

COLUMBIA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
BOARD MEETING

MINUTES

November 8, 2017

The Columbia County Board of Commissioners met in a scheduled session with Commissioner Henry Heimuller, Commissioner Margaret Magruder and Commissioner Alex Tardif, together with Robin McIntyre, Assistant County Counsel and Jan Greenhalgh, Board Office Administrator.

Commissioner Heimuller called the meeting to order and led the flag salute.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Tardif moved and Commissioner Magruder seconded to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2017 Board meeting and November 1, 2017 Staff meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

VISITOR COMMENTS:

Alta Lynch, Veteran's Bunker, 125 S. 13th Street, St. Helens: She is here to remind all that November 11th is Veterans Day and there are many events going on throughout the county to honor our Veterans.

Stephanie Klepel, 34067 Sykes Road, St. Helens: She is here to get any update on the new parks online reservation system. Robin stated that the contract is in Casey Garrett's office and is moving forward.

HEARING/DELIBERATIONS: PORT WESTWARD ZONE CHANGE:

This is the time set for the public hearing "In the Matter of the Application by the Port of St. Helens for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Goal 3 Exception to Reclassify and Re-zone Property from Primary Agriculture(PA-80) to Resource Industrial Planned Development (RIPD) for an 837 Acre Expansion of Port Westward on Remand from the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals".

Robin reviewed the history of the application. After the hearing was closed, the Board had an ex parte contact. Because of that, notice was posted for a public hearing specifically on the ex parte contact. The written communication received, as well as written submittals that were received on the exparte contact, were entered into the record and are included on the amended Exhibit list.

Commissioner Heimuller explained that he attended a meeting with the Port of St. Helens, to discuss the water system at Port Westward. During the course of that meeting, the Port produced a document that was specifically referred to a communication that we were trying to get clarified between them and Portland General Electric as it pertained to the water system. They printed the email and at the bottom of the email there was a reference to the Port Westward dock. After that meeting, those documents were turned over to our County Counsel to disclose the ex parte contact.

Commissioner Tardif had an ex parte contact with Heidi Coopley. She relayed a conversation she had regarding self scouring deep water port.

The hearing was opened for public testimony.

Scott Hilgenberry, Columbia Riverkeepers: On initial point of the disclosures of the ex parte contacts, he is a bit surprised that the Board has been in discussions with the Port about the water system. Extension of the water system to the subject property is within scope to this application. In earlier conversations, Goal 11 is applicable to this situation. Please reconsider the scope of the ex parte consideration.

Substantive information, reading from written testimony.

Rail Transportation Network -The *ex parte* communication clarifies that the availability of existing and planned rail transportation networks for the proposed uses has not been determined. The *ex parte* communication notes that PGE must retain the right to use existing rail infrastructure located on the Port Westward property, and that PGE needs to retain approval rights regarding use and improvements of the rail. *Ex Parte* Communication at 1. The communication clarifies that PGE will continue to have the power to withhold consent for certain rail improvements, changes or uses if PGE determines that proposed uses would have a material adverse impact on PGE operations or the airshed. *Id.* PGE is essentially indicating that it will not transfer or assign any rail infrastructure given the hazardous and unknown nature of some of the uses proposed by the Port, and PGE's sensitive operations. Not only do these statements by PGE demonstrate that the Port has failed to identify what transportation networks it needs for its numerous uses; it also demonstrates that the Port has failed to demonstrate that its proposed uses (including transportation uses) are compatible with adjacent uses at PGE and in the affected area. OAR 660004-0020(2)(d). Clearly, the Port cannot establish access to existing or planned rail infrastructure for all of its proposed use categories in violation of CCZO 1502(1)(A)—(B).

