

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

January 23, 1997

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer), Lisa Naito, Susan McLain, Ruth McFarland, Patricia McCaig, Ed Washington

Councilors Absent: Don Morissette

**Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad** called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. He announced that Councilor Morissette was out of the state at a conference and would not be in attendance at this meeting.

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** recognized Mary Alice Ford, Former State Representative.

### 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

### 3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

### 4. MCCI PRESENTATION

**Angel Olsen**, 805 S Alpine, Cornelius, OR 97113, Chairwoman of MCCI, spoke to resolutions concerning MCCI. She noted the nominees to come in front of the Council for annual vacancies on MCCI.

**Aleta Woodruff**, 2143 NE 95th Place, Portland, OR 97220, Vice Chair and a member of the Nominating Committee for MCCI said that through diligence, MCCI had been able to fill all positions except three chair positions. Geoff Hyde had resigned. She noted the list of nominees and positions in the Council packet. She introduced the new members; in District 1 Mr. Bob Wiggan, for position 2 and Mr. Dwight Rexin for position 3, in District 2 Ms. Peggy Neff for position 4, in District 3 Mr. Bob Bothman for position 9 and Mr. Dick Schouten for position 8, in District 4 Ms. BeBe Schindler for position 10, in District 5 Stefan Stent for position 14, in District 6 there was a vacancy, in District 7 Ms. Eilene Brady for position 19 and Mr. Don MacGillvray for position 21, from outside the Metro boundary Mr. Kim Van De Hey for position 24 and from Multnomah Citizen Involvement Committee Ms. Kay Durtschi for position 26. Ms. Durtschi would continue to co-chair the committee working on the public involvement process.

The nominating committee was continuing to work to find suitable volunteers. She asked that if either Councilors McLain or Naito had any recommendations, they would greatly appreciate them. She thanked the Council for offering an evening meeting and providing an opportunity for MCCI to be at that meeting.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** welcomed those returning and new members of the MCCI.

**Councilor McFarland** welcomed all of the hard working individuals who have served on MCCI as well as new members. She pointed out that Mr. Wiggin was an activist from east county and had been ill but had returned to MCCI in good health.

**Councilor Washington** welcomed Ms. Peggy Neff on behalf of Councilor Morissette as well as Mr. Stent from his own district.

**Councilor McLain** said she was looking forward to the retreat that have been planned for February 15th at Marylhurst College. She felt it would be a wonderful opportunity to have a chance to get to know the members of MCCI and have an opportunity to interact in an informal way at the retreat. She planned to be at the retreat and encouraged the Council to join them.

**Ms. Olsen** addressed the resolution on Citizen Involvement Principles. The Committee for Public Involvement Process had been working on this resolution with Multnomah County and the City of Portland as well as other jurisdictions within the Metro area to have it brought forward to Council. They appreciated the Council's commitment to citizen involvement.

**Kay Durtschi**, 2230 SW Caldew, Portland, OR 97219 reminded the Council that citizen involvement had been a very big part of the growth of this region for Metro as well as the cities in the area. Each of these entities had found how valuable it was to have citizens involved, citizens who represented the grass roots area of decision making. Citizens were the ones who voted the Council in, who wanted to work with the Council to make the programs the Council put in place of a benefit to all of the citizens of the region. When the Charter Committee was working on Metro's Charter it decided that there was need for a citizen's involvement component in this government. So they saw fit to put in place, CCI. Those were volunteers themselves who realized that without the citizens participating in the government it was not going to work because there was much discussion going as to whether Metro should even exist or not. She said the committee worked very diligently on the wording of these principles, words such as value, respect, encourage, provide communication and opportunity, organize, sustain, respond to citizens perspectives and insights and to coordinate the interdepartmental and interjurisdictional activities as well as to evaluate where MCCI was doing its job correctly, where they may be making mistakes and where they needed to improve. She requested that the Council adopt the principles and support the resolution.

**John Legry**, Executive Director of the Multnomah County Office of Citizen Involvement represented the Multnomah County Citizen Involvement Committee created by the voters and put into the Multnomah County Charters in 1984. He was at this meeting to support the resolution and the citizens who worked to create this foundation statement. In November 1995, the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners adopted its set of these principles, piggy backing on the City of Portland who had an active citizens process to create principles. The Multnomah County resolution was nominated for a National Association of Counties Achievement Award and showcased in their national volunteer newsletter. He believed the meat of the statement was its commitment to mutual respect of all parties' promotion of informed and involved citizens and the commitment of officials to honor their role to facilitate and respond to citizen advise. They also valued the promise to advance and cooperate with others on citizen involvement improvements, innovations and/or changes which helped citizens have a real voice in setting the course of their communities. Citizens did care but many felt they could no longer have an effect. They felt cut off and could only be heard when they formed large groups and protested loudly. Many believed that there had been a hostile take over by special interests and

lobbyists displacing the average citizen. How could civic health be improved? Promising practices included public participation plans which clearly provided for public involvement in policy making such as Metro's Regional Transportation Public Participation Plan, Citizens Budget and Productivity Committees which recommended improvements in policy, economy, efficiency and effectiveness. MCCI offered a strong new tool for continued improvement of Metro's relations with its citizens and the Multnomah Citizens Involvement Committee supported them and urged the unanimous adoption of the citizen involvement principles.

**Diane Linn** Director of the Office of Neighborhood Associations, City of Portland, said the City had adopted a variation on the theme of the principles on February 9, 1996. It was a collaborative effort to develop their principles to capture what they wished to get across. They had hoped that what could happen was that all of the jurisdictions of the area could adopt similar principles. She said once you adopt principles you must follow it with some action and some intention to see it happen. They decided that in addition to developing principles they would create an outreach and involvement handbook to really analyze the techniques that worked well in engaging citizens in development of public policy and difficult choices such as siting of facilities and district planning processes.

**Bob Bothman**, from the Garden Home in Washington County, spoke on behalf of the Washington County CCI. He was chair of his neighborhood association as well as MCCI. From his county perspective they did not have principles. He strongly supported the public involvement process for public transportation approved in July 1995. This document was great. This document had been incorporated into the principles that the Council was considering at this meeting. They were working on similar documents for other Metro departments, by the Council adoption of these principles he felt that it would encourage the departments to follow suit.

**Kay Durtschi** concluded by referring to what Van Claiborne said. He said, "that talents are gifts from God but careers are gifts from the people". MCCI hoped that being actively involved, participating, they could help the Council careers be a gift from the people.

**Ms. Olsen** summarized this presentation and suggested that anyone who was interested in MCCI get a hold of Barbara Herget. She noted conflicts of meetings that some of the members of MCCI had and again expressed her request for a Council evening meeting once a month. She encouraged the Council to go to the MCCI retreat.

**Councilor Naito** expressed her appreciation to MCCI and also greeted Former State Representative Mary Alice Ford, Diane Linn, Judy Watson, and Wally Marrins.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that he would move the order of MCCI resolutions for consideration and consider them at this point in the meeting.

There was no objection from Council.

8.4 **Resolution No. 96-2433**, For the Purpose of Adopting Metro Citizen Involvement Principles.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved the approval of Resolution No. 96-2433.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** read into the record the principles that MCCI had brought forward. (A copy of these principles may be found in the Permanent Record of the Council). She urged the Council's support of these principles.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

8.5 **Resolution No. 96-2432**, For the Purpose of Accepting Nominees to the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI).

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved the approval of Resolution No. 96-2432.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McFarland** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** noted the nominees names listed in the resolution and asked for the support of the Council.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

**Ms. Olsen** appreciated consideration of the resolutions at this time in the agenda.

## 5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of the Minutes for the January 16, 1997 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved the adoption of the January 16, 1997 Metro Council Meeting minutes.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

## 6. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

6.1 **Ordinance No. 97-676**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Dumping Plan and Incorporating it Into the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** assigned Ordinance No. 97-676 to the Regional Environmental Management Committee.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** announced that one of the Councilors had to leave early and there had been a request to consider Resolution No. 97-2451A at this point in the meeting.

There was no objection to the change in agenda.

8.6 **Resolution No. 97-2451A**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Metro 1997 Oregon Legislative Principles and Priorities.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved the approval of Resolution No. 97-2451A.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McCaig** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** reviewed the resolution, she said there were presentations from Brad Higby, the Metro lobbyist. In light of the fact that the Oregon Legislature had already started last week, they wished to move as quickly as possible on as many of the items as possible. She noted Exhibit A in the packet which outlined the Metro legislative priorities. She said there were some agenda items that would be coming before Council at a later date. The general areas were growth management, transportation, solid waste and recycling, regional parks and greenspaces, the zoo, utility deregulation, public contracting. In the exhibit there was one item related to Ballot Measure 47 that was adopted but not included in the packet. Staff had prepared this for inclusion.

**Motion to Amend the Main Motion:** **Councilor Naito** amended her motion to include the exhibit that was related to the implementation of Ballot Measure 47.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McCaig** accepted the friendly amendment.

**Motion to Amend the Main Motion:** **Councilor Washington** requested that the resolution include not only Executive Officer Mike Burton's name but Councilor Naito's name as an introducer. He noted that this was a dual effort on behalf of the Executive and the Council.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that this would be added to the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** asked if Metro was presenting their support on issues on transportation with any kind of a base such as the JPACT package or the Governor's initiative or if there was any kind of language in the resolution as far as how Metro stood on those two issues with the state and regional cooperation?

