

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, November 10, 2005
Hillsboro Civic Center Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Robert Liberty, Carl Hosticka, Brian Newman, Rod Park

Councilors Absent: Rex Burkholder (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 5:00 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3.1 Consideration of minutes of the October 27, 2005 Regular Council Meetings.

Motion:	Councilor Hosticka moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the October 27, 2005 Regular Metro Council.
---------	--

Vote:	Councilors McLain, Liberty, Newman, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed. [Councilor Park absent from the vote]
-------	---

4. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

4.1 **Ordinance No. 05-1089**, For the Purpose of Amending Chapter 3.01 of the Metro Code (Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Procedures) to Comply With Changes in State Planning Laws, and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion:	Councilor McLain moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1089.
Seconded:	Councilor Newman seconded the motion

Councilor McLain provided background information on the ordinance. She outlined issues related to processes that needed to be reviewed. She provided clarification on the “A” version.

Richard Benner, Senior Attorney (Office of Metro Attorney), outlined the objectives of the amendments. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) amended Goal 14 in April 2005. One objective was to bring Metro Code in line with legislative action to ensure a process to amend the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) that was relatively quick. The minor revisions respond to these changes. Mr. Benner also addressed substantive changes in the “A” version that came from the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). The most significant adjustments relate to factors considered by the Metro Council. He noted the with the “A” version

of the ordinance, a change has been proposed for Title 11 (planning for new urban areas). Mr. Benner asked the Council to consider making an adjustment to Section 020(b) 1 and 2. He referred to a letter from LCDC asking for a change to this section.

Council President Bragdon asked Councilor McLain to move to substitute 05-1089A for 05-1089 based upon Mr. Benner's recommendations. She agreed.

Vote on Motion to Substitute:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed. [Councilor Park was absent from the vote]

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1089 and 05-1089A.

Meg Fernekees, Field Representative to Metro from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), 800 NE Oregon Street, Portland, Oregon, reminded the Council about two concerns. One of them had already been addressed by Mr. Benner. The other one concerned the City of Canby's issue with Goal 14.

Councilor McLain asked for a summary. Ms. Fernekees responded that there was a sentence related to minor UGB amendment processes. Councilor McLain asked Mr. Benner to address set criteria that had already been discussed for minor adjustments. Mr. Benner said the issue is that the minor adjustment process in the Metro Code relates to small changes to the UGB. This was reviewed by LCDC in 1990. The case that Ms. Fernekees referred to was more recent, relating to a case where a parcel of farmland, that had not been included in the UGB, was added by the City of Canby. The Court of Appeals found that this was not an allowable action. LCDC said that Metro's current process, which had been approved, states that a small amount of land can be brought in even if it is not needed. Mr. Benner said he disagrees with this. He does not recommend that the Metro Code be changed.

Councilor Liberty noted that Metro would have to do this anyway in periodic review. Mr. Benner said Metro would not face this in periodic review. Ms. Fernekees agreed with Mr. Benner.

Councilor McLain said she would take the letter and review it again. She said she felt Mr. Benner has made a good case. Ms. Fernekees asked that the Council consider this case.

Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing, and continued Ordinance 05-1089A until the November 17, 2005 Council meeting.

4.2 **Ordinance No. 05-1070**, For the Purpose of Amending the Urban Growth Boundary to Increase Capacity to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment in Response to Remand From the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Motion:	Councilor Newman moved to adopt Ordinance No. 05-1070.
Seconded:	Councilor McLain seconded the motion

Councilor Newman yielded to Lydia Neill, Principal Regional Planner (Metro Planning Department). Ms. Neill provided background information on the ordinance. Ms. Neill explained the history of the process, the information received from LCDC, technical issues, and the factors used in the decision-making for the current Chief Operating Officer (COO) proposal. She

summarized the issues that LCDC had presented to Metro – including the timeline – and how the proposal addressed them.

Councilor Liberty asked for clarification from Ms. Neill regarding acreage. Ms. Neill said she had spoken with Washington County about this question. She was told that there are several remedies, including lot adjustment or partition.

Councilor Newman summarized the points he had heard. On the industrial lands decision, Metro had received a passing grade from LCDC but was asked to defend its position on Cornelius. In addition, they were concerned about Metro's decision that there was sufficient acreage and issues about Evergreen.

