

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

September 23, 1999

Washington County Chamber

Councilors Present: Rod Monroe (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Ed Washington, Bill Atherton,

Councilors Absent: Rod Park, David Bragdon, and Jon Kvistad (all excused)

Presiding Officer Monroe convened the Regular Council Meeting at 5:07 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Presiding Officer Monroe explained that three councilors were not present during introductions. Two were traveling to a conference, and Councilor Atherton was on his way to the council meeting. The Council delayed consideration of the minutes until the next meeting. Presiding Officer Monroe apologized for traffic conditions that led to delays in starting the meeting.

Before opening up the public hearing, Presiding Officer Monroe told the public that on the back table there were several pieces of useful information. These materials included a "Protecting the Nature of Our Region" document that listed all the hearings on urban growth matters and the transportation hearings scheduled around the region, a map of the urban area with all the urban reserves and urban growth boundary lands marked clearly, and a map of Urban Reserve 65. He said the Council will not take action on Urban Reserve 65 on September 23, 1999. The ordinance was still in the Growth Management Committee under Councilor McLain's leadership. Any action on it will be postponed, probably until November or December.

Councilor McLain spoke about the Urban Growth Report, it was important for the Council to pass the Metro Code changes, which dealt with urban growth boundary amendments, before the Council took action on this property or some of the other properties that may be coming to them through these hearings that they were going to be having in the next 4 to 5 weeks.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ed Kristovich, 167 NE 12th Ave., Hillsboro, representing 20/20 Hillsboro Task Force, said you folks constantly have meetings at 5 all over the metro area. This meeting excluded an awful lot of citizens because they were working and couldn't get here. He wished that these meetings were at a decent time in the evening when Metro had one out in a neighborhood like Hillsboro.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor McLain said the Council had an MPAC meeting Wednesday, September 22, 1999. One of the issues discussed concerned the Urban Growth Report. They also talked about other elements of the Urban Growth Report, as it was relayed by an outside group that brought an independent study of some of the areas of the Urban Growth Report to the meeting. She said discussion would continue at the next MPAC meeting. They invited some of these outside groups to come and talk to the Council and the Growth Management Committee. Some of their issues would include looking at industrial land, and the adequacy

of other factors and assumptions in the growth report. She said they always welcome outside reviews of any work done at Metro.

6. MINUTES

Consideration of minutes was delayed until the next Regular Metro Council Meeting due to lack of a quorum.

7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 99-812**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro Urban Growth Boundary and the 2040 Growth Concept in Ordinance No. 95-625A in Urban Reserve Area 65 of Washington County.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 99-812. He explained the rules of the public hearing on Ordinance. No. 99-812.

Donald Z. Guthrie, 10070 SW Murdoch St., Tigard, OR 97224, representing Ryland Homes, said this marks the 13th public hearing on site 65. To date, Ryland Homes believed all the information requested regarding this proposal had been submitted, provided and thoroughly analyzed. Many questions had been asked and many questions had been answered. Councilor McLain, as Chair of the Growth Management Committee was familiar with the details of this urban growth boundary expansion proposal. However, for the benefit of councilors who weren't on the Growth Management Committee or members of the public who had not participated in the last year or year and a half with the process, he wished to make some brief comments to some main issues. Regarding transportation, there were two main road projects in this area - the widening of 185th and the widening of Springville Road. Both projects were on Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. Both projects were needed regardless of whether site 65 was ever developed. Springville Road was designated as a major collector and it currently was single loaded. For those who didn't understand what single loaded was that meant it was developed on one half of its side. It was operating inefficiently as a major collector at this time. If site 65 was brought in, Ryland Homes would be developing the other half and widening the other half of Springville Road adjacent to its property. They were also on record and willing to contribute to the widening efforts of 185th. The site was served by bus lines 52 and 67 and also was served by light rail. In conjunction with Beaverton School District, they had integrated an 8 acre site. He noted the blue area on the concept plan. They had also been in discussion with the school district in locating one of the existing parks in the master plan adjacent to the school site to be used efficiently as a playground during the day and as a community park during non-school hours. They were continuing that process with the school district. As confirmed with the productivity analysis done by W.H. Pacific for Metro, site 65 was one of the most cost effective, and by some measurements the most cost effective, site to serve with urban infrastructure in all of the urban reserves. Over 20 percent of this site would be in parks and protected open space, the stream corridor that ran east to west would be fully protected in accordance with Title 3 and was designed currently to include a 200 foot buffer. Councilor Bragdon had praised the natural resource protection measures Ryland had taken into account in this plan. If other councilors were concerned with the natural resource protection of the stream or any portion of site 65 as developed, Ryland believed and understood it could be appropriate and legal to attach conditions of approval to the urban growth boundary amendment expressly stating that the development would be done in accordance with Metro's Title 3. Ryland Homes, along with property owners, the planning staff and elected officials of the city, county and Metro had worked very hard to comply with the process. Ryland had adhered to the 2040 Concept. They had adhered to the design principles that the livability of the land plan was just as important as the home designs. They had received endorsements from city, county and Metro officials. They had received endorsements from parks, afford housing and specialized housing in their efforts to provide affordable housing and specialized housing. They will continue to participate in the process and attend all Site 65 public hearings. He looked forward to the end of the process and the Council's final decision to make site 65 a model 2040 community.

