

**MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, June 17, 2004  
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Brian Newman (Deputy Council President) David Bragdon (Council President), Rod Monroe, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Rex Burkholder (by phone), Susan McLain (by phone)

Councilors Absent:

Deputy Council President Newman convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

Councilor Lynn Peterson from Lake Oswego and Mayor Charlotte Lehan of Wilsonville.

**2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

**3. CONSENT AGENDA**

3.1 Consideration of minutes of the June 10, 2004 Regular Council Meetings.

Motion: Council President Bragdon moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the June 10, 2004, Regular Metro Council.

Vote: Councilors Monroe, Park, Hosticka, Burkholder, McLain and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 abstain, the motion passed with Council President Bragdon abstaining from the vote.

**4. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING**

4.1 **Ordinance No. 04-1038**, For the Purpose of Adding a New Chapter 10.04 “Pioneer Cemeteries” to Metro Code Title X – Regional Parks and Greenspaces providing for the Management of Metro’s Pioneer Cemeteries And Repealing Metro Code Section 10.02.050.

Deputy Council President Newman assigned Ordinance No. 04-1038 to Council.

**5. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING**

5.1 **Ordinance No. 04-1044B**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget For Fiscal-Year 2004-05, Making Appropriations, and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes, and Declaring an Emergency (**PUBLIC HEARING**).

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Motion:   | Council President Bragdon moved to adopt Ordinance No. 04-1044B. |
| Seconded: | Councilor Monroe seconded the motion                             |

Council President Bragdon introduced the ordinance and urged support.

Deputy Council President Newman opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 04-1044B. No one came forward. Deputy Council President Newman closed the public hearing.

Councilor Monroe thanked the Council for action taken last week concerning the Neighborhood Clean-up program. Citizens had applauded restoring funds for this program. Council President Bragdon spoke to future needs of developing the budget and strategic objectives for agency.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, McLain, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.

5.2 **Ordinance No. 04-1040A**, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, The Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to Increase the Capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment.

5.3 **Ordinance No. 04-1041**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro’s Regional Framework Plan to Better Protect the Region’s Farm and Forest Land Industries and Land Base; and Declaring an Emergency.

Deputy Council President Newman spoke to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) recommendations made last week. He spoke to collaboration and deliberative processes within the region and Metro’s relationship with the local jurisdictions. He noted MPAC and Council’s compromise. He thanked members of the MPAC for their guidance. He noted specific recommendations from MPAC (a copy of which is included in the record). He talked about uniting the MPAC/Council partnership to work with the State.

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said they had added to the record three memos from the Planning Department (copies of which are found in the record).

Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Office of Citizen Involvement Manager, submitted a copy of the citizen comments to date concerning these issues. They would all be entered into the record. She noted how many people had commented on the issues. She thanked four individuals who had been involved in the production of the Public Comments Reports.

Councilor Hosticka said he was hopeful they would be able to discuss in general what they were doing as well as the alternatives. He asked how Deputy Council President Newman wished to proceed. Deputy Council President Newman suggested that if Councilors had general comments, he would like to entertain them now. Councilor McLain said she thought all of the Councilors had tried hard to make sure the product of this process would meet the needs and would support all types of industry. Second, she felt it was important to follow State hierarchy and criteria and make comments on the criteria or hierarchy that may not meet the needs of the region’s citizens. Third, whatever the product that was put forward should allow people to work, live and recreate in the region. She felt that whatever was voted on, must meet those three goals.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Motion to amend: | Councilor Hosticka moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with MPAC recommended Amendment #1. |
| Seconded:        | Council President Bragdon seconded the motion  |

Councilor Hosticka said partially in response to some of Councilor McLain’s comments, he felt there were other considerations that we had in mind as we make this decision. First, we needed to

be humble in our approach to being able to predict the future and the needs over the next 20 years and not let numbers that had been provided to the Council in those forecasts constrict the Council and force them into making decisions that they might not want to make. Also he thought they needed to take an expanded view of what the region was. They did have neighbors to the north that were in a sense part of the same economy. They needed to look at what they were doing as well as what we were doing. Finally, not only did they have to meet the hierarchy of state lands but they had to look at all of the goals in the state land use planning laws which included coordination with local governments and some engagement with the citizens through citizen participation. Given all of those issues, it was an appropriate act to make to not bring in the Wilsonville East study area since in the original justification and recommendation was that it included large tracts of land that were near major transportation, I-5 and we needed those kinds of tracts of land for warehousing and distribution purposes. As they looked at other considerations, they found the local government the City of Wilsonville's plan, did not provide or contemplate industrial use in this area. Industrial uses in the area conflicted with residential uses in this area and that provisional services to this area would be costly. There was no provision at this point in either Metro's transportation plan or the local transportation plan for improvements, which would be necessary. Given the issues of local concern and the broader issue of entire regional concern, he felt they could take this step and still meet the kinds of goals that they were trying to achieve in their larger vision of what they wanted for this region.

