

**CANBY CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
July 6, 2005**

Presiding: Mayor Melody Thompson

Council Present: Roger Harris, Walt Daniels, Georgia Newton, Teresa Blackwell, and Randy Carson. Councilor Wayne Oliver was absent.

Staff Present: Mark Adcock, City Administrator; John Kelley, City Attorney; John Williams, Community Development & Planning Director; Beth Saul, Library & Parks Director; Margaret Yochem, Transit & General Services Director; and Kim Scheafer City Recorder Pro Tem.

Others Present: Lloyd Mendenhall, Pam Serres, Karen Kroff, Rex Samples, Richard Oathes, Ronald Tatone, Karelyn Backstrom, Robert Backstrom, Jan Milne, Debbie Rose, Mavourn Stuart, Joyce Satter, K.W. Baller, Diana Parsons, Bruce Blackledge, Helen Benson, Jean Nkettome, Charlie Stinson, Heather Neafie, Jamie Netter, Betty Gabert, Wes & Eleanor Belieu, James Pederson, Mark Webber, Chuck Hathcoat, Jack Pendleton, Chuck Hammack, Tim Stuart, Jill Marie Wiles, Tina Boetz, Judi Thompson, Lyle Read, Fred Kahut, Duane Weeks, Jan Weeks, Will Newman II, Dave Stearns, Judy Adams, Kathy Thompson, Kathy Stuart, Toni Blackledge, Paul Satter, Bill & Linda Kinman, Lynne Bowen, Larry Bowen, Don Benson, Viol Loveall, Lee Whitcomb, Richard Neafie, Ralph Luchterhand, Leondard Walker, Donna Walker, Florence Ball, Richard Ball, Mr. & Mr. D. Munger, Nicholas Gitts, Bob Tice, Sheila Tice, Robert Warren, Charles Blackwell, JE Albrich, Lynn Kadwell, Patsy Johnston, Julie Whitney, Dave Whitney, Judy Klemsteen, Jim Newton, Jerry & Joyce Buchanan, Larry & Sandy Corder, Michelle Webber, Ron Yarbrough, Mariah Stuart, Jan Dickts, and Steve St. Amand.

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Thompson called the regular meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. at the Canby Adult Center, followed by the opening ceremonies.

Recreation and Parks Month – Mayor Thompson read a proclamation proclaiming July as Recreation and Parks Month. Beth Saul, Library and Parks Director, accepted the proclamation.

COMMUNICATIONS: None.

CITIZEN INPUT & COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.

MAYOR'S BUSINESS: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: ****Councilor Blackwell moved to approve Accounts Payable of \$564,388.09, Minutes of the June 1 City Council Regular Meeting & Executive Session, Minutes of the June 2 City Council Workshop, Minutes of the June 16 City Council Workshop & Regular Meeting, and Minutes of the June 22 City Council Workshop. Motion was seconded by Councilor Carson and passed 5-0.**

PUBLIC HEARING:

CPA 03-02/ZC 03-02 Northwood Investments – Mayor Thompson read the public hearing format.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

Councilor Harris - No conflict, plan to participate.
Councilor Daniels - No conflict, plan to participate
Councilor Newton - No conflict, plan to participate.
Mayor Thompson - No conflict, plan to participate.
Councilor Blackwell - No conflict, plan to participate.
Councilor Carson - No conflict, plan to participate.

EX PARTE CONTACT:

Councilor Harris - He had friends on both sides of this issue and had many conversations with them. He listened to the discussions and read articles in the newspaper. He had visited the site several times, but drew no conclusions.
Councilor Daniels - Walked the site a couple of years ago, but drew no conclusions.
Councilor Newton - Participated in the last hearing and had people approach her. Her comment had been that she could not talk about it, and drew no conclusions.
Mayor Thompson - She heard this application in 2003. Had spoken with a few people in casual conversations regarding their opinions, but drew no conclusions.
Councilor Blackwell - Had conversations much like the Mayor and Councilor Harris with no definite direction, just listened to opinions. Drew no conclusions.
Councilor Carson - Participated in the last hearings, visited the site, and told anyone that asked that he could not discuss this, and drew no conclusions.

STAFF REPORT: John Williams, Community Development and Planning Director, summarized the application and process. This application was originally filed in 2003, and the City Council approved it at that point, but it was appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals, and was appealed the Oregon Court of Appeals which remanded the decision back to the City. The applicants modified the application and they started the process over. The Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council. This would amend the Urban Growth Boundary to include seven tax lots totaling 30 acres. It was already annexed into the City limits and would be zoned low density residential.