Jim Moyer, 16638 NW Graf St., Portland, OR 97229, made three points. First, an honest label for this proposal would really be urban sprawl area 65. If Urban Reserve Area 65 was intended to provide room for 20 years future growth, why would the homes be built there immediately without first developing

vacant land already within the Metro growth boundary? There was a builder at these meetings who was practically drooling over the opportunity to break ground on 700 new homes in that area. Did that sound like controlled growth or reserved space? This proposal was really nothing more than an attempt by developers to break the Springville Road barrier. If they would build out 109 acres on the north side of Springville, they felt it would be easier and justified continued sprawl into the thousands of acres of farmland bounded by 185th, Kaiser and Germantown Road. This land grab should not be allowed. Two, allowing new peripheral areas to develop first only created more sprawl. If the Council was serious about providing urban growth reserves that worked, then designate any new reserve being added to the periphery of the metro boundary for long-term development only. Specify these new areas must remain undeveloped for 15 years after their creation, then the land that was already within the existing metro boundary will be developed first as it should be. This process would promote infill and limit urban sprawl, which they believed was supposed to be Metro's mandate. It would also give the cities and counties time to catch up their infrastructure before development reached further into the outlying farmland. Third, there was no housing shortage in the Bethany area. Housing shortages were created by market forces, not by the self-serving pronouncements of developers, builders or mayors. Here was what a real housing shortage looked like. Buyers camped out overnight to put deposits on new homes, builders held lotteries to determine who the lucky buyers would be, vacant lots sold quickly and new homes were started promptly, resale homes sold in a few days often with many offers. None of these symptoms were present in the Bethany area. Right now there were five buildable, developed vacant lots within two blocks of his home in Graf Meadows that had been on the market for more than two years without a buyer. He understood that growth would happen, but they expected controlled growth not a headlong rush into urban sprawl. He hoped Council would hold their ground against pressure from greedy speculators and demand clear evidence of need.

George L. Geannopoulos, 17130 NW Springville Rd., Portland, OR 97229, said he lived opposite the proposed expansion. They would like to respectfully request the Council's careful consideration of the implications of bringing URA 65 into the urban growth boundary at this time. Their schools could not handle the number of children they had now. Their roads were dangerous and extremely congested. They needed to catch up on current infrastructure demands before adding more to it. As voters and taxpayers, they were not anxious to have planning demands done by the City of Beaverton where there was no accountability to the voters of this area. A slide showed the current school buildout of the existing homes now. It was irresponsible to be considering still bringing more developable land into the urban growth boundary to further stress our schools and compromise the quality of our children's education. The fact that these developers were proposing a school site was of little consequence. Beaverton School District already had a site available that would help relieve overcrowding of this area, but they did not have money to build the school. He showed a slide of a portable school area that was the Kinder Village for Finley Kindergarten schools to relieve the overcrowding. They urged the community to closely review the implications to Beaverton schools. There was 140 kindergartners in this isolated area in the portable village behind Stoler Middle School because Finley school had no more room. Rock Creek and Finley would be responsible for absorbing the 280 elementary children from area 65. Rock Creek enrollment was growing daily due to development that was going on now. The school was already over-capacity. Finley was closed to new enrollment and was diverting children to the other schools in the Bethany area that were also over-capacity. Area 65 was remanded from LUBA and was not suitable for urban consideration because of the large percentage of resource land. This area being considered was 100 percent resource land. The only piece that was not resource land was the Nulty property, which was .6 percent and was not even being considered to be brought in. This should also be a primary concern to the Council. Let the final decision be made about the legitimacy of the area 65 and urban reserve before bringing in discussions of development. As residents of an area already suffering from piecemeal planning, no playgrounds, lack of connected sidewalks and overcrowded schools, they would like to see all of area 65 thoughtfully planned for livability before it was brought into the urban growth boundary. There were currently over 1,000 units of housing planned and not yet started in the Bethany area. This did not include the housing that was being completed daily on ongoing developments. We needed to stop and take a breath before moving into more. He didn't see a shortage in that area. He didn't understand why the Mayor of Beaverton indicated there was a shortage. The infrastructure of the surrounding area would not support the increased populations from the development area of 65 at this time.

