CONVENED: 10:12 a.m.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:
   Chair Linda Peters
   Vice Chair Kim Katsion
   Commissioner Kathy Christy
   Commissioner Andy Duyck

STAFF:
   Robert Davis, Assistant County Administrator
   Dennis Mulvihill, Intergovernmental Relations Specialist
   Dan Olsen, Interim County Counsel
   Alan Rappleeya, Sr. Assistant County Counsel
   John Rosenberger, Director, LUT
   Brent Curtis, Planning Division Manager, LUT
   Joe Grillo, Land Development Division Manager, LUT
   Jim Tice, Senior Planner, LUT
   Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner, LUT
   Scott King, Sr. Planner, LUT
   Mike Borresen, Division Manager, LUT
   Andy Back, Sr. Planner, LUT
   Greg Miller, Engineering Project Manager, LUT
   Bob Cruz, Conveyance Systems Dept. Director, USA
   Terri Ewing, CPO Coordinator
   Jeff Friend, Audio/Video Technician, SS
   Barbara Hejtmanek, Recording Secretary

PRESS:
   Don Hamilton, The Oregonian

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
   September 17, 1996
   September 24, 1996

Commissioner Rogers' absence was due to his representation of the County at an out-of-town meeting.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Peters announced an addition to the Consent Agenda from Emergency Medical Services entitled "Appointment: Request for Proposals for Emergency Ambulance Service, Evaluation Committee, Public Ambulance Service Operator Member". (Item appointed Captain Noel A. Jett as the Public Ambulance Service Operator member of the Evaluation Committee for the RFP for Emergency Ambulance Services for Washington County.)

It was moved to approve the Consent Agenda, noting the above.
The following actions were taken as the Board of Directors of the Unified Sewerage Agency - a County Service District.

1.a. Easements—Approval of Acquisition (Approved Under Consent USA RO 96-56 Agenda)

1.b. Willow Creek Trunk Upgrade (1889) - Final Acceptance and USA MO 96-100 Authorization for Final Payment (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

1.c. Subdivision Plat Approval Authorization (Approved Under Consent MO 96-419 Agenda)

SUPPORT SERVICES

1.d. Amendment to the Washington County 1996-97 Pay Plan Adding RO 96-164 the New Classifications of Telecommunication Technician and Senior Telecommunication Technician (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

The following action was taken as the Board of Directors of the Housing Authority of Washington County.

1.e. Comprehensive Grant Program Performance and Evaluation HA RO 96-9 Report, Fiscal Year 1994-95 and 1995-96

2. ORAL COMMUNICATION

Paul Choban, 6750 N.W. Gales Creek Road, Forest Grove, Oregon, asked for Dan Olsen's resignation. (Mr. Choban has made this request on other occasions.) He alleged that Mr. Olsen's actions have either directly or indirectly affected a lot of people negatively. Mr. Choban was troubled by Mr. Olsen's interpretation of the law and by his alleged failure to report evidence of a crime by an employee. He believed there has been a "cover-up" in the Office of County Counsel.

Commissioner Christy suggested that the Board discuss at some future time what constitutes Oral Communication. She was not comfortable with Mr. Choban's repeated accusations against Mr. Olsen. Commissioner Christy differentiated between doing this and asking the Board to investigate specific matters.

Chair Peters questioned the use of Oral Communication to repeatedly launch accusations at a particular staff member in the manner of a personal vendetta. She believed further discussion of the use of Oral Communication should occur and should include Mr. Olsen in his capacity of Interim County Counsel. Chair Peters mentioned that the Board has a high opinion of Mr. Olsen's integrity, legal scholarship, and legal acumen.

Commissioner Katsion asked Dan Olsen to provide a written legal opinion for Board consideration at a future Worksession.

Dan Olsen consented to prepare a written range of discretion for Board consideration. He said it would take two to three weeks to prepare this.

The Board agenda was slightly re-ordered at this time in that item 4.b. was placed at the beginning of the agenda.

4. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

4.b. Amend County Exceptions Document for Beef Bend Road/ MO 96-421 Extension Project
Brent Curtis introduced the item. He informed the Board that this item was initially set forth as an action item but assured the Board that steps were taken to adjust the notice as a public hearing item. Mr. Curtis commented that this case is rather different than usual to the extent that the Director of the Department of Land Use and Transportation is the applicant. He explained that the Planning Department has maintained the same relationship with this applicant as with any other.

Scott King summarized the staff report. He listed all the applicable regulations for this request as well as affected jurisdictions. Mr. King stated that the Beef Bend Extension is a proposed new arterial road that would provide a direct connection of existing north south link of Beef Bend Road on the north to Elsner Road on the south at the location immediately north of the Schamburg Bridge over the Tualatin River. He explained that the Beef Bend Extension is one element of a larger County project known as the 'Beef Bend Elsner Scholls Sherwood' or 'BBESS' project and that it is located entirely on lands designated as exclusive farm use. Mr. King noted that the Beef Bend Extension is currently included in the existing acknowledged Washington County Transportation Plan as a proposed minor arterial; however, due to statutory requirements, Washington County is required to adopt an exception to statewide goals 3, 11, and 14 to construct this project link. He said that a goals exception is required in this case because subsequent to the adoption of the current Washington County Transportation Plan in 1988, LCDC adopted the Transportation Planning Rule in 1991 with amendments in 1995 which included a list of specific transportation improvements and facilities considered consistent with goals 3, 4, 11, and 14. Mr. King added that this administrative rule does not include new arterial roads as an allowed use; therefore, under the provisions of the Transportation Planning Rule, a goal exception is required to construct the Beef Bend Extension even though the need, mode, function, and general location are already part of an acknowledged plan. He said that in addition to being part of the County's Transportation Plan, the Beef Bend Extension is also included in the current regional Transportation Plan as an element of the regional, financially constrained road network. Mr. King stated that the Beef Bend Extension is included in the Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program 3 (MSTIP3) which was approved by voters in 1995 by a wide margin. He related that the Beef Bend Extension is one of many roadway improvement projects included in the recommended alternative to the Western Bypass.

Mr. King informed the Board that the applicant has submitted two primary documents to address the applicable criteria for this request:


Supplementary Findings Relating to Statewide Planning Goals, Related Administrative Rules, and Comprehensive Plan Policies for the Goal Exception for the Beef Bend Road Extension.

He then listed all other materials submitted by the applicant into the record and all correspondence both in favor of and opposed to this request.

Scott King told the Board that on September 18, 1996, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval of this exception request to the Board. He recommended that the Board approve this request for a goals exception to construct the Beef Bend Extension. Mr. King suggested the Board issue a tentative approval of the exception today and continue the matter to October 22, 1996, for adoption of findings.

Mr. King showed a series of slides of the vicinity of the proposed Beef Bend Extension.

APPLICANT TESTIMONY

Alan Rappleyea swore in each person before he/she provided testimony.
A brief summary of applicant testimony follows.

Mark Greenfield, Attorney, 111 S.W. Columbia, Portland, Oregon, represented the applicant. He referred the Board to the Exceptions Document for the detailed legal requirements for goal exceptions relative to transportation improvements on rural lands. Mr. Greenfield told the Board that the Western Bypass Study identified a regional need for the Beef Bend Project, including the Beef Bend Extension. He said this need is also reflected in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan and in correspondence received. Mr. Greenfield said that the Beef Bend project is intended to be a major urban traffic connector to regional and town centers located in the southern and western portions of the region. He explained that because the urban growth boundary is not a concentric circle, it is necessary for this roadway to pass through rural lands. Mr. Greenfield said that the goal is to provide an efficient, safe major north-south transportation link in an area already served by the existing, substandard Beef Bend network. He informed the Board that the Beef Bend Extension would reduce vehicle miles traveled on an annual basis by approximately 3.4 million miles.

