

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, December 5, 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 2:12 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

3. TRI-COUNTY LEVEL POPULATION FORECAST

Mr. Tom Potiowsky, State of Oregon, State Economist, explained that they were there to present the forecast that they provide at the state and county level.

Presiding Officer Hosticka clarified that information presented today was updated since 1997. Mr. Potiowsky agreed.

Dr. Kanhaiya L. Vaidya, Ph. D., Oregon State, Senior Demographer, Office of Economic Analysis, Department of Administrative Services, 155 Cottage St. NE, Salem, Oregon, 97310 said that the long term county forecast was not yet complete. The draft long-term forecast goes to 2040 in a five-year cycle for the counties. He said that they look at the forecast from a demographic point of view and from an economic point of view, and then they compare the numbers. They use code (age) and component (migration, births, and deaths) models. They do separate forecasts for each cycle and then come up with the total forecast. Their current model for net-migration is based on net-migration rate for the last 20 years in 5-year cycles. In the last 2 decades they have seen highs and lows in Oregon. Based on the past 20 years of history, they take the average growth. In the last 2 years, migration growth was much lower than expected. For the Tri-County areas population growth figures he had were based on history and the recent past, from 2000 – 2020 was 1.28%, and 2000 – 2025 was 1.27%. These numbers were based on net-migration of 41,000 for 2000 – 2005, going up to 64,500 between 2015 and 2020. The net-migration rate for the Tri-County area went down from 8.2% between 1990 and 1995, to 5.5% between 1995 – 2000. He said it was a declining trend, and he said it would stabilize at about 3.6% by 2020. That would not mean that the net-migration as an absolute number would go down, only the rate would go down. The absolute number for 1995 – 2000 was 76,000, and based on recent history, it will go down. It would go down to 41,000 and by 2020 it would go up to 64,500. By 2040 it should stabilize around 75,000 – 78,000 net migration. The death rate forecast was based on the forecast of life expectancy in Oregon. He said the life expectancy for males would increase from 75.7 years in 2000 to 77.7 years in 2020. For females it would go from 80.3 years to 81.7 years. Based on these numbers they predict that the number of deaths in the Tri-County area would go up from 53,700 between 1995 – 2000 to 64,700 between 2015 – 2020. The last component of the code-component model was births. This number was based on the fertility rate; the total fertility rate will remain about 2 children per woman. He said that Multnomah County had less than 2 per

woman fertility rate, Clackamas and Washington Counties had slightly higher. The number of births would go up from 100,000 between 1995 – 2000, to 117,000 between 2015 – 2020. Based on these figures the Tri-County population would go up from 1, 452,000 for 2000 to 1,874,000 in 2020. Population growth rate for 2000 – 2005 would be 1.24% and growth rate for 2015 – 2020 would be 1.29%.

Presiding Officer Hosticka referred the council members to the documents pertaining to Dr. Vaidya's information. Dr. Vaidya explained that one side had the numbers he read to them and that the other side encompassed 5 counties. He said that the 5 counties page did not include Columbia County, but that the method of calculation was the same and that the figures were not that different anyway.

Councilor Atherton said that it was very usual information. He wanted to clarify that they were using a standard demographic technique; real world information.

Dr. Vaidya said that the numbers he presented were based on the demographic method. He said that they use other methods to check and cross verify the numbers. He explained that each person who calculated those numbers could come up with different numbers.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said if you had a hundred forecasters you would get a range of numbers, but they should cluster someplace, and then there would be uncertainty around the average. Dr. Vaidya said they don't give the range, they come up with one number to work with.

Councilor Atherton said he had an Appendix C from a memo from Mike Burton. He wondered how different the forecast on Appendix C, which showed a chart from the state office of Economic Analysis, County Population forecast, January 1997, would be from that forecast, because using more recent information than what he had, both numbers came up rather similar. He said that would indicate the validity of the state's forecast.

Dr. Vaidya said that the national growth rate would be a lot lower for the United States as a whole. He said that a few things have changed since the 1997 forecast, and the method of calculation was changed. He said the 2000 Census also changed the forecast. The base went up, but the rate went down in the last two years.

Councilor Bragdon said that he appreciated that 100 forecasters would come up with 100 different numbers, as they had had 3 forecasters come up with 3 different numbers; one by Metro, one by the port (for cargo flows), and one by the state (the one presented at the meeting). He said that he was concerned about checking those numbers, and he wanted to know if they had used other expert opinions to cross check. He said that Metro had had a peer review of the forecast that was done expressly for Metro for the 20-year period. He said that as Mr. Potiowsky was on that panel, would he address his involvement in that, explain the different approaches in terms of the peer review experience. He asked if Mr. Potiowsky had seen flaws in that process, or conditions that changed that would help reconcile the different forecasts.

Tom Potiowsky explained the process that was followed. He said that there were a number of people involved in the review process, and what they looked for was if anything jumped out at them that they would want to question. There wasn't really a red flag. The types of method used were methods used to do this type of forecast. He said as Dr. Vaidya had said, they check their own numbers.

Councilor Bragdon wondered if a peer review represented an endorsement of a particular product, or if it was a cursory look. But the peer review results differed from those presented by Dr. Vaidya and he was looking for an independent verification of either number.

Mr. Potiowsky said that he saw his role on the review committee as trying to see if something doesn't make logical sense. In terms of the population forecast and looking to see what was coming out of his office, he would not say that any one particular number was right.

Dr. Vaidya said that the population forecast included Clark County, which they hadn't included. He said that Clark County had grown very rapidly, which would pull up the number if included.

Councilor Burkholder said his question was about the impact of Clark County, and that it had been answered. He said that inclusion of Clark County would greatly affect the area.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if they had any information on what the numbers would be if they had included Clark County. Dr. Vaidya said they did not include Clark County in the forecast. He advised Presiding Officer Hosticka to check the forecasting division of Washington State for those figures. Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if he had ever done that. Dr. Vaidya said he had not.

Councilor Park wanted to know if they thought that the type of forecast that Dr. Vaidya did for the state was sufficient in terms of the type of forecast that Metro was required to do for the urban growth boundary expansion. He wanted to know if the two methodologies were similar.

Dr. Vaidya said that his economic method was slightly different from Dennis Yee's economic model. He said that for his calculations he had to take into account the state total, meaning all the counties figured on their own would, together, have to come back to the state total. Metro does not have to factor that into their calculations.

Mr. Potiowsky added that the demographic type modeling lends itself better to providing the type of detailed information that they need and use for their forecasting, whereas the economic or econometric model would look more closely at overall population trends. He said that they have a check and balance approach that they use in their office.

Councilor Park said in terms of addressing the needs of state versus looking at what Metro needs, it sounded as if the methodology was different based on their different requirements. He said it appeared that they were not worried about people within the state migrating from county to county because they ended up with a statewide number, whereas Metro had to worry about that because they were dealing with a smaller section of the state. He asked if that was a fair statement, rural versus urban. Dr. Vaidya agreed.

Councilor Atherton said he was looking at employment forecasts for the Portland/Vancouver area (he said it was included in the report to the council) where it showed the history of employment growth from 1970 to 2002. The first forecast was .8% per annum for 1970 through the 1980s. In the decade of the 1990s it was 1.2%, then it projects a 2% growth from 2000 – 2005. He asked if the projection of 2% employment growth from 2000 – 2005 was realistic. He wanted to know if that number jumped out at Mr. Potiowsky as a flag.

Mr. Potiowsky said he didn't think so. They were looking at 1.3% growth for 2003 at the state level, 2% in 2004, and 2.1% in 2005. He clarified that those were state numbers though. Even though they were starting off with some job losses in 2001 and 2002, he didn't feel that would be necessarily too high. State average would be a bit lower for that period. He said that he felt that the Tri-County area was still the growth area for the state.

Councilor Atherton said in the decade of the 90s was a period of decadence and in-migration. He asked if Mr. Potiowsky thought the next 10 years would bring the same kind of economic conditions. Mr. Potiowsky responded that forecast said it would not be. He said the state, for some years in the 90s, was

as high as 4%, but they were looking more at 2 – 2.1% for the current decade. Councilor Atherton asked if that was employment growth. Mr. Potiowsky said that was employment growth.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if a 100 economists would provide a 100 different numbers, what are they supposed to do. He asked if their number of 1.28%, or the 1.5%, or even the 1.6%, was a reasonable number for the Council to pick, or if one number was better than another.

Mr. Potiowsky said that the number that offers the greatest confidence would be the one based on the most recent years. Presiding Officer Hosticka said that that was where the greatest discrepancy was – in the near term number.

Mr. Potiowsky said that as Dr. Vaidya had mentioned, they do not include Clark County in their number, which explains some of the differences in the numbers. He said that their particular method of calculation might have a factor in the differences as well. He said that as far as he could tell, there was nothing to indicate that Metro's forecast was wrong.

Presiding Officer Hosticka thanked them for coming, and said they would just have to make a choice. Councilor Park suggested that if they were interested in helping Metro out in the future on additional peer reviews, he would welcome that. Mr. Potiowsky said they would be happy to be involved.

Councilor Atherton said that last August Mr. Potiowsky had made a presentation to American Public Works Association in concert with the Columbia Corridor Association, and Patty McCoy had taken notes. He said that she had reported to him that Mr. Potiowsky had said that the Columbia Corridor sub-region would be hurt the most, cut more deeply, and last the longest in the current recession. He wanted to know how important those factors were to the economy of the region.

Mr. Potiowsky said for that region, with the downturn in high tech, and with consideration to the high level of manufacturing in the region, it would hit them across the board. Therefore, the region has felt the recession more than maybe other areas in the nation that do not have such a high concentration of high tech and manufacturing. He said that the unemployment rates regionally were historically high relative to other regions of the state. He said that it was also the area of strength; manufacturing based industry tends to run in cycles.

Councilor Atherton said there was also some discussion at that meeting about a blue ribbon committee to look at future high tech industry that could provide a boost, such as biotech. He wanted to know if that was a risky proposition?

Mr. Potiowsky said that the biotech area was a debatable type area. He said that there had been a huge investment made over time into biotech to attract those firms. They had also made a high investment into those areas for higher education systems. The employment gains on the surface don't appear to be very large with biotech, although they are probably very high paying wages. He said he thought it was still a gamble, and an unknown risk factor.

Presiding Officer Hosticka thanked Mr. Potiowsky and Dr. Vaidya for bringing the Council their information.

4. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATION

Mike Burton, Executive Officer, thanked the council for their fortitude in going through this process. He said he knew that the decision before them was not easy to make. He said in 1997 when he brought his recommendation to the council, his concern had been that they end up, in the final analysis, dealing with

numbers. He said that numbers were important, but they should also make their decisions with a 20-year horizon in mind. He said that the goal was to take a serious look at community building. He mentioned that they were all subject to state law, and he admitted that he was critical of the state process. He expressed his disappointment that they could not do more community building and planning in the way that they were approaching the issue. He said that making the decision about the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) was, ultimately, just changing a line on a map. Building a community required the kind of process that was used in developing the Pleasant Valley area. That process included discussions on infrastructure, the green spaces, buffer zones, including a good communication and transportation system in and out of that area, and including a good balance of jobs and housing. He said that he had received hundreds of letters about the UGB process and about the potential for the land out there. He said that many concerns people expressed about bringing more land in when congestion and bad transportation situations existed would have been prevented if those areas had been planned properly. He said he thought that Metro's role was to make sure that planning for the long term took place. The other big portion of what they needed to do was maintain the resources and special aspects of the region that were currently within the UGB. The long-term issue would be to balance and protect both of those economies. He wished them well in the debate, he hoped they would be able to accomplish more aspirational planning for the future, and he congratulated them on the work they had done.

Councilor McLain thanked Mr. Burton for his efforts. She appreciated the bus tours, which allowed them to look at the Study Areas. She said it was a good example of his leadership. She said that going out and looking at the sites had more meaning than just hearing about them or simply view them on a map.

Councilor Bragdon acknowledged his appreciation of Mr. Burton for his management of staff, and for his open and engaged style. He also noted that while Mr. Burton ran a process according to the rules, he never hesitated to point out the limitations of that process. He said he felt that those two qualities in one person was tremendous, a good example of leadership.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

This item was moved for consideration to the end of the agenda.

6. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

6.1 **Ordinance No. 02-990**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add Land in the Site #48, Tualatin Quarry area.

Presiding Officer Hosticka assigned Ordinance No. 02-990 to Council.

7. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 02-969A**, 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.

Motion	Councilor Park moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-969A.
Seconded:	Councilor McLain seconded the motion

Presiding Officer Hosticka explained the procedure.

Councilor Park asked Mr. Richard Benner to go over the ordinance.

Richard Benner, Legal Counsel, reviewed the ordinance and the changes to the "A" version, which included the emergency clause removal. He noted the exhibits, most of which would make changes to the Regional Framework Plan, the Metro Code and the principle documents such as the Urban Growth Report. The ordinance would also bring areas into the boundary. The findings explained why each area was being brought in. He said most of the ordinance was unchanged. He noted Code provisions, which had been in response to requests from the Council or MTAC.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said if there were material changes these should be pointed out. Mr. Benner said most of the adjustments were minor.

Presiding Officer Hosticka opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 02-969A and any ordinances that involved amendments to the UGB. He said that under the state land use system that if anyone had not testified up to this point and did not testify today, then they would not have standing in further action on a decision.

Eugene Grant, Mayor of Happy Valley, 11311 SE Charview Ct., Happy Valley, OR 97236, asked for an amendment in the conditions for the Damascus area, condition #4 on exhibit M. He asked for study areas 14, 17, and 19 to be deleted from that condition. He submitted his request in writing (a copy of which is found in the meeting record).

Councilor Burkholder asked him to repeat his amendment.

Mayor Grant directed Councilor Burkholder to look at exhibit M of the ordinance, page 2, and paragraph 4. He said the request was to delete study areas 14, 17, and 19.

Presiding Officer Hosticka explained the intent of the conditions, which was to provide three things. The first was that the people of Damascus area were to plan their area. Second was that growth would proceed from a node or center and go outwards. The third thing was to try to maintain separation. He asked if the mayor's suggestion addressed those issues.

Mayor Grant said that for Damascus to plan, a decision about what was part of Damascus and what was part of Happy Valley had to be made. He said that they felt that study areas 14, 17, and 19 were part of Happy Valley. He said that for the second item on growth outward, they were concerned that it was impractical since the infrastructure would come from the Highway 212 area. He said that the ridgeline would be the separation line.

Councilor Atherton asked if that included area 19, Carver. Mayor Grant said that did not include Carver. There was a portion of area 19 that was in Happy Valley area.

Charles Becker, Mayor of Gresham, 1333 NW Eastman Pkwy, Gresham, OR 97030, said the council had received testimony from Richard Ross on November 27th. He said Gresham supported the Springwater area. It was essential to the well being in the community, due to a shortage of jobs. He said that they could provide infrastructure to that area in a timely manner. They were capable of taking a lead role in developing the concept plan for Springwater.

Councilor Atherton asked about the separation of Gresham and a new community of Damascus. He asked if Mayor Becker had any recommendations on how that might be addressed.

Mayor Becker said he felt these could be planned for and addressed with cooperation from partners and with their neighboring communities. He said that maintaining identity between communities was essential. He mentioned that they had agreements and were willing to live with those agreements. He said

that they supported maintaining that separation between cities. He talked about having a green gateway to Gresham. He said that with this development they did not foresee adverse effects to Hwy. 26.

