

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

April 2, 1981

Councilors in Attendance

Presiding Officer Jack Deines
Coun. Ernie Bonner
Coun. Cindy Banzer
Coun. Bruce Etlinger
Coun. Mike Burton
Coun. Bob Oleson
Coun. Charles Williamson
Coun. Craig Berkman
Coun. Jane Rhodes

Others in Attendance

Beth Blunt
Bob Blunt
Tom Culhane
Lloyd Keefe
Bob Weil

In Attendance

Executive Officer Rick Gustafson

Staff in Attendance

Denton Kent
Andrew Jordan
Joe Cortwright
Paula Godwin
Sue Woodford
Merle Irvine
Gus Rivera
Sharon Kullberg
Judy Roumpf
Ellen Duke
Norm Wietting
Caryl Waters
Mike Holstun
Marie Nelson

Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981

CALL TO ORDER

After declaration of a quorum, Presiding Officer Deines called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 527 S.W. Hall Street, Portland, Oregon.

1. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL

There were no written communications to Council at this meeting.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications to Council on non-agenda items at this meeting.

3. RESOLUTIONS

3.1 Resolution No. 81-234, For the Purpose of Establishing a New Classification "Public Information Specialist 2"; Authorizing Such a New Position in Public Information for Solid Waste (Coordinating Committee Recommendation)

Coun. Burton, Chairman of the Council Coordinating Committee, said the Committee had been asked to take two actions at their last meeting regarding public information positions: 1) to establish a new job title for the Zoo's Public Relations Coordinator; and 2) to establish a new solid waste position of Public Relations Coordinator. The Committee approved a title change for the Zoo position to Public Information Coordinator. The Committee recommended that staff prepare a job description for the solid waste position and recommend an appropriate salary range. Coun. Burton said he would endorse the staff recommendation before the Council which proposed a title of Public Information Specialist 2 and set the salary range at 8.0 (\$17,665 - \$21,396). He noted the salary survey provided by staff indicated the proposed pay range compared favorably with other agencies but in some cases, other positions were not dealing with the same level of complexity and controversy of issues as proposed for this position. Coun. Burton then moved the Council adopt the resolution. Coun. Bonner seconded the motion.

Coun. Etlinger explained he had opposed the position at the last Coordinating Committee meeting. He now supported the position but hoped at the end of six months or one year a work product would be delivered which would bring about more public support for a regional government. He suggested once the work product was delivered, the position could be used to assist in other areas.

Coun. Burton said he shared many of Coun. Etlinger's concerns. He also explained that in light of recent staff cutbacks, some could criticize the Council for increasing the solid waste staff. However, he said, the Council had an obvious mandate to carry out a number of solid waste programs and this position would be funded from the Solid Waste Department. The other public information positions eliminated were funded from other departments which no longer have a source

Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981

of revenue. He said the situation was unfortunate, but Metro would have to be realistic.

Coun. Bonner asked Coun. Burton if he would accept an amendment to the main motion which would provide a review of the position and work accomplished after six months. Coun. Bonner said this was the intent of the Coordinating Committee at their last meeting. Coun. Burton did recall that recommendation and questioned why no mention was made of it in the staff's report.

Coun. Berkman said a six-month review would not be fair to staff in their efforts to recruit competent candidates. He proposed funding for one year and to review the position as part of the annual budget review process.

Presiding Officer Deines said the six-month review was initially his proposal. He had made that recommendation to the Coordinating Committee not because he had a problem with the position but because of the slow progress and uncertain status of the resource recovery plant. If the program is held up, the position may not be justified, he said.

Coun. Bonner moved to amend the main motion which would add a new paragraph 3 to Resolution No. 81-234 as follows: "Be it resolved that this position be reviewed by the Metro Council at the end of the first six months of the program." Coun. Etlinger seconded the motion.

Coun. Burton said if any aspect of the solid waste program were delayed in the next year, the public information specialist would be needed to explain these delays to the public. He thought the job too critical to fund for less than one year.

Coun. Williamson thought if the work program for the position was uncertain enough to recommend funding for six months, then perhaps Metro would be better off to contract the work. He said the position should be funded only if enough work could be provided to warrant one-year funding.

