

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

February 8, 1996

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad, Deputy Presiding Officer Susan McLain, Councilor Patricia McCaig, Councilor Rod Monroe, Councilor Ed Washington, Councilor Don Morissette, Councilor Ruth McFarland

Councilors Absent: None

Presiding Officer Kvistad called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Executive Officer Burton addressed the Council. He presented an update on the current conditions resulting from the flood. He reported considerable amount of flooding at the Metro South Transfer Station with the hazardous waste facility has water up to within two feet of the roof. Measures are being taken to try to minimize damage both to the walls and electronic components. Waste has been diverted to Central Station. Waste is not being moved to Columbia Ridge at this point because of flooding on the highways. Local governments have been requested to not move waste to transfer stations until next Monday.

The Zoo is open but there has been another land slide under the railroad tracks in Washington Park near the garden. The train is not running as a result of a previous land slide. There is land sliding currently above the Cascade natural trail area. The Cascade exhibit has been flooded, pumped out and reopened.

The Expo center is being watched closely because it is on a hundred year flood plain. There is a hole in the roof caused by previous storm damage and there is water coming in.

Tanner Creek runs under Civic Stadium, another potential problem spot.

The Basement of Civic Auditorium has been emptied for preventative measures.

Oxbow Park is closed, Blue Lake has not been particularly affected, there is a potential of losing the docks at Chinook Landing. There is flooding at the Glisan Boat Ramp as well as the Sauvie Island boat ramp.

The Crisis Management Team has met three times today to discuss assistance in operating departments. All department meetings will be canceled for Friday, February 9 and a one hour delay for employees coming in to work has been announced. The Data Resource Center has received a request from the City of Portland to provide detailed maps on ownership of properties along the river so they can notify people. Mr. Burton said Metro has very good data and authorities are able to identify use of property, ownership, so that notification is going very well. He added that Councilor Monroe has been participating in the Crisis Management Team meetings.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 2

Councilor Washington expressed concerns about the boat ramps coming loose and damaging other property. Scott Moss, Risk Manager, said that was a possibility but there was nothing that could be done to prevent that from happening.

Councilor McLain asked about contingency plans for clean up. Mr. Burton said Metro has a number of contingencies. All depends on when HWY. 84 is reopened for complete access to Columbia Ridge.

Mr. Burton also made reference to the Excise Tax Expenditures and Appropriations Report through December 31, 1994. He said Metro has receipts for 7.7% above forecast for the month and 6% above forecast for the year. No Appropriations units exceeded budget last year.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Consideration of Minutes for the January 25, 1996 Metro Council Meetings.

Motion: Councilor Washington moved for adoption of the consent agenda.
Councilor Monroe seconded the motion.

Vote: All those present voted aye. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Clay Moorehead, with CDA Consulting, said page 10, item 201 and page 8 item 53 may be confused to say that he is involved in the inclusion of 201. His testimony is only related to that portion of 53 and he has concerns in how the language is giving a representation that he is supporting the entire 201 and he has not. Presiding Officer Kvistad said that is involved with the URSA discussion, not the minutes, and thanked Mr. Moorehead for the information and noted his comments.

5. Informational Items

5.1 *Canceled*

5.2 Report by Metro Auditor: Regional Environmental Management: Administration of Existing Contract for Waste Disposal Services.

Metro Auditor Alexis Dow reported on her review of Metro's management of the existing contract for Waste Disposal Services. It is the largest contract that Metro has awarded and approximately 9% of Metro's total annual expenditures. It approximates \$20,000,000 a year. This is a 20 year Contract that will expire in December, 2009 or until almost 17 million tons of waste has been delivered to Columbia Ridge Landfill. Generally the REM department has effective systems and procedures for reviewing the Oregon Waste Systems billings. There are nine areas of concern the Auditor mentioned in her report:

1. A rounding error with a net effect of about \$2000 or a potential overpayment of \$180,000 over the life of the contract if the correction had not been made.
2. Under Amendment 4 of the contract Metro receives a credit for solid waste that is delivered to the Columbia Ridge Landfill by certain other communities. The REM department has not set up a system to verify the accuracy of these credits.
3. The personal computers used to record information on waste loads bound for Columbia Ridge Landfill which are placed in scale houses are unnecessarily susceptible to damage, theft, tampering, altering and deletion of information.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 3

4. The Waste is being transferred by Jack Grey Transport. Weights are being recorded manually and not matched to logs kept at the landfill. Management is working on this problem.