Councilor Atherton said Mayor Grant had recommended a ridgeline as a natural boundary. He asked Mayor Becker if he felt there were any definitions between Gresham and a new Damascus community. Mayor Becker said he felt there were topographical areas for maintaining that separation.

Mayor Vera Katz, City of Portland, 1221 SW 4th Ave Suite 340, Portland OR 97204, summarized her testimony (a copy of which is found in the record). She also noted a letter from the city commissioners. She said that she didn't want to see the vision of 2040 lost. She said that the last minute addition of area 94 was not acceptable.

Councilor Atherton asked about the issue of the vacancy factor and housing targets. He said that if there was a vacancy factor of about 3% they could achieve everything she had just recommended.

Mayor Katz responded that in considering Damascus as an area for inclusion, there would be roughly 28,000 housing units, but if they take the new demographic information, then they would not have to do anything. She said that she did not understand the vacancy rates. There had been a recommendation to eliminate those.

Councilor Bragdon said he would be the first to say never ask the city to divert resources from town centers to develop on the fringe of Forest Park. He said that what he thought was the troubling part was that area 94 was within the city limits. He said that to him that was a signal to property interests in that area that they are to be treated as similarly situated areas. He said that the council wanted to protect the park. He questioned the tool used to obtain that protection. He said he felt that the UGB was not the appropriate tool.

Gil Kelly, Planning Director, City of Portland, 1221 SW 4th Ave Suite 340, Portland OR 97204, talked about study area 94. He said that area 94 had been annexed by election of voters in 1962 into the city. He referred to it as an historical accident. He said he thought they should treat it as an historical artifact. He said that he understood that the city council in the past in Portland had on two occasions considered whether or not to recommend that it be brought into the UGB, and on both occasions had said no. He said that they did not have a way to affordably extend urban services to that area. He said that area 94 was more country than urban and it did not meet the test for being included in the UGB.

Mayor Katz said the process was the issue she wanted to address. Area 94 came in very late. She had not had the opportunity to read the history on the site. She said that she understood that there had been a long history with the planning commission and the city council. She said, however, that their city council was totally unaware of it, and she asked the council to remove it.

Mr. Kelly noted an ordinance before the council, which was supposed to include exhibit M, but for which they could not find exhibit M. Councilor Park explained that it was in the packet, folded deep inside.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that the concern of whether area 94 was in or out of the boundary was directed at preserving the natural character of the area. He said he thought the question was could those same actions of protection be achieved through the city if it were in the urban growth boundary, and would the city be intending to do that.

Mr. Kelly said they had not studied it closely and that the reason to bring it in under the UGB would be to meet the housing need projection number, which would mean that it was contrary to that stated purpose.

Councilor Park said he was still concerned about this issue. He referred to other areas that were inside the city, but outside the UGB. He said that he knew Councilor McLain was working very hard on a similar issue in Forest Grove. He said that in this particular case the area was already within the jurisdictional boundary, it was already within the City of Portland, and therefore he did not understand how the environmental protections would change by bringing it inside the UGB, since it already was within an urban service area.

Mr. Kelly responded that there could be that there was no difference, but that it was not currently in their Goal 5 program. He said Portland's concern was that it was being brought in with the goal of urbanization. He said they would not have a problem studying it over the next few years with consideration of bringing it in during the next round.

Mayor Katz said that if the goal was increased density and add housing units, she would rather put their limited funds to main streets and town centers. She said that density ought to increase in those areas and not in the fringes. She said that she felt very strongly that they needed to maintain the vision of Senate Bill 100, which was to protect forestland and farmland, and to build the character of the region within the centers. She asked the council for more time to deal with area 94. She said that if they force her to deal with area 94, they would only have a short period of time, and she would have to set everything else aside.

Councilor Monroe said that the council was not forcing her do anything. He asked if she was prepared to de-annex area 94.

Mayor Katz said she was not prepared to deal with that particular area right now, nor was anybody at the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) or the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) prepared. She said that it had come in at the last minute. She said that as a member of MPAC, who spent many hours every month, she resented that. She said other areas of the region were thoroughly discussed by members of MPAC and MTAC.

Councilor Monroe said that the Executive Officer had recommended that they include a portion of area 94. He said that the council had looked at it, and they felt that it was the only piece of land in the state that was within a city's boundary and not within their UGB. He said that it seemed very illogical, and if the City of Portland's council didn't believe that it ought to be in the UGB then they should de-annex it.

Mayor Katz said that if Metro had given them an opportunity to study it, they would have come back with an answer.

Councilor Monroe said that they had had over thirty years.

Mr. Kelly made three additional points (a copy of his comments are included in the meeting record). He mentioned that they were interested in looking at the Housing Population Projection Number generated by the state. He felt that discussion of industrial land and residential land should be separated. He asked them to re-examine the residential need projections.

Councilor McLain thanked them for coming. She said that the Council had a high standard for centers. Regarding study area 94, it was part of the study this time around, and it was part of the study done in 1997. It was true that Mr. Burton did not put the whole area in his first recommendation. She said that what was in front of them had been studied by the staff or by the executive officer over that last two years.

Councilor Atherton said in letter they had submitted, they referred to the 20-year land supply law and the forecast rate. He asked that if the council adopted a 1.3% rate, would that provide the period of time to resolve the issues mentioned.

Mayor Katz said she agreed with Councilor Atherton. She said that after Senate Bill 100 was passed it was “highjacked” by special interests that added the need for a 20-year supply. She said that she thought the 20-year supply forced everyone to deal with numbers rather than exploring how to build communities. She said that the need for industrial land today was evident. She said they ought to repeal the 20-year law.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said the 20-year land supply forced them to talk about numbers, and not people. He said that was what the public hearing was for, so that people can talk about their communities and land.

Dave Wechner, Planning Director, City of Sherwood, spoke for Mayor Cottle and the Sherwood City Council, OR 97140, and provided a letter from Ross Schultz, City Manager, and summarized it (a copy which is included in the record). They supported study areas 93A and 59, but were opposed study area 55. It was not only its inclusion but its location was the problem and explained why.

Councilor Monroe asked if areas 54 and 55 would be developed in the next 20 years? Mr. Wechner said it would be very expensive to do so. His concern was if they were trying to get more housing units into the Metro urban area that was a high cost place to do it.

Councilor Monroe said it was exception land and there was not much exception land in Washington County. Mr. Wechner said that was true but it would be very expensive to develop.

Councilor Monroe asked if there was anything in the action of bringing it into the UGB that would force Mr. Wechner to make those infrastructure expenditures in the near future. Mr. Wechner said they were concerned because it put their eggs in a basket where they didn't want them. There were other areas that should be studied or if this area was brought in, that it is developed with an LID or cautionary measures.

Councilor Monroe asked if that was not up to the City of Sherwood. Mr. Wechner said they could do that but at a high cost.

Councilor Monroe said he had walked that land, it was flat, he wasn't sure why they felt it would be expensive to develop. Mr. Wechner talked about its location and where the trunk lines go through as well as the timing issue.

Councilor Monroe reminded him that they had 20 years.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked, as far as Ordinance No. 02-986A, if it now incorporated the areas that they were interested in. Mr. Wechner said it did and made some suggestions about the slope.

Dan Drentlaw, 320 Warner-Milne Road, Oregon City, OR 97045, spoke on behalf of John Williams, Mayor of Oregon City, regarding study areas 24, 25 and 26 in Oregon City. Approximately 79 acres were removed from consideration because they were designated resource land, he said. The city of Oregon City requested that they be brought back in to the UGB because the area is completely surrounded by the city on two sides and will be completely surrounded by UGB. A copy of this request was included as a part of the last public hearing meeting record.

Janet Stedman, 16999 Siler Ridge, Beaverton, OR 97007, spoke about Cooper Mountain and her opposition to the inclusion of study area 65 in the UGB. She noted that recently a neighbor had clear-cut

his timber, providing an example of what urbanization would bring to Cooper Mountain. Her concern is that if the area is urbanized, clear-cutting is inevitable and would result in the loss of the area's wildlife.

Presiding Officer Hosticka pointed out that the Council had not voted to bring area 65 into the UGB. Ms. Stedman said that she had heard that its inclusion was still a possibility.

Councilor Bragdon clarified that the land that was clear-cut was outside the UGB.

Mary Dorman, Planning Consultant, 6131 NE Alameda, Portland, OR 97213, read her testimony into the record (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). She also submitted a large map and other exhibits for the record. She said the area met all of the state criteria for urbanization and should be brought into the UGB.

Scott Rosenlund, Forest Park Neighborhood Association, 5900 NW Cornell, Portland OR 97210, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of area 94 in the UGB because of his concerns for the wildlife in the area. He said the remaining wildlife needed connectivity and that urban development would destroy the ecosystem and make Forest Park merely a tree farm.

Steven Edeman, P.O. Box 91519, Portland, OR 97291, supported inclusion of the western part of area 93 in the UGB. Copies of his testimony and map are included in the meeting record.

Bruce Vincent, 825 NE 20th, Suite 300, Portland OR 97232, said he represented landowners in areas 77 and 82, and spoke in favor of both areas being included in the UGB. He noted that Metro had already received his written testimony, which he summarized for the Council. He said both areas contained exception land and would add employment acres.

Keith Fishback, 11375 NW Roy Road, Banks, OR 97106, testified in favor of inclusion of areas 84 through 87. A copy of his testimony is included in the record. He said that these areas provided a buffer zone between urban land and agricultural land. He added that the area was no longer suitable for commercial agriculture because of conflicts resulting from urbanization. He also spoke in favor of including areas 93 and 94 in the UGB and against the inclusion of the Shute Road property.

Debbie Endicott, 4707 SE Mitchell, Portland OR 97206, said she owned three acres in study area 92 and supported inclusion of this area in the UGB. She said that there were ten property owners in this area and all ten wanted to be included.

Kathy Long Hollard, Clackamas County Economic Development Commission, 22 Yorick Street, Lake Oswego, OR 97035, spoke in support of the inclusion of employment sites identified by the Clackamas County Commission. A copy of her written testimony is included in the meeting record.

John Wyatt, Clackamas County Economic Development Commission, 16463 S. Ivel Road, Beavercreek, OR 97004, supported inclusion of more industrial and employment land in Clackamas County. He noted a letter submitted by the commission, which is included in the meeting record. He noted the following reasons for inclusion: 1) To allow the county to develop the proposed expansion areas in a holistic way; 2) to help address the jobs/housing imbalance; and 3) to address the lack of industrial and employment sites within the county.

Todd Chase, Clackamas County Economic Development Commission and OTAK Planning Manager, 17355 SW Boones Ferry Road, Lake Oswego, OR 97035, expressed his support for Ordinance 02-969A. A copy of his testimony is included in the meeting record. He recommended that additional strategic industrial and employment sites be added to the ordinance, as identified in the August 28, 2002, letter

from the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners. He said he believed that the current population employment forecasts were within the range of feasible long-range forecasts.

Councilor Bragdon asked Mr. Chase if he found the Metro staff study dealing with smaller 20-acre parcels to be accurate. Mr. Chase said the constraints of time and budget didn't allow them to get into the detail that Metro staff was able to go into, but they did flag the possibility of the need for 20 acres and larger.

Betty Atteberry, Westside Economic Alliance and Regional Economic Development Partners, 10200 SW Nimbus, Suite G3, Portland, OR 97223, summarized her written testimony (a copy which is included in the meeting record). She gave an overview of the Regional Partners, which is a group of professional economic development representatives from the public and private sectors, whose mission is to protect and enhance the Portland metropolitan region as a competitive place to do business. She said that having available industrial land was key to the region's competitiveness.

Max Talbot, City of Gresham, Regional Economic Development Partners, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham, OR 97030, commented on the critical shortage of industrial land in the Portland metropolitan region. He urged Metro to recognize the need for more industrial land as well as the longer-term need for local jurisdictions to develop ready-to-go sites in future UGB expansion decisions. He said the recommendations for industrial land to include in the boundary, while a good starting point, were insufficient for immediate and long-term economic development needs. He added that a shortage of employment land would have a negative impact on attracting large-scale industrial development to the region.

Councilor Burkholder asked what Metro could do that would assist in making employment land available versus bringing in raw land that might or might not be available for many years because the infrastructure was not there. Mr. Talbot suggested identifying those areas that would be able to serve in the near term and providing assistance now for concept planning so that when the economy recovered, the land would be ready and already marketed to the type of businesses the community needed.

Gregory Jenks, Clackamas County Business and Economic Development Services and Regional Economic Development Partners, 9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd., Portland, OR 97015, concluded the testimony on behalf of the Regional Partners. A copy of his testimony is included in the meeting record.

Jim Emerson, Forest Park Neighborhood Association, 13900 NW Old Germantown Road, Portland, OR 97231, summarized his written testimony. He opposed area 94 being included in the UGB because of issues relating to slope and drainage, and because of the effect on Forest Park. He also mentioned the uncertainty of population projections and the fact that the jobs/housing balance is changing with the economy. He asked for clarification of 11 parcels of land at the south end of area 94 that might not be inside the city boundary. Presiding Officer Hosticka asked Metro staff to check on that.

Gail Snyder, Friends of Forest Park, P.O. Box 2913, Portland, OR 97208, read her testimony into the record and included a map with her testimony. The Friends of Forest Park opposed inclusion of area 94.

Presiding Officer Hosticka posed the following question to Ms. Snyder: If the long term vision is to preserve the natural characteristics of area 94, is there a way to prevent the issue from coming up every five years and to protect the area over the long-term? Ms. Snyder replied that she would defer to people more informed than she was about land use regulations to answer that question. However, she said she and many others realized that they needed to be thinking beyond the outcome of the day's results.

Marcy Houle, Author of One City's Wilderness, 16600 NW Gillian, Portland, OR 97231, opposed including area 94 in the UGB. She read her testimony into the record, a copy of which is included in the meeting record

A citizen read the statement of Nancy Broshot, Assistant Professor of Biology, 2255 NW Northrup, Portland, OR 97210, which opposed inclusion of area 94 in the UGB. A copy of her testimony is included in the meeting record.

Jim Labbe, Audubon Society of Portland, 4805 N. Borthwick, Portland, OR 97212, read a letter into the record from Mike Houck, Director of the Audubon Society of Portland, which opposed inclusion of area 94.

Fred Bacher, 7547 NW Skyline Portland, OR 97217, spoke in opposition to including area 94 in the UGB. He said that in his meetings with Metro Councilors he learned that 517 acres at the top of Forest Park were being added to the UGB by this ordinance; that this was being done because one land owner in area 94 complained that the City of Portland would not let him build a house; that there are no state or Metro rules saying that Metro is to align the UGB with city boundaries and no findings that support including area 94 based on the 2040 Plan; and that Metro was worried about being sued by the land owner based on a potential future Oregon law. He said that Metro would surely be sued by adding area 94 to the UGB under these circumstances. A copy of his testimony is included in the record.

Rev. Frodo Okulam, Sisterspirit and Friends of Forest Park, 2804 NE 42nd, Portland, OR 97213, spoke in opposition to including area 94 in the UGB. She noted the problems with slope, old growth trees and streams, but focused on earth-based spirituality. She said that the area being discussed was the most remote section of the park and that it provided spirituality and culture for the citizens in the region. She said that if the area were narrowed, the impact would be widespread, and she encouraged councilors to be aware that this area was the "heart" of Portland.