**Councilor McCaig** responded that this had been discussed in Government Affairs and part of the concern was that the committee did not yet know all of the specifics of the governor's proposal. The hope was that they were establishing principles by which the Council felt comfortable and that the specific items related to both of those issues, particularly the Governor's initiative, would come back through the process where all of the Councilors would have a chance to vote specifically on the different components of the package. These were principles that had been stated as being supported by the Council over and over. The process would allow the Council to weigh in specifically on individual bills and components of those bills.

**Councilor McLain** said she felt comfortable with that response. There was one word she requested be added to number 1 on page 2, that was, Metro would support efforts to enhance Oregon's and the region's transportation programs.

**Councilors Naito and McCaig** indicated that they would accept this as a friendly amendment.

**Councilor Naito** added that the motion would include the changes specified by Councilor McLain, Washington and the addition of the Ballot Measure No. 47 language. She urged the Council's support.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** added that there was a resolution coming forward in the next few weeks from the Transportation Committee dealing with the Governor's transportation plan.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously as amended.

## 7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 96-665**, For the Purpose of Coordinating Comprehensive Plans by Establishing an Urban Service Boundary.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved the approval of Ordinance No. 96-665.

**Seconded:** **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** said that there had been a long standing dispute between the cities of Portland and Beaverton about some of the area between the two cities. She understood that the various parties had come to a governmental agreement among themselves as to what they all agreed should happen. However, Metro was the final arbiter of this decision. She had received many letters and phone calls on this issue. She asked staff to make a formal presentation.

**Mike Burton**, Executive Officer, overviewed the ordinance. He had with him representatives of the three governmental units involved, Chair of the Washington County Commission, Mayor of Beaverton and the City Commission from Portland. This had been an issue in contention in the courts for about 12 years. Metro was given the responsibility to end the fight. In the past year there had been resolve on a number of questions. He believed that this was the beginning of the process. The areas of concern were the unincorporated areas between Beaverton and Portland. These areas had been increasing in density and population and need for infrastructure. They found that there was a lot of agreement in place between providers of services, between Portland and the Tualatin Valley Water and Sewer Districts. Some issues concerning some parks had been resolved and ultimately got down to finalizing where the Urban Services Boundary was. He emphasized that they were talking about a services boundary not about an annexation. The question was who planned what and how did one find the common points of planning for something. At what point did the responsibility for coordinating what would occur there in the future, begin and end. He noted the four large public meetings as well as mailings that had occurred. There was an extensive effort to try to notify home owners in the area. He noted that these jurisdictions would still be neighbors, Portland and Beaverton would still continue to be neighbors and we needed to make certain that they continued to coordinate their planning in these efforts. He believed that an agreement had been reached that was a positive one for most people. He said they tried to find all of the points in logic that the Council could. He did not believe that a line defined a person's sense of neighborhood. This was part of what was at stake here. He appreciated all of the cooperation from the jurisdictions particularly from the hundreds of citizens who had participated in this process, a very polite but forceful view that the citizens made to have their points of view made on this issue. It was a very positive effort all the way through the process and he appreciated everyone's patience with this. He said Portland and Beaverton had adopted resolutions approving this and had begun to take some actions to implement that. He noted that Washington County was involved in this because under SB 122 they were required to begin to get out of the area for urban services. Commissioner Peters had had the responsibility of going to the neighborhoods, who in the final analysis thought that

nothing should ever change. Unfortunately the county would not be able to continue providing services. The SB 122 process going on in Washington County was exemplary.

**Linda Peters**, Commissioner of Washington County, said that this had been an extremely extensive process. It had involved delicate negotiations, a lot of citizens, neighborhoods and meetings. She was proud that the four individuals presenting had gone from a lot of conflicts, to an accord, to something that met almost everyone's needs and interests. She complimented Mike Burton for his role in bringing about this kind of mediation effort. She complimented Mayor Drake, Commissioner Hales, the staff of the organizations and Charlie Cameron on the processes that eventually led to an agreement that they could all sign off on. It was very important to the county that they get this issue of who planned for what neighborhoods in this area concluded. The county could actually get on to the planning process to figure out how and when these areas eventually got dealt with under 2040. It was her hope that the Council would reaffirm the agreement that they had reached understanding that some people had felt that their interests had not been responded to. She felt that this group was a lot smaller than it could have been had there been no negotiation or mediation to figure it out. It would be a good deal for the Metro Council to capitalize on the degree of consensus that there was on this issue and allow them to move forward. She requested their positive vote on this agreement.

**Mayor Rob Drake**, City of Beaverton, urged the Council's adoption of an urban service boundary line. This had been a long arduous process the past 12 years. It was time they moved on to other issues. This proposed agreement was ratified by Beaverton, Portland, Washington County and the special service districts that they were partnered with. He mentioned the efforts of Mike Burton, the Executive Officer, and his staff.

**Charlie Hales**, City Commissioner of Portland, Planning and Transportation Bureaus, noted that this was a test of the ability as a region and the Council's ability as regional policy makers to make these tough, sometimes locally unpopular planning, decisions based on common sense, a long term view and a view of the public interest rather than on emotion, a short term sense and personal interests. He felt that there were a lot of myths around this issue. He thought that there were principles that float above them, one was the test about how these tough decisions were made? This was also a test of Metro's role, whether they would supplement or supplant the role of local government in dealing with service provisions, service boundaries, police patrol areas and the other details that went into a planning effort like this. This was a test of whether a balance could be struck between Metro as a regional leader and policy maker and local government as the nuts and bolts service providers. Four of the myths were; one, that the county line mattered, there were eight areas that were areas in Washington County that were currently inside the city limits, not the urban service boundary but the city limits of Portland. Secondly, around the region, county lines didn't make sense anywhere as a responsible and practical boundary for planning and service purposes. Other examples were Wilsonville which spanned two counties, Portland included portions of three counties and Lake Oswego spanned portions of two counties. County lines weren't planning, they were section lines laid down by surveyors with no regard for the land. Myth two, there was a big tax difference between living in Portland and living in Beaverton. There was about a \$40.00 difference, with that difference going either way. This was before Measure 47. Now property taxes were based on what was paid last year not what the local tax rate was. Myth three, that this decision to ratify this negotiated urban services boundary between these two cities would have an immediate effect on some peoples lives. Those things would not happen because they were talking about an urban services line not an annexation line. Most of those who currently lived in the areas would have moved or died before annexation occurred to a municipality. Myth four, that this represented a change, that the folks in this area were being annexed or added to Portland's

Urban Services Boundary. The areas east of the line have been inside Portland's Urban Services Boundary since 1980. What the proposal would do was to either assign areas which were never in either city's urban services boundary to Beaverton or assigning areas that were in both urban services areas to Beaverton. They would not be assigning one square foot to Portland's Urban Services Boundary. They were subtracting enormous areas to Portland's Urban Services Boundary because the instruction that they operated under was to try to make real neighborhood boundaries out of this decision, don't use the county line, use the land, the development patterns but be as conservative as possible in moving Portland further into Washington County. In looking at the map, the areas in blue and red were all inside Portland's Urban Services Boundary. Everything to the right of the large dotted line had been inside of the Portland's Urban Services Boundary since 1980. What was before the Council was the most conservative version of a compromise, from Portland's standpoint conservative, not taking any more than possible in Washington County than made sense for planning purposes. As mentioned before, Portland and Beaverton had adopted resolutions setting in motion comprehensive plan amendment that would put these two lines into the comp plans of both of these jurisdictions. There were findings that he believed would support that decision. There weren't findings that would support a substitution of some other line by the Metro Council. There were seven local governments working effectively to reach this agreement and they urged the Council's support.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked if there was a double majority petition on file?

**Mr. Hales** responded that there were double majority petitions on hold in a number of the areas. There was a double majority petition in the blue area and also on hold in the red area east of Vermont Street. There were also areas where Portland already had annexation approval that were on hold as well.

**Councilor Naito** said that it was her understanding that the agreement was negotiated prior to the election. It was her understanding that if the line was drawn as proposed to the Council, certain areas would only be able to annex into one city or the other. Was this the effect down the road?

**Mr. Hale** responded that this was correct. This idea of an urban services boundary was not confined to the line between Portland and Beaverton. Portland had an urban service boundary that was negotiated with several jurisdictions such as Lake Oswego, Gresham, Happy Valley. It was the line in which the city was in title to annex over time as people petitioned for annexation. It was a planning tool. It did not produce annexation petitions in and of itself.

**Councilor Naito** said she only made that comment because in her mind one of the messages that she believed the public was sending with Measure 47 was the sense of really wanting a community to identify when they were joined to a particular city or another. She was particularly interested, as the Council listened to the testimony, in not only what people's wishes were but other public policy reasons why certain parts should be within the City of Portland versus the City of Beaverton down the road.

**Mr. Hale** answered that some of the principles used in coming up with this proposal were street connectivity, street identity, neighborhood identity, maintenance issues.

**Mayor Drake** said that from Beaverton's perspective there was double majority annexation currently sitting before the City Council in Beaverton and this was the Patton Road, Miles Court

annexation. This was included in the materials before Council. He thought that the Council would hear from the citizens in that area.

**Councilor McLain** noted that her interest was in where the 122 agreements were still pending. It was her understanding that there were some fire district USA issues that had been completed with both cities involved as well as the county and some that were not. This was information she needed.

**Mr. Burton** responded that the 122 process that went on was that essentially Washington County was using this as a model for the rest of the agreements so the agreements that had been reached across the board were addressed. The ordinance that was in front of the Council required a joint planning effort in those areas that had not been resolved. This took the Council to the last of the 122 questions. Other than that, the service issues had been resolved.

