

# MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

September 25, 1997

Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: None.

**Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad** called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

## 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

**Michael Roche**, Multnomah Neighborhood Association, 8920 SW 40th Street, Portland spoke to the council concerning the recent amendments to neighborhood maps. He read Metro's definition of a "main street." He formally requested the Council withdraw the Main Street designation from Multnomah Village. He said no support exists in the neighborhood for the designation. He said a town center is planned for Hillsdale, one mile north. A town center is also planned for West Portland, one mile south. This map clearly shows that the intent of the city is to form a third town center, not a main street.

He also questioned the use of the market factor. He said the Bureau of Planning stated in a recent letter that it was using a market factor in the Portland Plan. Market factors are illegal. Metro's Council has said so, and the courts have said so. He questioned why Portland was being allowed to use a market factor of 25% in all its development.

Third, he addressed recent comments made by Metro's executive officer, Mike Burton, which said few neighborhoods would be affected by increased density. Mr. Roche named several areas that, in his view, would be affected. He said the distribution of density as planned would not be equitable and fairly distributed.

Finally, Mr. Roche addressed Mr. Burton's comments that if Metro was going to expand the UGB, then the infrastructure needed to be dealt with prior to annexation. Mr. Roche agreed, but asked why no one seemed to care about the infrastructure already inside the UGB, where the density is being encouraged. He said no funding exists and the watershed problems in southwest Portland were enormous. He invited the Council to attend a meeting on October 16th where a joint transportation/land-use committee would be addressing the watershed problems.

**Mr. James Peterson**, Custom Woodworking, 2505 SW Multnomah Blvd. Portland OR 07219 addressed the southwest plan, the Functional Plan states that you can only zone for 80% of the intended capacity. He said that Portland was using the market factor, which violates the Functional Plan. He said the market factor is illegal, and the City of Portland needs to be told to stay within the guidelines.

**Councilor McFarland** said she had also gotten a phone call objecting to an action that had been taken at a City of Portland meeting chaired by Planning Director David Knowles. Councilor McFarland asked what recourse Metro had to address violations of the Functional Plan.

**Mr. Roche** said that his understanding of the Functional Plan was that Metro was setting guidelines that communities are asked to abide by in order to meet the growth projections. Rule-making without enforcement is meaningless.

**Councilor McLain** said that Mr. Peterson had been coming to MPAC about some of these issues. She said Metro's responsibility is only to set minimum standards with its Functional Plan. If a jurisdiction chooses to exceed those standards, that is not a violation. She said she understood that Portland had suggested greater density than Metro's minimum, but was reconsidering because of citizen objections. She said Metro's Functional Plan presented a concept, not specific numbers. Some jurisdictions have reached agreements or made exceptions or changed the specifics in cases similar to the one Mr. Roche had presented. She suggested his group try to do this with the City of Portland. She said Metro has the right to establish the concept, but as long as a jurisdiction develops plans in keeping with that concept, it cannot become involved in the details. She asked Mr. Cooper if Metro had established maximum targets.

**Mr. Dan Cooper**, Metro Legal Counsel, said no, but other provisions in the Functional Plan, such as those on traffic levels of service and stream protection must be balanced against density. Given the balancing requirements, it is not possible to answer that question without more investigation.

**Mr. Roche** asked whether Metro had designated Multnomah as a Main Street. Presiding Officer Kvistad said yes. Mr. Roche then repeated his formal request that the Main Street designation for Multnomah be revoked.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** put a disclaimer on the record in that he and his family own a business in Multnomah, so he has a personal investment in that village.

**Councilor McLain**, asked Mr. Cooper to describe the process for dealing with Mr. Roche's request to remove the Main Street designation.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reminded the Council that citizens may speak to any topic during this time in the Council meeting. He said that when this issue comes up formally, citizens can make a presentation to the Council on the issue and request a particular action.

**Councilor Naito** said she thought Mr. Roche was requesting that the designation of Multnomah Village as a Main Street be put on a future agenda. She said he was not asking the Council to address the issue at this meeting. She recommended that Growth Management hold an informational hearing on the issue.

**Councilor McLain** said she thought a process was already established for dealing with issues like this. She suggested that process might be similar to the one followed by those in dealing with the Wood Village issue.

**Mr. Cooper** said the Functional Plan Mr. Roche referred to and the designation of Multnomah as a Main Street were adopted by the Council by ordinance. He said a member of the Council, a committee member, or the executive officer may introduce an ordinance to accomplish what Mr.

Roche has requested. Once that ordinance is introduced, then the referral to MPAC and all the other procedures would be just the same no matter what the original source of the idea is.

**Councilor McLain** said she would take up the matter with the rest of the Growth Management Committee.

**Art Lewellyn**, LOTI Designer, 3205 SE 8th #9, Portland OR 97202, addressed the Council on the alignment of the North/South lightrail. He said he supports a North/South lightrail, but he opposes the current alignment. He supports the LOTI alignment, with the lightrail line being left on the east bank, with an electric bus providing service on the west side to the transit mall. He read a quotation by Robert F. that supports the use of electric buses. Mr. Llewellyn said he challenged Mike Burton, Executive Officer, to publicly debate the east bank alignment of the North/South lightrail. He said he felt a need for the public to know about the LOTI alignment.

### 3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

### 4. RLIS DATA: CUSTOMER SURVEY AND IMPLICATIONS

**Alexis Dow**, Metro Auditor, reviewed her report on Metro's Regional Land Information System (RLIS), dated September 1997. A copy of the report is included as part of the meeting record. Metro uses RLIS data for its own planning. It also sells RLIS data through subscriptions to local governments and others through its store front program. Sales of RLIS data have generated approximately 1.3 million dollars in gross revenues. Even at a cost of 1.2 million, it still generates revenues for Metro. The audit evaluates customer satisfaction with RLIS and also assesses RLIS as a system for Metro. To evaluate customer satisfaction, Metro sent surveys to 357 current customers. Of those, 196 surveys were completed,

Overall, most customers reported satisfaction with RLIS, but some problems were identified. Ms. Dow said Jim Luckeroth, who works for the auditor's office, would explain the problems.

