

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

June 26, 1986

Councilors Present: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner,
Hansen, Kafoury, Kelley, Kirkpatrick,
Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Councilors Absent: Councilors Cooper and Myers

Also Present: Executive Officer Rick Gustafson

Staff Present: Donald Carlson, Eleanore Baxendale, Jill
Hinckley, Neal McFarlane, Tuck Wilson, Rich
McConaghy, Dan Durig, Doug Drennen,
Jennifer Sims, Randy Boose, Ray Barker,
Phillip Fell, Vickie Rocker

Deputy Presiding Officer Gardner called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. for the purpose of interviewing the following candidates for the vacant District 9 Council Position: Ben Butzien, Edward Meece, Bob Palmer and Tanya Collier. A committee of three citizens from District 9 evaluated the interviews and asked questions of the candidates. The citizens were: Marsha Palmer, President of the Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association; Keith Skelton, an attorney; and Marie Williams, former member of the Boundary Commission. Each candidate responded to the following questions:

1. Why would you like to be a Metro Councilor?
2. What services do you think Metro should provide?
3. How should Metro relate with other governments in the region?
4. Metro Councilors are responsible for setting regional policy and for fiscal oversight of the Metropolitan Service District. Explain how your background would enhance the Council's ability to perform these tasks.
5. By assuming this position, you will be appointed to represent a district of approximately 78,000 people. Please share with us your knowledge of the needs and concerns of your district. What experience do you have in working with community organizations, as well as individuals in your district? How would you balance the needs of your district with the needs of the region?

Metro Council
June 26, 1986
Page 2

Upon completion of the interviews, the Deputy Presiding Officer called the meeting into recess at 5:40 p.m. Presiding Officer Waker reconvened the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

None.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S COMMUNICATIONS

Solid Waste Reduction Plan. Executive Officer Gustafson reported the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) would conduct a hearing on Metro's Plan June 27, 1986, and approval of the Plan was anticipated. He said the Council and staff should be proud of accomplishing the work within a short schedule.

Zoo Concerts. The summer concert season opened June 25 with over 5,000 people in attendance. The Executive Officer said plans to bus concert goers from local jazz clubs to the Zoo seemed to be working smoothly.

3.1 Summary of Intern Assistance Program. Executive Officer Gustafson introduced Mel Huie, Local Government Analyst, who reported that \$5,000 had been budgeted for the program which would be matched by local governments. The program, he explained, employed interns to conduct studies and other work for various local governments. Past projects had included housing inventories, economic development studies and land use planning. Many program graduates had gone on to secure good jobs in the public sector.

Councilor Kafoury said she had attended the tourism conference at the Marriott Hotel which had been coordinated by Mr. Huie. She commended him on conducting a good conference which had attracted people not previously familiar with Metro.

The Executive Officer said he had attended a Greater Portland Convention & Visitors Association awards breakfast the previous day at which both Bob Ridgley, CTS Committee Chairman, and Gene Leo, Zoo Director had received important awards.

Convention and Trade Center Facility (CTS) Project Update. Tuck Wilson, CTS Director, and Neal McParlane, Public Facilities Analyst, distributed a "CTS Work Plan Timeline" and discussed progress on the project. A six-month preliminary budget had been prepared, staff

were being organized, and a Resolution recommending a title for the general obligation bond measure would be presented to the Council for consideration on July 10, 1986. Mr. Wilson discussed the estimated budget for the project and the fact that outside agencies had been asked to review the budget and comment. He referred the Council to a letter from Erik Ingebretson of the Department of Transportation, dated June 19, 1986, which confirmed the project cost estimates. Finally, Mr. Wilson reported the Boundary Commission would review Metro's new CTS functions at a meeting that evening and was expected to approve them.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Estle Harlan, 2202 S.E. Lake Road, Milwaukie, representing the Oregon Sanitary Service Institute, addressed the Council regarding Metro's promotional and education campaign for the Waste Reduction Plan. Ms. Harlan objected to the "together we can get out of the dumps" advertising slogan. She said use of the word "dumps" along with the accompanying visual message conflicted with the negative image of landfills Metro and the solid waste industry had been trying for years to change. She questioned why the solid waste industry had not been more involved in planning the advertising campaign. Ms. Harlan submitted written testimony to the Council which elaborated on these points.

