

## MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

September 7, 2000

Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Rod Monroe, Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington (by phone)

Presiding Officer Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:02 pm.

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

### 2. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h), TO CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL CONCERNING THE LEGAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF A PUBLIC BODY WITH REGARD TO CURRENT LITIGATION.

**Members Present:** Alexis Dow, Katie Poole, Lisa Umshied, Bruce Warner, Pam Wilson, Alison Keene-Campbell, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Nancy Goss-Duran, council staff

2.1 **Resolution No. 00-2988**, For the purpose of Submitting to the Voters on May 21, 2002, an Amendment to the Metro Charter Titled "Prohibits, Repeals Metro Housing Density Requirements; Requires Notice, and Amends Charter."

**Motion:** **Councilor Park** moved to adopt Resolution No. 00-2988.

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

**Councilor Park** requested that Dan Cooper, General Counsel, explain the resolution. Mr. Cooper summarized the background to the resolution and noted that the council had the discretion to change the election date as long as it was May 21, 2002 or earlier. (More information can be found in the staff report that accompanies this legislation in the meeting packet that is part of the permanent record.)

**Councilor Park** said that although sufficient signatures had been obtained and certified to qualify the measure for the ballot, the question was which one. Metro Code 9.0.2.070 states that Metro must refer an initiative to the voters on the first available general or primary election no sooner than 90 days after signature certification. The earliest election that occurs 90 days after the date of certification, which was on August 24, 2000, is May of 2002. The petitioners acknowledged in print on the petitions that the signatures needed to be turned in by the July deadline, but they missed the deadline. Furthermore, putting this initiative on the November 7, 2000, ballot would limit the amount of time for public debate.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 00-2988.

**Robert Liberty**, Executive Director of 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW Third Suite 300 Portland, OR 97204, expressed support for the resolution. He noted that the Council could choose to put the initiative on the ballot in November, but that would show favoritism toward

Oregonians in Action, which had missed the filing deadline. Rushing the measure to the ballot would deprive voters of the chance to read about the measure in the voter's pamphlet or to discuss the measure and its implications for protecting farm and forest land. Mr. Liberty voiced his organization's objections to the measure itself as proposed by Oregonians in Action. He urged the Council not to allow the measure to go to the voters this November. He also urged the Council to put its own measure on the ballot as an alternative to this one when it does go to the voters in 2002. He offered suggestions as to what such a measure might include.

**Councilor Kvistad** said he would not debate the content of the ballot measure. However, he did think that the measure should go on the ballot since sufficient signatures had been certified. He asked Mr. Liberty if he thought that Metro ought to offer an alternative to every citizen-initiated measure.

**Mr. Liberty**, said no, not every initiative. But he did think voters should be able to read about measures in the voter's pamphlet. In addition, this issue directly concerns Metro, as Metro has a chartered responsibility to promote an alternative.

**Councilor Kvistad** said he had to make a decision about the legality of the process, not the measure's content.

**Mary Kyle McCurdy**, 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW 3<sup>rd</sup>, Portland, OR 97204, offered her 10 years of experience with Metro's proceedings and decision-making regarding growth issues. She said Oregonians in Action had never participated in any Metro hearings on these issues, and she saw this initiative as a way of bypassing public review and discussion of the ideas in the initiative. She urged postponing voter consideration until May of 2002.

**Marcus Simantel**, 2024 SW Howards Way, #204, Portland, OR 97201 said he was concerned because he thought density and efficient land use lay at the heart of good land-use planning. As a retired farmer, he opposed putting this initiative on the ballot so soon. He thought this type of measure needed much more time for people to consider the implications. He thought Oregonians in Action had hoped their measure would get lost. He urged postponing consideration until May of 2002.

**Rex Burkholder**, Metro Councilor-Elect, 1912 NE 11<sup>th</sup>, Portland, OR 97212, spoke in support of the resolution. He thought the measure should be argued in the voter's pamphlet, and that would be possible only if considerations were postponed until 2002, as proposed in the resolution.

