

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

August 7, 1997

Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Lisa Naito

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Councilor McFarland introduced the new reporter from the Daily Journal of Commerce, Ms. Linda Lanham.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Tanya Collier, Multnomah County Commissioner, briefed the Council on an possible resolution to form a regional facilities funding task force and to include OMSI as one of the regional facilities. She noted that Councilor McFarland had been working with the Multnomah County commission on this resolution as well as the City of Portland, OMSI, and the State. They had looked at OMSI's short term and long-term funding problems. To address the short-term, all parties agreed they did not want to give OMSI \$300,000 out of the general funds over the next five years.

The long term issue concerned future funding for all of the regional facilities. Metro assigned to MERC the task of taking a look at how to fund those facilities long range. Multnomah County was asking Metro to include OMSI in the responsibilities of a regional funding task force. Commissioner Collier said OMSI had developed a good long-term business plan, which Metro required of its other regional facilities.

In a separate issue, Commissioner Collier suggested that OMSI make it possible for low-income people to visit the museum. She noted that the Zoo had done this by offering reduced rates.

Councilor McFarland expressed her appreciation to Commissioner Collier for taking the lead on this issue. She said the Council supported bringing these issues forward. She was not adverse to expanding the scope of the regional funding task force committee to consider OMSI. She indicated that Mr. Mark Williams and she had already talked about forming this task force. The Council welcomed cooperation on this issue.

Commissioner Collier asked that the Council consider passing something formally. It would be a reinforcement because there were no specifics about how the task force be developed.

Councilor McFarland said she would work with Mr. Williams about this task force and bring recommendations forward to Council.

Councilor Morissette said that this Council approved a one year commitment of \$100,000 for OMSI.

Councilor McFarland said that the Council could not make a two year commitment, for budgetary reasons.

Commissioner Collier clarified that the purpose of putting the two years in was to notify the participating governments that they would be asked again next year.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

Presiding Officer Kvistad charged Councilor McLain and her committee to begin the process review today and bring the general overview of the process from this point forward back to Council, possibly next week, or no later than the first week of September. Public hearings had already been scheduled and should be on Councilor's personal calendars.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of Metro Council meeting minutes of the July 17, 1997, and those of the Metro Council Budget Committee meeting of April 23, 1997.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt the Metro Council meeting minutes of April 23, 1997, and those of the Metro Council Budget Committee meeting of July 17, 1997.

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

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. Councilor Naito was absent. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

6. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

6.1 Ordinance No. 97-709, An Ordinance Amending the FY 1997-98 budget and appropriations schedule by transferring \$2500 from contingency to materials and services in the Office of the Executive Officer's portion of the General Fund to provide for Metro's sponsorship of a symposium on bi-state issues, and declaring an emergency.

Presiding Officer Kvistad assigned Ordinance No. 97-709 to Government Affairs Committee.

7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

7.1 Ordinance No. 97-700, For the Purpose of Amending the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 97-700.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** asked that Bruce Warner explain the changes that had been made and the impact those changes would have.

Mr. Bruce Warner, Director of REM, reviewed the amendments to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. The amendments clarify 1) each agency's responsibility in developing the plan, and 2) the program and schedule for agencies to follow in submitting annual plans, so that REM can review them. The dates by which the agencies needed to submit their annual plans were also changed, to coincide with Metro's budget cycle. The changes were approved unanimously by the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-700. No one came forward to testify. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Councilor McFarland said she was comfortable with the recommendations and urged the aye vote of the Council.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. Councilor Naito was absent. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.2 Ordinance No. 97-708, For the Purpose of Granting a Franchise to TPST Soil Recyclers of Oregon, Inc., to Operate a Petroleum Contaminated Soil Processing Facility.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 97-708.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** reviewed this ordinance and urged the support of the Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-708. No one came forward. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Presiding Officer Kvistad recessed the Metro Council and convened the Contract Review Board.

8. CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

8.1 Resolution No. 97-2541, For the Purpose of Authorizing a Contract with OMSI to Develop Interactive Data and Curriculum Materials at Metro Washington Park Zoo.

Motion: **Councilor McCaig** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2541.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** said this was a wonderful grant from Tektronix to develop science stations. Also included in the grant was a request that Metro develop a contract with OMSI to provide the Web page. She urged Council support of item.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 97-2541. No one came forward. The public hearing was closed.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the Contract Review Board.