5. The physical controls at the transfer station are not adequate to prevent haulers and the public from using the Waste Transport contractor's entrance to the transfer station which would allow them to avoid Metro's inbound scales and Metro's fees. She suggested Metro adopt additional security measures to insure that unweighed waste does not become a problem. Video cameras are being installed to monitor activity.

6. REM does not have a process for monitoring Metro's guarantee to Oregon Waste Management of delivering at least 90% of acceptable waste annually. The budget and finance division is developing a routine monitoring system that will address this problem.

7. The department does do a monthly reconciliation of waste inflows and outflows to make sure everything is being accounted for at the transfer stations. She urged them to continue this process and also look for ways of refining it.

8. There was no regular verification of the insurance requirements of Oregon Waste Systems. The REM department intends to implement a system of monitoring that.

9. The department should look at different operational data to insure the overall reasonableness of the amounts billed by Oregon Waste Systems. The department has indicated that they will look at certain operational data and they think they will be looking at it quarterly.

Two other issues arose out of the audit:

1. Currently Metro pays Oregon Waste Systems substantially more than the current market rate for disposal services.

2. What is the net benefit, if any, from Amendment 4? There are a lot of technical difficulties in making that determination that require engineering expertise. It would be difficult, if not impossible to quantify to a useful degree of certainty what that benefit is or might have been.

Councilor McLain asked a question about amendment 4. She paraphrased Ms. Dow's comments that it was hard to analyze because it would take engineering specificity to be able to do that. She asked Ms. Dow if she would talk more about that.

Ms. Dow said it is not only because of the engineering specificity but also because of looking to the future. In terms of the engineering one thing is that the contract with Oregon Waste Systems deals only with the cost of disposal and many other contracts that would come into play under Amendment 4 and the voiding of the most favorable rate agreement are single price that includes both disposal and transportation and you would need to be able to break that out. The other items to consider are predicting the future and what other contracts might have been negotiated had the most favorable rate agreement stayed in place and volumes used from other communities.

Councilor McLain agreed with Ms. Dow regarding the speculative nature and asked if Amendment 4 was a large enough part of the contract that the speculation and analysis was important to do.

Ms. Dow answered by explaining that her primary focus for this report was looking at Metro's administration of the Oregon Waste Systems contract. Evaluation of benefits was not included in the scope. However, because there was so much interest regarding Amendment 4 she decided it would be inappropriate not to at least comment on it. And so her report said it was looked at and it would take a extensive effort to try to develop anything until there is a specific demand to do that.

Councilor McLain said that she thinks there will be such a demand in the near future for that information and she looks forward to working with Ms. Dow when that time comes.

5.3 Report by Metro Auditor: Review of Metro's Solid Waste Enforcement Unit.

Metro Auditor Alexis Dow next reported on the results of the audit of the Solid Waste Enforcement Unit. The unit was set up in 1993 to staunch suspected leakage of up to approximately \$2,000,000 from the solid waste revenue stream and to clean up illegal dump sites. At the end of two years operation the unit has collected about \$145,000 in retroactive user fees and fines and has increased the revenue that has been captured. The unit has cost Metro \$830,000 over the last two years and has budgeted for \$550,000 in this current year. One of her concerns is that other measures of effectiveness have not been developed for the division. There have been about 1200 illegal dump sites cleaned up but little is known as to whether that has been an effective effort. She recommends that the unit develops a clear statement of its objectives with clear and measurable tie ins to the overall solid waste management plan. The unit has done a good job but the absence of measurable goals makes evaluation difficult. She had 7 recommendations:

1. Performing an analysis of solid waste trends similar to the study performed by the center for urban studies in 1992. This would give REM a sense of whether enforcement has decreased the risk to its revenues.