The Ex Parte Communication Demonstrates that an Exception to Goal 11 is Required- The *ex parte* communication supports our prior arguments that the Port's proposed uses necessitate an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services. As noted above, when considering a re-zone, the county

must identify evidence that all necessary facilities, services and transportation networks exist or are planned to be provided concurrently with development. CCZO 1502(1)(A)—(B). Based on the nature of the proposed uses, and representations made in the *ex parte* communication, it is clear that the proposed uses necessitate extension of public facilities onto resources land. Therefore, an exception to Goal 11 is required. An exception to Goal 3 does not relieve a jurisdiction from remaining goal requirements and does not authorize uses, densities, public facilities and services or activities other than recognized by the applicable exception. OAR 660-004-0018(1). Here, the *ex parte* communication indicates that PGE is planning to assign and transfer the water intake infrastructure and discharge system infrastructure to the Port. *Ex Parte* Communication at 1. The *ex parte* communication also alludes to the Port building discharge infrastructure including a discharge piping system from the existing pump station to the river, and developing vehicular access to the outfall facility. *Id.* The infrastructure that may likely be transferred to the Port is located on the existing exception site, and includes a water supply system located on the southeast end of the property, a water distribution system serving the PGE facility and dock, water treatment facilities, and sewage treatment facilities including a sewage collection system. Columbia County Comprehensive Plan at 118. Use of these existing facilities and development of new public facilities and services such as sewer infrastructure for uses located on the subject property necessitates an exception to Goal 11.

The Port's ability to obtain an exception to Goal 11 for sewer infrastructure is extremely compromised. Extension of sewer service by a private or public service provider onto rural land is prohibited absent a demonstration that such extension is necessary to mitigate a public health hazard, or to avoid an imminent significant public health hazard. OAR 660-011-0060(4)—(9). As defined by administrative rule, sanitary sewer includes both treatment facilities systems and primary collection systems. OAR 660-11-0005(7)(b). Sewage includes industrial waste. OAR 660-011-0060(1)(e). A sewer system includes pipelines, conduits, pump stations, all other structures and facilities used for treating or disposition of sewage or collecting or conducting sewage to an ultimate point for treatment and disposal. OAR 660-011-0060(1)(0). The *ex parte* communication supports our prior arguments that the Port is seeking to extend public facilities, including sewer lines onto rural lands, although the Port has not requested an exception to Goal 11. Moreover, the Port's ability to obtain an exception to Goal 11 clearly is constrained by the limited allowances under Goal 11 for extensions of sewer. OAR 600-011-0060(4)—(9). Relatedly, disclosure of required services and facilities for the re-zone is required for both an adequate *Shaffer* analysis⁹ and CCZO 1502(1)(A)—(B).¹⁰ Simply put, the Port cannot ignore the needed and probable services and facilities associated with its most intensive proposed uses when seeking an exception to re-zone agricultural land. Because the Port has failed to identify the suite of services and facilities necessary for the proposed uses, this application should be denied. To the extent, the Port has

demonstrated that it needs sewer services, and other public facilities and services, it is clear that extension of facilities and services requires an exception to Goal 11, which the Port has not requested, and is prohibited from receiving absent a demonstration of a public health hazard. Accordingly, this provides another basis to deny the Port's application.

For the reasons explained above and in previous testimony, 1000 Friends of Oregon and Columbia Riverkeeper urge the Board of Commissioners to deny the Port of St. Helens.