9. RESOLUTIONS

9.1 Resolution No. 97-2528A, For the Purpose of Approving the Recommended South Willamette River Crossing Options for Further Evaluation as Contained Within the Screening Results and Recommendations Report, April 1997.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2528A.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** summarized the Resolution and asked staff to come forward for further review.

Chris Deffebach, Senior Transportation Planner, explained that the purpose of the study was to identify crossing improvement strategies for the Willamette River between I-205 and the Marquam Bridge. She said it was important to realize the intent was to develop the overall scope and make recommendations that fit in the Regional Transportation Plan. Project-level work would come later. She explained the three basic steps to this process: defining the range of options, screening those options for further consideration, and evaluating the options. The purpose of the resolution before the Council was to endorse the selected options that would go on to the evaluation stage. She said the public comments heard so far indicated a great deal of concern over impacts to neighborhoods.

Councilor Washington said that the purpose of this resolution was to collect data for further study. There was already a public hearing before the Transportation Planning Committee which gathered quite a bit of information. He said he wanted Council to be very aware of the impact of this Resolution.

Councilor McLain said that items 5 and 6 were added to examine alternatives for the existing Sellwood Bridge; both elements were an important part of previous conversations. She felt comfortable supporting the resolution. She felt the connectivity from the east and west side of river was extremely important.

Councilor Morissette said he did not support this resolution and felt it sent a signal to some potential study areas that have, in his opinion, absolutely no way of happening. He urged Council not to support this resolution, but to consider looking at current corridors as a means of managing the flow of traffic through these areas.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he also expressed some concern in Committee over some items. He said he had received a letter from Mayor Klammer of Lake Oswego, who had major concerns over the two Lake Oswego options. In addition, a great deal of testimony from people in the

Sellwood community had concerns about the impact of the Tacoma crossing. Metro needed to make sure to listen to the local communities and make sure to do a great deal of community outreach.

Councilor Washington urged Council support for this first step.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette voting nay.

9.2 Resolution No. 97-2529, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Phase I Interim Strategy for the U.S. 26 (Portland to Cannon Beach) Corridor.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2529.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said this Resolution would make sure that Metro supported the interim corridor strategy document so the second phase could go forward. The second phase would coordinate with our Regional Transportation Plan update, recognizing that relevant changes in the transportation performance measures would be included in that document. We also would make sure this study was consistent with Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and with the staffs of Washington County and Metro.

Councilor Morissette said he did not support this resolution. He read and commented on parts of the information provided with the resolution:

“...limited expansion of highway capacity within the Metro UGB”

Councilor Morissette said he felt the multimodal process of handling traffic within the UGB was a great idea but that it would come nowhere near meeting the majority of transportation needs, which was for improving and widening roads.

“...no capacity expansion outside of the UGB”

Councilor Morissette commented there was no way.

...“increased freight movement by rail and air to the coast”

He commented that the majority of the transportation needs for getting the goods to coast was going to continue to be roads. We were kidding ourselves if we thought this was going to be any different.

...“apply restrictive access management standards consistent with the planning of land use”

He commented that the numbers of what people actually choose and how they got to things still hadn't registered so he absolutely didn't support this one resolution, it was just like the last one resolution.

Councilor McLain pointed out that the resolution did mention road improvements and widening during the 20 year planning period, including work on Highway 6 and US 26. She asked for support from Council and felt this was a good foundation for this study to go forward.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette voting nay.

9.3 Resolution No. 97-2532, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Executive Officer to Execute Intergovernmental Agreements with the City of Portland Parks and Recreation to Manage the Powell Butte-Featherston and the Kelly Butte-Walters Properties Purchased by Metro and the City of Portland.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2532.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** reviewed the intergovernmental agreements between Metro and the City of Portland Parks and Recreation to manage land purchased. She addressed the limitations mentioned in the staff review and urged an aye vote on this item.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.4 **Resolution No. 97-2537A**, For the Purpose of Confirming Nominations to Fill Vacancies on the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2537A.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** said the nominees were highly recommended and qualified and said a complete list of the advisory committee roster was available and included a Clark County advisor. She urged an aye vote for these nominees.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.5 **Resolution No. 97-2539A**, For the Purpose of Approving General Policies Related to Granting of Easements, Right of Ways, Leases and Licenses for Non-Park Uses Through Properties Managed by the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department.

