

BEFORE THE COUNCIL
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

April 10, 1980

Councilors in Attendance

Presiding Officer Marge Kafoury
Vice Presiding Officer Jack Deines
Coun. Mike Burton
Coun. Donna Stuhr
Coun. Charles Williamson
Coun. Craig Berkman
Coun. Corky Kirkpatrick
Coun. Jane Rhodes
Coun. Betty Schedeen
Coun. Cindy Banzer
Coun. Gene Peterson

Others in Attendance

Mr. Bob Weil
Ms. Beth Blunt
Mr. R. W. Blunt, Jr.
Mr. Dennis O'Neel
Mr. Terry Morgan
Mr. Steve Kearney
Mr. Jack Leigh
Mr. Mike Schmauch
Mr. Bob Stacey
Mr. Gary McDonald

Councilor Not In Attendance

Coun. Ernie Bonner

In Attendance

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson

Staff In Attendance

Mr. Denton Kent
Mr. Andrew Jordan
Mr. James Sitzman
Mr. McKay Rich
Mr. Warren Iliff
Ms. Jill Hinckley
Ms. Leigh Zimmermann
Ms. Marilyn Holstrom
Ms. Berta Delman
Ms. Linda Brentano
Mr. Charles Shell
Ms. Mary Carder

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

CALL TO ORDER

After declaration of a quorum, the April 10, 1980, meeting of the Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) was called to order by Presiding Officer Marge Kafourfy at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Metropolitan Service District, 527 S.W. Hall St., Portland, Oregon 97201.

1. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizens present who wished to speak at this time.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

2.1 A-95 Review, directly related to Metro.

Coun. Deines moved, seconded by Coun. Kirkpatrick, that agenda item 2.1 be approved.

Coun. Stuhr questioned item 5 of the A-95 Review wherein the applicant was the Metropolitan Service District, and the request concerned a program to reduce auto travel in neighborhoods, increase utilization of neighborhood centers and make residential roads attractive to pedestrians.

Mr. Kent explained that this was a proposal to support transportation planning efforts to reduce automobile travel. It is a joint application between Metro and the City of Portland, and Clackamas County. The primary purpose is to seek location of facilities in neighborhoods to reduce transportation with a resulting reduction in automobile travel.

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

Executive Officer Gustafson introduced Ms. Sue Woodford, new Personnel Officer at Metro.

Presiding Officer Kafoury advised that she would request that Council adjourn to an Executive Session at the conclusion of the formal meeting through the provisions of ORS 192.660 (2) a.

3. NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearing.

3.1 Ordinance No. 80-89, Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in Clackamas County. (First Reading).

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

It having been first ascertained that it was the consensus of the Council to do so, the Clerk read Ordinance No. 80-89 the first time by title only.

The Presiding Officer outlined the method for proceeding with a public hearing and said that written testimony would be accepted on this matter until April 14. All testimony would be referred to the Regional Planning Committee which has scheduled a special meeting April 21 in the Metro offices to consider such testimony.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Ardis Stevenson, representing Clackamas County, said that she had made comments at the hearing held in Clackamas County on April 7. Because of requests for additional information which had been received by Metro staff, she wished to make additional comments at this time. Ms. Stevenson outlined past actions taken by Clackamas County, saying that the County has a very responsible policy in land use designation for urban land developed in an urban manner and for agricultural uses on areas outside the UGB.

Mr. Tom VanderZanden spoke in connection with the East Urban Extension Area, No. 3. He explained the need for additional land and outlined the proposed new boundary. Coun. Peterson asked if this was a year 2000 boundary. Mr. VanderZanden replied that it absolutely would be.

Coun. Deines commented regarding comments made at the previous hearing by representatives of Happy Valley in connection with a sewer extension. Mr. VanderZanden said he had contacted the Mayor of Happy Valley and that this item had not appeared on their Council agenda. However, the Mayor will sign a letter which says they are signing a planning area agreement with the County. That letter will be forthcoming prior to the 14th of this month.

Coun. Stuhr questioned Mr. VanderZanden about testimony referring to extending the boundary even larger. Mr. VanderZanden said there had been suggestions made to extend further to add another 500 or 600 acres of property, but the County is not suggesting that this be done at this time.

Mr. Bob Stacey, staff attorney for 1000 Friends of Oregon, said his comments were addressed toward the Boundary as a whole, rather than specific portions of the amendment. His comments were more general than he wished, since he had only yesterday received a copy of the draft preliminary staff report on this amendment. Mr. Stacey was not prepared to say that 1000 Friends either supported or opposed the proposal before the Council, because of inadequate review.