Dock and Port Facility Access and Use - Throughout this process, the Port has struggled to demonstrate that it has access to the existing dock infrastructure that is located over the Columbia River and on land located on the prior-approved exception area at Port Westward, although the dock and port facilities are its sole basis for why the Port believes it is entitled to a reasons exception under OAR 660-0040022(3)(a). The *ex parte* communication addresses dock access, and states that, with conditions, PGE is "willing to assign and transfer both access legs as well as the connector to the Port[.]" *Ex Parte* Communication at 1. What the communication fails to address is the actual use of the dock, a required determination under CCZO 1502. Moreover, this non-binding e-mail from PGE does not provide substantial evidence to demonstrate that dock and port facility access is available. As noted in our previous comments, PGE's binding lease agreement already addresses dock and port facility access, and gives PGE considerable discretion as to what uses can occur on the dock. Even if access is available, the Port still has failed to demonstrate if it can use the existing dock and port facilities in a manner that can accommodate the most intense of its many proposed uses, considering the restriction of PGE's Master Lease Amendment. See Testimony of 1000 Friends of Oregon and Columbia Riverkeeper (August 16, 2017) at 3. The Port has also failed to identify any planned expansions for the dock and port facilities, and any planned expansions would necessitate a compatibility analysis, which has not occurred. OAR 660-004-0020(2)(d). Accordingly, the Port has failed to demonstrate that it has adequate existing or planned water-oriented transportation networks to serve all of the proposed uses. The *ex parte* communication also appears to indicate that the road to the dock will need to be improved to accommodate the Port's uses. *Ex Parte* Communication at 1 (requiring a condition that the Port improves the dock access road). Based on this, the Port has not demonstrated that the existing road to the dock is adequate to serve the proposed uses, or that there are any planned improvements to accommodate the many proposed uses in violation of CCZO 1502(1)(A)-(B). The Port cannot demonstrate that any unique resources are located on agricultural or forest land that would entitle it to an exception. The port and dock facilities are located over the Columbia River and the exception land at existing Port Westward. Lands located within an acknowledged exception area for Goal 3 are not agricultural lands. OAR

660-033-0020(1)(c). Accordingly, even if the *ex parte* communication could be read to support a determination that OAR 660-012-0060(5) provides

"The presence of a transportation facility or improvement shall not be a basis for an exception to allow residential, commercial, institutional or industrial development on rural lands under this division or OAR 660-004-0022 and 660-004-0028.

"OAR 660-012-0005(30) and -0020(2)(e) further clarify that a port facilities are transportation facilities.

OAR 660-004-0022(3) provides that industrial development can be sited on resources land if the proposed use is "significantly dependent upon a unique resource *located on agricultural or forest land*."

" Emphasis is added that the Port may have access to the existing dock and port facilities, that cannot provide a basis for the Port to receive a reasons exception.

Heidi Coopley 80039 Quincy Magyer, Clatskanie OR: She is here to testify for her neighbor George Poskie, who recently broke his shoulder he is unable to attend today. His reports state that a tug boat was illegally parked at the dock for three days prior to what he calls a sweetheart inspection, rumors are they were dredging to make this a deep water port, Poskie's questioning if this is a self scouring deep water port? It has been tested personally by Heidi it is a deep water port but not sure if it is self scouring or not. The dock was built in 1940's with a 40-year shelf life it was suppose to be torn down in the 1980's it is not even suppose to be there.

Heidi also had concerns with the railroad, her conversation was outside of the scope of the *ex parte*. Commissioner Heimuller said that we should be able to help with the concerns, and to please contact our office.

Christine Patterson, 35102 Oliver Heights Court, St. Helens: Reading her *Ex parte* letter previously submitted regarding dock access: My comments will be on the *ex parte* email, dated Oct. 10, 2017, from Kristin Ingram representing PGE, to Doug Hayes of the Port of St. Helens and others. The *ex parte* email referenced PGE/Port of St. Helens Amendment 5, regarding dock access easement referred to in paragraph no. 1, bullet point no. 4 and the final paragraph of the email. The above listed email acknowledges three times, that there is an easement/access issue for the deep-water dock at Port Westward. PGE states in the last paragraph: "We appreciate that these positions don't fully meet the Port's requests, but feel that this provides a good compromise."

The applicant says, their modified re-zone application is substantially based on the five proposed uses being; "inexorably tied to the deepwater port and existing dock

facilities at Port Westward for viability." (see attached). Without the dock access agreement in place, the proposed uses are not viable. I have not seen any proof that the Port has access to the dock. The email demonstrates that the Port cannot prove their easement to the dock for the proposed uses described in the modified application, this modified application is incomplete and premature. This re-zone should be denied.

