

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

February 13, 1992

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Presiding Officer Jim Gardner, Deputy  
Presiding Officer Judy Wyers, Roger  
Buchanan, Tanya Collier, Tom DeJardin,  
Richard Devlin, Sandi Hansen, Ruth  
McFarland, Susan McLain and George Van  
Bergen

Councilors Absent: Larry Bauer

Also Present: Executive Officer Cusma

Presiding Officer Gardner called the regular meeting to order at  
5:35 p.m.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced that Agenda Item No. 5.2,  
Resolution No. 92-1563, For the Purpose of Confirming  
Appointments to the Metropolitan Greenspaces Policy Advisory  
Committee, had been added to the Consent Agenda.

1. CONSIDERATION OF A CANDIDATE FOR THE VACANT DISTRICT 11  
COUNCIL POSITION

A. Interviews of Candidates by the Council:

Presiding Officer Gardner announced that due to the January 10,  
1992, resignation of District 11 Councilor David Knowles, the  
Council had been involved in a process to select a person to  
serve in that position. He said vacancy notifications to the  
public were published in The Oregonian, The Skanner, The Portland  
Observer and that neighborhood associations, business  
associations and elected officials were also informed of the  
vacant position. He said applications were made available to all  
interested citizens beginning January 13.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced that a Council subcommittee  
comprised of Councilors Collier, Hansen and Wyers held a public  
meeting at the Westminster Presbyterian Church on Wednesday,  
February 5, 1992, to hear the candidates and receive testimony  
from interested citizens.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced the Council would interview  
the candidates for the vacant District 11 Council position per  
the provisions of Metro Code Section 2.01.180. He said the order  
of interviews had been chosen randomly by lot. He said each  
applicant would have up to 15 minutes to respond to the five  
questions they received in the application packet and to make  
closing remarks. He said individual Councilors could ask follow-

up remarks which would not be applied against the applicants' allotted time, but that Councilors were urged to keep their follow-up questions brief and that applicants were asked to keep their responses brief also. Presiding Officer Gardner asked candidates to remain outside the Council Chamber until they had testified.

The following candidates were interviewed.

1. Mike Dolan
2. Robert Phillips
3. Joe Ross
4. Margaret Bax
5. Ronnie Dansby
6. Ed Washington
7. Michel Wagner

The seven candidates were each asked the following five questions.

1. An independent committee is drafting a Metro charter to put before the voters in November. What powers, authority, and functions should be included in Metro's Charter?
2. What should Metro's relationship be with other governments in the region?
3. Metro Councilors are responsible for setting regional policy and for program and fiscal oversight of the Metropolitan Service District. Explain how your background would enhance the Council's ability to perform these tasks.
4. By assuming this position, you would be appointed to represent a district of approximately 80,000 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 District 11 with the needs of the region?
5. What do you believe ought to be changed about Metro, if anything?

After all seven candidates answered the questions listed above and participated in question and answer sessions with the Council, Presiding Officer Gardner closed the interview process.

**B. Selection of Candidate for the District 11 Position**

Presiding Officer Gardner asked for nominations.

**First Nomination:** Councilor Hansen moved, seconded by Councilor Buchanan, to nominate Mr. Washington.

**Second Nomination:** Councilor Devlin moved, seconded by Councilor McLain, to nominate Ms. Bax.

**Third Nomination:** Councilor DeJardin moved, seconded by Councilor McFarland, to nominate Mr. Phillips.

Presiding Officer Gardner asked if there were any further nominations. There were no further nominations and the nominations were closed.

The Council discussed the nominations.

Councilor Hansen said she nominated Mr. Washington because he displayed a depth of regional knowledge gained from participation on the Columbia Slough wetlands, mid-county sewer issues, Tri-Met issues and the Riedel Composter facility. She was impressed with the breadth of Mr. Washington's background due to his service on various state, county, city and neighborhood committees. She said Mr. Washington had attended Metro committee, Charter and Council meetings for the last two months and said Mr. Washington would make a wonderful addition to the Metro Council.

Councilor Devlin discussed the process to appoint new Councilors. He said the current process was preferable to the old process but believed Council vacancies should be filled through election. He said all of the candidates under consideration were excellent. He said he based his selection of Ms. Bax on various factors. He said Ms. Bax clearly had a strong connection with her community, but also had a strong regional perspective. He said Ms. Bax had experience in complex issues such as urban growth management, housing and other areas.