**Councilor McLain** said she understood asked there was an 87% level of satisfaction?

**Ms. Dow** said the numbers in the report are not percentages of those satisfied; rather, they are rating scales. On a scale of 1 to 10, with one meaning "very unsatisfied" and 10 meaning "very satisfied," the ratings for various RLIS products ranged from about 6.5 to about 8.

**Jim Luckeroth**, who works for the auditor's office, said that a rating of 7.5 can mean that half the people rated the product a 5 and the other half rated a 10. That does not mean that 75% of the people are happy. The types of the problems customers reported with data quality fell into four categories: 1) inaccuracies; 2) out of date; 3) insufficient detail; and 4) incompleteness. The problems affected all the RLIS product categories. Examples of problems include tax lot lines that were incorrectly drawn, demographic fields not broken down enough or into appropriate categories, and incorrect zoning. Private -sector customers complained about the expense of the data; they pay full price while public-sector customers get discounts.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked if the problems represented exceptions or the rule.

**Mr. Luckeroth** said that these were the exceptions, but they were not infrequent and they should not be underplayed. He said that out of 196 returned surveys, ratings below 5 were assigned 501 times.

**Councilor McLain** said 1.3 million dollars worth of this product was sold, mostly to repeat customers. That implies a number of people were satisfied. She questioned whether customers had other sources of more accurate or more current data, since most of the other sources purchase their data from Metro.

**Mr. Luckeroth** said better demographic data were available from other vendors. He said most of the repeat customers were individuals employed by cities and counties, who did not have to pay out of their own pockets. Those who had to pay full price from their own pockets, such as real estate developers, were not among the repeat customers.

**Councilor McCaig** said two things within the audit caught her attention. One was that the Growth Management and Map departments gave a pretty clear disclaimer along with the maps it supplied. The disclaimer warned that the maps contained old information that needed to be updated. She asked if there were areas that could be updated without incurring unreasonable costs. She suggested the Data Resource Center (DRC) concentrate on areas that can be improved.

**Mr. Luckeroth** said the Center had been asked to study the problem. It was also asked to more clearly communicate the limitations of the data.

**Councilor McCaig** asked Mr. Luckeroth if the departments would be getting back to him with information about the areas that could be improved and at what cost. He said a report to the Executive Officer, describing what might be possible and what cannot be done, is within 6 months.

**Ms. Dow** summarized the conclusions from the study. First, the Data Resource Center is successfully generating revenues. Second, there is a general level of satisfaction with the products, but some of the customers who gave RLIS a high rating had serious complaints. She said Metro is held responsible for the accuracy of the data, even though it only collates and distributes them. She said in some cases purchasers' expectations were too high; in others they failed to take the disclaimers seriously. To address the problems, it's important to recognize that Metro has limited ability to improve the accuracy of the data. It doesn't make sense to spend a whole lot of money to increase the accuracy beyond the level Metro needs internally for its own planning. But the product limitations should be clearly communicated. The report recommends that the DRC try to improve the accuracy, the level of detail, and the timeliness of the data. But the DRC also needs to decide which areas don't make practical sense to improve.

Two other important improvements relate to service. First, customers must know the limitations of the data. Second, complaints need to be handled more efficiently. The report recommends setting up a tracking system for each call, to be sure the complaint gets handled. It also recommends bills itemize all charges. Finally, the report suggests the DRC establish a vehicle, such as a newsletter, whereby subscribers can be informed when updates are issued.

**Councilor McLain** said she agreed that disclaimers need to be very apparent and that complaints needed to be handled efficiently. She thought, however, that the audit report did not emphasize the reason RLIS exists--i.e., first and foremost for Metro to use for its own planning. Metro has only so much money, and it must go to serve Metro's needs first. She said money spent to

promote private industry is another matter. Metro should help, but not at the expense of meeting its own needs.

**Ms. Dow** addressed Councilor McLain's points. She said her office's recommendations were that Metro plan to improve the accuracy, detail, and timeliness of the data, but the recommendation is qualified insofar as these improvements meet Metro's needs. Improvements beyond that need to be relayed to the value-added resellers. Ms. Dow called the Council's attention to a table at the back of the report that summarizes the responses to the survey. Appendix D shows how customers rated each product. It can serve as a guide for making improvements.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that he does information service work for a living. He knows perfection is hard to attain. The DRC does a good job, but problem areas need to be identified and addressed.

## 5. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration of Metro Council meeting minutes of the September 18, 1997.

**Motion:** Councilor McFarland moved to adopt the Metro Council meeting minutes of September 18, 1997.

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

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

## 7. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 97-712**, To Adopt the Hearings Officer Findings and Recommendation, Approving Urban Growth Boundary Case 91-1; West Linn. (*Presentation of Hearings Officer's Report and Recommendation*)

**Councilor Morissette** said he has had conversations on this issue from both sides and it shouldn't alter his ability to vote on this.

**Councilor Naito** asked that Resolutions No. 97-2560 and 97-2561 be considered at this time, before Ordinance No. 97-712.

Presiding Officer Kvistad set the consideration of Ordinance No. 97-712 aside until after consideration of the two resolutions.

9.1 **Resolution No. 97-2560**, For the Purpose of Confirming a Citizen Member to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

**Motion:** Councilor Naito moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2560.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** said Scott Leeding, a realtor from Clackamas County, has been active in his community and he would be great for MPAC. Mr. Leeding said he has a great deal to learn, but he can offer the market perspective to the discussions.

**Councilor McLain** said Mr. Leeding has come to MPAC meetings, asked questions, and already made acquaintances on the committee. He has shown dedication, which she appreciates.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

9.2 **Resolution No. 97-2561**, For the Purpose of Confirming a Citizen Member Alternate to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2561.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** said Rebecca Read would serve as citizen alternate to Peggy Lynch on MPAC.. She has served on numerous community boards and committees, and she is highly qualified.