Lynn Jennings, Friends of Forest Park, 3103 NW Wilson Street, Portland, OR 97210, opposed inclusion of area 94 in the UGB. A copy of her testimony is included in the record. She said that she was a retired Olympic middle-distance runner, and that during the course of a normal week, she ran 50-60 miles on Forest Park's trails and knows the area well. She said that area 94 was not suitable for efficient land use or diverse housing, and that its development would endanger natural resources.

Arnold Rochlin, P.O. Box 83645, Portland, OR 97283, read his testimony into the record regarding area 94 and gave a brief history on how the area was included within Portland city limits. He said that the area was annexed in order to help with the city's plan to develop and protect Forest Park and that the affected taxpayers should be thanked for carrying the burden for the whole region to maintain this magnificent resource.

Mary Scarlock Adamson, Pacific River Council, 10575 NW Skyline Blvd, Portland, OR 97231, opposed inclusion of area 94 in the UGB. A copy of her written testimony is included in the meeting record.

Jerry Grossnickle, Forest Park Neighborhood Association Board of Directors 13510 NW Old Germantown Road, Portland, OR 97231, submitted written testimony and summarized it for the Council (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). He spoke against inclusion of area 94 and gave the reasons why he opposed inclusion, which included wildlife habitat, steep slopes, and the effects of urbanization.

Scott Powell, 7617 NW Skyline Blvd, Portland, OR 97229, spoke about study areas 84 through 87 and area 94. A copy of his written testimony is included in the record.

Cheryl Neal, 12115 NW Skyline Blvd, Portland, OR 97231, opposed inclusion of areas 84 through 87 and area 94 in the UGB and talked about the presence of the Western Blue Bird, which has been designated as a sensitive species. A copy of her testimony had previously been submitted to the record.

A citizen read a letter from Palmer Byrkit, 10843 NW Laidlaw Road, Portland, OR 97229, supporting the proposal for area 93, a copy of which is included in the meeting record.

Corinne Bacher, 7547 NW Skyline Blvd., Portland, OR 97229, opposed the inclusion of study area 94 in the UGB and contrasted the economic gains to be made by inclusion versus the less tangible gains of a less developed area.

Tom Vanderzanden, 15903 NW Logie Trail, Hillsboro, OR 97124, added to his previous testimony about areas 84 and 86 in the Bethany area. He said he had been working with an engineering firm to plan for a possible exception-land-only urban community in the area and showed via maps what could be done. His conceptual plans are included in the meeting record.

Bruce Goldson, 6564 SE Lake Road, Milwaukie, OR 97222, did not testify.

James Kennedy, 17035 NW Brugger Road, Portland, OR 97229, supported the inclusion of area 84 into the UGB because he said the land would be needed in the near future for housing and jobs. He added that he is unable to make a living from his 10-acre farm, which has a natural boundary on one side formed by Rock Creek.

Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon, Portland OR, said that her written testimony (a copy of which is in the record) addressed a number of issues she said she wouldn't repeat, and talked about the industrial land need. While this discussion would continue in Task 3, she said she thought there were some faulty assumptions going into the decision and she listed five faulty assumptions. 1) There was an overstatement of the lack of large parcels. 2) The Executive Officer's report acknowledged that the project for parcel size need was based entirely on past patterns of firm sizes and lot sizes, which was both unrealistic, she said, and potentially dangerous in that we are not planning for the future industrial users that might actually come. 3) There's a lack of examining alternatives to the sprawling development pattern. 4) There's a myth about the loss employer, Applied Materials, as they had not yet, to 1000 Friends knowledge, built anything on the west coast. 5) The alleged uniqueness of the Shute Road site regarding specialized dual power and nitrogen gases – she said she thought Metro needed to tighten up that condition if it were going to meet a specific identified land need. In conclusion, Ms. McCurdy advocated that the Metro Council bring in the Boring area, including the Boring industrial site. As they'd heard in previous testimony, it was ready to be serviced today.

Councilor Atherton asked about LSI generating its own nitrogen gas in Gresham, on site. Ms. McCurdy said that was her understanding from the Gresham Planning Director. She said she thought the gas was piped to the Shute Road area, but said Metro Planning staff could provide a better answer to that. Councilor Atherton said he was having a difficult time getting a response to that question, and he knew how critical that gas was to industrial siting. Ms. McCurdy said the electrical power use alone was not unique, and providing gas through a pipe, if that's how it was brought in, might be unique, but other semiconductor manufacturers, as she understood it, provided it on-site through some capacity where they generated it themselves.

Thomas Lawhorn, 14605 NW Springville, OR 97229, did not testify.

Michael Krahmer, 12265 NW Lovejoy, Portland, OR 97229, spoke against the expansion of the UGB on the crest and slopes of the Tualatin Mountains and against the inclusion of 200 acres of industrial land on the corner of Shute and Evergreen in Hillsboro. Population increase had not been handled well on the west side, he said, but local governments have been good at developing land into one of three options: insular industrial complexes without out-of-state owners who little care for the community's well being beyond their self interest; dense, poorly designed housing developments; or California-style strip malls with super-sized parking lots. Regional government has not met the task of protecting green space and wetlands, creating an integrated and smooth functioning transportation grid, and shielding existing residents from developments associated with infrastructure improvement costs. With regard to expansion of the UGB on the north side of Skyline to the edge of Forest Park, he said he was taken aback. The Forest Heights and attendant development on the high elevations of the Tualatin Mountains are probably the most expensive developments with regards to use of public funds to install sewer, water, and in the future to resolve the traffic fiasco on Saltzman and other southern outlet roads leading away from Skyline. Public funds are paying for the widening of Cornell, he said, although the root cause of the problem was dense, new development on the north side of that arterial. The higher elevations on the Tualatin Mountains are a key component of the west side watershed, and he could not in good conscience support any inclusion of these lands within the UGB until wider buffers on streams, firmer watercourses and wetlands are enacted. Fifty-foot negotiable buffers around only permanent streams was simply too small and a travesty. With regards to 200 acres of industrial land for Hillsboro, both Hillsboro and Beaverton must both realize they are never going to annex themselves into prosperity or livability.

John Burnham, 14419 NW Springville Rd., Portland OR 97229, testified on study area 81. Mr. Burnham's family farm has been unprofitable 90% of the time as the land is of very poor quality. This is his third time testifying before the council. His property is not affected by the recent decision to bring in 730+ acres in the Bethany area north of Springville Road into the UGB. He said he and his family strongly support the view that areas 84, 85, 86 and 87 be kept together and brought into the UGB because of its poor agricultural viability. His property is buffered by the 100-wide BPA right-of-way (running north to south from Springville Rd. up the hill).

Kim Vandehey, 17202 SW Siler Ridge Lane, Aloha, OR 97007 provided his written testimony for record regarding study area 65. He said he worked in CPO in the late '70s and '80s and helped to pass SB 100. He said he should ask the council to add in only 100 acres of area 65; the wildlife corridor would be protected by Goal 3 and the Natural Marine Fisheries Wildlife Act. The area that was logged was not in that corridor, but one of the logged areas is the future owner's homesites. Those same neighbors didn't squawk when the land was being clearcut for their homes. The areas south and west of the 100 acres he spoke of can't be easily served for sewer, which is why he asked that they be excluded, and he included the Meeks property. He said they were told five years ago that even though they scored high on the criteria, they were not brought into the UGB, and again they've been left out with a high score. He said he'd like to know why. Please don't ignore them again. He questioned why Forest Park, with a low residential yield, was brought in when his area could be used more efficiently. A goal of the Framework Plan was efficient use of land, and leaving them out was not efficient. Beaverton has said they would provide governance and would like this area brought in before areas 69 and 67, and very close to area 66. He said he didn't want to wait another five years to go through this again, and if they followed their own staff's and Executive Officer's recommendation, this would be included. Mr. Vandehey then asked to council to project their decisions out 100 years and think about what they would be then.

Shehla Dar Aziz, 10279 SW Egret, Beaverton OR 97007 did not testify.

Richard Coanlee, Attorney, Hungerford Law Firm, resident of 16509 SW Edenwild Lane, Oregon City OR 97045, said he opposed area 24's inclusion in the UGB. He did not think the Oregon City's Commission's request for inclusion of this area should be given any, or if any, minimal weight. He cited

examples of Sherwood and West Linn where this council overrode the jurisdictions' recommendation. There was no valid reason for inclusion of this area, he said. Oregon City's most recent Local Transportation Plan (2001) identified 14 needed connector projects, but does not mention once the need for a connector road between Holcomb Boulevard and Redland Road. Moreover, he said, the Oregon City School District submitted extensive comments vehemently opposing this road, based on safety reasons for two schools' elementary school children. The Oregon City Commission never consulted the school district on this issue, he said, and two of the three Oregon City Commissioners who made that recommendation have been removed from office. Based on a review of the record, his firm has revealed that this was based on the proposal or wish by one developer to construct that road in order to facilitate a combination shopping center/housing development in that region. In contract, he said he believed this council had heard at the public hearing at Clackamas County Community College (on October 22nd) that the Oregon City residents who actually live in that area were vehemently opposed to inclusion of that area, while at the same time acknowledging that there was little debate about inclusion of area 26. Regarding the growth projections, he thought if this body proceeded with the 1.6% growth factor, he had serious doubts whether that would be legally defensible given testimony give at this meeting. To proceed with the high figure was, he said, at a minimum, arbitrary and capricious.

Julie O'Dwyer, 20009 S. Forest Hill Dr., Oregon City OR 97045, spoke in opposition to inclusion of areas 24, 25, and 26. Ms. O'Dwyer submitted her written testimony (a copy is included the record). She said at all the city Planning Commission meeting she'd attended this fall, only the developer was in favor of this proposal and those who stood to receive monetary gain. School overcrowding, run-off on the property, and traffic were her main reasons for requesting these areas be removed from the proposal.

Dennis Burkhart, 14825 NW Ash, Portland OR 97231, commended the council for developing green space for the future. Mr. Burkhart said he opposed including areas 84-87 and area 94. Regarding area 94, Mr. Burkhart said he encouraged the council, in their planning for the future and for the decision today, that they give careful consideration of natural resource buffers (a copy of his testimony is included in the record, he sent his testimony prior to the hearing).

Carol Chesarek, 13300 NW Germantown Rd., Portland OR 97231, said she was opposed to inclusion into the UGB of area 94, and provided written testimony regarding her opposition of including 84 through 87. Ms. Chesarak summarized her letter for the record.

Claire Stock, Forest Park Neighborhood Assoc, 14025 NW Germantown Rd Portland OR 97231, did not testify.

Catherine Dalziel, 18747 NW Columbia, Portland, OR 97231, did not testify.

Joe Angel, 356 SW Kingston, Portland, OR 97205, on property located at 5100 NW Skyline, testified on study area 94 (and provided written testimony for the record by Robert Van Brocklin). He said he took a little bit of offense on how he'd been characterized today. Money was not his motivation, but fairness was. When the City of Portland annexed Forest Park 40 years ago, they approached the property owners and told them they would provide the water and urban services. For 40 years, these same owners have had the services and have paid city taxes. In the 1990s a new water tower was built and the city encouraged the development of Forest Park and the adjoining properties. Storm sewers have been there for years, schools have been there, sanitary sewers are on Skyline, a new fire station was sited by the city just this year on Skyline. Mr. Angel said the city has the most extensive environmental policies of any city in this state, and bringing this property and all of Forest Park that's already in the city into the UGB would not degrade anything.

Sandra Diedrich, Board member, Northwest District Association, 117 NW Trinity Place, Portland, OR 97209, spoke to study area 94 and said the Board had examined the proposal to include area 94 into the UGB and, looking at Metro's own criteria, did not find that area 94 met that criteria. They further questioned whether that area met the urbanization goals in terms of the most cost efficient provision of public facilities, given that area's physical characteristics. Additional urbanization in that area would also have an adverse impact on Portland's crown jewel. In addition to representing the Northwest District Association, Ms. Diedrich spoke as a citizen who spent a lot of time in the park, and she urged removal of this area from consideration into UGB. She also thanked the committee for urging people to look beyond this series of deliberations to how those corridors, those boundaries and those buffers can be addressed in the future. She also thanked the council for the time and commitment they give to this process.

Councilor Bragdon asked Mr. Angel about paying urban service taxes, and Mr. Angel said a portion of his taxes were in forest deferral because it has over the years been run as a forest operation, but the other taxes that he pays are the same as anybody else. Councilor Bragdon clarified that Mr. Angel meant other similarly situation properties, and Councilor Park asked Mr. Angel if he meant timber deferral. Mr. Angel said he never cuts timber, but has managed it as a forest. That was the bind he was in, he said, because he'd never wanted to use his asset in that way. If he can't build home there, then the other alternative is to be outside the UGB where he can cut timber. Mr. Angel said he would prefer not to do that, that he would prefer to be in the city as he has been for 40 years.

Ralph Henkhaus, 10511 NW Laidlaw Road, Portland, OR 97229, requested that his 17 acres on the east side of study area 93 be brought into the UGB. He said it looked like the west side would be brought in. Mr. Henkhaus has testified previously on this and had submitted written testimony, as well, which he resubmitted (and is made a part of this record). The property is adjacent to Forest Park and is ready for development, and he said services were not an issue. He also said if area 93 were not brought into the UGB, that would be okay with him. If it were brought in, however, his was the property that would get all the traffic on Laidlaw Road, and there is already enough traffic there now.

David Miller, 16415 NW Bruegger Road, Portland, OR 97229, testified on Ordinance No. 02-987A, specifically study area 85. He said he supported this coming into the UGB and had explained in an earlier letter he wrote to the Council and earlier testimony. Mr. Miller said he'd heard that the northerly portion of area 85 would be reduced by deleting the area north of Bruegger Road, and that he was opposed to that. Mr. Miller asked the Councilors to please review his written testimony on this.

Councilor Monroe said the proposal that was discussed was Abbey Creek and the riparian zone leading into Abbey Creek from either side as the northern boundary and the appropriate buffer between urbanization and rural and agricultural activities, which would leave your land well within the area to be in the area. Mr. Miller agreed that that was an appropriate buffer.

Councilor Hosticka said this would not be over until the council votes on it, and even then it goes to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in Salem, and may start up a little again after that.

Jin Park, 13555 NW Laidlaw Road, Portland, OR 97229, first spoke to study areas 84 and 85, and said the reason 85 is going to be included is because of 84. The truth, he said, is only 30% of 84 will be serviced by 85. Mr. Park also spoke about improvement and transportation concerns with areas 85 and 83, and the difference between the two. Lastly, Mr. Park spoke to the school site, and said he was more than willing to exchange the acreage within 85 or the same acreage within 83.

Bob Zahler, 13937 NW Springville Road, Portland, OR 97229, said he lived just at the eastern edge of area 87. He said he supported bringing into the UGB areas 83, 84, 85 and 87, saying he really believed

additions to 84 through 87 would provide a firmer, well established development plan, which right now the area does not have. Another thing Mr. Zahler said was that most of the property there was once considered as farms, but are now mostly hobby farms and the ability to actually farm is almost impossible.

Jerome Parson, 23000 NW Gillihan Road, Portland, OR 97231, commented on study area 92. He's owned his 3-acre parcel for 44 years, has paid taxes on it, and has tried to build on it since he purchased it, but has never received approval. Essentially, Mr. Parson said, the county, Metro, and LCDC have passed dozens of regulations creating more barriers to making his property useless. It is less than 300 feet in Washington County where the current zone is 6 houses per acre and about ½ mile from the existing Multnomah County UGB. The small parcel of land is approximately 2,500 feet wide separating the Portland UGB and the Washington County UGB and makes no sense to have substantial different rules in this no man's land. He respectively requested including study area 92 in the proposed expansion of the UGB so that he can build on his property.

