



**SUMMARY OF
BPA’S PROPOSED
CHANGES TO
AVERAGE SYSTEM
COSTS**

Sharing low-cost power from federal dams among all homes and farms in the Northwest was a key principle in the Regional Power Act. This principle could be destroyed by changes the Bonneville Power Administration proposes to make to the method used to share the power. A new regional spirit of cooperation to solve energy problems and meet future energy needs will likely suffer as well.

BPA wants to cut by more than half the benefits PGE’s home and farm customers receive under the Regional Power Act. The result would be a rate increase of as much as 38 percent. At the same time, BPA plans to do this in a way that ignores time limits and public participation requirements in the Regional Power Act.

The Regional Power Act was the result of five years of intensive negotiations. Compromise among the major energy producers and users in the region was a key to its passage by Congress. Publicly owned utilities wanted to protect their rights to low-cost federal power. Aluminum smelters needed new long-term power contracts with BPA. Their existing power contracts were about to expire and weren’t going to be renewed. PGE and other investor-owned utilities wanted their customers to have equal access to the low-cost power from federal projects that had been built with taxpayer funds.

**Negotiation
and compromise**

Negotiation led to a compromise acceptable to all three groups. Continued preferential access to federal power is now guaranteed for the public utilities. Aluminum smelters now have new long-term contracts. In turn, the smelters have given up some of their share of the power from the federal hydro projects and as a result are paying higher rates.

Homes and farms served by investor-owned utilities can now receive the benefits of the low-cost hydropower that once had gone to the aluminum companies. This is handled through an “exchange agreement.” BPA sells power to the investor-owned utilities, like PGE, at the same low rate it sells power to public utilities. In turn, BPA buys power from PGE at the average of all the Company’s costs for generating and transmitting power; its “average system cost”. The difference in cost is added to BPA’s



other rates, primarily the aluminum companies’. PGE’s customers are credited directly for the savings and receive them dollar for dollar. There is no increase or change in the utility’s profits.

Now BPA wants to change the way it has agreed to determine average system costs. The end result: up to 38 percent higher rates for PGE’s customers. Under the existing method of determining average system costs, homes and farms throughout the Northwest can expect to save some \$256 million in 1984-1985. These benefits will be cut to \$35 million if BPA goes forward with its plans.

To justify the changes, BPA claims the existing method costs its other customers too much. Surprisingly, however, the cost of the exchange during 1984 is only a fraction of the \$400 million BPA said it expected to pay during Congressional hearings on the Act.

Checks and balances

Consultation among everyone concerned was the foundation for developing the existing average system cost methodology. The cornerstone was an agreement to rely on decisions made by the regulatory commissions in each Northwest state. This was agreed to because the states’ decisions best reflect the utilities’ cost of serving their customers. A system of checks and balances requiring review by state public utility commissions, BPA, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, a review board from the four Northwest states and potentially the courts, provides opportunities for adjustments and prevents any abuse of the exchange agreements.

Now BPA wants the authority to arbitrarily set the price it pays for the electricity it buys under the exchange agreements. At the same time, BPA wants to keep the right to set its own price for selling electricity.

BPA hopes to make its changes without regard to the time limits and the open discussion process it agreed to in the original contracts. In the BPA Administrator’s decision on the original average system cost methodology, he states, “. . . No effort to change the methodology may begin prior to one year after FERC’s approval of any current methodology.”



**No time for
discussion**

Contradicting its agreements, BPA wants to make its changes in the summer of 1984. By the rules already agreed to, the process should not even start until at least September 1984. And it should include detailed, open discussions among all interested groups and involve the Northwest Power Planning Council. All of these steps are called for in the Act.

In its new schedule, BPA grants only 45 days to comment on its proposal and only 30 days to respond to comments by other parties. The hurried schedule appears designed so BPA can have the changes in effect early this summer.

Interestingly, BPA’s changes come just in time for the start of an important rate period for the aluminum smelters. The Regional Act sets July 1, 1984 to July 1, 1985 as the time to set the “floor rate” for the smelters. Their rates from BPA can never fall below this floor rate. Consequently, the smelters would pay about \$900 million less to BPA during the next decade if BPA’s proposal goes into effect. But other customers, including the homes and farms served by PGE, would have to pay \$900 million more.

Unrealistic methods of determining costs are proposed by BPA in several areas. In fact, BPA plans to use a double standard. If the federal agency were to apply similar standards to itself, it would have to lower its own rates by 54 percent.