Coun. Burton explained the Coordinating Committee had debated whether to contract for the public information work but decided to recommend hiring a staff person. The Committee generally agreed the tasks to be accomplished were complex and controversial and would require the dedicated efforts of a full-time employee.

Coun. Williamson moved the previous question. The motion carried. Coun. Berkman asked if the amendment was consistent with current personnel policies. Mr. Denton Kent said the current policy does not provide for Council review but does call for the supervisor to review a position at the end of six months. A vote was taken on the amendment to the main motion. The motion carried. A vote was taken on the main motion which also carried. Presiding Officer Deines declared Resolution No. 81-234 adopted as amended.

3.2 Resolution No. 81-232, For the Purpose of Recommending the City of Portland's Request for Acknowledgement of Compliance with LCDC Goals (Regional Development Committee Recommendation)

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981**

Coun. Bonner said a number of Portland residents had appeared at the Regional Development Committee meeting speaking for and against the proposed resolution. He then asked Mr. Joe Cortwright to address the Council regarding the resolution, especially regarding the condition of acknowledgement.

Presiding Officer Deines said he would accept public testimony on the resolution after staff's presentation.

Mr. Cortwright explained the former Regional Planning Committee had noted the City of Portland had adopted language in their Comprehensive Plan that was not consistent with regionally required coordination language. The City has subsequently, by working with Metro staff, identified other language which is consistent and the new language would commit the City to coordinate with Metro's Solid Waste Management planning process. Mr. Cortwright said the City of Portland Planning Commission will hear the amended language on April 6, 1981, and the amended language will be before the City Council on April 7, 1981. He said both the City and Metro anticipate the language will be approved. He also said the staff report and resolution before the Metro Council were prepared conditional upon the approval of that language by the City of Portland. Mr. Cortwright then introduced Mr. Tracy Watson, Chief Long-range Planner for the City of Portland, to the Council.

Coun. Bonner moved to adopt Resolution No. 81-232 as introduced by the Regional Development Committee, Coun. Berkman seconded the motion.

Mr. Watson read a letter from Mr. Terry Sandblast, Acting Director of the City of Portland Planning Bureau. The letter explained that Commissioner Schwab had intended to appear at tonight's Council meeting but could not because of urgent business in Washington, D.C. The letter further explained that Mr. Sandblast could also not attend because of other commitments made before the Council meeting date had been announced. Mr. Sandblast wrote that his staff had met with Metro staff regarding the Comprehensive Plan concerns and a mutual agreement was reached regarding the language change suggested by Metro. He said the City of Portland was moving ahead to adopt the plan as amended and thanked Metro for their cooperation and assistance and recommended adoption of the proposed resolution. After reading the letter, Mr. Watson said he expected an emergency ordinance would be adopted by the City Council on April 7, 1981.

Coun. Rhodes asked what would happen if the City of Portland decided not to approve the language change. Mr. Watson said the Comprehensive Plan would then come back to Metro and would not be submitted to LCDC.

Coun. Banzer read a letter she received, dated March 25, 1981, from the President of the Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association. The letter read: "Dear Cindy, as you are probably aware, we at the Laurelhurst area are definitely not in favor of the Comprehensive Plan, specifically in the areas of the add-a-rental and the home occupancy provisions. We note that Laurelhurst is an exceptional area and we wish to keep its single family character and would hope that no extraneous additions will detract from its presently proud reputation. Sincerely, Helen Backenstein, 4211 N.E. Hazelfern Place, Portland,"

Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981

In response to the letter, Coun. Burton asked Mr. Watson what assurance he had that add-a-rentals would not be subject to indiscriminate variance procedures. Coun. Burton was concerned that such variances could possibly result in neighborhood densities not intended in the plan as proposed.

Mr. Watson explained the City Code limits variances to very specific elements. The Code requires that occupancy in a dwelling with an accessory unit not exceed the same occupancy requirements without such a unit. He said the number of people within a dwelling unit cannot be appealed through the variance procedure. He also said a twelve-month owner occupancy requirement was imposed on those wishing to convert their dwelling into one with an accessory unit. This twelve-month requirement was not subject to variance.

