

COLUMBIA REGION ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 1978

Members in Attendance

Chairman Corky Kirkpatrick  
Comm. Stan Skoko  
Mayor Neil Goldschmidt  
Coun. Paula Bentley  
Comm. Miller Duris  
Mr. Gunner Ingraham  
Coun. Dick Pokornowski  
Mr. Donald L. Jones  
Coun. Frank Corsiglia  
Mr. Richard Carroll

Staff in Attendance

Mr. Denton Kent  
Mr. Andrew Jordan  
Mr. James Sitzman  
Mr. William Ockert  
Ms. Judy Bieberle  
Ms. Marilyn Holstrom  
Mr. Michael Huston  
Mr. Tim Holder  
Mr. Jeff Gibbs  
Ms. Jennifer Sims  
Ms. Barbara Zeller  
Ms. Lorelle Bennett  
Mr. Keith Lawton  
Mr. Stanley Hirota  
Mr. Herb Beals  
Mr. Rod Sandoz  
Mr. John Gregory  
Mr. Jack Bails

Others in Attendance

Mr. John C. Nelson  
Mr. Jack O. Harper  
Ms. Marjorie Stewart  
Mr. Cliff Rutan  
Mr. Herald Campbell  
Mr. Bob Stacey  
Mr. John Hankee  
Mr. Martin Cramton  
Mr. Larry Cole  
Mr. Dick Ragland  
Mr. Dave Prescott  
Mr. Dick Springer  
Mr. Michael Alesko  
Mr. Lans Stout  
Mr. Alan Brickley  
Mr. Wilbur Bishop  
Mr. Rick Daniels  
Mr. Steve Lockwood  
Mr. Peter Grant  
Mr. Peter MacIver  
Mr. Tom Vanderzanden  
Mr. David Seigneur  
Mr. Larry Kato  
Mr. Ernie Bonner  
Mr. William Zenger  
Mr. Doug Davina  
Mr. Eldon Hout  
Mr. Ted Spence  
Ms. Lee Hames  
Mr. Denzil MacNeice

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Chairman Kirkpatrick introduced new members of the Board. She explained that Mr. Don Jones was a representative from the State of Oregon, taking Michael Burton's alternate place on the Board; Mr. Gunner Ingraham is replacing Mr. Hershhal Tanzer as the alternate representative from Tri-Met, and Mr. Frank Corsiglia is representing the cities of Columbia County and is on the City Council of St. Helens.

Since there was not a quorum present, Chairman Kirkpatrick asked that the meeting begin with an item which would require no action.

4.1 Progress Report on the Housing Work Program

Mr. Herb Beals explained that a Housing Technical Advisory Committee had been formed in September, and had prepared drafts of areawide housing policy which would soon be before the Board. Mr. Beals described the scope of work through three phases, and explained that additional public discussion of the policies will be held in late February and early March and that early drafts are now available for Board review. After the public discussion, copies of the initial policies will be sent to the Board.

Director Kent noted that one of the reasons for bringing this matter before the Board at this time was to prepare the Board for the issue before the March meeting. In terms of overall impact on the Agency budget, Mr. Kent noted that housing elements and land use elements are the two major requirements of the HUD funding process. HUD areawide funding will be reduced by about 20% next year, even if all timeframes are met and more if they aren't, so this is an important consideration and should be dealt with as soon as possible.

There was no action required on this matter.

Mr. Ingraham asked to have Agenda Item 6.2 heard out of sequence. After discussion, it was agreed to leave it where it was on the agenda.

CALL TO ORDER

After declaration of a quorum, the February 23, 1978, meeting of the Board of Directors of the Columbia Region Association of Governments was called to order by Chairman Corky Kirkpatrick at 5:30 p.m. in Conference Room "C" of the CRAG offices.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

1. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

There were no written communications to be considered by the Board at this time.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizens present who wished to make presentations to the Board at this time.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Comm. Gordon moved, seconded by Comm. Duris, that the following items of the Consent Agenda be approved:

3.1 Minutes of the Meeting of January 26, 1978

3.2 A-95 Reviews

3.3 Amendments to FY 1978 Transportation Improvement Program Annual Element (Resolution BD 780201)

3.4 Recommendation of Water Resources Task Force Regarding Membership.

There were no comments or questions raised on any of the above items. The question was called on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

4. REPORTS

4.1 Progress Report--Housing Work Program (See beginning of minutes)

4.2 Staff Response to Coopers and Lybrand "Report to Management"

Director Kent referred to the Management Summary, and said that staff, in answer to a Board request, had responded item by item to the Coopers and Lybrand report. He recommended that the report be received and filed.