**Councilor McLain** said Ms. Read has also attended at least one MPAC meeting. She welcomed Ms. Read to the committee.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

The Council resumed consideration of Agenda item 7.1, **Ordinance No. 97-712**, To Adopt the Hearings Officer Findings and Recommendation, Approving Urban Growth Boundary Case 91-1; West Linn. Presiding Officer Kvistad asked Mr. Cooper to review the process for a first reading of this ordinance.

**Mr. Cooper** said this ordinance proposes to amend the urban growth boundary; it is a locational adjustment to the UGB. He said it is a quasi-judicial proceeding, so councilors are bound by different rules, and the Council's discretion in this matter is limited by the Metro Code. The Council's job is to apply the facts to the criteria and make a decision. The hearings officer has heard the issue; he is present and will give his recommendation. After that, the Council will hear argument from different parties. A request has also been made to submit new evidence into the record. Unless the Council decides to allow the new evidence, the Council is bound to apply only the facts that are already in the record. Council must also disclose whether any member has had any contact with individuals involved in this litigation.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked if any other members had a disclosure to make at this time?

**Councilor McLain** said she had received letters from both sides concerning the urban reserves issues.

**Mr. Cooper** said that was a separate proceeding. He said the Council must confine its decision to only the information that is already in the record. The matter will proceed as follows. After Ray Valone of Metro's Growth Management Department gives a brief introduction, Richard Forester, the Hearings Officer, will present his report and recommendations and explain the details of the case. One of the parties, Robert Thomas, has submitted a written request for the Council to reopen the record to accept new evidence. The Council will then decide whether to

accept new evidence into the record. If the Council decides to allow new evidence to come into the record, the matter should be sent back to the hearings officer. The hearings officer can then consider the new evidence and issue a new report. If new evidence is not allowed, then Council would hear arguments from parties on two exceptions to the hearing officer's report that have been filed. After that, the matter would need to be put forward to another Council meeting for a second reading of the ordinance and Council action. The Council can either accept or reject the hearings officer's report and recommendations. If it accepts the report, then it would be sent on for a vote. If it rejects the report and recommendations, then Council needs to pass a preliminary motion to that effect. The Metro Code then allows you to direct either the office of general counsel or the hearings officer to prepare new findings of fact and report. Those findings will then, in effect, become the Council's decision, and be reviewed on appeal should anyone choose to do that.

**Councilor Naito** said she had a memo regarding options for dealing with new evidence. Her question was, what should Council listen to according to what standards?

**Mr. Cooper** said the standards that are in the code say that the party wishing to submit additional evidence must explain why the information was not provided at the hearing, and must demonstrate that the evidence is relevant and will likely result in a different decision. So, it's necessary for the party who's making their request to give you some explanation of what that evidence would be. You can't take it into account in your decision until after you have formally admitted it into the record and the other parties have an opportunity to comment on it and discuss it. That's why new evidence would be sent back to the hearings officer.

**Councilor Naito** asked if Council still must decide whether to admit the new evidence.

**Mr. Cooper** said yes.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said there would be a consideration of the motion for a review. If no motion is made and seconded, Council would go forward with the rest of the procedure.

**Ray Valone**, Associate Regional Planner for the Metro Growth Management Services Department, said the proposal before the Council today would add 17.34 acres to the UGB just west of the intersection of Rosemont and Day Roads, in the Tanner Basin area. The city of West Linn wants this adjustment to accommodate a new middle school for the West Linn/Wilsonville school district. A public hearing was held on June 17th of this year at the West Linn City Hall, conducted by Mr. Richard Forester, the hearings officer.

**Richard Forester**, Hearings Officer, reviewed his report and recommendations. The full report and recommendations is included as part of the meeting record. A brief summary of Mr. Forester's presentation is presented here.

Mr. Forester said his report was based on staff findings. He accepted staff recommendations to grant this locational adjustment for the school with the condition that it only be used for the school itself. The petitioner, the City of West Linn, proposed to adjust the UGB to include the 17 acres of land. In addition to this land for the middle school, the district plans to use 4.5 acres of the land located immediately northeast of the site, which is already inside the UGB, for the actual school buildings. The reason they are asking for the 17 acres is to locate the athletic field and the parking lot outside the UGB. The building itself, for various reasons, has to be within the UGB.

The Wilsonville/West Linn school district has researched appropriate sites of between 17 and 22 acres. The Metro staff looked at five potential sites in the area, and found that this site to be the most suitable. The area outside the UGB is zoned RR-55, (Rural Residential, five-acre residences). Schools are a conditional use, so the school district has to file a conditional use application with the city of West Linn and Clackamas County. In effect, the district proposes the classrooms be within the UGB but the athletic field and parking areas outside.

Arguments put forth by Curtis Hunter against approving the adjustment include 1) there is insufficient water available; 2) the school will alter stormwater drainage and runoff; 3) various Intergovernmental Agreements have been violated; 4) American Indian Artifacts have been found on the proposed site; 5) a superior site exists nearby. The hearings officer found either that proper action was planned or the allegations could not be substantiated.. Details are included in the written record.

Arguments put forth by Robert Thomas opposing the adjustment include 1) if a school is allowed, other urban uses quickly follow; 2) the City is in the middle of a water crisis; 3) growth the school was to accommodate has not happened yet; 4) utilities cannot be provided to the site; and 5) a superior site exists. These allegations were either unsubstantiated or rebutted credible authorities. Details are included in the written record.

**Councilor Naito** asked about the criterion that requires maximum efficiency of land use. What size, in acres, is a typical school site. Is the acreage involved here reasonable?