Greg P. Malinowski, 13450 NW Springville Rd., Portland, OR 97229, representing CPO-7, said there were a couple of continuing concerns of the neighborhood. The schools were a very big issue. Schools needed to be an essential service. Council was considering urban service needs next on the agenda, but right now schools needed to be an essential service. Schools needed to be part of essential services. They were in a crisis situation. His son went to these schools. There were 28 kids in a 4th grade class. It wasn't the biggest class. He noted that the City of Beaverton said they were taking responsibility for this, although one could see from where the city limits were to where area 65 was there was a gap. It jumped over a big piece of unincorporated Washington County. If they wanted an urban area to take care of, he didn't know why they couldn't consider one of the areas that currently existed between the urban growth boundary and the city limits, instead of jumping outside it. They were not part of it. They had no representatives. The county was trying to go ahead and work out a deal with them where they could do some things for that area like provide planning. They didn't elect any of those folks. They didn't have a voice. They were visitors and guests when they went to speak to them. There were big infrastructure issues. Half the road was constructed on one side, the side that was already developed. What he meant was they had located a sidewalk about 15 feet off the pavement, and there was gravel filled in between the pavement and the sidewalk. There was not another lane there. The road was just as narrow as it always was. So even if they provided an equal service on the other side, that meant they would have this narrow two-lane road, still with this 12 foot wide gravel swath on each side. It would be extremely dangerous for people who would attempt to use that gravel road like it was a paved road. There was a little ravine there also, and no sidewalk across the ravine. People had to crawl out onto the pavement or shoulder to get to the other side where the sidewalk was. The developers didn't have to put sidewalks in because Washington County agreed to take \$8,000 instead and they would take care of it. They had spent the last three weeks trying to find out who and when they were going to take care of this. Guess what? He could barely get a phone call back. The truth was, they didn't have any plans (to put in a sidewalk) but they got the money. They had a memorial bridge on Cornell Road because some kid was run over. The kid had to get off the side of the road and get on the pavement to cross. That was not a good way to develop the infrastructure. The community raised enough money to finally put a bridge in but they didn't want memorial bridges all over Washington County. Washington County was not prepared to handle the infrastructure load. When they asked Washington County about installing a sidewalk, the county said it was Beaverton's responsibility. When they asked Beaverton, the city said Washington County was ultimately responsible. So, they were having a hard time getting a straight answer. He believed it was all agricultural land. He said it wasn't a good time to develop the property.

Mary Carol Britt, 7770 NW Kaiser, Portland, OR 97229, a neighborhood resident, lived here for seven years and watched the growth from Highway 26 to Springville. She attended quite a few meetings, especially about schools. It seemed like growth in the area was moving so fast and there was so much of it. There was no consideration for the community of people who already lived there. They were constantly stopping for flaggers. The roads were really bad to begin with. And there was an awful lot going on already and so much more slated that hadn't started. Some had started. Some of it hadn't started, like development on the corner of 185th and Springville. There were going to be hundreds of additional homes on that property. There was talk about putting in a fiber optic line and there was so many projects that people wanted to do right in this area. She felt that the schools should be a strong consideration. The Council saw a picture of Kinder Village. If she had kindergarten children, she would not send them there. They were not protected. They were isolated. She was a teacher. She never liked portables. She felt the kids who went to portables were isolated. They were not part of the school. They didn't get a feeling of being in a real school. She was incredibly upset that the kindergarten was over at Stoler Middle School. Moving them behind Stoler had just increased the problems at Finley, because now the kindergartners added tons more kids to the lunchroom. Her daughter was incredibly stressed from having to rush through lunch, not getting the classes she wanted. They had to cut back on everything. Classes were all overcrowded. The teachers were having problems with that. She was not against development, but this area needed a break. They didn't need 700 more houses on Springville now. She suggested completing some of the projects that were already slated, then waiting to see what happened. She said Springville and 185th needed to be widened regardless of the outcome for this 700 house parcel. The school, the parks, that all looked great to her. That was going to take care of the people who lived in that immediate development. It was not going to help the community that was already there or the houses that were just beginning to be built that didn't have any parks or schools included. She had read in the paper the idea that it was not

productive farmland. She had 11 acres of good land. She grew everything. It was wonderful land with no clay. People came to her home and they couldn't believe how wonderful the ground was. She would much rather move over for a tractor than be run off the road by a dirt truck that was overloaded and speeding. They dodged those trucks every day. She hoped that Council could wait on this issue. It looked like a decent project, but it was just not time yet.

Councilor Washington asked Ms. Britt if she could give some thoughts about what would be an appropriate time.