**Councilor McLain** said, using the bottom piece on the map, it was her understanding that Beaverton served that blue area right now or had made an agreement to serve that blue area.

**Mayor Drake** responded that none of those areas were currently in the City of Beaverton other than an annexation in the West Slope area south of the Sunset Highway that would be in effect July 1.

**Councilor McLain** said that her point was if Beaverton had finished the 122 agreements in any of that unincorporated area that were there to serve that area.

**Mayor Drake** said at this point the 122 discussions were still on going but in terms of service agreements they had a working relationship in service agreements with all of the special districts that served those areas. None of those areas would go begging for services upon annexation and most likely would retain all their current service providers for a period of time if not forever.

**Councilor McLain** asked who was serving the red areas at the bottom of the map?

**Mayor Drake** said that the area was in the unincorporated areas of Washington County, they all had a water and parks providers, USA was providing sewer services.

**Councilor McLain** said that the letters, comments and calls she had been receiving had been talking about their identification with Washington County services, Beaverton parks, with a particular service. She asked, as they made their agreements and negotiations, had they not taken into consideration the service provider?

**Mayor Drake** said that was not true. The Executive Officer was correct. All of that was being considered. They currently had agreements with all of those special services districts so there would be no interruption of service. The 122 process was not done at this point but there was no agreement that wasn't in effect with those other agencies. They had partnered with them for a long time. What the citizens of those areas would see would be a change in general government. They would still be residents of the county. Those other special services were in place now and would stay in place.

**Councilor McLain** said, as an example on the top of the map, she knew USA Sewer was a service provider for the City of Portland, Washington County, and Beaverton. In that situation, they had the same service provider but different jurisdiction as a governing body. But there were

such situations where right now the people were receiving a Portland service, a Beaverton service and/or a Washington County service. Did any of this get into the conversation other than it was just status quo?

**Mayor Drake** responded that none of the area was currently being provided service by the City of Beaverton. They were currently being provided service by Washington County and the special districts. Upon annexation, the services would change other than general government and most likely police services.

**Mr. Burton** added that the issue here was on providing of services, if the service boundary moved you had already written agreements between Portland and the services providers in a lot of cases. The question was the assumption that if you took some of those blue areas and those would be in Beaverton's service area, did you change the service provider from who was providing those services to Beaverton? Beaverton, unlike Portland, provided a lot of its services to its citizens through special service districts. This would not change except that the contract order would become the City of Beaverton rather than Washington County.

**Ms. Peters** said, in follow up to Councilor McLain's question, it was her understanding that they couldn't go a lot farther with the agreements until they knew who the agreements had to be concluded with. That was what they wanted a decision from the Council on. The odds were good that if area A was to be in Beaverton's Urban Service Boundary, Beaverton would conclude future urban service agreements that would probably perpetuate the use of the special districts because they were already doing a lot of this. It may be different for Portland or it may not. But the point was, who signed the agreements? She said they didn't know that until they had the urban service boundary defined. This was why they needed the Council's action in order to go ahead and finish the process.

**Mr. Hales** said that the Boards of Directors of all four special services, water, sewer, parks and fire had approved this agreement and all of those issues had been addressed. The City of Portland was already serving areas where those special districts and the City have had to work together particularly with respect to parks, water and sewer as well as fire because there was a mutual aid agreement that covered the entire area. The real effect in the shorter run would be in the planning side not in service provision because if each entity was going to meet Metro's requirements for 2040 compliance someone had to plan the intersection of Vermont Street and Olsen Road. Again he reminded the Council that the City of Portland did not do these annexations but they were stuck with them today. What could be done would be to do some decent neighborhood planning other than a line that was the result of an individual property owner annexation in the past.

**Councilor McLain** said that the reason for those questions was to put them on the record that it was important for the Council to look at what did it mean by saying that this was a service boundary for this particular neighborhood. Did that change their service provider, did it change their status and did it change their opportunity or what they considered to be their community? Those were different issues. It was important for the Council to deal with those issues. She asked Dan Cooper, Metro Legal Counsel, about the options that the Council had. She said that it was important for the public as well as the Council to be reminded of options that the Council had. The cities and county were bringing their advise to the Council as jurisdictions who had to implement any decision that the Council made on this land use position, that was, the Council was supposed to be giving it a blessing for three reasons. First, the Council would be saying that this made the most sense for urban services provisions or services in these area and would go along with Metro's other responsibilities such as the 2040 growth concept. The Council was

seeing this as reasonable, a reasonable boundary. The second thing that the Council would be doing would be to say that the Council believed that all of the interests that have been involved in these discussion had been heard and this seemed like a reasonable problem solution, that the Council was seeing this as a reasonable solution. So did the agreement meet Metro's goal of 2040 growth concept, Metro's goal for regional planning, and personal goals for urban services? Third, the Council was supposed to be acting as a mediator between jurisdictions who up to this point had not come to a solution through other means either the court, personal negotiations, etc. The Council was trying to make a decision because these entities had not been able to up to this point so they had been sent by the court to the Council to have this decision made.

**Mr. Dan Cooper**, Metro Legal Counsel, answered yes. The statutory provisions that gave the Council the authority was the authority granted to coordinate comprehensive plans to ensure that they ended up being integrated, not in conflict. The values the Council assigned to the three portions that were met were how that decision was made up, those were the factors. The basis of this was that the Council was resolving existing conflicts between the existing comprehensive plans between Washington County and the cities of Beaverton and Portland.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reviewed the process and said there would not be a final vote on this ordinance this evening due to the absence of one councilor and the need for another councilor to leave prior to the end of this meeting. Following the public hearing, the Council would like to take a bit more time on this issue to listen to the public testimony. The public record would be left open until Wednesday, January 29, 1997 at 5:00 p.m. This would allow neighborhoods and jurisdictions an additional week to provide public testimony to the members of the Council. There would then be a work session on February 13, 1997 to consider the public testimony and the written testimony and make a determination as to whether to move forward to the agenda on February 20, 1997 for final action or to send it back to the jurisdictions for a discussion of any item that the Council decided they would like them, as a preferred alternative, to discussion.

**Councilor McCaig** asked if the Council was planning to hold the public hearing on February 13th concerning the Urban Reserves?

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** clarified that the February 13 meeting would be a work session to discussion whether or not the Council moved this resolution and ordinance forward based on the testimony and whether or not the Council would adopt this proposal and move the ordinance forward for a vote or if the Council had another idea or proposal that they vote forward. In that case, if the Council had recommended changes, he would recommend to the jurisdictions that they possibly consider the changes that the Council would recommend, giving them approximately 45 days to come back to Council. He would like this process to be completed no later than March 27, 1997. This process would give the Council the maximum degree of public input as well as the Council's ability to go through the specifics.

**Councilor McCaig** said, given that the Council did not have nearly the workload assigned for February 6, 1997, was the only reason that they were not having the work session on the 6th was that the Presiding Officer would like to keep the record open until that time?

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that the record would be closed on January 29, 1997. He said that he would be out of town on the 6th and he would like to have a full complement of the Council so that all seven could participate.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance 96-665 at 7:18 p.m. Each testifier would have three minutes.

**Councilor Naito** asked if the witnesses could point on the map to the area they lived in.

**Mary Alice Ford**, Former State Representative, 6620 SW Hickman Lane, Portland, Oregon 97223, of the Garden Home area thanked the Council for the opportunity to present their views at the public hearing. She said that the wonderful planning process that took place earlier before this item became an ordinance before the Council had not given them the opportunity to present their views and to state into which jurisdiction they would like to be sent for urban services planning. She indicated that the Charlie's Cameron and Hale had spent weekly updates and community input. They had their input as did the special districts. Unfortunately the public was not allowed into that process. She believed that it was Mike Burton who made a comment. He said allowing did not define a sense of neighborhood. She could not agree more with this statement. This was exactly the way they felt about it whether it was a county line or city street with a name that continued for one jurisdiction or into another. This did not define a sense of community, her sense of community (she noted she was in the lowest red area that was up for grabs). Unfortunately in the late 1960 when some developers decided to grab larger apartment jurisdiction allocations along Garden Home Street, it cut Garden Home in half and destroyed their association. However, when the TV Park and Rec. District put the Garden Home Rec. Center in, it brought their community back together. This was where their community was as well as in the rest of the Washington County special districts and in the City of Beaverton. It had been said that they would not lose services. Garden Home may not be annexed to the City of Portland for a long time. It was Mayor Katz who said that they could not be forced to be annexed, they would have to vote on it. True, however, if all of the areas around Garden Home were annexed to the City of Beaverton and Washington County did what it said it was going to do which would be to close down providing urban services, Garden Home would not have two major urban services, one in particular. Garden Home would be forced to be annexed to the City of Portland. The one major service was police protection. Whether they liked the county line that was drawn 150 years ago, it existed and until it was changed, if it was changed by the legislature, it was there. Their police protection may be city but their court system was county. She thought that the Council had seen a letter from Mr. Colin Lamb who very much regretted that he allowed his area to be annexed some 20 years ago. This was a major problem delivering services. Roads and police protection were two areas that Garden Home would not have as urban services. When she looked at that plan and could see all that could have gone into the City of Portland planning urban service area she wondered why. Those two small red areas without neighborhood associations were included, she wondered why, it did not make sense to her. It was throwing a barking dog a bone so that that barking dog would quit trying to nip at the neighbors. She asked why did the City of Portland even want to be bothered with these two little areas? The special districts had signed off because now they did not have to worry about a bigger bite being taken out by the barking dog. When you were the bone that had been thrown, it was not very comfortable. When your sense of community was going to be destroyed for absolutely no reason for service delivery and for what you and your community wanted, it did not make sense. She asked the Council, why?