**Ray Phelps**, 16 Touchstone, Lake Oswego, OR 97035 said he had been a director of elections in the past. He said he had worked on the timing sequence for exactly the reasons that have been stated. He said before the 1979 election, no one knew when initiatives would appear on the ballot. That created considerable confusion among voters and expense for those printing the ballots. He said that if this were to be put on the ballot, it would create confusion in local election offices, a number of which have already printed their ballots. In addition, some voters might not receive ballots out of this confusion. He urged passing this resolution if only to affirm what election officials and the legislature thought was a good idea nearly 30 years ago and has worked since then.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** closed the public hearing.

**Councilor Kvistad** said he objected to how this issue has been handled. He reiterated that his concern was not for the content of the initiative, but for what he saw as an inconsistency with

how Metro had rushed its charter reform measure to the voters. He suggested the measure could be put on the primary ballot next year or in the special district election as well as the rest. He emphasized his support for citizen involvement in the political process, and thought the citizens deserved to have their initiative on the ballot. He also objected to how this resolution came to be put on the agenda in such a hurry today.

**Councilor McLain** said she would support this resolution because 1) the initiative was not filed in time for the November election; 2) by May of 2002, Metro would be going out to the public for a thorough public review. She noted that the charter reform had undergone a four-month public review process. She would like to have the same kind of process precede a vote on the initiative. 3) Metro would be fulfilling its responsibilities as outlined by state law and its own code.

**Councilor Atherton** said that although he did not agree with how Metro had approached the charter reform process, he did not think that two wrongs make a right. He said he would support this resolution to avoid the mistakes he saw with the charter reform amendment process.

**Councilor Monroe** said the voters would have an opportunity to vote on the initiative, although he did not agree with the paid signature-gathering process for initiatives. He thought that violated the intent of the initiative process and encouraged signature gatherers to sometimes misrepresent the initiative. He said that although Metro has a responsibility to put this on the ballot, it also had the responsibility to make sure voters understood the measure.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said he would be supporting this resolution. He said the job at hand was not to decide whether the initiative should appear on the ballot, nor was it to decide the validity of the signatures. That was the election officer's job. It wasn't even a question of the merits of the issue. The question was one of following the law and meeting deadlines. Democracy depends on people following the same rules.

**Councilor Washington** said there was never perfection in these types of issues. He said a year and eight months is not a long time, but it would allow time to have the needed conversation about the issue.

**Councilor Kvistad** reiterated his position that the issue should have been on this agenda regardless, not just because the court said it should. He also said he did not object to voting on the issue in 2002. He simply thought the issue had been handled poorly on Metro's part.

**Councilor McLain** said she was voting on this today because of the merits of the resolution, not because of any court order. She said Monday, September 11, was the last day to put anything on the November ballot. This issue needed to be decided today.

**Councilor Park** recapped that if this resolution passes, the initiative would be on the ballot in May of 2002. The citizens would have an opportunity to make their decision. Putting this on the 2002 ballot is consistent with Metro's own code. The petitioners missed a deadline that they were clearly aware of. He urged passage of the resolution.

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

### 3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

#### 4. MCCI COMMUNICATIONS

**Ted Kyle**, MCCI Chair, thanked the council and the Executive Officer for the time that they took to talk with him concerning citizen involvement. He said he had learned a great deal, particularly about different perspectives on what citizen involvement means. The charter says it is communication between the government and the citizens. Councilors saw MCCI in various ways, ranging from being committed to being activists to expecting to be involved in making policy. He noted that MCCI's public-involvement planning guide, completed some years ago, had been well received and proven useful.

Mr. Kyle also said that the Council did not see MCCI as having much of an impact lately. He noted that the Council was not aware of all MCCI had done. For example, it had sent out a Metro flyer in utility billings—an outreach tool that had cost very little. But not everyone knew about it. He said when he had asked about what a successful MCCI would look like, he got a range of suggestions, many of which cannot realistically be done. MCCI considered all this at its retreat, and came out with three main things: First, MCCI's role needs to be defined and clearly communicated to the Council and Executive Office. Second, the Committee needs to improve its own processes. And third, MCCI needs to develop a way to evaluate progress in programs and processes that involve citizens.