Council President Bragdon said he supported the amendment. There were issues that got raised in this process in terms of priority of warehousing and distribution. He was supporting this amendment primarily because of the impacts on the neighborhoods. It was important to notice the many good things that were happening in that community.

Councilor Park said in 2002 there was a cry that we needed large industrial sites. Since then the cry had died down. Without that original cry, he felt that the decision could have been finished in 2002. He spoke to the process since. He was disturbed about only looking at part of the puzzle. He felt that in the future, they should look at the full context instead of braking up that decision into two parts.

Councilor Monroe said this had been a tough decision. It exemplified what was wrong with the process. He suggested the best way to move the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) would be to pre-plan those areas. He felt it was important to listen to our regional partners.

Deputy Council President Newman said he would also be supporting this amendment. This land was resource land. What drove them to the Frog Pond area was a report in the findings that they needed good access to I-5 for warehousing and distribution. He spoke to Wilsonville's efforts in moving forward in trying to plan for industrial areas. He said staff had reviewed all of the comprehensive plans for this area. Not one plan suggested they were planning for the future of distribution.

Councilor McLain commented that she understood the desire to look at the local partners plans. She spoke to all of the MPAC amendments. It was important to note the agriculture report, which indicated looking at the differences in land. The amendment flew in the face of that advice. How did we help all industries in their endeavors? She would not be supporting this amendment.

Councilor Hosticka closed by saying that it had been an interesting discussion. He agreed with Councilors that this was a flawed process. One of the better processes in the future would include them planning beyond our UGB to look to the larger vision before we addressed growth in the UGB. He said the Port and north of Oregon were interested in warehousing. This area was

included in the third tier, which the agriculture report said they would place a lower priority on in urbanization.

Vote to Amend:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 nay, the motion passed with Councilor McLain voting no.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Motion to amend: | Councilor Hosticka moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with MPAC recommended Amendment #2. |
| Seconded:        | Deputy Council President Newman seconded the motion  |

Councilor Hosticka spoke to the amendment and what it recommended. He talked about potential alignments and possible development in the area. The other issue that needed to be addressed was the compatibility between the residential areas and the industrial area in the Tualatin area. He said there were a number of ways to solve the problem. He detailed some of those methods. He was moving this because it was the MPAC recommendation.

Council President Bragdon said he opposed this motion. He felt there was another way to plan for the connector. He talked about the conditions in the draft ordinance, which would assist in the siting of the connector. He talked about large lot industrial purposes. He felt there was a need for industrial land, which had been addressed by both the City of Tualatin and the Regional Economic Partners. He also said this land ranked very low in terms of agricultural requirements.

Councilor Monroe provided history for the connector. He talked about the Westside Bypass. It was rejected but there was a commitment at that time to include other modes of transportation in that area of the region. He asked what the best way was to make sure that connector got built. He noted the increasing congestion in the area. He said the connector was badly needed. What was the best way to get it done? Everyone agreed that industrializing right up to the residential areas would be a degradation of those neighborhoods. They were probably bringing in all of south Tualatin, putting restrictions on the land and supporting facilitation of the building of the connector. He said it was very hard to plan and build an urban highway that was not inside the UGB. He felt what they needed to bring this entire parcel into the UGB.

Councilor Park said this was a huge area. It was exception land, and an area that had already been deemed as not viable for farming. We had a unique opportunity. He talked about the Damascus area that may meet some of the other criteria, which would allow exchanging some of the lands from industrial to residential and visa-versa. There may be a win-win scenario. In order for that to occur, they had to bring this land into the boundary. He would oppose this amendment because you had to have to right pieces.

Councilor Hosticka said if this motion to adopt the MPAC recommendation failed, they had to turn to specific conditions to address the issues that Councilors had raised. He detailed some of the conditions currently in Ordinance No. 04-1040A (a copy of these conditions were included in the record). He said he would withdraw this motion if Council adopted the conditions.

Councilor Bragdon called the question on MPAC Amendment #2. Deputy Council President Newman called for objection. There was no objection.