**Thomas Curtis**, 6836 SW Peyton Road, Portland, Oregon 97223 said Metro must recognize that the City of Portland was probably the most important constituent and they understood this. The Council's role in this issue was arbitration. So it was not hard to conclude that conciliation was the reason that Garden Home was assigned to Portland. There could be no other reason. Conciliation was defined as, "to gain good will or favor by pleasing acts." This described exactly what had happened. He contacted each of the current service providers and asked them if

there was a difference in the requirements or was there any benefit in the line being drawn at the county line or at the Olsen Road boundary. He got an answer of none. There was no difference physically, politically as far as providing this service. There had been a lot of discussion tonight which Mr. Curtis classed as rhetoric, contrived rhetoric. Rhetoric was defined as "the art of influencing the thought and conduct of hearers and the language that is intellectually vacuous". This was exactly what he thought it was. Furthermore, it was his hope that each of the Council put those words to the test. Did they think it was intellectually vacuous? The Council would be making the decision, this was the challenge that the Council needed to address. As far as retaining the community, he believed that the purposes listed were, a logical boundary and retain the neighborhood. Logical was in the eyes of the beholder. "Retain the neighborhood", he liked the word retain because if they were going to retain a community, the line should be on the county line. His community boundary was formed by the people they knew, where their kids went to school. Their community ties were with the CPO in Washington County and the boundary was only aligned but through experience they had known these people, they had helped make decisions that had developed their community of Garden Home, and this was not true in Multnomah County. So he liked the word 'retain the community'. He spoke of public input. There was a lot of public discussion about public input at this meeting. Metro staff had done a good job of soliciting public input, workshops, contacting people, this public hearing. He felt Mike Burton had given him a lot of support, made him feel comfortable but they had ignored what they found out. The blue area that was solicited for a poll, their mail in ballot poll was two to one in favor of Beaverton. Therefore, they cut the blue line back to the county line. The larger red area was four to five, 83% of the respondents to that survey said they preferred Beaverton. Why was this not considered? The action Garden Home took in order to further identify this was to circulate a petition to annex to Beaverton. He had given a copy of this petition to Metro. He felt that the ordinance took away the right of the citizens to choose their government. For what reason? What could be done about it? The most expedient and the easiest thing that he could recommend was to delete item 1.B from the ordinance. He believed that Garden Home had been given a very decided injustice, this ordinance, not recognizing the voice of the people in the effected area, violated the principles that our country was founded upon. He ended with "come on Councilors give us a break".

**Councilor Naito** asked Mr. Curtis is he was in the Beaverton School District?

**Mr. Curtis** responded Beaverton School District.

**Chuck Wiese**, 1515 SW 66th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97225 said he was pleased when Metro decided to query them as to what their thoughts about this urban service boundary were. He noted the area he lived in on the map. He had responded to the survey and had the results of the survey that was sent to him. 80% of the respondents said that if they had a choice between being annexed by the City of Portland or Beaverton, they wanted to go to Beaverton. Yet they had been voted against by this proposed settlement. He thought that there must be a logical reason why their request to be annexed, if they ever had to, would have been denied by Metro. They must have a good reason. He asked Mr. Burton and he got no answer from him. His response was that there was no direct road access from Mr. Wiese's neighborhood to other areas in Washington County without traveling through the City of Portland. All the neighborhoods adjoining Mr. Wiese's were served by Portland, therefore, including his neighborhood within the City of Portland's urban service boundaries allowed for efficient provision of services. How did it do this Mr. Burton? He couldn't get an answer to that question. What was Mr. Burton talking about when he said it meant more efficient provision of services? There was no definition given by Metro. If one was talking about police protection, putting a clock on it made no sense at all. If a criminal was going to commit a crime, he would do it

anyway. The police always came after the fact, gathered the evidence, found a perpetrator, jailed them and enforced the law. They did not stop crime. If one was talking about fire protection, their service came from the Tualatin Valley Fire Department, five minutes away. If his neighborhood got annexed into the City of Portland, the fire service would come from a Portland Fire Station on 23rd Street. Had Mr. Burton measured response times between the two stations. Mr. Wiese had, it was five minutes to the one they had now, it would be almost 20 minutes with good traffic for the one on 23rd to reach his neighborhood. Did this make any sense? None that he could see. He could not see any logical reason why their neighborhood should be put into the City of Portland should any future annexation occur. Beaverton was more logical, 80% of the neighborhood requested it and until Metro or the City of Portland could show that his neighborhood would be better off with the City of Portland, why should they be forced into something they didn't want to do. He asked the Council to please not play politics with their lives and property. He asked the Council to ask themselves these same questions and if they answered them honestly, the Council could only vote to exclude their neighborhood from this final settlement. If the Council needed petitions to prove that 80% requested Beaverton, they would be happy to provide those petitions. Unfortunately, his neighborhood was left out of the process at the beginning and they were scrambling for time to catch up with the process. This was why he was at this meeting tonight to tell the Council how disgusted he was with what appeared to be politics being placed versus what was the right thing to do.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reiterated that the public record would remain open for one additional week so that Mr. Wiese and his neighbors could submit written testimony. Now that this ordinance was at the Council, this was the decision making body of this government, the Council would listen, be thoughtful and actually make a decision based on all of the testimony that came in not based on simply a presentation made by the executive of the agency.

**Charles Waltemath**, 7130 SW Sylvan Court, Portland OR 97225, said that state law mandated that urbanized areas needed to be annexed into cities so that they could receive city level services, something that some of these areas didn't receive at the present time. This was also a policy of the Washington County Commission. This was a process that should be accelerated if possible because these areas did need city services. What the Metro Council could do in this was to accelerate the process and make it a peaceful non-contentious process. Portland Mayor Katz was correct in July 1993 when she said that "it doesn't make any sense to me to bring in citizens who will fight us every inch of the way." She was correct again several months ago when she observed following the Metro vote after the meetings Mr. Burton had, "these people will never be annexed to Portland". Mr. Hales alluded to the fact in his mythology concerning myth 3 that if these areas were given to the City of Portland annexations would not take place for years. That also did not meet the State mandate nor did it meet the policy of the Washington County Commission. The citizen petitioners in the red areas whose current double majority annexation was now on hold had chosen their city, they had approved their annexation and the process would be rapid and without contention. These folks had done their part to advance the State and County goals of annexing these urbanized areas into a city. As the Council had heard these evening with the CCI group, it was important to the Council that the citizen activity be pushed, that the feelings of citizens be accepted and given a high priority. He thought that this citizen participation was the only way to accomplish these annexations goals quickly and peacefully. He felt that urban services boundary should be drawn along the county line. One of the reoccurring themes that Mr. Hale had said was that the county line didn't mean anything. Everyone that lived along this area knew exactly where their tax statement came from every year. They knew where they were identified with. These folks had talked about being identified with their community. He thought that it was very important that they be identified with their

community. They had now identified that community with the City of Beaverton. He believed that they should be allowed to join with the City of Beaverton.

**Jeff Johnson**, 20665 SW Blanton, Aloha, Oregon, Fire Chief for Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Department, said that they served many of the people that were testifying before Council. He said they served 310,000 people on the south and west side of Portland. They were the fire department for eight cities who didn't have their own fire department including parts of Washington, Multnomah and Washington counties. They were the State's largest fire district and had nearly 500 personnel. They had proudly served this area and continued to do so at this time. They asked that the Council support the ordinance for a number of reasons. First, based on where the stations were located, this line was far more rational than any line they had seen in the past. It made sense from their service delivery perspective. The county line did provide citizens the ability to identify with their service providers and they thought that this made a lot of sense. If however this Council decided to address the issues of the citizens that were asking to be included in Washington County, they would be happy to continue to serve that area as always. He thought that this process had been a long road, a lot of credit went to Mr. Burton, the Council, local government and the City of Portland for finally bringing resolution to an issue that had occupied a lot of time. It would be nice to see this issue resolved once and for all.

**Kevin Hanway**, Intergovernmental Relations Manager for Tualatin Valley Water District, PO Box 745, Beaverton, Oregon 97075 served 140,000 people around the City of Beaverton including most of the blue and red area in discussion at the southeast corner as well as the blue area at the northwest. He seconded Chief Johnson's comments that his board adopted resolution in support of this boundary. The Water District served the area that individuals were testifying about at this meeting and may well continue to serve those areas after any annexations. They stood ready to continue to serve them if that line was moved.

**Councilor McLain** said that the question that she was trying to get at before the beginning of the public hearing was the fact that both Mr. Hanway and Mr. Johnson had said that they would continue to serve that population no matter who they were annexed to because they had some responsibilities to more than one jurisdiction. In their mind, what would they need to make sure that it was the very best possible, was it just because it was a solution and a compromise and a finished product that they were applauding or was it the line itself that they were applauding?

**Mr. Johnson** responded that he felt that they would be asking him to look in the hearts and minds of their elected officials when they also passed resolutions supporting this. He thought all of the issues that Councilor McLain touched on were accurate. It was a compromise, it had been a long hard fought oftentimes resolution. The citizens had worked very hard to try to make their voice heard and he believed that they were finally having an opportunity to do that. He thought to go beyond that would be subjective but he said that one of the previous resident stated that was Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue was the closest service provider to these areas. Commissioner Hales accurately stated, however, that because Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue and the City of Portland had a closest force response agreement they would always send the closest emergency response vehicle regardless of whose jurisdiction it was within. They did this in the interest of the tax payers not because it made great business sense.