Mr. Stacey concurred with the staff finding that the capacity

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

in cities had been underestimated but recognized that even with this adjustment there would be a need for additional land in Clackamas County. The staff report suggests that there will still be an unmet need by the year 2000. Mr. Stacey questioned this need, both on the basis that vacant land was available in Washington County to accommodate it and on the grounds that the "208" projections for the County were unreliable. On the other hand, he recognized the problem of rural growth but did not think there was sufficient substantiation of the problem so that he could urge approval on that basis.

Mr. Stacey asked that staff reports be forwarded to his office so that he would have sufficient time to prepare testimony before the next meeting. The Presiding Officer told him that the staff reports would be ready previous to the meeting of the 21st of April.

Mr. Terry Morgan, representing the Happy Valley Landowner's Committee, asked to submit written testimony at this time. He asked if the amount of land being added could be justified and whether it was in the right location. He questioned whether land currently inside the boundary was adequate to accommodate urban growth.

Mr. Mike Schmauch said he represented the people of the Sieben Lane area. He had testified at the Monday night meeting but wished to clarify his testimony in reaction to some of the things he had heard after that meeting. His big concern was not whether or not his land would be within the UGB, but rather when the land in area #3 would actually be converted to urban uses. He was concerned about conversion criteria and said that apparently the conversion criteria were very much in place and approved by LCDC. However, he wanted to be certain that one of the criteria would be showing a need on a regional basis.

Mr. Gary MacDonald said he represented Larry Weber of the Rock Creek Community Association. He asked to present a letter to the Council from Mr. Weber. He said that the area of their concern was the east extension and that Mr. Weber's statement endorsed the Clackamas County petition for amendment of the regional UGB known as East Urban Extension Area.

Mr. Ed Davis of the City of Wilsonville, said he had not been able to attend the Monday night meeting. He opposed the Clackamas County exclusion of what they referred to as area #5, Wilsonville industrial area. He concurred with a Metro staff recommendation to retain area #5 in the UGB.

Presiding Officer Kafoury suggested that Mr. Davis might wish to attend the meeting of the Regional Planning Committee on April 21, when this matter would be discussed again.

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

Mr. Dennis O'Neel said he was from the area west of Marylhurst and lived in Lake Oswego. He had purchased a 10-acre site and was building his own home, but had had no success obtaining water. For this reason, he wanted to be included in the UGB. He felt that this would help him to obtain services. He had requested annexation and had received a favorable consideration from the Boundary Commission.

Presiding Officer Kafoury clarified that Mr. O'Neel was indeed speaking in support of the Clackamas County request. Mr. O'Neel said that was correct.

In answer to Coun. Burton, Mr. Sitzman said that questions had not been answered concerning serviceability of the area. This matter would have to be reviewed and he would expect to have a full staff report at the meeting of April 21.

Mr. Steve Kearney, a resident of Lake Oswego west of Marylhurst, said that he had a letter from State ~~Senator~~ ^{Rep (amended 4/24/80)} T. C. Achilles, Jr., which he wished to present to the Council. He said that they were concerned primarily with area #7, which they felt should not be urbanized. Adding more people would compound the problem of getting services.

Coun. Peterson clarified that what Mr. Kearney was asking was an exclusion from the area. Mr. Kearney said that what they wanted was to maintain the rural character of their area.

Coun. Burton brought out that if they were in the UGB they could get better services. Mr. Kearney said he would like to have better service and thought that perhaps it was a tradeoff.

In answer to Coun. Peterson's question concerning location of the property, Ms. Stevenson pointed out that three property owners were to the north of this property and would prefer to be outside the Boundary, and that there were two lots to the south where the residents wished to be inside the Boundary. She felt that the difference was in acreage and in terms of the drainage basin.

There being no other persons who wished to speak at this time, the public hearing was closed.

Presiding Officer Kafoury again announced that the next opportunity for testimony would be at the Regional Planning Committee meeting April 21, at 5:00 p.m., here at Metro.

3.2 Ordinance No. 80-90, Amending Ordinance No. 79-72
Adding Supplemental Appropriations to Fiscal Year
1980 Budget (First Reading)

Coun. Kirkpatrick moved, seconded by Coun. Rhodes, that Ordinance No. 80-90 be adopted.

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

It having been ascertained that it was the consensus of the Council to do so, the Clerk read Ordinance No. 80-70 the first time by title only.

The public hearing was opened. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Ordinance No. 80-87, Relating to Times for Regular Council Meetings and Order of Agendas and Amending Ordinance No. 79-65. (Second Reading)

It having been ascertained that it was the consensus of the Council to do so, the Clerk read Ordinance No. 80-87 the second time by title only.