There were no comments regarding the report.

4.3 Federal Aid Urban System Program--Revised Report

Director Kent called attention to the status report of staff in the Management Summary. He said it was ori-

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

ginally anticipated that a recommendation would be made on a process to establish priorities on Federal Aid Urban funds. Staff is still working with the TIP Subcommittee and expects to return to the Board with a decision for action at the next Board meeting.

5. OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Intergovernmental Aging Services Agreement

Director Kent explained that the Intergovernmental Aging Services Agreement had been brought to the Board in December. The Board adopted the Resolution to enter the contract only on condition that agencies report back on actions taken regarding recommendations from the Aging Services Review Committee. Staff has pursued this direction and found that the other twelve members felt that these items had been adequately addressed, and asked that the contract be signed as submitted. Director Kent said the terms of the agreement give the committee sufficient authority to prevent duplication and inconsistency in the aging programs.

Comm. Gordon moved, seconded by Comm. Duris that the recommendation of staff be approved. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said that she would take under immediate advisement the matter of a Board appointment to this committee.

5.2 Final Recommendation, Framework Plan Amendments (Order Nos. 77-13 and 77-14). (Rule No. 782)

Mr. Jim Sitzman, Director of Natural Resources, noted that Mr. Dale Hermann, Hearings Officer for the Quasi-Judicial amendments, was present to inform the Board of events occurring since the Board postponed these two items in December. Mr. Sitzman explained that, in the case of Petition #39, the property had changed hands and the petitioner had requested additional time to participate in the deliberations. Mr. Sitzman called attention to the legislative portion of the Praggastis petition and said this petition identified an area of 20 acres under one ownership which could be served by gravity flow sewer. This item had been held over to give the parties time to furnish further information to the hearings officer.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Quasi-Judicial Petition #39, City of Portland

Mr. Sitzman explained that this petition concerned expansion of a 10 acre parcel, and that the issue involved the Urban Growth Boundary and annexation to the city of Portland so that water could be extended to the property. Staff recommended the petitioner refile a petition with Portland for an extraterritorial water connection.

Mr. Hermann said he had no comments to make in addition to those in his supplemental findings, which had been included in the Board agenda packet.

Mayor Goldschmidt explained the city of Portland policy prohibiting extraterritorial water extensions. The City has given guidance to the Boundary Commission that if property expects service from the City, it must be annexed.

After further Board discussion, Mayor Goldschmidt commented concerning a question raised by the Hearings Officer whether there was now a procedure in the CRAG rules which would allow annexation to occur under these conditions.

Mr. Hermann clarified that he did not believe there was anything in the rules to take care of such a case by extending the Urban Boundary under a hardship rule.

Mr. Jordan said the rules provided a hardship provision for an extraterritorial water extension, but there was no hardship provision for annexation to a City.

Mr. Stephen Janik, speaking for the applicant, said the applicant did have a hardship. All he asked was water for domestic purposes. He would like to put one other home on the property in the future, but he would restrict the property by deed controls to prevent more than that. Mr. Janik said construction of a well in that area would cost approximately \$10,000.

Mayor Goldschmidt felt the Boundary Commission should be able to handle this case under CRAG rules. He said he would be prepared to recommend to City staff that an extraterritorial extension be granted immediately if CRAG said it would adopt rules to allow such hardship extensions.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Mr. Jordan said that under regulations adopted recently in the plan regarding extraterritorial extensions, the regulation would allow this extraterritorial extension.

In answer to Coun. Bentley's questions concerning the well previously used by the owner of the property, Mr. Janik explained that the well was on an adjacent piece of property and that the owner would neither sell the property nor allow his client to continue to use the well. He said the well was uncertain, and during dry periods, produced no water. Mr. Janik said his client would by deed restriction comply with present City land use policies.