**Councilor McLain** said he answered her question.

**Mr. Hanway** added a reminder of what Mayor Drake said which was that there was more to this urban service boundary agreement than the services provided by the four service districts, there

was general government services as well and those were decisions that had to be reached between the cities of Beaverton and Portland.

**Gordon Hovies**, 6832 SW 67th, Tigard, Oregon 97223 (by Canby Street) spoke in opposition of the ordinance. He presently worked for the City of Portland Bureau Fire Rescue and Emergency Services as a fire fighter for over 15 years. He was presently assigned to Truck 13 located at NE 10th and Weidler. He was here today as a concerned citizen voicing his opinion. He asked the Council to strike from the ordinance in question the areas annexing them in and go back to the original boundary line because the boundary line was established many years ago with good intent. The service level of the public works, safety, water, parks and other essential services would be status quo as it was now. The only difference he was aware of was fire safety. Portland presently staffed a fire engine with four, a truck with four and a core area with five. Tualatin Valley staff their engines with three. But this was a moot issue because the area in question, both fire departments would arrive at or about the same time. There was presently a mutual aid agreement between the both departments. He noted areas and response times by both fire departments. The people of his area had spoken by returning the Metro survey with an 80% response requesting Beaverton services. Beaverton would annex the area in question and provide the services. This wouldn't change anything as they were right now, it would be status quo. There would be no financial impact with Metro but would have financial impact with the citizens. Let the ordinance allow this area to be annexed into the City of Beaverton.

**Catherine Darby**, 6620 SW Canby St., Portland, Oregon 97223 lived in the lower hand red area of the map. The families in this area attended Beaverton Schools, utilized the Tualatin Valley Parks and Recreation District. Right now they considered themselves to be part of the Garden Hood Neighborhood area with the Rec. district right there. If they were to be annexed to the City of Portland their children would no longer be eligible to participate in Tualatin Hills Rec. Center facilities and their districts as residents. It would personally cost her family hundreds of dollars each year as a non-resident to continue that participation. All of the children that her children went to school with were participants in those programs so it really impacted the families negatively in the neighborhoods to annex to Portland. She helped take one of the petitions around in her neighborhood, almost 100% of those she talked with were wanting to go to the City of Beaverton and felt very strongly about that. In conclusion, it was her hope that Metro would consider the impact on families in this neighborhood and to consider the negative impact that it would have on these families that live there. These children attended Beaverton schools and were involved in recreation through Tualatin Valley Parks and Recreation District.

**Bruce Clere**, 6675 SW 67th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97223, was one of the 83 percent living in the red area. The unity of thinking among his neighbors was absolutely wonderful and part of the sense of neighborhood. He had been there 22 years and his children had gone through Beaverton schools. He had been asked by his neighbors to read excerpts from a letter presented by Colin Lamb who was the biggest business man in Garden Home, the owner of Lamb's Thriftway. 'One area that stood out was criminal protection, if he had a shoplifter they called the Portland Police, prosecution however was done in Washington County which necessitated the police officer from Portland traveling to Washington County. On many occasions paperwork was lost between Portland and Hillsboro or the police officer did not show up and the case was dismissed. In remodeling the shopping center, they needed to coordinate everything between the City of Portland and Washington County since they didn't talk to each other. Part of the shopping center would use the Tualatin Valley sewer system, part of it used Portland, no one was sure whether the bills would come from Portland or Tualatin Valley, the trouble with duplicate billings. Portland police were late to respond, giving only minimal service. He truly felt that they were in the fringe area simply paying their money to Portland and not

getting equal treatment with residents that were closer in. Over the years they had strongly supported Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation Center across the street from them, however, they were not in the park and recreation district and therefore denied many of its benefits. Lastly, they were tied in with the community who lived in Washington County, they had limited ties with the City of Portland. The area nearby that was proposed as an annexation had the same ties to Washington County and not Portland. Having the business in the split jurisdiction had led to a number of frustrations which he believed would be prudent to avoid by simply not putting more citizens into a similar situation'. On a personal level, Mr. Clere concurred and had in twenty two years the experience of neighborliness, belonging and location. His personal feeling was similar to Mr. Lamb's with some of the same reasons and some more personal ones.

**Peggy Lynch**, 3840 SW 102nd Ave., Beaverton, Oregon 97005 lived in the West Slope, Garden Home, Raleigh Hills Citizen Participation Organization, a county organization said it was important that the Council understood where their community was. Secondly, she pointed out the school district boundary became something that had a sense of community, with the exception of that one section, all of the area was Beaverton School District. That one section with the Portland School District had chosen itself to select Beaverton because of the special service provisions, service providers and their link with the Washington County community and would as of July 1 become a part of the City of Beaverton.

**Councilor Naito** asked about the red area and whether it was Portland or Beaverton School District.

**Ms. Lynch** said that only one red area was Portland School District the rest was Beaverton. She continued that for the past eleven years she had been involved in the issue before the Council. Much of that time had been as the West Slope, Raleigh Hills and Garden Home CPO representative. These past three years had seen a positive change in this discussion. Citizens in the contested area had been given information about the variety of services and type of governance at the heart of this decision. She asked that the Council amend the proposed agreement to include her neighbors represented by Tom Curtis and Mary Alice Ford (the red area in the Garden Home area) in the Beaverton Urban Services Boundary. This request was not about good city/bad city it was a request that followed the kind of 2040 planning principles the Council supported. As Portland was rightfully proud of its neighborhood associations so were they in Washington County. In the mid 1970s and early 1980s they as citizens developed community plans. To offer one reason for amending this agreement, the chair of CPO 3 amending this process, lived in the community, the red area under discussion and many of the residents participated in planning their community to the west all the way to Hwy. 217. Another served her community ably in the State legislature for a number of years and her district was from the county line westward. They needed citizens willing to help keep their neighborhood and communities healthy and vibrant. These citizens were asking that the Council recognize their sense of community westerly to Beaverton. She responded to Mr. Hale's comment about annexation Portland into Washington County and the Council had seen some of the small areas. The Council had heard Mr. Lamb's letter. In fact what happened down in the Garden Home area when those annexations began to occur was that some of them immediately responded, got involved, and it now had resulted in the urban planning area agreement that existed today which said that if such annexation occurred they couldn't change their zone for at least one year because they recognized that it was cutting their community a part. Much of all of that area was also in Beaverton's Urban Services Boundary not just Portland's. That was what got the neighborhood into this. Portland's USB at one time went to 205th Street. The Council had heard the police issue. The other comment Mr. Hale made was that this was not an annexation line, she referred to page 2 number 1 of the ordinance, the fifth line said, "boundary

line between Beaverton and Portland as the area of ultimate annexation to each city." No SB 122 urban services agreements had been signed in this area. They had long time water and sewer service agreements particularly between Portland and those special districts but no 122 agreements had been signed. The Council had heard that the parks district provided park service to this area, they provided the middle school athletic program for the Beaverton School District, that was a key relationship here. Many were tax payers to the City of Portland, Portland would respond to this by saying that they could sign an IGA with the parks district to provide service but as tax payers of the City of Portland, were they willing to have their taxes spent to provide the higher level of parks services that THPRD residents now received? That was a critical issue in this discussion.

**Jeff Stoll**, 7417 SW Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy., Suite 525, Portland, Oregon 97225 spoke to two properties, pointing them out on the map (Olsen, Vermont and Shattuck Roads). The properties he owned were being requested to be placed in the Portland Urban Service Boundary area. He felt that the people of his area were more supportive of remaining in the Beaverton Urban Service Boundary. He associated himself with the westside, he did not like the Portland services. He felt more comfortable aligning himself with the westside. The people in the area had spoken, they did not want to be part of the City of Portland. He requested to be taken out of the Portland urban services area and be allowed to remain with Beaverton urban services.

**Donis McArdle**, 1519 SW 66th Ave., Portland, Oregon 97225. At a meeting last summer, Ms. McArdle had spoken with Mayor Drake and Mike Burton. At this time, Mr. Burton indicated that it looked as if Beaverton would serve the area she lived in, more than 77% of the people had requested being served by Beaverton. Mr. Burton also commented at that same meeting that the decision would not please Portland. In October she received a letter from Mr. Burton indicating her area would be included in the Portland Urban Service Boundary. Paragraph 5 of Mr. Burton's letter stated that "citizen's preference, logical neighborhood boundaries, and logical service connections are the basis for the Urban Service Boundaries". She said that this statement was inconsistent with the Urban Service Boundary agreement before the Council. First, the ballot indicated that more than two thirds of the citizenry preferred Beaverton and in fact according to the analysis she picked up from Beaverton her area voted overwhelmingly to be served by Beaverton. Second, her neighborhood flowed to the west, the only thing between her area and the area already annexed to Beaverton was the state highway property. She went shopping and recreating on the west side. Third, her fire protection came from the West Slope station which was less than 5 minutes to her neighborhood. She understood that this would not change, however, if it was not going to change why should her tax dollars go to the City of Portland for her neighborhood to be served by the West Slope area. In addition, the new Tualatin Hills Fire Station on Cornell Road was not more than 5 minutes from her area. Police protection from the City of Portland was a joke. Her family had been on the receiving end of that protection, if one was lucky enough to get a Portland police officer to crime, the criminal would still be housed in Washington County jail as well as the court case would be in Hillsboro. As evidenced in the Thriftway cases, the police officers failed to show up at arraignments and hearings. The criminal then walked. Portland fire response time would be more than tripled. The City of Portland was supposed to put in a fire station when Forest Heights was annexed. That fire station had never happened, the Tualatin Hills Fire District currently served that area. The agreement before Council was not based on citizen preference, logical neighborhood boundaries, or the service connection.