The Council discussed the process for developing the promotional and educational program, particularly the extent of Council involvement in the process. Councilor Kelley said she had wanted more Council input at initial stages of planning and review. Executive Officer Gustafson explained he had appointed Councilors Gardner, Kirkpatrick and Prewing to assist in planning. Councilors Gardner and Prewing explained the process and their involvement. Councilor Gardner said the "together we can get out of the dumps" slogan had been tested on several focus groups with no negative reaction.

Teresa DeLorenzo, 10907 N.W. Copeland Street, Portland, Chair of Metro's Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee (SWPAC), Distributed copies of a memo to the Council from SWPAC, dated June 3, 1986, which outlined the Committee's concerns about the advertising campaign and slogan. Ms. DeLorenzo reported SWPAC's concerns as follows: the slogan's use of the word "dumps" was negative, confused dumps and landfills, and undermined Metro's and the industry's efforts to use the correct term, "landfills;" the slogan erroneously suggested landfills could be eliminated, potentially compromising

Metro Council
June 26, 1986
Page 4

Metro's and DEQ's efforts to site a new landfill; the slogan caused grave concern among solid waste hauling industry, recyclers and Metro staff; and the slogan used a negative rather than positive, proactive approach. In conclusion, Ms. DeLorenzo reported 15 out of 16 SWPAC members objected to the slogan. She said the Committee wanted to review Phase II of the promotional program before it became public and to be appraised of Phase I evaluation and findings.

After continued discussion on the promotional program, the Council requested staff give special attention to evaluating Phase I. The Executive Officer pointed out that calls received at the Recycling Information Center were up 37 percent from the previous June, perhaps attributable to the media campaign.

Councilors Kelley and Frewing, requested staff provide a written description of future aspects of the promotional and education program for Council review. This, they agreed, would ensure that any debatable issues could be aired before final plans were made by staff.

John Drew, 2885 N.W. Bauer Woods Drive, Portland, a Portland area recycler, referred to a letter to Metro Councilors, dated June 2, 1986, from Kathy Cancilla, Education Chair, Association of Oregon Recyclers. Mr. Drew said he and Ms. Cancilla shared many of the concerns discussed previously about the "together we can get out of the dumps" slogan. He noted it was unfortunate that a promotional campaign designed to encourage recycling had not pleased the Oregon recycling industry. Mr. Drew urged the Council to choose a more positive message.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilor Kelley noted Councilor Kafoury, not Kelly, should have been listed as absent from the Meeting of May 1, 1986.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved to approve the minutes of April 22, 1986, as submitted and May 1, 1986, as revised. Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

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

Absent: Councilors Cooper and Myers

The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

7. ORDINANCES

7.1 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-203, Amending Metro's Code Section 2.05 regarding Deadlines and New Evidence and Exceptions to Revised Orders (First Reading and Public Hearing)

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

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Ordinance be adopted and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Jill Hinckley, Land Use Coordinator, reported that if adopted, the Ordinance would provide for the Executive Officer to set deadlines for filing exceptions and requests for submitting new evidence in contested cases.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on the Ordinance. There being no public testimony, the hearing was closed and the Ordinance passed to a second reading to occur on July 10.

7.2 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-204, Amending Ordinance No. 85-189 (Temporary Procedures for Hearing Petitions for Major Amendment of the Urban Growth Boundary) (First Reading and Public Hearing)

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

Ms. Hinckley explained the Ordinance would establish bi-annual deadlines for parties requesting major amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). She said other amendments to the procedures could be requested when permanent rules were prepared.

Councilor Kelley noted that Section 2(b) of the Ordinance did not provide specific reasons for which the Council could waive filing deadlines. She thought reasons should be specified in order to avoid arbitrary decisions. She requested staff prepare language for an amendment to that section to provide for waivers under unusual circumstances.