Vote to Amend:

Councilors Park, Monroe, McLain, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted against the motion. The vote

was 1 aye/6 nay, the motion failed with Councilor Hosticka voting yes.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Motion to amend: | Councilor Monroe moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with conditions related to D, south Tualatin area (a copy of these conditions are in the record). |
| Seconded:        | Council President Bragdon seconded the motion  |

Mr. Cooper noted that under D, condition number 4, relating to the conceptual transportation plan and an interchange area management plan in cooperation with ODOT, that language was prepared by staff at the request of ODOT yesterday. There was a subsequent meeting between ODOT, Metro and Planning staff and there was similar language in a condition for Helvetia for a similar condition on Hwy 26. After that meeting and receiving some comments from the City of Wilsonville, ODOT had agreed to withdraw its request for this condition and instead believed that there was an alternative way of solving this problem without having Metro adopt the condition. At this point, there was no recommendation from anyone for condition #4 and it was unrelated to the issue that was before Council. Councilor Monroe agreed to a friendly amendment to consider D, Tualatin Area only without condition #4. Council President Bragdon concurred with the friendly amendment. Councilor Park asked if there would be proposed alternate language that would be placed in the general condition? Mr. Cooper said ODOT now believed that in the findings, we could address some of these related issues and give some direction and encouragement towards the voluntary development of this or some similar concept between ODOT and the local jurisdictions. Councilor Park expressed the desire to place our fingerprints on this fairly squarely because of the concerns on how the interchange may or may not function in the future. The concern being that other cities had placed less than appropriate things along I-5, which were creating capacity problems on I-5. Dick Benner, Senior Metro Attorney, responded that he would suggest that Council directs the staff as it was completing the final staff report that would support and inform the final Council's decision, direct them to address this in that staff report and then when Council had it assuming that Council agreed with what it said, endorse it. That would be clear direction from Council to ODOT and other local governments. Council President Bragdon's said in our conditions, generally what they were trying to achieve was broad policy outcomes rather than being too prescriptive about any one particular given area. He wondered if they were crossing that line or prejudging an outcome or taking away options for local governments when we said specifically particular neighborhoods would be designated if there was a particular finding here as opposed to just place conditions that there be concept planning but that designation of particular neighborhoods was really a matter reserved to the local government. The wording on paragraph 2 seemed to him that we were substituting our judgment prospectively as to how particular areas were going to be designated rather than saying the local government would do that once all of the facts were in.

Councilor Monroe said he had looked at the language. He wanted to know what an inner-neighborhood designation meant and where was the southern alignment. Mr. Cooper explained on the 2040 Concept Map where the southern alignment was. He thought that Councilor Monroe was referring to the alignment further south. The reference in this condition was a certain line. The designation of an inner-neighborhood was something they had done in the 2002 decision. He then spoke to the concept Councilor Bragdon's put forward. They understood that the current 2040 concept designation for the existing area of Tualatin that was residential was an inner neighborhood designation. So having the condition designated as the new area just to the south also inner neighborhood was intended to be consistent with the current comprehensive plan as we knew it from the City of Tualatin. So the Council was saying, go forth and do this. It certainly would be possible for the Council to say, we designated inner neighborhood or such other designation requested by the City of Tualatin that would be consistent with its own comprehensive plan. And if for some reason in doing the planning process, they found something

that was not quite inner neighborhood in our 2040 concept but that they believed was consistent with their own comprehensive plan, that would meet the intent that he had heard the Council say, that it was really Tualatin that should be planning down to that connector assuming it was some place in that area and we would intend that they do that planning consistent with their own current comprehensive plan designations for the area in the city limits.

Councilor Hosticka said if you looked at Exhibit F under number B, it said the city or county with land use planning shall apply the 2040 growth concept shown in Exhibit E. As far as he understood, all of the areas under consideration were shown as industrial. So to Council President Bragdon's comment, we were designating 2040 growth concept for these areas by this ordinance and so this condition as related to that general condition under number F was necessary to allow for a different use than industrial if we brought this area into the UGB. He deferred to Mr. Benner or Mr. Cooper for a different legal interpretation if he was wrong.

Councilor Monroe said his intent was to say the area north of the connector, the new highway, shall not be industrial. The City of Tualatin should have discretion in terms of the highest and best use transitional zoning from their inner city neighborhood to that highway. Did this language allow for this? Dick Benner, Senior Metro Attorney said the Code required you to place some kind of design type designation on it. He suggested saying something about the design type, which would happen when the siting of the connector happens. Secondly, when the area got planned through Title 11, the jurisdictions would do adjustments to the design type designation as there was with Pleasant Valley. That was really the right time to settle it and ultimately then Council made adjustments once that was done. Councilor Monroe said this language did what he wanted done. He urged support.