Councilor Collier said based on testimony given at this meeting, she would vote for Ms. Bax. She said all of the candidates were excellent, but that it was essential Councilors be able to make strong decisions in light of pending issues including the Metro Charter. She said there had been debate over who the Council represented - local governments or citizens. She believed the Council represented a mix of local governments and citizens, but that citizens should always be considered first.

Councilor McFarland concurred with Councilor Collier on the strength of the field of candidates.

Councilor Buchanan said he worked with Mr. Washington on the Multnomah County Mental Health Advisory Committee and on the Composter Enhancement Committee and said Mr. Washington would contribute greatly to the Council.

Councilor McLain said all of the candidates under consideration were excellent.

Presiding Officer Gardner asked if there were any further Councilor comments or discussion. He explained individual Councilors would vote for one candidate and sign their ballots per Metro Code Section 2.01.180 provisions. He said a candidate would be appointed outright if he or she received at least six votes. He said if no one candidate received a majority of six votes, a second ballot would be held on the two candidates receiving the most votes on the first ballot. He said in the case of a tie for the first or second spots on the first ballot, all candidates in the first and second spots will be on the second ballot. He said the same procedure would follow for all subsequent ballots.

First Vote: Councilors Buchanan, Hansen, McFarland, Van Bergen and Wyers voted for Mr. Washington. Councilors Collier, Devlin, Gardner, and McLain voted for Ms. Bax. Councilors Bauer and DeJardin were absent.

Mr. Washington received five votes, Ms. Bax received four votes, and Mr. Phillips received no votes. Mr. Washington and Ms. Bax were then under consideration for the second ballot.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced one candidate must receive six votes to be appointed to the Metro Council. Presiding Officer Gardner asked for another vote.

Second Vote: Councilors Buchanan, Hansen, McFarland, McLain, Wyers and Van Bergen voted for Mr. Washington. Councilors Gardner, Collier and Devlin voted for Ms. Bax. Councilors Bauer and DeJardin were absent.

Mr. Washington received six votes and Ms. Bax received three votes. Presiding Officer Gardner announced that Mr. Washington had been appointed to the Metro Council to fill the District 11 Council vacancy. Presiding Officer Gardner congratulated Mr. Washington on his appointment.

C. Resolution No. 92-1567, For the Purpose of Appointing a Candidate to Fill the Vacant District 11 Council Position

Motion: Councilor McFarland moved, seconded by Councilor Devlin, to suspend the Council's rules requiring resolutions to be referred by committee so that the Council as a whole could consider Resolution No. 92-1567.

Vote: Councilors Buchanan, Collier, Devlin, Hansen, McFarland, McLain, Van Bergen, Wyers and Gardner voted aye. Councilors Bauer and DeJardin were absent. The vote was unanimous and the motion to suspend the rules passed.

Motion: Councilor McFarland moved, seconded by Councilor Hansen, to adopt Resolution No. 92-1567.

Vote: Councilors Buchanan, Collier, Devlin, Hansen, McFarland, McLain, Van Bergen, Wyers and Gardner voted aye. Councilors Bauer and DeJardin were absent. The vote was unanimous and Resolution No. 92-1567 was adopted.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced new Councilor Washington would take the oath of office and be seated at the beginning of the next regularly scheduled Council meeting on February 27.

Mr. Washington thanked the Council for appointing him, Mrs. Washington for her support, and thanked the other six candidates.

Presiding Officer Gardner recessed the Council at 8:10 p.m. for a dinner break.

The Council reconvened at 8:43 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

Presiding Officer Gardner introduced Professor Jack Corbett and Public Administration Program students from Lewis & Clark College who were present to observe the Council meeting. He thanked them for attending the meeting.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

4. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of Minutes of October 10 and 24, and November 14 and 26, 1991

5.2 Resolution No. 92-1563, For the Purpose of Confirming Appointments to the Metropolitan Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Motion: Councilor Collier moved, seconded by Councilor Devlin, for adoption of the Consent Agenda.