Ms. Britt felt that the developments that were in progress now and the ones that were slated like George (Geannopoulos) suggested, for instance the corner of 185, should continue. They had already been approved. Then some of these other projects should be finished before Council added more stress to the community. They said they were not against development, but they could only handle so much at one time.

Mary Manseau, 5230 NW 137th Ave., Portland, OR, representing CPO-7, said she and CPO-7 opposed inclusion of URA #65 inside the urban growth boundary. (A copy of her written testimony can be found in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Dave Nadal, 3024 SW Florida Ct., #D, Portland, OR 97219, said he had family in Bethany and the Oak Hills area and was concerned about the issue in general. He was confused by the Oregonian article a couple of days ago that made it sound like this decision may not happen or was going to be delayed for weeks or months. This notice was in the Oregonian about two days ago and he had some other people who were interested in testifying as well. He assumed it was going to be delayed until November. His request was for another hearing sometime around 7 p.m. before the actual thing happened, because a number of people may have been misled by the same article. It was quite a news story. It said some people were even claiming victory who were opposed to the project or opposed to the expansion, and that they were being told to not assume that there was any victory. Since he hadn't prepared any testimony, he felt the Council knew what he thought. The whole 2040 program in general was a failure. The assumption that growth was inevitable was a politician's lie. It was totally legal to control growth for quality of life reasons. Recently passed state legislative laws which said they couldn't have a moratorium. When the politicians defer to those state laws, were they down there arguing in Salem to change those laws? No, they were not down there. The City Council of Portland was not down there in Salem to get rid of the moratorium law. He didn't think the Metro Councilors were either. He felt people were unwilling to slow the growth substantially. He said the 2040 plan was a hoax under the guise of a lie. He said they should be able to have a small quality community in Portland and Oregon, and the kind of semi-rural, small town atmosphere that they desired. He said the power structure in Portland and the people who were making some of these decisions had different values than most of the population. That was what was needed to change. In his view, the whole program was completely dishonest. Please vote against expansion.

Bonney Bryan, 5800 SW 213th Ave., Aloha, OR 97007, talked about the Butternut Creek area. Presiding Officer Monroe said he would call on her to speak later.

Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing on Ordinance No. 99-812.

Councilor McLain thanked the audience and those who had already testified for attending the meeting. She also thanked Ryland Homes for attending the meeting. She said Ryland Homes had participated in all 13 hearings, and had always done a very professional job of presenting information to the Metro Council, Multnomah County and others. She thanked them for making the entire process easier to understand.

She noted that the rest of the public had spoken against this particular piece of land. She said the Council would resolve the following issues before they would consider adding the proposed area to the urban growth boundary. She clarified that the Council was working on a state mandate that indicated that they were to have a 20 year supply of urbanizable land. Before they were able to ascertain if more land was needed inside the urban growth boundary, they had to have an update of the growth report. She said the report took into consideration how land was used inside the urban growth boundary, and protection of wetlands and other sensitive lands. The report also determined which current policies indicated that this

particular type of land needed to be protected. She said, because of all those things, the Council was not ready to act on Area 65 right now. She said they would not change the boundary in a light way or a way that would be impractical or irresponsible. She said the Council had worked very hard at making sure this process was fair and equitable. She pointed out that the 65 area had also gone through the test of Multnomah County, which was to bring it inside the jurisdiction of Metro. She said they would be sure that everyone who testified, as well as all others on the 2040 list, were given notice, and they would consider scheduling the meeting at 7 p.m.

Presiding Officer Monroe asked Mr. Cooper to introduce the Metro Code issue.

Councilor Atherton talked about the state mandated 20 year land supply law mentioned by Councilor McLain. He suggested that people who oppose the law should talk to the state and local officials who have supported this legislation. He said it was a state mandate. It was the state that forced the movement of the urban growth boundary. He also said that neighborhood issues, such as pathways and sidewalks, should be dealt with at the local level, because they were not regional concerns. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and discussing these issues.

7.2 **Ordinance No. 99-818A**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Requirements for Urban Growth Boundary Amendments, Urban Reserve Planning Requirements in Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Appendices A and B of the Regional Framework Plan and Metro Code Requirements for Local Government Boundary Changes and Declaring an Emergency.

Mr. Dan Cooper, Legal Counsel, explained Ordinance 99-818A. He said the code amendments amended three substantive areas of Metro's ordinances. They amended the procedures and criteria for amending the urban growth boundary in Chapter 301, the criteria and provisions of Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and Chapter 309 of the Metro Code, which regulated annexations and boundary changes.

Councilor McLain thanked Hillsboro's lawyer and the other staff members for their work on this particular issue. She appreciated the time they spent reviewing the document. She said it was important that everyone understand that the Metro Code indicated what Metro's responsibilities were, and what were responsibilities of the local jurisdictions, when dealing with the urban growth boundary.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on the Code amendment.