Motion: **Councilor McCaig** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2539A.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** explained this resolution would establish a policy to guide Metro in deciding whether to grant easements or rights-of-way for non-park uses on park lands that Metro owns. She said in the last year Metro had received two requests for non-park uses on park lands, one at Oxbow from the City of Gresham to upgrade a sewer line on an existing easement, and one at Blue Lake from PGE to bury existing overhead utility lines on an existing easement. As a result of those requests, the Open Spaces staff made a recommendation, but in doing so realized requests like this would increase in the future as 6,000 acres of land come under Metro management. With that responsibility, Metro should establish a policy ahead of time to ensure resources were protected--i.e., to prevent uses that would have a significant impact on the natural resources, cultural resources, recreation facilities, or recreational opportunities, or have a negative impact on the operation and/or the management. Some requests might result in positive or neutral impacts. Metro needed a policy and process in place to review these requests.

Councilor McCaig explained that staff drafted the original resolution with the intention of clarifying Metro's minimum requirements for approval of requests and delineating the rights of applicants. It also addressed the need for Metro to recover its costs. This original resolution

came before the Regional Facilities Committee, and she had proposed changing the wording in the document to make clear that the resolution addressed process for reviewing requests, not criteria for approving them. She also raised the issue of looking at any easement, park use or not. Both properties Metro had received requests for easements on came under Metro's management with existing easements. The requests were for modifications and improvements. She had suggested there might be a distinction between property Metro managed that had existing easements and property with no existing easements. Before Metro put requests through this process it had another standard whereby Metro required that a master plan be developed before it would review those requests and consider any easements at all.

Councilor McLain expressed her appreciation for Councilor McCaig's briefing on the resolution and asked if there would be a change in the process whereby people who lived near the affected property would be notified.

Councilor McFarland said she had sat in the committee when the resolution was reviewed and tightened up and said that staff had asked for guidance so it could move forward with things that were pending. She felt it was important to move forward with this, though not without addressing citizens' concerns.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked Ms. Nancy Chase to come forward to give an overview.

Ms. Nancy Chase, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Senior Real Estate Negotiator, summarized the request review process. The request would first be reviewed by the staff. Necessary information would be collected at that review. If the property was new, staff might ask the applicant to hire a biologist or an archaeologist to evaluate potential. The request would then be reviewed by Charles Ciecko, the department's director, regarding harm to the park, possible alternative locations, or other alternatives. If it passed this review, the application with recommendations would then go to the Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee, then on to the Regional Facilities Committee, then to Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad clarified that there would be no automatic easements, and even existing easements would be reviewed by the Director of the Department as well as the Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee and be the subject of a public hearing.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 97-2539A.

Mr. Anthony Boutard, 1640 SW Davenport St., Portland, Oregon 97201 urged the Council to send the resolution back and do more work on it. One disturbing piece was that it made no reference to Metro Parks and Greenspaces Master Plan. The Master Plan stated that the public was not allowed to use lands that were taken over by the Greenspaces Program until a master plan was developed for those properties. This resolution seemed to contradict that plan. He felt Metro should know how the land was going to be used granting or changing an easement. He felt the standards for this sort of approval needed to be tightened and a citizen participation element needed to be in there before the approval.

Ms. Liz Callison, 6039 SW Knightsbridge Dr., Portland, OR 97219 said people reacted very quickly and very strongly and most opposed non-park uses. She suggested some language about funding for enforcement and enforcement policies. She also mentioned the need for state or federal permits. She also recommended more public involvement before easements were granted or modified. She suggested withholding approval of any easements while this resolution was being considered. She referred Council to the May draft of the Regional Framework Plan, page

235, section on publicly owned open spaces. She said the resolution appeared to contradict that section, as it did not mandate that a master plan be in place.

Mr. Lewis Marcus, 7318 N Syracuse St, Portland, OR 97208, representing himself, said he had worked on the Metro Greenspaces and that the public perception that Metro was doing a good thing was important. He agreed with Councilor McFarland that the two pending requests for easements must be dealt with. He suggested the resolution not be passed at this time, but go back for more citizen involvement and for clarification, because it was vague. He said he hoped it could be reconsidered after it had citizen input. He said he was an advocate of strong infrastructure improvements, but he wanted to be reassured that the parks were not being negatively affected.