Councilor Frewing agreed that more specific language should be provided and that staff require petitions be consistent with various local comprehensive plans.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved Ordinance No. 86-204 be adopted and Councilor Gardner seconded the motion.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on the Ordinance. There being no public testimony, the hearing was closed and the Ordinance passed to a second reading to occur on July 10.

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-650, for the Purpose of Accepting the Hearings Officer's Report in Contested Case No. 85-7 (Kaiser), Furthering Annexation of the Affected Property to Metro and Expressing Council Intent to Amend the Urban Growth Boundary

Jill Hinckley, Land Use Coordinator, reported when the Council considered the Resolution at its June 12 meeting, it voted to remand the matter to staff to work with the petitioners on providing better assurance the property would be used to meet large parcel needs. She also explained the proposed action was a resolution to: 1) join in a "triple majority" petition for annexation to Metro; and 2) express the Council's intent to amend the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) as requested once the property was within Metro's jurisdiction. Ms. Hinckley then reviewed staff's proposed language to amend the Hearings Officer's Report as contained in Exhibit D (the exhibit distributed was erroneously marked "C").

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved to adopt Resolution No. 86-650 as published in the staff report with the following revisions: 1) change "Exhibit C" to read "Exhibit D" ("Amendments to the Hearings Officer's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Application of Kaiser Development Corporation and Co-Petitioners") under the fourth "whereas" and the first "be it resolved" in the Resolution; 2) include the new language in Exhibit D with the following changes; a) in Exhibit D, item 5, change the reference to "Resolution No. 86-6571" to read "Resolution No. 86-651"; b) in Exhibit D, item 6, delete the word "givs" (sic) from the first sentence; c) in Exhibit D, item 6, fourth line, change the word "district" to read "distinct." Councilor Van Bergen seconded the motion.

A discussion followed about whether it was the Council's intent to encourage large lot preservation for all cases or for this case only. The Presiding Officer noted the need for large lots was not universal throughout the District. Councilor Frewing suggested staff schedule a workshop for Councilors, developers and local government planners to offer instruction on UGB issues. The Presiding Officer said a workshop could be scheduled.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

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

Absent: Councilors Cooper and Myers

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-650 was adopted as revised.

8.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-658, for the Purpose of Granting Public and Commercial Rate Increases at the Killingsworth Fast Disposal Landfill

Rich McConaghy, Solid Waste Analyst, introduced Gary Newbore of Killingsworth Fast Disposal Landfill (KFD) and presented information relating to the rate increase request. He first noted KFD's request had been evaluated by Metro's Rate Review Committee (RRC) according to the rate review guidelines previously reviewed by the Council. Mr. McConaghy then discussed the specific formula for calculating franchise rate fees as contained in the printed agenda materials.

George Hubel, RRC Chair, reviewed the process by which the RRC evaluated KFD's rate increase request. Special issues of concern included the fact that no funds had been set aside for post closure costs and that KFD received some income from salvage and recycling efforts. He said the RRC determined KFD should receive a financial incentive to encourage recycling.

A discussion followed regarding KFD's post closure fund. Presiding Officer Waker asked what assurance the Council had that KFD would actually spend the fund on that activity. Mr. McConaghy explained recent Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regulations required the fund and governed its use.

Councilor Gardner said he was concerned that increased rates at KFD would divert more business to St. Johns Landfill. Mr. Hubel assured the Council the rate increases were modest and would not have a negative effect on St. Johns.

The Council then discussed the proposed rate incentives for recycling. Presiding Officer Waker said he objected to granting KFD an incentive when it was questionable how much material was actually being diverted from landfills as a result of their efforts. Councilor Kelley said she was very concerned about granting KFD a rate increase in addition to a generous break for recycling. Councilor Frewing said he had no problems with the recycling incentive but thought such a policy should apply to all franchises on a District--wide basis.

Presiding Officer Waker requested, as suggested by Councilor Frewing, staff prepare for Council review a policy regarding rate guidelines for franchises to encourage recycling activity.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor Frewing seconded the motion.