Mary Dorman, Professional Planning Consultant, Dorman & Company, 6131 N.E. Alameda, Portland, Oregon, provided background information and an overview of the project in a regional context. She introduced existing and projected traffic volumes in the corridor and described general land uses adjacent to the proposed Beef Bend Extension. Ms. Dorman (and subsequent speakers) used a variety of visual aids during presentation. She regarded transportation links as critical to viable growth in the area under discussion. Ms. Dorman related that major, new open space uses are planned for the vicinity and that the Beef Bend Extension would provide accessibility to these new regional destinations. She believed that the large-scale public ownership would uniquely limit pressures for urbanization.

Mark Greenfield addressed compliance with applicable exceptions standards. He said that a key requirement is the demonstration that there is a transportation need that cannot be met through measures or alternatives not requiring an exception. Mr. Greenfield said the principal components to the need are 1) the identified regional need for an arterial connection to facilitate the movement of people and the flow of goods and services between subareas that have been earmarked by Metro's 2040 growth concept for substantial population and job growth as well as to provide access to regional destinations, and 2) the need for a roadway system that is safe and efficient. Regarding alternatives, he said that the Transportation Planning Rule requires consideration of a variety of alternatives to see if any can reasonably accommodate the identified need. Mr. Greenfield reported that Tri-Met has indicated that the Beef Bend area ranks low for service. He described the alternatives that were examined. Mr. Greenfield concluded that: 1) All of the standards required for an exception are met; 2) The project is needed; 3) None of the alternatives can reasonably accommodate the use; and 4) Local people in the area strongly support this alternative.

Five handouts were distributed to the Board, which may be found in the Meeting File.

The following individuals testified in support of the proposed plan amendment:
- Dene Mallory, 17500 S.W. Elsner Road, Sherwood, Oregon
- Judge Owen Panner, 620 S.W. Main, Portland, Oregon (Letter from Judge Panner was read by Mr. Mallory)
- Bob Terry, 9650 S.W. Hardebeck, Gaston, Oregon
- Bill Hill, Superintendent of Schools, 23295 S.W. Sherwood Boulevard, Sherwood, Oregon
- Mary Tobias, President, Tualatin Valley Economic Development Corporation, 10200 S.W. Nimbus Avenue, Tigard, Oregon
- Daniel Brooks, 17819 S.W. Elsner Road, Sherwood, Oregon
- Steve Hasuike, 15265 S.W. Beef Bend Road, Sherwood, Oregon

Commissioner Katsion related a message from Representative Tom Brian that he is in support of the
Commissioner Katsion related a message from Representative Tom Brian that he is in support of the application.

Reasons given for support of the Beef Bend Extension project included:

1. Widespread concern for safety issues associated with the increased traffic in the area.
2. Importance of increased connectivity.
3. Reduction in vehicle miles traveled per capita.
4. Improved road conditions for future transit service.
5. Protection of the national wildlife refuge.
6. Improved conditions for moving agricultural products, equipment and employees.
7. Need to create safe conditions for school bus travel.
8. Lack of opposition to the project by residents of the area.

OPPOSITION

Loretta Pickerell, Sensible Transportation Options for People (STOP), 26370 S.W. 45th Drive, Wilsonville, Oregon, said she is a member of the Project Advisory Committee for the Beef Bend Road Improvement Project. (Testimony of Ms. Pickerell may be found in the Meeting File.) She reported that STOP recognizes the need for north-south connection in this area and the existence of serious safety problems along this road. Ms. Pickerell explained that STOP does not specifically oppose the extension itself but rather the process being used to determine safety and transportation needs in the area. She did not believe the process being used would result in the best design for the project as a whole. Ms. Pickerell felt that the County has failed to seriously consider road improvements and alternative measures which have been proposed by the public and which would accommodate the needs of the rural community, protect farmland over the long run, and minimize the inducement of travel in this corridor. She expressed the opinion that exceptions to or changes in the adopted design standards must be considered to support an exception. Ms. Pickerell said that by refusing to take an exception to its own design standards, the County is trying to support an exception to the State land use laws. She pointed out that the County has not looked at speeds lower than 45 mph for the project as a whole even though it is well known that traffic moves most efficiently at 30 mph. Ms. Pickerell disputed other standards set forth by the applicant. She concluded that both transportation and community needs can be met by using creativity. Ms. Pickerell recommended that the Board direct staff to re-examine the assumptions used in the alternatives analysis. She suggested that staff engage the public more effectively in evaluating design alternatives.