Darryl Whipple, 76439 Alston Mayger Road, Rainier: Reading from his previous submitted ex parte letter : I am Darrel Whipple, Co-chair with Carroll Sweet of Envision Columbia County, rising to comment on the ex parte contact matter. My address is 76439 Alston-Mayger Rd, Rainier, Oregon 97048.

Re: PGE's Oct. 10 letter to the Port

What do we learn from this inadvertent ex parte communication, other than that the Port is scrambling to shore up its evidently weak case for converting protected farmland to industrial uses? Specifically, we learn the following:

1) We learn that PGE is willing to transfer to the Port the dock access "legs" and connector, provided that the Port maintains these roads to an agreed-upon standard and PGE retains access. But how would a tenant access the legs, and thereby the dock? Via Kallunki Road? Via (the incomplete) Hermo Road? Via the Thompson wetlands? Surely, the so-called "connector" road is the one that joins the two legs along the shore, a distance of only a few hundred feet. Hence, the Port still needs to demonstrate on a map the secured access routes to the dock for each of the 16 parcels south of the PGE leasehold. Otherwise, there is still no guarantee of access to the dock for a future tenant, and since access is essential to "dependency," and dependency on a unique resource must be shown in order to justify re-zoning farmland, the Port's case fails.

2) The context of the PGE letter is not clear; where is the request from the Port to PGE? PGE says it appreciates that its stated position do not fully satisfy the Port's request. So, what is lacking? As a Commissioner trying to understand this communication you need to see the Port's request.

3) PGE is willing to transfer the water system intake and discharge, with PGE retaining certain rights. How then does the Port deliver this water to the 17 parcels? Does the Port have a plan to provide water and sewer to the parcels? If so, wouldn't that require a Goal 11 exception in addition to a Goal 3 exception?

4) PGE is willing to transfer rail infrastructure but only if the Port enforces the same limits (8 unit trains per week, or whatever the updated? agreement specifies) that PGE placed on use of the Port "lead" in its Safe Harbor agreement. And PGE

reserves the right to review, comment on, and withhold consent for tenant uses of the rail that would harm PGE's operations, facilities or airshed. Period.

Therefore, it appears that the Port cannot by its own authority guarantee to a prospective tenant access to rail, a significant detriment to further heavy industrial development at Port Westward regardless of any proposed re-zoning.

In summary, in spite of these assurances of cooperation by PGE expressed or implied in the subject letter, the Port still falls short of showing that the re-zone parcels are significantly dependent on the dock. Hence, they do not qualify for a Goal 3 exception under Oregon land use law. The Port's case fails.

Accordingly, Envision Columbia County urges you to reject today the Port's modified application. Please vote no and thereby end the rezone attempt today, and avoid throwing more good money after bad. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Anne Christensen, 35234 Hazel Street St. Helens: Reading from her ex parte letter previously submitted:

Page 5 of the Port's modified application by Beery, Elsmo and Hammond, LLC states, "...each of the five proposed uses... are (sic) inexorably tied to the deepwater port and existing dock facilities at Port Westward for viability."

I previously commented (August 14, 2017) to you that the 837 acres of land in question cannot be determined as "significantly dependent" upon the "deepwater port and existing dock facilities" because there is no access between the property and the docks. (I even surmised that since the lack of access was such a startling omission, perhaps the port has no plan to use the existing docks!) Access has been a glaring omission to this application since the beginning. The Port has been attempting to re-zone this land for many, many years, and they still do not have access to the docks.

I attended the Columbia County staff meeting on July 27, 2017, to hear the presentation and discussion regarding the upcoming hearing on this re-zoning application. Questions from the public were not allowed, and access to the docks was not addressed. Darrel Whipple and I, as well as Courtney Vaughn from the Spotlight newspaper, stayed afterwards as Glen Higgins, the County Planner handling this application, answered our questions. With the map of Port Westward, he pointed out the acreage in question, the docks, and a few other landmarks. Asked how material would get from the acreage to the docks, he replied somewhat vaguely, by pointing to an area coded in green. Darrel Whipple responded, "Isn't

that PGE's mitigation area?" Mr. Higgins responded that perhaps it is, but he wasn't sure. He assured us, though, that this is the path materials would take.