Clearly, BPA’s proposal violates the spirit and the intent of the Regional Power Act and many associated agreements. BPA must not be allowed to go through with its plans.

CALL TO ACTION

BPA Administrator Peter Johnson is the proponent of these changes that would so dramatically affect the electric rates of each of us. But the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has final say over rates under the Regional Power Act.

Members of Congress from the Northwest, many of whom worked hard to pass the Act, are interested and concerned about the effect of rates on each of us.

Join us in urging these decision makers to conduct a complete, open and unbiased review of the effect of the proposed changes■

THE FACTS ABOUT BPA'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO AVERAGE SYSTEM COSTS

Drastic changes are being proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration to one of the agreements stemming from the Regional Power Act. Every electric consumer in the Pacific Northwest would feel the effects in some way. Here are the facts about BPA's plans:

- Rates would increase as much as 38 percent for the homes and farms served by Portland General Electric Co.
- The higher rates paid by the home and farm customers will be used to lower rates for the aluminum companies and other industries served directly by BPA.
- BPA's proposal uses a double standard. If BPA were to apply the same standards to itself, it would have to lower its rates by 54 percent.
- BPA plans to make the changes as early as the summer of 1984. Earlier agreements with BPA, however, prohibit it from even starting the process to make the changes until at least September 1984.
- Lowering the rate by this summer allows BPA to lower its rate to the aluminum companies by \$900 million over the next decade. Other customers, including the homes and farms served by PGE, will end up paying that much more.
- BPA would be the agency deciding how much it pays to buy power instead of the state regulatory commissions.
- Utilities could be forced into BPA conservation programs that are inferior to the utilities' own programs and are not cost-effective for their customers.
- Regional Power Act requirements to include the Northwest Power Planning Council and all interested parties in the negotiation process are being ignored by BPA.
- Instead of the more open and detailed discussion process called for in the Regional Power Act, BPA has granted only limited time for review and comment on its proposal.



**Portland General Electric
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204**

AVERAGE SYSTEM COSTS: BPA'S ONE-SIDED PROPOSAL

"BPA's plan to change average system cost methodology ignores the premise of the Regional Power Act: regional teamwork and compromise. The end result would mean a rate increase of up to 38 percent rate increase for residential and small-farm customers and dampen the region's spirit of power planning and sharing."

MEMO

TO: City Council

DATE: April 10, 1984

FROM: City Manager

SUBJECT: Resolution for PGE

The attached resolution is requested by our PGE representative. The information attached is self-explanatory. Due to the need for the passage of this resolution we will discuss it at our April 26, 1984 seminar.

25


Michael Warren
City Manager

MW/bjm

Enc.

JME

DRAFT

3/29/84

RESOLUTION re ASC/BPA

WHEREAS, hundreds of thousands of Oregonians have and should continue to benefit from the power exchange provisions of the Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980;

WHEREAS, the extent of these benefits for residential and rural customers has been determined by a methodology developed by the utility regulatory commissions of the four Northwest states and approved by the Bonneville Power Administration on August 26, 1981;

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator is now unilaterally proposing a complete revision of ~~that~~ ^{The} methodology which would substantially increase residential and rural electric customers up to as much as 38 percent and deny these ratepayers the full benefits of the power exchange provisions promised under the Act;

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator has not provided sound justification for proposing changes in the current power exchange methodology, nor has he accepted reasonable requests for impartial hearings on this BPA directed revision;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

_____ is/are opposed to the arbitrary and biased revision to the current residential and rural power exchange methodology proposed by the administrator, and we call upon the administrator to either withdraw this unfair proposal, or at least permit adequate time and circumstances for full and independent public hearings on this change before he allows this intolerable, discriminatory provision to occur this July.

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE UNILATERAL REVISION OF THE METHODOLOGY GOVERNING THE POWER OF EXCHANGE PROVISIONS OF THE NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING CONSERVATION ACT OF 1980.

WHEREAS, hundreds of thousands of Oregonians have and should continue to benefit from the power exchange provisions of the Northwest Electric Power Planning and conservation act of 1980; and

WHEREAS, the extent of these benefits for residential and rural customers has been determined by a methodology developed by the Utility Regulatory Commissions of the four northwest states and approved by the Bonneville Power Administration on August 26, 1981; and

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator is now unilaterally proposing a complete revision of the methodology which would substantially increase the rates paid by residential and rural electric customers up to as much as 38% over their current billings and deny these rate payers the full benefits of the power exchange provisions promised under the act; and

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator has not provided sound justification for proposing changes in the current power exchange methodology, nor has he accepted reasonable requests for impartial hearings on this BPA directed revision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, as follows, to-wit:

1. That the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, is opposed to the arbitrary and biased revision to the current residential and rural power exchange methodology proposed by the Bonneville Power Administrator, and we call upon the Bonneville Power Administrator to either withdraw this unfair proposal, or at least permit time and circumstances for full and independent public hearings on this change before the Bonneville Power Administrator allows this intolerable, discriminatory revision of methodology to occur this July of 1984.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, this 25th day of April, 1984.

