

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, November 21, 2002

Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Carl Hosticka (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, David Bragdon, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder

Councilors Absent:

Presiding Officer Hosticka convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:10 p.m. and announced that they would move directly to the public hearing on Ordinance No. 02-969.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3.1 Minutes of the November 14, 2002 Regular Council Meeting were not considered.

4. ORDINANCES – FIRST READING

Presiding Officer Hosticka announced that without objection they would begin the meeting with the public hearing on Ordinance No. 02-969. There was no objection.

4.2 **Ordinance No. 02-969**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code in order to Increase the Capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Population Growth to the Year 2022; and Declaring an Emergency (**PUBLIC HEARING**)

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-969 to the Council and opened a public hearing Ordinance No. 02-969. He spoke to the process to date. They will accept public testimony on this ordinance and other urban growth boundary amendments at tonight's meeting. He also talked about how to testify and opened the record.

Motion: Councilor Park moved to substitute draft Ordinance No. 02-969 for the current Ordinance No. 02-969.

Seconded: Councilor McLain seconded the motion.

Vote: There was not objection to the substitution.

Councilor McLain put a letter from Brad Young on Area 77 into the record.

Councilor Atherton said Melissa McDonald from West Linn had left a message indicated Metro should not move the Urban Growth Boundary, she liked space that surrounded communities and felt there was plenty of land inside the UGB now. Second, he noted a letter from Oregon City

Metro Council Meeting

11/21/02

Page 2

Public Schools indicating that they had just recently been informed about Urban Growth Boundary choices preferred by Oregon City. Third, he placed an email in the record from Tom Petowski of the State Office of Economic Analysis (a copy of this may be found in the record).

Councilor Park gave an overview of testimony that had been received as of 2:30 p.m. today (a copy of these is found in the record).

Councilor McLain noted that this was additional information that we had received after the first record was closed on November 1, 2002.

Presiding Officer Hosticka added that if individuals did not wish to testify orally they could submit written comments on the purple Comment Card.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, gave a brief overview of the urban growth boundary expansion and growth within the region. He talked about the proposed policies in Ordinance No. 02-969 as well as recommended expansion areas. He also talked about the specific land need ordinances (a copy of his speaking points are included in the record).

Presiding Officer Hosticka said they would be taking action on the Ordinance on December 5th, and possibly on December 10th or 12th.

Councilor Park talked about the process that they had gone through at the Community Planning Committee in considering possible expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary. This was the most complete overhaul of the UGB the Metro had done. He talked about the public involvement process they had gone through in the past year.

Councilor McLain added that they appreciated the citizens being here today. They were here to listen today. They would do their best.

Tom Hughes, Mayor of Hillsboro, 123 W. Main St. Hillsboro, OR 97123 summarized his statement concerning Shute Road and Evergreen Road (a copy of his letter/testimony is found in the record).

Brent Curtis, Washington County Planning Manager, 155 N. First Street, Hillsboro, O R 97124 spoke to the conditions for the Shute Road/Evergreen Road (he provided a copy of his testimony for the record). He supported Mayor Hughes comments.

Councilor Bragdon said he supported the conditions and the need to be flexible in the future. Mayor Hughes said he was confident something could be worked out. Councilor Park asked for clarification on Mr. Curtis comments and whether they were comments from the Commission. Mr. Curtis said they were not but he was able to speak for the Commission. Councilor Park asked if they could get an official Commission comment on these issues for the December 5th Council public hearing.

Norman King, Councilor, City of West Linn 22500 Salamo Road, West Linn, OR 97068 said he was disappointed in the Metro Council's recommendation to bring Area 37 into the Urban Growth Boundary (a copy of his testimony is included in the record). He questioned the economic metric model. He spoke to Councilor Atherton's comments earlier in the meeting concerning population. He recommended reconsideration of the population growth rate. He also expressed concern about the vacancy rate.

Bob Adams, Councilor Elect, City of West Linn, 22500 Salamo Rd, West Linn, OR 97068 supported the opposition to include the Stafford area. He felt this was a direct violation of state goals 1 and 2 and explained why this was in violation. (A copy of his testimony is included in the record).

David Tripp, Councilor, City of West Linn, 22500 Salamo Rd, West Linn OR 97068 said he opposed expansion into the UGB. He was re-elected on that platform. If they added Area 37, they would add to the transportation problems. Traffic was now at capacity at peak travel times. (He provided a copy of his testimony for the record).

Bill Wilson, Councilor, City of West Linn, 22500 Salamo Rd, West Linn OR 97068, expressed concern about Area 37. West Linn had consistently opposed bringing Area 37 into the UGB. He recommended limiting development and not expanding the UGB. He didn't want to decrease the livability of the community. It would increase taxes and utility rates. He was also concerned about the quality of education with decreased state funding and increased growth (he provided two pieces of testimony for the record).

Mike Kapigan, Councilor, City of West Linn, 22500 Salamo Rd, West Linn OR 97068, opposed the addition of Area 37. He gave an overview of why. He spoke to their town center. He felt there had been misrepresentation to the Metro Council by developers. He hoped that Council would listen to the City of West Linn elected officials. Look at the analysis and consider what should be included. He felt West Linn had been a regional player. He spoke to fair share. He felt West Linn had accommodated a tremendous amount of growth. The infrastructure costs were burdensome. West Linn still had zoning to allow for additional population, they didn't need to expand.

David Dodds, Mayor of West Linn, 22500 Salamo Rd, West Linn OR 97068, said he felt the city council had spoken to his issue. He said the alternatives analysis for Area 37 showed difficulty for water and other public utilities because of the difficult topography of Area 37. (He provided written testimony for the record). He suggested finishing Goal 5 and Title 3 analysis before considering this area. He noted correspondence from citizens opposing Area 37. He said Area 37 was not considered a town center. The Tanner Basin had been developed as a master plan town center. There was no need to add Area 37. This process and the purpose of the Metro Council should be to achieve livability for the region and for the local jurisdictions. He noted the importance of separation of community. He urged reconsideration of Area 37.

Jack Hoffman, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego, PO Box 369 Lake Oswego, OR 97034 applauded Council for their courage to make the land use decisions. He encouraged the Council not to bring in the entire Stafford Basin. He spoke to Goal 1, significant high value farmland, jurisdictional governance, infrastructure challenges, and quality of life impact on neighboring communities. He publicly acknowledged Metro staff.

Judie Hammerstad, Mayor of Lake Oswego, PO Box 369 Lake Oswego, OR 97034 reiterate Councilor Hoffman's remarks for a job well done. She thanked Councilor Atherton for his passionate protection of the Stafford Triangle. She suggested Council considers the next tasks and not revisits the land decisions. (A copy of her testimony is included in the record). She encouraged not designating urban reserves at this time. She noted that the City of Lake Oswego would be submitting additional testimony

Richard Meyer, Community Development Director, PO Box 608, Cornelius, OR 97113 representing Mayor of Cornelius, read his testimony into the record (a copy of which is included in the record).