**Mr. Forester** responded that the school testified that they needed between 17 and 22 acres for a middle school site.

**Councilor Naito** asked if the buildings were one- or two-story.

**Mr. Forester** responded that the area within the UGB is only 4.5 acres and because the land-use system does not allow extensions of utility service outside the UGB, the main utility service has to be connected within the UGB and therefore the buildings have to be within the UGB. If two buildings are constructed on 4.5 acres, no play area is left.

**Councilor Naito** asked about the chain link fence around the facility to separate it from agricultural uses. What would happen to the fence were the area to become more residential?

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** requested we answer questions later, and that Mr. Robert Thomas come forward. He reminded Mr. Thomas that he would have three minutes to argue why new evidence should be presented, not to argue the merits of the case itself.

**Robert Thomas** said the evidence that was not available at the time of the hearing was that on August 10, 1997, the West Linn-Bolton pump station that supplies water zone in which the School would be located has set a new Maximum Daily demand that exceeds the capacity of the pump station. Also the Hearings Officer did not reply to Mr. Thomas input concerning June 24th. He mentioned that they only looked at staff findings. He also mentioned that he was a professional engineer. He had been on the water rate task force for West Linn and currently on the moratorium review committee for West Linn. There is not adequate water, there is not adequate funding. The city went before the boundary commission and contended that they do have the funding. Then they admitted they didn't. They only have \$210,000 from developers; they need a total 3.5 million dollars to bring the site into compliance with water criteria.

**Mr. Shonkwiler**, on behalf of Jeffrey Seymour and Curtis Hunter said he was here to support Mr. Thomas' request to reopen the record. There was evidence on water capacity issues that came out after the hearing. He said Metro should have a complete record before it makes a decision.

**Mr. Cooper** said that the theme of water supply is definitely one of the issues. Mr. Thomas testified today that a report came out August 10, after the date the evidence was closed. Mr. Thomas believes the report is relevant. Mr. Shonkwiler agrees. If it is relevant, then the decision before the Council is whether to allow the evidence.

**Councilor McLain** asked Mr. Cooper if there is a higher standard for a new theme versus a theme that already appears in the record.

**Mr. Cooper** said no.

**Jim Oliver**, representing the City of West Linn and the Attorney General's Office for West Linn, 1727 NW Hoyt St. Portland, OR 97209 said the City objects to reopening the record to admit new evidence. He said that although the report to which Mr. Thomas referred might not have been available before August 10, the issue of water availability has been actively addressed since January of 1997. The City's position is that the theme has been present and the record should not be reopened to admit new evidence. The City, however, will abide by the Council's ruling.

**Motion:** **Councilor McCaig** moved to deny additional evidence to be put into the record.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** asked whether in denying opening of the record, the two-reading process would continue or would the Council listen to it today. **Mr. Cooper** said the two-reading process would continue. **Presiding Officer Kvistad** clarified that no final vote would be taken at today's meeting.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

**Councilor McCaig** raised a point of clarification. She asked why there needed to be a motion to deny. Presiding Officer answered that the motion to deny allows those in evidence to come forward and make their case.

**Mr. Cooper** advised a motion because the code says the Council will either refuse the request or remand. A positive decision is better for the record.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reiterated that Mr. Thomas and Mr. Shonkwiler would have the opportunity to bring forward their testimony on exceptions. **Mr. Cooper** explained that this addressed the question of whether the hearings officer applied the criteria to the facts correctly in making his recommendation to the Council.

**Mr. Robert Thomas** said he was submitting written proof that a new maximum daily demand was being set for the Bolton pump Station. He thought he was going to be asked for that proof before the Council made its decision.

**Councilor Naito** asked whether it would be appropriate to look at evidence that is not currently part of the record.

**Mr. Cooper** said yes, but Mr. Thomas is not an attorney. He said that if anything Mr. Thomas presents convinces the Council to not accept the hearings officer's recommendation, and it's in the nature of statements about water that Mr. Thomas has made already, the Council should revisit that motion, reopen the record, gather all the evidence by going back to the hearings officer, and let everybody have a shot at it. Technically facts that are not part of the record, however, should not be considered for the decision.

**Councilor McLain** said the paper had been handed to the Clerk of the Council, not to the Councilors.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** clarified the procedure he understood the Council needed to follow. He said his procedural list says that Mr. Thomas and Mr. Shonkwiler would present arguments for the exceptions they had already filed.

**Mr. Cooper** confirmed the presiding officer's understanding of the procedure. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Shonkwiler had filed their written exceptions. This is their opportunity to persuade the Council of the merits of their exceptions.

**Mr. Thomas** submitted a written copy of his exceptions, which has been made part of the meeting record. He summarized his exceptions for the Council. He said he had two main exceptions: 1) the city engineer is not a registered engineer, so his analyses are not valid; and 2) the water supply is currently inadequate, but even so, it could be obtained by means other than expanding the UGB. Mr. Thomas said the board of engineers had assured him that any analysis of city infrastructure, particularly having to do with water and sewer, needed to be signed by a registered engineer over a seal showing the expiration of the registration. No such signature appears on the documents. Regarding water supply, according to the school district itself the UGB does not have to be expanded in order to obtain sufficient water for the school, it can be obtained via extraterritorial rights. Further, the Bolton Station can not provide sufficient water to service the school.

**Councilor Washington** asked Mr. Cooper whether the Council should have received the written exceptions, as Mr. Thomas said, and didn't.

**Mr. Cooper** said no.

**Jim Shonkwiler** said the documents he submitted contained all the exceptions he wished to present. He hoped the document would be read by the Council. A copy of the exceptions is included as part of the meeting record. Highlights of his document are 1) the hearings officer based his decision on insufficient evidence for water supply, sewers, and storm drainage; 2) the site must be shown to be feasible for locating a school and that has not been shown; 3) Indian artifacts exist on the site; 4) the land is zoned forest and farm with class 3 soil; and 5) the site has been limited to school use, but without any time limit on the limitation.