Emma Steen 2304 SW 64th Avenue, Portland, OR 97221, spoke to Ordinance No. 02-983B, Evergreen and Shute Road. Ms. Steen said she had educated on the crisis that has been happening on the farmland throughout the United States and that she is a member of a food sustainability and environmental program of the American Dietetic Association. American farmland is disappearing at the rate of 2 acres every minute, 120 acres every hour, 3,000 acre per day, and we must recognize that 200 acres doesn't sound like much but it is opening the door to change that is going to impact future generations tremendously. Oregon has some of the richest farmland in the world and to convert this to industrial use is a gross injustice, she said. There is other land available for industrial use, and she asked that farmland be protected and that they not open the door to let any of it go to other uses.

Kent Seida, 17501 SE Forest Hill Drive, Clackamas, OR 97015, testified on study area 37 and that he thought there has been poor planning by the opposition. Mr. Seida said he plea was that the Council go ahead and bring in 37 this time. Councilor Atherton said that Mr. Seida's story is a very interesting one and he was glad that Councilor Park mentioned the property was outside the urban growth boundary, was condemned, and brought in for a school. Councilor Park said the school was not even allowed there; it was annexed into the city.

Herb Koss, 1098 Rosemount Road, West Linn, OR 97068, said he was a landowner in study area 37, and he thanked the Council for their continued support of this area. He said he has testified three or four times and would not reiterate that testimony, but said he really appreciated the fact the council was going to give us the opportunity to complete our town center concept up at Rosemount Road next to the 800 screaming kids. Mr. Koss quoted an article from *The Oregonian*. He said he would like the Council to consider the inclusion of areas 38 to 42, at least as an urban reserve.

Mike Stewart 20577 SW Johnson Road, West Linn, OR 97068, said he was a little alarmed that people were saying they were blindsided by Executive Officer Burton's inclusion of the Stafford Triangle on his recommendation the 5th. In Clackamas County's newsletter that was out in May of this year, it states that the date that the Economic Development Commission first recommended the Stafford area come in to the urban growth boundary. That was in the year 2000. And then again in February of this year, that was reiterated. So for the people that were blindsided, they were not paying attention to what was released by the county. Mr. Stewart told the councilors their task is to plan for the future. He said Clackamas County was working on catching up regarding jobs versus housing, and placing the Stafford Triangle in the UGB as employment land now would encourage new business and provide land for existing business to stay and grow. That would decrease the outflow of traffic from Clackamas County, which is a major concern, and it will increase the tax revenue. With the information presented to you in the Phase III Regional

Industrial Land Study, Mr. Steward said, you have the dated support to correct the decision and that decision is to bring the Stafford Triangle in the UGB as employment land today.

Constance Ewing, 227 Fourth Street, Lake Oswego, OR 97034, talked a little about infill development, saying Metro's definition mentions only vacant land, but a more general definition says of "unused or vacant land and under-utilized land." One definition would be infill development keeps resources where people are already live allows rebuilding to occur, and infill development is the key to accommodating growth and redesigning our cities to be environmentally and socially sustainable. Ms. Ewing quoted from a document from Smart Communities Network, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy that addressed sprawl and infill, and spoke more on that. She concluded that, as the document of photographs she provided showed, vacant land is available and there are many, many properties that are under-utilized.

Councilor Burkholder said that the one thing the Council really cares about is how do we infill. In our next year, we have quite a few programs that we are working on in terms of how do we encourage more development in areas. We do look at areas that are under-utilized, too, in our vacant land inventory or under-utilized land development. He said a lot of us would like to see more of that and we are putting more money in resources into that in the future as well.

Dorothy Cofield, 4248 Gailwood, Lake Oswego, OR 97035, said she represented Bill Vandermolen, who in study area 31, which was not proposed to be included in the UGB. She said she had submitted written testimony on November 1st, November 21st, and December 4th and has testified. She quickly reviewed the facts of this case, the Vandermolen property, and asked that the Council include inside the UGB that part of area 31.

Rob DeGraff, Portland Business Alliance, 221 NW 2nd, #300, Portland, OR 97209, reiterated his support for the Regional partners and their approach in the industrial lands need that the Council is addressing in this expansion of the UGB. He said MPAC and MTAC had done a pretty good job in terms of addressing the immediate need. There are still greater needs for industrial land and that will have the opportunity to address those in Task 3. He thanked the Council for their efforts on this issue and said he looked forward to working with them in the future.

Councilor Park said he just wanted to make sure for the record that the regionally significant industrial lands overlay was something the Portland Business Alliance does support in terms of protecting that industrial base. Mr. DeGraff responded yes.

Phillip Lapp, 17400 SW Brookman Road, Sherwood, OR 97140, submitted his written testimony on study area 55, and reviewed it for the Council. The City of Sherwood and the county said they were in no position or unwilling to serve that area. Both NW Natural and Metro say they don't know about a NW Natural proposed 24-inch gas line going down Brookman Road. Mr. Lapp said he thought the two agencies needed to talk to each other. He said if we are talking about bringing that land in so that we can plan for it than he was in favor of that so that we don't have to build a road and dig it up the next day to put in a gas line and vice versa. That property would significantly increase the traffic on to 99W or into Sherwood and they are not in the position to upgrade that. He said he had also heard from a lot of agriculture people who are saying that when you have urbanization next to agriculture land they can no longer can farm, and as he owned 57 acres there, that was his position. He actively farmed, or was trying to. That property acts as a buffer between the high-density Sherwood area and his agriculture operation. If urbanization moves over to Brookman Road he will be forced to, not by his own choosing, but because of neighborhoods, abandon farming. And he said he doesn't know what Metro wants to do. He said he thinks that if we want to look at in a large case, the present border provides a soft boundary to the growth. If we bring it up to Brookman Road, it becomes a hard boundary. And you have a half street, because half of it is in and the other half is out, which is a poor utilization of land. If we are going to do anything,

Mr. Lapp said let's move it clear up to the bottom of Ladd Hill and look at that whole area then. But he concluded by saying he recommended not including area 55 and especially that area that is impacted by his agricultural operation.

Doug Rux, Community Development Director, City of Tualatin, 18880 SW Martinazzi Avenue, Tualatin, OR 97062, spoke to study area 47 and area 49 partial, specifically to Exhibit M, Section 2, Specific Conditions, Subsections E2 & E3. Subsections E2 and E3, he said, deal with 50-acre parcel size and E3 deals with no commercial uses. He said he thought there was a need to provide some clarifications on this particular area. First of all, the area is 62 acres gross which includes railroad right-of-away, public rights-of-away, wetlands, and the BPA power line. The individual properties (there are 7 individual properties under 6 ownerships) total 49.9 acres. When the wetlands (approximately 3 acres) were taken out, it's down to about 46 acres. There is no physical way, unless you vacate rights-of-way or somehow get BPA to relinquish their ownership of their power line, that you are going to get to a 50-acre minimum in that particular area. He directed the Council to Exhibit F, which is the regionally significant industrial land, Section 3.07.420, Subsection F, which already puts restrictions on limitations on minimum parcel sizes. He said Tualatin believes it should follow within that category. Finally, on that particular topic, is the one about no commercial uses. Again, he referred to Exhibit F, Section 3.07.420, Subsection C, which already has limitations on commercial uses within regionally significant industrial land areas. The belief is that both of these conditions are onerous and really don't work for this small limited area.

Councilor Hosticka asked Mr. Rux if he was recommending taking out that whole Subsection E.

Mr. Rux said they could eliminate Subsection 2 and Subsection 3, but that he would caution against to doing that. He said he was just clarifying that Exhibit F applies to regionally significant areas that have been designated on a map to be adopted by December 2003. Whereas, the conditions that are specific to 47 and 49, he believed, would go into effect with the adoption of the ordinance.

Councilor Hosticka and Mr. Rus discussed Exhibit F and what it meant. Mr. Rux's second point of this testimony was concerning the regionally economic development partners and he spoke on their behalf concerning comments that were submitted into the record this evening from 1000 of Oregon concerning the issue of how the methodology was calculated in the industrial land need. He said he supported the Regional Industrial Land Study and how that was used by Metro in the Urban Growth Report. Of the material that was submitted, some of the items have not reviewed by any professionals in economic development or land use planning and the variables, and he recommended the Council use caution in looking in that information.

Bob Thomas, 2563 Pinnacle Drive, West Linn, OR 97068, said he had earlier submitted documents by fax today and was told by the Council office that they were all distributed to the Councilors. The main point of my submittal was to show through valid numbers that there is no need to expand the UGB anywhere at this time for housing residential use. Mr. Thomas then spoke to his written testimony, asking that Metro leave his City of West Linn alone because they don't need any more housing, they have enough room for 8,000 more regardless of what developers say and he emphasized that in the whole metropolitan region no land for housing is needed outside the UGB. He also encouraged them to read his testimony regarding jobs and commercial.

Cindy Strid, 9323 NW Old Skyline, Portland, OR 97231, asked to share her feelings and ideas on behalf of the population that has no voice concerning the proposed expansion of the UGB to include study area 94. The population she spoke of was the deer, the bobcat, the coyote, the raccoon, frogs and the birds. As stewards and elders of our lands as she perceived the Council to be, she urged on behalf of future generations to vote no in allowing this part of urban growth boundary proposal to be developed.

Presiding Officer Hosticka closed the public hearing and closed the record, except for Ordinance No. 02-990, which would be heard next week. He thanked everyone for their patience and then explained the procedure for consideration of the ordinance. He said the ordinance was a framework that referred to a series of exhibits, starting with Exhibit A and ending with Exhibit P. He suggested working through it exhibit by exhibit to have the opportunity to discuss each one and consider any proposed changes, then when they were finished, to look at the whole ordinance.

Councilor Atherton asked when the Urban Growth Report (UGR) would be considered. Mr. Benner replied that Section 14 of the Ordinance made reference to Appendix A, which contained the UGR, but it was not an exhibit, it was an appendix to the exhibit. He said the council could take it up at any time, but it made sense to take it up after the exhibits amending the code or the regional framework plan. Presiding Officer Hosticka clarified that they would go through the exhibits dealing with policy, then the UGR, and then the maps.

Councilor Park thanked the public for being involved and for working on the urban form. He thanked the local partners and Metro staff, and Mr. Burton. He said this process was unique to Oregon. He recapped the current recommendations, prior to amendments and gave an overview of the massive public outreach efforts that had been made. He noted that not all of the amendments were addressed in Ordinance No. 02-969. He some would be addressed later in separate ordinances. He reviewed the criteria and the pieces they were considering. He said they had been studying approximately 80,000 acres in 94 study sites, and that recognized that the laws and the goals were often competing. He said they were trying to achieve the best balance for the state and the region and had painstakingly followed the state law and goals (see a copy of his remarks included with the permanent record of this meeting). Presiding Officer Hosticka directed that they would go through the exhibits dealing with policy issues, then look at the Urban Growth Report, and then specific sites and conditions. Mr. Benner reviewed Exhibit A and some recommended minor changes. Councilor McLain asked about different reporting standards from different jurisdictions. Mr. Benner said the reporting requirements in the ordinance were general. She noted the Council expected there would be standardization of the definitions used by the jurisdictions for easier comparison for the 2003 work. Councilor Monroe asked if any of the changes would require the ordinance to be held over. Mr. Benner said no. Councilor Park noted that the capacity numbers and that this was no longer a target, and would be what was actually zoned.

Mr. Benner said there were no proposed changes to Exhibit B. He gave an overview of the Exhibit.

Mr. Benner said Exhibit C was a new title in the Metro Code Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, which implements the policy in the Code. He explained the changes, which included MTAC recommendations and included in the draft the council was looking at.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Burkholder moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A to change the word "consider" in Exhibit C, Section d, to "prioritize".

Seconded: Councilor Bragdon seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this represents a material revision. Mr. Cooper said no.

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

Mr. Benner said Exhibit D had two new policies having to do with industrial land. In combination, they established a new design type for the 2040 Growth Concept called Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and described those areas as especially suitable for industrial development. It also says Metro will work

with local governments to protect them from incompatible uses. Councilor McLain clarified that there was a year for them to take the concept map of what that would account to and have an opportunity to work with jurisdictions on what would be significant industrial land. She reminded the council that they had made a commitment to get the agricultural community to the table in 2003. Mr. Cooper said Exhibit D was the policy in the Framework Plan and the detail Councilor McLain was speaking of related to how Exhibit E, the map, related to the text of the Functional Plan provisions, Exhibit F, which would be discussed next.

Mr. Benner said Exhibit F was revisions to Title 4, which went with the new policies, 1.4.1 and 1.4.2, and the map. He said Title 4 was already in the Code and the revision was the addition of the section on regionally significant industrial area and a few revisions to the provisions already in Title 4. He said with respect to the regionally significant industrial areas already inside the boundary, there were not precise boundaries of those areas shown, rather Title 4 talked about a process that would begin after this ordinance was adopted and wind up by the end of 2003.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Bragdon moved to amend Exhibit F (a copy of which is included in the record).

Seconded: Councilor Monroe seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this represents a material revision. Mr. Cooper said no.

Councilor Bragdon said these amendments reflected some of the comments that Beverly Bookin and others had spoken to in their testimony. The change was designed to prevent office encroachment into industrial areas. He said an exception was made under "e" for corporate headquarters. He said violating the industrial sanctuaries with office use would be a very rare occurrence, as for a large employer for a headquarters. He said F.1 related to sites and parcels. He said approximately half of the acreage need was in the 20 acre or less range and they needed to provide some flexibility to be adaptable to market conditions. The amendment provides that flexibility on the lower end of the scale, still confined to industrial uses. Councilor McLain clarified that they were talking about lots less than 50 acres so the Shute and Evergreen corner would not apply. Councilor Bragdon said that was correct. Mr. Cooper further explained the conditions that applied to land being brought into the UGB were cumulative for regionally significant industrial areas. He said there was a condition yet to be discussed that said if land is brought into the UGB as a regionally significant industrial area, when the comprehensive planning is done it must meet this section of the code, plus any additional conditions. He noted Shute and Evergreen had an even stronger condition. Councilor Bragdon reviewed some final housekeeping changes. He urged approval of the amendments to Exhibit F. He said they should consider this as the first step of going forward on Task 3 if this amendment passed.

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

Mr. Benner explained Exhibit G, which had no proposed changes. Councilor McLain thought Exhibit G showed Metro's definite support of centers. Councilor Bragdon added that if they were successful at this, there would be fewer UGB decisions in the future.

Mr. Benner explained Exhibit H and MTAC's recommended changes, which were included in the document in front of the Council. Councilor Burkholder asked why the deadline for community centers was set for five years. Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said MPAC had recommended five years, and MTAC had recommended coordinating that centers planning activity with the periodic review that each local government would be going through. He said they were concerned that this was an aggressive plan as not all centers were created equal. Councilor Park asked why they had left off neighborhood centers.

Mr. Cotugno said they didn't have any identified neighborhood centers at this time. Councilor Park asked, if they knew such things existed, and they knew they were trying to create them, why would they not want to include them at this time. Mr. Benner responded that it was an unknown burden for local governments. He said they might want to change it over time as neighborhood centers were known.

