

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

December 19, 1985

Councilors Present: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Councilors Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

Also Present: Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer

Staff Present: Eleanore Baxendale, Dennis Mulvihill, Dan Durig, Doug Drennen, Patrick Minor, Norm Wietting, Chuck Geyer, Wayne Rifer, Jan Schaeffer, Ray Barker, Vickie Rocker, Gene Leo and Peg Henwood

Presiding Officer Bonner called to meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved to adopt the Consent Agenda and Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Councilor Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the following resolutions were adopted:

- 6.1 Resolution No. 85-609, Authorizing the Transfer of Section 3 "Trade" Funds to the Oregon City Transit Station and Amending the Transportation Improvement Program Accordingly
- 6.2 Resolution No. 85-610, Endorsing the Revised Ozone Control Strategy for the Portland-Vancouver Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA)
7. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUITON NO. 85-611, for the Purpose of Adopting Solid Waste Reduction Policies

Motion: A motion to adopt the Resolution was made by Councilors Waker and Gardner at the meeting of December 5, 1985.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Waker moved, seconded by Councilor DeJardin, to amend the main motion by incorporating all amendments embodied in Resolution No. 85-611A plus the following changes: 1) amending the fifth "WHEREAS" to read: "WHEREAS, The policies described below will..."; 2) amending policy 1 to read: "...c) the acceptable cost for recovery [in compliance with state law]..."; 3) amending policy 6 to read: "b)...accepted at [the landfill] disposal facilities which do not process waste recovery of those materials if more appropriate disposal options are available..."; and 4) amending policy 10 to read: "...The [draft] program and time frame submitted to the Council are consistent with these policies."

The Executive Officer explained the document entitled Resolution No. 85-611A included all amendments made by the Council at their work session on December 12.

Vote on Motion to Amend: The vote resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Rafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried.

Before the vote was taken to adopt the Resolution, Deputy Presiding Officer Waker, Chairman of the Solid Waste Reduction Task Force,

explained the Task Force had worked hard to develop a comprehensive Waste Reduction Program which reflected a variety of Council interests. Implementing the program, he said, would require more hard work of the Council. He thanked Councilors and staff for their efforts.

Councilor Hansen said the Waste Reduction Program was not just a six-month project and explained the process actually started three years ago. He said although it represented compromise solutions, all Councilors would need to work to accomplish its objectives.

Vote on the main motion, as amended: The vote resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, and Waker

Abstain: Councilor Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 85-611A was adopted as amended.

8. ORDERS

8.1 Consideration of Order No. 85-5, in the Matter of Contested Case No. 84-2, a Petition for an Urban Growth Boundary Locational Adjustment by Portland General Electric et al

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved to consider the Order at the meeting of January 9, 1986. Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the matter was postponed until January 9.

9. ORDINANCES

9.1 Consideration of Ordinance No. 85-193, Adopting a Final Order and Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary for Contested Case No. 85-4: Foster Property (Second Reading)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a second time by title only.

Motion: A motion to adopt the Ordinance was made by Councilors Kelley and DeJardin on November 26, 1985.

Jill Hinckley reported staff recommended accepting the Hearings Officer's Report and adopting the Ordinance.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Nays: Councilors Kafoury and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 85-163 was adopted.

9.2 Consideration of Ordinance No. 85-194, for the Purpose of Restricting the Use of the St. Johns Landfill to Waste Generated in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties (Second Reading)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a second time by title only.

Motion: A motion to adopt the Ordinance was made by Councilors Kirkpatrick and Kelley at the meeting of September 12, 1985.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Hansen proposed the Section 2 of the Ordinance be amended to read: "[That] Effective January 1, 1986, solid waste generated outside of the Planning Area shall not be accepted at the St. Johns Landfill or Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center for disposal. However, until June 1, 1986, Metro will accept waste from outside the Planning Area if (a) waste was delivered to the St. Johns Landfill or Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center during the period of December 1, 1984, to December 1, 1985, and (b) there is no solid waste disposal facility in the county in which the waste was generated. Such waste will be accepted only in the quantity delivered between December 1, 1984, and December 1, 1985, on a monthly basis. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

Councilor Hansen explained this amendment was a reasonable response to the concerns raised by those testifying at the public hearing on the Ordinance.