Vote to Amend:

|  |
|--|
| Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, McLain, and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye/2 nay, the motion passed with Council President Bragdon and Councilor Burkholder voting no |
|--|

Council President Bragdon explained his vote: he agreed entirely with Councilor Monroe's intent. His no vote was his reservation about the means.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Motion to amend: | Council President Bragdon moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with MPAC recommended Amendment #3. |
| Seconded:        | Councilor Burkholder seconded the motion  |

Council President Bragdon said this recommendation had gotten a lot of discussion over the past several weeks. He said this was included in the COO's recommendation. He was not unsympathetic to the needs of local jurisdiction. Councilor Park said he was conflicted over this site. He didn't think he would be supporting this site. He said the concern was the long term planning. He had already heard that there was a desire by Cornelius to move further north. He spoke to the need for natural barriers. He noted that he did understand the fiscal health issue.

Councilor Monroe said this was a tough one for him. He looked for logical edges, buffers and boundaries that divided rural and urban. The northern boundary of Cornelius was Council Creek. To the north prime farmland, to the south of Council Creek was Cornelius residential area. He was listening to the farmers in the area. Councilor McLain said her points were already on the record.

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Motion to amend the | Councilor Hosticka moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A by adding S/W |
|---------------------|--|

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| amendment: | Cornelius areas to the original amendment of 91 acres in Cornelius. |
| Seconded:  | Council President Bragdon seconded the motion                       |

Councilor Hosticka explained why this was a good idea. Councilor McLain asked for clarification on the amendment. Deputy Council President explained the amendment. Councilor Hosticka withdrew his amendment to the amendment.

Deputy Council President Newman talked about why he supported the amendment. Originally he didn't think he had done his homework. He had compelling information since then to include this area. He talked about partnering with local partners. We needed to do anything we could to help cities.

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Vote to Amend: | Councilors Hosticka, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 4 aye/3 nay, the motion passed with Councilors Park, McLain and Monroe voting no. |
|----------------|---|

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Motion to amend: | Council President Bragdon moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A by adding 36 acres to the west of Cornelius/ south of Council Creek. |
| Seconded:        | Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion   |

Council President Bragdon said he felt there had already been discussion on this amendment. Councilor Park said this area was west of Council Creek. He would be supporting this amendment. Councilor McLain clarified the amendment. Councilor Burkholder felt that the 91-acres was different than the 36 acres. He would not be supporting this amendment.

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Vote to Amend: | Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, McLain, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 6 aye/1 nay, the motion passed Councilor Burkholder voting no. |
|----------------|--|

Deputy Council President Newman asked where they stood in terms of acreage. Staff responded that we had a total of 1067 acres.

Councilor Park asked about the area near Gresham along Hwy 26. He thought it was approximately 20 acres suitable for industrial use. Did our running total address this as well as the conditions that had been placed on it and to add a clause to the ordinance that said, where as the change of design type designation of a portion of Study Area 12 added to the UGB on December 5, 2002, from residential to industrial will help the region accommodate the need for industrial use without reducing the region's residential capacity below the need?

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Motion to amend: | Councilor Park moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with Park amendment on Springwater (a copy of which is included in the record). |
| Seconded:        | Council President Bragdon seconded the motion  |

Councilor Park explained the motion related to Springwater area. Councilor Burkholder asked for clarification on the amendment.

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Vote to Amend: | Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, McLain, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed. |
|----------------|---|

Council President Bragdon spoke to conditions on Shute/Evergreen area and changes recommended by City of Hillsboro. There were still questions about this recommendation. It had been recommended that this issue be delayed.

Deputy Council President Newman asked for clarification on the need. Mr. Cooper explained the total need. Deputy Council President Newman said they had fulfilled over 99% of that need. His preference was to close this process. They would vote on this ordinance next week.

Councilor Burkholder said based on the earlier discussion about rates of commercial and industrial, he felt comfortable closing out this process. Councilor Hosticka said he didn't feel comfortable with not meeting the need. He felt that this would leave us open for challenge and also leave open the opportunity for people to make the case. He asked legal counsel to make a recommendation on language. Councilor Park said there had been a lot of interesting discussion about what the region needed. To Councilor Hosticka's point, he felt there was still some uncertainty because of the lack of complete concept plans. He felt we were close to being there. He hoped we could show we have met our need. Council President Bragdon said he heard Councilors say they were eager to close the books. He appreciated the importance of going through the process. The Council was weighing all options. He agreed with Councilor Hosticka's point of view but didn't think he could support additional acreage. He concurred with Councilor Burkholder. He was eager to hear the debate.