There was further discussion regarding annexation of this property to the city of Portland.

Mr. Jordan clarified that from the regional point of view if the Board adopted the plan change, it would be designating the property for urban use.

Comm. Gordon moved, seconded by Comm. Duris, that Order #77-14 be adopted by the Board. Rollcall vote. Kirkpatrick, Gordon, Bentley, Duris, Pokornowski and Jones voted aye. Goldschmidt, Ingraham, Corsiglia voted no; Skoko abstained. Through provision of the weighted vote, the motion failed by a margin of 18 ayes and 21 noes.

The matter was continued on the agenda to allow time to develop amended language.

Quasi-Judicial Petition #40, James J. Praggastis

Mr. Sitzman explained that the Board had heard this matter at its December meeting and had held it over to all the jurisdictions involved to provide new findings to the Hearings Officer. The applicant submitted findings to the Hearings Officer, which in his opinion, offered no new evidence.

Mr. Dale Hermann confirmed Mr. Sitzman's statement, and said that no new evidence had been presented for him to consider.

Coun. Bentley moved, seconded by Comm. Duris, to accept the recommendation of the Hearings Officer to deny extension of the Urban Growth Boundary to include the James J. Praggastis property.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

In answer to a question posed by Coun. Bentley, Comm. Skoko said that both Clackamas County and Lake Oswego supported inclusion of the Praggastis property inside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Coun. Bentley felt that this was a broad policy decision, not just a consideration of this particular parcel.

Director Kent explained that findings which would typify this property as a special case were not included in any material received by the Hearings Officer. If the Board decided to include this property inside the Boundary, the staff again would request direction on a basis to consider comparable issues.

Chairman Kirkpatrick pointed out that this was a Type II boundary, which had been worked out by the County and the City so that it would not include any additional area.

Coun. Bentley asked about the legislative issue. Chairman Kirkpatrick explained that the legislative question involved a change in language in the Land Use Plan and that it was tied in to this petition.

Mr. Sitzman clarified that the staff recommendation was that the Board act on the legislative petition. If it was adopted, it would automatically include the Praggastis petition. If it were rejected, the Board could then deal with the quasi-judicial issue. To deal with the quasi-judicial petition directly, the Board could leave the legislative petition with no action.

Mr. Praggastis read the letter of January 18 from Mayor Gerber expressing interest in having this property annexed.

Mayor Goldschmidt called attention to the fact that the Board was only considering the 20 acres belonging to Mr. Praggastis, but that another 80 acres were involved.

Director Kent agreed that there were another 80 acres which could be served by a gravity flow sewer and that staff felt these were also at issue.

Mayor Goldschmidt said that, as he understood it, LCDC had said CRAG had allowed too much land for immediate development, and that it seemed the Board was considering adding more.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Director Kent clarified that this was the position of 1000 Friends of Oregon. LCDC had said CRAG had not established findings to justify the growth boundary.

Coun. Bentley said that what the Board needed to discuss was not just available land, but available buildable land. From what she had read and heard, this was buildable land, with services available.

Director Kent called attention to the requirement for a need criteria and said need had not been established. It was difficult to establish regional need, but this should not be overlooked.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said she would agree, under normal circumstances, but this matter had been in the works for three years and had been very complicated.

Mr. Hermann said that while he had recommended denial, there was a strong case presented for approval. However, the burden of proof was on the petitioners and they had not proved that it should be changed, nor that there was need for additional land within the total urban growth area. He agreed that this would be difficult to do, with the statistics available.

Mayor Goldschmidt felt statistics should be available to petitioners from CRAG and that the jurisdictions should have this information available.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said the water system was at the point where Lake Oswego needed to consider a capital improvements program and that the particular area had no critical problem at the moment.

Mr. Marlin DeHaas, consulting engineer, agreed with Chairman Kirkpatrick's statement, and explained that the only site in the area requiring a large amount of water was the high school.

Mayor Goldschmidt said he would make a motion, but only with the understanding that the other 80 acres were not similarly situated. His reasons for this action were 1) that the petitioners development was three years in the process, and had been caught in the drawing of the boundaries; 2) that there was no evidence that Lake Oswego wanted to provide or had the capacity to provide, water to the other 80 acres; 3) that Lake Oswego



Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

itself would be prepared to support the continuing proposition that the admission of those 80 acres or any others would require a showing of regional need; 4) that the Board would be unwilling to entertain any more of these changes until their own statistics were prepared regarding available buildable land.