Arvilla Page - City Recorder

Bull

AGENDA
NEWBERG CITY COUNCIL
GOAL SETTING WORK SESSION #2

Wednesday, 6:00 P.M.
Council Chambers

April 25, 1984
Newberg, Oregon

1. Place Dinner Order 6:00 p.m.
2. Call to Order ----- Mayor Hall 6:10
3. Resolution: Opposing the unilateral revision
of the methodology governing the power of
exchange provisions of the Northwest Electric
Power Planning Conserv ation Act of 1980-----Mike Warren 6:15
4. Determine Discussion Date for Sewer
Bond Payment-----Mike Warren 6:20
5. Review Last Meeting's Decisions (attached)-----Mike Warren 6:25
6. Progress Report--PLANNING-----Clay Moorhead 6:40
7. Progress Report--LIBRARY-----Doreen Turpen *Hang up* 7:25
8. Progress Report--ATTORNEY-----Rick Faus *omit* 7:55
9. BREAK----- 8:15
10. Progress Report--FINANCE -----Brenda Stroud 8:25
11. Progress Report--RECORDER-----Arvilla Page 8:45
12. Other Business.-- 9:05
 - a. Confirm Next Meeting
 - b.
 - c.
13. Adjournment----- 9:15

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, May 3, 1984 - 6:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Subjects: Police, Fire; Procedures for Special Projects;
Informal Meetings with Manager.

Council =

*Mayor
Mike*

*Clay
Doreen*

Rick

Brenda

Arvilla

Alan Hershey

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE UNILATERAL REVISION OF THE METHODOLOGY GOVERNING THE POWER OF EXCHANGE PROVISIONS OF THE NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING CONSERVATION ACT OF 1980.

WHEREAS, hundreds of thousands of Oregonians have and should continue to benefit from the power exchange provisions of the Northwest Electric Power Planning and conservation act of 1980; and

WHEREAS, the extent of these benefits for residential and rural customers has been determined by a methodology developed by the Utility Regulatory Commissions of the four northwest states and approved by the Bonneville Power Administration on August 26, 1981; and

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator is now unilaterally proposing a complete revision of the methodology which would substantially increase the rates paid by residential and rural electric customers up to as much as 38% over their current billings and deny these rate payers the full benefits of the power exchange provisions promised under the act; and

WHEREAS, the Bonneville Power Administrator has not provided sound justification for proposing changes in the current power exchange methodology, nor has he accepted reasonable requests for impartial hearings on this BPA directed revision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, as follows, to-wit:

1. That the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, is opposed to the arbitrary and biased revision to the current residential and rural power exchange methodology proposed by the Bonneville Power Administrator, and we call upon the Bonneville Power Administrator to either withdraw this unfair proposal, or at least permit time and circumstances for full and independent public hearings on this change before the Bonneville Power Administrator allows this intolerable, discriminatory revision of methodology to occur this July of 1984.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, this 25th day of April, 1984.

Arvilla Page - City Recorder

DECISIONS OF NEWBERG CITY COUNCIL

GOAL SETTING WORKSHOP

April 18, 1984

This year's process shall seek to:

1. Hear progress reports from all Department Heads, ask questions, list issues that should be considered for prioritization in the 1984-85 goals.
2. "Shake down" the existing list by a) deleting accomplished goals, b) adding new goals, c) reprioritizing the list.
3. Discuss and develop procedures to guide councilmembers on how to seek action on a special project.
4. Consider whether Council and the City Administrator should schedule regular informal meetings of the whole Council, the sole purpose of which would be to hear administrative progress reports and to ask questions re administrative action and schedules.

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE 1984-85 GOALS

1. Mapping
2. Villa Road
3. Hancock and Main
4. Annexation of "islands"

Prepared by
A. Hershey
4/19/84

SUMMARY OF BPA'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO AVERAGE SYSTEM COSTS

Sharing low-cost power from federal dams among all homes and farms in the Northwest was a key principle in the Regional Power Act. This principle could be destroyed by changes the Bonneville Power Administration proposes to make to the method used to share the power. A new regional spirit of cooperation to solve energy problems and meet future energy needs will likely suffer as well.