Councilor McLain said she would make a recommendation to take this out and put it into Task 3.

Joe Grillo, Community Development Director, City of Beaverton PO Box 4755 Beaverton OR 97076 spoke for Mayor Rob Drake and summarized his testimony. He will send a copy of his testimony for the record.

Councilor Monroe asked for clarification on Area 67, would the City of Beaverton also request Areas 65 and 66 be included?

Hall Bergsma, City of Beaverton, PO Box 4755 Beaverton OR 97076, spoke for Mayor Drake and said Area 67 was a lower priority area where 65 and 66 were closer to the city limits. They would continue to be involved in this process.

Richard Ross, AICP, Community Planning Division Manager, City of Gresham, 1333 NW Eastman Pkwy, Gresham, OR 97030 spoke for the Mayor Becker (his testimony is included in the meeting record).

Ross Schultz, City Manager, City of Sherwood, 20 NW Washington, Sherwood, OR 97140 said he and Dave Wechner, Building and Planning Director, were speaking for the Mayor Cottle. Mr. Wechner summarized the City of Sherwood comments (a copy of which is found in the meeting record).

Councilor Bragdon said in addition to the staff presentation from Sherwood he had also spoken with Mayor Cottle. Mayor Cottle clarified that the City and the School District often did these things jointly. They had a parks program that joined the schools so he wanted to make sure that in the conditions that were placed on that site that it was to be used for a school and a park. He would make sure wording was appropriate in the Ordinance. Presiding Officer Hosticka said that with those conditions the Council supported that inclusion.

Dan Drentlaw, Community Development Director, City of Oregon City, PO Box 3040, Oregon City, OR 97045 spoke for Mayor John Williams and include his testimony in the record.

Councilor Burkholder noted a letter from Oregon City School District expressing concern about traffic levels and lack of sidewalks around their school in Area 25. He was considering a condition be placed in the ordinance that the new connector between Holcomb and Redland and other roads that access the school include sidewalks and bike lanes. Mr. Drentlaw said he didn't see any problem with that. That collector road did not front that particular school. Councilor McLain asked about his presentation at MPAC. Mr. Drentlaw said the only new information was the discussion about the service provision. MPAC's discussion never got to the level of detail of suggesting that a portion of Area 24 and 25 be removed. She suggested Mr. Drentlaw get those areas mapped for staff. She asked what MPAC recommended on Henreese Road both above and below? Mr. Drentlaw said MTAC recommended both sides, MPAC did not.

Al Burn, Portland Planning Bureau, 1900 SW 4th Portland OR spoke for Mayor Vera Katz, City of Portland and provided Mayor Katz written testimony which he summarized. He also acknowledged Metro's staff and their good work. He suggested addressing certain titles this year. He also acknowledged Mayor Hughes proposal for Shute Road.

Keith Liden, City of King City and West Linn-Wilsonville School District, 400 SW 6th Suite 802 Portland OR 97204, said King City appreciated having the flood plain area included in the

recommendation. West Linn-Wilsonville School District appreciated having Area 45 still remain in the recommendation. There was an important school site that was part of that area. The district did not have a position on Stafford Basin. They would like to remind Metro and local agencies that Stafford Basin was in the West Linn-Wilsonville School District and if brought in, it had huge implications for the district in terms of future enrollment. They estimated that Stafford Basin as a whole would represent a new high school, one or two new middle schools and three to five elementary schools. They would like to be involved in planning at the ground level.

Keith Fishback, 11375 NW Roy Rd Banks, OR 97106, spoke in favor of inclusion Areas 84-87. He was a farmer in Washington County and a nurseryman. These four sites were critical to keep together. If you did not include Area 87 with the others, there would be a jigsaw puzzle style of expansion with a boundary that had no buffers between agriculture and urbanization. Area 87 would provide a buffer between development and agriculture. You could also plan for an efficient community.

Tom VanderZanden, 15903 NW Logie Trail, Hillsboro, OR 97124, said on-site viewing had helped Council determine natural boundaries for Site 84-87. He shared a map of the area and showed how those natural boundaries worked. It kept agriculture and development separated. He felt these areas would help master plan the community and allowed for urban efficiency planning.

Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested he leave the map of that area. Councilor Monroe asked Mr. Fishback if he believed that this recommendation would be acceptable to the Washington County Farm Bureau. Mr. Fishback responded that the Farm Bureau would have to meet and make that determination.

Mark Ellerbrook, 14515 NW Springville Rd Portland, OR 97229, said he owned a wholesale nursery inside Area 87. Currently there were problems with water. If the boundary was moved and they were not included they would have even greater problems with both water and noise. If the area is brought in he would be forced to move.

Bruce Hosford, 7805 NW Kaiser Rd., Portland OR 97229 said they had a 72-acre farm which had been in the family for 60 years. He was in Area 87. Only 13 acres were farmable and they couldn't make a living farming. Most of the land was wetlands. They agreed with the Council's plan. Their farm should be a part of Metro's plan. They had complaints about their farming because of noise, dust and smell. Their property offered a buffer to farming.

John Van Grunsven, 614 EW Main, Hillsboro, OR 97123 did not testify.

Craig Loughridge, 18553 S. Somewhere Lane, Mulino, OR 97042, was a real estate broker in Clackamas County, but not a developer and didn't represent them. He respected the residents of the Stafford area and West Linn but they also needed to consider what the Metro Council was supposed to be considering which were the overall regional needs and impacts of UGB planning and expansion in this process. He summarized the rest of his testimony (a copy of which is found in the record).

Richard Stevens, 400 Marylhurst Dr., West Linn OR 97068 said he lived in Area 39 and 41. He urged inclusion of these areas into the UGB. Prime farmland was used as a reason not to bring this area in. He felt the opinion that the UGB should not be expanded was a valid opinion but should not be the basis for the Council's impending decisions, for that they must be held to law. Regardless of the outcome he encouraged Metro to carefully explain the choices they make. The majority of the Stafford area city dwellers appeared to be on a crusade to keep Stafford out. He

suggested we be governed by the rule of law instead of being subjected to the tyranny of the majority.

Mark Dane, 13005 SW Foothill Dr Portland OR 97225, urged inclusion of Area 83. This was part of the Bethany area adjacent to Holcomb Lake. It had 128 acres of which 70 acres had been farmed historically. He encouraged bringing in less than more farmland if possible. This property was located adjacent to a town center, West Union Village. It was an urbanized boundary. It has urban services for immediate development. It was also located close to PCC Rock Creek. It also had important transportation implications including the essential intersection of 185th and Springville. These were major transportation corridors that have significant effects and needed significant improvements in order to work. This was one property under single ownership. This property could be master planned immediately.