Mayor Goldschmidt clarified that the foregoing was a motion to approve Petition #40, James J. Pragastis.

Chairman Kirkpatrick reminded Mayor Goldschmidt that there was a motion on the floor. Coun. Bentley and her second agreed to withdraw the original motion.

Mr. Pokornowski seconded Mayor Goldschmidt's motion.

Mayor Goldschmidt said he had been nervous about the problems the developers had in dealing with CRAG. It was his belief a notice should be delivered to the Board, to the development community and to member jurisdictions that, while the Board had found a case that got caught astride the line, he did not see this as a problem and would only see it that way if in fact it were going to be treated as a precedent. Mayor Goldschmidt felt there was sufficient grounds to distinguish this case because of its history and because of what the jurisdictions had done to try to solve some of the problems. Mayor Goldschmidt was satisfied that the next case would have to stand on its own and stressed that the additional 80 acres would not be considered on this principal but would have to have other grounds than those being considered now.

Coun. Bentley said she could accept this motion, if the Board was dealing only with this 20 acres.

Mayor Goldschmidt commented that the Hearings Officer had done an excellent job, that his findings had been easy to read, and that they provided good direction.

Comm. Gordon asked the opinion of the legal counsel whether the action taken by Mayor Goldschmidt's motion could be defended.

Mr. Jordan said that CRAG would have to justify the urban growth boundary, but he did not see any difficulty as a matter of law in approving the petition.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Comm. Gordon felt that Lake Oswego staff should be instructed to come up with additional findings and conclusions to support this motion.

Chairman Kirkpatrick explained that this direction had been given two months ago, and none were forthcoming.

Director Kent said it was his understanding that Mayor Goldschmidt's motion directed that a policy be established by the Board.

Comm. Gordon agreed that the policy should be beefed up, rather than this particular case.

Director Kent said that if the motion for approval was based on the understanding of those four points, his interpretation was that this would be Board policy, which would be followed in any future considerations of this type. It could be written up and inserted at the appropriate place in the CRAG rules if that was deemed necessary.

Chairman Kirkpatrick asked if staff had a substitute order prepared which could become a part of the motion.

Mr. Jordan recommended that the Board vote on the motion before it, and said he would prepare a resolution for the Board for adoption prior to the adjournment of the meeting.

Rollcall vote on the motion as stated. Kirkpatrick, Groener, Goldschmidt, Gordon, Bentley, Duris Ingraham, Pokornowski, Jones and Corsiglia all voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS, 7:30 P.M.

5.6 Amendment, Study Areas (Rule #78-1)

Mr. Jim Sitzman explained that this public hearing had been called to consider amendment of the Study Area Rules in the Framework Plan. Tentative dates have been proposed for nine study areas. The city of Troutdale requested that the study area south of Troutdale be tabled, and consideration for resolution be tied to findings on the Urban Growth Boundary itself.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Mr. Denzil McNeice said he lived in Oregon City, and that he had been assured that this study area issue would be resolved by February 5, 1978. He had been ready to go before the Planning Commission the end of May, 1977 with a proposal to use his property, but the matter was postponed until December. Now it had been extended until September of 1978.

Comm. Skoko felt Mr. McNeice had a valid point.

Comm. Gordon had no objections to the recommendations since the jurisdictions could act prior to the time set, if they wished.

Coun. Bentley moved, seconded by Comm. Skoko, that Rule 78-1 be adopted, with the exception of item 3, south of Troutdale. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

5.7 1979 Criminal Justice Plan (Resolution BD 780203)

Mr. Jack Bails, Director of Criminal Justice, introduced Captain James Slauson of the city of Gresham, Vice Chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee.

Captain Slauson explained that the 1979 Criminal Justice Plan had been developed by the Criminal Justice Committee at CRAG. The Law Enforcement Council required a full service district to develop a complete plan so that monies could be allocated and a basis provided so that projects could be awarded. This was basically the same plan approved in 1977, with minor modifications. A survey had been sent out to agencies in the CRAG region soliciting comments for any proposed changes to the plan and these had been addressed by the Committee and incorporated in the document.