Councilor McLain said that 98-99% was accepted and acknowledged, emphasizing that a very small amount of work remained to be addressed. Council President Bragdon concurred. Ms. Neill noted correspondence received by the City of Hillsboro supporting the inclusion of the Evergreen and Cornelius areas. [copy of which is included in the meeting record]

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-1070.

Stone Rose, 24555 NW Oak Drive, Hillsboro, Oregon 97124, said he lives in the area of the proposed Evergreen expansion. He recognized that change occurs; however, he wanted to know what would happen to the value of the property if it was included. He noted that most residents do not plan to move. He asked that Councilors consider the nature of the neighborhood before industrial zoning begins. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Councilor McLain asked Ms. Neill to show an area on the map. She wondered whether the area shown in blue would have to come in as an industrial spot in order to get a road built. Valerie Counts, Planner, City of Hillsboro, said the issue was that the intersection of Meek and Shute Roads was too close to the interchange, and constituted a safety issue. Ms. Counts noted that the exact alignment will be studied at a future date.

Krystal Laas, 6140 NW Birch Avenue, Hillsboro, OR 97124, addressed the Evergreen expansion area – specifically, an area known as Sunset Acres. She recognized that the LCDC remand put Metro between a rock and a hard spot. She offered reasons why these 35 acres should be excluded from the Evergreen expansion area. She said the staff report stated that the City of Hillsboro supported the inclusion; but she had not seen any communication from the City of Hillsboro that supported it. In the summary in the actions to satisfy the remand, the need for large lots is listed as a pro for the Evergreen expansion decision. Ms. Laas also addressed the probability of all owners selling their properties at the same time. She said this kind of re-zoning fueled the fire for ballot initiatives like Measure 37. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Councilor Newman asked, of the net areas counted for industrial need, how many were in the Sunset Acres area. Ms. Neill said that a lot of the land in this area was already developed, adding that less than half would be considered buildable land. Councilor Newman asked for clarification. Ms. Laas said property owners do not want to be zoned for industrial. Councilor McLain thanked Councilor Newman for defining the issues. She said she wanted to be clear that Metro was bringing in industrial land. If Hillsboro did not want it to be zoned industrial, then Metro needed to know this.

Councilor Park said that once the land was brought into the boundary, there were a number of steps that needed to be taken before rezoning could occur. Ms. Neill outlined the steps. Councilor Park noted that there were other options available to citizens to negotiate.

Council President Bragdon asked how this parcel got picked up when it did not meet the criteria. Ms. Neill said it was exception land that had to be considered, adding there is an established industrial cluster of uses in the area; hence, its consideration.

M. Jean Morgan, 5745 NW Sewell Road, Hillsboro, OR 97124, said that as a property owner of land partially in and out, she was not exactly sure how she felt about the issue. She expressed concern about the reduction of farmland and the advance of development. She was not sure why there was a need for industrial land in the area. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

James H. Burns, 5840 NW Sewell Road, Hillsboro, OR 97124, addressed the Evergreen property, noting that his property was in the 100-year floodplain. [No written testimony was provided]

Bruce Dean, 4700 NW Sewell Road, Hillsboro, OR 97214, expressed concern about the effect this proposal would have on the environment. He addressed the noise impact of the Hillsboro Airport. He was not supportive of industrial development in the area. He didn't want to impede progress; yet, he preferred studying other options for development. [See written testimony provided.]

Henry Oberhelman, 26185 NW Evergreen, Hillsboro, OR 97124, reiterated that he and his wife, Anita want to be included in the urban growth boundary. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Richard Langdon, 870 SW 84th Court, Portland, OR, said he represents two local landowners in the annexation area. As a real estate developer, he said it was not entirely appropriate for zoning the area being considered industrial. He said it was very important that small industrial parcels be available, adding that his clients' land would be suited for smaller parcels for industrial development. He was hopeful that the property would be annexed into the urban growth boundary. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Jonathan Schlueter, Executive Director, Westside Economic Alliance, 10220 SW Nimbus Avenue, Tigard, OR 97223 reiterated his organization's interest in adding industrial land for development. He said the Evergreen annexation was a good choice. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Councilor Liberty asked Mr. Schlueter to respond to comments and testimony claiming there was still a great deal of vacant land available. Mr. Schlueter referred to an Oregonian article addressing population growth in the west. Councilor Liberty said he understood the pace of growth. He said we were essentially taking land from one industry and giving it to another industry. He cautioned about taking land designated for one type of industrial use and giving it over to another type of industrial use.