Dirk Knudsen, 5517 NW Skywest Pkwy Portland OR, testified in favor of including of Area 83. Area 83 was the most urbanized piece of farmland in Washington County. He gave specifics of the property. 45-acres would be given to public trust. He talked about the EFU buffer. He showed their town center. They were completing a gap in the Urban Growth Boundary. He felt Area 83 was the gateway to the area.

Councilor Atherton asked about the aerial photograph. Mr. Knudson said he had provided Metro with aerial photos in 2002.

Jin Park, 13555 NW Laidlaw Rd Portland OR 97229, was an owner of Area 83. The only way that EFU land can be included was to provide opportunities to Areas 84 and 85. He said his engineer's report could provide water service to Areas 84 and 85. He noted Areas 83 was excluded on November 19th. Planning staff at Metro had said Area 83 was excluded because it was farmland.

Ryan Jeffries, 8835 SW Canyon Lane Portland OR 97225, said he was Mr. Jin Park's engineer. He had completed a study of Area 83 and found that it would provide sanitary sewer service to the other areas. Without Area 83's inclusion, Areas 84 and 86 would require pump stations for sanitary sewer services. He showed on a map the recommended service areas. It was his opinion that by extending service through Area 83, Areas 84-86 can be serviced most efficiently.

Presiding Officer Hosticka announced that the West Linn bus was leaving and encouraged them to stand to show their support of their position. 8 people stood.

Greg Hathaway, Attorney for David Wright and Tremaine, 1300 SW 5th Portland OR 97201, spoke to Area 83 and provided attributes of the property for inclusion into the UGB. He said it was difficult to farm in the area. He said this property had a natural barrier, which was significant. This was a legally defensible case because it could provide efficient urban services with the least amount of taking of EFU land to provide services to those exceptions lands. It was good planning. City of Beaverton's comments indicated City of Beaverton was willing to govern it.

Teresa Lockwood 17495 SW Brookman, Rd PO Box 1471 Sherwood OR 97140, spoke to the Tualatin area, Area 54 and 55. She requested inclusion (a copy of her testimony is found in the record). The property was contiguous with the City of Sherwood with few constraints to impede service. This was a logical extension to the community. They wanted to work with Metro and City of Sherwood to participate in a solution for future growth in this region.

Bob Mitchell 5303 NW 124th Portland OR 97229, did not testify.

Roger Martin, 2949 Mountain Lane West Linn OR 97068 said he lived south of the Stafford Triangle. He complimented Council for their diligence and patience. He objected to any further consideration anywhere along the corridor of I-205 from I-5 to the Oregon City area because of traffic. He spoke to transportation issues in the area on Stafford Road, I-205, and Borland Road. He had requested improvements on the roads in the area. He encouraged no increase in the amount of cars.

Councilor Monroe spoke to future transportation improvements in the area.

Brian Bellairs 16555 SW High Hill Lane Aloha OR 97007, said he was here to discuss Area 65. It was adjacent to the UGB and consisted of exception lands. It was an easy commute to the high tech corridor and NIKE. This land had been assessed thoroughly by Metro. Metro staff gave Area 65 high scores and recommended it for inclusion. He asked why Council had not decided to include this land. Land in the area had already been developed but their neighbors didn't want them to develop their land. He felt this was for political reason. The public was promised their land would be included based on its own merits. He encouraged Council to consider their site.

Kim Vandehey 17207 SW Siler Aloha OR 97007 spoke to Area 65. They had a higher yield in their area than some that were being proposed. He encouraged Council make their decision based on rankings. They needed to see a logical process. Area 65 was closer to a town center than many other areas that were being proposed.

Arnold Rochlin, Forest Park Neighborhood Association, PO Box 83645 Portland OR 97283 summarized his testimony and provided a copy for the record (which is found in the meeting record). He provided the natural resource assets of the area and why it should not be brought in. It did not meet the UGB criteria for inclusion. It would be costly to bring in urban services.

Beverly Bookin spoke for Todd Shaeffer, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties 15300 SW Millikan Way Beaverton OR 97005. She summarized the testimony and provided it for the record. She noted changes to the proposed language. NAIOP was pleased that Metro had chosen to expand the inventory of industrial sites. It was the core of economic development.

Kent Seida, 17501 SE Forest Hill, Clackamas, OR 97015, provided information for the record and said he was property owner in Area 37. He thanked the Council for their decision. He thought this area was the most logical area to bring into the UGB.

David Selby, PO Box 1427 Tualatin OR 97062, represented a group called South Grahams Ferry Business Group. He talked about an area immediately south of Site 49 along Grahams Ferry Road. He pointed out that he felt Council was close to bringing in this area and drawing the correct boundary for the south end of Area 49. Clackamas/Washington County line rather than the railroad. Conversely, they were extremely fearful if this property was not brought in, they would be a black hole that was become even more isolated than what it was previously. He noted Councilor McLain's interest and the fact that she came to look at the property. Lastly, they had shown the interest in being included.

Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested he submit written testimony as to where the line should be. Mr. Selby said there was roughly 500 feet between the railroad line and the Clackamas County line along Grahams Ferry Road. He also thought there was a piece of property across Grahams Ferry Road that he thought was owned by Metro that also had as its south boundary, the Clackamas County line. He indicated he would provide a map for the record.

Jayne Cronlund, Executive Director, Three River Land Conservancy 470 2nd St Lake Oswego, OR 97034, expressed concerns about expanding the boundary into certain areas and gave specifics of the Damascus, Stafford, Forest Park, and Sherwood areas, Area 94, 54, 55 that should be left out. There was need to protect the natural resources. She encouraged Council, if they decided to bring these areas in, to expand their greenspaces plan to include these areas. The Conservancy would be there to support Council.

Debbie Craig, 850 Cedar St Lake Oswego OR 97034, a Metro foot soldier, said there were many who were thrilled that Metro was leaving Stafford Basin outside the UGB. She spoke to Lake Oswego downtown core. If they brought in the Stafford Basin their effort to develop the core would be for not (a copy of her testimony is included in the record).

Andrea Hunderford 16509 S Edenwild Lane Oregon City OR 97045 did not testify

Dorothy Cofield, 4248 Galewood Lake Oswego OR 97035 represented Bill Vandermullin and Susan Schnell who owned property in area 31. She submitted testimony into the record today, a two page letter with several attached maps. She spoke to the attributes of the property. The property can't be farmed because of lack of water. It was under single ownership. She encouraged Council to include the property.

Chuck Adams, Outreach Director Alternative to Growth Oregon, 2255 Brandon Pl West Linn OR 97068, objected to including Area 37 into the proposed expansion (a copy of which is included in the record).