**Matt Katzer**, 1416 NW Benfield Drive, Portland, Oregon 97229, was a new home owner in the Meadow Ridge area. When they purchased their home they looked at taxes, cost of services, property values and chose to live in the Washington County side simply because services were

better, the taxes were roughly the same but the level of services from Beaverton was much higher and better than what they could get from Portland. The majority of his community was against the annexation into Portland. This USB rezoning was the beginning of that annexation process and there needed to be a stop put to it now. The majority of his community did not work in Portland but rather in the Beaverton area. They identified with services in the Beaverton area. Commissioner Hales brought up an issue that this was a democratic process and they took people into consideration allowing them to vote yet there were draconian measures by the City of Portland putting deed restrictions on people's titles, removing their rights to vote. How could this Council look at a boundary redistricting and support a city that refused to let people have a right to vote? He recommended that the Council maintain this area with Beaverton services, require the City of Portland remove the deed restrictions from all the properties involved in the area, and ask Commissioner Hales to put that area to the vote of the people. If the popular vote was for moving into one area versus another, let that happen. His community was against moving to the Portland side.

**Ericka Hoffman**, a Meadow Ridge resident, 9440 NW Wells Ct., Portland, Oregon 97229 noted the letters that had been written to the Council. It was her hope that the Council had not already made up their minds on this issue. Her neighborhood had worked very hard since last May but she felt that the political process had failed them every step of the way. Her neighborhood had been 100% unanimous in their desire to join the City of Beaverton with the full support of the CPO#1 yet no one had been listening. Mid-way through the process they were told by Mike Burton that a mistake was made and because of this the people of Meadow Ridge should have not been allowed to participate yet they were asked anyway and their reply was to join unanimously with the City of Beaverton. The mistake she referred to was an oversight of a pre-annexation agreement the City of Portland forced on the developer of Meadow Ridge subdivision for sewer access. However, this coercion was not defensible. The neighborhood incurred the cost of sewer access through the prices of their lots and homes. They had paid into the USA sewer system to which Portland connected westside residents with their Washington County taxes. They were glad that this had been brought to the Meadow Ridge residents attention because they knew once Portland drew the USB line around them that they would inevitably be annexed to Portland. The assumption the City of Portland the rights to be annexed was given via a deed clause was false. At no time were the residents given proper information of this restriction. This was not done in good faith as Mayor Katz had stated. The deed restriction was nothing more than a bureaucratic hoop that the developer was forced to jump through to get his permits. It was instead an excuse for Portland to force annexation upon them and at the same time be able to walk away with a small piece of a larger picture which failed. Portland had ignored the recommendation from John Bonn of their own planning commission who had told her that with a few bits and pieces here and there would not impact the city's comprehensive plan in a positive manner to warrant annexation of only a few neighborhoods. From Mayor Katz' letter it seemed that her office was misinformed of the actual situation. No, she was not anti-Portland. This issue had to do with which city could provide them with the best services at the least cost to its citizens. There had been no investment made by the citizens of Portland to her neighborhood. The services they received were all Beaverton/Washington County based. They were served by Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue with less than one minute response time, the Tualatin Valley Water District, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation with several locations within minutes of her home, shared a sense of connectivity and community with the larger Cedar Mill community and supported its libraries and businesses, and were in the Beaverton School District, as a result most of her family activities revolved around Beaverton. They understood about the various intergovernmental agreements that went on between the two cities but it would be more cost effective and efficient to deal directly with the City of Beaverton which had already established excellent services to her neighborhood. Further, there

was more security knowing that their services were tied in directly with the same city which provided them. Their goal was to be able to determine their own destination to join the City of Beaverton and to help the Council see that the collective rights of the citizens, their neighborhood, Meadow Ridge, should take precedent over some coerced agreement Portland made in order to pursue its agenda. She asked the Council to please understand that this decision was much more than who would provide their services, it was also which city they would ultimately be identified with and the type of involvement and commitment that they would make to their city.

**Councilor McLain** asked about the deed restriction, had there been any test of the validity of that deed restriction, to the time limit for that deed restriction?

**Ericka Hoffman** responded that it could be contested because it was never disclosed. There was something not right when you were taking away someone's right to vote, gagging them and saying that if they said anything they would automatically be counted as a yes vote into Portland. She indicated that there were big legal fees to pursue this which their neighborhood simply did not have.

**Councilor McLain** said that even if the services provided were equal between Beaverton and Portland did Ms. Hoffman still feel more sense of place from the City of Beaverton and the Beaverton School District?

**Ms. Hoffman** responded that this was very true, they travelled westward and their involvement due to the fact that they had small children was with the Beaverton School District.

**Ken Wolfgang** 7200 SW Sylvan Court, Portland, Oregon 97225 in the West Slope area. He said that his neighborhood had been successful in the double majority vote. He looked forward to participating in the government in Beaverton, having more and faster services from Beaverton. He felt that Mr. Hales did not want to hear what the citizens had to say. His letters to Mary Alice Ford indicated that there were more important things than the interests of the citizens involved. There were a number of reasons why Mr. Wolfgang was a co-petitioner in his area. One of the things that he liked about the City of Beaverton was if he wanted to go to a city council meeting or a planning meeting, they occurred in the evening. If he wished to attend a city council meeting for the City of Portland he would have to take time off work to meet their agenda. He wanted to be a part of the City of Beaverton, he looked forward to being involved in the city streets program something that Washington County had not been able to do.

**Patrice Westphal**, 1811 NW 93rd Place, Portland, Oregon 97229 said she lived in Meadow Ridge which was completely surrounded by Forest Heights. She said that they did not need the City of Portland roads to gain access to and from their neighborhood, there was an easement for services as well as new roads which were going in which would connect directly over to Cornell Road. They were concerned about Chief Johnson's statement that they had a current service response from the Tualatin Valley Fire where they would go immediately to a fire and/or respond to an emergency whether or not their neighborhood was in the City of Beaverton or Portland. The Fire District had recently built a new fire station at Cornell and Miller, approximately one mile from her home. She was concerned that if the Fire District did not care whether they were in the City of Portland or Beaverton why had the Fire Chief endorsed that their neighborhood be in the City of Portland when 100% of their residents and the double majority had voted to stay in the City of Beaverton and Washington County. There were currently 32 children in their neighborhood of which 21 were under the age of 8. The families were involved in the county, in the Beaverton schools. They did not drive into Portland in the

evenings to take their children to and from activities, they were in Beaverton School District. The Council had said that they had three goals, the future growth and planning, the service areas and to be a mediator between the people. Their neighborhood had 100% indicating that they wanted to go to the City of Beaverton. She requested that the Council be their mediator because right now they were failing. They had been to every single meeting, responded to every survey, and were still here tonight feeling like they were on a sinking ship. All of the current services were from Beaverton and Washington County and they would remain that way. There would not be a paver that stopped in the middle of the street and could go no further to pave potholes because of an arbitrary line.

**Michael Whalen**, 6634 SW Peyton Rd, Portland, Oregon 97223 said he had lived at that address for about 10 years. He planned to be there until after he retired. He said they were part of the Montclair School District, their neighbors on Olsen were part of Beaverton and this was where they wished to be as well.

**Bob Bothman**, CPO #3, 7365 SW 87th, Portland, Oregon 97223. He called the Council's attention to the letter from CPO#3, West Slope/Raleigh Hills/Garden Home area. There were about 40,000 individuals in their neighborhood and were on record with a letter to the Council stating 100% unanimous supported to maintain the county line as the division between Beaverton and Portland. In his own experience over the past 23 years, they developed their community plan as a CPO process and project in the mid-70s. They developed their community plan and had defended it for over 20 years, he referred to all of the area shown in red. He said that his CPO area was on the mayor's weekly TV show with the Lamb's Thriftway development as a model example of a neighborhood association working with a developer, not a Portland neighborhood association but his neighborhood association across the street. They had developed a model neighborhood community with main street designs, 2040 concepts, parking behind the buildings, pedestrian walk ways. Mr. Lamb had been a terrific supporter of Mr. Bothman's neighborhood, the Garden Home neighborhood not the Portland neighborhood. The Garden Home neighborhood association had worked very hard to implement designs of their community as well as opposing businesses such as bars coming into their area. He said his neighborhood should be with Beaverton.

**Councilor Washington** said it was clear that many had a strong sentiment about coming into Portland. He asked Ms Westphal where she worked and if most of the people in her area worked in Portland?

**Ms. Westphal** responded that she worked in the west area and many of her neighbors work at Intel and at St. Vincents. The majority of work was directed west bound.

**Councilor Washington** summarized that Portland was a good place but Ms. Westphal did not want to be part of the City of Portland. Yet she did come to Portland for some services.

**Ms. Westphal** answered that she did use entertainment services in Portland. She said that they were asked the question about the legality of the deed restriction. Most of her neighborhood were in homes that were three years and younger. When they selected their lot, knew they were in Washington County, knew where their children would be going to school, liked the builder and the lot, you became tied in with that construction. You did not close on that sale until about a year or two after you had made those decisions and the process had begun. At the closing was when they were given the deed restriction. This was not an acceptable practice. She asked the Council to say that this was not acceptable and that they would not accept this. She said that

they picked their neighborhood, they picked Washington County, they chose it for some certain definite reasons.