Councilor Park asked Mr. Schlueter whether he would support an amendment proposed by Councilor Burkholder to look for additional capacity in the city center for residential housing. Mr. Schlueter said the shortage of residential property in the area was not a secret. He said he was supportive of finding infill in existing cities. Councilor Park continued by saying the jobs population number is going to hit seven years sooner than previously projected. Mr. Schlueter

said 72,000 workers in the neighborhood head to town to work; they are met with 72,000 Washington County workers heading out of the area. This was a testimony to the kind of opportunities that were being created here. Creating more residential housing was a given need, but so was the need to keep the area growing in terms of employment.

Mr. Schlueter said he thought he had neither the right nor the obligation to be choosy about the types of commercialization. Council President Bragdon said Mr. Schlueter had argued for a certain type of development. What if the land ended up being used for other purposes? Mr. Schlueter didn't think that had ever happened in this area and was not concerned about it.

Larry Duyck, Farm Board, 885 SW Baseline, Hillsboro, OR 97123, spoke to the difficulty of farming in Washington County. People have been leaving the area in order to find easier places to farm. The increasing industrialization has made farming more and more difficult. Many canneries and suppliers have gone out of business. Congestion and crowding have put pressure on the quality of life in the area. He was not concerned about flooding, as long as the flood plain was available to absorb the water. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Dave Vanasche, Washington County Farm Bureau Director, 36130 NW Wren Road, Cornelius, OR 97113, said there was a healthy diversity of crops being raised in Oregon. He was also representing his family farm. His son would like to come back and farm, but Mr. Vanasche was not sure there would be an opportunity for this. He was not opposed to inclusion of the entire area, just the best farmland. He also had a map that was displayed and is included in the record. He described many of the agricultural properties as being of significant size. He emphasized the importance of agriculture in the region. [He also had a letter from the Fisher-Ernst Group] He spoke to the relationship of the farmers, the suppliers, and the distributors, and wondered about their fates. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Councilor Park asked about how the jobs in the area were increasing faster than the housing. He asked the citizens for their comments. Mr. Duyck stated his observations of the loss of farmland. Mr. Vanasche seconded this observation. He asked the Council to look at the situation in a larger context. He stressed the need to keep agricultural reserves available. He described the large amounts of farmland that have been lost in the past 15 years. Councilor Park had some questions about the map Mr. Vanasche submitted. He asked about the history of some of the properties. Mr. Vanasche described some of the history of how farmers had bought land, leased land, and sold properties to farm most effectively. He commented on the productivity of all the farms. He talked about the increase in traffic that has caused obstacles to farming. A lot of the problem is commuters on their way to and from work. He wondered how much additional traffic farmers could bear.

Councilor Liberty asked about the land south of Council Creek. Mr. Vanasche had no objection to this area. Mr. Duyck concurred. Councilor Liberty had a question about some property in the Cornelius area. He wondered if the Farm Bureau objected to this inclusion. Mr. Vanasche said that they did object. He thought there might be a domino effect of losing farmland. Councilor Liberty had a question about Waible Creek and whether it was much of a boundary. Mr. Vanasche stated that those properties were not of so much concern to him. He described the creek as being 5 to 10 feet wide. Councilor Liberty referred to a portion of the Farm Bureau letter that suggested permanent protection of certain farmlands. Mr. Vanasche responded that he would be interested in discussing this issue. He expressed his desire to continue as a family farm, but said he needed some certainty about the protection of farmland and not having it continually chipped away at. Mr. Duyck agreed. Councilor McLain said she understood Mr. Vanasche's appreciation

for “give and take” in the urban/rural balance. She asked whether either the Cornelius or the Evergreen decision would preclude the certainty that Mr. Vanasche was looking for. Mr. Vanasche stated that once you crossed Council Creek, then the end would be in sight for farming in this area. Councilor Park referred to a previous discussion in Hillsboro (about seven years ago), when citizens were interested in having more housing in the area. He asked Mr. Vanasche his opinion about whether development in a direction other than south – specifically, the Reedville area – would be preferable. Mr. Vanasche replied that he would be open to discussing this site. He also mentioned the potential for the area around 185th and Kaiser Road. He said land in this area was not nearly as productive as the land in his area.

Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW Third Avenue, Portland, OR, said her group did not support the inclusion of either the Evergreen or Cornelius areas. She opposed expansion north of Council Creek, both exception land and farmland. She brought up some of Metro’s goals, of using natural and built features, and to have clear distinctions between rural and urban areas. She noted that the UGB kept moving west into Washington County. She wanted Metro to be consistent with its own policies on including land. She emphasized the importance of keeping as much farmland as possible undeveloped. She listed a few other sites that she said would be preferable to the ones proposed by Metro. She noted the problem of increased paving and accompanying flooding effects. She preferred expansion south of Council Creek. She emphasized the productivity of the soil and commented that the lack of irrigation infrastructure should not be interpreted as a lack of productivity. [See testimony submitted to the public record]

Councilor McLain asked for staff to point out on the map the area Ms. McCurdy was concerned about. Councilor Park expressed his appreciation to Ms. McCurdy for her work on the Damascus project. Councilor Liberty asked what Metro’s legal position would be if all the land that LCDC required was not obtained. Ms. McCurdy said that perhaps Metro could call “close enough” “good enough.” She thought Metro’s reasonable range had already been achieved; she did not believe that every single acre had to be identified.

David Noren, Attorney, TVA City Health Care, 217 E. Main Street, Hillsboro, OR 97123, wanted to make sure that industrial land that was brought in was actually used for industrial purposes. [No written testimony was provided]

Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Council President Bragdon indicated that proposed amendments had been collected and had been submitted for consideration. He said that the cities of Hillsboro and Cornelius have been supportive of the recommendations. [A copy of the amendments was submitted to the public record].

Councilor McLain addressed her recommendation to amend Exhibit A to designate the portion of Evergreen as Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA).

Motion 1 to amend:	Councilor McLain moved to amend Exhibit A to Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion

Councilor Hosticka expressed his concern that none of the local government representatives were present to provide their input on proposed amendments. Council President Bragdon expressed his support of Councilor McLain’s amendment. He also agreed with Councilor Hosticka’s concern

about the absence of local officials to discuss the amendments and suggested that their input be sought prior to final adoption of the ordinance.

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, discussed the Chief Operating Officer's recommendation. He noted the difference between an employment designation and an industrial designation. Dick Benner said that the current version of Title IV is silent on schools and spoke about existing zoning rules.

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Newman, Liberty, Park and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye, the motion passed.

Councilor McLain presented another recommended amendment relating to Waible Creek, stating that the use of this creek as a boundary would ensure that metro was keeping the lots close to the creek so that property owners' land would not be divided.

Motion 2 to amend:	Councilor McLain moved to amend Exhibit A to Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion

Councilor Newman said that if the change is made, there were two large parcels that would be taken out of the mix. He asked if the property owners had provided input on this issue. He also asked what the reduction in acreage be. Councilor McLain said Metro would keep within the state's recommendations. Councilor Newman asked whether the need is not the issue. Councilor McLain said the property owners indicated that they wanted to be either in or out, but not split (being half in, half out). In addition, Councilor McLain stated that this amendment would address the desire of Sunset Acres property owners to have a buffer.

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Newman, Liberty, Park and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye, the motion passed.

Motion 3 to amend:	Councilor Park moved to amend Exhibit A to Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor McLain seconded the motion

Councilor Park spoke to his recommendation for this amendment to Ordinance 05-1070, to remove Areas 37 and 94 from the UGB, and declaring that previous additions to the UGB were sufficient to meet the need for housing.

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Newman, Liberty, Park and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye, the motion passed.

Councilor Liberty introduced his amendment, the purpose of which would be to notify appropriate local governments and landowners that land may be subject to a windfall assessment.

Motion 4 to amend:	Councilor Liberty moved to amend Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Council President Bragdon expressed his support of the amendment but had a few recommendations regarding textual changes. Councilors McLain and Hosticka expressed their support, as well.

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Park, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye, the motion passed.

Councilor Park presented the amendment proposed by Councilor Burkholder. This amendment would add a condition to require Hillsboro to add zoned housing capacity associated with Evergreen.