The questions of whether MCCI is a policy group or an advisory group was key, and the group was divided. Mr. Kyle suggested that because MCCI covers all aspects of Metro's mission, it has a broad view of Metro's policies. But he thought direct involvement with policy should come from members as individual citizens, not from MCCI as a group. He did think the group had a role in providing advice, particularly on citizen involvement. He promised to bring a report that outlines what MCCI can and cannot do in order to solicit the Council's advice on how MCCI should focus its efforts.

**Councilor Monroe** praised Mr. Kyle's leadership at MCCI and said he looked forward to working with him to make the relationship work.

**Councilor Atherton** asked Mr. Kyle how he would like to receive direction from the Council—through Council action or directly from individual councilors.

**Mr. Kyle** said MCCI appreciated it when the Council liaison attended meetings. He said phone calls would also be appreciated.

**Councilor Atherton** asked how MCCI viewed Metro's initiative for charter reform in terms of citizen involvement.

**Mr. Kyle** said the group met and talked about the initiative, but had not adopted a formal position. It did feel the measure was moving very fast.

**Councilor Atherton** asked if he communicated that to the Council.

**Mr. Kyle** said that although the group had not formally voted to adopt a position, he had communicated to the Council what he believed MCCI's view was.

**Councilor McLain** praised Mr. Kyle's leadership and his efforts to communicate with the Council.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said that MCCI in the past had requested more evening meetings, but that attendance had not indicated that evening meetings were better attended.

**Mr. Kyle** said he did not know how the group felt, but he personally felt that it would depend on the issue. He said listening posts had received rave reviews.

**Councilor Park** noted that the general public expects to be served. He noted that night meetings cost extra money, because staff has already put in its eight hours. He asked how to make sure the public gets its money's worth.

**Mr. Kyle** said that was an excellent question, and the concern was one MCCI had, also. He said he would ask the group to discuss how best to use night meetings.

**Councilor Washington** offered his thanks to Mr. Kyle and a special thanks to Aleta Woodruff, who attended most Council meetings.

#### 4. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

#### 6. AUDITOR COMMUNICATIONS

**Alexis Dow**, Metro Auditor, presented the results of the Open Spaces Acquisitions audit. She first explained her job as Metro Auditor and then presented a power point presentation of her audit (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

**Councilor McLain** asked about the audit methodology, which in the report appeared not to include a comparison of policies and procedures with other open space acquisition programs.

**Ms. Dow** said that she had surveyed other governments and tried to gather as much information as possible. She noted that Metro was a leader in this area, and their survey had not turned up any other audits on other open spaces programs.

**Councilor McLain** said that the report included recommendations that had not been part of the Greenspaces Department's everyday practices, that conflicted with her personal experience. She said every recommendation made were everyday practices, many of them in place before the report was issued.

She also noted that Ms. Dow had referred to the "willing seller" nature of the program, but then proceeded to request improvements in the purchase patterns. She asked how that could be done in the face of the "willing seller" requirement—would that include condemnation?

**Ms. Dow** said that with regard to the recommendations, each one was based on an exception found in the audit testing. As each exception was found, it was brought to the attention of the staff. It is to their credit that many of the recommendations were implemented. As a result, by the time the report was issued, many were already in place.

As to the willing seller requirement, Ms. Dow recognized how that hindered purchasing certain properties. She said she was not suggesting condemnation. She did suggest that more effort be put into purchasing properties in the greenway areas, where targets have not been met. She added that she understood that when a program first starts, many goals need to be met. But as the

program proceeds, some areas surface that need more attention. She had suggested this was one of those.

**Councilor McLain** referred to the recommendation regarding converting the Burlington Northern line as a trail. She said that the short-line is still operating on that line. She asked how Metro could reorganize that into a trail without condemnation.

**Ms. Dow** said she understood that the Council could declare an area infeasible and then reallocate the money. She said that might need to be done in this case. Her point was, however, that action had not been taken in that area because of external circumstances.