There was no one to speak in opposition to the Plan.

Comm. Gordon moved, seconded by Coun. Corsiglia, that Resolution BD 780203 be adopted. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

The public hearings were closed and the meeting adjourned to convene the General Assembly. Minutes of the General Assembly meeting are included with these minutes as Attachment "A".

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

The Board meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

Continuation of Petition #39

Mayor Goldschmidt presented an amendment to Order #77-14 which would add sections so that, while the petition would still be denied, the situation could be avoided where the urban growth boundary would be adjusted to extend urban services. He felt this would be a more creative solution than bending the boundary. The Board would adopt standards at some point that would provide the Boundary Commission a basis to make annexation decisions wherein the property would stay outside the urban growth boundary, but a jurisdiction could provide services. Rather than depending on covenants, the property would be outside the urban growth boundary.

Coun. Bentley was concerned about the reaction of the LCDC to this proposal.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Coun. Corsiglia, that Order #77-14 be amended as proposed in the material he had distributed.

Mayor Goldschmidt clarified that the petitioner would not get a special dispensation, but that if standards were adopted, the City could extend the water line. City staff would be directed to operate on that basis.

All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Continuation of Petition #40.

Mr. Jordan distributed a draft of fifteen proposed findings for approval of the quasi-judicial petition. He said the first eleven were facts staff had gathered and found to be true. The remaining four were items stated by Mayor Goldschmidt in his earlier motion.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Comm. Gordon that the proposed substitute order be approved.

There was some discussion about the meaning of item 14 and whether it would set a precedent. Mr. Jordan clarified that item 14 simply recognized, as a matter of law, that the burden of proof was on the petitioner and that this was an impossible burden under the circum-

**Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978**

stances. Therefore the Board was not requiring this of the petitioner, in this particular case.

Mayor Goldschmidt said that if this was the case, he was in favor of the amendment.

Question called on the motion. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jordan proposed a substitute Rule #78-2 to amend the Land Use Framework Element Map in accordance with the Order just adopted.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Comm. Skoko, that substitute Rule #78-2 be adopted. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

**5.3 Funding Recommendation--TSM Projects (Resolution BD 760202)**

Mr. William Ockert, Transportation Director, explained that the TSM Prototype Study had been completed and staff was prepared to make final recommendations on allocation of the remaining Category V TSM Reserve Funds. These recommendations had been summarized in Staff Report No. 20, Revised. He said that both the TSM Task Force and TTAC had reviewed the recommendations and had recommended that the Board reserve the remaining Category V monies for TSM projects as documented in the Staff Report.

Coun. Bentley had some concerns about possible over or under expenditures which might occur in the future. Mr. Ockert explained that there was a contingency fund to provide for such changes.

Mayor Goldschmidt said that the project was well done and the staff should be commended for its fine work.

Comm. Duris moved, seconded by Comm. Gordon, that Resolution BD 78202 be adopted. All Board members voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Goldschmidt questioned the matter of state match for Interstate Transfer projects. It was his understanding that there was a recent action by the Oregon Transportation Commission which would commit the State to share the match.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Mr. Ted Spence clarified that if the two funding referenda to be conducted this year are successful, the State is committed to contribute one-half the local match for Interstate Transfer projects on state highways. A policy statement is being prepared and will be distributed to the Board.

5.4 Future of Growth Management Task Forces

Mr. Sitzman said staff had been directed to survey the Growth Management Task Forces to determine their interest in future work on revision of the Urban Growth Management Strategy. Responses to the survey were minimal and mixed, leading staff to believe that the Task Forces did not have a clear interest in continuing work on the urban service area determinations, at least not in a lead capacity. Therefore, it was staff recommendation that the Board allow the presently scheduled local and regional planning programs to proceed with work related to the question of service areas, allowing the Task Forces to individually decide whether and how they might support existing local and regional planning programs. If the Board concurred with this recommendation, no formal action would be necessary at this time.