**Jill Thorn**, Mayor of West Linn, 22825 Willamette Dr. West Linn OR 97068 spoke in favor of the land-use application before the council today. She then read her written comments into the record (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). In summary, she said the city is in compliance with all the master plans and sufficient water exists for the school.

**Keith Liden**, McKeever and Morris, on behalf of the City of West Linn and West Linn-Wilsonville School District, 209 SW Oak Suite 200 Portland OR 97204 said he helped prepare

the application before the Council. He reviewed his written statement, (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). Those statements respond to Mr. Shonkwiler's exceptions. Two significant points: 1) the proposed site is identified as a school site in the Tanner Basin master plan, and that plan has been adopted by the State; and 2) the area is presently zoned for rural-residential and farm/forest, with a 5-acre minimum. The land was excepted by the County as farm land, although farming is one of the accepted uses. Adequate facilities are available. The other issues--such as stormwater drainage--should be dealt with at the conditional use site plan-review stage. Options exist to deal with that. Regarding archaeological artifacts, a study has been completed. It is in the record. The artifacts consist of obsidian chips. Nothing has surfaced yet that precludes development, but more archaeological study might need to be done before the school is built. Speaking to Councilor Naito's comments about school size, the West Linn-Wilsonville school district studied school size relative to facilities needed.

**Councilor Naito** noted that the school would be used for recreation in non-school hours. She also noted that this is an Urban Reserve site. The record refers to a chain link fence that would set the school property apart from the school from the agricultural uses surrounding it. She asked Mr. Forester if, knowing that the site is part of the Urban Reserve, and knowing that the City of West Linn opposes bringing this area into the UGB, does that mean no master plan incorporates this site into an future urban development.

**Mr. Forester** referred the question to the City of West Linn. Regarding the chain-link fence, it serves to separate the students from the surrounding area.

**Councilor Naito** said her interest is in efficient use of land for long-term planning.

**Mr. Forester** said he was not aware of any master plan for the area.

**Mr. Cooper** mentioned that the Council was confined to the facts that were in the record. The current question has not been part of record. He reminded the Councilors that they were a week away from needing to make a decision. That would be plenty of time to look at the record and find out what is and what is not already in there.

**Councilor Naito** said there were quite a few things about transit in the record. She asked about bus service to that site as well as bicycle lane development.

**Mr. Forester** summarized the transit provisions that are in the record , which include bicycle lanes, and said the transit service to the site is currently under negotiation. He added that regarding other exceptions made by Mr. Thomas and Mr. Shonkwiler, they have mixed criteria with conditional-use issues. He said the question is not whether what exists now can meet the criteria, but whether they can be improved to meet the criteria.

**Councilor Naito** asked Mr. Cooper whether the time limit issue raised by Mr. Shonkwiler needed to be addressed. She asked whether the council needed to consider that or act on that or should the Council accept the hearing officer's report or reject it.

**Mr. Cooper** said yes, the fact that there is a condition that has been attached, if the Council wishes to change the terms of that condition as Mr. Shonkwiler suggested, then that is within the purview of the Council. Someone would need to prepare the language to do that and be certain the findings support the change.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** solicited motions to reject the hearing officer's report. No motion was put forward, so the item was moved forward for a second reading and action at the next Council meeting.

## 8. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

8.1 **Ordinance No. 97-691C**, For the Purpose of Amending Title 8 on Council Interpretation of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan; and Declaring an Emergency.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved adoption of Ordinance No. 97-691C.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** reviewed Ordinance No. 97-691C. This ordinance was created because the Council asked the Metro legal staff to solicit input from the local jurisdictions to best deal with Title 8 of the Functional Plan. The amendments in this Ordinance have been reviewed by the Council's Growth Management committee at least three times for information and discussion. In addition, Mr. Cooper has been consulted, both formally and informally, about this issue.

First, in Section 3b, any of the comprehensive plan changes must comply with the same notification to Metro that they give to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DCLCD) pursuant to ORS 197.610 or 197.615. Also, they request that Metro then make certain it has the findings for this particular work given to the Metro Council within 14 days of when the local jurisdiction scheduled a final hearing on the proposed amendment. In Section C, the appeal is filed within a 21-day period set out in ORS 197.8308 to the amendment to a city or county comprehensive plan land-use regulation to implement the functional plan shall be deemed to be in compliance with this functional plan. So the Council has 21 days for review.

She reminded the rest of the councilors that Metro has a responsibility to make sure the comprehensive plans follow the Functional Plan. She also pointed out that in Section 5, citizen involvement process, Metro made certain any citizen may contact Metro staff or Metro executive officer or appear before the Council to raise issues regarding local functional plan compliance, to request Metro participation in the local process, or to request that Metro Council appeal a local enactment for which for which notice is required to be given to the Metro code, pursuant to Section 3 of Title 8. She reminded them that citizens may do that either through oral or written testimony. This would be forwarded to the Council if it goes to the staff or executive officer. In Sections b and c of this section, notice that in addition to consideration of these requests, any citizen can appear in front of the Council at any regular meeting and be provided the opportunity to address the council on any of these issues. Also, in subsection c, notice that Metro again makes sure that cities, counties, and Metro must comply with their own adopted and acknowledged citizen involvement requirements. This must be a system that citizens understand. Thus, the executive officer is required to at least annually publish and distribute a citizen involvement fact sheet after consulting with the MCCI, to be certain that citizens understand all of their opportunities for involvement. Councilor McLain said she believes this amendment strengthens the Functional Plan and should be adopted.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked for an explanation of the deletions and additions to this amendment.