Dave Lohman, Port of Portland 121 NW Everett Portland OR 97209 did not testify.

Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends, 534 SW 3rd Portland, OR 97204 read her testimony into the record, and she complimented the Council on the policy discussion they had had at the Community Planning Committee on the vacancy rate.

Matt Brady, Gramor Development, 19767 SW 72nd Ave, Tualatin OR 97062 testified on the Stafford Triangle, Area 42. He submitted a document, which he spoke to. It will take time to plan this area, he said, to make the infrastructure work. He urged the council to bring this area in.

Barry Cain, Gramor Development, 19767 SW 72nd Ave, Tualatin, OR 97062 said he was also speaking in favor of Area 42. They've heard the tales of the two Staffords, by now, and can decide whatever they will. Area 42 had an opportunity to create a significant employment area now. The public's concern was about residential, and that was all he believed they had heard tonight. He agreed the roads were terrible and that was one of the main reasons to bring it in. Something needed to be done now, not in 10 years. Clackamas County wasn't doing it. No one was saying development should happen ahead of the infrastructure. Roads should be planned and built first. This would be a solution to the problem. You needed employment opportunities in Clackamas County and not just on the far east side. Thousands of cars traveled over these poorly constructed roads each day to work in Washington County. Job related land was needed now, the roads needed fixing now and conditional uses were eating the area up. The only real opposition you will get was that if you brought Area 42 in with the expectation that it would be traditional industrial property because that would never work in this area. This should be Kruse Way II or better yet, Borland Business District.

Councilor Park asked Ms. McCurdy about the Boring area. He hadn't brought it up because he thought it was a Task 3 issue. Ms. McCurdy said she wasn't referring to the Noyer Creek, but an existing parcel, an abandon rural industrial site that could be developed.

Constance Ewing, 227 4th Street, Lake Oswego, OR 97034 was a concerned citizen and had sympathy for what the Council was trying to do. She hoped they were looking at underutilized properties for infill. Please pursue creative use of these properties and not create more strip malls. Adding traffic simply adds more pollution, please add mass transit and parks.

Adam Klugman, Rosemont Alliance, 19798 S. Hazehurst Lane, West Linn, OR 97068 said he lived in the rural area of West Linn. He felt that the tyranny of the twenty-year land supply law had all of their hands tied. The system undermined their resources. He spoke to the Stafford area and the fact that they had received assurances that Stafford was off the table. They felt betrayed. If Council insisted on proceeding with Area 37 they will be put in position to interpret it as an act of aggression and not friendship. They will fight to protect their community.

Councilor Park said in the process Mr. Klugman had been assured that the area was not coming in. He wanted to know who told them this?

Mr. Klugman said Councilor Atherton had indicated that West Linn was not on the table. They received late notice of the change. There had been no public process. Councilor Park said there was a public process. Presiding Officer Hosticka clarified Mr. Klugman's comments.

Ken ITEL, 12155 SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Tualatin, OR 97062 supported inclusion of Study Area 48, it was proposed for industrial land and received unanimous support from MTAC and MPAC (a copy of his testimony is included in the record).

Councilor Burkholder asked whom Mr. ITEL worked with? Mr. ITEL said he was employed by the City of Lake Oswego but was not representing the city.

Herb Ross, 1098 Rosemont Rd, West Linn, OR 97068 was a property owner in Area 37. He supported inclusion of this area. He felt there was an employment base that had been missed. He spoke to current zoning, which would add more jobs and mixed use development opportunities. He submitted to Metro at the Oregon City public hearing a build a building map, which he obtained from Metro. He took out the steep slopes and flood plain. The result was you could hand count the permits. He had done a study on infrastructure and SDC credits. Area 37 was part of the Tanner Basin plan. He also spoke to Area 38 and 42. These areas weren't being farmed and it was not economical to do so.

Councilor Bragdon asked about city hall in Area 37. Mr. Ross responded that there was need for office space expansion in West Linn.

Erik Eselian, 18018 S Skyland Circle, Lake Oswego, OR 97034 was a Rosemont Property owner. He talked about high value farmland in Stafford Triangle. He noted that in Metro's records there was a copy of a study commissioned by Lake Oswego which indicated that the Stafford area had never been, is not now nor will ever be economically feasible farm land. He noticed that there was no empathy from West Linn for the people of Damascus. He hoped that Council would readdress their feelings about Stafford and bring it in.

George Faris, 9300 SE Philips Place, Portland, OR 97266 urged inclusion of the Boring Damascus area. They knew it wouldn't develop right away and would take time. He focused on

Areas 17 and 18 and noted a sewer line, a water pump station, and a new water line. They would like to bring some jobs into the area. They were surrounded on three sides by the UGB.

David Adams, 19621 S. Hazelhurst, West Linn, OR 97068 said he opposed inclusion of Area 37. He summarized a letter from Michael Jordan Commissioner of Clackamas County. He had also talked with the other commissioners.

W.L. Campbell, 24711 SW Campbell Lane, West Linn, OR 97068 was in favor of inclusion of Area. 37. Lake Oswego and West Linn had grown far quicker than expected. Without planning we would continue to see additional growth by one to twenty acre gentleman farms. This was not a good use of urban lands. He spoke to careful planning (a copy of his notes are included in the record).

Robert Bruechert, 27300 SW Campbell Lane, West Linn, OR 97068 was in favor of inclusion of Area 37. He was a property owner across from West Linn City Hall. He said urban services were done for this area. They felt it would be an advantage to West Linn to include the land. Planning Commission of West Linn had asked to come to inspect the land for possible inclusion into the city. He spoke to his farming experience and felt that Stafford Triangle was not self-sustaining for farming (a copy of his notes are included in the record).

Charles Hoff, Rosemont Association, 21557 SW 91st Tualatin, OR 97062 talked about the public process for the Stafford area (a copy of his testimony is included in the record).

Nick Stearns 2531 NW Westover Rd, Portland, OR 97210 supported inclusion of Area 32 (a copy of this testimony is included in the record).

Councilor Bragdon said at committee level they had recommended this area.

Gail Snyder, Friends of Forest Park, 2366 NW Thurman, Portland, OR 97210 talked about the proposal in the Forest Park area. Metro had been a wonderful partner for Friends of Forest Park. They knew Metro understood the value of Forest Park. Forest Park was long and skinny, much of the habitat was considered edge habitat. They have sought conservation easement to provide a buffer for habitat and water quality. She encouraged continuing to keep buffers and not include Area 94.

Councilor Bragdon suggested that staff recalculate what was realistic in terms of housing in Area 94. He thought it would be helpful if they could add to that analysis some textual description of the environmental regulations that the City of Portland applies in the zone. It was his understanding from discussion with staff that there would be fairly strict City of Portland regulations. He was also curious to know if there was any place else within the City of Portland that was outside the UGB.