BPA wants to cut by more than half the benefits PGE's home and farm customers receive under the Regional Power Act. The result would be a rate increase of as much as 38 percent. At the same time, BPA plans to do this in a way that ignores time limits and public participation requirements in the Regional Power Act.

The Regional Power Act was the result of five years of intensive negotiations. Compromise among the major energy producers and users in the region was a key to its passage by Congress. Publicly owned utilities wanted to protect their rights to low-cost federal power. Aluminum smelters needed new long-term power contracts with BPA. Their existing power contracts were about to expire and weren't going to be renewed. PGE and other investor-owned utilities wanted their customers to have equal access to the low-cost power from federal projects that had been built with taxpayer funds.

Negotiation and compromise

Negotiation led to a compromise acceptable to all three groups. Continued preferential access to federal power is now guaranteed for the public utilities. Aluminum smelters now have new long-term contracts. In turn, the smelters have given up some of their share of the power from the federal hydro projects and as a result are paying higher rates.

Homes and farms served by investor-owned utilities can now receive the benefits of the low-cost hydropower that once had gone to the aluminum companies. This is handled through an "exchange agreement." BPA sells power to the investor-owned utilities, like PGE, at the same low rate it sells power to public utilities. In turn, BPA buys power from PGE at the average of all the Company's costs for generating and transmitting power; its "average system cost". The difference in cost is added to BPA's

other rates, primarily the aluminum companies'. PGE's customers are credited directly for the savings and receive them dollar for dollar. There is no increase or change in the utility's profits.

Now BPA wants to change the way it has agreed to determine average system costs. The end result: up to 38 percent higher rates for PGE's customers. Under the existing method of determining average system costs, homes and farms throughout the Northwest can expect to save some \$256 million in 1984-1985. These benefits will be cut to \$35 million if BPA goes forward with its plans.

To justify the changes, BPA claims the existing method costs its other customers too much. Surprisingly, however, the cost of the exchange during 1984 is only a fraction of the \$400 million BPA said it expected to pay during Congressional hearings on the Act.

Checks and balances

Consultation among everyone concerned was the foundation for developing the existing average system cost methodology. The cornerstone was an agreement to rely on decisions made by the regulatory commissions in each Northwest state. This was agreed to because the states' decisions best reflect the utilities' cost of serving their customers. A system of checks and balances requiring review by state public utility commissions, BPA, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, a review board from the four Northwest states and potentially the courts, provides opportunities for adjustments and prevents any abuse of the exchange agreements.

Now BPA wants the authority to arbitrarily set the price it pays for the electricity it buys under the exchange agreements. At the same time, BPA wants to keep the right to set its own price for selling electricity.

BPA hopes to make its changes without regard to the time limits and the open discussion process it agreed to in the original contracts. In the BPA Administrator's decision on the original average system cost methodology, he states, "... No effort to change the methodology may begin prior to one year after FERC's approval of any current methodology."

No time for discussion

Contradicting its agreements, BPA wants to make its changes in the summer of 1984. By the rules already agreed to, the process should not even start until at least September 1984. And it should include detailed, open discussions among all interested groups and involve the Northwest Power Planning Council. All of these steps are called for in the Act.

In its new schedule, BPA grants only 45 days to comment on its proposal and only 30 days to respond to comments by other parties. The hurried schedule appears designed so BPA can have the changes in effect early this summer.

Interestingly, BPA's changes come just in time for the start of an important rate period for the aluminum smelters. The Regional Act sets July 1, 1984 to July 1, 1985 as the time to set the "floor rate" for the smelters. Their rates from BPA can never fall below this floor rate. Consequently, the smelters would pay about \$900 million less to BPA during the next decade if BPA's proposal goes into effect. But other customers, including the homes and farms served by PGE, would have to pay \$900 million more.

Unrealistic methods of determining costs are proposed by BPA in several areas. In fact, BPA plans to use a double standard. If the federal agency were to apply similar standards to itself, it would have to lower its own rates by 54 percent.

Clearly, BPA's proposal violates the spirit and the intent of the Regional Power Act and many associated agreements. BPA must not be allowed to go through with its plans.

CALL TO ACTION

BPA Administrator Peter Johnson is the proponent of these changes that would so dramatically affect the electric rates of each of us. But the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has final say over rates under the Regional Power Act.