2. The flow control enforcement and illegal dump clean up activities should be more integrated into the ten year regional solid waste management plan.

3. The unit should develop measurable objectives of its enforcement efforts.

4. The unit should increase its efforts to delegate authority under illegal dumping ordinances to facilitate prosecution of illegal dumpers and to make enforcement penalties consistent within Metro's boundaries.

5. Data on illegal dump sites be compiled from all jurisdictions not just those that Metro is working on and use it to better judge whether there is too much concentration of clean up effort in Multnomah County.

6. There should be a coordination with other jurisdictions to insure that all Metro citizens can count on clean up, investigation, and prevention of illegal dumping in an equitable fashion.

7. There should be continued effort to solve the problem regarding the definition of beneficial materials and to address the problem the failure to charge Metro fees on certain solid waste at certain landfills.

Ms. Dow said that the Executive's response indicated that appropriate action is being taken on each of the recommendations. She made two more observations:

1. If Metro does revise the financing of its solid waste operations which would result in lowering of the tipping fee enforcement needs may lesson.

2. Some of the flow control rules may be challenged in Federal Court that stems from the 1994 U. S. Supreme Court ruling regarding a New York town indicated that certain of its flow control requirements were illegal under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Metro legal counsel believes that Metro flow control regulations are not in violation of this clause in the Constitution, however, if there is a challenge mounted any change to our flow control ability would also affect our need for enforcement.

Councilor McLain asked if the audit was done under the perspective of legal requirements we have for having a system the requires us to do the disposal for the region.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 5

Auditor Dow said the audit was done from the perspective that we have a solid waste enforcement unit that is costing the organization over a half million dollars a year and they were trying to evaluate the effectiveness.

Councilor McLain asked for an example of a measurable goal.

Auditor Dow suggested: The recapture of avoided fees and fines; deterrence of illegal dumping in particular areas that have been chronic; a quantification of decrease in volume that is being dumped outside our region.

Councilor McLain said that she was going to ask the chair of the solid waste committee to get Ms. Dow on a committee agenda soon so there can be further discussion on this issue.

Councilor Washington asked Ms. Dow the amount that has been recovered for the half million spent.

Ms. Dow said \$145,000. However, they have also identified people who were reporting low amounts of waste being taken outside the region that were charged a lower amount. There are no measures to say it's been effective or not.

6. ORDINANCES -FIRST READINGS

- 6.1 ORDINANCE No. 96-632, Amending the FY 1995-96 Budget and Appropriations Schedule for the Purpose of Adopting the FY 1995-96 Supplemental Budget; and Declaring an Emergency
Assigned to: Finance Committee

7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READINGS

- 7.1 Ordinance No. 95-626A Amending the FY 1995-96 Budget and Appropriations Schedule by Transferring \$45,000 From the Spectator Facilities Fund Contingency to the Performing Arts Center Personal Services to Add Four New Positions to Meet Unforeseen Increased Work Loads; and Declaring an Emergency

Motion: Councilor McFarland moved for adoption of Ordinance No. 95-626A

Second: Councilor Washington seconded the motion.

Councilor McFarland spoke in support of Ordinance No. 95-626A. She said the Ordinance has been in the mill since late last year. It was modified to reflect the change from \$90,000 to \$45,000 because of the delays in getting it heard at Council. The implementation will be April 1, 1996 and will proceed until the beginning of the new fiscal year. It addresses the increase in business that has caused an increased need for staffing.