Ms. Pickerell responded to Board questions.

REBUTTAL

A very extensive rebuttal was provided by a team of speakers.

Mark Greenfield responded to the Pickerell testimony in detail. He took issue with the conclusions reached by Ms. Pickerell.

Alan Rappleyea swore in the following expert witnesses all at one time.

Mike Borresen, Road Engineer, Department of Land Use and Transportation, Washington County, 155 N. First Avenue, Hillsboro, Oregon, explored the issues of road standards and liability in depth. He maintained that the County does build its roads to functional, structural, drainage, and safety standards. He assured the Board that the County does not compromise public safety in the design of these roads.

Jerry Parmenter, Capital Projects Management Manager, Department of Land Use and
Transportation, 155 N. First Avenue, Hillsboro, Oregon, addressed the issues of design exceptions and driver expectations. He briefly discussed his investigation of the design standards adhered to by Clackamas, Multnomah, Marion, Lane, Benton, and Jackson Counties.

Randy Hammond, Senior Transportation Engineer, CH2M Hill, 825 N.E. Multnomah, Portland, Oregon, reported the results of his study of different aspects of both traffic calming measures and alternative design applications along the corridor. He noted that the County would generally employ the traffic calming devices on collector and local streets—not on an arterial roadway. Mr. Hammond discussed the safety aspects of different roadway designs in terms of how to achieve accident reduction.

Mark Greenfield now rebutted testimony from STOP and 1000 Friends relative to the issues of segmentation and induced growth. (Letters may be found in the Meeting File.)

In closing argument, Mr. Greenfield reviewed the evidence regarding how dangerous the current roadway is and how much a new roadway is needed. He regarded the STOP and 1000 Friends proposals as not being consistent with applicable standards. Finally, Mr. Greenfield pointed out that those most affected by this support the proposal and asked the Board to do the same.

Mr. Greenfield responded to numerous Board questions.

It was moved to make a tentative decision to approve the proposed plan amendment based on findings and evidence in the applicant's submittal, the staff report, and Planning Commission recommendation. The public hearing was continued to and staff was directed to bring back findings on October 22, 1996, for adoption.

Motion - Christy 2nd - Katsion Vote - 3-0-1

Abstain - Peters

Commissioner Katsion thought the applicant made a good case for approval of the plan amendment. She especially appreciated the aspects of it that would 1) contribute to connectivity, 2) reduce vehicle miles traveled, and 3) safely transport school children.

Commissioner Duyck favored adoption of the plan amendment.

Commissioner Christy assured Loretta Pickerell that her suggestions for alternative transportation would be looked at further. She appreciated the support of the community for the proposed extension.

Chair Peters shared STOP's and 1000 Friends' concern that the scope of analysis did not extend far enough to look at how demand for the use of this facility might be reduced by alternative transportation measures. She strongly believed that these issues must be taken up when the County revises its Transportation Plan.

Chair Peters clarified that any testimony on October 22, 1996, would be confined to the findings themselves.

RECESS: Noon

RECONVENE: 12:13 p.m.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS - LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION AND COUNTY COUNSEL

3.a. Appeal of Casefile #95-235-P, Jim and Patty Huntzicker, Applicant RO 96-165 (CPO 7)
Alan Rappleyea told the Board he has reviewed the findings and has found them to be adequate.

Dan Olsen acknowledged receipt of a letter from Jeff Bachrach of O'Donnell Ramis Crew Corrigan & Bachrach. (Letter may be found in the Meeting File.)

No one indicated the desire to comment on the findings.

It was moved to adopt prepared findings for approval of application.

Motion - Duyck 2nd - Katsion Vote - 3-1

Nay - Christy

Commissioner Christy observed that her review of the Minutes for September 17, 1996, indicated a lack of discussion regarding some of the topics covered in the findings. She was not comfortable with this situation.

Alan Rappleyea speculated that the reason a lot of the issues were not brought up at the Board hearing was because no one attended the meeting that day on behalf of the appellant. He said that there is support in the record for these determinations, however.