Steve Larrance, 20660 SW Kinneman Rd., Aloha, OR 97007, disagreed with removing the concept planning requirement from the Code. He felt the requirement ensured that real life situations and issues would be looked at and favor the ability to provide services for the proposed pattern of development the concept plan laid out. He felt if that requirement was removed there would be no gauge to determine if needed facilities and services could be provided. Another way to provide that gauge without the concept plan would be to assume development at the full build-out based on 2040 design types and then decide whether or not the needed urban facilities at the build-out had been or could be assured by enforceable conditions not simply planned for facilities without funding. He said this was not a new concept and was usually referred to as concurrency. He said the area residents needed to know that expansion needs would be taken care of, not simply wished or hoped for through paper-only planning.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Larrance if he felt the Code adequately addressed the basic issues of build-out and cumulative impacts.

Mr. Larrance felt it did not if the property was taken in before planning because there was no gauge to determine the needs. He said perhaps they could think about substituting the concept plan with 2040 principles. That could help determine if it would be realistic to provide the facilities.

Councilor Atherton continued to wrestle with the concept of Metro in an enforcing role.

Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing on the Metro Code amendment as nobody else came forward to testify.

8. PUBLIC HEARING ON URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY ISSUES

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on Urban Growth Boundary issues.

Councilor McLain said because of decisions being faced this fall, she would like to focus the testimony to help the Council in their review of the Urban Growth Report in October to assess the need for any changes in the boundary. She also asked for comments regarding the ESA listing or other water quality issues.

Mayor Gordon Faber, City of Hillsboro, confirmed Hillsboro's nomination of the South Hillsboro resolution lands for UGB inclusion. He read his testimony into the record. (A copy of his testimony can be found in the permanent record of this meeting.)

Tim Erwert, Hillsboro City Manager, continued with written testimony regarding inclusion of URA Sites 51 - 55 into the UGB (a copy of this testimony is with the permanent record of this meeting).

Winslow Brooks, Hillsboro Planning Director, continued with written testimony regarding inclusion of URA Sites 51 - 55 into the UGB (a copy of this testimony is with the permanent record of this meeting).

Timothy Sercombe, Hillsboro City Attorney, continued with written testimony regarding inclusion of URA Sites 51 - 55 into the UGB (a copy of this testimony is with the permanent record of this meeting).

Becky Smith, Housing Services Coordinator, spoke to the need for affordable housing. She said the current stock was incredibly inadequate to meet the need and the wait list for subsidized housing was at 1-2 years. These families had to live in outlying areas, thus contributing to traffic, or they were spending way more than they could afford on their housing costs. To illustrate that, she told of a client who worked in retail with a gross income of \$1,200 a month. Of that, she had to pay \$560 for rent and \$620 for child care. That left her with \$20 a month for food and utilities and emergencies. She did not qualify for public assistance so she had no medical benefits or food stamps to help her. She said this woman was at risk of eviction and it was only through emergency programs that she was not homeless at his point. She said 43% of the renters in the County were unable to afford the fair market rent of \$645 for 2 bedrooms. She added that affordable, adequate housing provided a foundation for families. She said there were real people in need and more affordable housing was necessary.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Sercombe about the criteria for the South Hillsboro plan. He wondered what acreage the council felt was a threshold for that.

Mr. Sercombe did not know the precise number. He said his point was there were 3 different bases that the council concluded there was a need for at this particular change, a regional need, the jobs-housing need, and livable community need. He said at least 2 of those were still viable for making the UGB change.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Brooks about the DKS report. He said there had been a tacit admission that right now they were exceeding the limits on the TV Highway.

Mr. Brooks said he had actually said they were likely to exceed limits in the future, and there was no question there needed to be improvements on the highway.

Councilor Atherton asked about the jobs-housing balance ratio in downtown Portland.

Mr. Brooks was not aware of those figures. Ms. Wilkerson said it was approximately 10.

Councilor Atherton asked about reducing the industrial jobs land as a strategy as opposed to increasing housing. He was told they had looked at that, a large portion of the employment area within the Hillsboro was designated in the 2040 plan as a industrial sanctuary and was intended as a major employment center.

Councilor Atherton asked without that if they would approach the balance that Portland had.

Mr. Brooks answered no.

Councilor Atherton said it was part of their job to evaluate that and be sure they were not exceeding the transportation system limits. He noted testimony that addressed the 20 year supply.

Mr. Sercombe said every city had obligations under that bill to inventory and ensure sufficient buildable lands under Goal 10. He reiterated that part of their point was they were seriously out of whack with complying with Goal 10 and HB 2709 to ensure sufficient land to meet housing goals of the statewide planning goal.

Presiding Officer Monroe guided the discussion back to the public hearing.