Motion 5 to amend:	Councilor Park moved to amend Exhibit B to Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Liberty seconded the motion

Councilor Park stated his arguments in favor of the amendment. Councilor McLain indicated her lack of support for the amendment, as did Council President Bragdon. Councilor Hosticka said he would support it.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, and Liberty voted in support of the motion. Councilors McLain, Newman and Council President Bragdon voted against the motion. The vote was 3 aye/3 nay, the motion failed. Councilor Park then changed his vote to nay, for right of reconsideration. The final vote was 2 aye/4 nay.
--

Councilor Hosticka presented an unscheduled amendment that would remove Sunset Acres from consideration.

Motion 6 to amend:	Councilor Hosticka moved to remove Sunset Acres from consideration.
Seconded:	Councilor McLain seconded the motion

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, McLain, Park, Newman, Liberty and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye, the motion passed.

Councilor Park presented an amendment to delete the expansion of the UGB and to declare that previous additions to the UGB are sufficient to meet the need for industrial land.

Motion 7 to amend:	Councilor Park moved to amend ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Liberty seconded the motion

Councilor Park provided his rationale for this amendment, saying that it was within Metro's discretion to make the decision that the goal had already been achieved. Councilor Newman said he would not support the amendment, based upon his feeling that this issue would come up again. He said he was ready to move forward with the package currently before the Council.

Councilor Liberty proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to support inclusion of the UGB the area south of Council Creek as identified by the Washington county farm bureau as not being

objectionable to use as industrial land. Councilor Park asked for clarification and then accepted the friendly amendment.

Council President Bragdon said he would not support the amendment. He added that this motion only guaranteed that the 2002 decision would still be on the Council's plate in the future. He said Metro would not get to talk about new things if it did not come to a final resolution on this matter.

Councilor McLain provided her arguments against the motion. The fact that the farmers would be willing to consider other options for rezoning of certain agricultural lands to industrial represented a positive sign that other options could be pursued. She also said Metro needs to continue to refine what is happening on the edges (e.g., buffer issues, conflicting use issues).

Councilor Park closed by stating that very difficult decisions were made in 2002. He said there was a great deal of debate whether the numbers were close enough or not close enough. He said the debate about where to stop would continue into the future.

Vote:

Councilors Liberty, Park, and Hosticka voted in support of the motion. Councilors McLain, Newman and Council President Bragdon voted against the motion. The vote was 3 aye/3 nay, the motion failed. Councilor Park then changed his vote to nay, for right of reconsideration. The final vote was 2 aye/4 nay.
--

Councilor Hosticka presented an unscheduled amendment to include only land south of Council Creek.

Motion 8 to amend:	Councilor Hosticka moved to amend Ordinance 05-1070
Seconded:	Councilor Liberty seconded the motion

Members of the Metro Council debated some areas of the map. They wanted to take out anything north of Council Creek. Councilor Hosticka said his motion was based on the discussion of the need for this land for industrial purposes in the short-term. There is already land that has been previously brought in for industrial purposes that has still had no action on it. He said that moving north of Council Creek limited the options for future discussion. The purpose of his motion was to leave that area open for discussion as a possible edge between urban and rural areas. If we moved north of Council Creek, there wasn't another natural boundary until Dairy Creek.

Councilor McLain asked staff how much acreage this would be. Council was told by LCDC that it was the findings that they were not comfortable with; LCDC did not necessarily disagree with the reasoning, but with the findings. Councilor McLain asked Mr. Benner what made Metro staff comfortable that we've added enough information to the findings for LCDC to accept it. Mr. Benner said that there were two parts that had troubled LCDC. The first one was the new Metro policy on the protection of agricultural land, which said that if we had to choose between two parcels of land that were similarly productive, we should choose the land that was less significantly productive; LCDC did not understand this. Secondly, when we were talking about the efficiency of the use of land, we had focused only on the land that was being brought in, and we hadn't addressed how it related to land that had already been brought in. Mr. Benner thought the current proposal addressed LCDC's issues.

Council President Bragdon said he would reluctantly vote no on the amendment. He wanted to support the procedures discussed by at Council, and cautioned about amendments being brought

up at the last minute. He emphasized that he was ready to move past the 2002 decision, and did not want to face another remand from LCDC. He agreed with Councilor Newman that it was better to face the future than clean up the past. Councilor McLain supported Councilor Hosticka's reasoning for the motion, but she shared the concerns of Council President Bragdon. She thought there was still time to address the issues. Development in this area was not happening that quickly. She thought that staff had addressed LCDC's request to take another look at the findings.