Councilor Monroe said he had similar concerns. He wanted to see it protected. He supported bringing Area 94 in because it was part of the city of Portland and they had strong protections.

Ken Olson, 6021 Canfield, West Linn, OR 97068 was in favor of including Area 37 as well as 38 through 42. He said West Linn was getting crowded. He said one of the city councilors had said that West Linn had room for 8000 more people. He wanted to know where. Schools were getting too crowded. Area 37 was close to major roads and freeways that needed improvements to support existing as well as future growth that would happen in the area. The whole Stafford Basin needs to be included in the UGB to accommodate the residential and business needs of the area.

Elizabeth McNaron Patte, married to President of Friends of Forest Park, 3204 NW Wilson St., Portland, OR 97210 recommended excluding Area 94 and provide written testimony for the record.

Mike Stewart, 20577 SW Johnson Rd., West Linn, OR 97068 provided his oral comments for the record.

Nicholas Storie, PO Box 12490, Portland OR, 97212 represented himself and the Tonquin Industrial Group. They supported areas 47-49 being included into the UGB. The Tonquin Industrial Group included about 70 acres of what was presently an NAE zone. They would like to be included into the boundary. They were close to I-5. They were restricted in an NAE zone. They had rail available, which would take trucks off the road. This could be an industrial park.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if they were aware that there was a motion to include these parcels? Mr. Storie said he thought they were but then someone had called from the Oregonian and indicated that they weren't in. Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested talking with staff about the status of those areas.

Greg Malinowski, 13450 NW Springville, Portland, OR 97229 summarized his testimony, which he included in the record. He said that the proposed changes in the Bethany area would leave his farm on a peninsula. The CPO was concerned about adding this area. He spoke to the CPO recommendation, which would take the least amount of agricultural lands and still service the most amount of exception area. He also included maps and photos of the farmland for the record.

Bob Thomas, 2563 Pimlico Drive, West Linn, OR 97068 summarized his testimony asking for exclusion of Area 37 and the Stafford Triangle. He placed his testimony in the record.

Dean Apostol Landscape Architect and Boring CPO, 23850 SE Borges, Gresham, OR 97060 was representing himself tonight. He spoke to the numbers for the Damascus/Boring area. He was not sure we could get the small town and greenbelt that they had advocated with those numbers. When he had sketched out the circles, he had come up with about 55,000 people and that included Boring and Damascus. Metro's numbers were 79,000 people without Boring. He was unsure how it would work and have a functional greenbelt. He had asked for the maximum flexibility both on the numbers and acreage. He would also like to see more explicit language in the decision that recognizes what their community wanted and Metro's intent to facilitate the concept planning. They felt a complete community included farms which would require a greenbelt.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked Mr. Apostol if he had seen the draft conditions? Mr. Apostol said, yes he had. He felt condition number 10 spoke to their request of separation of town centers. Presiding Officer Hosticka said he would appreciate Mr. Apostol's commentary in detail. He thought the concern of the committee was that 1) the planning process led by the people in the area, 2) that the development proceed from a center outward, and 3) protection of natural areas. They wanted a commentary as to whether those conditions accomplished the goals. Mr. Apostol said those helped. The addition one would be that Metro foresees the possibility of having a functional greenbelt with farming. That would be helpful. Presiding Officer Hosticka clarified for the record that the numbers on this spreadsheet were not targets. They were not requirements, they were estimates of productivity. Mr. Apostol said if they came back with a plan that showed the town centers and greenbelts and the numbers were different that would not knock them out of

the ballpark. Councilor McLain said don't plan so well that they created a place that every one loved or they would get more than 55,000 people. Presiding Officer Hosticka said no one would say they didn't meet a target.

Mr. Apostol closed by saying that there was a lot of public involvement done in Damascus area. There was a clear consensus in the community that they didn't want development out there. Choice number two was the greenbelt concept, choice number one was no growth at all. He suggested Metro needed to revisit the Forest Park recommendation. More development around Forest Park was not a good idea.

Councilor Bragdon talked about Area 94. Forest Park itself was within the UGB. The impression that this creates development in Forest Park was erroneous. Mr. Apostol said it was not the "in" Forest Park but the adjacent area.

Elizabeth Lindsey Graser Beaver Creek CPO, 21341 S. Ferguson, Rd, Beaver Creek, OR 97004 addressed why the northern park of Area 28 should be left out of the UGB as Metro had done thus far. The CPO and MPAC opposed this area for inclusion. She detailed the area and why it should not be brought in which included transportation, schools, services and farming issues.

John Hartsock represented Committee for the Future of Damascus, 12042 SE Sunnyside Rd, Clackamas, OR 97015 said this had been a long process. He praised staff and council. The feeling of the community understood the process and that every piece of exception land was a potential. They wanted enough land brought in to plan appropriately for a complete community. They had good community involvement. There was a question on Tri-Met. Tri-Met didn't want to serve the area. Metro and Clackamas County felt that the Committee for the Future of Damascus should lead the planning and public involvement effort. He spoke to governance, services and including Boring.

Councilor Park thanked Mr. Hartsock for his hard work. He spoke to connectivity, the complete community concept and what efforts were currently underway. Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested Mr. Hartsock give his perspective on starting at a center and growing out versus growing in from the edge. Mr. Hartsock responded that they wanted enough land so that they didn't do another Sunnyside and piece parcel into it. They wanted to start in the center. The Boring piece would help the planning.

Dave Herman, 1148 Rosemont Rd, West Linn, OR 97068 said he was a proponent of including Area 37 in the boundary. He felt it supported the Council's policy and contributed to reasonable growth. This property was reasonable to develop. It was currently zoned five to ten acre lots. This was not a good use of property that was immediately adjacent to the boundary and to the city limits. The area was steep, had poor soil and services were available. The only value of this area was its scenic value. He felt inclusion of this area in the boundary would contribute to controlled and reasonable growth.

Councilor Atherton said his aerial photos from 1984 showed this area as all forested. He asked when it was logged. Mr. Herman said there was parts of it that were still forested. There was much more of the land that was not forested than was forested.

J. Douglas Gless, 1161 Woodbine Rd, West Linn, OR 97068 spoke against including Area 37 in the UGB. He felt the public had been blindsided by this recent decision. They had not been notified. They would like to be heard. The citizens of West Linn did not want to see this area developed. He was an engineering geologist. He said much of this area was steep, wet and

unstable. They were never going to get the density they planned without having high density, multi-family housing throughout much of the area. He asked the Council to give them some time to develop the infrastructure to make the system work.

Councilor Park said it was his understanding that both Lake Oswego and West Linn have voter annexation for this area. Mr. Gless said yes.

John Skouates, 17010 SW Weir Rd., Beaverton OR 97005 said he lived on Cooper Mountain. He had a parcel that had water on three sides. He spoke to Presiding Officer Hosticka's editorial. He felt that nothing was going to change because the majority of Council was anti-growth. He wanted Area 65 included.