Coun. Rhodes asked Mr. Watson whether strict structural requirements, such as outside access and total square footage, would also impose density limits. Mr. Watson said the current code allowed up to four additional boarders per home. The changes to the plan would allow those same four boarders to remain but they could be housed in a self-sufficient unit within the dwelling. He said this was different from duplex conversion in that owners would be limited to converting 25 percent of total square footage into an accessory unit. In answer to Coun. Burton's question, Mr. Watson said the 25 percent square footage requirement for conversion was variancable. However, he said, variances must prove physical hardship and not just a desire to deviate from code requirements. Mr. Watson also said such variances must go through a public hearing process before the City Council.

Presiding Officer Deines announced that two members of the general public wished to address the Council regarding the proposed resolution. The Presiding Officer requested these two people limit their comments to ten minutes each.

Mr. Lloyd T. Keefe, 7100 S.W. Burlingame Avenue, Portland, had previously mailed copies of his statement to Councilors. At the Presiding Officer's request, Mr. Keefe presented highlights of that statement. He urged rejection of the Comprehensive Plan saying the plan would require extensive rezoning of some neighborhoods. He said the plan would sow the seeds of blight in the City's many exceptional residential neighborhoods, robbing the City of a strong tax base to support needed social services. He said we must guard against overcrowding, deterioration, poverty and consequent bankruptcy which now plagues several eastern cities. He did not think the plan would solve the problems it set out to alleviate, but rather aggravate them: more dwelling units would be created but fewer people would be housed and urban sprawl would be abetted rather than arrested. Housing costs would increase and fine, old neighborhoods would be destroyed. He said if there were no LCDC goals, the Council would not approve the rezoning of Portland. He cited Brooklyn and Sunnyside as areas where rezoning to allow more density had destroyed the original single family neighborhood character. Irvington, however, had been down zoned and is now a very attractive neighborhood and an example of how to bring families back into the City.

Mr. Keefe said the fine neighborhoods of Laurelhurst, Portland Heights, Westover, Eastmoreland, Rose City Park, Alameda and Green Hills represent a vast City resource that should be conserved. These neighborhoods represent billions of dollars in investment and assessed values. They are also a vast reservoir of affordable housing in the metropolitan area since new construction would cost much more, he said.

Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981

Mr. Keefe summarized by saying that he and the other 184 people who have been circulating initiative petitions to stop the plan are alarmed about the changes proposed.

Coun. Burton said the neighborhoods cited by Mr. Keefe as valuable resources would not be particularly affected by rezoning. Mr. Keefe said residents of Rose City Park would not agree.

Coun. Burton then asked if the City has taken into account basic services that would be needed, such as sewers, if density increases in specified neighborhoods. Mr. Keefe said the existing sewers in many neighborhoods were not designed for higher density use. This meant developers would have to pay for increased capacity or, more likely, residents would be assessed more taxes for the service. Mr. Keefe said he would not object to developers paying for increased capacity but his experience showed the City usually paid the bill which was then passed on to taxpayers.

Coun. Oleson said he thought Mr. Keefe was asking the Council to preserve his neighborhood and to second guess judgments already made by the City. Coun. Oleson said this was not the Council's role. He said Metro's role was to ensure the Comprehensive Plan conforms with LCDC's goals and guidelines. Coun. Oleson then said there was very little in Mr. Keefe's statement that commented on Metro's mandated role or gave direction to that effect. He also questioned whether more housing density would actually decrease Portland's population as in the case of some eastern cities. He thought the opposite would actually occur in view of the current energy shortages and population trends.

Coun. Etlinger said he represented a district for which seven light rail stations were proposed. He thought growth was inevitable and asked Mr. Keefe what the City's responsibility should be to accommodate some of that growth. Mr. Keefe said Portland had already met its obligation since it is more than twice as densely developed as surrounding suburban areas. The responsibility must be shared until the suburbs become as dense as urban Portland, he said.

Coun. Berkman asked about the status of Mr. Keefe's initiative campaign. Mr. Keefe said no accounting of additional signatures had been made since he recorded some 10,000 signatures as reported to the Metro Council. Since most residents are unaware of the Comprehensive Plan, he said his work would be lengthy and difficult.