Dan Olsen stated that it is not uncommon for every issue not to be discussed orally. He regarded the issue today to be whether the Board is comfortable drawing these conclusions based upon its review of the written materials.

The applicant was present in the audience.

3.b. First Reading and Public Hearing - Proposed Land Use Ordinances MO 96-416 No. 483, 484, 485, and 486 - Amendments to the Urban Comprehensive Framework Plan; the Transportation Plan, the Cedar Hills-Cedar Mill Community Plan; the Sunset West Community Plan; and the Community Development Code Relating to Station Area Planning

There was a motion to read proposed Land Use Ordinance 483 by title only.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Christy Vote - 4-0

Dan Olsen read the proposed ordinance by title.

It was moved to read proposed Land Use Ordinance 484 by title only.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

Dan Olsen read the proposed ordinance by title.

There was a motion to read proposed Land Use Ordinance 485 by title only.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Christy Vote - 4-0

Dan Olsen read the proposed ordinance by title.

It was moved to read proposed Land Use Ordinance 486 by title only.

Motion - Christy 2nd - Katsion Vote - 4-0

Dan Olsen read the proposed ordinance by title.

Hal Bergsma stated that these ordinances address land use circulation and development design in urban unincorporated areas around four light rail stations: Sunset Transit Center, Merlo, Elmonica, and Willow Creek. He emphasized that these ordinances are viewed by staff as works in progress.
Throughout Mr. Bergsma's staff report, visual aids of exhibits from the ordinances showing proposed plan designations and circulation were displayed.

Mr. Bergsma acknowledged that these ordinances are in need of additional refinement, including the addition of design standards. He recognized that these ordinances are controversial. Mr. Bergsma reviewed the written testimony received which pertains to these ordinances. Based on the above, he recommended that the Board continue Ordinances 483, 484, 485, and 486 to next Spring to allow further time for consideration of amendments and resolution of issues in the interim.

Mr. Bergsma reported that the Planning Commission, at its October 2nd meeting, voted to continue hearings on the station area planning ordinances to March 5, 1997. He said the Planning Commission indicated an interest in conducting worksessions with staff next winter to clarify and discuss issues as well as alternative means of resolving them. Mr. Bergsma added that Counsel has determined that such worksessions would not violate the public hearing provisions of Chapter X of the County Charter. He said a number of issues have been raised in testimony received by the Planning Commission relating to land use and circulation proposals in the ordinances.

Mr. Bergsma commented that key issues that have been raised relate to 1) connection of existing residential streets to streets serving new development in station areas, 2) reclassification of some existing streets to a distributor or collector street function, 3) proposals to apply higher development densities near existing lower density residential areas, 4) proposals to establish minimum development densities that are viewed by some as too high for today's market, 5) limitations on land uses, 6) dimensional and design standards relating to development features such as building heights and setbacks; location and amount of public spaces; and the location and amount of parking provided in the station areas, and 7) the degree of protection that should be provided for natural resources at station areas, particularly the significant wildlife habitat areas on the Peterkort property.

Mr. Bergsma recommended that the Board receive testimony today on all the station area ordinances combined and continue the hearing to October 15, 1996, to receive additional testimony and to provide staff with direction on issues of greatest concern. He added that if the Board feels it has received sufficient testimony to provide a sense of the key issues at the end of today's hearing, then staff recommends continuing the public hearing to a date certain in March, 1997, while directing staff to continue working on refining the ordinances and resolving the issues.

Bob Browning, Attorney, Box 430, Forest Grove, Oregon, represented the Wilson Family Trust. He identified Mr. and Mrs. Howard Wilson as the owner of the 40+ acres, of which some portion has become the Elmonica Maintenance Facility and the Elmonica Light Rail Station. Mr. Browning corrected two typographical errors in written testimony submitted to the Planning Commission, namely, Tax Lot 500, Lot 3 and Tax Lot 600, Lot 4. (Underlined portion is added.) He emphasized the Wilson's desires in terms of zoning of their area. Mr. Wilson then spoke on behalf of all the people who are suffering uncertainty in the absence of precise regulations.