Councilor Washington added that there were a lot of people who had come to testify and he did not feel it was fair to Q & A the elected officials and not the public. He said he had come to listen to what the public had to say. He said perhaps they should schedule appointments to discuss certain points with the elected officials if necessary.

Robert Millette, 15605 SW Roshak Rd, Tigard, OR 97224, Alternatives to Growth Oregon, read his testimony regarding whether to slow growth or not to grow at all into the record. (A copy of this testimony can be found in the permanent record of this meeting.

Diane Jette, 3605 Pacific Ave., Forest Grove, OR said she was a realtor and the majority of people who came to her looking to buy a house were looking for a large lot or small acreage near the outskirts of the city. Most of them ended up compromising for a small lot in a dense area because that was available. Not expanding the UGB caused potential buyers to compromise in an increasingly unhealthy way. The very things valued, good schools, clean air and water, safe and adequate highways and greenspaces inside the UGB were eroding exactly because of the present level of overcrowding. She urged building necessary housing on the identified and unidentified marginal lands outside the UGB instead of pretending there would be granny flats and flag lots in Dunthorpe.

Hardy Gruen, 24925 SW Ladd Hill Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140, spoke in favor of adding area 45 to the UGB. He wanted to see the development happen in an orderly manner. He believed adding the area to the UGB would help make sure that happened.

Walt Hellman, 2451 SE Clover Ct., Hillsboro, OR 97123, felt the area they had moved to find was being taken away from them. He said poor planning damaged them in other ways as well, undermining confidence. He said the reserve can not handle the additional people planned for the area. Even in theory the transportation would be inadequate.

###

8. PUBLIC HEARING ON URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY ISSUES

Ed Harvey, Harvey Marine, 21250 SW Tualatin Valley Highway, Aloha, OR 97140 said he was a lifelong resident of the area and did not understand why the expansion was not being talked about for in the north. He felt the best way to get to Intel was Highway 26. He said his 8-10 employees were not adding to the traffic mess and he was not going to roll over and leave town.

Don Blanchard, 16490 SW Brookman Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140 spoke about URA 45 near Sherwood. He said many other property owners in his area shared his opinion but he was speaking without their authority. He hoped Metro would take URA 45 into the UGB as it was almost entirely exception land with no EFU land. He said many property owners in the area were willing to participate in development so there would be housing benefit. He noted that the Sherwood area had little available land within its boundary which was affecting housing affordability. He referred to Mr. Millette's point about stopping growth as something he would also like to see, but knew that change was inevitable and had to be dealt with. He hoped Metro's planning process would work.

Bonney Bryan 5800 SW 213th Ave., Aloha, OR 97007, was concerned about the Hillsboro south urban reserve growth and with the traffic on the Tualatin Valley Highway, 209th and Rosa Road. She shared a map of the area. She said she and her husband had hoped 30 years ago when they bought their property that their 5 daughters could eventually build homes on the property. She said now the extension plan for Rosa Road went right over her house and through her bedroom so of course she was concerned about the traffic it would cause. She said when her daughters were attending school the traffic was already so bad she had to meet them a few blocks from home because it was not safe for them to navigate the area to get home by themselves. She noted the traffic had not decreased since then. She was also concerned about the zoning changes that would take place. She said she did not like it when people told her what to do with her property.

Presiding Officer Monroe assured her that Metro had no authority to do zoning, that was a matter of the local jurisdictions.

Doug Draper, Genstar Land Company Northwest, 11515 SW Durham Rd., Suite E-9, Tigard, OR 97224, read his testimony in favor of adding the south Hillsboro urban reserve area into the UGB, including the St. Mary's property, into the record. (A copy of the testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Betty Atteberry, Partners for Sensible Growth and Westside Economic Alliance, Tigard, OR, read her testimony in favor of considering economy and livability of the areas to be included in the UGB into the record. (A copy of her testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Dick Scott 17433 SW Brookman Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140, a longtime homeowner in the UR 45 area. He said it was primarily exception land adjacent to existing urban development already inside the UGB in Sherwood. He said extending utilities into the area was feasible. He said the area was well suited for community development. He said he was in favor of adding area 45 to Metro's UGB and hoped it would happen this year.

Beverly Bookin, 621 SW Morrison, Suite 200, Portland, Or 97205, Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC), read her testimony in favor of adding Area 45 into the UGB. (A copy of her testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Teresa Jaynes Lockwood, 17495 SW Brookman, P.O. Box 1471, Sherwood, OR 97140, testified in favor of adding area 45 into the urban growth boundary. She said the land was all exception land and numerous property owners were in favor of moving the boundary also. She said the area was considered easy to develop topographically, and there was a strong need for a full and complete community that would address the centralized shopping and employment needs of Sherwood.