At Councilor Kirkpatrick's request, Dan Durig responded to Councilor Hansen's proposed amendment. He explained that as a result of negotiations with Columbia and Yamhill County representatives, staff had received a letter dated December 19, 1985, from the city of Washugal stating Yamhill County would work with the City to receive waste at their landfill starting approximately March 1, 1986. Between January 1 and March 1, Columbia County haulers could dispose of waste at Cowlitz County Landfill, Lackner Landfill in Clark County. Therefore, Mr. Durig did not think the proposed amendment was necessary. He stated an amendment would weaken the Ordinance. Also, he pointed out that just as Columbia County would find disposal alternatives more expensive, Metro would find that alternatives to landfill disposal would be more expensive as alternative technologies were developed.

In response to Councilor Kelley's question, Norm Wietting reported that about 3,000 tons of waste generated in Columbia County were currently being disposed at the St. Johns Landfill per day. Over a six-month period at this volume, the life of St. Johns would be extended one and one-half days, he said.

Councilor Hansen questioned the logic of inconveniencing Columbia County when the result would be extended the life of St. Johns only one and one-half days or less.

Mr. Durig again explained that to amend the proposed Ordinance would weaken it and that Columbia County had been presented with reasonable alternatives for their disposal problems.

In response to Councilor Gardner's question, Eleanore Baxendale explained the proposed amendment was constitutional, but it would be simpler if the Ordinance were not amended.

Vote on the Motion to Amend: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Gardner, Hansen, Kelley and Bonner

Nays: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Kirkpatrick, Rafoury,
Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion to amend the Ordinance failed.

Vote on the Main Motion: A vote on the main motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick,
Rafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Abstain: Councilor Cooper

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the Ordinance was adopted.

10. CONTRACTS

10.1 Consideration of a Golden Monkey Loan Agreement Between the Metropolitan Service District and the City of Seattle for an Animal Exhibit

Gene Leo briefly reviewed terms of the contract and announced the exhibit would be opening in Seattle on February 8, after which the Chinese delegation would be visiting Portland. Mr. Leo invited Councilors to participate in these events.

Regarding Item 6(d) of the contract, Councilor Van Bergen expressed concern that soliciting money could cause embarrassment for Metro, especially if the vendors were selected for future contracts. Mr. Leo explained this contract provision referred to the hospitality industry's provision of goods and services to the Chinese delegates. Councilor Van Bergen continued to object to the contract provision.

Councilor Kafoury asked how the project would be financed. Mr. Leo replied \$56,000 was included for the project in the FY 1985-86 budget and mid-year transfers. Forty thousand dollars would be budgeted next fiscal year. Forty to fifty thousand dollars would be donated by corporations who would serve as co-sponsors to the project. Regarding expected revenues, Mr. Leo said it was difficult to project specific amounts. However, he explained the San Diego Zoo had experienced a 9.1 percent attendance increase after the same exhibit was installed. If the Washington Park Zoo experienced the same percentage increase, about \$150,000 additional revenues would be taken in, he reported.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the contract be approved and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers, Oleson and Waker

The motion carried and the contract was approved.

11. RESOLUTIONS

11.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 85-613, for the Purpose of Appointing Solid Waste Industry Members to the Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee (SWPAC)

The Presiding Officer suggested consideration of this matter be postponed to the next regular Council meeting in order to give Councilors time to review staff's recommendations.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved to postpone consideration of the Resolution until the meeting of January 9, 1986. Councilor Van Bergen seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Myers, Oleson and Waker

The motion carried and consideration of the item was postponed.

12. DISCUSSION OF ELECTION OF 1986 COUNCIL OFFICERS

In response to Presiding Officer Bonner's question, no one indicated the intent to nominate Councilors other than Waker and Gardner for the offices of Presiding Officer and Deputy Presiding Officer respectively.

Presiding Officer Bonner declared a recess at 6:20 p.m. and announced the Council would reconvene at 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on the proposed Tigard site for the Washington County Transfer & Recycling Center. Deputy Presiding Officer Waker chaired the remainder of the meeting in Presiding Officer Bonner's absence.

13. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 85-614, for the Purpose of Designating an Additional Site for the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (Hunziker Street between 72nd & Hall, Tigard)

Deputy Presiding Officer Waker reported that at the public hearing on two Beaverton area sites previously considered by the Council on September 12, 1985, it was announced that Metro would conduct additional public hearings if other sites were considered for the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (WTRC). He reported that since that September 12 meeting, the Tigard site and the Champion Wood Products site had been brought forward for consideration. The hearing for the Champion site would occur on January 9, he said, and

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 8

the Council would then decide which site should be selected for the transfer facility on January 16. The Deputy Presiding Officer then reviewed rules for the public hearing on the Tigard site.