Vote: Councilors Buchanan, Collier, Devlin, Hansen, McFarland, McLain, Van Bergen, Wyers and Gardner voted aye. Councilors Bauer and DeJardin were absent. The vote was unanimous and the Consent Agenda was adopted.

6. ORDINANCES, FIRST READINGS

6.1 Ordinance No. 92-444, An Ordinance Adopting a Final Order and Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary for Contested Case No. 91-2: Forest Park (Public Hearing)

The Clerk read the ordinance for a first time by title only.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced the Council would consider Ordinance No. 92-444 in its capacity as a quasi-judicial decision-maker.

Ethan Seltzer, Regional Planning Supervisor, introduced Hearings Officer Chris Thomas.

Mr. Thomas noted the Council had already received his report and staff's report. Mr. Thomas explained the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) amendment involved an application by HGW, Inc., representing Forest Park Estate Joint Venture, and the City of Portland for approval of a trade under which certain lands would be brought within the UGB and other lands would be moved outside the UGB. He said the land proposed for addition to the UGB, referred to as Parcel A, was southwest of Skyline Boulevard, west of NW Saltzman Road, and north of NW Laidlaw and NW North Roads, consisting of 120 acres, and owned by Forest Park Estate Joint Venture. He explained the land proposed for deletion from the UGB, Parcel D, was southeast of NW Newberry Road, at the northern

end of Forest Park, consisting of 139.8 acres, and owned by the City of Portland. He said the amendment also involved a larger transaction with two other parcels of land privately owned by the Ramsey family within Forest Park. He said HGW, Inc., would acquire one of the parcels and part of the other parcel to give to the City of Portland to be into the parts of Forest Park under public ownership and be protected as part of Forest Park on a permanent basis.

Mr. Thomas said it was important the City be the owner and the municipality with permanent jurisdiction over the parcel of land traded outside of the UGB. He said if the City was not one of the applicants the trade could not occur, because land trades outside the UGB had to have as party to the application either the owner, or the jurisdiction interested in the parcel.

Mr. Thomas explained the Hearings Officer had to evaluate evidence based on the relative urbanizability of the parcel traded out in comparison to the urbanizability of the parcel traded in and what parcel inside the UGB would make urban services to abutting parcels already inside the UGB more efficient. He said the record was clear that the parcel proposed for inclusion in the UGB could be better served and would make provision of City services to abutting parcels inside the UGB more efficient, whereas moving the other parcel outside the UGB would have no effect on urban services because it would not be developed whether it was inside the City limits or not. He said Metro UGB standards established that effectively.

Mr. Thomas said the City of Portland had stated that if the transaction with the Ramsey family was not concluded in a manner considered satisfactory to the City, it would not serve as an applicant in this case. After evaluation of Metro's standards for UGB trades, he said this trade should be approved whether the Ramsey property was part of the overall transaction or not. He said all conditions were met without the Ramsey family transaction, although that transaction would improve the trade, but that he had stated in his report it was not necessary to meet the approval criteria. He did not believe it was appropriate to say the trade could not occur unless the Ramsey transaction was completed based on those standards. He said the UGB amendment could not occur unless the City was one of the applicants. He said he recommended, to which the parties to the case agreed, that the effectiveness of Ordinance No. 92-444 be conditioned on the trade being completed in a manner satisfactory to the City, within 90 days after adoption of the ordinance. He said that recommendation differed from previous cases discussed wherein UGB amendments were approved with the condition that affected lands be developed in a specific way in the future. He said this UGB

METRO COUNCIL  
February 13, 1992  
Page 8

amendment would not become effective unless the Ramsey transaction was completed satisfactorily within a 90-day period.

Mr. Thomas said the dissenting party to the case took the position it was not appropriate to let the City of Portland determine how much of the Ramsey land it would accept in order for the amendment to be approved. Mr. Thomas said he concluded that, because the transaction without the Ramsey transaction, met Metro's standards for a trade, that it was not appropriate for him as Hearings Officer to say the trade had to occur in a particular way and that the only relevance of the Ramsey transaction to approving the trade was the City's position that it would withdraw from its position as applicant unless the trade was completed in a manner satisfactory to them which did fit within Metro criteria.

Presiding Officer Gardner opened the public hearing.