Ron Crutcher, 1800 NW 167th Pl., #100, Beaverton, OR 97006, was disappointed that the Council was considering asking for a delay or eliminating implementation of the second half of the mandated expansion of the UGB. He felt not seeing the wisdom of completing the expansion was disturbing. He wondered if it was really practical to include the back portion of Dunthorpe or the Grotto or Alpenrose Dairy as buildable inventory. He said there was already a housing shortage if the setbacks were left at 50' so it made sense to expand the boundaries further should the setbacks be 100-200'. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of the average citizen to say supply and demand had no bearing on home prices. Traffic was also a problem that validated the need to finish the expansion. He urged inclusion of this area into the UGB.

Rick Clements, 4185 SW 205th, Aloha, OR 97007, said a large part of this property was to address the high tech industry needs. He noted that people in his area worked in a lot of different outlying places. To say they would all move out was not realistic, at least not for a long time. He said the housing imbalance needed to be addressed but he did not feel this was the best way to do that.

Steve Larrance, 20660 SW Kinnaman Rd., Aloha, OR 97007, Citizens Against Irresponsible Growth, said the people he represented were very concerned and willing to fight this proposal. He said they were not

opposed to growth, they were opposed to not being served. They realized that you can't serve another 22,000 people in the south Hillsboro area without providing offsite transportation improvements, not to mention schools and water, etc. He respectfully disagreed with Mr. Brooks on his take on the DKS study which had completely different amounts of trips generated, completed different percentages of trips going different directions, and significantly more impacts to the TV Highway than the Kittleson report. He urged the Council to use this extension time for the ESA to re-evaluate the urban reserves and redesignate the ones necessary to help with the transportation issues.

Richard Smith, 12640 SW Clark Hill Rd., Hillsboro, OR 97123, agreed with Mr. Larrance and added that in the first 9 months of 1999 there were 1,165 new homes sold in the 3 county area, and as of the day before there were 739 lots listed for sale. That appeared to be 7-8 months worth of buildable lots available for the area. He said his experience as a realtor gave him a good view of what was going on in the area as far as land. He had customers who had asked him for maps of where the buildable land in the area was located. He also knew of wonderful buildable land but the owners were not willing to sell. He wondered how those parcels could be counted as available if you could not build on them. He cited Metro's fact that 1.8% of the new housing would be "granny flats". He said the flats included with the new homes he was seeing were few and far between, more like .8%, not 1.8%.

Ed Harvey, Harvey Marine, 21250 SW Tualatin Valley Highway, Aloha, OR 97140 said he was a lifelong resident of the area and did not understand why the expansion was not being talked about for the north. He felt the best way to get to Intel was Highway 26. He said his 8-10 employees were not adding to the traffic mess and he was not going to roll over and leave town.

Don Blanchard, 16490 SW Brookman Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140 spoke about URA 45 near Sherwood. He said many other property owners in his area shared his opinion but he was speaking without their authority. He hoped Metro would take URA 45 into the UGB as it was almost entirely exception land with no EFU land. He said many property owners in the area were willing to participate in development so there would be housing benefit. He noted that the Sherwood area had little available land within its boundary which was affecting housing affordability. He referred to Mr. Millette's point about stopping growth as something he would also like to see, but knew that change was inevitable and had to be dealt with. He hoped Metro's planning process would work.

Bonney Bryan 5800 SW 213th Ave., Aloha, OR 97007, was concerned about the Hillsboro south urban reserve growth and with the traffic on the Tualatin Valley Highway, 209th and Rosa Road. She shared a map of the area. She said she and her husband had hoped 30 years ago when they bought their property that their 5 daughters could eventually build homes on the property. She said now the extension plan for Rosa Road went right over her house and through her bedroom so of course she was concerned about the traffic it would cause. She said when her daughters were attending school the traffic was already so bad she had to meet them a few blocks from home because it was not safe for them to navigate the area to get home by themselves. She noted the traffic had not decreased since then. She was also concerned about the zoning changes that would take place. She said she did not like it when people told her what to do with her property.

Presiding Officer Monroe assured her that Metro had no authority to do zoning, that was a matter of the local jurisdictions.

Doug Draper, Genstar Land Company Northwest, 11515 SW Durham Rd., Suite E-9, Tigard, OR 97224, read his testimony in favor of adding the south Hillsboro urban reserve area into the UGB, including the St. Mary's property, into the record. (A copy of the testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Betty Atterbury, Partners for Sensible Growth and Westside Economic Alliance, Tigard, OR, read her testimony in favor of considering economy and livability of the areas to be included in the UGB into the record. (A copy of her testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Dick Scott 17433 SW Brookman Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140, a longtime homeowner in the UR 45 area. He said it was primarily exception land adjacent to existing urban development already inside the UGB in Sherwood. He said extending utilities into the area was feasible. He said the area was well suited for community development. He said he was in favor of adding area 45 to Metro's UGB and hoped it would happen this year.