Doug Drennen reviewed information about the proposed site as contained in the meeting agenda materials. He first reviewed the site's basic characteristics as illustrated in an aerial photograph. He explained four members of the WTRC Advisory Group voted to rank the site with those meriting further consideration by the Council. Four other members, however, did not think the site merited further consideration mainly because of the site's close location to the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center (CTRC).

Mr. Drennen then reported staff had employed Wilsey & Ham to conduct a traffic impact study on the Tigard site. The consultant's study determined the current level of traffic in the area would not be impacted if the transfer facility were built at this site. He further stated the nearby interchange met the minimum traffic safety guidelines established by the State Department of Transportation.

Gary LaHaie then presented the Advisory Group's recommendation. He said the Group did not agree on whether the Tigard site deserved further consideration and as such, decided the Council should hear public testimony and make that decision. The Advisory Group also concluded no new sites should be considered after the public hearing on the Champion site occurred. In conclusion, Mr. LaHaie said staff had notified the affected public far more than the law required and the selection process had been extremely open. He noted that as a result of the public notification process, additional sites were brought to staff's attention for consideration.

Deputy Presiding Officer Waker then opened the public hearing and limited testimony to three minutes per person. He also announced that Councilor Oleson left the meeting early due to illness.

Geraldine Ball, 11515 S.W. 91st, Tigard, NPO #4 Chairperson, testified NPO #4 was opposed to the site because of concerns about traffic. She said residents were very concerned about the safety of Phil Lewis school students who had to walk across Hunziker Street before and after school, during lunch and during vacation time. She asked the Council to consider the children's safety when making their decision.

Robert Pierce, 14010 S.W. High Tor Drive, Tigard, President of the Tigard Chamber of Commerce, explained the Chamber was supportive of a transfer station but did not support the Tigard location on Hunziker Street because the site was incompatible with nearby residences, small business, the planned revitalization of the downtown area and the Phil Lewis School. The Chamber also had major concerns

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 9

about potential traffic problems if WTRC were sited at that location. Further, he said the site was a long distance from the projected center of waste which was in conflict with Metro's stated siting objectives. In conclusion, Mr. Pierce said the Tigard site seemed the least desirable of all those considered and urged the Council not to recommend it for the transfer facility.

Matt Takahashi, 7610 S.W. Cherry, Tigard, a student at Phil Lewis School, testified he and his brother walked to school. He said that the road near his school was already busy with traffic. If the transfer station were built in Tigard, the additional 600 trucks per day would cause much noise when windows were open in the school building. The trucks would also create safety hazards on Hunziker Street because some of those blocks had no sidewalks for the children. Mr. Takahashi said the site was not a good place to add more traffic.

Craig Hopkins, 7430 S.W. Varns, Tigard, Chairperson, CPO #5 and member of the Tigard Civic Center Advisory Committee. Mr. Hopkins testified the membership of CPO #5 unanimously opposed the Tigard site because it did not meet Metro's criteria of compatibility, closeness to the center of waste and traffic impacts. He did not agree with Gary LaHaie's earlier statement about good public notification. Rather, Mr. Hopkins said staff's notification did not encompass a large enough area. Several neighborhoods adjacent to the site, he said, had not been served with notice of Metro's proposal. In conclusion, he requested the Council consider a more reasonable site for the WTRC.

David Sudtell, 7219 S.W. Cedar Lane, Portland, explained that as previously announced, his property at the west edge of Hillsboro was still available for use as a transfer facility site. He then read a letter from the city of Hillsboro Planning Department stating that the zoning for the site was compatible with that of a transfer facility such as Metro proposed. Mr. Sudtell furnished the Clerk with a copy of the letter to be entered into the meeting record.

Betty Nitsos, 8465 S.W. Hunziker, Tigard. At the request of Ms. Nitsos, the Deputy Presiding Officer read her statement. She testified she was opposed to siting a transfer station on the Tigard site due to severe traffic problems the additional trucks would create. She also testified neighboring property values would decrease and odor problems would result, as had occurred with the CTRC in Oregon City.

Councilor Van Bergen reported it had been documented CTRC did not create bad odors. Rossman's Landfill was the cause of the odor, he said.

Sharon Takahashi, 7610 S.W. Cherry, Tigard, complained about the bad timing of the public hearing. She testified two WTRC Advisory Group members living in her neighborhood had testified against the Tigard site. She reported the "B" intersection rating was not accurate considering the probable use of that intersection by WTRC transfer trucks. She challenged a transfer truck to maneuver the intersection at noon when traffic was heaviest. She also reported a neighborhood resident, Larry Schmidt, owner of Schmidt's Sanitary Service, told her if Metro sited a station in Tigard, it would not be providing a true regional service. A Tigard site, he had said, would duplicate about one-third of the service currently provided by CTCRC.