After notification of the ex parte communication, I spoke in person to Glen Higgins on October 31, 2017, asking for the port request that prompted the email from Kristin Ingram. (Her email states clearly that PGE was responding to the Port's request and that "these positions don't fully meet the Port's requests...") I believe that her email would be better understood if we know the context and what requests the Port made of PGE. Apparently this document is not part of the record.

During this same conversation with Mr. Higgins, I commented that clearly there are no existing easements or other permissions from PGE for the 837 acres to have access across their land to the existing docks. He replied that there is no need for easements at this time. He said that easements will be applied for after the land is re-zoned, when there is a new project.

Given my two conversations with Mr. Higgins, the county staff meeting on this topic, and Kristin Ingram's email to the Port, there is now overwhelming evidence that there is no access from the 837 acres to the "unique resource," namely the docks at Port Westward. Approval for this project REQUIRES a demonstration of dependency (" *the use is significantly dependent upon a unique resource.* "). Land use cannot be dependent on, or "inexorably tied" to the existing docks if there is no access.

Please deny this application because it does not meet the most essential element of the state law.

Greg Petit, 34538 Kelleher Dr. Warren: Read and submitted his written testimony into the record marked Exhibit "151".

The memo from Kristin Ingram to Doug Hayes, et al, October 10, 2017 raises more questions regarding potential Port Westward facility tenant access to critical infrastructure and dock access than it answers. The rationale submitted for the re-zone is based upon the proposed uses being inexorably tied to a unique resource, in this case the deep-water port. However, the October 10th memo only indicates PGE is willing to negotiate with the Port regarding critical infrastructure availability and would in effect control the final decision on what if any businesses locate at the Port. There is in fact, no legally binding agreement currently in place that can guarantee potential tenants access to critical infrastructure and the Dock.

This is just another example of how wishful thinking, susceptibility to global corporate manipulation, and a lack of attention to important technical details have beset this project. It is time for the Board of County Commissioners to cut their losses and realize that Port Westward is not going to be the goose that laid the golden egg for Columbia County. As best as I can tell \$73,000,000 from a variety of sources; many public, have

been spent since 2004 in attempts to develop Port Westward for industrial uses and attract industry. That translates to nearly \$1500 for every man, woman and child in Columbia County. One can only imagine the good that much expenditure could have achieved for the citizens of Columbia County if it had been invested more wisely to address our many critical needs. He would urge the Board to vote no and end the re-zone attempt.

Marsha Dennison, 71115 Morse Drive, Rainier: She began to read her written testimony into the record. She was stopped because her testimony was not specific to the ex parte contact. After looking through her testimony, she read just a portion that dealt with the ex parte contact. "Due process of the second hearing because corporate influences on public officials and those in favor had not reached the threshold they had hoped for in the first hearing PGE subverts that due process. Public officials support out of state pollution industries instead of local farmers and railroad residence, make us all losers. NO re-zoning...Forbidden untimely ex parte communications with PGE will not serve well to all hearing parties, it is to late now. Conclusion is noted that if someone wants to something different at the Port it must be done above the table all hands showing, public included ."

Chip Bubl, 32221 Church Road, Warren: Reading from his Ex parte letter previously submitted:

I need to make it clear that these comments are mine alone, acting as an interested private citizen. Thank you for allowing this testimony.

After months of work and millions of public and private dollars spent, the re-zone of agricultural land to industrial use at Port Westward can be denied by LUBA because the Port does not have an unfettered right to use the dock from the parcels they are asking the County to re-zone. Dock use is required to justify the re-zone. The five proposed uses require dock access according to the Mackenzie report.

It had been thought for some time that PGE would never allow unrestricted access across its leased (for 99 years) property that might, in any way, compromise its current and future generation capacity which is extremely important to the Northwest power grid, and future PGE development on the site.