Councilor Park said the current proposed expansion was over 18000 acres. He was not anti-growth. Councilor McLain said Area 65 was still on the list, there had been no decisions made yet. Mr. Skouates said the staff said that Area 65 had been voted out. Councilor McLain said they had made no decisions yet.

Stephan Lashbrook, Community Development Director, City of Lake Oswego, PO Box 369, Lake Oswego, 97034 said the city had taken a position opposing the urbanization of the Stafford area. He wanted to respond to Mr. Cain in his testimony regarding Area 42. Mr. Cain felt that bringing Area 42 would fix the roads. Mr. Lashbrook said that was a bold statement and explained some of the current traffic problems. He said he was suspicious when developers tell you that their development was going to fix problems rather than cause more of them.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked him to comment on the issue of golf courses in Area 38 and the role of the City of Lake Oswego. Mr. Lashbrook said he had been told that there were people interested in golf course development in Stafford. He felt there was a potential zoning problem if in fact this was high value farmland. He didn't think the city's opposition to the Stafford area had anything to do with golf courses.

Councilor Atherton talked about Area 42. Had there been other testimony similar to this? He thought Sunnyside Road testimony was similar. Did Mr. Lashbrook think this was good planning policy? Mr. Lashbrook said the entire state was not doing well at transportation funding. We are not dealing with the problem nor are we ahead of the curve and we will keep getting further and further behind. He had supported the gas tax increase to help generate revenue and encourage a decrease in driving.

Councilor Park asked about purchase of parks in the Stafford Basin? Mr. Lashbrook said it could be included. Lake Oswego had acquired about 100 acres in the Stafford Basin for parks. He would be happy to supply more information about the bond measure.

Councilor Bragdon asked if he believed urban service should be sited outside the UGB. Mr. Lashbrook said he didn't believe that urban services should be located outside the UGB.

Councilor Atherton commented on the Lucsher Farm and active sports fields. He noted an article that he wished to have submitted for the record.

Judy Eselius, Lake Oswego, OR provided written testimony but did not testify.

Jim Emerson, Forest Park Neighborhood Association Board member, 13900 NW Old Germantown Rd Portland OR 9723 provided a copy of his testimony and did not testify.

Dawn Adams 2310 Century Lane West Linn, OR 97068 provided written testimony (which is found in the record) and did not testify.

Presiding Officer Hosticka closed the public hearing.

4.1 **Ordinance No. 02-965**, For the purpose of Amending Chapter 2.02 Personnel Rules, of the Metro Code to conform to the Metro Charter amendments adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-965 to the Governmental Affairs Committee.

4.3 **Ordinance No. 02-983**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add land for a specific type of industry near specialized facilities north of Hillsboro; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-983 to the Community Planning Committee.

4.4 **Ordinance No. 02-984**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add Land for a public school in Study Area 85; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-984 to the Community Planning Committee.

4.5 **Ordinance No. 02-985**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary in the Vicinity of the City of Forest Grove by Adding and Deleting an Equivalent Amount of Land; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-985 to Community Planning Committee.

4.6 **Ordinance No. 02-986**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to Add land for a road improvement in the Sherwood Area, East of the Pacific Highway and North of the Tualatin-Sherwood Road; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-986 to Community Planning Committee.

4.7 **Ordinance No. 02-987**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add land in the Bethany area; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-987 to Community Planning Committee.

4.8 **Ordinance No. 02-988**, For the Purpose of Establishing Regional Fiscal Policies Regarding Land Added to the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and Implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept; and Declaring an Emergency.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-988 to Community Planning Committee.

5. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

5.1 **Ordinance No. 02-966A**, For the Purpose of Amending Chapter 2.04 Metro Contract Policies of the Metro Code to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.2 **Ordinance No. 02-967**, For the Purpose of Amending Title II Administration and Procedures (Chapter 2.03, 2.05, 2.06, 2.07, 2.09, 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17 and 2.18), of the Metro Code to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.3 **Ordinance No. 02-972A**, For the Purpose of Amending Title III Planning of the Metro Code (Chapter 3.01 through Chapter 3.09), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.4 **Ordinance No. 02-973**, For the Purpose of Amending Title IV Oregon Zoo of the Metro Code (Chapter 4.01), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.5 **Ordinance No. 02-974**, For the Purpose of Amending Title V Solid Waste of the Metro Code (Chapter 5.01 through Chapter 5.09) to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.6 **Ordinance No. 02-975**, For the Purpose of Amending Title VI Commissions of the Metro Code (Chapter 6.01), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.7 **Ordinance No. 02-976**, For the Purpose of Amending Title VII Excise Taxes and Title VIII Financing Powers and Chapter 2.06 Investment Policy of the Metro Code, to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.8 **Ordinance No. 02-977**, For the Purpose of Amending Title IX Elections of the Metro Code (Chapter 9.01 and Chapter 9.02), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

5.9 **Ordinance No. 02-978**, For the Purpose of Amending Title X Metro Parks and Greenspaces of the Metro Code (Chapter 10.01 through Chapter 10.03), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion	Councilor Bragdon moved to consider Ordinance Nos. 02-966A, 967, 972A, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978 as a package.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion
Vote:	There was no objection.

Motion	Councilor Bragdon moved to adopt Ordinance Nos. 02-966A, 967, 972A, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978 as a package.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Bragdon said this continues the process of amending the Code language to conform with the charter amendment that was approved on November 7, 2000. The major pieces had been done in June 2002. What was left was the clean up of the rest of the code. The Governmental

Affairs Committee had reviewed all of the work. The distinction that was made was that things that were administrative in nature were changed to Chief Operating Officer, things that were policy oriented were either delegated to the Council or the Council President, and things that were general counsel shifted to Metro Attorney. The committee approved these changes unanimously and recommended adoption.

Councilor McLain spoke to the amendments in Ordinance No. 02-972A. She felt it preserved the public review process. She supported the block of ordinances. Councilor Bragdon said Councilor McLain was correct. Whenever there was a need for Council review, they would notice the Councilors. Councilor McLain said with the commitment to notify Councilors, she felt it would be fine. Councilor Park said he was comfortable with this housekeeping effort. He appreciated Councilor McLain's comments.

Presiding Officer Hosticka opened a public hearing. No one came forward. Presiding Officer Hosticka closed the public hearing.

Councilor McLain said this was breaking ground. There may additional amendments to the Code that they might want to support. She reminded everyone, this was an on-going continuing transitional period.

Councilor Bragdon said this was detailed, but it was important to remember the principles behind it, to preserve and enhance the Council's policymaking function. He felt Mr. Cooper did a good job with committee supervision. He urged an aye vote.