**Councilor McLain** referred to Table 9 in the report, which presents appraised value versus the purchase price for selected transactions. The table suggests that a few of the properties had purchase prices that exceeded the appraised value by more than 10%. In looking at all the purchases together, however, more than \$750,000 less was spent than the total appraised value of all of those properties. She asked why that final total column had been left off that table.

**Ms. Dow** said Table 9 shows individual properties. She said she did not believe one could draw a conclusion based on those individual properties, and that was the reason the total had been left off.

**Councilor McLain** said she appreciated the answer but did not understand the reasoning. She then asked about target area budget issues. She noted that she had been present for the discussion on those budgets, and she remembered a decision to consider refinement areas rather than target budgets. She asked where the ordinances and council actions on that decision were in the report.

**Ms. Dow** said the evidence was conflicting. She said there had been discussion of establishing refinement plans and of target area budgets. The work plan refers to requiring the Executive Officer to bring to the Council for approval any purchase that exceeds the target area budget. The conflicting evidence is in the report, and it is because of the conflicting evidence that she had suggested staff get Council approval. She said that if there are no target area budgets, then that should be modified in the work plan.

**Councilor McLain** said the Council did not just have discussion on that issue, it took action. She asked if Ms. Dow had not accepted the resolutions and ordinances that decided that debate.

**Ms. Dow** said that based on her reading of the ordinances and her understanding of other discussions in the Council, the record was not clear.

**Councilor McLain** said she thought it was clear, but understood that Ms. Dow did not.

She asked where the report recognized that this was only the first phase in a much larger greenspaces acquisition program. She noted that Metro had published in all the election material that one bond measure could not purchase all the greenspaces in the master plan.

**Ms. Dow** said the recognition comes from looking at the bond measure and the information sheets that accompanied it, which acknowledge the limited resources. However, the material seemed to imply a correlation between dollars and minimum acreage that could be acquired.

**Councilor McLain** said it sounded to her that Ms. Dow did recognize—even though she might not have put it in her report—that Metro had indicated it would purchase a minimum of 6,000 acres out of 14,000 possible areas with the money from that first bond measure.

**Ms. Dow** said she recognized that the Council had the authority under the bond measure to develop refinement plans, and that the Council had established refinement plans that it was working toward. She said, however, that the voters had been led to believe that the goal was to purchase acreage that was geographically dispersed. They expected Metro to continue working toward that goal.

**Councilor Monroe** said he had been on the Council when the bond measure had been put forward. He said that targeting and goals were not firm dollar allocations and they never were intended to be. He thought the auditor was confused about that. He added clarification regarding the complexities of Regional Balance (see a copy of his remarks in the permanent record of this meeting).

**Ms. Dow** directed the councilors to pages 17-18 of the Auditor's report, which listed what she saw as conflicting data on whether target area budgets exist. She said her professional standards required her to base her conclusions on documentary evidence, which was not clear in this area. She said there were a number of places that showed conflicting evidence and it was not a matter of the auditor not understanding. She said she was asking the council for clarification.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** asked about the internal document she referenced as well as her verbal report, in particular, about the target area budgets having an affect on sellers being more willing to sell. He concluded that the seller would actually have the financial advantage if he knew what the buyer was willing to pay.

**Ms. Dow** responded that if money was available to acquire one piece of property, then that would be true, but if that money was to acquire several pieces of property in the same target area, that would not necessarily be the conclusion. She said she was looking at it as a management tool for the council to help insure their policy was being followed.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said if everyone knew the agency wanted to buy 100% in an area, it would strengthen the bargaining position of the seller because they would know they could hold out for a higher price because the seller had to meet the target goal.

**Ms. Dow** said the target areas were much larger than the minimum acreage goals that had been established for each target area. So if the minimum goal was the entire target area, or 80% of it, then you would be at a disadvantage, but in fact it was not a large percentage.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** reiterated Councilor McLain's point, that it shouldn't be construed as failure on the agency's part that the railroad had chosen to continue operating and the agency had chosen not to condemn the property.