Councilor Monroe asked Mr. Cooper if he felt comfortable defending this package. Mr. Cooper said yes. They would, in preparing the final staff report, be able to demonstrate within the degree of any variables, that Council had completed the process if they stopped here. Councilor Monroe said lets move on. He spoke to upcoming Goal 5 decisions. Councilor McLain said she wanted to make sure that they would vote on June 24<sup>th</sup> as amended. Deputy Council President Newman said yes. Councilor Hosticka asked if there were words they could add to ensure this was the final decision. He expressed his concerns that we might leave ourselves open to challenges and criticisms. Mr. Cooper said he couldn't think of any words to add. They would prepare the amended staff report, if they could think of wordage; they could bring forth a technical amendment, which would not change the adoption date. Councilor Hosticka said he favored adding land in the Evergreen area. He didn't sense support for this addition. He wasn't sure of a way to get us further. Councilor Park said he understood Councilor Hosticka's reluctance given the past decision of 2002. He asked since they were dealing with goals, did we have more flexibility? Mr. Cooper said they were dealing with goals and rules.

Deputy Council President Newman explained his reason for closing this process. They had fulfilled over 99% of the need. He did not know of any particular area that had the votes to add another area. He called for final discussion. He spoke to the story over the past two weeks, which had focused on the dispute between local jurisdictions and Council. The story was, we as a region, could agree that there was a consensus decision. He noted this was scheduled for next week. Council President Bragdon requested that staff summarize their comments made today and send this to members of MPAC. It was important to note that neither MPAC nor Council was a monolithic body. All of these people were individuals trying to do the best they can. He echoed Councilor Newman's comments. He felt councilors had considered everything.

Mr. Cooper explained the conditions amendment (a copy of which is included in the record)

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Motion to amend: | Council President Bragdon moved to amend Ordinance No. 04-1040A with Condition H, Quarry, and Coffee Creek areas. |
|------------------|---|



|           |                                      |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| Seconded: | Councilor Monroe seconded the motion |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Vote to Amend: | Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, McLain, Burkholder, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed. |
|----------------|---|

Councilors Burkholder and McLain said they must leave the meeting.

**6. RESOLUTIONS**

6.1 **Resolution No. 04-3454**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Capital Improvement Plan For Fiscal Years 2004-05 Through 2008-09.

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Motion:   | Councilor Monroe moved to adopt Resolution No. 04-3454. |
| Seconded: | Council President Bragdon seconded the motion           |

Councilor Monroe said this proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was the 8<sup>th</sup> year of Metro’s long-range capital improvement process. It allowed coordination of capital improvements to maximize the benefits to the public and provide opportunities to save money. This resolution was the formal instrument by which the plan would be adopted. He explained why we did a CIP, to review and consider all capital projects at the same time, to evaluate projects' operating costs, to coordinate projects that might affect other projects (principally cost, but could include timing, avoiding duplication, etc), to prepare an overall assessment of Metro's fiscal capacity to fund capital projects and to coordinate the actual financing of capital projects. In FY 2004-05, there were a total of 51 projects, totaling \$14.4 million. Over the 5 years of the plan, there were 96 projects totaling \$49.6 million. He urged support. Council President Bragdon also supported this resolution. He spoke to deferred maintenance. This was one of the tools they used to keep a handle on this. Linking this tool to the budget was also helpful. He felt this was a good step in an ongoing evolution.

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| Vote: | Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed. |
|-------|---|

6.2 **Resolution No. 04-3457**, For the Purpose of Making Recommendations to the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon Concerning the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan.

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Motion:   | Councilor Park moved to adopt Resolution No. 04-3457. |
| Seconded: | Councilor Monroe seconded the motion                  |

Councilor Park introduced the resolution and said that the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon had directed that a draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan (CO Plan) be prepared. Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) had worked with local governments to identify CO Plan issues prior to completing the draft plan for review in the fall. Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) met and identified several issues pertaining to transportation and/or the regional economy, such as: Motor vehicle emission budgets, should Transportation Control Measures be included in plan, change DEQ vehicle emissions test procedures, should oxygenated fuels be continued? Adoption of this resolution would support the development of the CO plan, which would make it possible for the

region to demonstrate conformity for CO. He said there had been one question about oxygenated fuels. These were questions that DEQ would be answering. He urged adoption. Councilor Monroe said 30 years ago they were out of compliance one out of every thirty days. Now we maintained the region below the threshold. He was troubled by the federal government’s allocation of money to clean air. This would continue to reduce the level of CO in the region. Councilor Hosticka asked if oxygenated fuel was addressed here or would it be in the future. Councilor Park said it would be discussed this fall.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed.