Mr. Benner explained that Exhibit J was a new policy to the Regional Framework Plan, 1.9, that would implement the centers policy that says when you amend the UGB, you should strive to ensure that the amendment enhanced and aided a center. He said there no additional changes proposed since it came out of the Community Planning committee.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Burkholder moved to amend Exhibit J to replace the word "consider" with "determine" in the phrase, "when Metro expands the boundary it shall ~~consider~~ determine whether expansion will enhance the roles of regional town centers. (see Burkholder #2 amendment.)

Seconded: Councilor Bragdon seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this represents a material revision. Mr. Cooper said no.

Councilor McLain asked legal staff for clarification on the responsibilities that would go along with the word "determine". Mr. Cooper replied that it would not be much different and would not be a material revision of the ordinance. Mr. Benner pointed out that this amendment would change the policy, and for it to be effective, you would also have to change the following Exhibit where it was put into code language. Councilor Atherton asked if there were other sections that incorporated Urban Growth Boundary principles. Mr. Benner said there were other sections of the Regional Framework Plan, i.e., the policy on urban form. There is direction from the Council on the UGB in several existing policies, but this would be a new policy. He said the objectives were in the RFP itself. Councilor Park wondered if they were leaving the central city out by enhancing the goals of town centers and regional centers. He suggested leaving changing the wording to say simply "centers" rather than regional or town centers. Mr. Benner responded that central city was not included in the policy because it was not bordered by the UGB and, generally speaking, the UGB was quite distant from the central city. Councilor Park asked if this wording would allow them to not consider the central city if they chose not to. Councilor McLain said there had been considerable discussion about why central city was not included. She said a future amendment could work, but she thought they needed to test this out as it was new.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said they had seen plenty of evidence that their actions to change the UGB could have an impact on the city center, so while this was prospective language, he agreed for the purposes of discussion that they probably should talk about centers in general at some time. Councilor Park agreed.

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

Mr. Benner explained Exhibit K. He said it was an amendment to existing codes on UGB expansion to implement the policy just approved, so to be consistent with current policy, the language would be changed to say the council "shall determine" whether...

Motion to Amend: Councilor Burkholder moved to amend Exhibit K to include "determine" instead of "consider", per Burkholder Amendment #2.

Seconded: Councilor Atherton seconded the amendment.

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

Mr. Benner explained that the language in Exhibit K would authorize the council to place conditions on the expansion of an UGB. He said Section 0.4.0 authorized them to place certain kinds of conditions, but this was a more general authorization to ensure that the addition of land would comply with state planning laws in the RFP.

Mr. Benner explained Exhibit L amends Title 11 which plays a large role in conditions and making sure that areas newly coming into the UGB got well planned. He said the changes update and modernize Title 11.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked for discussion of Appendix A, the Urban Growth Report.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Atherton moved to amend the Urban Growth Report to reflect a growth rate between the current time to the year 2022 of 1.3%.

Seconded: Councilor Hosticka passed the gavel to Deputy Presiding Officer McLain and seconded the amendment.

Councilor Atherton said this was not an issue of which forecaster to believe. He said the validity of the forecast was not the issue. He said they were called upon to exercise their judgment, and given the evidence in the record, a lower growth rate was prudent. He explained in detail from reports in the record why the Metro forecast was inaccurate. He felt strongly that the lower rate should be used and urged adoption of a smaller, 1.3% growth rate.

Councilor Atherton demonstrated an example of the relationship between plumbing and public policy using physical props. He said if the plumbing doesn't fit right, the pipes wouldn't hold water, and neither would policy arguments. He said the repairs for either could be extremely costly.

Vote to Amend: The vote was 2 aye/ 5 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors Park, Monroe, Burkholder, McLain and Bragdon voting no.

Presiding Officer Hosticka called for discussion of Exhibit N.

Motion to Amend: Councilor McLain moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A by removing sites 75 and 76, at the request of the City of Cornelius, and adding Site 77 (exception land).

Seconded: Councilor Bragdon seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this represents a material revision. Mr. Cooper said no.

Councilor McLain pointed out that she was not asking for a separate ordinance. She explained the amendment. Councilor Burkholder commented that Sites 75 and 76 were intended as industrial and had no dwelling units capacity. He asked about the dwelling unit capacity in Site 77. Councilor McLain said it was non-residential and none of the requests had noted a need for residential. Councilor Park asked if it was inside the city limits. Mr. O'Brien said yes.

Councilor Burkholder commented that the City of Cornelius was interested in more industrial land but because of the EFU land they were asking to bring in, the council did not feel they could support it. He said they would be considering industrial needs in the next year and had told Cornelius that would be a more appropriate time to talk about specific that might include EFU land. Mr. Cooper said there would need to be additional conditions and findings amended in the future, and he would point them out. Mr. Benner recommended repealing the conditions that would have applied to areas 75 and 76 and in its place have a new condition that would apply to partial area 77. It would read, "Washington County or upon annexation of the area to the City of Cornelius, the City shall complete Title 11 planning for the included portion of study area 77 shown in Exhibit N." He said the general conditions in Exhibit N would also apply to this area. Presiding Officer clarified that the words Mr. Benner just read would be a substitute for M where they would substitute 77 partial and put in the words that Mr. Benner just read. Mr. Benner said that was correct.

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

Motion to Amend: Councilor Hosticka moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A by deleting area 94.

Seconded: Councilor Atherton seconded the amendment.

Councilor Hosticka said that they had heard testimony from the City of Portland and citizens. From a residential capacity point of view that the additional or deletion of area 94 would make very little difference to the amount of residential capacity that we would be adding to the Urban Growth Boundary. There was also a legitimate question whether the addition or deletion of area 94 would effect the natural resource and habitat qualities of that area and the protections that would be afforded to those areas. He was persuaded, by both the testimony of Mayor and a number of the citizens, that leaving it out of the UGB at this point in time provided a greater opportunity for a variety of methods to be used to continue protection of that area and that bringing it in might preclude some of those protections. There was not a lot of substantive difference on either side to bring it in but their options would be enhanced by leaving it out he was moving to take it out.

Councilor Monroe said the issue was an issue of fairness. Fairness was very important. The City convinced property owners 40 years ago to be annexed. This property had been within the City of Portland for 40 years. The city had been collecting taxes and the property owners had been paying taxes for the past 40 years. Yet they property owners' hands have been tied in terms of being able to do anything productive with their land. There were portions of this land where productive activity could take place. There were other portions with steep slopes or that were riparian that must be protected. He felt the City of Portland's regulations were the strictest in the State and would protect natural habitat. If the City of Portland wanted this land to be left outside of urbanization, then they should have de-annexed. The city had 30 years in which they had collected taxes from these property owners. It made sense to increase the regulation of this area by bringing it into the UGB allowing the City of Portland at its discretion to appropriately plan for what needed to be protected and what kind of regulations needed to be enforced and what kind of minimal development may be appropriate in certain portions of it. He opposed the motion.

Councilor Bragdon said this was a difficult decision. The appeal had been made to save Forest Park through a UGB action. That was the troubling part for him. Legally, as well as, morally that was a flawed rationale for making an Urban Growth Boundary decision. Forest Park itself was within the Urban Growth Boundary, it was not a matter of being in or out of the UGB that saved Forest Park, it was a matter of if being purchased by the public sector and the buffers around it being appropriately regulated and zoned by the jurisdictions. When you come to area 94, the proposal was not to build houses in Forest

Park. Everything that was said about area 94 was correct. There were two other things that were true that this decision hinges on. One, this was privately owned property, this property was similarly situated to others who had had their property treated differently because of the UGB. The second distinguishing factor was that it was within the city limits. It seemed to him that annexation implied with it an intention to urbanize. That was when this bell was rung. That gave the property owners certain expectations that related to the fairness of it. They pay taxes to be in the City of Portland and they pay taxes for a level of urban services. To use a regional tool such as an Urban Growth Boundary which was designed under state law to separate cities from county to separate one part of a city from another and treat like situated property owners differently, was a misapplication of the UGB. It was privilege to live near Forest Park. He didn't think that the UGB should be use to extend that privilege to some residents of a city and deny it to other similarly situated residents of the same city. It was a misuse of the tool. The proper tool to protect Forest Park was primarily in the hand of the City of Portland and explained further those tools. The final piece was hearing the testimony that was because it was treated outside the UGB under the Forest Practices Act of Oregon could actually eligible for clear cutting if it was not in the UGB. That was a matter of fairness as well. He was going to oppose this amendment.

Councilor Burkholder said he would be supporting this amendment. He didn't think this was about Forest Park or wildlife habitat. It was about what were they doing here today and whether area 94 met the goals that they had. In 1.9, one of the goals was to enhance the roles of the regional town centers and to ensure that it did. They had done an analysis of how well each piece met the 2040 fundamentals in terms of how can we achieve our 2040 Growth Concept. This property ranked at the very bottom. It also ranked at the bottom in terms of its value for urbanization and ease of urbanization. Standing by itself it was not meeting the goals that Metro had set when they were looking at land to bring into the UGB. We try to resist trying to use our UGB decision making to solve all of the problems out there that had been created over the last 100 years through varies types of zoning practices. He tried to look at each area and asked if it met out 2040 fundamentals. Is it the best choice for urbanization? Does it provide housing capacity, which was the purpose for expanding the UGB at this time? In all of those cases this property failed regardless of its value as habitat or proximity to Forest Park. He supported the motion to withdraw it.

Councilor Park said he agreed of much of what Councilor Bragdon said. It was an inappropriate tool for the use in this particular case. He found it interesting in terms of consistency that they had other areas that were currently outside of Metro jurisdictional boundary that they were having to enter into intergovernmental agreements on regulation of those particular areas pursuant to our Title 11 policies because they were outside of our jurisdictional boundary. He didn't think we should use this tool for environmental protection or that it would be supported by LCDC. He would be opposing the motion for consistency sake.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Benner if there were other cities in the State of Oregon who had annexed territories beyond their UGB?

Mr. Benner responded that he was aware of circumstances of about half a dozen to a dozen where there were currently city limits outside of UGBs. It had not been the situation that Councilor Atherton described. It had been where the UGB was drawn after the territory was annexed. The area was drawn based on Goal 14 and left land that was in the city limits outside of the UGB, Dundee was an example.

Councilor Atherton asked about the Forest Practices Act and the requirement for replanting regardless of whether it is inside or outside a UGB.

Mr. Benner said that was correct. The Forest Practices Act still regulates Forest Practices whether land was inside or outside of the UGB. The difference was that once forestland was within the UGB, a city or

county could chose to regulate the practices. If they do not exercise that option, then, forestland could be harvested inside a boundary.

Councilor Atherton said in this particular case, the land was inside a city boundary so they could have jurisdiction over the forest practices.

Mr. Benner said the City could prohibit forest practices on land inside its city limits if it was outside the boundary. If it comes into the UGB, the city could prohibit logging.

Councilor Atherton asked if the property owners in area 94 paid regular property taxes? If they had farm/forest deferral lands then they get lower tax only on that parcel.

Mr. Benner said if they chose they could enroll their land in any of the special assessment programs for forestlands.

Councilor Bragdon appreciated Mr. Benner's clarification on State Forest Practices Act. It sounded like area 94 would be governed by that and the forest could potentially be cut. The moral question was, was it proper for the government to say to a property owner, no we will not let you be part of a city but on the other hand no we won't let you use it as the resource land. He felt this was troubling irony and the other irony was that other people were being allowed to enjoy this privilege in terms of living close to the buffer and trying to prevent other similarly situated people from having that privilege.

Councilor McLain said they had spent many hours on this issue. First, there was a balance where there were property owners who had been treated as city dwellers because they had been paying taxes. That was half of the balancing act. We have people who have had to pay for services that had been provided in certain areas but they had been treated as if they belonged to the City of Portland and that they have citizenship to that city. We also have a situation where we have a city park, Forest Park was an urban park. It was inside the UGB. The other balancing act was figuring out how much we can buy, how much we can be regulated by the City of Portland and how much we can do with other tools. We know that when we include that acreage that they were going for a high density of housing in this area. We know we weren't going for building houses in the park, it was a public owned park. She would be voting against this motion. She would be bringing forward an amendment that may take care of all of these concerns.

Presiding Officer Hosticka closed by saying he appreciated the discussion they had. The discussion kept the faith. From his perspective these concerns were not persuasive. Annexation proceeded the creation of the UGB so this was a similar situation to other places and that the annexation wasn't following the UGB. Regardless of when it happened, times change. One of the founding principles of our democracy was that the sins of the parents wouldn't be visited on the children. If a decision was made previously that they don't like today, they shouldn't have to stick with that decision or we have to pay the prices of that decision rather we should say what can we do to make things right from here. On the fairness issue, they had heard testimony from more of the property owners in that area that they would rather be outside the UGB than said they wanted to be in. The main reason for making this motion was to talk about how this area and natural habitat values of this area could be protected. He said Councilor Monroe had suggested one option, which was to be annexed. If it comes into the UGB, he thought they were foreclosing on that possibility. Regardless of what is done tonight there was not likely to be a lot of change in that area or in the urban form. If we bring it into the boundary, we have limited our options for future considerations.

Vote to Amend:

The vote was 3 aye/ 4 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors Monroe, Bragdon, McLain and Park voting no.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Atherton moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A to delete areas 24, 25 and 26P.

Seconded: Councilor Hosticka seconded the amendment.

Councilor Atherton said this was a semi-rural area, which had significant impact on Newell and Abernathy Creeks in Oregon City. They had extensive testimony from the people who live there that they do not want to be incorporated into the UGB. They also had testimony while in Oregon City that there had not been any significant public process for review of this within their community. There was also a surplus of 660 dwelling units. If you were to take these sites out, that would bring it into almost perfect alignment with the need.

Vote to Amend: The vote was 1 aye/ 5 nay/ 1 abstain. The motion failed with Councilor Atherton voting aye and Councilor Hosticka abstaining from the vote.

Mr. Benner spoke to changes in conditions in Exhibit M. There was a new general condition, G. It applied to all areas.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if they had adopted an inventory. Mr. Cooper said, yes, Council had already adopted an inventory and forwarded to an ESEE analysis stage. Presiding Officer Hosticka said that the maps that were adopted last summer would be applicable under this condition? Mr. Cooper responded yes.

Councilor Atherton said they had earlier conditions that were directed toward trying to allow a new community of Damascus to create a greenbelt community concept. Did this allow for that type of development? Mr. Cooper said the wording of this condition was verbatim removed from the Damascus only conditions and would now apply everywhere through all of the UGB additions. The exact words were still applicable to Damascus that had that intent to allow that.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said, on the Bethany area, were these similar conditions or were these blanket conditions? Mr. Cooper said when they got to Bethany they will explain how those conditions would be piggy backed on to these. In general yes, they intended to make sure that the applicable general conditions would also apply in Bethany.

Mr. Benner noted that A-2 was now a general condition. It would apply to all areas. He said another change that they had prepared was on page 3, which required the protection of the rights-of-way for the Sunrise.