**Councilor Washington** said he was sensitive to all of this because his entire district was in Portland and he did have a vote in the process.

**Ken Baer**, 6526 SW Canyon Ct. Portland, Oregon 97225, President of the Roundhill Service Association #2 represented twenty two townhouses in his Sylvan neighborhood. They very strongly wanted to be part of Beaverton. Every home owner he had spoken with in the association wanted this. Most services came from Washington County with one exception, water. As a neighborhood they used the services of Beaverton. They went west when they want to use parks, recreate or shop. Their taxes went to Washington County. They were particularly concerned about the fire services. They lived in an area which was less than five minutes to the West Slope Fire Services. The alternate Portland fire service would be from 23rd Street significantly delaying response time to his area. When his neighborhood was petitioned the vast majority said they would like to be part of Beaverton. They felt that the Beaverton line should go all of the way to the county line. He recommended that Item 1D from the ordinance, specifying his area of Roundhill, be removed.

**Georgene Young**, 6718 SW Peyton Rd, Portland, Oregon 97223 part of Garden Home. She expressed her feeling about her neighborhood. She had lived many places in Portland, Eugene, Medford and had never felt any place to be as strong a neighborhood and a community as Garden Home. Garden Home was an area where there were second generation people, original owners, many families with children in the Beaverton School District, with a focus to the west to Beaverton. The Parks and Rec. District was very important to their sense of neighborhood and community in Garden Home. She believed that the impact on the families in that area would be extreme. They socialized through the recreation center and the school district. It would be nice to have an identity with one entity, Beaverton.

**Michael Mulflur**, 9249 NW Fullner Court, said that if you told someone that you had Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue, Beaverton School District, Tualatin Valley water, Tualatin Hills Park and Rec. and Washington County they would assume that you lived in Beaverton. All of these entities were associated with Beaverton and as families they were asked to make a choice, they made decisions based on the areas they moved to. He had heard no testimony from residents requesting that they go to Portland. It was not that they disliked Portland in fact they counted on Portland for a lot of things that they did. But given a choice and where they identified with and where the services were that they used the most, they were in Beaverton. If Portland wanted the red area they should have annexed it when it was Forest Heights, not after the fact. There was not one single resident in his area, given the choice, that voted to go to Portland, 100% double majority. All of the testimony had been directed, if given a choice because of what they were tied to today, to Beaverton.

**Carol Gearin**, 2420 NW 119th Ave, Portland, Oregon 97229, was a member of the Board of Directors of Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue as well as a citizen activist. She said that Councilor McLain asked what was in the Board's mind when they supported the ordinance. As a board member, what was in her mind when she voted was that in the eleven years that she had been involved in this fight, this was the best compromise offered. As an elected official of the fire district, she felt that she had to take the best thing offered because she felt the responsibility to the citizens who had elected her. She commented that she believed the Chief was misunderstood, she did not believe that the Chief said that he did not care where anyone went. The fire departments had mutual aid agreements. She assumed that if the Council chose not to

change the line that the fire departments would continue those mutual aid agreements. She had been a citizen activist in Washington County since 1983. Since 1985 she had been in the forefront of the Urban Service Boundary fight. In 1988 the City of Portland's area of interest expanded to 219th. They pushed Portland's interest back to 185th, then to 143rd, then to Saltzman Road and then back to 113th. At that time the Oregonian carried a story saying that Portland and Beaverton had come to an agreement of 113th. Her community of Cedar Mill exploded. She continued that as a citizen activist she had always supported the county line and would live in Washington County.

**Gary Hoffman**, 9480 NW Wells Court, Portland, Oregon 97210 read a letter from Gene Gibly and Becky Jackson, his neighbors who lived at 9440 NW Marvin Lane, Portland, OR. They were opposed to annexation of their neighborhood into the City of Portland. When they purchased their lot in Meadow Ridge to build their home they were given no advance notice or choice regarding the condition that as new owners they agreed to the developer's concession to the City of Portland for annexation. They considered it an unfair pressure from the City of Portland to force them into such an agreement. Their neighborhood was more closely associated with Beaverton through the county, the schools, shopping and other physical adjacencies. Becoming part of Portland would not enhance their area or offer them any services for which they were not already paying. It was their belief that the City of Portland had taken undue advantage of their neighborhood in order to secure it into the City. They were opposed to this action and asked Council for a reconsideration.

**Will Moore**, CPO #3, 8440 SW Godwin Ct., Garden Homes Oregon 97223 lived in the Garden Home area. He was testifying to give support to his fellow citizens in the Garden Home area. The people in this area had put a lot of taxes, blood, sweat and tears into their area. To arbitrarily chop down through the middle of it and separate them was like tearing apart a set of twins. The people who lived on the westside equally share the people who lived on the east side of Olsen Road. He believed that this line was an arbitrary line just as the Willamette Stone set up an arbitrary line for the Multnomah/Washington county line. However, the arbitrary line of the two counties was known by everyone who lived there. In addition, there was true geography that separated the Maplewood Neighborhood from the Garden Home Neighborhood, a large canyon and drainway. He did a lot of business in both the Multnomah and Washington county areas but his heart and soul was in the Garden Home area. He believed that dividing this neighborhood would tear its identify away from it. He reminded the Council that you do not need to have Portland or Tigard or Beaverton on your mailing address if you feel associated with a particular neighborhood, he had encouraged his neighbors to follow his lead and list Garden Home on his letters.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing at 8:54 p.m.

**Councilor McLain** felt that there was something that she wanted the audience to know. One, the Council did not ask for this decision to be dropped in their laps. It was brought to Council by the courts who felt there was a need for some kind of mediation. She personally thanked Executive Officer Mike Burton who had tried to do a very good job in this process by doing two things. He tried to make sure there was good notification on this process and she believed he did do this. Two, he tried to concentrate on service provision and on problem solving. She believed that when dealing with a county, two cities, special districts that he pulled together as much of that as he could. Her yardstick if she was going to be involved in the decision of mediation on a boundary must make some sense. She appreciated the advise that had been brought to her by the jurisdictions and the jurisdictions had come to an agreement or a compromise. She appreciated the fact that whether these areas were annexed to Beaverton or

Portland that they would have reasonable services at reasonable prices even though there may be some small difference on particular services. She did not think that the service provision was the major issue. She thought that the major issue had to do with sense of place, where citizens fit into the process of having some pride in neighborhood, identification with school districts and with services. It was extremely important for Council to look at the advise of the surveys and information that was given to Council by the citizens in these areas and see if Council could refine this compromise in a way that not only suited the local jurisdiction, the providers of services but suited the citizens and the neighborhoods that live in those areas. She was not yet comfortable that they had that or that they had done as much as could be done. She thought the local jurisdiction had done as much as they could do and Mr. Burton had done as much as he could do. The service providers in the 122 agreements had gotten as far as they could get. Now it was time for this citizen Council to see if they could add the final ingredient. The final ingredient in her mind was what the citizens in those areas needed in sense of place and identity. She was not in favor of sending it back to the local jurisdictions or to more mediation. She was ready as a Council and had been ready for almost six years to make a final decision within the next thirty days because she thought it was important to get to the 2040 concept building of neighborhoods with Garden Home being a flower out there for the Council to learn from. The Council needed to make a decision and finally decide what the service provision boundary would be between Beaverton and Portland. She was ready to listen to other Councilors ideas.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** had attempted to stay as neutral as possible but had waited a long time for his opportunity to speak. He did not think that the City of Portland had made their case to cross the county boundary. He had not thought this for quite some time but he felt that if the case was made by Commissioner Hales and by those that worked on this agreement that it was his responsibility to step up to the plate and do his share as an elected official. He would advocate over the next weeks that not only the line be drawn at the county line but that all areas within Washington County that were currently within the City of Portland have the opportunity to de-annex and go to the west. He noted that this had been a very difficult time for the community and those members of the jurisdictions. There had been a lot of hard work. As with the Garden Home community which was within his district, Metro was working to develop communities that worked, to develop senses of place. He said he would do his very best to come up with a quality decision.

**Councilor Naito** thanked all of the individuals for coming and testifying today. She assured the group that the Council would evaluate the testimony very carefully, their voices had been heard today.

**Councilor Washington** thanked all for coming to this meeting. He had not taken a position on this yet. He assured everyone that he would be very fair in his procedure.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that the Council would continue Ordinance No. 96-655 and Resolution No. 96-2426 to the Council meeting on February 20th. Written testimony would be accepted until Wednesday, January 29, 1997 at 5:00 p.m. The vote would be delayed until February 20th.

8.2 **Resolution No. 96-2436A**, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Statewide Advisory Committee Recommendations on the Oregon Transportation Initiative.

**Motion:** **Councilor Washington** moved the approval of Resolution No. 96-2436A.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McLain** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor Washington** said that this was the initiative that was coming from Governor Kitzhauber. The most substantive item in the resolution was the statement that the Metro Council hereby endorsed the general principles of the Statewide Advisory Committee recommendation on the Oregon Transportation Initiative as described in Exhibit A. Exhibit A was all the piece part of it. They were not saying that we supported everything in the Advisory Committee's recommendation but the Council did endorse the general principles.