Vote:	Councilors Park, McLain, Bragdon, Atherton and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed with Councilor Monroe and Burkholder absent from the vote.
-------	---

6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Presiding Officer Hosticka thanked the audience, staff, Council. This was a good opportunity to listen to the people of the region.

Councilor Atherton talked about transportation interchanges. He also suggested we needed to change the forecast.

7. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER
21, 2002**

ITEM #	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOC. NUMBER
3.1	MINUTES	11/14/02	METRO COUNCIL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2002 SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL	112102C-01
4.1	AMENDED VERSION OF ORDINANCE NO. 02-965	11/19/02	Ordinance No. 02-965, For the purpose of Amending Chapter 2.02 Personnel Rules, of the Metro Code to conform to the Metro Charter amendments adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.	112102C-02
5.1	"A" VERSION OF ORDINANCE NO. 02-966	11/20/02	Ordinance No. 02-966A, For the Purpose of Amending Chapter 2.04 Metro Contract Policies of the Metro Code to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency.	112102C-03
5.3	"A" VERSION OF ORDINANCE NO. 02-972	11/20/02	Ordinance No. 02-972A, For the Purpose of Amending Title III Planning of the Metro Code (Chapter 3.01 through Chapter 3.09), to Conform to the Metro Charter Amendments Adopted on November 7, 2000, and Declaring an Emergency	112102C-04
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	A table of contents for those documents submitted as evidence to Ordinance No. 02-969 and related ordinances will be available prior to the December 5, 2002 Council meeting.	
		UNDATED	Council Action Sheets	112102C-05
		UNDATED	Community Planning Worksheet for UGB Expansion	112102C-06
		11/21/2002	Revised Metro Council Meeting Packet	112102C-07
	ORDINANCE NO. 02-696	11/27/2002	Memorandum from Richard N. Ross, City of Gresham, re: Summary of Testimony to Metro Council Hearing on Ordinance No. 02-696	112102C-08
	ORDINANCE NO. 02-696	11/25/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Arnold Rochlin re: Proposed UGB Expansion Sites 94 and 89	112102C-09
			Miscellaneous submission regarding area 37	112102C-10
		11/21/2002	Email to Councilor Bill Atherton from Tom P. Potiowsky re: preliminary population growth estimates for Multnomah, Washington and	112102C-11

			Clackamas Counties	
			Letter to Metro Council from Bob Adams in opposition to Area 37 inclusion in urban growth boundary	112102C-12
			Written testimony re: urban growth boundary expansion into the Stafford Triangle	112102C-13
			Letter to Metro Council from Dawn Adams re: opposition to	112102C-14
			Testimony submitted by Dean Apostol	112102-15
			Testimony submitted by Robert Broeckert re: area 37	112102C-16
			Testimony submitted by Brian Bellars re: area 65	112102C-17
		11/21/02	Letter to Metro Council from John Breiling, CPO-7	112102C-18
		11/21/02	Letter to Presiding Officer Hosticka and Metro Council from Mayor Vera Katz, City of Portland re: 20-Year Growth Management Decision; also submitted CD	112102C-19
			Testimony submitted by W.L. Campbell re: area 37	112102C-20
		11/15/2002	Email to John Atkins from Dave Carr and email to Commissioner Kennemer from Dave Carr re: opposition to urban growth boundary inclusion of Stafford	112102C-21
		11/20/2002	Memorandum to Tim O'Brien, Metro Planning Department from Maggie Collins, Wilsonville Planning Department, re: UGB Expansion Area #45	112102C-22
		11/19/2002	Letter to John Atkins from Caroline Cooley re: opposition to Rosemont/Stafford inclusion in urban growth boundary	112102C-23
		11/20/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Debbie Freepons Craig re: Urban Growth Boundary Expansion: Stafford Basin	11/21/02C-24
		11/19/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Ann Culter re: request for Stafford Triangle exclusion from urban growth boundary	11/21/02C-25
		11/4/2002	Letter to Tim O'Brien, Metro, from Nora Curtis, Clean Water Services with Malinowski correspondence and maps, re: Sanitary Sewer Service UGB Areas 83-87	112102C-26
		11/19/2002	Letter to Carl Hosticka and Council from State Representative Richard Devlin re: excluding Stafford Basin in	112102C-27

			urban growth boundary	
			Mayor Dodds testimony and maps re: exclusion of study area 37	112102C-28
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Dan Drentlaw re: area 28	112102C-29
		11/21/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Jim Emerson re: remaining rural	112102C-30
		11/25/2002	Email to Mr. Burton from Erik Eselius re: Lake Oswego farmland	112102C-31 AND 32
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Judy Eselius re: inclusion of entire upper are of Area 38 placed in urban growth boundary	112102C-33
			Testimony from Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, Speaker of Beaverton CPO re: study area 28	112102C-34
		11/15/2002	Letter to Executive Officer Mike Burton from Linda Hamel, Chair, League of West Linn Neighborhoods re: opposition to urbanization of Stafford area	112102C-35
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Mayor Judie Hammerstad, City of Lake Oswego re: Stafford and next periodic review in 2007 and not designating urban reserves	112102C-36
			Testimony from David Herman re: inclusion of Area 37	112102C-37
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Charlie Hoff re: support for Stafford inclusion in urban growth boundary	112102C-38
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Jack Hoffman, Lake Oswego City Council re: excluding South Basin from urban growth boundary	112102C-39
		11/21/2002	Statement from Tom Hughes, Mayor, City of Hillsboro re: Proposed Conditions of Adding Shute Road Site to urban growth boundary	112102C-40
		11/20/2002	Email from Michael Mazzini re: leaving land undeveloped	112102C-41
			Testimony from Ken Itel re: inclusion of 461-acre portion of area 48	112102C-42
			Testimony from Norm King, City Councilor, West Linn re: exclusion of area 37 from urban growth boundary	112102C-43
			Map of 83 acres of Forest Park submitted by Dirk Knudson	112102C-44
		11/21/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Mary McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon re: inconsistent parts of land inclusion in urban growth boundary	112102C-45