Director Kent said he had received a call from Joy Burgess, member of the Clackamas County Task Force, asking that the Management Summary be clarified that Paragraph 4 was stated in terms of setting a time frame and would not reflect any dilatory action on the part of the Clackamas Task Force.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said the Board was in accord that the Task Force continue in whatever manner it saw fit.

The Board took no action on this matter.

5.5 Proposed Compliance Schedule for LCDC

Mr. Sitzman explained that CRAG was responsible to submit to LCDC for its approval a compliance schedule on which the agency plans to complete work to meet the LCDC Goals. This schedule was due for consideration by LCDC at its meeting of February 24. Staff had amended the original compliance schedule to address changes which had occurred in the interim. Mr. Sitzman summarized the changes as follows:

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

1. Selected topic areas for regional compliance taken from LCDC Goals #3 and #14.
2. Introduction of annual policy formation, prior to completion of a comprehensive plan.
3. Two stage plan for development and acknowledgement; the first stage, to seek acknowledgement according to local and regional approved schedules and the second stage to look to local jurisdictions to reopen acknowledged local plans for compliance with newly adopted regional policies.

Mr. Sitzman said the compliance schedule recognized the considerable difference in timing of compliance schedules of local jurisdictions.

Director Kent said CRAG had been handed a compliance schedule which had been impossible to make sense out of in terms of cities, counties and CRAG reaching any kind of smooth system on compliance dates. The purposes of this schedule were to minimize the effects of those decisions being on disparate schedules, and to try to apply some continuity to the local plans as they are adopted. Director Kent said the proposal was thought to be a good compromise. The schedules had been preliminarily discussed with staff and policy members of LCDC who indicated that CRAG is moving in the right direction on this matter.

Mayor Goldschmidt questioned a portion of the document dealing with shelter, income and environment, and asked about the impact on the CRAG budget and whether the proposal could be carried out within budget constraints.

Director Kent said analysis of the impact of each project had not been done, but he was sure it could be kept within the budget, or at least within a modest increase.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Comm. Skoko, that Res. BD 780205, for the purpose of approving CRAG's Regional Planning Program be adopted.

Mr. Ingraham asked how the Board would be kept informed of progress. Chairman Kirkpatrick explained that a work program would deal with this.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Director Kent called attention to Page 48 of the Compliance Schedule which was a flow chart schedule. He said this illustrated the time frame in which work was to be done, showing the work programs, annual reviews and policy analyses, coinciding with the end of the fiscal year, at which time additional policy decisions may be made.

The question was called on the motion. All Board members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.

6.1 Establishment of Immediate Growth Areas

Mr. Sitzman explained the Urban Growth Boundary and said that Immediate Growth Areas were being defined to insulate lands from LCDC Goal #3 (agricultural lands) considerations until the Urban Growth Boundary findings are completed. Several jurisdictions had contacted CRAG, saying they did not believe the lines were drawn large enough. Other areas had urged that the regional Urban Growth Boundary be decided at the earliest possible time. Multnomah County especially objected to inclusion of parts of West Hills land in the Immediate Growth Area.

Mr. Martin Cramton of Multnomah County planning staff explained the point of view of the County and encouraged the Board to pressure staff to move as rapidly as possible toward justification of the Urban Growth Boundaries.

Director Kent explained that staff had been receiving proposals from jurisdiction staff regarding exclusion and inclusion of certain portions up until the beginning of this meeting. Staff had declined to accept proposals that had not been approved by the legislative body of the affected jurisdiction. It was felt CRAG staff should not interject itself into the decision-making of those legislative bodies. He said that striking this boundary was basically a permissive situation extended by LCDC and that nothing would actually be lost by not striking the boundary, save the necessity to go through an agricultural exception for development of any land outside the city limits. This process would insulate that land from LCDC goal #3.



**Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978**

Mr. Lynn Dingler, representing the cities of Canby and Molalla, presented proposals requiring additions to the Immediate Growth Areas.

Mayor Goldschmidt asked if it would be possible to approve the boundaries, with later consideration of minor adjustments.

Chairman Kirkpatrick explained that LCDC had requested that a decision be made. She did not feel petitions represented a major amount of property.

Mayor Wilbur Bishop of Tigard said he approved of Mayor Goldschmidt's suggestion, saying that he had been unable to get a response from the Washington County Planning Commission regarding the boundaries.