Vote: The vote was unanimous and the motion passed Councilor Morissette was absent

- 8.1 Resolution No. 95-2244, For the Purpose of Amending Urban Reserve Study Areas.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 6

Councilor Susan McLain, Chair of Metro Council Growth Management Committee, reviewed Resolution 95-2244 and its history. The RUGGOs (Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives) document was produced five years ago, was passed both by Metro as well as the regional partners in order to begin discourse as to what the "bottom lines" were in so far as livability and the important qualities of life in this region. The RUGGOs document was updated in 1995 and that had laid the foundation for the work to be accomplished this evening. The second document was the Future Vision Statement. This report, over two years in the writing, reflects the goals and values that form the foundation of the planning efforts in this region. As well, there are land-use laws, state laws, especially HB 2709, which reflect specificity in the kinds and types of planning that can and is to be done by Metro such as jobs / housing balances, etc. The preceding are the most important types of foundation work that Metro has accomplished as it has proceeded through the many different types of activities in order to fulfill legal responsibilities of the agency in its review of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Chair McLain stated that between September and January 1995-1996, the Council has heard more than 2500 people have testified regarding which study areas seemed the most reasonable as well as what seems the best course for this region to take. All quadrant maps have been studied and discussed twice. Chair McLain reiterated that urban reserve areas are not what is being voted today. On this date, Metro Council will be voting on urban reserve study areas.

Presiding Officer Kvistad responded to a concern voiced by Clay Moorhead that the maps would be renumbered with the current numbering system.

Public testimony was offered by former Metro Councilor Ed Gronke: *"I am here as a private citizen this afternoon, as a businessman and as the delegated representative of the Clackamas County Business Round Table. The Clackamas County Business Round Table is a business group which is appointed by the County Commission to work with them, bringing up business perspectives to local problems and hopefully to work in the development of better business opportunities in Clackamas County and in the Metro region. Many of you have seen me attend many of the MPAC meetings as an observer; I have watched the development of the RUGGOs and the discussions on the URSAs. We are very concerned that there is little land available within the UGB in Clackamas County right now for industrial development and for further business development. We are very committed to the goals DEQ has set for us in trying to put jobs as close as possible to housing. The current math in Clackamas County makes that next to impossible to do. We would ask you to please make what we feel is a very worthwhile investment at this point and look at all the URSAs. Include as many as you possibly can. We are not asking you to expand the growth boundary; we are not asking you to even designate urban reserves but we are asking you to study these areas so in the future, when those problems arise, and we all know they will, that Metro Council will be in a position to make a reasoned decision and the proper decision on these parcels of land."*

Forest Grove Quadrangle: No changes are proposed for the Forest Grove quadrangle.

Hillsboro Quadrangle: Councilor Morissette requested an amendment to this quadrangle. **Parcel 67, modified to Parcel 506** on the map. The original proposal for this site scored reasonably well other than the high percentage of EFU lands. A substantial portion of the high EFU on this site was on Tax Lot 901 which has now been dropped from the site. Presiding Officer Kvistad requested four votes for consideration of this amendment. Presiding Officer Kvistad requested four votes for consideration of this amendment.

Motion: Councilor Morissette made the motion for the reconsideration of Parcel 67 (506).

Vote: The Vote was 6/1 in favor of reconsideration with Councilor Monroe casting the no vote.

Councilor McLain stated that this area is next door to a current URSA, is bordered by Highway 26; the total acreage is 18. This makes sense so far as the natural and man-made features are concerned. Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that an aye vote means that the parcel will be included in the URSAs; a no vote indicates that it will not be included in the URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 6/1 aye with Councilor Monroe casting the no vote.

Presiding Officer Kvistad declared that Site 67 (506), as amended, is added to the URSA map.

Linnton Quadrangle: Councilor Monroe stated that since much of the “finger” of land that extends from the eastern-most edge of **Parcel 75** down along Skyline Boulevard is already in the city limits of Portland. It is exception land. Since it is surrounded by the present UGB, it ought to be studied. This would include the Angel property and all of the property that lies south and west of the Angel property.