Councilor Bragdon asked about number 5, in terms of the transportation facilities, Sunrise Corridor was talked about without a lot of discussion about the design. Did the use of the highway preclude boulevard in the appropriate urban portions? Did the word highway imply a certain design that the community may not end up wanting? Mr. Benner said he didn't think it was binding in any way on the nature of the facility. The term came from the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan. Councilor Bragdon asked, if the community should determine that they want portions of it to be in a boulevard type treatment was the precluded by the current wording? Mr. Benner said he did not believe so.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, said Councilor Bragdon made a good point. Since the concept planning hadn't been done, and a final decision on whether it was a highway or some other form of roadway out there hadn't been decided yet, he suggested using the word Sunrise Corridor. Once the

concept planning had established what it is, then, they preservation of right-of-way would need to be kicked in.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Bragdon moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A to read in subsection 5, page 3 if prior to the completion by Clackamas County by Title 11 planning, the County and Metro determine through amendment to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan to build a proposed Sunrise Corridor. The County shall provide the preservation of proposed rights-of-way as part of the conceptual transportation plan.

Seconded: Councilor Monroe seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka called for objection. There was none, the motion passed unanimously.

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

Motion to Amend: Councilor Burkholder moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A to insert a sentence after the sting of study areas 19, which said appropriate portions of other study areas shall be considered those intended for governance by a new city of Damascus. (it was the part associated with Damascus rather than Happy Valley).

Seconded: Councilor Bragdon seconded the amendment.

Councilor Park said he thought number 4 covered Councilor Burkholder's concern.

Mr. Benner said it didn't hurt to cover it twice.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked about number 1. He thought it only directed them to look at existing official governmental bodies. Was there anyway they could incorporate non-governmental bodies like the CPO in that area into this language?

Mr. Benner said he didn't think there was anything that would prevent that. He explained what Title 11 said, it spoke to local government that have land use planning authority and that was cities and counties. There was a sentence in the section that said the counties and they were the ones that had the authority today because it was within their jurisdictions. It said, the counties should invite the participation of the cities of Gresham and Happy Valley. You could also require that they invite the participation of other special districts.

Presiding Officer Hosticka's said his concern was that we were saying that this had to be done in four years. His intention in asking for these kind of conditions was that some how the residents of the area itself are participants. It may be unlikely that a portion of the area would incorporate within those four years. So, he didn't see what mechanism you have written in here for the residents of the area to be participants. He thought there should be some designation that would be group representing the citizens and the CPO seemed to be the official one he was aware of.

Councilor Park said the question was an excellent one. He understood their plans were to seek incorporation in the Fall 2003, which would be within the time period. He wasn't sure how we would

designate an entity that doesn't exist today. They would have to invite citizen participation in that particular area as part of their Goal 1 responsibilities. He thought they were being too prescriptive.

Mr. Benner said anyone could participate in that because it will have to be an open process. What Councilor Hosticka was talking about was a more formal type of participation. He didn't know how you would make reference to an organization that doesn't yet exist.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if citizen-planning organizations exist in Clackamas County?

Mr. Cooper said to the extent that you were referring to Goal 1, Clackamas County would be required to have the CPO involved in this. The CPO will have to have a formal role in process.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said he wanted this on the record.

Councilor Atherton said area 19 had to be deleted per Mayor Grant's testimony. Councilor Park said that area referred to the Carver area and Mr. Grant said that was below Hwy 212 and Happy Valley was not interested in that particular area. It would be more appropriate for the Damascus area.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this would materially change this ordinance? Mr. Cooper said no. Presiding Officer Hosticka called for objection to the motion. There was no objection to the motion, the motion passed.

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

Mr. Benner said there was testimony from the City of Gresham that it wanted to make sure that it was involved in the planning. He noted A-1 on page 2, "the counties shall invite the participation of Gresham and Happy Valley". They will be involved in the planning.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked about other issues on conditions.

Mr. Benner said on page 4 of Exhibit M dealing with studies areas 47 and 49. He noted the testimony of Mr. Rux of the City of Tualatin who urged them to delete E-2 and E-3. Study areas 47 and 49 were added to the UGB to provide for industrial land.

According to Exhibit N, the map, portions of both of those study areas were designated a regionally significant industrial area. This was the reason the staff recommended the two conditions E-2 and E-3. In the testimony tonight they heard that there was no possibility of getting an aggregated parcel there as large as 50 acres because the total area did not add up to 50 acres and it had a wetland on it. He recommended taking out #2 which required the consolidation. The second was to change #2 about the reconfiguration plan, which would read "develop a lot parcel reconfiguration plan for the areas that results in the largest practicable parcel." The purpose for keeping it was that they had designated regionally significant, you were responding to evidence in the record that there was a shortage of large parcels and this parcel can't get to 50 acres but it could larger than the constituent parcels that make it up. They didn't recommend a change to point 3.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Monroe moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A Exhibit M Condition E-2 on Study Areas 47 and 49, the condition would be changed to "develop a lot parcel reconfiguration plan for the areas that results in the largest practicable parcel."

Seconded: Councilor Atherton seconded the amendment.

Councilor Burkholder reminded the Council that they shouldn't look at this in isolation. There was another ordinance, which may or may not pass to add land to the north of these parcels in area 48 for industrial purposes.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked Mr. Benner if they can't reconfigure the plan because the landowners don't agree, what happens to this condition?

Mr. Benner said the term practicable means it was not enough for the landowners just to disagree. He was not sure how it worked out if they have no landowners interested in putting it together. He presumed what would happen then was the city or the county which was doing the Title 11 planning would come back to Council and tell them what the situation was and say we just can't do it and the condition needed to be changed.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said it said, in conjunction with property owners. Did that mean that any unit of government could compel property owners to reconfigure their lots?

Mr. Benner said yes, they could do that.

Councilor McLain said, she felt strongly that the industrial land that had been recognized by the regional partners and had discussed with the Council related to this area even though it may be something that Metro looked at or added to that area to get the industrial land numbers up in areas that the Council thought were appropriate. She thought the new language that Mr. Benner had suggested give them the goal of trying to put together the largest practicable parcel. If the can't do that they could come back to Council. They had looked at conditions from other jurisdictions and have modified when they couldn't make the condition work. The Council gave them the goal of trying to do it. Because they were between 1800 and 2000 acres low on industrial land and they had been told there was a variety of needs out there, that they needed to let the condition work.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said he would be voting against this motion because it was based on false premises. The premise seemed to be that somebody had asked them to bring this in for certain purposes. As he understood the history of these particular parcels, they had been brought in on motion of individual councilors. They were not part of someone else's master plan. There are other areas which Council was considering in another ordinance next week which were part of that bigger plan which dealt with resource areas which were the areas that they were primarily concerned about in terms of regionally significant industrial lands. These lands were exception areas and should be treated as any other industrial lands. They had just made a motion to let any parcel less than 50 acres be subdivided down to as small as practicable. He didn't think that we should be adding extra conditions on these particular pieces of land because he didn't think they fit the definition that they were using for regionally significant industrial land.

Councilor Atherton said wasn't the special condition here the existence of a power line and easement property? Presiding Officer Hosticka said this was exception land entirely.

- | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vote to Amend: | The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilors Hosticka and Atherton voting no. |
| Motion to Amend: | Councilor Burkholder moved to amend B of Exhibit M to include study areas 24, 25, and 26 under the second condition. |
| Seconded: | Councilor Monroe seconded the amendment. |

Councilor Burkholder said area 24 included the new road and he wanted to ensure that was include as well and then any other road improvements that happen in that area that lead up to the school since the school district raised that issue very specifically as their major concern was traffic without having sidewalks and bike lanes coming to their school.

Councilor Park suggested a friendly amendment, to take B-2 out of the specific conditions for the specific areas to be brought in and put it under general conditions to be applicable to all land added to the UGB. Then it would apply to any school site and the transportation plan referring to that school sites. The maker of the motion and seconder of the motion accepted the friendly amendment. Presiding Officer Hosticka reiterated the motion. Mr. Benner suggested in the same motion dropping D-3, which had that condition on area 45 because that area had a school site in it. Presiding Officer Hosticka said the motion included where ever reference to transportation plans for school areas appears in the conditions that they be taken out of the specific conditions and put into general conditions.

Councilor Monroe said this was good public policy to advocate for sidewalks and bike lanes to and from schools. This was also a cost saving measure and explained that this would have the effect of reducing bussing costs to local school districts.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this materially effected the ordinance? Mr. Cooper said no. Presiding Officer called for objection to the motion. There was no objection to the motion, the motion passed.

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

Mr. Benner spoke to additional recommended amendments. Page 5, Item K, Study Areas 67 and 69. Mr. Bergsma pointed out that a portion of area 69 which would come in, it was likely that Hillsboro should be responsible for the Title 11 planning and would ultimately annex it. He suggested that they add, after the City of Beaverton, or the City of Hillsboro.

Motion to Amend: Councilor McLain moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A under condition K in the first sentence, after the words Beaverton, we add or the City of Hillsboro.

Seconded: Councilor Burkholder seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka called for objection to the motion. There was not objection, the motion passed.

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

Mr. Benner said based on the previous action, M would be changed and there would be two changes to study areas 93, 89 and 94. There was language on area 93 that said complete the Title 11 planning within six years after the effective date of this ordinance. This was added after testimony from the City of Portland about it being a while before they could get to the planning. They erroneously attached it to area 93 but should be attached to area 94. The Council would need to decide if they wanted it to be six years. The change would be to take the clause and put it down under area 94. Councilor McLain had spoken earlier about a condition that would speak to the density, the number of dwelling units, that would come out.

Motion to Amend: Councilor McLain moved to amend Ordinance No. 02-969A under N to delete the words "within six years after the effective date of the ordinance" and under O was to insert those words at the end of the first sentence and then add a second sentence

which said "the expected number of dwelling units determined in Title 11 planning process shall reflect the City of Portland's residential farm forest zone including environmental overlay zones".

Seconded: Councilor Park seconded the amendment.

Councilor Park asked if including environmental overlay zone trumped our Goal 5 inventory? Councilor McLain said her understanding was that this dealt with Title 3. They had Goal 5 language in general conditions and there were interim conditions listed as well. Mr. Cooper added that the Goal 5 program was explicit that what ever you do was not a limit on what local jurisdictions can do. They can go beyond Metro's Goal 5. If they have more stringent environmental protections that Metro requires in Goal 5 they were free to adopt them.

Presiding Officer Hosticka called for objection to the motion. There was no objection. The motion passed.

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

Councilor McLain asked about Exhibit M where they would be inserting area 77 partial, it would read that it would be covered by general conditions?

Mr. Benner said yes. Councilor McLain said she didn't see Bethany. Mr. Cooper responded that Bethany was in a separate ordinance. What Councilor McLain had done on her amendment in Cornelius on area 77 partial was on the map it would show as an employment area not as a residential area.

Councilor Atherton asked about Exhibit N on the map, he wanted to ask about a change in the description for West Linn study area 37 where it calls for enhancement of the near by civic center. He noted testimony from the Mayor of West Linn and members of their council that this was not designated their civic center, it was a neighborhood center. They had expressed the interest in developing a community and civic center down by the river. Councilor Park asked for clarification on the findings. Were they supposed to be changing the findings? Mr. Cooper suggested that Mr. Benner explain what the findings were and what they intend to do and how they tie together with the rest of the ordinance. To some extent word smithing the findings was a meaningless exercise as well as not changing the law.

Mr. Benner divided the findings, Exhibit P, into two general sections. Section one was general findings and section two was specific findings. In the general findings was where they say what the regional need was. It didn't make sense to talk about need in the context of individual areas. Also there were some general findings about coordination with local government, citizen involvement and the need for land. There was then a discussion on page 2 about the process Council followed in examining alternatives. The first alternative they considered was increasing the capacity of the existing UGB. There was discussion about what the Council did to increase the capacity for housing and for employment. On page 3, the section talked about expanding the UGB. Having taken the efficiency measures, there was still a need for dwelling units and employment land. E talked, in a general way, about how Council decided which areas to take into the boundary. Then, page 4 through the end of the general findings, Council discussed how they considered water quality, natural hazards and economic development. All of these were things they considered when they decided which areas to take in. On page 5, there were specific findings for particular areas. There was discussion of the locational factors of Goal 14 which Council weighed when they decided to take parcel A and not parcel B. These were Metro's Regional Framework Plan policies, the Metro Code provisions and other relevant criteria. There was a lengthy discussion starting on page 5 to 11, which was a description of all of the factors and how they were applied to the Damascus-Gresham areas. Then following that, there was discussion of specific study areas concerning the alternatives

analysis, and particular materials that were submitted into the record during consideration of the areas. Further, since Council had deleted areas 75 and 76, it would be appropriate to delete the findings for those two areas, and include the findings for area 77 partial.

Motion to Amend: Councilor McLain moved to remove the findings for Areas 75 and 76 and add findings for partial area 77.

Seconded: Councilor Atherton seconded the amendment.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if this made a material difference to the Ordinance. Mr. Cooper said no. Presiding Officer Hosticka called for objection to the motion. There was none. The motion passed.

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

Motion to Amend: Councilor Atherton moved to change the reference to civic center in area 37 be changed to neighborhood center.

Mr. Cooper explained why the term, civic center, was used. Civic center was not a term that was defined in the Functional Plan, town center was. They reflected the testimony from the City of West Linn that this area there was not a town center so the use of the term civic center was their descriptor to label that area. Neighborhood center was a term inserted into the Code for the first time under the Functional Plan as something that went into an inner neighborhood. This may or may not have been designated by the City of West Linn as a neighborhood. He didn't think the difference between the two terms made a lot of difference. The purpose of the finding was to explain to the commission why it was we were doing what we were doing. Either term would be equally effective.

Councilor Atherton said it was his opinion that neighborhood center more accurately reflected what it was and what the citizens expect it to be.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked legal counsel what the significance was if they say that the reason why we included this area was to enhance something that doesn't exist.

Mr. Cooper said there was evidence in the record that there was something there. The question was what do you call it. There was also more than 20,000 square feet of retail there, which was bigger than the definition of a neighborhood center that Council had adopted. It was not designated on the 2040 Growth Concept Map as a town center. It was a commercial area. The point was that the Council was explaining to the Commission that there was some commercial, city hall, school area there which was the reason why the Council had decided the leave this area inside the areas to be added to the UGB. The facts were there, the question was what was the label for the facts.

Councilor McLain said the difference between a civic center and a neighborhood center was great because of the definition they had just added on neighborhood center. That was a problem for her. She was not willing to put in the words 'neighborhood center' when she knew that she had been there and it did not reflect what they said the definition of a neighborhood center was. They also had not mapped neighborhood centers. It was not a town center because it was not mapped and not that type of area.

Councilor Monroe said he taught civics for many years and civic center was the most appropriate terms because it was the center that surrounded city hall.

Councilor Park suggested leaving it as it is.

Councilor Bragdon said they were using a colloquial term instead of a proper noun, wouldn't that get the point across?

Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested leaving it as vague as possible and explained why. It seemed that there was no formal designation for what the area was.

Councilor Atherton said he was trying to reflect the wishes and sentiments of the citizens of West Linn and their city council. He knew that they were very serious about trying to create a civic center by the river where the library and police station was. The discussion was on the record.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if there was anything further discussion on the findings?

Mr. Cooper said the ordinance referred to appendices that were prepared in the original ordinances, which were ones submitted by the Executive Officer. What was currently in the ordinance was all of the revisions that Council had adopted and updated. They were using the Urban Growth Report that the Council had produced as a result of all of their deliberations.

Councilor Atherton noted emails he had received and the economic information on the forecast that he wished to have in the record.