Mayor Goldschmidt felt LCDC should accept this type of proposal subsequent to approval of the Immediate Growth Boundary.

Mr. Dick Raglan, Planning Consultant for the city of Tualatin, said he had two annexations of 20 acres and 23 acres that he thought should be included within the Boundary. He felt that within the next four or five months the final urban growth boundary should be completed.

Mayor Alan Brickley of West Linn, asked what the consequences would be if a recommendation was made to LCDC and it was not acceptable to them.

Director Kent explained that those parcels not included in the Immediate Growth Boundary determination would be given consideration in the findings for the overall Growth Boundary determination which would be an action subsequent to the one proposed.

Mr. Bob Stacey, staff attorney for 1000 Friends of Oregon, said the first three criteria were relatively easy to reduce to map form. He said the Washington County proposal for the Hillsboro area was based on the fourth criteria which requires a showing of need for the land. He questioned whether an adequate showing was produced for an area northwest of Hillsboro.

Director Kent continued that the staff recommendation encouraged the Board to urge its jurisdictions to

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

cooperate with CRAG staff to try to make findings on the Urban Growth Boundaries sooner than the approved twelve month schedule.

There was further discussion of the requirements of LCDC and what adoption of these interim areas would provide.

Mr. Lans Stout of Washington County planning staff said the Planning Commission had adopted the urban growth boundary shown on the map based on population projections for 1985. To the best of their knowledge it met the criteria of Goal #14.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Comm. Duris, that Resolution BD 780206, for the purpose of approving Immediate Growth Boundaries for the Region, be adopted, and that it be amended if specifics were raised.

Comm. Gordon explained that he would have to vote no because of the County's position on the matter of the West Hills Area.

Mr. Sitzman said that the city of Sandy had submitted a letter requesting a somewhat larger area for immediate growth than staff was willing to recommend. They requested inclusion of three small parcels not within the present city limits. Clackamas County had requested a small parcel between Lake Oswego and West Linn. Staff had been unable to do a review, but the requests were being noted for the record.

Mayor Goldschmidt moved, seconded by Comm. Gordon, that Resolution 780206 be amended to permit a procedure to be presented to LCDC which would allow subsequent minor changes after review by staff. These would have to meet the four criteria.

Question called on the motion to amend. All Board members present voted aye. The motion carried. Coun. Pokornowski abstained from voting.

There was further discussion of the main motion.

Director Kent called attention of the Board to the Praggastis property approved earlier by the Board, and said it should be reflected on the map.

Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

Coun. Bentley moved, seconded by Comm. Skoko, that the Resolution be amended to include the Praggastis property. All Board members present voted aye except Coun. Pokornowski, who abstained from voting. The motion carried.

Question called on the main motion. All Board members present voted aye except Comm. Gordon who voted no. The motion carried. Coun. Pokornowski abstained from voting. Comm. Gordon commented that his negative vote had been cast in opposition to inclusion of the Forest Park area.

6.2 Addition to Unified Work Program--Transportation Corridor Development Corporation Feasibility Study (Resolution BD 780204)

Director Kent explained that TTAC had recommended addition to the Unified Work Program of a feasibility study of a Transportation Corridor Development Corporation. Staff has recommended addition of a CRAG Board member to the Task Force, which will be the policy guidance group on this study. Director Kent asked that the draft resolution be amended to strike the words "...and the planning team."

There was Board discussion regarding representation on the Task Force.

Mr. Gunner Ingraham of Tri-Met explained that the study will investigate current and potential development in the I-205 Corridor and the feasibility of a Transportation Corridor Development Corporation.

Comm. Gordon moved, seconded by Comm. Skoko, that Resolution BD 780204, for the purpose of adding a feasibility study to the UWP and providing for CRAG representation on the Task Force be adopted.

Commissioner Skoko suggested that Clackamas County should participate on the Task Force. Mr. Ingraham said the study would initially be limited to a portion of the Corridor in Multnomah County, but suggested that Clackamas County could participate on the planning team for the study.