Presiding Officer Kvistad requested four votes for consideration of this amendment.

Motion: Councilor Monroe made the motion for the discussion of whether or not to include the Parcel 75 with the Angel property and all the property that lies south and west of the Angel property.

Councilor McFarland requested that the entities of Parcel 75 and the Angel property be split and voted separately. Councilor McFarland later rescinded her objections to this proposal.

Vote: The Vote was 7/0 to discuss this amendment.

Councilor Monroe moved that this area be included in the URSAs so that it can be determined the proper and best use of this land which lies surrounded by the current UGB. It needs to be know whether some of it could be best applied to Forest Park. The land in the “finger” from the Angel property south and east of the Skyline parcel be included in the URSAs. Councilor Monroe then requested a clarification of whether his motion would encompass all of the area that is outside the current UGB and inside the city limits of the City of Portland.

Councilor Monroe proposed that his motion reflect that all of the territory in the Skyline region that is outside the UGB but inside the city limits of the City of Portland as well as Parcel 75 is included in this motion. Councilor Monroe stated that his primary interest is in land that is currently within the city limits of the City of Portland or is designated “future urban” status.

Mr. Turpel stated that to the north and west of the Angel property, there is some land that is inside the City of Portland but is outside the UGB. Mr. Turpel estimated that 150 acres were involved.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 8

Councilor Monroe stated that his motion was to include all of the land and only that land that is within the City of Portland's city limits. Councilor Monroe modified his motion to include only the land that is within the boundaries of the City of Portland, including the Angel property.

Councilor McLain stated her agreement with Councilor Monroe that there is an area in this Site that seems to constantly not fit the mold. She stated that she cannot vote for anything in this area as URSAs except for site 75.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the vote will be to include the properties defined by Councilor Monroe including Site 75 as well as excluding anything except the land that meets the criteria within the boundaries of the City of Portland yet outside the present UGB. An aye vote will include those acres and a no vote will leave them as they area.

Vote: The vote was aye 4 and nay 3. The motion passed. Councilors McLain, Morissette and McCaig vote no.

Linnton Quadrangle: Councilor Morissette moved the study of Site 80. Presiding Officer Kvistad requested four votes for consideration of this amendment.

Motion: Councilor Morissette made the motion for the reconsideration of Parcel 80.

Vote: The Vote was 7/0 aye. The motion passed unanimously.

Councilor Morissette suggested that this was a piece of property that would be difficult to put to farm use. Mark Turpel of Growth Management Department stated that this site is 61 acres and nearly all of it has EFU designation at this point. The soil is a predominant Class III with some Class II. From a technical standpoint, it is an agricultural property. LCDC felt that this parcel was of not of a high priority for retaining as EFU land.

Councilor McFarland stated that this was an irrational application of the EFU standard (a very good rule, in most instances) since the owner of this site stated that it was not even worth crossing the road to farm that particular piece of land. The owner would not even pay the taxes on it for the opportunity to farm it.

Motion: Councilor Morissette made the motion for the inclusion of Parcel 80 in the URSAs.

Vote: The Vote was 7/0 aye. The motion passed unanimously and Presiding Officer Kvistad declared that Parcel 80 is included within the URSAs.

Beaverton Quadrangle: Presiding Officer Kvistad requested a discussion of **Site 107 (24)** in King City which is currently numbered as **Site 508** revised.

Presiding Officer Kvistad requested four votes for consideration of this amendment.

Motion: Presiding Officer Kvistad made the motion for the reconsideration of Parcel 107 (24) (508).

Vote: The Vote was 7/0 in favor discussing Parcel 107 (24) (508).

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 9

Presiding Officer Kvistad formally stated his proposal to reduce this area from 268 acres to 120 acres. The proposal is to allow the portion between 131st and 137th Avenues to remain in the within the current URSA; the land that is to the west of that line would be eliminated from the study. The land being taken out of the URSAs is not EFU land but rather is exception land that has developed into five-acre parcels. There is a landing strip in this area.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 to reduce Parcel 107 (24) (508) 268 acres to 120 acres.