Jim Sjulín, Bureau of Parks and Recreation, City of Portland, and Richard Whitman, attorney for HGW, Inc./Forest Park Estate Joint Venture, testified as proponents to the case. Mr. Whitman said the Hearings Officer's report was thorough and would not elaborate on that report, but wanted to testify on how the trade would benefit the public and gave a brief history of events leading to the amendment. He said 120 acre parcel proposed for inclusion in the UGB, was the subject of a development application made to Multnomah County two years previously. He said that application was denied by the County after being heard by the Multnomah County Planning Commission and the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners largely because of City of Portland and Metro staff testimony given which expressed concern about developing that parcel at a density level which would have precluded future urbanization. He said the development proposal was to put 12 lots on the property, each lot from 5 to 20 acres. He said after that proposal was denied, HGW, Inc., evaluated whether or not to submit another proposal to the County, but said John Sherman, Friends of Forest Park, presented the proposal to the City and HGW, Inc., which led to the proposed amendment. He said as currently structured, a minimum of 103 acres would be added to Forest Park, consisting of the 73 acre Ramsey property and at least 23 acres of the other Ramsey property, the two major inholdings left in Forest Park. He said The Oregonian published an editorial stating the City should ensure that Forest Park would not be developed, and said the UGB amendment assured no development would occur by removing the largest parcels. He said removing the northern end of Forest Park from the UGB would make it much more difficult for the rural lands outside the UGB to the north of Forest Park to develop at any urban levels of density. He said to amend the UGB in that



area, applicants would have to create a non-UGB island of land in the northern end of Forest Park. He said this amendment addressed the current major inholding in Forest Park and also partly solved the problem of creating a wildlife corridor from Forest Park out to the coast range.

Mr. Sjulín responded to concerns raised by the Forest Park Neighborhood Association in their letter. He said he could not respond officially on the City's position, but wished to state for the record that the Portland Parks Bureau concurred with their letter and would accept the Forest Park Neighborhood Association's position that the minimum requirement was that the City should ultimately receive the 73 acre parcel in addition to at least 23 acres of the 46 acre parcel.

Mr. Whitman concurred with the City's request. He wanted to ensure the amendment's flexibility, and state either 20.3 acres or the area of that particular parcel which had been zoned environmentally protected by the City, would be traded.

Councilor Devlin asked Mr. Whitman if he had reviewed proposed language. Mr. Whitman said he briefly reviewed proposed language but wanted to review it again before any official action was made.

John Sherman, Friends of Forest Park, said adding the two parcels to the park was the most important action needed to protect the integrity of the park, both with respect to wildlife habitat and recreational value.

Arnold Rochlin, Forest Park Neighborhood Association, said the language he proposed to add to the Hearings Officer's recommendation would be placed at the end of Ordinance No. 92-444, Section 1. He said per testimony given at this meeting, the proposed amendment appeared acceptable to Mr. Whitman and Mr. Sherman. He disagreed with Mr. Thomas on whether incorporating the Ramsey properties into the ordinance as a condition of approval would be a proper condition. He said it could be a proper condition because there was a requirement regarding public services that the efficiency and economical viability of the provision of public services not be hampered by approval of UGB exchanges. He said schools represented a weak point in the findings. He said there was no substantial evidence that the number of children added to the schools that served the area in question would not be excessive. He said there was some specific information about Skyline Elementary School, that the school had extra capacity, although he said he had heard from other parties that was not true. He said there was no real information indicating that the middle schools or the high school serving the

area could absorb additional children and had heard that they could not. He said Mr. Thomas assumed it would be no more expensive and no more inefficient for the schools to build more facilities to serve the additional children if necessary there than anywhere else. He said that issue could be solved by making the Ramsey portion a specific condition, because the number of units of housing that could potentially be built on the Ramsey portion approximated the number of units that could be built on the land that would be brought within the UGB. He said the City land that would leave the UGB was park land, no housing units would be lost, and would not represent a real trade. He said the third parcel provided the balance required to make a genuine exchange. He said if otherwise, the exchange on paper would not be the usual UGB exchange. He said that issue was a legitimate point, and that the Council could decide to balance the housing potential going out of the UGB with what lands would come in.