In a recent communication from PGE to the Port (the *ex parte* communication at issue), PGE said regarding rail access "*Thanks for your patience as PGE works through addressing the Port's request that certain infrastructure properties be transferred and assigned back to the Port and that a more certain access route to the dock be established Further down the letter stated "PGE has always had concerns about use of the rail given its close location to PGE facilities. PGE has set Safe Harbor Rail Activities limits and other limitations with Cascade Grain/Global regarding the rail and it is critical*

to PGE that these are enforced. Given PGE's need and concerns, transfer and assignment to the Port may not make sense unless the Port is willing to accept and pass through these limitations." In other words, whatever PGE might transfer to the Port will still be governed by PGE's decisions as to acceptable use. This is not a free and unfettered right of way to the dock from the proposed rezone parcels by any stretch of the imagination. PGE's letter finishes by noting "We appreciate that these positions don't fully meet the Port's requests, but feel that this provides a good compromise."

The Port has spent decades pursuing projects without thorough investigation. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars justifying what they had already done even after negative impacts became apparent. The original re-zone application, LUBA remand, and modified application submission demonstrates the Port did not thoroughly vet this proposed re-zone, but resorted to obfuscation when confronted with lack of dock access. Way too much Port, county, and state agency staff time and money has been wasted on this re-zone project. It is time to end the re-zone effort.

Chris Turner, #8 Cedar Gates Prod, Longview Wa. She has made numerous comments about this re-zoning she has not seen a feasibility study to show that this property can accommodate the rail access, dock access or other components that would be required for this large re-zoning. You are receiving extra comments after the record has already been closed. I believe that a lot of the public that made comments do not know about this hearing today. I believe in Riverkeepers calling this a rolling application it never seems to end. All of this would be deep water dependent, you are arguing about one dock which would not be sufficient to handle the 837 acres re-zoning. Tesoro in Vancouver you could put 16 of those oil transfer facilities on this property. That would be the largest oil terminal just one of them. Only one of the tesoros would use 8-10 trains per day. That is 20 transits through town. The other thing is like I said that you are arguing about one dock, and whether they would give access, this plan is not well thought out, it is now bringing up water and sewer issues in addition to the beginning. It is time to make a decision and deny the application for the re-zone.

Paul Semons 27354 Archibald Lane, Deer Island: It seems to him that the ex parte communication, shows that the Port has a lot of unresolved issues with the proposal to develop the property. Secondly, the Board has spent a lot of time on this re-zone, it seems that the Port has not been a very good partner in that because they have given you a mess to carry forward. I suggest that with this last nail in the coffin, cut the losses and move forward, it not ready for prime time.

Spencer Parsons, Berry Elsner & Hammond, representing the Port of St. Helens. Will be asking for time to review comments and submit final written testimony, so will make his comments here brief. This application is not asking for those facilities to be brought into the expansion area. The application is asking for a (RIPD) re-zone. The dock access I think you have everything that has been brought up regarding the access in the record that is consistent with the ex parte. I will discuss

some of the things in my written submission to you. The substantial evidence shows that the port has access to the dock. having a contractual agreement with PGE for the dock use. PGE has provided access to the dock, we have expression from PGE intent to do that with past practice moving into the future. This is all in the record for consideration.

Spencer invites the Commissioners to review the written submission from the Riverkeepers submitted last week. It discusses reasons and expatiations for urban land, we are asking for rural, he feels that by reviewing this it will help clear up some questions.

Last the rail facilities, the staff has done an excellent job addressing those issues. We have submitted substantial testimony addressing all the questions that have been raised. We appreciate the counties' earnest efforts to answer those questions raised by the public.

We will submit the rest of our testimony in writing to you.

Robin - the Board has been asked by the applicant to hold the record open for an additional 7 days to submit the Ports final arguments, however it cannot include an new evidence. Oregon law allows for this. Columbia Riverkeeps asked point of order.