Councilor McLain said she thought the work that had been done by the Community Planning Department, the legal staff, Councilor Park and the rest of the council followed the state regulations and laws that guide these types of decisions. Secondly, they understood that the need assessment, which they had used for this ordinance was guiding the amount of land that they say they need for residential and industrial need. They had heard a lot of important testimony and a lot of participation by the community. They had tried to be respectful and listen and then sort out all of the different statements. They were trying to demonstrate that this was not about amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary but about complete and full communities. This was about trying to use center strategies to try and find other tools in the tool box to utilize land inside of the UGB appropriately and to try and make sure that we have density only in places where density was appropriate particularly in the centers, main streets and in the corridors along the transit lines.

Councilor Bragdon said the process was not perfect. The size of this was daunting. The amount of acreage was staggering to him. He sometimes wondered why do all of that when you step outside of the building and see under utilized vacant lots across the street and knowing that a more wise resourceful society would be more careful about using that in the future. There was a lot of geographic imbalance in this, market pressures on one side of the region but much of the expansion was on the other side of the region. There were huge challenges of infrastructure. If they take this action tonight it didn't change a thing on the ground unless those areas could be served. The fiscal challenges were enormous. On the other hand, there was a lot of good that had come out of this year. He appreciated having these debates but they had always been very policy oriented and that had been part of the value. He felt the process had been very open and very fair. It has been as faithful to state law as they possibly can be. That was to everyone credit here. It has only begun to raise some of the conceptual issues that they will have to deal next year and into the future.

Councilor Atherton said he had been the representative of the district where most of the growth was being placed. The people there had expressed very clearly that the vast majority didn't want this kind of change. This was not just numbers. We were dealing with people's lives. He had tried to carry that message. He spoke of his experience as a boy and how it effected his decisions today. He reminded everyone, you had one chance to do it right, do it clean and not miss. Your arguments need to hold water. He thought we had missed an opportunity in this forecast. There were defining moments.

Councilor Burkholder said was the question was, was he satisfied with this decision, yes and no and explained why. He felt we could do better but we are doing better than many parts of the United States.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that he had read in the newspaper that some people felt that this was a very messy process, and his belief was that it was inherently a messy process, because it was a democratic and open process. At times the Council had appeared to be divided on some major issues, but he said he felt that reflected real divisions in the population. The genius of the process, and of Metro, was that democratically elected people had conducted it out in the open, whereas in other Metropolitan areas the process takes place behind closed doors, and by people who were very indirectly accountable to the people. While it hadn't always appeared as smooth as some would like, he said he felt that the basis on which the whole effort had been done, namely the population forecast, was not what he would think was going to happen. However, as they had heard from Mr. Potiowsky, reasonable people can make different judgments about these things, and the majority of the council had made the judgment that the number produced by Metro staff was the one to use to make decisions. He said he thought that it might be a wrong judgment, and if it were then they would have to be vigilant over the next five years and into the future. He said he wanted to make sure that the problems that may be encountered by being over-optimistic in the forecast wouldn't overwhelm the other things that Metro was trying to do in the region. He said that he intended to be at Metro and to be vigilant. He said that in the spirit of democracy, he would support the resolution, and urged the other members to do the same.

Councilor Park said that he felt that the decision proved the 20-80 rule in which you get 80% done with 20% of the effort, and then the last 20% of work takes 80% effort. He said that they needed to start working on the 80% that was currently inside the boundary. He said understood Presiding Officer Hosticka's concern about the potential of having too much land within the boundary. He said he had faith in our strong regional growth policies to prevent sprawl. He said that the UGB in the past had only contained sprawl, and that it really hadn't been adjusted. He said he thought the key issues were the strong regional policies, especially towards centers, figure out how to recycle our land supply. We need to look beyond what was done today and beyond the Metro boundaries, we need to look out to the 7-county level as Mr. Burton said, and look at planning a broader area if we really want to make a difference. He said he had a concern that satellite cities were being created, due to the lower rate of houses to jobs, and the impact that would have on the rural community. He said that he appreciated that the Presiding Officer would support the Ordinance. He said it was an open and tiring process, but that he thought that the decision would be the best that Metro had produced so far. He said that he hoped that the two attorneys at the meeting would bring back very little for them to look at once the commission had reviewed the process.

Presiding Officer Hosticka called for the vote.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain, the motion passed Councilor Atherton voting no.
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that there were a number of other Ordinances and Resolutions on the agenda and he said he felt that it would be useful to go through Ordinance No. 02-983, 02-984, and 02-987.

Councilor Park said that he thought Ordinance No. 02-983B was the only other one in condition to be considered.

Mr. Cooper explained that they did not have the findings written on all the other ones. Their effort had been put into getting the big one completed. He said that it was appropriate that Presiding Officer Hosticka could go through the other ones and takes a tentative vote, and then direct that they be carried forward for final adoption for the findings.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said he was concerned that if they were held over until the next meeting, then there were substantive amendments that materially change those ordinances, they would have to hold them over for yet another week. He said that his hope would be to come to final decisions on all of them so that they wouldn't have to get into a position of holding them over.

Councilor McLain asked if they had a basic discussion a few of them, could they bring the findings to the Council on December 10th or 12th. She wanted to know if they could be voted on by the December 12th meeting.

Mr. Cooper said yes and added that if they disposed of anything now that might look like a material amendment, they would avoid what she was worried about.

7.2 **Ordinance No. 02-983B**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add land for specific types of identified land need.

Motion	Councilor Bragdon moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-983B.
Seconded:	Councilor McLain seconded the motion.

Councilor Bragdon said this ordinance addressed a need that had been identified in the regional industrial land survey for a very specified type of land-use relative to the high tech cluster on the westside. It had a very specific need, and it was very specific site. It had been adopted at the committee level and he urged affirmation of the ordinance.

Councilor McLain said that the letter the City of Hillsboro sent on December 2nd 2002, and the letter before that which indicated their support of the conditions that Metro had put on the item that it would be for regionally significant industrial land, gave her confidence that the 200 acres would be used specifically for that type of activity. She asked the legal staff to respond to Mary Kyle McCurdy's testimony earlier, regarding the type of electricity and gas.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that he thought the request had been to change wording from "or" to "and."

Councilor McLain asked the legal staff to speak to that.

Mr. Cooper said that the implications to "or/and" narrowed even further the type of industry that would be qualified to be sited on the property. He said that from what he understood from the testimony by 1000 Friends, changing the "or" to an "and" would not necessarily mean they would withdraw their opposition to the site. He said that he and Mr. Benner felt that the "or" was sufficient.

Councilor McLain wanted to know if the lawyers had looked at the site to determine if there were alternative uses for the land.

Mr. Cooper said that the key difference between 1000 Friends' view and his findings was site assemblage versus existing parcels in one common ownership. He said that it was a judgment call.

Councilor McLain asked if Metro was required to walk the map and demonstrate that there was no other place for that designated land need, anywhere in the region.

Mr. Cooper said that the findings prepared, and the conditions, and the evidence pointed to this site. He said that Boring was not a relevant choice vis-à-vis this specific identified land need.

Councilor Park said that of all the ordinances before them, he would like to vote no on this one more than anything else. He said that enough of a case had been made to bring it in, with the 9 conditions. He said they should trust Hillsboro as a city to not squander the site.

Presiding Officer Hosticka invited Mayor Hughes to speak on the record.

Mayor Hughes said he had two issues he wanted to speak to. Regarding adding the “and” instead of the “or,” he was concerned about future technology being prohibited by conditions in the ordinance. He said that they were committed to not squandering the land. He said that the idea that the government using eminent domain power could assemble parcels was not correct. He said they would have to demonstrate a public use, or elimination of blight. He said that he did not think that was a realistic tool that could be used to assemble sites.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if blight used here was a term of urban planning and not an agricultural term.

Councilor Atherton said that Clackamas County got away with creating a tax increment district on a blighted cow pasture.

Mayor Hughes said that they had recently had experience in eminent domain that would indicate that trading softer would be a more practical legal procedure.

Councilor Atherton asked if there were any other places in Hillsboro where they had dual feed power.

Mayor Hughes said that was the only substation that provided dual feed power in the Northwest. He said it was actually triple feed, and therefore very unique. He said there were a number of other plants in that area making use of that substation. He thanked the councilors, and said that he was appreciative of the final product.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain, the motion passed Councilor Monroe voting no.
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.3 Ordinance No. 02-984A, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add Land for a public school in study area 85.

Motion	Councilor McLain moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-984A.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked the staff what the condition of the ordinance was regarding final adoption.

Mr. Cooper said that the findings for this ordinance had not yet been formally prepared. He said that there were conditions that came out of the ordinance. He said that he did not foresee a material amendment being attached to it.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked if they adopted the procedure Mr. Cooper had suggested for this and other ordinances, would they have to have a public hearing on December 12, 2002.

Mr. Cooper said no.

Presiding Officer Hosticka verified that the record was closed. Mr. Cooper agreed.

Councilor McLain said that the school district in Beaverton and the Assistant Superintendent, Joe Fisher, indicated their desire to have the school site go forward in a separate ordinance. She referred to earlier discussion and testimony of the ordinance.

Mr. Cooper said that Mr. Benner pointed out to him that he spoke in error. He said that the ordinance was actually ready for final adoption.

Councilor Burkholder said that he felt it was not appropriate to have a school that was not in the neighborhood that it served. He felt that the other ordinance pertaining to the Bethany area would bring the school into the area. He objected to this ordinance as a stand-alone ordinance, and said he would vote against it.

Councilor Park said he understood the argument by Councilor Burkholder, but state law does allow for it, so he would vote in favor. He said that he felt assured by Mr. Fisher's testimony that the school district would not be seeking other EFU lands for schools at this particular time.

Councilor Bragdon said he felt it was bad planning practice to be making the decision about a school site in isolation from the community that it should serve. A school should be the centerpiece of a community, rather than isolated on the edge. He said that he did, however, understand the path that got them there. He said he would support it.

Councilor McLain said that the council, executive officer, and the participating legislature had basically made a commitment to try to make it possible that schools do their job. She felt that the ordinance would help them along that path.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, and McLain voted aye. The vote was 4 aye/ 3 nay/ 0 abstain, the motion passed with Councilor Burkholder, Monroe and Presiding Officer Hosticka voting no.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.4 **Ordinance No. 02-985A**, 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.

Motion	Councilor McLain moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-985A and direct staff to write findings and conditions.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion.

Councilor McLain said that there were letters already in the record from the City of Forest Grove. Some of the reasoning for the swap was that it would allow for necessary transportation connection and help maintain the land for a supply of jobs in Forest Grove. She said they were swapping out land for 62.1 acres for 59.9 acres. She listed all the benefits derived from making the land swap. She pointed out that this was very different from the other ordinances, but that state law allows swaps.

Councilor Bragdon said it was a novel ordinance. He said he wanted to read the findings before making a final decision.

Councilor McLain said it was not the final decision; it was contingent on findings and conditions. She said they would take the final vote on December 12, 2002.

Councilor Bragdon said he would support it with the understanding that he had to see the findings and conditions before the final vote.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that they were looking for any material amendments before moving forward to the straight up or down vote next week.

Councilor McLain asked them to vote forward for findings and conditions to be completed.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.5 Ordinance No. 02-986A, 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.

Motion	Councilor Hosticka moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-986A and direct staff to write findings and conditions.
Seconded:	Councilor Bragdon seconded the motion

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that the ordinance would add two pieces of resource land in the Sherwood area. The purpose of adding these lands would be to improve the traffic circulation around that area and to increase the efficiency of services within the UGB. It also makes a more logical boundary.

Councilor Park said he would vote in favor of it, but he said he had a problem with the power station that should not have been sited on EFU land and it was one of 37 allowed uses.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that 37 uses meant there was no such thing as exclusive farm use land.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.6 Ordinance No. 02-987A, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to add land in the Bethany area.

Motion	Councilor McLain moved to adopt Ordinance No. 02-987A and direct staff to write findings and conditions.
Seconded:	Councilor Monroe seconded the motion

Councilor McLain said that the goal was to try to produce communities that were complete. She said that they were making the findings and conditions that they believe the most efficient service provision would happen with inclusion of this resource land to aid the exception land of this particular site.

Mr. Cooper said that the conditions were included and that it was the findings that were missing.

Presiding Officer Hosticka clarified that the conditions they had talked about were regarding Goal 5 protections they adopted to be added into this ordinance.

Mr. Cooper said that was correct, and they would have to revisit the general conditions to make sure that they were included.

Councilor McLain asked if the general conditions applied to both the school connections and bike paths, as well as the Goal 5 elements.

Mr. Cooper said yes.

Councilor McLain said that in the general conditions it said that the city or county with the land use planning responsibilities for the site should apply the 2040 Growth Concept design types. She said they were trying to make sure they had a large enough area.

Councilor Burkholder said that some of the issues raised by the property were complicated and he was concerned that they did not meet the state land-use laws. He said that he would vote against it. He said that he felt area 65 should be first on the list. He said he was worried that they would not meet the housing capacity requirements with this ordinance.

Councilor Monroe said that they were doing it the way that it was supposed to be done by finding a natural buffer between agricultural activity and urbanization; that natural buffer being Abby Creek. He said that they could add all of the area below Abby Creek, if they wanted to.

Councilor Park said that he still stood by what he had said about this site earlier. If it was 84, 85, and 86 he could support it.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said he was supporting this for idea of complete communities and the natural buffers that Councilor Monroe had mentioned. He pointed out an error on Councilor Monroe's part.

Councilor Monroe agreed that he had meant that the slopes become part of the buffer and not the creeks.

Councilor Atherton asked if they could split a parcel along a landform like they had done in Tualatin and Sherwood, for this property.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that to the best of his knowledge the lines on the map most closely approximate the natural features.

Councilor McLain agreed. She said that they were trying to make sure that the lines drawn would make agricultural and urban areas compatible, which is done by creating the buffer area.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain, the motion passed with Councilor Park and Burkholder voting no.
-------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 **Resolution No. 02-3254B**, For the purpose of Establishment of a Centers Team within the Planning Department and to Commence Implementation of the Centers Strategy.

Motion	Councilor Bragdon moved to adopt Resolution No. 02-3254B.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion.

Councilor Bragdon said that this resolution would establish a centers team to talk about and study the reinvigoration of existing centers. He urged support of this effort.

Councilor Park said that this was where the rubber meets the road.

Councilor McLain said that this was 50% of what they were sending to the state. With the centers work would try to do a good job of utilizing the land inside of the UGB. Also, they want to help local jurisdictions to meet the 2040 vision.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that he would support this resolution because it was important to do centers planning and to show substantial progress in that area. He said it was also important to finish the work on the Fish and Wildlife Protection Program. He urged them to be sure those two efforts were complimentary.

Councilor Bragdon said that if you liked what was happening in Orenco Station, Fairview Village, downtown Gresham, or downtown Lake Oswego then vote yes and we would get more of it.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8.2 Resolution No. 02-3255A, For the Purpose of Directing the Chief Operating Officer to Prepare Recommendations and a Report Addressing Options on: Regional Fiscal Policy Regarding Land Added to the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and Implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept.

Motion	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 02-3255A.
Seconded:	Councilor Bragdon seconded the motion.

Councilor Burkholder said that along with centers team implementation this was a final piece that ties all their work together. He said that they see a huge disparity of capacity between communities. This resolution would help balance growth in the region through tax base sharing. He said that they wanted research done on this and to see some options. They also want to work with the state legislature and local partners on this. The second thing that the resolution would do was related to finding a way to bring some of the wealth generated by bringing land into the UGB back into the regional community, specifically to deal with costs of growth and to provide for other public purposes. He urged support of this resolution.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that he was excited and interested in this resolution. He felt it would give important weight to land-use decisions.