Coun. Rhodes pointed out that this matter had been discussed at the meeting of the Regional Planning Committee. Problems were in connection with the regular meeting part of the Ordinance, rather than with the second part which had to do with the order of business.

Coun. Rhodes moved, seconded by Coun. Stuhr, to amend the Ordinance, section 3, regular meetings, by returning to the original wording and then replace the word "second" with the word "first." She clarified that this would then read, "The Council would meet regularly the first and fourth Thursday of each month at a time designated by the Presiding Officer."

Question called on the motion to amend. Roll call vote. Couns. Stuhr, Williamson, Berkman, Kirkpatrick, Rhodes, Schedeen and Kafoury voted aye. Couns. Banzer, Peterson, Deines voted nay. Couns. Burton and Bonner were absent. The motion carried.

Coun. Burton returned to the meeting.

Roll call vote on approval of the Ordinance as amended. Couns. Kafoury, Stuhr, Williamson, Berkman, Kirkpatrick, Rhodes, Schedeen, Banzer voted aye. Couns. Burton, Deines, Peterson voted nay.

Coun. Banzer changed her vote from nay to aye for purposes of reconsideration. The Ordinance will be reconsidered at the next regular Council meeting.

5. GENERAL DISCUSSION

5.1 First Five Years Survey.

Ms. Jennifer Sims told Councilors the results of the first portion of the Survey. She talked about the next portion, giving timelines for its distribution and coding.

Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980

Councilors questioned Ms. Sims about certain aspects of the results of the Survey and made suggestions about construction of the next phase.

The Executive Officer asked Councilors' consideration of development of a Five Year Operational Plan. He suggested a Saturday workshop to develop policy. He hoped to use the Survey results in an analysis. Presiding Officer Kafoury suggested that the Coordinating Committee consider and comment back to the Council how to proceed with the Five Year Operational Plan.

5.2 Zoo Levy Committee Report.

Senator Ragsdale and Carol Lewis reported to the Council on progress of the Zoo Serial Levy Campaign Committee. Senator Ragsdale told how the campaign was proceeding and how Councilors would be expected to contribute to the effort.

Councilors questioned Senator Ragsdale about the progress of the campaign fund drive and what the Committee had done toward distributing campaign materials, the progress on the movie and what was being done with billboards.

5.3 Report from Budget Task Force.

The Executive Officer outlined a memo from the Budget Task Force which summarized recommendations made as a result of their meetings and deliberations. Through the Memorandum, the Task Force outlined priorities and requirements for sufficient contingency. It appeared that there was strong agreement that Metro needed a State lobbyist.

Councilors discussed the recommendations of the Task Force and the role of Metro with relation to priorities and the Task Force choices.

5.4 Major projects for next six months.

The Executive Officer called attention to a document outlining a schedule for major projects for Council decisions within the next six months. He asked the Council how they wished to handle this detailed list. Councilors discussed the report and agreed that this report should be a major item for consideration on the next discussion agenda.

5.5 Landfill Siting.

The Executive Officer explained that preliminary screening of sites for landfills has been accomplished. Sites designated for first consideration are primarily outside the UGB. Council agreed that it would not be necessary to take action or make decisions on siting, since the majority of the sites were outside

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 10, 1980**

the UGB. Mr. Gustafson said the Council would be kept informed of considerations given to designation of sites.

5.6 Johnson Creek.

Coun. Rhodes announced that there will be a Council meeting on June 16, 1980 at 7:00 p.m. at Marshall High School to hold a remonstrance hearing and first reading of the Johnson Creek LID Formation Ordinance.

The Executive Officer said it had been suggested that an ad be put in the newspaper outlining the remonstrance procedures for the Johnson Creek LID. After Council discussion, it was the consensus not to put such advertising in the paper or to print a remonstrance form.

The Executive Officer announced that Mr. Burke Raymond, City Manager of the city of Gresham, had accepted the position of Director of Environmental and Technical Services with Metro. Mr. Raymond has requested that he be allowed to retain his ICMA pension fund when he is employed here. To do this would require a variance of the Personnel Rules. It would be necessary for the Council to vote on such a variance, if Council approves an amendment to the Personnel Rules. If this amendment is adopted, employees at Metro would have the option of taking advantage of the ICMA pension plan at no additional cost.

Coun. Williamson moved, seconded by Coun. Schedeen, to recommend a variance from Personnel Rules allowing inclusion of the ICMA pension plan as an employee option. All Councilors present voting aye, the motion carried.

There being no other business the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Carder
Clerk of the Council