**Board of Directors  
Minutes of February 23, 1978**

Question called on the motion. All Board members present voted aye except Comm. Duris who abstained. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Carder  
Recording Secretary

MEC:dc:02  
5/1-20

## ATTACHMENT "A"

## COLUMBIA REGION ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 1978

Members in Attendance

Comm. Stan Skoko  
 Coun. Terry Vandermark  
 Coun. Corky Kirkpatrick  
 Coun. Alayne C. Woolsey  
 Mayor John C. Nelson  
 Mayor Alan Brickley  
 Comm. Mel Gordon  
 Coun. Paula Bentley  
 Mayor Neil Goldschmidt  
 Mayor R. M. Sturges  
 Comm. Mel Gordon  
 Comm. Miller Duris  
 Coun. Jack Nelson  
 Mayor Jack O. Harper  
 Mayor Wilbur Bishop  
 Coun. Dick Pokornowski  
 Coun. Frank Corsiglia  
 Mr. Donald Jones  
 Mr. Gunner Ingraham  
 Mr. R. L. Carroll

Staff in Attendance

Mr. Denton Kent  
 Mr. Andrew Jordan  
 Mr. James Sitzman  
 Mr. William Ockert  
 Ms. Marilyn Holstrum  
 Mr. Michael Huston  
 Mr. Tim Holder  
 Mr. Jeff Gibbs  
 Ms. Jennifer Sims  
 Mr. Keith Lawton  
 Mr. Stanley Hirota

Others in Attendance

Ms. Marjorie Stewart  
 Mr. Kent L. Taylor  
 Mr. Cliff Rutan  
 Mr. Herald Campbell  
 Mr. Robert Stacey  
 Mr. John Hankee  
 Mr. Martin Cramton  
 Mr. Larry Cole  
 Mr. Dick Ragland  
 Mr. Dave Prescott  
 Mr. Dick Springer  
 Mr. Michael Alesko  
 Mr. Lans Stout  
 Mr. Rick Daniels  
 Mr. Steve Lockwood  
 Mr. Peter Grant  
 Mr. Peter MacIver  
 Mr. Tom Vanderzanden  
 Mr. David Seigneur  
 Mr. Larry Kato  
 Mr. Ernie Bonner  
 Mr. William Zenger  
 Mr. Doug Davina  
 Mr. Eldon Hout  
 Mr. Ted Spence  
 Ms. Lee Hames

General Assembly  
Minutes of February 23, 1978

CALL TO ORDER

After declaration of a quorum, the February 23, 1978, meeting of the General Assembly of the Columbia Region Association of Governments was called to order by Chairman Corky Kirkpatrick at 8:00 p.m. in Conference Room "C" of the CRAG offices. Chairman Kirkpatrick said the first item of business would be the election of officers. She said that she had appointed a nominating committee of Lloyd Anderson, Robert Burco and Alan Brickley. The committee had forwarded a letter to the Board which had been included in the Board agenda packet. It was the recommendation of the committee that the terms of the incumbent officers of CRAG be extended another year. The committee said that this recommendation considered the effectiveness and dedication exhibited by the current officers, and that both had expressed a willingness to serve another term.

Coun. Bentley moved, seconded by Comm. Gordon that the report of the nominating committee be received and that Corky Kirkpatrick and Jim Larkins be nominated to serve another term as Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively of the Columbia Region Association of Governments.

Chairman Kirkpatrick called for a rollcall vote. Comm. Gordon moved that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast as indicated in Coun. Bentley's motion.

All members present voted aye except Alayne Woolsey, who expressed reluctance to vote. She said she had received late notification and that she had not received a copy of the committee report. Director Kent apologized for the oversight in failing to include the report in the General Assembly mailing, and promised to remedy this failing in the future.

Mr. Brickley read the report of the nominating committee. Based on the reading of the report, Ms. Woolsey changed her vote to aye, making the vote unanimous.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said she would appoint a budget committee in the near future, and encouraged members of the General Assembly who were interested in serving to contact her or leave word with the Executive Director.

Chairman Kirkpatrick said the next meeting of the General Assembly would probably be in June.

**General Assembly  
Minutes of February 23, 1978**

The meeting of the General Assembly was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Mary E. Carder*  
Mary E. Carder  
Recording Secretary.

MEC:dc:02  
5/21-23