Mr. Tom Culhane, 3641 S.W. Tunnelwood, Portland, a member of the Southwest Hills Residential League, addressed the Council. He said the people of Portland were being called upon to make a sacrifice no one else was willing to make. He said current changes in farm land use was contrary to LCDC's goals since many non-farm residences and "hobby" farms sprout up indiscriminately on land zoned for commercial farm use. Therefore, he said, valuable farm land is not being saved. Mr. Culhane said he realized the Council was not debating this question but he wanted to point out the lack of rationale in how the Comprehensive Plan is administered. He further said that accessory units, which he said were actually duplexes, would be allowed to be built anywhere. Once built, no one would inspect them for compliance to City Code, he said. He was concerned that housing stock would increase but at the same time, the population would decrease. He also said zoning was being changed in contemplation of a light rail system which may not transpire.

Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981

Coun. Burton said Metro's goal was to examine the more general areas of density and urbanization of the Comprehensive Plan. Since Portland was already urbanized, he saw the problem as putting parameters on this process. He asked Mr. Watson if the plan would radically alter the overall density of the City. Mr. Watson said the overall density would not be radically changed.

Coun. Burton told Mr. Watson he was concerned about how the City would address the need for increased services in some areas and asked what the City was doing to resolve those problems. Mr. Watson said the City was working with LCDC in order to designate the specific level to which future zoning may go. This would not mean certain areas would automatically be rezoned to provide for higher density, he said. Rezoning would take place on a case-by-case basis which would allow for a rational process. The City was also working with utility companies to ensure adequate public facilities would be present at the time or by the time rezoning would occur. Public facilities can be added by utility companies or by private developers, he said. He also agreed with Coun. Burton that the City was not greatly increasing in overall density. Mr. Watson further explained that if the light rail transit project were scrapped, no major rezoning would occur.

Coun. Etlinger asked if there were plans for providing increased sewer capacity to outlying northeast areas of the City. Mr. Watson said that was included in the plan but since funds were limited, each case must be carefully prioritized. The City would consider areas without service a priority over areas needing minor improvements.

Coun. Banzer asked if Resolution No. 81-232 were adopted, how extensive would Metro's role then be in regulating details of the Comprehensive Plan. She also asked if state law required a mailing to residents who would be directly affected by the plan. Mr. Watson said the state law requires such a mailing for counties but not for cities. He said, however, the City has sent out some general mailings in the past.

Coun. Banzer requested that Mr. Sitzman send a summary of testimony received at the Planning Committee hearing to LCDC. Presiding Officer Deines said that tonight's testimony would also be forwarded to LCDC.

Coun. Banzer reported she had received a copy of a letter from a resident of Metro District 10. The letter was from George Walker, Chairman of the Rose City Neighborhood Association. Mr. Walker took exception to the City of Portland's Goal 1 (regarding citizen involvement) and Goal 10 (regarding housing). The Association was concerned about equity and density and how this would affect their individual neighborhood. Coun. Banzer realized this was not an issue to be addressed by Metro, but wanted to share these concerns with the Council.

Mr. Watson, in response to the Association's concern with Goal 1, said the City had made two mailings early in the Comprehensive Plan process to every household and business in the City. The mailings cost a total of \$30,000 under the old postal rates. To continue mailings through every phase of the plan process would have been prohibitive, he said. Mr. Watson then distributed

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981**

to the Council copies of the completed evaluation report of the Committee for Citizen Involvement dated March, 1981. He said the report cited numerous efforts of the Committee to inform the public at every stage of the plan development.

Coun. Rhodes said she represented a neighborhood that supported the Comprehensive Plan and some sections of her neighborhood would be rezoned to allow for higher density and commercial use. She said the only disappointment expressed by some residents was that some of their more innovative suggestions were not adopted by the City planners.

Coun. Oleson asked Mr. Watson to address the questions raised earlier about add-a-rental zones. He asked for any evidence that would substantiate or refute Mr. Keefe's testimony that such additions would destroy the character of neighborhoods as they now exist. Mr. Watson said the impact on neighborhoods will be no greater than if homes maintained the same occupancy they were built to accommodate. No additional off-street parking would be required for these units, he said, because the code will not allow more residents than it now allows. The visual, traffic and noise impacts would not be detrimental, Mr. Watson said. He also said other cities such as Seattle were looking at similar code changes because of the need for more housing.