Beverly Bookin, 621 SW Morrison, Suite 200, Portland, Or 97205, Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC), read her testimony in favor of adding Area 45 into the UGB. (A copy of her testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting.)

Teresa Jaynes Lockwood, 17495 SW Brookman, P.O. Box 1471, Sherwood, OR 97140, testified in favor of adding area 45 into the urban growth boundary. She said the land was all exception land and numerous property owners were in favor of moving the boundary also. She said the area was considered easy to develop topographically, and there was a strong need for a full and complete community that would address the centralized shopping and employment needs of Sherwood.

Ron Crutcher, 1800 NW 167th Pl., #100, Beaverton, OR 97006, was disappointed that the Council was considering asking for a delay or eliminating implementation of the second half of the mandated expansion of the UGB. He felt not seeing the wisdom of completing the expansion was disturbing. He wondered if it was really practical to include the back portion of Dunthorpe or the Grotto or Alpenrose Dairy as buildable inventory. He said there was already a housing shortage if the setbacks were left at 50' so it made sense to expand the boundaries further should the setbacks be 100-200'. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of the average citizen to say supply and demand had no bearing on home prices. Traffic was also a problem that validated the need to finish the expansion. He urged inclusion of this area into the UGB.

Rick Clements, 4185 SW 205th, Aloha, OR 97007, said a large part of this property was to address the high tech industry needs. He noted that people in his area worked in a lot of different outlying places. To say they would all move out was not realistic, at least not for a long time. He said the housing imbalance needed to be addressed but he did not feel this was the best way to do that.

Steve Larrance, 20660 SW Kinnaman Rd., Aloha, OR 97007, Citizens Against Irresponsible Growth, said the people he represented were very concerned and willing to fight this proposal. He said they were not opposed to growth, they were opposed to not being served. They realized that you can't serve another 22,000 people in the south Hillsboro area without providing offsite transportation improvements, not to mention schools and water, etc. He respectfully disagreed with Mr. Brooks on his take on the DKS study which had completely different amounts of trips generated, completed different percentages of trips going different directions, and significantly more impacts to the TV Highway than the Kittleston report. He urged the Council to use this extension time for the ESA to re-evaluate the urban reserves and redesignate the ones necessary to help with the transportation issues.

Richard Smith, 12640 SW Clark Hill Rd., Hillsboro, OR 97123, agreed with Mr. Larrance and added that in the first 9 months of 1999 there were 1,165 new homes sold in the 3 county area, and as of the day before there were 739 lots listed for sale. That appeared to be 7-8 months worth of buildable lots available for the area. He said his experience as a realtor gave him a good view of what was going on in the area as far as land. He had customers who had asked him for maps of where the buildable land in the area was located. He also knew of wonderful buildable land but the owners were not willing to sell. He wondered how those parcels could be counted as available if you could not build on them. He cited Metro's fact that 1.8% of the new housing would be "granny flats". He said the flats included with the new homes he was seeing were few and far between, more like .8%, not 1.8%.

Presiding Officer Monroe thanked Mayor Faber and the people of Washington County for their time and courteous input into the process. He closed the public hearing.

10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Metro Council Meeting

September 23, 1999

Page 12

Councilor Washington thanked the citizens for coming out to give their opinions. He said it was a very difficult process and they couldn't please everyone but tried their best.

Councilor McLain echoed Councilor Washington's comments and indicated that the process was just beginning as far as the public hearing portion. There would be more meetings in Gresham and Milwaukie, and 2 more at the Metro building.

Councilor Atherton commented that they had heard about the recession in Oregon in the 1980s. He said it was obvious as they listened that some people felt there was enough growth. He said Council needed to figure out how much was too much and how much was enough. He said he had offered proposals addressing the issue of carrying capacity. He said he would be happy to share ideas and views with anyone who was interested. They needed to find a balance and the process they had now was not working for them. He thanked Mayor Faber for his hospitality.

11. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Monroe adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
	9/23/1999	RE: Inclusion of URA Sites 51-55 "Resolution Lands" into the UGB	Metro Council/Hillsboro City contingent (Mayor Faber, Tim Erwert, Winslow Brooks, Tim Sercombe, Robert Millette)	
	9/1999	Position Statement, 9/99, Metro Urban Growth Boundary		
	9/23/1999	Testimony before Metro Council on the Urban Growth Boundary Issue	Doug Draper, Genstar	
	9/1999	Testimony before Metro Council on the Proposed Urban Growth Report 1999 Update	Beverly Bookin, CREEC	