Ms. Amanda Fritz, Friends of Arnold Creek, 4106 SW Vacuna St, Portland, OR 97219, applauded Metro's proactive rather than reactive approach in addressing this issue. She agreed that consideration should be given to not allowing any uses at all without a Master Plan. She also felt language should be included about the public benefits outweighing all potential impacts, significant or not. She called attention to pictures of an easement being put in at the headwaters of Arnold Creek. She felt the project was being done as well as possible and it had been approved with public hearings. She said it had taken over a year to gain approval, cost twice as much as it should have, and it was awful. It had obliterated the creek. She would like to see language in the ordinance which would give a good public process for approving the current resolution.

Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Councilor McLain asked Legal Staff to explain the legal meaning of "regional significance" and "significant impact." She wondered what had been discovered regarding these terms.

Alison Kean-Campbell said the term "significant" has a different meanings depending upon the context. In this document it was meant to be interpreted on a case-by-case basis.

Councilor McLain said in number 4, qualifiers addressed the kind of impact and to what resources. It seemed to her that the concept of a master plan was being addressed in number 4 without using the term "master plan."

Ms. Kean-Campbell said it did speak to the issues, but without saying "master plan." She also said that many of the properties for which easements or licenses of right-of-way would be requested would not be properties that would have a master plan.

Councilor McLain the citizens needed to understand that Metro would be looking for partners to help manage many of the properties it would be acquiring. In those cases, master plans would not be done by Metro alone.

Ms. Kean-Campbell said it would be a mistake to require a master plan in all cases, because as Councilor McLain had just noted, no funds were allocated for master plans. She noted 13B, which reads, "staff will determine if additional information is required". That additional information could be a master plan. She restated that the whole purpose of this document was for resource protection and to give staff written guidelines to provide to applicants that spell out requirements for resource protection before Council would even consider granting the request. Perhaps clarification language could be added to 13B language to say something like "upon receipt of the detailed proposal, the department shall determine if additional information or a master plan is required."

Councilor Washington said he received several calls on this issue. He said he would not support this resolution because the number of calls raised concerns with him. He said he was uncomfortable doing committee work at a full Council meeting. If this resolution involved a deadline or if an advisory committee had forwarded it to Council, it would be different. He said there seemed to be gaps in the information flow.

Councilor McCaig proposed two items: First, the issues did not surface in the Committee. She suggested some amendments to reconcile some of the issues today or if there continued to be unclear issues, it could also be moved back to committee. Second, the description of significant impact allowed more flexibility than less, with the opportunity to apply criteria to specific situations rather than to create a generic and general description that by its nature would restrict the Council's ability to judge the merits of each case. What was stunning about this for her was when this resolution hit on the Internet, she had 37 calls from people in her district, all but one of whom had assumed the worst. The one person who had not assumed the worst said she called to find out more, because this did not sound typical for Councilor McCaig. The rest of the calls on the resolution assumed Metro was opening its parks and greenspaces up to wholesale development. She thought the fault lay in the way the resolution was drafted in addition to the public's willingness to believe the worst. This suggested resolutions need to be crafted more carefully.

Motion to Amend #1: **Councilor McCaig** proposed to use language to make clear, for the purpose of approving general policies relating to the review of the easements, rights-of-way, leases, and licenses for non-park uses through properties managed. And on Exhibit A again change the granting to a review.

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

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Washington voting nay.

Motion to Amend #2: **Councilor McCaig** proposed to delete the language in Exhibit A under number 1 "and approve", provide for formal review and approval of all proposed easements. This would remove "and approval" so the sentence would read, provide for formal review of all proposed easements.

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

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Washington voting nay.

Motion to Amend #3: **Councilor McCaig** proposed adding in #5, "and require full mitigation and related maintenance as determined" by the department of all unavoidable impacts to natural resources.

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

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Washington voting nay.

Discussion: **Ms. Kean-Campbell** said that this was adding on to Councilor McCaig's amendment number 2 where she deleted "and approval" from paragraph one. She thought that the Council might want to make the whole paragraph consistent. When the underlined language was added, "still subject to the review and approval" Ms. Kean-Campbell suggested adding "or denial". She indicated that it might be overkill but might make the change clearer.