Frank Hammond, Attorney, 1727 N.W. Hoyt, Portland, Oregon, represented the Peterkort family. He summarized a letter which was submitted at an earlier date to the Board and Planning Commission. Mr. Hammond recalled that the goal of this letter was to set out broad issues facing the County as it goes forward with station area planning and which will form the basis for more specific, detailed discussions with staff. He enumerated the relevant topics of concern as follows: concept of "economic realism", the role of the 1981 agreement with the Peterkort family, the need to support transit-oriented development while protecting natural areas, and encouraging mixed uses. Mr. Hammond had time today to address only the topics of economic realism and encouraging mixed uses. He emphasized that transit oriented development has not been tested in the Portland market.
Therefore, Mr. Hammond encouraged the Board to recognize and address the special economic hurdles associated with such development. He envisioned two approaches to transit-oriented development: 1) structure the County's regulations to encourage the market to undertake more ambitious transit-oriented development as it becomes economically feasible, or 2) move ahead of the market by publicly subsidizing transit-oriented development that the market could not otherwise support today. Regarding mixed uses, Mr. Hammond said that everyone agrees that this is a goal of station area planning. He said a related goal is to streamline the land use permitting process while providing increased certainty as to allowed uses. Mr. Hammond believed that the County should provide more flexible mixed uses. In addition, he felt the County should also allow mixed uses outright and abandon the conditional use approach for many of them. Mr. Hammond said that by providing certainty and streamlining the development process, mixed use development would be encouraged. He plans to provide staff with increased specificity over the next few months.

Lorraine Nelson, 915 S.W. 95th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, identified herself as a property owner in the West Haven neighborhood. She informed the Board that S.W. Springcrest Drive is not an appropriate candidate for extension into the new high density neighborhood Peterkort property. Ms. Nelson stated that Springcrest Drive is clearly mentioned in the Cedar Hills-Cedar Mill Community Plan as remaining a dead end street due to topography. She reported that her neighborhood does not wish to access the new development in this way. Ms. Nelson asked the County to strive to retain the stands of trees/vegetation bordering the west side of the West Haven neighborhood, as called for in the Cedar Hills-Cedar Mill Community Plan. She requested the County to maintain the maximum buffer.

Jake Mintz, 9849 S.W. Springcrest Drive, Portland, Oregon, submitted a packet of materials to the Board, which may be found in the Meeting File. He spoke as representative of the West Haven neighborhood. Mr. Mintz characterized his neighborhood as an established one and opposed zoning it in such a way as to promote rental units. He urged the Board to zone accordingly, given the character of his neighborhood. Mr. Mintz said that his experience with the light rail overlay process has caused him to wonder how much public involvement has meant.

Staff responded to Board questions regarding Mr. Mintz’s testimony.

Commissioner Christy and Chair Peters encouraged Mr. Mintz to continue to participate in this important process.

Mr. Bergsma volunteered to hold a worksession with the Board this Winter to talk over these issues, just as the Planning Commission is planning to do.

Dominic Ogbonnah, 17822 S.W. Pointe Forest, Beaverton, Oregon, said he sponsored a petition that was submitted to Washington County on August 19, 1996. He expressed appreciation for the way in which staff has dealt with these difficult and emotional issues. Mr. Ogbonnah said his neighborhood opposes connecting the existing stubs in the Elmonica development to the Pointe Forest community. He feared traffic would greatly and unacceptably increase in his neighborhood. Mr. Ogbonnah spoke in support of connecting pedestrian paths between neighborhoods--but not roads. He wanted the children in his neighborhood to continue to be able to play in the streets.

Scott King and Andy Back responded to Board questions arising from Mr. Ogbonnah’s testimony.

