

## ***TALKING POINTS – BORING WITHDRAWAL FROM METRO***

This is not an “Anti-Metro” stance ...

This is a “Save Our Community” stance

### **1) Fixing a Wrong**

- a) In 1977, Representatives Glenn Otto and Mike Ragsdale arbitrarily and without reasoning, established the boundaries for Measure 6 which formed Metro by a vote of the people.
- b) Half of Boring is within the Metro boundary and half is outside the Metro Boundary.
- c) This creates a divided community.

### **2) Looking to the Future**

- a) With a divided community, Boring neighbors can be treated differently depending on whether they are in or out of Metro.
- b) Boring has neighborhoods that are fractured by the Metro Boundaries. One side of the street is within Metro and one side of the street is outside of Metro.
- c) A Clackamas County official advised the Boring Community Planning Organization in a Public Meeting that Clackamas County, under certain circumstances, must treat those within the Metro boundaries differently than those outside Metro.
- d) In the event of incorporation , if or when that happens, two distinctive plans will need to be adopted and melded into the required comprehensive plan. One for the area within Metro, the other for the area outside of the Metro boundaries.
- e) This will cause divisions within the Community. Look at Damascus; over ten years and they still have not passed ONE comprehensive plan.
- f) Boring needs to be completely outside of the Metro boundaries to be enabled to adequately compete for residents, businesses and jobs in the future.
- g) Being half in Metro and half out, puts Boring at a disadvantage to compete with similar rural communities such as Sandy and Estacada which are outside of the Metro boundaries.

**3) This has been a 2 year process**

- a) Hours of research
- b) Multiple inquiries and meetings with elected officials
- c) A series of Public Meetings
- d) 20+ volunteers meeting with Boring residents
- e) No one offered an appropriate solution for the Boring problem
- f) As a result, the community of Boring supported the only option:  
Withdraw from Metro

**4) This is the WILL of the people**

- a) Almost 700 signatures were gathered which equates to about 30% of the registered voters of the withdrawal area.
- b) Of the people approached to sign the petition, the experience was 90% would sign. 10% elected not to for various reasons.
- c) Previous Metro issues on the ballot in the precincts within the withdrawal area were defeated by 2 to 1 margins on average.
- d) The petition was signed by Democrats, Republicans, Independents and Non Affiliated Voters.
- e) This is a bi-partisan measure. This is not a motion of a few, but the cause of many.

**5) To establish unity in a community, the local governance must be fair and equitable.**

- a) Having a divided community with fractured neighborhoods does not bode well for the future of Boring.
- b) Treating members of a community differently because of a regional boundary is neither fair nor equitable.

**6) Solid Waste Disposal**

- a) Areas outside of the Metro boundaries in Boring are receiving the same solid waste disposal services as those who reside within the Metro boundaries in Boring.
- b) Sandy, Estacada and the unincorporated areas surrounding those cities are outside of Metro and they receive adequate solid waste disposal services.

Conclusion: Withdrawal will not affect solid waste disposal services

**7) Clackanomah Reserves**

- a) The Clackanomah Urban and Rural Reserves are established by Inter-Governmental Agreement between Clackamas County and Metro and said Agreement meets with the requirements of State Law.
- b) The subject Inter-Governmental Agreement is in force for fifty years from the date of signing and has NO termination clause.

Conclusion: Withdrawal will not affect the Clackanomah Reserves

**8) Urban Growth Boundary**

- a) Be it known that according to maps provided by Metro, some territory within the current Urban Growth Boundary is outside the jurisdictional boundaries of Metro.
- b) The Urban Growth Boundary expansion requires agreement between Metro and the three counties.

Conclusion: Withdrawal will not impact future expansions of the Urban Growth Boundary

**9) Green Space and Park Land Ownership by Metro**

- a) Metro has been purchasing land for green space and park usage for the future.
- b) Metro currently owns land for these purposes outside of its jurisdictional boundaries.

Conclusion: Withdrawal will not impact Metro land ownership and future green space and park development.

**10) Sherwood has areas outside of the Metro Boundary**

- a) A Metro official was quoted in a Pamplin article stating that Sherwood has areas in and out of the Metro Boundary. It was inferred that Sherwood has no problems concerning the Metro Boundary.
- b) The Metro official did not divulge the percentages of land mass and population within Sherwood that is inside the Metro Boundary and outside of the Metro Boundary.
- c) It has been surmised that less than 10% of the Sherwood land mass and less than 5% of the Sherwood population is outside of the Metro Boundary.

Conclusion: This is not a fair and equitable comparison with the Boring experience as a minor percentage of the Sherwood population is outside of the Metro Boundary while Boring is presented with nearly a 50% majority inside and outside of the Metro Boundary.

**11) This will set a precedent for other withdrawals**

- a) It has been suggested that this would establish a precedent for other communities to withdraw from Metro.
- b) The Boring community studied and worked on this process for two years. It took time and effort for the people to identify their desires.

Conclusion: Even if a precedent is set, the process is long and tedious to pursue a petition and seek the establishment of a House or Senate Bill. In the end, the people are expressing their desires and instruction to the elected officials which is democracy in action.