Deputy Presiding Officer Waker said he also regretted the hearing was scheduled a week from Christmas, but adherence to a tight hearing schedule was necessary because siting of WTRC was several months behind schedule.

Greg Edwards, 7545 S.W. Cherry Street, Tigard, said he violently opposed the Tigard site for WTRC. He did not agree with Metro's traffic study and challenged anyone to drive through the area during rush hours.

Ray Pirk1, 7745 S.W. Varns, Tigard, said he did not object to a site in Tigard, but he did object to the one now proposed. Mr. Pirk1 objected to the Hunziker site because it was too close to CTCRC, it would be too near residences and incompatible businesses, it was incompatible with the nearby civic center, traffic problems were severe and the WTRC Advisory Committee was divided about the site's suitability.

Larry Hibbard, 13137 S.W. Pacific Highway, Tigard, Assistant Superintendent, Tigard School District, submitted a letter to the Council expressing the District's opinions and concerns regarding the proposed site. He testified the site would create additional traffic and pose a hazard to students who walked to the Phil Lewis School. The school's buses would also be forced to compete with transfer trucks, compounding existing traffic problems. He also said the increased traffic would create more noise for the school students.

In response to Deputy Presiding Officer Waker's question, Mr. Hibbard said although the Phil Lewis School was not in an ideal location, there were no plans to move the facility.

Garry Ott, 9055 S.W. Edgewood, Tigard, Acting Chairperson of COP #1, reported the membership of COP #1 unanimously opposed a transfer station at the Hunziker site. Reasons for this opposition, he said, included difficult access to the site, traffic impacts, incompatibility to surrounding residences and business and the Advisory

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 11

Group's low ranking of the site. He requested the Council delete the site from further consideration.

Paul Phillips, 15075 S.W. Dawn Court, Tigard, State Representative, questioned why the Council would consider the Tigard site after the divided vote of the WTRC Advisory Group. Representative Phillips said he had outlined his specific concerns in a letter to Metro's Executive Officer. He said most of his concerns centered around the effects the facility would have on an already bad traffic situation combined with the hazards posed to pedestrian school children. Finally, Mr. Phillips testified the site was too near the CTRC to be efficient. He urged the Council to do what was right and consider another location for the WTRC.

Ted Mast, Vice President, Applegate Natural Foods, 7805 S.W. Hunziker, said he was worried about the potential for vermin problems if the transfer station were located at the Hunziker site. He said about 90,000 square feet of grocery wholesale business was located in the area. He also thought the increased traffic created by the transfer station would cause serious problems for the area.

Councilor DeJardin pointed out the grocery wholesale business could be analogous to the transfer station. Both industries involved trucks coming into and going out of the area and both could be said to attract rodents. However, he said rodents would not pose a problem at the transfer station because no garbage would remain in the transfer station overnight.

In response to Councilor Kelley's question, Mr. Mast said the public did not object to Applegate Natural Foods and Albertson's locating in their current location. He said he doubted the public knew of the potential traffic that would be generated as a result of those food distribution businesses.

Donald Moen, 11395 S.W. Ironwood Loop, Tigard, stated that although he was the president of the Tigard Planning Commission, he was not testifying in that capacity. He worked for Cohen Manufacturing in Tigard and, as such, was concerned about the possible traffic impacts of the transfer station. He encouraged the Council to listed to NPO representatives because their comments were objective and informative. Mr. Moen said the proposed Tigard site was incompatible with adjacent residences and businesses, and the probable impact on traffic would be severe.

Councilor Kelley asked Mr. Moen what he thought the planning goals were for the Tigard site. Mr. Moen said the area in question was a difficult one. Zones had been established by evolution, he said, rather than by careful planning. He saw the site being developed

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 12

for compatible industrial use. The transfer station, he said, would be subject to a conditional use permit process. In response to Councilor Van Bergen's question, Mr. Moen responded a transfer station would be permitted under the current conditional use process.

Thomas Sullivan, 12105 S.W. 72nd, Tigard, Chairman, Tigard Transportation and Advisory Committee, submitted a letter to the Council outlining his testimony. In addition to the letter, Mr. Sullivan said he was concerned about much traffic converging from diverse locations into one area. He also pointed out when the Dartmouth extension was completed, Dartmouth and 72nd and Hunziker would be the easiest way for traffic from I-5 North to get to Portland.