Mr. Rochlin said Metro Code Section 3.01.040(a)(3) required consideration of environmental factors. He said the Code was not clear on what that consideration meant, and said there had been some consideration of environmental factors, but said for the language to mean anything as a standard for approval, there had to be some consideration that indicated whether the environmental factors had been properly addressed and whether they were in reasonable balance, meaning no harm had been done to the environment.

Mr. Rochlin said Mr. Whitman's testimony on beneficial factors occurring from the trade were correct because the Ramsey lands would come into the UGB and the wildlife corridor would be kept open. He noted on the map displayed (on file in the Planning and Development Department) that the Linnton urban area bulged up toward the Ramsey parcels and created a bottom neck for wildlife migration. He noted Mr. Whitman had stated an island outside the UGB at the north end of Forest Park would make it difficult to rationalize extending the UGB further north around that island. He said if the large 70.3 acre Ramsey parcel and other smaller parcel were not brought into the park, it would not matter if the UGB was protected or not. He said the wildlife corridor would be effectively destroyed at that point. He said such an amendment would be effective for other purposes, but not for the environmental purposes at issue and that the standard listed in Metro Code Section 3.01.040(a)(3) as a condition for approval would not be met. He noted Mr. Whitman stated 73 acres plus 23 acres was 103 acres and said the property in question was really 96 acres.

Presiding Officer asked if any other citizens wished to testify. No other citizens appeared to testify and the public hearing was

**METRO COUNCIL**  
**February 13, 1992**  
**Page 11**

closed. He said final consideration and action on Ordinance No. 92-444 had been tentatively scheduled for February 27.

The Council as a whole discussed the ordinance. Councilor Devlin stated for the record he would vote for the ordinance at its second reading. He said for timely action on the ordinance to take place, that language amendment activity should occur during the interim so that when the Council considered the ordinance again on February 27, all parties to the case would be in complete agreement on what that language should be.

Councilor McLain asked questions for staff to answer when the Council considered the ordinance again. She said Mr. Rochlin stated dissatisfaction with the housing trade of lands going in and out and dissatisfaction with the purity of the wildlife corridor and whether it would be able to function in relation to other lands and location. She said those factors should be considered and wanted to hear more about those factors from staff at the February 27 Council meeting.

Councilor Hansen asked Mr. Seltzer if the ordinance would set a precedent for other similar trades. Mr. Seltzer said Metro had done such trades before, that trade procedures were listed in the Metro Code, and that such procedures were not new. He said with regard to other inholding in Forest Park, he did not know the City's position at this time. He said Metro staff took the condition seriously because Metro had limited ability to enforce conditions. He said the issue to staff was whether the City of Portland was a party to this transaction. He said if the City was, then the amendment met Metro criteria, and the Hearings Officer had recommended that it be approved. He said staff believed the City should have the ability to determine its own satisfaction and that Metro should not anticipate the City's actions. He said staff accepted the Hearings Officer's report because the City had its own process for determining its satisfaction in such cases. He said the question to be asked was what would occur should Metro and the City of Portland disagree if the City was dissatisfied. He said Metro's criteria and the Hearings Officer's report was based on the City's determination of its satisfaction.

Councilor Van Bergen asked for assurances that proposals developed after the hearing process would not prejudice the case after adoption of the ordinance. Councilor Van Bergen cited past cases and said such trades did not necessarily mean real equity in land trades. Councilor Van Bergen disagreed with staff on Metro's authority and cited Metro's post-conditions placed on City of Wilsonville on the amphitheater they wanted to build near a water tower. He said he was in favor of Ordinance No. 92-444,

but did not want to set precedent for inequitable trades. Mr. Thomas agreed with Councilor Van Bergen on the appropriateness of conditions. He noted he served as the Hearings Officer on the case that removed the conditions from Wilsonville on the case that Councilor Van Bergen cited. He said this particular case would not become a UGB amendment with the condition that the land in question be developed in a specific way in the future. He said the amendment would not occur at all unless it happened in a manner satisfactory to the City. He said he would be concerned that even though the trade would be appropriate without the Ramsey land transaction, if the Council took the position that the City had to do the Ramsey transaction. He said condition language had to be written very carefully and said he had always written opinions with the view to their future precedential value. He said land use lawyers in the future should be able to read opinions the Council had adopted and be able to count on whatever legal rulings were implicit in them as rulings they could rely on in the future on what they could and could not do. He said he would not want the Council to adopt something beyond the Council's authority.