Coun. Oleson then asked Mr. Watson to answer Mr. Keefe's statement that increased housing density will decrease the City's population. Mr. Watson answered it was true the plan called for more dwelling units. However, average household size has decreased on a national scale over the last twenty years. Projections indicate that household size will continue to decrease due to more single people buying homes, families splitting up and smaller family units. He said this did not mean the population was decreasing, but rather, the demand for housing units is continuing to rise. By providing more accessory units, Portland will be able to maintain the current population and allow for some increase. This will correlate with the City's efforts to provide more jobs and become a major economic center, he said. Mr. Watson was confident that as the plan was carried out, people would see first-hand the benefits rather than the detriments.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Resolution No. 81-232. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Watson said it was not stated in the resolution the Executive Officer would take any positive action. He requested a letter from the Executive Officer to LCDC when the policy is amended indicating to them the City of Portland is in compliance with LCDC's goals.

Regarding the earlier discussion on Resolution No. 81-234, Presiding Officer Deines said he did not intend to give the impression that because of delays in the resource recovery program, staff was not doing their job. He apologized to staff if that impression was received and explained the process of accomplishing solid waste goals was difficult, as dictated by realities.

The Presiding Officer called a five-minute break.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

4.1 Ordinance No. 81-107, For the Purpose of Providing for a Temporary Partial Waiver of Charges at the St. Johns Landfill for Woody Wastes (First Reading)

Coun. Banzer moved for adoption of the ordinance, seconded by Coun. Rhodes. At the Presiding Officer's request, the Clerk read the ordinance by title only.

Coun. Banzer said the ordinance was intended to provide an economic incentive to dispose of yard clippings that would normally be burned in back yards. She explained the Regional Services Committee discussed the issue and had asked for the ordinance to be drafted to request a partial waiver of fees to coincide with Metro-sponsored cleanup weeks in May. She said the Committee was requesting Council to hold a public hearing tonight, the Committee would then review the ordinance and make possible revisions for Council's consideration at a second reading to be held at the end of April.

Mr. Gus Rivera reported staff had developed the program and cleanup weeks had been scheduled. Three sites had been established, brochures were ready for distribution to advertise the program, and commercial haulers had agreed to participate in the program. He said advertisements had also been ordered which would appear in various regional newspapers.

Coun. Etlinger asked if any mailings were planned, when could Council review the brochure, how would the public distinguish woody waste from other yard debris, and if Metro supported this project, would they support other, private neighborhood cleanup drives.

In answering Coun. Etlinger's last question, Mr. Rivera said a provision was in the ordinance giving the Executive Officer an option of continuing the fees for a period of time to be determined. This could apply to private cleanup drives, he said. In responding to other questions, Mr. Rivera answered that the City of Portland was also coordinating ten cleanup days to take place on Saturdays. He said brochures would only be mailed to people calling the Recycling Switchboard and requesting them. Mr. Rivera recognized the problem of educating the public to understand the difference between woody waste and other yard debris and said staff were making efforts in this area.

Coun. Rhodes reminded Council this ordinance was on the next Regional Services Committee agenda and further discussion could take place at that meeting.

Presiding Officer Deines opened the public hearing on Ordinance No. 81-107. There being no public testimony, the hearing was closed.

5. MOTION

5.1 Addition of Allen Johnson to the list of Metro Hearings Officers

Mr. Andrew Jordan explained Mr. Johnson was an attorney residing in Eugene and was formerly an LCDC hearings officer before the Land Use Board of Appeals

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981**

was established. He was a highly experienced land use lawyer and hearings officer, Mr. Jordan added.

Coun. Rhodes moved to add Allen Johnson to the list of Metro hearings officers and Coun. Oleson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Budget Report

In explaining the recent announcement of staff cuts, Executive Officer Rick Gustafson said it was a difficult budget period for Metro. Federal funds had been reduced and the future of dues funds was uncertain. He said his proposed budget would eliminate 19 positions and the total budget would be reduced by six percent. Primary programs affected would be housing, comprehensive planning, economic development, sewer planning, water quality and drainage management. Support services would also be affected since part of their funding has been provided by program grants that no longer exist, he said. The Executive Officer explained his proposed cuts were made at all position levels and would require a complete agency reorganization. He said he was also imposing an immediate freeze on hiring and travel and was requesting Council to suspend any action on the recommendation of a salary commission to increase his salary.