Mike Wells, Commercial Real Estate Broker, Cushman & Wakefield, 200 S.W. Market, Portland, Oregon, appeared on behalf of Sequent Computer Systems. He informed the Board that Sequent owns nearly 40 acres north of Jenkins and to the east of 158th in the Sunset West Community Plan. Mr. Wells said that Sequent generally supports the station area ordinances and would like to explore the concept of master planning ability for large parcels in the transit-oriented employment district. He listed six major benefits to that as follows: 1) Efficient review of multi-phase projects,
Promote flexibility of individual buildings, 3) Efficient arrangement of the buildings, 4) Preserve natural resources more efficiently, 5) Suitably locate the common facilities within the master plan, and 6) Assurance to the applicant that ultimate approval will be granted for the last phase (thereby justifying investment along the way). Mr. Wells discussed the campus development and project concepts that would facilitate enactment of master planning.

Robert Edmonds, Aloha Christian Church, 185th & Baseline, clarified that this Church is not opposing the expansion and light rail development; rather, the Church has a concern with getting information that will enable it to make a decision about its future. He said that the proposed and tentative plans would completely encircle the Church with concrete and road, impeding the function of the Church. Mr. Edmonds expressed a concern, too, with building restrictions if the Church decides to stay in its current location. He told the Board that the Church needs answers to these questions in order to make an intelligent decision on what is best for both the Church and surrounding community.

Marty Sevier, 2607 S.W. 28th Drive, Portland, Oregon, addressed County Ordinance 81-411M (the document that governs the development of the Peterkort property). He described how the Peterkorts have complied with this document over the years--at great expense to the family. Mr. Sevier wished to ensure that the continuing process will result in certainty for the Peterkorts. He estimated that the development of the Peterkort property would take about 20 years. Mr. Sevier emphasized that it is very important to get on with development without enduring major uncertainty regarding regulations.

Following citizen testimony, staff responded to Board questions and comments.

Commissioner Christy voiced the hope that staff would come back in March with a "very sharp" ordinance so that the uncertainty expressed during testimony could be alleviated.

It was moved to continue the public hearing on proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 483 to March 11, 1997.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

There was a motion to continue the public hearing on proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 484 to March 11, 1997.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

It was moved to continue the public hearing on proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 485 to March 11, 1997.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

There was a motion to continue the public hearing on proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 486 to March 11, 1997.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

3.c. Second Reading and Public Hearing - Proposed Land Use MO 96-417 Ordinance No. 482 - Amendments to the Rural/Natural Resource Plan by Applying to the Mineral and Aggregate Overlay District to Two Quarry Sites North of Buxton (CPO 14)

There was a motion to read proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 482 by title only.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Christy Vote - 4-0

Dan Olsen read the proposed ordinance by title.
Jim Tice provided a staff report. He reviewed that this item was continued from September 17, 1996, in order to allow the Planning Commission additional time to hold another hearing. Mr. Tice reported that the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend that the Board adopt this ordinance with proposed conditions. He referred the Board to the September 30th Staff Report for complete list of conditions. Mr. Tice called attention to an addendum Staff Report distributed today, which contains important clarifications. (Addendum Staff Report may be found in the Meeting File. He then showed slides of the site(s) under consideration.

Bob VanBrocklin, Attorney, (name may be misspelled; no address given; did not sign in), represented the Applicant. He was accompanied by Peter Coffee, Traffic Consultant, DKS (did not sign in either). Mr. VanBrocklin said that staff has summarized the application well. He asked for approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment element for each of two sites in order that both sites could be mined. Mr. VanBrocklin explained that there are protections in place with respect to an impact area surrounding the site. He and his entourage were available to answer questions.

It was moved to continue the public hearing for proposed Land Use Ordinance No. 482 to October 22, 1996 for adoption of this ordinance.

Motion - Duyck 2nd - Katsion Vote - 4-0

4. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

4.a. Request to Determine Hearing Procedure - Appeal of Casefile MO 96-418 96-226-S/V/HRV, Quality Homebuilders, Inc., Applicant (CPO 1)

Joe Grillo briefed the Board on this item and recommended that the Board deny this request for a full de novo hearing and direct the appeal to be heard on the record.

There was a motion to deny the request for a full de novo hearing and to direct that the appeal be heard on the record.

Motion - Katsion 2nd - Duyck Vote - 4-0

5. ORAL COMMUNICATION

None.

6. BOARD ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT: 1:55 p.m.

Motion - Duyck 2nd - Katsion Vote - 4-0