Councilor Van Bergen concurred with Mr. Thomas and said those concerns were his exactly. He said if the City made additional conditions, Metro would not be made privy to the process because it was an urban growth manager and not a planning manager. He expressed concern that Metro was getting into the planning process and wanted this transaction to be procedurally sound. Mr. Seltzer said that was why Executive Officer Cusma and staff supported the Hearings Officer's report to keep the planning decisions at the local level and to keep the determination of the City's position in the hands of the City. He said Mr. Thomas said Metro was not conditioning the development, Metro was conditioning the completion of a transaction which would lead to the completion of Metro's action. He said staff was attempting to avoid being in the position of making local decisions through conditions and EFU agreements.

Councilor Devlin asked if the language proposed would be acceptable to the City of Portland. Mr. Thomas said if there were issues with the transaction, the City should deal with those decisions within their own process. He expressed concern about the implication that there was a way around the UGB process with a condition in the UGB amendment.

Councilor McLain discussed the suitability of the lands traded in and out, but said her previous questions should be answered by staff. She did not mean to raise issues about local planning procedures.

**METRO COUNCIL**  
**February 13, 1992**  
**Page 13**

Councilor Van Bergen noted during a Council consideration of a previous UGB case, Hearings Officer Larry Epstein said he had compiled a history of Metro consideration of UGB cases, and asked for copies of that history for the full Council.

**7. ORDINANCES, SECOND READINGS**

**7.1 Ordinance No. 92-448, For the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Section 5.06.070 to Clarify the Composter Community Enhancement Boundary, and Declaring an Emergency (Public Hearing)**

The Clerk read the ordinance for a second time by title only.

Presiding Officer Gardner announced that Ordinance No. 92-448 was first read on January 23, 1992, and referred to the Solid Waste Committee for consideration. The Solid Waste Committee considered the ordinance on February 4 and recommended it to the full Council for adoption.

**Motion:** Councilor Buchanan moved, seconded by Councilor Hansen, for adoption of Ordinance No. 92-448.

Councilor Buchanan gave the Solid Waste Committee's report and recommendations. He said the ordinance was a housekeeping measure to redefine the boundaries of the Composter Community Enhancement boundary. He said the ordinance which established the original boundaries was intended to include properties on both sides of the boundary streets, but said that language was inadvertently left out.

Presiding Officer Gardner opened the public hearing. No citizens appeared to testify and the public hearing was closed.

**Vote:** Councilors Buchanan, Devlin, Hansen, McLain, Van Bergen and Gardner voted aye. Councilors Bauer, Collier, DeJardin, McFarland and Wyers were absent. The vote was unanimous and Ordinance No. 92-448 was adopted.

**8. RESOLUTIONS**

**8.1 Resolution No. 92-1557, For the Purpose of Authorizing Issuance of a Request for Proposals for a Study of Weight-Based Collection Rates as Economic Recycling Incentives and Entering into Multi-Year Contracts with the Most Qualified Proposers**

**Motion:** Councilor Hansen moved, seconded by Councilor McLain, to refer Resolution No. 92-1557 back to the Solid Waste Committee for further consideration.

Councilor Hansen gave the Solid Waste Committee's report and recommendations. Councilor Hansen explained staff had received calls from local governments and haulers who had questions about the bid documents slated to be issued requesting proposals on how to run the study. She asked that the resolution be referred back to Committee for revision by staff.

**Vote:** Councilors Buchanan, Devlin, Hansen, McLain, Van Bergen and Gardner voted aye. Councilors Bauer, Collier, DeJardin, McFarland and Wyers were absent. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

**9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**9.1 Report on January 30 Presentation to the Metro Charter Committee**

Presiding Officer Gardner deferred Agenda Item No. 9.1.

Councilor Buchanan reported on the second Composter Neighborhood Community Enhancement Committee meeting held to-date.

Councilor Van Bergen distributed the FY 1992-93 Budget meeting and hearing schedule.

All business having been attended to, Presiding Officer Gardner adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Paulette Allen  
Clerk of the Council