**6.3 Resolution No. 04-3465, For the Purpose of Adopting Comprehensive Financial Policies for Metro.**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Motion:   | Councilor Park moved to adopt Resolution No. 04-3465. |
| Seconded: | Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion                |

Councilor Park said Metro currently operated without a set of financial policies to guide the agency’s overall financial management. This resolution would adopt a set of financial policies for Metro and would: Broaden the scope of formal policy direction, identify policies that were of greatest importance to the agency. Policies would be guidelines, not mandatory – although Council should be apprised of exceptions. The policies were drafted by Finance staff and management, reviewed by finance staff from all major operating departments, and by the Senior Management Team. Highlights of proposed policies included: reviewed annually by Council, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) will develop guidelines and procedures in some areas, definition of balanced budget, justification for a budgeted draw on fund balance, affordability study done before any new program was implemented, Council’s existing capital asset management policies were incorporated, one-time revenues used to pay for one-time costs. Councilor Park urged support for the resolution. He knew that the Council President was very much in support of these policies. Council President Bragdon added his support. These were things they were already doing. What they were doing now was making this explicit.

Vote:

Councilors Park, Hosticka, Monroe, Council President Bragdon and Deputy Council President Newman voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye, the motion passed.

**7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION**

Michael Jordan, COO, welcomed back the Council President. He congratulated the Council for their hard work in the industrial lands ordinance.

**8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

Council President Bragdon echoed Mr. Jordan’s thanks. He had been invited to Australia to present information on Metro.

**9. ADJOURN**

Metro Council Meeting

06/17/04

Page 11

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington

Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 17, 2004**

| Item | Topic                 | Doc Date      | Document Description   | Doc. Number |
|------|-----------------------|---------------|--|-------------|
| 3.1  | Minutes               | June 10, 2004 | Metro Council Agenda for June 10, 2004 meeting   | 061704c-01  |
| 5.1  | Amended ordinance     | 6/17/04       | To Metro Council From: Kathy Rutkowski, Budget Coordinator Re: Ordinance No. 04-1044B  | 061704c-02  |
| 5.2  | Memo                  | 6/16/04       | To: Lydia Neill, Principle Regional Planner From: Amy Rose, Assistant Regional Planner Re: Dominant Soil classifications for proposed UGB expansion areas                  | 061704c-03  |
| 5.2  | Memo                  | 6/16/04       | To: Dick Benner Senior Metro Attorney From: Tim O'Brien, Senior Regional Planner Re: Relative Earthquake Hazard for proposed industrial land expansion areas               | 061704c-04  |
| 5.2  | Memo                  | 6/16/04       | To: Lydia Neill, Senior Regional Planner From: Amy Rose, Assistant Regional Planner Re: Water issues regarding the Sherwood-Dammasch-Wilsonville Ground Water Limited area | 061704c-05  |
| 5.2  | Amendment             | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: MPAC Re: MPAC recommendation #1, eliminate the Wilsonville East Study Area from consideration  | 061704c-06  |
| 5.2  | Amendment             | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: MPAC Re: MPAC recommendation #2, eliminate the north half of Tualatin Study Area from consideration  | 061704c-07  |
| 5.2  | Amendment             | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: MPAC Re: MPAC recommendation #3, restore 91-acres portion of Cornelius Study area contained in COO's recommendation                                | 061704c-08  |
| 5.2  | Proposed conditions   | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: Dick Benner, Senior Metro Attorney Re: Proposed conditions for council consideration for Ordinance No. 04-1040A                                    | 061704c-09  |
| 5.2  | Amendment             | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: Rod Park Re; Proposed amendment for 90-acre tract in Springwater area  | 061704c-10  |
| 5.2  | Items for the record  | 6/17/04       | To: Metro Council From: Lydia Neill, Senior Regional Planner Re: Items to be added to the 04-1040A record  | 061704c-11  |
| 5.2  | Public Comment Report | June 2004     | To: Metro Council From: Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Public Involvement Manager Re: Public Comment Report, Addendum A June 2004  | 061704c-12  |