Gary Newbore, representing KPD, addressed the Council regarding the rate request. He described the recycling/salvage operation in more detail and the new DEQ requirements for post closure of the landfill.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Nay: Councilor Kelley

Absent: Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

Councilor DeJardin commended staff and the RRC for their impressive work on the rate review project.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:15 p.m. Presiding Officer Waker called the Council into executive session under the authority of ORS 192.660(1)(e), (f) and (h) to discuss confidential matters related to the West Transfer & Recycling Center project. The following Councilors were present: DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker. The Council reconvened into regular session at 8:45 p.m.

WEST TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved to declare the Cornelius Pass site selected by the Council on February 13, 1986, was no longer a suitable site because of the Washington County Board of Commissioners' recent interpretation that the Special Industrial District required more protection than other industrial zones. Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried.

Motion: Councilor Frewing moved to direct the Executive Officer and legal counsel to take all necessary steps to terminate acquisition of the land parcel known as the Cornelius Pass site. Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried.

A discussion followed about the new sites identified as options for the transfer station. These sites were 1) 21450-21480 N.W. Cornell Road; and 2) 1770 N.W. 216th Avenue (Fairway Western Property). The Presiding Officer noted that the 209th Avenue/TV Highway site had been subject to a public hearing and was still an option for Council consideration. He polled the Council on their preferences regarding sites they wished to consider.

Councilor Kirkpatrick said she would stand by her previous decision to look at sites in the Cornelius Pass area. She said she would only look at the 209th/TV Highway site as a last resort.

Councilor DeJardin agreed with Councilor Kirkpatrick explaining he wanted to minimize the impact of the transfer station on existing development.

Councilor Frewing explained he was not a Councilor when initial discussion occurred about the Cornelius Pass and 209th/TV Highway sites. He questioned why the Council had not pressed for sites in the Beaverton area because that was the center of waste generation.

In response to Councilor Frewing's statement, Presiding Officer Waker said the Council was not persuaded Beaverton was the logical area for a transfer station. They were persuaded on the argument that the center would best be located near Sunset Highway due to superior transportation access and development opportunities.

Councilor Gardner added he had preferred the Cornelius Pass area because it was deemed best from the standpoint of getting a conditional use permit.

Metro Council
June 26, 1986
Page 10

Councilor Oleson said he would prefer the new sites discussed because they were close to transportation access and not in developed areas. He questioned whether those sites were vulnerable to zone changes by Washington County.

Eleanore Baxendale, General Counsel, explained a transfer station was an outright permitted use under current Washington County zoning. The County could, however, interpret their Code any way it saw fit, she said. She added staff had received no indication the County would change zoning codes since they recently added transfer stations as a permitted use in that area.

Councilor Kelley advised postponing the transfer station project until DEQ had sited the regional landfill.

Councilor DeJardin said the Oregon City Planning Commission would not agree with Councilor Kelley's advice due to the severe strains Washington County's waste was currently placing on the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved to take public testimony on Site Number 52 (216th and Cornelius Pass Road) and Site Number 57 (1.3 miles from Highway 26) because they were in the Cornelius Pass/Highway 26 area, for sale to Metro, and zoned for a transfer station. The testimony should be taken on July 22, 1986, in Washington County and the Council would make its decision at the July 24, 1986, Council meeting at the Metro Offices. The Council should consider the same issues for selecting a site as it used previously: access to major transportation routes, impact of the traffic, impact on residential and industrial development, and design/development practicality. The 209th/TV Highway Site would be held in reserve, and testimony on the 209th/TV Highway Site would not be taken unless it was necessary to consider selecting that site. Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Councilor Frewing asked if the Council decided on July 24 not to consider Sites 52 and 57 further, would the 209th/TV Highway Site have the same status as the Champion Site in Beaverton. The Executive Officer said they would have the same status.

Councilor Hansen said he would vote against the motion. He shared Councilor DeJardin's concerns about the additional waste flow diverted to Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center but thought it best to follow Councilor Kelley's advice and wait until a new landfill was sited before continuing with the transfer station siting process.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:
Ayes: DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker
Nays: Councilors Hansen and Kelley
Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved to direct the Executive Officer to obtain options on the property known as Site Numbers 52 and 57. Councilor Gardner seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:
Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker
Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried.