**Ms. Dow** agreed.

**Councilor Atherton** asked Ms. Dow if she had found what she considered an acceptable appraisal value range in doing her research.

**Ms. Dow** responded that appraisal was more an art than a science and the appraisers worked within professional standards. She added that within the appraisal industry there was recognition

that one could signal for a high or a low appraisal. She said upon review, there were some elements of concern in some of the appraisals that she felt should be considered individually.

**Councilor Atherton** noted in the report that almost all of her recommendations had been accepted by the Executive Officer or were already adopted and in practice.

**Ms. Dow** said that was correct. She repeated that the conclusion of the audit was that it was a very good program but there were some areas of improvements that could further strengthen the program. She said the Executive Officer and staff had recognized the value of the recommendations and they had undertaken to implement them, that enhanced the future credibility of the program.

**Councilor Park** asked, during the 27 months of the audit, whether Ms. Dow would grade the program as being successful based upon the goals being met with less money than was estimated originally.

**Ms. Dow** said she would rate it as a success. She said when the audit was completed there was still \$40 million left, including interest earnings, and still things to be accomplished. She thought the program was on track and she expected it to be 100% successful.

**Councilor Park** asked if Ms. Dow was suggesting in her report that it would generate some type of increased competition if they did a break down by subregion with certain dollar amounts in each sub-region.

**Ms. Dow** responded that the number of acres to be acquired for each target area had been identified on the information sheets for the bond measure so the subregions were already identified. She asked if they wanted to take it the next step and identify the dollars as well. She said arguments could be made for doing that. It was a decision that needed to be made by the Council one way or the other.

**Councilor Park** said in his experience, the development pattern of a property made a difference in the appraisal value. He wondered about the concern that individual properties may have been above or below certain levels when, as Councilor McLain had pointed out, the overall acquisition price of the twelve properties was less than the appraised price of the twelve properties. He felt they should have been focusing on the total piece rather than a single property. Referring back to his original question, he asked why parts of the report made it sound like they were not successful, even though they acquired 6,000 acres+ for less money than they had originally cited.

**Ms. Dow** pointed out on Table 9 that almost all of the savings had to do with one particular property. She repeated that one could not apply the data to all the properties across the board because each property had to be looked at as an individual transaction as to whether they were successful in getting it at, above or below market value as defined by the appraisal.

**Councilor Park** disagreed but felt they had a difference of strategy. She had suggested breaking into subregions would be more effective but the Council and staff felt it should be looser to allow competition within the region to remain. He said he wondered why some of the items had been brought up, but felt staff had done a good job and they had a successful program. He hoped they would take the audit and move on.



**Ms. Dow** agreed. She said they found the program had a good team and was accomplishing their objectives, but as with any large program, there were areas that could be improved or tightened to enhance the program.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** and **Councilor McLain** thanked the auditor for the report.

**Councilor McLain** continued her comments (a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). She cited page 18, "lack of reference to target area budgets in certain key documents." She pointed out that all of the bullet points in the explanation were Council actions and that it was important that audits did not ignore those actions, but she also noted that the dialogue from debate in the minutes were not Council actions. She added that, with all of those actions, the Council clearly was not confused about what they meant by refinement areas and not having target budgets.

She wanted the Auditor to know that the entire Council and the appraisal team wanted to make sure the public dollar was spent well, and it was. She found nothing in the audit to say that. She said the appraisal process was sound and had integrity and while Ms. Dow wanted the Council to look at each individual appraisal of all the transactions, she herself had only looked at 12 of over 200 appraisal transactions in this program that carried out the integrity of the team. She thanked the Greenspaces program for their diligence and hard work.

**Councilor Washington** asked if this report was a final step.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said yes, the Executive Officer's response was bound into the report with steps he was taking to implement some of the recommendations.

## 7. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

## 8. CONSENT AGENDA

8.1 Consideration of the meeting minutes of the August 17, 2000 Regular Council Meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor Monroe** moved to adopt the minutes of the August 17, 2000 Regular Council meeting.