**Vote:** The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion unanimously of those present.

8.3 **Resolution No. 96-2442**, For the Purpose of Endorsing a Regional Position on Reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

**Motion:** **Councilor Washington** moved the approval of Resolution No. 96-2442.

**Seconded:** **Councilor McFarland** seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** **Councilor Washington** said that this was a five year reauthorization of the ISTEA which covered all of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, i.e., freight, roads, bridges.

**Councilor McLain** said that this had been reviewed both at the Transportation Committee and also at JPACT and TPACT. Both JPACT and TPACT had acted upon this and supported it. There had been a couple of changes made at the Transportation Committee level to make sure that it reflected the fact that they were still able to act as a region and deal with some of the local issues and be pro-active locally. They did say through this document that they agreed with the basic concept that the state transportation initiative and all of the other items that Metro deals with the federal funding. They were working in partnership with JPACT and ODOT. They believed that the Reauthorization of ISTEA was very important and there were statements included as to how they thought the reauthorization should go.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that he and Councilor Washington would be going to Washington DC to lobby for the ISTEA program and additional ISTEA funding.

**Vote:** The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion unanimously of those present.

## 9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that since it was a five Thursday month, there would be not Council meeting this coming Thursday. The next Metro Council meeting would be on February 6, 1997.

**Councilor McLain** mentioned that in this month they had had two MPAC meetings and two sub-committee meetings with MPAC. Both the Executive Officer and she had been working on some of the issues dealing with the Urban Reserve Rule and the Urban Reserve Ordinance forthcoming in February. Mr. Morrissey and Mr. Shaw would be happy to meet with Councilors individually if they would like an update on that work. There were three major issues, the amount of urban reserves that would be designated, at this point MPAC had not shown support

for the 18,000 acres as a package. MPAC would like the Council to reconsider and look at the 2,900 acres that were considered to be resource or EFU designation. The second issue was that they do believe that it was important for the Council to have the Metro Code amendments present so that they could review them. Metro gave them to MPAC and have started receiving remarks back on the draft of the Metro Code changes that would need to be in place as Metro transition from no urban reserve designation to a state where Metro would have urban reserves. There was 85% agreement and some parallel thinking in that area. The third area of concern was the length of the planning period. Right now they were dealing with a planning period of 30 to 43 years. There was some agreement that looking at the need assessment for 30 years was different than looking at the need assessment for 43 years. That was still a debatable issue. The 43 year planning period went along with the 2040 growth concept work they started seven years ago and they got a change in the state urban reserve rule to make it possible for Metro to fit their 2040 growth work into that sequence even though they had lost seven years in their fifth year planning period.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that they would schedule a work session to deal with the urban reserves and an overview of the findings probably following the Growth Management Committee meeting.

**Councilor McFarland** announced an additional scheduled Regional Facilities meeting Monday, January 28th at 3:30 PM to consider the amendments to the code having to do with MERC.

## 10. ADJOURN

With no further business to come before the Metro Council this afternoon, the meeting was adjourned by Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad at 9:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

URBAN SERVICE BOUNDARY RECORDS MAY BE FOUND IN THE PERMANENT  
RECORDS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER URBAN SERVICE BOUNDARY

\*Addendum/Attachments

A copy of the originals of the following documents can be found filed with the Permanent Record of this meeting, in the Metro Council Office.

Document Number	Document Name	Document Date
012397-01	Ericka Hoffman 9480 NW Wells Court Portland, OR 97229	January 28, 1997
012397-02	Ericka Hoffman 9480 NW Wells Court Portland, OR 97229	January 20, 1997
012397-03	Susan Burnett/James Hall 7222 SW 70th Ave Portland, OR 97223	January 24, 1997
012397-04	Charles L Waltemath 7130 SW Sylvan Court Portland, OR 97225	January 23, 1997
012397-05	Rob Drake, Mayor City of Beaverton 4755 SW Griffith Drive PO Box 4755 Beaverton, OR 97076	January 23, 1997
012397-06	Meridian Garden Petition	
012397-07	Bruce Clere 6675 SW 67th Ave Portland, OR 97223	

012397-08	Mary Terman 2555 SW 84th Ave Portland, OR 97225	January 28, 1997
012397-09	Colin Lamb Lamb's Thriftway 7410 SW Olsen Portland, OR 97223	December 5, 1996
012397-10	Background Reports on Service Provision for the Unincorporated Area of Washington County Between the Cities of Portland and Beaverton.	
012397-11	Record in Consideration of the Establishment of the Washington County Segment of Portland's Urban Service Boundary from 1986 to 1993	
012397-12	City of Beaverton's Submittal to Metro on the Proposed Urban Services Boundary (USB) Ordinance	January 23, 1997
012397-13	Catherine Darby 6620 SW Canby Portland, OR 97223	January 29, 1997
012397-14	Mike Burton Executive Officer Metro 600 NE Grand Ave Portland OR 97232	May 21, 1996
012397-15	Mike Burton Public Hearing Notice - Brochure	December 30, 1996
012397-16	Mike Burton Memo to Intererested Parties on Urban Servies Perference Survey Results	August 16, 1996
012397-17	Mike Burton Changes in the Urban Services Boundary Open Houses Notices	5/29/96-6/3/96
012397-18	Barbara Clark Portland City Auditor (FAX 503 823-4571) Resolution 35562 - Accepting Metro's proposed USB Settlement with Beaverton, Washington Co. and affected Special Service Districts	November 5, 1996

012397-19	Mayor Rob Drake City of Beaverton 4755 SW Griffith Drive PO Box 4755 Beaverton, OR 97076	November 12, 1996
012397-20	Charles Cameron County Administrative Office Washington County 155 N First Avenue Suite 300, MS 21 Hillsboro, OR 97124	November 12, 1996
012397-21	Unified Sewerage Agency Board of Directors Approve Resolution and Order Ratifying Urban Service Boundary Settlement	October 30, 1996
012397-22	Jeff Johnson, Fire Chief Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue 20665 SW Blanton St Aloha, OR 97007	November 6, 1996
012397-23	Urban Service Boundary Settlement Signed by: Charles Cameron, Washington County Rob Drake, Mayor City of Beaverton Charlie Hales, Commissioner, City of Portland Mike Burton, Executive Officer, Metro Ronald Willoughby, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Jeff Johnson, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue William Gaffi, Unified Sewerage Agency Jess Lowman, Tualatin Water District	
012397-24	Urban Service Boundary Map (8 1/2 x 11)	
012397-25	Urban Service Boundary Map (Large)	
012397-26	Washington County Water Purveyors Map (Large)	
012397-27	United Sewer Agency Map 1	
012397-28	United Sewer Agency Map 2 USA Collection System for Durham	
012397-29	United Sewer Agency Map 3 USA Collection System for Rock Creek	
012397-30	United Sewer Agency Map 4 USA Collection System for Forest Grove/ Hillsboro West	

012397-31	Lynora Printz 6564 SW Hickman Lane Portland, OR 97223	January 27, 1997
012397-32	Thomas Curtis 6836 SW Peyton Rd Portland, OR 97223	January 28, 1997
012397-33	Walt Gorman President of CPO #1 Member of the Board of Directors USA 12230 NW Sunningdale Portland, OR 97229	December 6, 1996
012397-34	The Residents of Meadow Ridge Portland, OR 97229	June 24, 1996
012397-35	Gary & Ericka Hoffman 9480 NW Wells Ct Portland, OR 97229	January 9, 1997
012397-36	Sue Marshall, President Tualatin Riverkeepers 16295 SW 85th Ave Tigard, OR 97224	January 15, 1997
012397-37	Jesse Lowman General Manager Tualatin Valley Water District 1850 SW 170th Ave Beaverton, OR 97075	October 25, 1996
012397-38	John Lemmer Jr MD 1373 NW Benfield Dr Portland, OR 97229	January 15, 1997
012397-39	Dale and Mary Jo Derby 7179 SW Arranmore Way Portland, OR 97223	January 16, 1997
012397-40	Catherine Darby 6620 SW Canby St Portland, OR 97223	January 21, 1997
012397-41	Thomas Curtis 6836 SW Peyton Rd Portland, OR 97223	January 15, 1997
012397-42	Jay Almarode 6800 SW 68th Ave	no date

	Portland, OR 97223		
012397-43	Alpha White 6575 SW Canyon Ct Portland, OR 97225	January 25, 1997	
012397-44	Connie Reynolds 6830 SW 68th Portland, OR 97223	January 27, 1997	
012397-45	Matthew and Betty Lou Braich 6850 SW 68th Ave Portland, OR 97223	January 27, 1997	
012397-46	Kristin Taggart-Nelson 5335 SW Oleson Rd Portland, OR 97225	December 2, 1996	
012397-47	Ray Bartel Chair Portland Metropolitan Area Local Govt Boundary Commission 800 NE Oregon St #16 Suite 540 Portland, OR 97232	January 16, 1997	
012397-48	Memorandum from Michael Morrissey and Jeff Stone to Council re: Urban Service Boundary background and recommended timeline.	January 15, 1997	
012397-49	Thomas Curtis 6836 SW Peyton Rd Portland, OR 97223	February 13, 1997	
012397-50	Jeff Johnson Fire Chief Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue 20665 SW Blanton St Aloha, OR 97007	3/4/97	
012397-51	Ronald Willoughby General Manager 15707 SW Walker Rd Beaverton, OR 97006	2/27/97	
012397-52	Kvistad Amendment No. 1	2/13/97	
012397-53	Kvistad Amendment No. 2	2/13/97	
DOCUMENT NUMBER 012397c-01	DOCUMENT DATE 012397	DOCUMENT TITLE list of USB documents	TO/FROM