Tom Brian, 7630 S.W. Fir, Tigard, said he was concerned about the process by which the WTRC Advisory Group evaluated the Tigard site and the proposed site's proximity to the Oregon City area. He questioned why the site, which had received an overall rating of 54.5 points, had been forwarded to the Council for further consideration. The original cutoff point for forwarding sites to the Council had been 55 points, he said. He also questioned why Metro would want to site any transfer station in a city's downtown area.

Presiding Officer Waker read a letter into the record from Start Right Inc. Day Care & Pre School, 8485 S.W. Hunziker Street, Tigard, signed by Geoff Levear, Secretary. Mr. Levear objected to the proposed Tigard site because the process being used to select WTRC sites was not the "best possible process," the criteria established for site selection was not the most practical and the Hunziker site possessed severe limitations.

Councilor Kirkpatrick read a letter into the record from the Palmer G. Lewis Company, Inc., 525 "C" Street N.W., Auburn, Washington, to Peg Henwood. The letter noted that although there were some similarities between CTRC and the proposed WTRC, the major dissimilarity was the site proposed for WTRC was not compatible with existing surroundings. The potential for creating severe traffic problems in the Tigard area was also a problem as well as the proposed site's proximity to CTRC.

There was no additional public testimony.

Deputy Presiding Officer announced the Executive Officer had recommended the Council adopt Resolution No. 85-614 which would designate an additional site for the WTRC. He explained that even if the Council did not adopt Resolution No. 85-614 and the Tigard site were not added to the list of site to be considered, a public hearing was scheduled for January 9 regarding whether the Champion site in Beaverton should be designated for additional consideration. Subject to Council confirmation, a special meeting would be held

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 13

January 16 to determine which of the proposed sites should be considered for acquisition. He said the Council was not deciding at this meeting whether the site should be further considered.

An unidentified woman asked whether Councilors would visit all sites under consideration before any final determination was made. Deputy Presiding Officer responded the Council would visit the sites. She also asked when staff's traffic studies of the Hunziker area had been conducted. Doug Drennen replied a hand count was performed December 4 between the hours of 6:30 a.m. through 9:00 a.m., 10:30 a.m. through 2:00 p.m., and 3:00 p.m. through 6:00 p.m. The count occurred at the intersection of 72nd and Highway 217 and Hunziker, he said. Finally, the woman asked why Dave Sudtell's property wasn't considered. Mr. LaHaie of the WTRC Advisory Group responded the Sudtell property was about 12 to 15 miles from the center of garbage distribution. The Group had determined that any site more than seven miles away from the center of waste generation would not be considered.

Councilor Van Bergen said he was familiar with the Tigard site. He did not expect a perfect site would be located which would not raise concerns from neighbors or surrounding businesses. He also thought that because of zoning problems with the Tigard site, the City would have problems with continued industrial development in the area. However, Councilor Van Bergen explained the problem he had with the site was that it was not the most appropriate because it didn't meet with centralized collection location criteria. He said he would reject the site because if condemnation of a site were necessary, it would serve Metro's interests to select the best possible site. Councilor Van Bergen further stated he had objected to staff's placing earnest money on the Tigard property and had voted against that contract at the Council Management Committee level.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Council adopt Resolution No. 84-614. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Councilor DeJardin challenged Tigard to solve their traffic problems, saying Metro should not be penalized or accused of creating and adding to problems that already existed. He appreciated the factual public testimony and said he was swayed by it. He took offense, however, to the argument that the site was too close to Oregon City.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved the site located on Hunziker Street between 72nd and Hall in Tigard be removed from any further consideration. Councilor Van Bergen seconded the motion.

Metro Council
December 19, 1985
Page 14

Councilor Kirkpatrick said the Tigard site did not meet the test of the center of garbage. She also hoped that those at the hearing who spoke so well against the Tigard site would help Metro find a suitable site.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors Myers, Oleson and Bonner

The motion carried.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved that consideration of all additional sites, after the public hearing on the Champion site, be closed. Councilor Gardner seconded the motion.

In response to Council discussion about the motion, the Executive Officer said the action, if adopted, would remain in effect until the Council changed its mind.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Nay: Councilor Hansen

Absent: Councilors Myers, Oleson and Bonner

The motion carried.

There being no further business, Deputy Presiding Officer Waker adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

amn
4990C/313-2
01/15/85