Members of Congress from the Northwest, many of whom worked hard to pass the Act, are interested and concerned about the effect of rates on each of us.

Join us in urging these decision makers to conduct a complete, open and unbiased review of the effect of the proposed changes■

THE FACTS ABOUT BPA'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO AVERAGE SYSTEM COSTS

Drastic changes are being proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration to one of the agreements stemming from the Regional Power Act. Every electric consumer in the Pacific Northwest would feel the effects in some way. Here are the facts about BPA's plans:

- Rates would increase as much as 38 percent for the homes and farms served by Portland General Electric Co.
- The higher rates paid by the home and farm customers will be used to lower rates for the aluminum companies and other industries served directly by BPA.
- BPA's proposal uses a double standard. If BPA were to apply the same standards to itself, it would have to lower its rates by 54 percent.
- BPA plans to make the changes as early as the summer of 1984. Earlier agreements with BPA, however, prohibit it from even starting the process to make the changes until at least September 1984.
- Lowering the rate by this summer allows BPA to lower its rate to the aluminum companies by \$900 million over the next decade. Other customers, including the homes and farms served by PGE, will end up paying that much more.
- BPA would be the agency deciding how much it pays to buy power instead of the state regulatory commissions.
- Utilities could be forced into BPA conservation programs that are inferior to the utilities' own programs and are not cost-effective for their customers.
- Regional Power Act requirements to include the Northwest Power Planning Council and all interested parties in the negotiation process are being ignored by BPA.
- Instead of the more open and detailed discussion process called for in the Regional Power Act, BPA has granted only limited time for review and comment on its proposal.



**Portland General Electric
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204**

AVERAGE SYSTEM COSTS: BPA'S ONE-SIDED PROPOSAL

"BPA's plan to change average system cost methodology ignores the premise of the Regional Power Act: regional teamwork and compromise. The end result would mean a rate increase of up to 38 percent rate increase for residential and small-farm customers and dampen the region's spirit of power planning and sharing."

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

A. NCRC

Agenda

Finance & Project Committee Setup

Loan Application Preparation

Loan Program Preparation

Loan Review

Construction Review & Inspections

Draw Down Reviews

Historic Preservation Ordinance Draft

Budget Preparation - Departmental/NCRC

PR

Volunteer

Uptown Merchant Liaison

Follow-Up NCRC Directives

Press Coverage

B. GRANTS

Historic Preservation \$30-35,000

LCDC - Comp Plan/Historic \$6-50,000

Library CBDG Grant \$360,000

Economic Development Grant/Mike

C. PLANNING STRUCTURAL -1983 to date

- 7 - Partitions
- 7 - Variances
- 4 - Annexations
- 8 - Zone Change/Comprehensive Plan Amendments
- 5 - Conditional Use Permits
- 4 - Design Reviews
- 1 - Planned Unit Development
- 2 - Vacations
- 29 - Peddlers Licenses
- 90 - Amusement Device/Cigarette Machines (1984)

D. G-FILES

Home Occupation Standards

CBDG 83

News stands

Church Signs

Main Street ODDA - 83

Cigarette & Amusement Licenses

Highway 99W Bypass/Petition and Committee

Budget 83 & 84

Sewer Allocation Ordinance

Temporary Signs Ordinance

Transfer Station Committee (Newberg/Dundee Disposal Alternatives
Committee)

Corridor Issue

Historic Register Nomination

Turn of Century Survey

Comprehensive Plan Update

Main Street 84

City Planning Directors Association - Responsible for Legislative
Issues

Flood Insurance Mapping

E. ACTIVITIES

Economic promotion & solicitation

Computer review

Technical and legal responses to planning issues

Meetings with developers and prospective developers

Monitoring developments, agreements & contracts

Promote higher quality

Ordinance, Resolution & Staff report writing & research

Keep up with current issues affecting cities

Planning Commission Meetings coordinator

City Council participation

NCRC participation/seminars, packets

Maintaining City image

LID reapportionments

Maintain notice & hearing schedules and deadlines

Referral of PW questions/coordination

Maintaining assessors information update

Research - telephone system, change of economic base, influence of
Portland, etc.