Councilor McCaig said she would accept that language.

Motion to Amend #4: **Councilor McCaig** returned to Amend #1 and added in the last sentence, the words "or denial". Additionally, #13 under B in Exhibit A would read, "upon receipt of the detailed proposal, the department shall determine if additional information or a master plan is required (delete "for a thorough") prior to further review and analysis of the proposal.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** clarified that this was giving the staff the flexibility at the front end where there was no master plan to make a determination to not go forward because there was no master plan on any of the proposals regarding that piece of property.

Councilor McLain addressed amendment #4. She thought that this amendment was the most needed, she supported this amendment because it helped the citizens as well as the Metro Council indicate if they felt that if there was not a master plan in place, there was not any partner in place who wanted to manage it and Metro had not intention or budget to manage it or develop it at that point as a park facility, that it might be a way for Metro and the Council to say no and to deny that particular easement. She thought that this amendment got to the heart of what the Council had heard from citizens. She urged the Council's support of the amendment.

Presiding Officer Kvistad clarified the amendment, the first part being the technical amendment to section 1 in Exhibit A and the second part was the addition of the language after the word, information "or a master plan is required prior to further review and analysis of the proposal". This was added to section 13B. "For a thorough" was deleted from the sentence.

Councilor McCaig asked that Mr. Michael Morrissey make his point about the word "denial".

Mr. Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst, said that the underlined language in item #1 would read, that it was the final determination whether the determination is an approval or a denial that is subject to approval by the Council, so the Council could approve a denial. He thought putting approval or denial by the full Council was redundant, that approval did not mean approval of the request it meant approval of the determination which had been put forward.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he felt it was redundant.

Councilor McCaig added that she had no doubt that the Council was not lessening it. So she felt that if their attempt was to make it more clear and in fact it was less clear, then it should be left as it stands. She was comfortable leaving it as it stands.

Councilor McLain, the seconder, approved deleting "denial" from the motion.

Motion to Amend #4: **Councilor McCaig** moved to change 13B to read after the word information, "or a master plan is required prior to further review and analysis of the proposal."

Seconded: **Councilor McLain** seconded the amended amendment.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Washington voting nay.

Councilor McCaig said there were four remaining issues she did not have amendments for, but she would like to put them before the Council to see whether anyone would make a motion, or if anyone felt strongly enough about those issues that the amended resolution would be sent back to committee. The four issues were: public notice, a definition on significant impact, funding for enforcement, and whether to broaden the resolution to include all easements and not just those for non-park uses. She asked if the Council would like to deal with these amendments at this meeting or send it back to committee.

Councilor McFarland said she had heard and read enough from the public to believe that public notice was important to the public. The other three issues might or might not need to be addressed specifically. She agreed it would be good to send the resolution back to committee.

Councilor McCaig said she was comfortable sending the amended version back to committee and directing the committee to address the items that had been raised by the citizens at the public hearing. The committee then could make a recommendation to the full Council on those amendments. She urged Council to vote the amended version back to committee for review of the four or five items that had been raised today, with a request to quickly come back with a recommendation on those specific amendments.

Councilor McFarland asked Council to send back to committee the amended version to have the issues raised today addressed.

Presiding Officer Kvistad indicated that at any time the chair of the committee could request that a resolution be returned to committee with consent and assent of a majority of the Council. He asked if this was what Councilor McFarland was suggesting.

Councilor McFarland said she wished to hear Councilor McCaig's response to what she had said. If this was the way to do it, she would return it to committee.

Councilor McCaig said one of the things she wanted to do was to get those areas which had already been discussed and reviewed previously, decided by the Council so that those areas did not have to be revisited in committee. She felt that this had been done with the votes today. She was comfortable sending the amended version back to committee and containing the committee work to the items that had been raised in the public hearing that were not amended at this meeting and make a recommendation to the full Council on those amendments. It was her hope that the Council would vote the amended version back to committee for review of the four to five items that were raised at today's meeting with a request that the committee come back with a recommendation on those specific amendments.

Councilor McFarland requested the Council send back to Committee the version that the Council had amended in today's meeting. Those public hearing issues would be considered in committee.

Presiding Officer Kvistad called for any objection to returning the resolution as amended back to committee? There was no objection.

Councilor Washington said he voted against all of the amendments but would vote to send it back to committee. He did not support the amendments because he wanted it sent back to committee.