With no further testimony coming before the Board, the hearing was closed and the record left open for 7 days for final rebuttal by the applicant. The Board set deliberations for November 29, 2017 at or after 10:00 a.m.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Heimuller read the consent agenda in full. Items (K) & (L) were added to the agenda, however Commissioner Tardif requested Item (L) be pulled for discussion. With that, Commissioner Tardif moved and Commissioner Magruder seconded to approve the consent agenda as follows:

- (A) Ratify the Select to Pay for the week of 11.06.17.
- (B) Approve Personnel Action for Michael Paul.
- (C) Approve Expectations Letter for Michael Paul.
- (D) Appoint Blanche Katz (to replace Nick Rohrig), term to expire 12.31.18 and Charlotte Hart (to replace Julie Stevens), term to expire 12.31.17; and reappoint Genell Crow, term to expire 12.31.19 to the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee.

- (E) Reappoint Ernie Martin, Mike Sheehan, Kirk Duncan and Jason Hudson to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee for a 3 year term, to expire 12/31/2020.
- (F) Order No. 72-2017, "In the Matter of Conveying Certain Real Property In Vernonia, Oregon, to Juan Marcos Ruiz and Tracie M. Ruiz [Tax Map ID No. 4N4W3BC 10600; Tax Account No. 22496".
- (G) Order No. 80-2017, "In the Matter of an Application by Dale Strom for Approval of an Oregon DEQ Land Use Compatibility Statement for the Deer Pointe Meadows Mobile Home Park (LUCS 17-44)".
- (H) Quitclaim Deed to Juan Marcos Ruiz and Tracie M. Ruiz [Tax Map ID No. 4N4W3BC 10600; Tax Account No. 22496] and authorize the Chair to sign.

AGREEMENTS/CONTRACTS/AMENDMENTS:

- (I) Purchase and Sale Agreement with Juan Marcos Ruiz and Tracie M. Ruiz for Property Tax Map ID No, 4N4W3BC10600 and Tax Account No. 22496 in Vernonia, Oregon.
- (J) Permit and Hold Harmless Agreement with the City of St. Helens for Use of the Plaza for Holiday Decorations and authorize Chair to sign.
- (K) **Cancel the November 15, 2017 Board and Staff meetings.**
- (L) **Out of State travel authorization for (3) deputies to attend Internal Investigative training. (Pulled for discussion)**

The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM (L) - OUT OF STATE TRAVEL:

Commissioner Tardif asked that this item be pulled for discussion because he had a question on the IA training and if that is for in-house investigation or outside investigation. He will contact the Sheriff and address this at the staff meeting this afternoon.

COMMISSIONER HEIMULLER COMMENTS:

Commissioner Heimuller will be in Astoria tomorrow for NWACT meeting, which follows the NOEA meeting- all day discussion about housing and transportation.

Afterwards he will be traveling to eastern Oregon for a wedding. He will be back for the VA event at McCormick Park. Columbia County has a lot of different programs for our veterans throughout the county.

COMMISSIONER MAGRUDER COMMENTS:

Commissioner Magruder wanted to thank Alta Lynch for mentioning the VA events taking place this coming weekend.

The Board will be attending the annual AOC conference next week in Eugene and will be showcasing product from Columbia County. She and Commissioner Tardif will be graduating from AOC County College will in Eugene.

Commissioner Heimuller elaborated on the AOC County College program and how it benefits incoming Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER TARDIF COMMENTS:

Commissioner Tardif will not be shaving the month of November for awareness and support of prostate cancer and cancers within. Please get tested.

There was no Executive Session held.

With nothing further coming before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Dated at St. Helens, Oregon this 8th day of November,

NOTE: An audio CD of this meeting is available for purchase by the public or interested parties. A video of the meeting is also posted on our website at www.co.columbia.or.us

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

By: _____
Henry Heimuller, Chair

By: _____
Margaret Magruder, Commissioner

By: _____
Jan Greenhalgh
Board Office Administrator

By: _____
Alex Tardif, Commissioner