		11/21/2002	Testimony from Richard Meyer, City of Cornelius re: Cornelius Request for UGB Expansion for Industrial Use	112102C-46
		11/18/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Mary Regan re: opposition to Rosemont-Stafford urbanization	112102C-47
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Arnold Rochlin re: opposition to inclusion of site 94 in urban growth boundary	112102C-48
		11/12/2002	Letter to Rod Park, Chair, Community Planning from Daniel Rodriguez, Superintendent of Schools, Oregon City re: inclusion of land close to Holcomb School in urban growth boundary	112102C-49
		11/21/02	Testimony of Ralph Raines re: opposition to Stafford inclusion in urban growth boundary	112102C-50
			Testimony of Elilizabeth McNarron Patte re: exclusion of Forest Park land from urban growth boundary	112102C-51
		11/18/2002	Email from Vince Pelly re: opposition to inclusion of Rosemont-Stafford area in urban growth boundary	112102C-52
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Alex Pierce re: exclusion of Stafford Triangle	112102C-53
			Testimony from Ken Olson supporting inclusion of area 37 in urban growth boundary	112102C-54
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Richard Ross, re: New Framework Plan Policy on Centers Exhibit G to Ordinance No. 02-696	112102C-55
		11/21/2002	Letter to Presiding Officer Hosticka from Todd Sheaffer, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Portland Chapter re: industrial land restrictions	112102C-56
		11/21/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Ross Schultz, City Manager, City of Sherwood re: non-support of inclusion of additional housing development in Sherwood	112102C-57
			Submission to Mike Burton, from Kent Seida re: support for inclusion of area 37 in the urban growth boundary	112102C-58
		11/21/2002	Testimony from Jack Simpson re: exclusion of Stafford Triangle from urban growth boundary	112102C-59
			Testimony from Nick Stearns re: support for inclusion of area 32	112102C-60
		11/22/2002	Email from Bruce Vincent, Planning	112102C-61

			Consultant for S. Grahams Ferry Business Group re: support for inclusion of area 49 in urban growth boundary	
			Map Attachment B of Area 49 and Subject Sites	112102C-62
			Testimony from Mike Stewart re: inclusion of complete community in Stafford Basin	112102C-63
		11/21/2002	Memo to Metro Council from Robert Thomas re: Opposition to expansion of UGB anywhere in the Tri-county metropolitan region at this time	112102C-64
		11/19/2002	Letter to Metro Council from Brad Toman re: preservation of farm land	112102C-65
			Testimony from David Tripp, City Councilor, West Linn re: opposition to inclusion of area 37 in urban growth boundary	112102C-66
		11/19/2002	Testimony from Don Turax re: opposition to urbanization of Rosemont-Stafford area	112102C-67
			Testimony from Bill Wilson, Councilor, City of West Linn re: opposition to inclusion of Stafford area including area 37	112192C-68
			Submission of "A New City Between West Linn and Lake Oswego?"	112102C-69
			Submission of "Study Area 42" by Gramore Development, Inc.	112102C-70
			Unidentified testimony	112102C-71
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Jay Cosnett	112102C-72
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Andrea Hungerford	112102C-73
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Mary Manseau	112102C-74
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Ronald Ulrich	112102C-75
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Julia Simpson Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-76
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Debra Endicott Supports inclusion of Area 92 in UGB	112102C-77
4.2	ORDINANCE No. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: David and Cathrine Marks Support inclusion of Stafford Triangle	112102C-78

			in UGB	
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Roberta Schwarz Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-79
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Edward Schwarz Opposes inclusion of Area 37 and Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-80
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Richard Attanasi Supports inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-81
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Peter Lyttle Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-82
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Rita Kenny Opposes Ordinance 02-969	112102C-83
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Azar Salem Opposes expansion of UGB	112102C-84
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Rouhbakhsyl Pachduitann Opposes expansion of UGB	112102C-85
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Catherine Jones Opposes expansion of UGB in West Linn area	112102C-86
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Casey McNamee Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-87
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: J. Douglas Gless Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-88
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Hugh Black Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-89
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Jim Whitbeck Allow students of West Linn to voice their opinions	112102C-90
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Paul Nagaoka Opposes inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-91
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Mark Pyatt Opposes expanding UGB in West Linn	112102C-92
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Constance Ewing Opposes expansion of UGB	112102C-93

4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Mark Fahey Supports inclusion of Areas 39 and 40 in UGB	112102C-94
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: S.H. Findlay Supports expansion of UGB in West Linn	112102C-95
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Naima Panow Opposes expansion of UGB in West Linn	112102C-96
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Julie Jones Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triange in UGB	112102C-97
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/5/02	To: Metro Council From: Ronald Ulrich Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-98
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Jay Cosnett Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-99
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Hungerford Law Firm Opposes inclusion of Area 24 in UGB	112102C-100
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Mary Manseau Opposes expansion of UGB in Bethany area	112102C-101
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Kent Seida Supports inclusion of Area 37 in UGB	112102C-102
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro Council From: Robbin Stewart Supports inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-103
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: John Kysar and Judith Davis Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-104
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Ed Doubrava, Stephen Bizon, Dave Selby, Phil Bizon Support inclusion of their properties along Grahams Ferry Road in UGB	112102C-105
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Elizabeth McNaron Patte Opposes expansion of UGB in Forest	112102C-106

			Park area	
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Richard Ross Supports Framework Plan Policy on Centers	112102C-107
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/20/02	To: Metro Council From: Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland Supports MPAC and MTAC recommendations on industrial land parcels to be included in UGB	112102C-108
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/24/02	To: Metro Council From: Residents of McNamee Road Oppose inclusion of Areas 84, 85, 86, 87 and 94 in UGB	112102C-109
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/23/02	To: Metro Council From: James and Judith Emerson Oppose inclusion of Areas 84, 85, 86, 87 and 94 in UGB	112102C-110
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Mike and Alice McGary Oppose inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-111
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Robert Minshall Supports inclusion of Area 92 in UGB	112102C-112
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Michael Litt Opposes inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-113
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Jim Labbe, Leslie Labbe, Kassandra Griffin, Jim Wiagand, David King, Rob Williams, Brian Tibbetts Oppose inclusion of Area 94 in UGB	112102C-114
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Joe Grillo Represents the City of Beaverton's position on various areas.	112102C-115
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Mike Gates Stafford community has not had time for input on inclusion of Stafford Triangle in UGB	112102C-116
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Mayor Richard Kidd, Forest Grove Re Forest Grove UGB land swap	112102C-117
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	UNDATED	To: Metro council From: Jan and Thomas Campbell	112102C-118

			Opposes inclusion of Area 94 in UGB	
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/19/02	To: Metro Council From: Jayne Cronlund Opposes expansion of UGB in several areas	112102C-119
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/20/02	To: Metro Council From: Lance Burton on behalf of Kristine and Mike Jones Supports inclusion of property in Boring in UGB	112102C-120
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/15/02	Map – 44-10	112102C-121
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/25/02	To: Metro Council From: Tom Brian Re expansion of UGB in Bethany area	112102C-122
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Dorothy Cofield representing Bill Vandermolen and Susan Schnell Supports inclusion of Area 31 in UGB	112102C-123
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/25/02	To: Metro council From: Mary Scurlock Adamson Opposes inclusion of Areas 84, 85, 86, 87 and 94 in UGB	112102C-124
4.2	ORDINANCE NO. 02-969	11/21/02	To: Metro Council From: Tom Aufenthie Opposes expansion of UGB in Sherwood area	112102C-125