Councilor McLain said she would not be able to attend the meeting for this and wanted her thoughts about the four issues Councilor McCaig had brought up, known to Council. She felt the public notice was the number one priority and needed to be addressed. She agreed with Councilor McCaig about significant impact. The funding for enforcement contained some issues she felt needed discussion. She felt the language and perception of non-park use vs. park use was too much for one resolution and needed to be a separate document.

Councilor McCaig restated that three of the four items to be addressed--public notice, significant impact, and funds for enforcement--would be looked at and recommendations made. She said she was comfortable taking the park vs. non-park issue off the list.

Presiding Officer Kvistad returned the matter to Regional Facilities Committee.

9.6 Resolution No. 97-2540, For the Purpose of Filling a Vacancy on the Traffic Relief Options Study Task Force.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2540,

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** stated that Mark Gorman from Intel would be filling the vacancy on the Traffic Relief Options Study Task Force. She said he was deeply involved in trying to look for balanced transportation systems, ride shares, etc., at Intel. He would make a great committee member.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

9.7 Resolution No. 97-2543, For the Purpose of Supporting the Goals of Oregon Homeownership Partners Project 2000 to Increase Home Ownership Rates in Oregon and the Nation.

Motion: **Councilor Morissette** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2543.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Morissette** said home ownership was one of the cornerstones of having such a successful country, and it helped build good communities. He believed this initiative would help home ownership rates start back up again. He recommended approval of this resolution.

Councilor McFarland asked how this would increase the commitment to affordable housing.

Councilor Morissette said it redoubled efforts about the importance of home ownership with an actual motion and supported a program that was a collective of many other groups in the state and across the country

Councilor McFarland asked Councilor Morissette if this would increase the opportunity for people with limited resources to find housing.

Councilor Morissette said it addressed some of the issues that would allow people to afford housing. Part of that would be cutting costs of home ownership, including reducing financing costs, production, purchase transactions, and would make buying and owning a home more affordable.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

10. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor McLain passed a list of the items covered at the last Growth Management Committee meeting. These were important items that would be voted on in the next month.

Councilor Morissette reviewed some things that were happening with Solid Waste and invited Councilors to come to him with questions and/or comments.

Councilor McFarland said she had spent time reviewing these issues with the REM staff and felt it was important to listen to them, as they were important policy questions.

11. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM
080797c-01	07/30/97	OMSI Draft Resolution concerning Short Term Support and investigation of long term solution to OMSI's Indebtedness	to Presiding Officer Kvistad from Don Carlson and Tanya Collier

080797c-02	08/07/97	Letter concerning resolution no. 97-2539	to Metro Council from Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland
080797c-03	no date listed	Record of call to Michael Morrissey concerning Resolution No. 97-2539	to Clerk of the Council from Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst
080797c-04	08/05/97	Letter concerning South Willamette River Crossing Study, Resolution No. 97-2528A.	To Presiding Officer Kvistad From WK Klammer, Mayor of Lake Oswego
080799c-05	no date listed	Resolution No. 97-2539A requested amendments	To Metro Council From Amanda Fritz Director of Friends of Arnold Creek
080797c-06	08/07/97	Request for reconsideration of Resolution No. 97-2539	To Metro Council From Liz Callison
080797c-07	08/07/97	Letter concerning Resolution No. 97-2539	To Metro Council From Sha Shady, Friends of Newell Creek Canyon, 17855 Alden St, Oregon City OR 97045
080797c-08	08/07/97	Letter concerning Resolution No. 97-2539	To Metro Council From Mike Houck, Urban Naturalist
080797c-09	08/07/97	Letter concerning Resolution No. 97-2539	To Councilor Patricia McCaig From Jere Retzer, attached comment to Metro Council
080797c-10	08/07/97	Letter concerning Resolution No. 97-2539	To Metro Council From Frank Selker
080797c-11	08/07/97	Memo concerning Homeownership Partners Project 2000	To Metro Council From Mike Burton, Executive Officer
080797c-12	08/07/97	Memo concerning Title 8 Functional Plan, Ordinance No. 97-691B, UGB amendment procedures and decision steps, proposals to the Regional Framework	To Metro Council From Susan McLain, Chair, Growth Management Committee

Plan, Affordable
Housing