Councilor Frewing requested the Executive Officer develop a schedule for a functional plan. The Deputy Executive Officer said a schedule was being developed.

8.3 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-654, for the Purpose of Amending the FY 1985-86 Budget and Appropriations (Public Hearing)

Jennifer Sims, Director of Management Services, reported that none of the six requested budget amendments required the review of the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC). Detailed explanations for the budget amendments were included in the meeting agenda materials.

There was no public testimony on the Resolution.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.
Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:
Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

8.4 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-659, for the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget for FY 1986-87, Making Appropriations from Funds of the District in Accordance with Said Annual Budget, and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes (Public Hearing)

Ms. Sims explained the Council had previously adopted Resolution No. 642 which approved the new budget and transmitted it to the TSCC. Upon review, the TSCC recommended the following changes: 1) Solid Waste Operating Fund and Zoo Operating Fund balance estimates be revised; 2) Unappropriated Balances be maintained for a required penalty payment should Metro not appropriate funds for the office space lease; and 3) the Convention, Trade and Spectator Facilities (CTS) Fund be amended to reflect Metro's role in the project. Ms. Sims also referred the Council to a letter from the TSCC, dated June 19, 1986, regarding those recommendations. Ms. Sims Memorandum to the Council, dated June 26, 1986, outlined staff's response to the TSCC's recommendations.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved to adopt Resolution No. 86-659 to include the following changes: 1) on page 1 of the Resolution, change "June 9" to read "June 10;" and 2) the three amendments as outlined in Ms. Sim's memorandum to the Council dated June 26, 1986 be incorporated into the Resolution. Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Ms. Sims said staff would return to the Council at a later date with further adjustments relating to the CTS project budget.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Kelley, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

8.5 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-657, for the Purpose of Authorizing a New Classification (Program Assistant 2) and Amending the Pay and Classification Plans

Jennifer Sims reported staff were requesting the position of Zoo

Metro Council
June 26, 1986
Page 13

Volunteer Coordinator be reclassified to Program Assistant 2 because the greatly expanded volunteer program has resulted in more job responsibilities.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilor Gardner requested salary information be included on the first page of future staff reports which discuss reclassifications or new positions.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Kelley, Myers and Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

8.5 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-660, for the Purpose of Amending the Pay Plan for Non-Union Employees

Jennifer Sims explained that non-Zoo employees did not receive a 7 percent salary increase granted non-union Zoo employees in FY 1982-83. Resolution No. 82-333 granted three additional personal holidays to non-Zoo employees in lieu of the 7 percent increase until wage parity could be restored. Ms. Sims said if Resolution No. 86-660 were adopted, parity between Zoo and non-Zoo salaries would be achieved by granting non-Zoo employees a 2 percent salary increase. The three personal holidays granted in lieu of the 7 percent salary raise would not be continued after June 30, 1986. She also explained staff would soon return to the Council requesting all non-union employees be granted an annual cost of living adjustment (COLA). Depending of the actual Consumer Price Index, she said that amount requested would be around 3 percent.

In response to Councilor Frewing's question, Ms. Sims said 2 percent had been budgeted for a FY 1986-87 COLA and an additional 3 percent remained in contingency funds for salary increases. A 3 percent increase would cost Metro an additional \$155,000 for the year, she said.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor Gardner seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Metro Council
June 26, 1986
Page 14

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen,
Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Kelley, Myers and
Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

**8.7 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-656, for the Purpose of
Appointing Citizen Members to the Solid Waste Rate Review
Committee**

Ray Barker, Council Assistant, reported the proposed Resolution called for appointing the following individuals to the Solid Waste Rate Review Committee (RRC): Jonathan Block would be appointed as a local government administrator; and Charles O'Connor would be appointed as a certified public accountant. Both terms would expire December 31, 1986, but each person could be reappointed for an additional term.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen,
Kirkpatrick, Oleson and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Kafoury, Kelley, Myers and
Van Bergen

The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

There being no further business, Presiding Officer Waker adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

amn
5923C/313-2
07/24/86