F. CURRENT ISSUES

1. Sewer Treatment Plant

Scheduling of hearings and property deadlines

Scheduling notice & hearing deadlines for review of Sewer
facility plan

Mapping for KCM

Preparation of land use conditional use permit applications

Coordination with county

Preparation of sewer discharge inventory

2. Library

Initial proponent of the turn of the century theme

Participation in the space needs based upon expected
population growth

Design review meeting

Preparation of CDBG for \$360,000 grant application/monitoring

Coordination with NCRC

Street & Lot parking planning

Staff report/notices, referrals for PC review

3. NCRC

Loan review - Bunn/Brown & Tarlow

Budget preparation

Committee scheduling

Turn of the century ordinance preparation

Promotions & PR

4. CURRENT APPLICATIONS

Hal Medici's DR

Chehalem Park & Rec. Partition

Adult Book Store Ordinance

Mobile Retailer Ordinance

Joyful Servant DR

Captain Crunch DR

Otter/Stein Partition

Island annexations/Wilhelmson-Newall

John Coleman Partition - violation

Grant monitoring

G. THINGS TO INITIATE

① ✓ Major Comprehensive Plan Review & Update including UGB changes

② ✓ Traffic/Uptown Area Plan

Airport Area Plan

③ ✓ Public Facilities Plans - legislative mandate

Tourism

Computer

Legislation - annexations, assessment, reapportionments, # of sewer
outfall locations, community entrance signs, condemnation
issues

Development Ordinance Revisions

Overall Bike Plan

Open Space Acquisition

⑤ ✓ Market Analysis

NCRC

Development Fee Schedules - distributed more equitably

Map updating

Historic Inventory

④ + Economic
Develop

total
⑤

*good
Presentation*

4/25/84

TO: CITY MANAGER
CITY COUNCIL

FROM: LIBRARIAN

SUBJECT: GOAL SETTING WORK SESSION

I. REVIEW OF 1983-84 PRIORITIES

Priority
#12

AK

A. Library Building Maintenance

Major items have been noted, budgeted and accomplished.
Some items have been left for renovation as part of the
expansion project.

Identification of projects and budgeting are improved.

Impact of enlarged facility: Will require review of maintenance
schedule; reassessment of necessary manpower and budget;
clarification of responsibilities.

Priority
#18

B. Library volunteers

On-going -- there has been some change in use of volunteers;
role of volunteers needs to continue to be evaluated.
Development of task descriptions has begun -- needs to be
continued and expanded.

Priority
#23-24

AK

C. Library early notification/overdue book control

Objective: develop procedures that track delinquencies and
misuse of materials with minimal impact on staff.

Time schedule for overdues has been created; working closely
to keep it at correct interval

Fine structure is in place

To be done:

1. Work on implementing final step on overdues
2. Internally clarify procedures for maintaining registration
records and overdues
3. Cross-train staff for total overdue procedure

Priority
#31

*AK
(on-going)*

D. Library future plans

Planning is an on-going process -- relationship to other goals
Immediate issues:

1. Board will be addressing operations and policies that will
reflect our changing physical situation, e.g., the
impact of the space and anticipated circulation increase
on staff; programming now possible with expanded facility;
use of technology by both the public and staff...
2. The formation of a district--should involve creation of
of committee to study the issue (don't groan!), development
of a support group; will require two elections--one for
formation of the district, a second for funding.

Priority
#34

- E. Library information processing
 - Budget reserve for future automation
 - Regional library automation plan; commitment for next LSCA funds
 - Use of microcomputer

Priority
#35

- F. Library Building Expansion
 - 1. Role of staff in planning
 - 2. Fund raising
 - 3. Preparing for construction; impact on operations and services

II. DIRECTION FOR 1984-85

In addition to continuing with 1983-84 priorities I expect the Board will be working on:

- A. Adopting a book selection policy; complaint procedures
- B. Formation of a foundation

Internally we will continue to organize and refine procedures and policies:

- A. Internal movement of materials
 - ordering -- cataloging -- processing -- circulation
- B. Collection building;
 - 1. Periodicals -- evaluate and select; transfer acquisitions to a jobber
 - 2. Define subject areas for development
 - 3. Weeding
 - 4. Serials management -- particularly in reference
- C. Programming
 - 1. Maintain quality children's programs
 - 2. Increase school cooperation/communication
 - 3. Develop adult programming
 - 4. Increase public awareness; educate the public on how to use resources
 - 5. Use of cable T.V.
- D. Continue staff development, particularly in reference skills; cross-training of staff

Responsibilities outside the community

- A. Follow legislative actions at both federal and state level
- B. Continue participation on CCRLS Advisory Committee; CCRLS Automation Committee
- C. 1984-85 - Fulfill responsibilities of Pres. of PYM Librarians
- D. Participation in Oregon Library Association; membership committee