**Mr. Cooper** said that the had been deleted reefers only to a process by which citizens may request the Council issue a formal interpretation of the Functional Plan. It does not speak at all to requests that Metro participate in any way in local government actions. In the Functional Plan as adopted, two sections referred to interpretations. One was an interpretation process that would be made by the Council at the request of a local government, and the other would be interpretations made at the request of citizens. This interpretation section being deleted was narrow. The substitute is much broader, and recognizes that Metro has the power to enforce the Functional Plan and provides much more power to participate. This enhances the power of citizens to request that Metro intervene on their behalf. This amendment also codifies the right of citizens to appear before the council on their own behalf, on management issues that are not on the agenda. The fact sheet, also, is a brand new item, that ensures citizens receive information on the processes available for citizen involvement.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said currently the Council allows citizens to address the Council. Mr. Cooper said that is true. This simply puts the current practice into an ordinance.

**Councilor McCaig** clarified that Section 3 (B) provides no additional opportunities for citizen involvement. Mr. Cooper said this elevates a practice to an ordinance. Councilor McCaig asked Councilor McLain to summarize what the net gain in citizen involvement would be.

**Councilor McLain** said one improvement is that citizens would have 14 days rather than the original seven to review an amendment proposed by local a jurisdiction. Another improvement is that Metro must receive notice at the same time as the DLDC, which offers citizens as well as Metro more opportunity for review. And finally, citizen opportunity to address the Council on a non-agenda item has been put into an ordinance. That formalizes a practice that has up to now depended on who the presiding officer is or the practice of a particular Council.

**Councilor Naito** commended Legal Counsel on the amount of work put into this Ordinance that recognizes a balance between citizen involvement and the complexities of land-use decisions. She could foresee some issues that might arise in the future, but they could be handled if and when they do arise. She urged support for the ordinance.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-691C at 4:32 p.m.

**Michael Roche**, 8920 SW 40<sup>th</sup> St., Portland OR, spoke as a representative of the Southwest Neighborhood Association. He said the board of the Association voted last month to leave the language as it is in Title VIII, Section 6, as presented by Councilor McCaig. He said the association's support was based on balance, and he believes the balance is now slipping away. First, codifying a three-minute presentation from a citizen does not satisfy the requirement. Some arguments take longer than that. The cities and counties have more time. He suggested allowing citizens to appeal first to the Metro executive, then for a formal interpretation.

The 45-day notice is an improvement. The 14-day requirement to submit an analysis does not allow sufficient time to make a LUBA appeal, particularly if the analysis is extensive.

On September 2 another version of this, drafted by Mr. Cooper, was issued. Mr. Roche said his organization preferred that version. That version reads in second paragraph, "The executive officer shall, within 10 of receipt of the request, either take action on behalf of Metro to appear and participate in the proceeding or appeal as requested or transmit the request to the Council with a recommendation. The Council shall schedule the request at the next available meeting that will allow Council action on the request in a timely fashion. The Council shall notify the

requesting citizen and city or county that is subject of the request of the time and place of the meeting at which the request will be considered. After considering the request, the Council may request the general Council appear and participate in the proceedings. Mr. Roche said this language has the force he believes the ordinance needs.

**James Peterson**, 2502 SW Multnomah, Portland OR 97219 said that before the ordinance was amended, the Council had to take some kind of action. The current version, the way he understands it, does not require action. He does not think the current version, as amended, is as good. He recommended eliminated the amendment.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing at 4:39 p.m.

**Councilor McCaig** reminded the Council that this issue had arisen last year, that the Council had devised a plan for citizen involvement that seemed workable, and that plan had then been scrutinized by jurisdictions and attorneys. The current ordinance, which codifies three minutes, is insufficient. More can and should be done. She said she appreciates the work that has gone into the ordinance, but she would not support it because it does not go far enough.

**Councilor Naito** put her support for the ordinance, as amended, on record. She said the current ordinance has balance. It is practical. It allows for projects to proceed without limiting citizen input. Nothing precludes the presiding officer's scheduling an informational hearing, and nothing prohibits the presiding officer from extending the 3-minute time limit.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked Mr. Cooper whether the ordinance precludes the Council from setting some limits on a serial testimony on the same item.

**Mr. Cooper** said that nothing in the ordinance would keep the Council from limiting repeated testimony.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad**, following up on Councilor Naito, said that he agrees with some of what Councilor McCaig said, but said that the 3-minute limit is not hard and fast. He said he would have liked to see more opportunities for citizen involvement opportunities, but he would support the ordinance anyway.

**Councilor McLain** said she believes the ordinance does provide more opportunities for citizen involvement that has been provided for in the past. She summarized the review processes the ordinance prescribes. Further, she said other methods that are available will be made public through the fact sheet to be issued by the executive office. She urged support for the ordinance.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor McCaig voting nay.

8.2 **Ordinance No. 97-706**, For the Purpose of Amending Ordinance No. 97-625A to Amend the 2040 Growth Concept Map and Ordinance No. 97-647C to Amend the Title 4 Map Regarding the Wood Village Town Center.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Ordinance No. 97-706.

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

**Motion to** **Councilor Naito** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-706.

**Amend #1:**

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

**Councilor Naito** said this ordinance makes the Growth Concept map consistent with the RUGGOs. The amendments are technical.

**Mr. Cooper** said that although the amendments are technical, they are substantive enough that the ordinance should be pushed forward one week after the amendments have been passed.

**Councilor McLain** mentioned two areas the amendments address: 1) taking out part of the title; 2) making sure the map is referenced.

**Michael Morrissey**, Council Analyst, added that Larry Shaw, Metro Legal Counsel, had assured him these two amendments were necessary and would make a tighter ordinance.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion to amend passed unanimously.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said this ordinance would be held over to the next week's agenda.

8.3 **Ordinance No. 97-707**, Amending the Metro Code Regarding Salary Administration for Non-Represented Employees.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved adoption of Ordinance No. 97-707.

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

**Councilor Morissette** explained that this ordinance simply gives the executive office the opportunity to give non-represented employees the cost-of-living increases. This practice has been a matter of policy already.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-707 at 4:52 p.m.

No one came forward. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing at 4:53 p.m.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/0 nay/abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

## 9. RESOLUTIONS

[Note: Agenda items 9.1 and 9.2 were addressed earlier in the meeting.]