Scholls Quadrangle: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad asked the Council for consideration of parcel K1A which has been reviewed on several occasions by Metro Council. Presiding officer Kvistad asked for four votes for consideration of this piece of property, the Segel site.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye and 2 nay in favor of studying this property. Councilors McCaig and Monroe cast the nay votes.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that this parcel, by virtue of the testimony presented, compelled him to bring it forward again for consideration. Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he had made a commitment to the four widows who own this parcel to bring it forward.

Vote: The vote was 1 aye and 6 nay to bring this area into the Urban Reserve Study Areas. Presiding Officer Kvistad cast the single aye vote.

Sherwood Quadrangle: Presiding Officer Kvistad brought forward Site 102 (504 and 505). The City of Wilsonville requested Site 504. Presiding Officer Kvistad requested a vote to discuss these sites.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 aye in favor of studying these parcels. Presiding Officer Kvistad declared the vote unanimous.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the eastern portion of Site 102 fell into a wetlands category. Site 102 was accordingly deleted. The lines of the contour of the land were not taken into consideration when this site was discussed by Metro Council earlier. Presiding Officer Kvistad requested that Site 505 be added for study because it is on the uplands portion, away from the wetlands, and is connected to the other parcels in the area. Several of these parcels are already within the current study.

Vote: The vote was 3 aye and 4 nay to add Site 505 with Councilors McCaig, Washington, Monroe and McFarland voting nay. The proposal failed.

Presiding Officer Kvistad requested a vote in favor of including Site 504 within the URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 aye in favor of including Site 504 within the URSAs. The proposal passed unanimously.

Presiding Officer Kvistad proposed Site 18. This is a 31 acre parcel near the City of Wilsonville. It falls within the Dammasch State Hospital reserve area. Deletion of this parcel has been requested by the City of Wilsonville.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 aye in favor of discussing Site 18.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 10

This parcel falls within the Dammasch State Hospital area. Wilsonville has requested its deletion since it does not fall into the area that they plan to consider for actual urban growth. Parcels to the right and left of this portion have been deleted over the last three meetings.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 aye in favor of deleting Site 18 from the URSAs.

Lake Oswego Quadrangle: Councilor McLain stated that no additions or deletions to this quadrangle have been proposed. This quadrangle is considered complete.

Oregon City Quadrangle: Councilor McLain stated that no additions or deletions to this quadrangle have been proposed. This quadrangle is considered complete.

Canby Quadrangle: Councilor McLain stated that no additions or deletions to this quadrangle have been proposed. This quadrangle is considered complete.

Gladstone Quadrangle: Councilor Morissette moved Site 502 for consideration of addition to the URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 aye in favor of considering Site 502.

Councilor Morissette stated that Site 502 is just north of Site 77 and east of the current URSA No. 1. To the right on the map is an area that Metro is presently studying. To the south is 147th where the road had to be closed because of the topography. To the north is a rural reserve because of the lava domes. Based on the testimony, the topography seemed as though it would work as an Urban Reserve Study Area. If this area is not included, according to Councilor Morissette, an "island" could be created based upon the roads that are bounding it. The area is approximately 189 acres. The parcel is exception lands. Two property owners in this area requested inclusion in the URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 7/0 in favor of the addition of Site 77 to the URSAs.

Damascus Quadrangle: Councilor McLain stated that no additions or deletions to this quadrangle have been proposed. This quadrangle is considered complete.

Sandy Quadrangle: Councilor McFarland recommended the withdrawal of Site 309 from the URSAs. She stated that she drove around the area with Mayor Gussie McRobert. She stated that the area really is farmland and is being used as such. Councilor Kvistad requested four votes to consider Site 309.

Vote: The vote was 6/1 aye in favor of studying Site 309. Councilor Morissette was the nay vote.