Councilor Park said he was supportive of this also. He said that due to the current taxing system on property taxes there has been a distortion of the land use system. We put massive amounts of money into the transportation system and then individual jurisdictions fighting against what was put in, because of what it would bring. He hoped this resolution would address that by leveraging the public dollar in a way that made sense and was fair.

Councilor Atherton said he supported the basic direction but that it was missing a component. He said that people usually want to know who will pay for growth and how it will affect existing residents. He said he would want clarification of the nature and extent of public subsidies to growth, and who would be bearing the burden of costs.

Councilor Burkholder suggested that the resolution be passed and then have another meeting to discuss what Councilor Atherton was suggesting next week. He said that with 26-29 they were moving in that direction also.

Councilor McLain said that this resolution was a step in trying to figure out how to deal with these funding and financial issues. Sometimes a good idea like this has to percolate. She said that she saw this as a positive start to this discussion and that she would be voting yes.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said that he would support this but that he did not see it as a final action.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed with possible reconsideration.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of minutes of the November 14 and 21, 2002 Regular Council Meeting.

Motion	Councilor Bragdon moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the November 14 and 21, 2002, Regular Council meeting
Seconded:	Councilor Burkholder seconded the motion.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked for corrections or objections to the consent agenda.

Vote:	Councilors Bragdon, Atherton, Monroe, Park, Burkholder, McLain and Presiding Officer Hosticka voted aye. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor McLain said that she had attended the Regional Water Consortium where they talked about moving forward with the Regional Water Supply Plan and update. She said she had copies in her office and was happy to share with anyone who wanted to see it.

Presiding Officer Hosticka thanked the staff and the cable company for their endurance of the length of the meeting.

10. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

Prepared by

Metro Council Meeting
12/05/02
Page 43

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 2002

ITEM #	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOC. NUMBER
7.5	FAX ON ORD No 02-986A	12/5/02	LETTER TO: METRO COUNCIL FROM: PHILIP LAPP RE: OPPOSING 208 ACRE PARCEL IN SHERWOOD	120502c-01
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO: METRO COUNCIL FROM: DAVID DODDS, MAYOR OF WEST LINN RE: OPPOSING AREA 37	120502c-02
7.1	LETTER ON ORD No 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO: MICHAEL MORRISSEY FROM: RICHARD MEYER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, CITY OF CORNELIUS RE: 15.86 ACRE ADJUSTMENT	120502c-03
7.1	LETTER ON ORD No. 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO: METRO COUNCIL FROM: DAN ANDERSON RE: AREA 83	120502c-04
7.1	LETTER ON ORD No 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM: KEN BARTUS WICCO CHAIR RE: INDUSTRIAL/EMPLOYMENT LANDS	120502c-05
7.1	ORD No 02- 969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO: METRO COUNCIL FROM: JERRY SMITH CHAIRPERSON FOR EDC RE: INCLUSION OF THE SITES	120502c-06
7.1	LETTER ON ORD No 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO: MAYOR KATZ PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AND METRO BOARD MEMBERS FROM AARON ERNST RE: AREAS 84-87 AND 94	120502c-07
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO DISTRICT COUNCILORS FROM ANITA WITT LICENSED CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKER RE: OPPOSING AREA 94	120502c-08
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM TOM & CHERYL SKORIC RE: OPPOSING BETHANY AREA	120502c-09
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM EARL, LORIS AND KENNETH ITEL RE: OPPOSING AREA 48-PARTIAL	120502c-10
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JIM & CHERYL COON RE: OPPOSING AREA 94	120502c-11
7.1	EXIHIBIT P ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	EXIHIBIT P TO ORD NO 02-969A FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	120502c-12
7.1	BURKHOLDER AMENDMENT #1 ON ORD NO	12/5/02	BURHOLDER AMENDMENT #1 ORD NO 02-969A IN EXHITBIT C LETTER D	120502c-13

	02-969A			
7.1	ATHERTON AMENDMENT ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	ATHERTON AMENDMENT TO EXHIBIT A ON 02-969A	120502C-14
7.1	HOSTICKA TALKING POINTS ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	HOSTICKA TALKING POINTS ON ORD NO 02-969A	120502C-15
7.1	PARK TALKING POINTS ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	PARK TALKING POINT ON ORD NO 02-969A	120502C-16
7.1	DRAFT MAP EXHIBIT E ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	POTENTIAL REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INDUSTRIAL AREAS EXHIBIT E ON ORD NO 02-969A	120502C-17
7.1	MAP EXHIBIT E ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	POTENTIAL REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INDUSTRIAL AREAS EXHIBIT E ON ORD NO 02-969A	120502C-18
7.1	MEMO ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO CARL HOSTICKA FROM TIM O'BRIEN REVISED CONDITION FOR STUDY AREAS 89 AND 94	120502C-19
7.1	MAP ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CITY OF OREGON CITY PROPOSED UGB EXPANSION WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	120502C-20
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ROSS SCHULTZ CITY MANAGER CITY OF SHERWOOD RE: OPPOSING AREA 54 AND 55	120502C-21
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARY DORMAN AICP RE: INCLUSION IN BEAVERCREEK ROAD AREA	120502C-22
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM REGIONAL PARTNERS RE: INCLUSION OF INDUSTRIAL LAND	120502C-23
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM GAIL SNYDER FRIENDS OF FOREST PARK RE: AREA 94	120502C-24
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DAVID MILLER ESQ. RE: INCLUSION	120502C-25

	969A		AREA 84, 85 AND 86	
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	11/29/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MIKE HOUGH AUDUBON SOCIETY OF PORTLAND READ BY JIM LALIBE RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-26
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARY SCURLOCK ADAMSON RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-27
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO CARL HOSTICKA FROM VERA KATZ MAYOR CITY OF PORTLAND RE: OPPOSING AREA 94	120502C-28
7.1	CHART ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DENNIS YEE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE CHART CLACHAMAS, MULTNOMAH, WAHSINGTON	120502C-29
7.1	SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM SCOTT POWELL RE: OPPOSES AREA 84-87, AND 94	120502C-30
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO CARL HOSTICKA FROM ROGER METCALF VICE PRESIDENT TIGARD SAND & GRAVEL CO., INC. RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 48	120502C-31
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JUDIE HAMMERSTAD MAYOR CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO RE: OPPOSING AREAS 38 THROUGH 42	120502C-32
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JERRY GROSSNICKLE RE: OPPOSES AREAS 94, 84-87	120502C-33
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO SUSAN MCLAIN FROM BRUCE D GOLDSON PE COMPASS ENGINEERING RE: INCLUSION OF AREAS 84-87	120502C-34
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM WEST UNION ACRES RESIDENTS AND PROPERTY OWNERS RE: OPPOSES AREA 82	120502C-35
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CYNDI STRID RE: OPPOSES AREA 94, AND 84-87	120502C-36
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM STEVEN EDELMAN RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 93	120502C-37
7.1	LETTER ON	12/5/02	LETTER TO CARL HOSTICKA FROM VERA	120502C-38

	ORD NO 02-969A		KATX MAYOR CITY OF PORTLAND RE: 2040 GROWTH CONCEPT	
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO CARL HOSICKA FROM ROBERT VAN BROCKLIN STOEL RIVES ON BEHALF OF JOE ANGEL RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 94	120502C-39
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM TODD CHASE GAVE TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RE: INCLUSION OF 02- 969 AND EMPLOYMENT/INDUSTRIAL LAND BE ADDED	120502C-40
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARCY HOULE RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-41
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM NANCY BROSHOT PH.D ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY SCIENCE DEPARTMENT LINFIELD COLLEGE RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-42
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM BETTY ATTEBERRY REGIONAL PARTNERS RE: INCLUSION OF INDUSTRIAL LAND	120502C-43
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM LYNN JENNINGS RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-44
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ROBERT THOMAS RE: OPPOSES EXPANDING UGB ANYWHERE IN THE TRI-COUNTY AREAS	120502C-45
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ARNOLD ROCHLIN VICE PRESIDENT FOREST PARK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION RE: AREA 93 AND OTHER AREAS	120502C-46
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JAN & DENNIS BURKHARD RE: OPPOSES 84- 87 AND 94	120502C-47
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CORINNE BACHER RE: OPPOSES EXPANDING UGB AT THIS TIME	120502C-48
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM FRED BACHER RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-49

7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ROBBIN STEWART RE: STAFFORD TRIANGLE	120502C-50
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM LISE STORC AND ANDREW COMEAU RE: OPPOSES AREAS 84-87 AND 94	120502C-51
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 96A	12/2/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM TERRY PETERS PRRESIDENT WASHINGTON COUNTY FARM BUREAU RE: OPPOSES BETHANY AREA	120502C-52
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JIM EMERSON RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-53
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	8/20/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JEROME PARSON RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 92	120502C-54
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM RALPH AND KAREN HENKHAUS RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 93	120502C-55
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM SANDRA DIEDRICH CHAIR NWDA PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-56
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CAROL CHESAREK RE: OPPOSES AREA 94 AND 84-87	120502C-57
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARY KYLE MCCURDY STAFF ATTORNEY 1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON RE: OPPOSES BETHANY AREA	120502C-58
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM TOM VANDERZANDEN RE: BETHANY AREA	120502C-59
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DIRK KNUDSON RE: AREAS 83-87	120502C-60
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER AND EXHIBITS TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JEFF BACHRACH RAMIS CREW CORRIGAN & BACHRACH, LLP RE: BETHANY AREA	120502C-61
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM KIM VANDEHEY RE: INCLUSION OF AREA 65	120502C-62

7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM KIM VANDEHEY RE: 65, 71, 83, AND 87	120502C-63
7.1	MEMO ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	MEMO TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DON HANSON RE: AREA 94/SKYLINE	120502C-64
7.1	EXHIBIT F ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	EXHIBIT F TITLE 4: INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT AREAS	120502C-65
7.1	WORKSHEET ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE ACTION WORKSHEET FOR UGB EXPANSION	120502C-66
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	6/28/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM BARBARA SACK CITY PLANNER CITY OF PORTLAND RE: CITY OF PORTLAND'S LAND USE REVIEW	120502C-67
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM KEITH FISHBACK RE: INCLUSION OF 84-87	120502C-68
7.1	REVISED AGENDA ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	REVISED AGENDA 12/5/02 TO METRO COUNCIL	120502C-69
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DIRK KNUDSON RE: OPPOSES BEAVERTON SCHOOL SITE 10 ACRES	120502C-70
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ARMIN BESTEL RE: INCLUSION OF AREAS 84-87	120502C-71
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM SALLY MCLANTY RE: OPPOSES STAFFORD TRIANGLE	120502C-72
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM FRED BACHER RE: OPPOSES AREA 94	120502C-73
7.1	TESTIMONY ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	PHONE MESSAGE TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JEFF CHAMPION RE: OPPOSES ANY EXPANSION OF UGB	120502C-74
7.1	MEMO ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DAN COOPER METRO GENERAL COUNSEL	120502C-75
7.1	EMAIL ON ORD NO 02-969A	10/25/02	TO MICHAEL MORRISSEY FROM DENNIS YEE RE: REGIONAL FORECAST	120502C-76
7.1	EMAIL ON ORD	11/27/02	TO SUSAN MCLAIN FROM SCOTT &	120502C-77

	NO 02-969A		HILARY RE: OPPOSES AREA 94/SKYLINE	
7.1	EMAIL ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DEREK MOELLER RE: INCLUSION OF SEWELL ROAD IN HILLSBORO AREA	120502C-78
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM PAULA REA WILSON MD RE: OPPOSES STAFFORD TRIANGLE	120502C-79
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MAYA TRYSIL THISTLEDOWN FARM RE: OPPOSES STAFFORD TRIANGLE	120502C-80
7.1	FAX ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/4/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MIKE STEWART RE: INCLUSION OF STAFFORD TRIANGLE	120502C-81
7.1	MAP ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	UGB EXPANSION AREAS MAP EXHIBIT M AREA 77	120502C-82
7.1	MAP ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	2040 GROWTH CONCEPT MAP EXHIBIT N	120502C-83
7.1	MAP ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	GOAL 5 INVENTORY MAPS	120502C-84
7.1	DOCUMENT ON ORD NO 02-969A	11/19/02	DOCUMENT TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CONSTANCE EWING RE: INFILL DEVELOPMENT: A BETTER ALTERNATIVE	120502C-85
7.1	PHOTO'S ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	PHOTO'S TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARCIA HAMANN RE: WILDLIFE PHOTO'S IN SPRINGVILLE LN AREA OPPOSES INCLUSION	120502C-86
7.1	MAP	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ISSA KARAM UGB EXPANSION AREAS EXHIBIT M RE: INCLUSION AREA 26	120502C-87
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MICHAEL KRAHMER RE: OPPOSES 84-87, 89, 93 AND 0 AREAS	120502C-88
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DIRK KNUDSEN RE: ORD 02-987A OPPOSES	120502-89
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	DOCUMENT TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JOANNE RICE SENIOR PLANNER WASHINGTON COUNTY LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SUBMITTED BY CURT HINCK	120502C-90
7.1	LETTER ON ORD NO 02-	12/3/02	LETTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM KABDEBO & BALOGH RE: INCLUSION OF	120502C-91

	969A		BETHANY AREA	
7.1	POSTER ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	POSTER TO METRO COUNCIL FROM BEN EMERSON RE: SPRAWL IS SOCIALLY AND ECONLOFICALLY DESTRUCTIVE OPPOSES AREA 87	120502C-92
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM DOUG RUX	120502C-93
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JULIE O'DAYER	120502C-94
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ALAN MALONE	120502C-95
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM ALAN CABELLY	120502C-96
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM GREG LEO	120502C-97
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JAMES KENNEDY	120502C-98
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM W. JAMES KUHL	120502C-99
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM OLVIE KUHL	120502C-100
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CARLEEN BREWER	120502C-101
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MIKE NELSON	120502C-102
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JENNIFER ALLEN	120502C-103
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM REV. FRODO OKULAM	120502C-104
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM PALMER BYRKIT	120502C-105

	NO 02-969A			
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARK FREIDBERG	120502C-106
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CLAIRE STOCK	120502C-107
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM SHEHLA DAR	120502C-108
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD ON 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM AMY DEE	120502C-109
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD ON 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM A. DEVITO	120502C-110
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM CINDY CATTO	120502C-111
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM PHIL PENNINGTON	120502C-112
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM SEAN COSTOR	120502C-113
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM MARY YOUNG	120502C-114
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM JOHN BONTINEN	120502C-115
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM NICHOLAS STORIE	120502C-116
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL JACKIE MAISANO	120502C-117
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM KAY DURTSCHI	120502C-118
7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM THOMAS LAWHORN	120502C-119

7.1	COMMENT CARD ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM EMMA STEEN	120502c-120
7.1	OVERSIZED DRAFT MAP EXHIBIT ON ORD NO 02- 969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL OVERSIZED DRAFT MAP EXHIBIT UGB EXPANSION AREAS (SEE DRAWER B FRO OVER SIZED MAPS)	120502c-121
7.1	OVERSIZED MAP EXHIBIT ON ORD NO 02-969A	12/5/02	TO METRO COUNCIL FROM RANDALL REALTY CORP. OVERSIZED MAP EXHIBIT 2001 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY (SEE DRAWER B FOR OVER SIZED MAPS)	120502c-122