9.3 **Resolution No. 97-2562A**, For the Purpose of Supporting Cities and Counties Implementation of Functional Plan Policies to Actively Protect Parks, Open Space, Recreation Trails, Stream Corridors, and Other Environmentally Sensitive Lands.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2562A.

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

**Councilor McFarland** explained the history of the resolution, which originated with Executive Officer Burton and was passed unanimously out of the Growth Management Committee. She said that although the resolution does not change anything, it does make Metro's position clear. She urged support for the resolution.

**Motion to** **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2562A to  
**to Amend #2:** add "which includes a recommendation that identifies lands that would provide for the unaccommodated capacity located inside and outside the urban growth boundary and near or adjacent to the city or county."

**Councilor Morissette** said this is the same language that is in Title VIII. This emphasizes that this is not new language, and nothing is being removed from the original document. He said the Council had already, in fact, voted to accept this language.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McCaig** asked what the net effect of the amendment would be on the resolution. Councilor Morissette said it does not change the resolution. Councilor McCaig asked Legal Counsel to verify that. Mr. Cooper said Councilor Morissette's assessment was correct. The language only adds clarification.

**Councilor Naito** said she would not support the amendment, not because she disagreed with the substance of the amendment, but she objected to the process. She said the amendment should have been brought forward in committee.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/0 abstain with Councilor Naito voting nay.  
The motion passed.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on the resolution as amended.

**Jere Retzer**, 5115 SW Alfred St., Portland OR, 97219 testified as a citizen who also helped to co-found the Crestwood Headwaters group. He said three headwaters are located in the Crestwood area. He said his group has worked closely with the Metro Staff to add property to the greenspaces. He urged Metro to provide as much of a buffer as possible around the streams to ensure water quality and mitigate the effects of strong water. He urged support for the resolution.

**Rich Rodgers**, assistant to City Commissioner Eric Sten, Rm. 702 1400 SW 5th Portland OR 97204 testified in support of the resolution. He said the message that Metro supports greenspace protection as part of the Functional Plan is an important one to send right now. He said that people are concerned about the effects of growth on water quality, open spaces, and environmentally sensitive lands. He said he had sent a letter to Mr. Burton on a way to protect Johnson Creek, which is suffering from greater runoff due to urbanization. He encouraged Metro to work with the City and other jurisdictions to work with the City of Portland to solve this and other similar problems.

**J. Michael Reid**, ACA Land Use 2920 NE 24th Ave Portland OR 97212 spoke in support of the resolution as a neighborhood land-use director, director of "Friends of Trees," and as Chair of Metro's Greenspace Advisory Committee. He commented on three words in the resolution: the first two are in the first line of the "be it resolved" section. The first is the word "define." All resolution that define what is unbuildable and what needs to be protected need to be encouraged to promote honest discussion on what's inside the boundary that is buildable and what isn't. The

second word is “protected.” One political point is that often the perception is that what is being protected is the land, when what is often being protected that people are being protected from paying the social cost of building on, say, flood plains and blocking a best-use of land. The third word is in the third section. It is the “exemption,” where Metro Council grants an exemption consistent with Title VIII. This needs to be promoted to the public. The public often believes this doesn’t happen--it often believes Metro simply dictates.

**Mike Houck**, representing the Audubon Society of Portland and the Coalition for a Livable Future, 5151 NW Cornell Rd Portland OR 97210 spoke in support of the resolution. He said that although this is already codified in the Functional Plan, the gesture toward passing this resolution is still important to address the public angst. He said he was pleased that this was a joint effort on the part of the executive office and the Council. He said the resolution states unequivocally and clearly that Metro intends to protect greenspaces within the boundary.

**Jay Mower**, 777 Southwest Chestnut Street, Portland, OR 97219 stated his support of the resolution and read from a report written December 31, 1903, entitled *Report of the Park Board with the Report of Meurs. Almstead Brothers Landscape Architects Outlining a System of Parkways, Boulevards and Parks for the City of Portland*. A copy of the article is included in the meeting record. Mr. Mower said Resolution 97-2562 helps to elevate the preservation of parks away from the predictions of the article’s authors.

**Amanda Fritz, 4106 Southwest Vacuna Street, Portland**, encouraged the Council to pass Resolution 97-2562.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he believes the resolution is a positive action on the part of the Council to reaffirm the Council’s long-term commitment. He commended the executive officer, staff and Mr. Houck for their work on the resolution.

**Vote:** The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

9.4 **Resolution No. 97-2717**, For the purpose of appointing members to the Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2717.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** directed the Council’s attention to exhibit A of the resolution.

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

## **10. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(e). DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO NEGOTIATE REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.**

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked Jim Desmond, Manager of Open Spaces, if any of the action items on agenda item 10 are time sensitive.

**Mr. Desmond** said Resolution 97-2557 needed to be acted on immediately. The other two resolutions could be postponed for a few weeks.

**Presiding Kvistad** moved into executive session.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reconvened the Council meeting.

10.1 **Resolution No. 97-2555**, For the Purpose of Amending the Fanno Creek Greenway Target Area Refinement Plan.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2555.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** presented the resolution.

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

10.2 **Resolution No. 97-2556**, For the Purpose of Amending the Willamette River Greenway Target Area Refinement Plan.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2556.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** presented the resolution.

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

10.3 **Resolution No. 97-2557**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Executive Officer to Amend the East Buttes and Boring Lava Domes Target Area Refinement Plan and to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Portland to Manage the Rocky Butte-Schultz Property.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2557.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** presented the resolution.

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

**Councilor Washington** complimented Mr. Desmond on his work as the Director of Open Spaces.

## 11. COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS

11.1 **Resolution No. 97-2550**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 1997 Urban Growth Report Analysis of Developable Land.