Councilor McFarland stated the area is farmland and is being used as such. In addition, it present real challenges in obtaining service infrastructure.

Councilor Morissette stated that he had received a letter from the Multnomah County Farm Bureau encouraging Metro Council to include both sites 201 and 309 in the URSAs. These two areas are already highly urbanized and are in need of urban services. Councilor Morissette urged the Council to leave these two areas in the URSAs.

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 11

Councilor Monroe stated that the City of Gresham has been one of the strongest and most progressive cities in terms of supporting 2040 and moving forward with a the new kind of land use decisions that are necessary to make 2040 work. The City of Gresham has asked specifically not to include Site 309 in the URSAs.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that Site 309 was one of the ten parcels that he had in his package of K1 - K10 and he would vote not to exclude it at this time. A yes vote would exclude this Site from the URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 4 aye and 3 nay to exclude Parcel 309 from the URSAs.

Councilor McFarland asked that Site 201 be deleted with the exception of 23 acres on the west side.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye and 1 nay to discuss Site 201. Councilor Morissette cast the nay vote.

Councilor McFarland stated that the 23 acres are adjacent to the golf course and they are within the framework of some planned housing that is already there. The amenities are going to be extended to those 23 acres. Councilor Monroe said that she feels that the 23 acres are appropriate for inclusion. The remainder of Site 201 is the Boring lava domes and they do not lend themselves to very much of anything. There is much "up the hill and down the dale" in this part of the county.

Councilor McLain stated that this area was a difficult decision for her. Many mixed voices have been heard in both in favor of and opposed to inclusion of this site. Councilor McLain stated that Site 309 would have provided jobs and Site 201 is much the same in this regard. There are some possibilities for jobs as well as residential study done there. It is not right on the Boring lava domes but is only close to these geologic features. WRPAC and consultant reports both said that this area could be served for water and sewer. Site 201 is still a good study area.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that those voting aye will be voting to exclude this area. Those voting nay will be voting to continue the parcel in the existing URSAs.

Vote: The vote was 3 aye and 4 nay. Councilors McLain, Washington, Morissette and Kvistad voted nay. Site 201 is to remain within the URSAs.

Councilor Susan McLain brought the process to an end with a summation of the work Metro Council has completed to date on 2040 Urban Growth Boundary issues. A review times three of the quadrangle maps has been completed. This is only study and is not tax-lot-specific. This is only a location study to look at areas that might possibly be good for urbanization if Metro identifies a need for site for future urbanization.

Councilor McCaig stated that she would vote against this ordinance, stating that is a bad piece of work; has far too many acres, send a message across the region that Metro is looking at a larger expansion of the UGB than she is comfortable with. The product lacks policy guidelines and was built upon individual pieces of criteria that do not add up to a cogent picture.

Councilor Monroe stated that he would support this resolution although he is in agreement with Councilor McCaig that it has too much EFU land in it. The process, according to Councilor

Metro Council Minutes

Meeting Date: Feb. 8, 1996

Page - 12

Monroe has been fair. He commended Councilor McLain for her meticulous efforts through the whole process.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he is pleased with the process to date. He agreed with Councilor Monroe that the next round of decisions will be far more difficult with far fewer acres included.

Councilor Morissette stated that he had done extensive research on the parcels for which he voted for inclusion. He suggested that going back and forth on these decisions could be just as detrimental to people as making wrong decisions. He stated his support for Resolution 95-2244.

Councilor Washington voiced his approval of Resolution 95-2244.

Motion: Councilor McLain moved for adoption of Resolution No. 95-2244

Second: Councilor Washington seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was 6/1 aye with Councilor McCaig casting the no vote. The motion passed.

9. Councilor Communications

None.

The meeting was adjourned by Presiding Officer Kvistad at 5:45 PM.

Prepared by

Cathy Ross
Acting Council Clerk

David Aeschliman
Council Assistant