-way either by agreement/contract or ordinance; to set terms of right-of-way use and to set the rate of compensation. In recent

years the FCC has passed rulemaking through various orders like the Small Cell Orders (FCC 18-133 and FCC 18-111) and the Cable Franchising Order (FCC 19-80) that erode cities' right-of-way and franchising authority. Local governments around the U.S. are fighting these orders in court. There is a fear that the language of these orders will be codified in state legislatures. This would mean if the orders are overturned in court at the federal level, they will still impact cities in states that have passed laws codifying the orders.

*Presented by the Telecom, Broadband & Cable Committee*

## X. State Highway Funds Formula

**Legislation:**
Consider opening the state highway fund distribution formula to allow for an additional percentage to cities. Currently the split is 50-30-20 with the State receiving 50%, Counties receiving 30% and the balance going to Cities 20%.

**Background:**
Oregon has had a distribution formula for the state highway fund for decades. This fund combines the revenues generated from the state's gas tax, weight-mile tax on heavy trucks, licenses, fees, and bond proceeds. Approximately 77 percent of the total revenue collected by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is from state sources, while only 23 percent comes from federal sources. During the 2017 session base level funding for the least populated counties was established along with a $5 million-dollar small city fund for cities under 5,000 in population with a maximum award of $100,000 and no match requirement. LOC will engage with other transportation interests to determine if there is adequate support to advance legislation that would revisit the current 50-30-20 distribution.

*Presented by the Transportation Committee*

## Y. Tort Liability Reform

**Legislation:**
COVID-19 and existing federal court decisions have added risk exposure to cities in areas where their authority has been limited or have not received adequate support. This priority seeks to ensure that cities are not held liable in these areas.

**Background:**
CIS has already had a COVID related claim filed against it for a COVID related exposure. While there may be many legitimate reasons for a person to seek damages related to the outbreak, local governments have been hampered by inadequate supplies of PPE, testing capability, direct financial support, and legislative relief.

Additionally, the Boise decision that prevents cities from enforcing no camping rules and ordinances subject cities to additional tort liability. The ruling holds that if a person has no place else to go, a city must allow them to sleep somewhere. While there is a logical basis for the core of the ruling, if a city allows a person to sleep in an area that is not designed for camping, such as a park, the person may seek damages. Please note that recreational users of parks may not seek damages due to Oregon's recreational immunity statute that were corrected in 2017.

Finally, in previous sessions, legislation has been introduced but not passed to require cities to permit shelters in areas where they may not be appropriate and "codify" the Boise decision in state law. This legislation did not include immunity from tort liability while removing city authority.

*Presented by the General Government/Human Resources Committee*

## Z. Water Utility Rate and Fund Assistance

**Legislation:**
The League will work during the 2021 legislative session to provide water utility funding assistance for ratepayers that are experiencing ongoing or recent economic hardships. In addition, the LOC will work to identify opportunities for additional investments in public infrastructure, including water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater management, green infrastructure opportunities and resilience for water systems. Finally, the LOC Water & Wastewater Policy Committee has identified a need for additional, targeted grant funding assistance that will benefit smaller communities. This includes additional funding to conduct rate studies, feasibility studies and funding to help communities comply with new regulatory requirements, including the requirement to include a seismic risk assessment and mitigation plan within regular water master plan updates.

**Background:**
In response to economic impacts associated with the spread of COVID-19, many of Oregon's drinking water and wastewater utility providers have offered additional assistance to ratepayers. The LOC is aware that most water utility providers have temporarily ceased water service shut offs (disconnections) for non-payment or past due bill collection during this period of economic hardship. Impacts associated with residential ratepayer revenue losses and decreased water consumption from businesses that have either closed or limited operations has resulted in revenue losses for many Oregon water utility providers. Some water utilities have outstanding debt from prior infrastructure investments and have expressed concerns that reductions in revenue may impact the ability to make the ongoing debt payments. In addition, the economic hardships that are being experienced by many Oregonians, especially in low-income and minority communities, will be ongoing; highlighting the need for additional ratepayer assistance investments that focuses on equity and our most vulnerable populations.

The LOC will work to identify funding for water utility ratepayer assistance and will work to establish a framework for the distribution of funds and will seek to ensure that this crisis does not exacerbate existing inequities, especially for Black, Indigenous, other Communities of Color and for rural Oregonians.

In addition, while COVID-19 has created unique revenue challenges for water utility providers, a key issue that most cities continue to face is how to fund infrastructure improvements (including maintaining, repairing and replacing existing infrastructure and building new infrastructure to address capacity and regulatory requirements). Increasing resources in programs that provide access to lower-rate loans and infrastructure-specific grants will assist cities in investing in vital infrastructure improvements which will also help bolster economic recovery. Infrastructure development impacts economic development, housing, and livability. The level of funding for these programs has been inadequate compared to the needs over the last few biennia and the funds are depleting and unsustainable without significant program modifications and reinvestments.

The LOC will pursue additional funding through the state's Special Public Works Fund, which provides funding assistance through Business Oregon for a variety of public infrastructure needs and will explore state bonding capacity opportunities for water-specific infrastructure needs. In addition, LOC will pursue funding for small communities that face regulatory and operational challenges. Examples of small-community funding assistance opportunities may include expanded grant opportunities through existing funding programs and additional funding assistance to help communities with regulatory compliance and engage in utility best practices, including rate studies.

*Presented by the Water/Wastewater Committee, endorsed by the Community Development Committee*