The Executive Officer said he was reluctant to dismiss loyal and dedicated staff but the changes were in some ways timely. The comprehensive planning process had gone through its first phase, 20 of the 27 plans in the metropolitan area had been reviewed, many have been acknowledged and the next step would be for local governments to implement their plans. The Executive Officer continued by saying Metro would move into an assistance role to identify particular shortcomings, especially in helping to finance services. He said he would have preferred a modest reduction of staff each year rather than the dramatic change in activities this year.

The Executive Officer explained these changes would match the reduction in federal activity this year but he expected Metro to continue providing needed services to the region. He said although the government was moving to let local jurisdictions solve their own problems, he was concerned that sufficient federal tax dollars would be returned to fund projects that could solve regional problems.

Regarding specific Metro budget units, the Executive Officer reported the zoo's budget would increase slightly as a result of new capital projects. He saw solid waste as the agency's primary effort and said half the agency's operation budget was for solid waste concerns. A \$15 million capital program would be proposed for solid waste which included the following activities: 1) resolution of the Wildwood landfill siting process with Multnomah County; 2) closure of Rossman's Landfill in June, 1982; 3) opening of the receiving center in Oregon City; 4) commencement of constructing the resource recovery plant; and 5) a \$100 million plus bond issue for resource recovery. He said these efforts would be in addition to other programs such as recycling support, the Recycling Switchboard and the waste reduction program.

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981**

The Executive Officer concluded his message by saying the budget had been prepared assuming dues would be assessed from local jurisdictions. If those funds are not received, he said additional budget reductions would have to be made.

Mr. Andrew Jordan, in reporting on another matter, said the case in front of the Land Use Board of Appeals regarding the Beaverton Recycling Center had been lost. Metro now had two options: 1) to appeal the case before the Board of Appeals; or 2) go back to the Beaverton City Council and again ask them to establish the recycling center. He said he would prefer the latter action and asked for the Council's comment.

Coun. Bonner said Metro should assist people already engaged in recycling efforts and work toward other measures, such as a landfill diversion fee, to encourage waste reduction.

At Coun. Etlinger's suggestion, Coun. Banzer said it would be appropriate for the Regional Services Committee to discuss this issue at their next meeting. Because a decision must be made in two weeks about how Metro should respond to the legal case, Coun. Banzer said the Committee would examine the costs involved, Metro's recycling policy and make a recommendation to staff.

Coun. Williamson reported he had received calls from constituents about recycling. He thought the Beaverton recycling center was necessary and should be established as soon as possible.

Mr. Jordan said he wished to discuss this matter in more detail with Mr. Irvine and the Executive Officer before further Committee or Council action is requested.

Ms. Caryl Waters presented several new recycling and waste reduction public service announcements to the Council. She said the announcements about the resource recovery plant would be aired when the permit is granted from Oregon City. The Council enjoyed and endorsed the announcements. Mr. Waters also reported that Mr. Merle Irvine, Ms. Karen Hiatt and Coun. Kirkpatrick had appeared in three different "Bumpity" children's television programs in order to educate viewers about solid waste problems and solutions.

6.3 Committee Reports

Coun. Banzer reported the Regional Services Committee had met regarding the proposed Wildwood landfill site. She thanked staff for their support and a well done job.

7. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Isaac Regenstreif reported Senate Bill 852 was scheduled for a hearing on April 13. He said Councilors should ask major constituents to call or write legislators in support of the bill. Senators Groener, Hanlon and Simmons would be key legislators in the process, he said.

Mr. Regenstreif said that draft tax legislation on the resource recovery facility is now available. He anticipated the House Revenue Committee would

**Metro Council
Minutes of April 2, 1981**

introduce the bill next week. He also reported the bill which would allow Metro to refer its legislation had passed the House and is now scheduled for a Senate hearing on April 16.

Presiding Officer Deines reported Clackamas County was hosting a forum on April 16 for residents to express their views about the resource recovery plant. He and the Executive Officer would be participating in order to explain Metro's views about the plant. Coun. Rhodes pointed out the forum was planned for the same day as Metro's legislative forum. The Executive Officer said he realized a conflict of dates existed, but the resource recovery forum was very important because Oregon City would soon commence hearings to grant the plant a permit.

There being no further business, Presiding Officer Deines adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson
Acting Clerk of the Council