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

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 1 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Washington abstaining from the vote.

## 9. ORDINANCES – FIRST READING

9.1 **Ordinance No. 00-877**, For the Purpose of Annexing Approximately 14 acres of land in the Jackson Bottom Wetland Preserve Near the City of Hillsboro and Declaring an Emergency.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** assigned Ordinance No. 00-877 to the Council and opened a public hearing. No one came forward. Presiding Officer Bragdon closed the public hearing.

**Lydia Neill, Growth Management**, briefed the Council concerning this ordinance.

9.2 **Ordinance No. 00-873**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Code Chapter 5.02 to Remove the Retrieval Rate Requirement for Regional System Fee Credit Eligibility.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** assigned Ordinance No. 00-873 to the Regional Environmental Management Committee.

9.3 **Ordinance No. 00-876**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Chapter 5.02 to Create a Disposal Charge for Compostable Organic Waste at Metro Transfer Stations and Making Related Changes to the Metro Excise Tax and Metro Code Chapter 7.01.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** assigned Ordinance No. 00-876 to the Regional Environmental Management Committee.

## 10. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

10.1 **Ordinance No. 00-870**, For the Purpose of Increasing to One Year the Maximum Period of Exclusion from the Oregon Zoo and Declaring an Emergency.

**Motion:** **Councilor Atherton** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 00-870.

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

**Councilor Atherton** summarized the ordinance.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 00-870. No one came forward. **Presiding Officer Bragdon** closed the public hearing.

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

## 11. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(e). DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED TO NEGOTIATE REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS and 12. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h), TO CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL CONCERNING THE LEGAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF A PUBLIC BODY WITH REGARD TO CURRENT LITIGATION.

Members Present: Charles Ciecko, Jim Desmond, Alison Kean Campbell, Council staff, Dan Cooper and Larry Shaw.

11.1 **Resolution No. 00-2985**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Executive Officer to Purchase Land in the East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes Target Area.

**Motion:** **Councilor Monroe** moved to adopt Resolution No. 00-2985.

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

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 00-2985.

**Richard Shook, Steering Committee Mt. Talbert Nature Park**, 4815 SE Casa Del Rey Drive, Milwaukie, OR 97222 spoke in support of the resolution.

**Mike Henley, N. Clackamas Parks and Recreation District Director**, 11022 SE 37<sup>th</sup> Ave., Milwaukie, OR 97222 supported the resolution.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** closed the public hearing. He added that he had previously been to the site on nature hikes and it was clear that this piece was essential to making it all work.

**Councilor Monroe** felt this would be even better than Powell Butte Park, which was one of his personal favorites.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor McLain absent from the vote.

**Presiding Officer Bragdon** said Councilor McLain had to leave for a previous commitment, but had asked him to convey her support of this resolution.

### 13. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Presiding Officer Bragdon reminded the Council that the next regularly scheduled meeting would be held in Hillsboro next Thursday, September 14, 2000 at 5:30 p.m.

### 14. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

<b>Document Number</b>	<b>Document Date</b>	<b>Document Title</b>	<b>TO/FROM</b>	<b>RES/ORD</b>
090700c-01	8/24/00	Letter RE: Ordinance No. 00-872, Jackson Bottom Locational Adjustment	Presiding Officer & Metro Council/ Tim Erwert, Chair Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve Board	Ordinance No. 00-872
090700c-02	8/22/00	Letter RE: Ordinance No. 00-872, Jackson Bottom Locational Adjustment	Presiding Officer & Councilors/ Bill Gaffi, Unified Sewerage Agency of WA Co.	Ordinance No. 00-872
090700c-03	9/7/00	Resolution No. 2988, plus staff report		
090700c-04	June 2000	Regional Parks and Greenspaces Open Spaces Acquisitions	Council/Dow	

090700c-05

Audit

Hard copy of slide show  
from Greenspaces audit

090700c-06

Remarks from Councilor  
Monroe RE: audit

090700c-07

Remarks from  
Councilors Monroe and  
McLain RE: audit