**Councilor McLain** introduced the resolution. She said the Council has been reviewing the UGB for several years, and the report in question is part of the issue. She said a number of variables are involved. For example, variable 1 is the forecast of jobs and households; variable 2 is the inventory of unbuildable lands; and so forth, up to variable 7, farm use assessment. Currently, the two variables that have received the most attention are 1) the underbuild and sell factor, and 2) redevelopment and infill factor or rate. Councilor McLain urged more conversation on these issues. She said she would be proposing amendments on these matters, but preferred to wait until next week.

**Councilor Naito** suggested more conversation and work sessions on these issues. She suggested a special-agenda meeting of the Council or putting aside time next week for focused discussion.

**Councilor McLain** said she had planned to request from the Presiding Officer, invited testimony. Three groups have asked to speak to these issues: MTAC, an MPAC member, and a staff represented from the Growth Management Department. She agreed with Councilor Naito that they should begin a review of this process next week.

**Councilor Washington** said this issue is extremely important and should be dealt with at the beginning of a meeting, with all Councilors present. He suggested not continuing the discussion given the late hour and the long meeting that had already taken place.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** reiterated that this resolution had not been put on the agenda as an action item; it was here for discussion only.

**Councilor McLain** said that at the meeting, certain parties needed to be invited. Those parties--MPAC, MTAC, a representative from the Growth Management Staff, and a representative from the Coalition for a Livable Future--might be allowed five minutes to summarize their points. She would then ask for an hour for the Councilors to talk about the testimony and the issues before beginning deliberations. She said the entire meeting might take only an hour and a half.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** objected to opening another public hearing on an issue on which public hearings had already been held.

**Councilor McLain** said she did not believe another public hearing was out of line, because this issue is so important and because if these discussions were not held in public, then they might be held in private and amount to lobbying.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said in his view, the Council needed more time to deliberate among themselves. He said he did not feel that more testimony from invited, special interest groups was as important as, say, more testimony from individual citizens.

**Councilor McLain** said the reason she suggested invited testimony was because many of the groups had not had a chance to respond to other public testimony and had new information to present. Further, two of the Councilors had not been at the public hearings and had not had a chance to hear the arguments.

**Councilor Naito** supported the idea of invited testimony. She said she would welcome the opportunity to hear from the groups as to how they support their arguments. She said she needed to hear more from MPAC, also. She said she did not see the meeting as public testimony.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked for consensus from the Council on holding the suggested meeting. The Council agreed to hold the meeting. Presiding Officer Kvistad objected to MTAC's participating, being that it is a technical advisory committee, but would agree to invite them if the rest of the Council so desired.

**Councilor Naito** emphasized that this is not another public meeting, but an information-gathering meeting for the Council. Presiding Officer Kvistad said the meeting had been agreed to and would be held next week.

11.2 **Resolution No. 97-2559**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 1997 Housing Needs Analysis.

**Councilor McLain** suggested this item be put forward for discussion until after Monday, September 29, when a housing seminar would be held. She said information gathered at the seminar would be valuable in discussing this issue.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** agreed to hold this item over.

## 12. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said the executive officer asked if the Council would like to have a joint budget work session with him, before the budget is crafted. He said he would schedule that work session.

## 13. ADJOURN

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

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
092597c-01	9/22/97	Letter of support for Green Infrastructure Resolution	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sue Marshall, Tualatin Riverkeepers 16340 SW Beef Bend Rd Sherwood OR 97140	Resolution No. 97-2562A
092597c-02	9/25/97	Proposed amendment	TO: Metro	Resolution No.

		to Resolution No. 97-2562A	Council FROM: Don Morissette	97-2562A
092597c-03	7/14/96	Letter to editor on Oregonian Forum "Road to Tomorrow"	TO: Oregonian Editor FROM: Art Lewellyn	
092597c-04		RLIS Data: Customer Survey and Implications Slides	TO: Metro Council FROM: Metro Auditor	
092597c-05	9/97	Multnomah Main Street Staff Response	TO: Metro Council FROM: ??	
092597c-06	5/22/97	Letter concerning Title 8 of Functional Plan	TO: James Peterson FROM: Mike Burton Executive Officer	
092597c-07	9/22/97	Memo concerning Contested Case 97-1 (West Linn UGB Amendment)	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Dan Cooper	Ordinance No. 97-712
092597c-08		Response to exceptions of Curtis Hunter and Jeff Seymour concerning West Linn UGB Amendment	TO: Metro Council FROM: ??	Ordinance No. 97-712
092597c-09	9/23/97	Letter concerning UGB Case No. 97-1 West Linn Objection to the Submission of New Evidence	TO: Clerk of the Council FROM: James Oliver, Jr. O'Donnell, Ramis, Crew, Corrigan and Bachrach	Ordinance No. 97-712
092597c-10	9/22/97	Letter concerning UGB Case 97-1 Objection to Motion to Reopen the Record	TO: Metro Council FROM: Kathryn Wilson O'Donnell, Ramis, Crew, Corrigan and Bachrach	Ordinance No. 97-712
092597c-11	9/25/97	Statement of Mayor Jill Thorn concerning UGB Case 97-1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mayor Jill Thorn, City of West Linn	Ordinance No. 97-712

Metro Council Meeting

September 25, 1997

Page 22

09/25/97c-12	9/25/97	Amendment to Ordinance No. 97-706	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jon Kvistad	Ordinance No. 97-706
09/25/97c-13	8/29/97	Memo concerning Ordinance No. 97-706	TO: Jon Kvistad and Susan McLain FROM: Mike Burton	Ordinance No. 97-706
092597c-14	12/31/1903	Park Systems Should be Managed Independently of City Governments	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jay Mower	Resolution No. 97-2562A
092597c-15	9/25/97	Watershed letter	TO: Mike Burton FROM: Eric Sten	Resolution No. 97-2562A
092597c-16	9/23/97	Letter concerning UGB Amendment Case 97-1	TO: James Peterson 2502 SW Multnomah Portland OR 97219	Ordinance No. 97-712