Councilor Liberty talked about the disparity of resources as distributed amongst the various communities. He was supportive of the motion. Councilor Hosticka was not convinced that LCDC wouldn't still have problems with the COO recommendation. He preferred to make the best possible decision regarding which land to include, rather than seeking assurances of finality which may or may not occur.

Vote:

Councilors Hosticka, Park, McLain, and Liberty voted in support of the motion. Councilor Newman and Council President Bragdon voted against the motion. The vote was 4 aye/2 nay, the motion passed.
--

Council President Bragdon directed staff to revise Ordinance 05-1070A and continued the ordinance to the November 17 Council meeting. He cautioned members of the Council that any further revisions could jeopardize meeting the December 1, 2005 deadline.

5. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

There were none.

6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

There were none.

7. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Prepared by,

Becky Shoemaker
Acting Clerk of the Council

Dove Hotz
Administrative Assistant II

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 10, 2005

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
3.1	Minutes	10/27/05	Metro Council Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2005	111005c-01
4.2	Fax of letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Deanna Palm, President, Greater Hillsboro Area Chamber of Commerce Re: 330 acres at Evergreen in response to LCDC remand	111005c-02
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Bill Wyatt, Executive Director, Port of Portland Re: Evergreen Study Area	111005c-03
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Stone Rose Re: Evergreen Expansion Area	111005c-04
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Krystal Laas Re: Amending Metro Urban Growth Boundary, Evergreen Expansion Area	111005c-05
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: The Landon Family Re: Expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary for Industrial Use in NW Hillsboro	111005c-06
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Henry & Anita Oberhelman Re: Additional Industrial Lands – Evergreen Study Area	111005c-07
4.2	Memo	11/8/05	To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Planning Re: Remand of Court of Appeals Decision on Areas 94 and 37	111005c-08
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Bruce Dean Re: Proposed land use, annexation and rezoning	111005c-09
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Jonathan Schlueter Re: In Consideration of Proposed Additions to Regional Industrial Land Supply	111005c-10
4.2	Letter and Oversized Map	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Tad VanderZanden, Washington County Farm Bureau Re: Evergreen Study Area	111005c-11

4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Pete Graham, Fisher Implement Company Re: Washington County agricultural community	111005c-12
4.2	Letter	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Jeff Duyck, Vice President, Pacific Harvest Supply Co. Re: Evergreen and Cornelius areas	111005c-13
4.1	Ordinance	11/1/05	Ordinance No. 05-1089A , For the Purpose of Amending Chapter 3.01 of the Metro Code (Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Procedures) to Comply With Changes in State Planning Laws, and Declaring an Emergency.	111005c-14
4.2	Amendments	10/20/05	To: Metro Council From: Metro Councilors Re: Proposed Councilor Amendments to COO Recommendation	111005c-15
4.2	Letter, with attachments	11/10/05	To: Metro Council From: Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon Re: Ordinance No. 05-1070; UGB Industrial Expansion	111005c-16
4.2	Letter, with attachments	10/26/05	To: Metro Council From: Gary Gentemann Re: UGB Industrial Lands Study	111005c-17
4.2	Letter, with attachments	10/31/05	To: Metro Council From: Rob Hallyburton, Department of Land Conservation and Development	111005c-18
4.2	Letter	11/7/05	To: Metro Council From: Tom Hughes, Mayor, City of Hillsboro Re: Metro Ordinance 05-1070, Metro UGB Amendments to Increase UGB Industrial Capacity	111005c-19
4.2	E-mail	11/7/05	To: M. Jean Morgan From: Lydia Neill Re: Proposed land inclusion in to the Metro district	111005c-20

4.2	Maps	Various	Map 1: Chief Operating Officer's Recommendation: Cornelius Map 2: Chief Operating Officer's Recommendation: 2005 UGB Industrial Land Expansion Map 3: 2002 and 2004 Urban Growth Boundary Expansions – 2002 Expansion (dated 12/12/2002) Map 4 and 5: 2004 Aerial Photography: Industrial Remand Areas Under Consideration	111005c-21
-----	------	---------	---	------------