John Kelley, City Attorney, wanted to make sure that everyone was clear on the legal issues. He reviewed the process the application had gone through and read the Land Use Board of Appeals remand to the City in regard to Goal 14 and the need factor. The hearing that night was for the purpose of the remand to determine whether or not they could establish an exception to the OAR 660.014.0030 Goal 14 requirement. He would be advising the Council that in order to hear and make an appropriate decision they should be looking at the evidence that discussed the exception.

Mr. Williams said the applicants modified the application that they made in 2003 to propose exceptions to three of the statewide planning goals, numbers 11, 3, and 14. Goal 14 had to do

with urbanization, Goal 11 had to do with public facilities and services, and Goal 3 had to do with agricultural lands. A Goal 14 exception would authorize urban uses on rural land if it was found the rural land was irrevocably committed. The second exception would be to expand the urban growth boundary to include the property. Mr. Williams read from the Oregon Administrative Rules to explain it further. If the Council found that the criteria had not been met there were no grounds for an exception. If the Council found that the criteria had been met it would provide a justification for approving the application. The key decision in the modified application was whether the land was irrevocably committed to urban uses.

Mayor Thompson asked why this could not be referred to the voters. Attorney Kelley stated that the City of Canby Charter had a provision that said annexations were to be voted on by the citizens. This piece of property was already in the City. Land use decisions were the purview of councils, planning commissions, Land Use Board of Appeals, Oregon Court of Appeals, and possibly the Oregon Supreme Court. A judicial process was followed in land use matters rather than having an election. There was no ability in this particular instance to have an election.

There was a question from the audience about the Council taking an opinion vote of the citizens whether or not they wanted this to come in that they could use in their decision. Attorney Kelley said the Council made a decision based on review of the evidence as it applied to the criteria. Otherwise they had a totally subjective system in the majority control of all the development of a person's private property.

Mayor Thompson opened the public hearing at 8:25 p.m.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

APPLICANT: Mark Greenfield, representative of Northwood Investments, said that the Court of Appeals said that this proposal could be approved without demonstrating that there was a need for this property under Goal 14 if they followed the exceptions process. They modified the application to conform with the Court's direction. Mr. Greenfield talked about the nature of a remand proceeding. Everything that was in the prior record was part of the record of this proceeding. The purpose of a remand was to correct errors in an application, not to revisit old issues. On a remand, when a record was reopened, any party could raise new issues that related to the new evidence, but could not raise old resolved issues.

The basis for the exception was that the property was irrevocable committed to urban residential development. To determine commitment you looked at development on adjacent land. The property was located entirely within the City limits and was encircled by the Urban Growth Boundary. The property was encircled by lots that had been developed for residential uses or for church use. The typical lot sizes were 7,000-10,000 square feet. The surrounding properties had largely diverse ownerships. A diverse ownership pattern for small urban scale lots was indicative of urban uses and urban development. The property had immediate access to numerous locations on all sides of the property to a full range of urban facilities and services. There were eight water lines and five sanitary sewer lines that extended to the borders of the property. There was access to telephone, electricity, natural gas, and cable. Seven residential streets stubbed out at the property line to the east, south, and west sides of the property, and

Territorial on the north. The Northwood property received fire and police services from the City, not the rural service district. The Court of Appeals said the City could amend its Urban Growth Boundary without demonstrating compliance with all of Goal 14 factors through the exceptions process. It was needed over the next 20 years. It made sense to bring it inside the Urban Growth Boundary and they were asking for approval. If approved, this site would go through master planning. The fact that this property had good soils did not mean it could be practically farmed. LUBA found that the evidence in the record supported this City Council's decision that it was irrevocably committed to urban development. The Department of Land Conservation supported this application. The Planning Commission in 2003 recommended denial of the application, but they voted approval in 2005.

PROPOSERS: Charlie Stinson, said that he had spent 12 years on the Canby School Board. He was not speaking on behalf of the School Board, but of his experiences. The schools were designated for a certain student capacity, and each student provided more revenue than cost to the district. Schools were better off financially with increased enrollment. Class size was established by the School District independent of the total student population. The revenue determined the number of teachers the District could afford to hire. Stable enrollment and low and steady increases were best for the District and developments like this would help with that.

Richard Othes, said that the property had been surrounded by housing for a long time. He was astounded that it had not been developed already. It did not have any other use.

Nicholas Gitts, said that this was a big piece of property, but they could not safely spray or fumigate it because it was near housing. He was an advocate of saving all the farmland they could, but it was getting harder to farm with all of the restrictions. They had previously farmed the property and had received complaints from neighbors.

Jerry Albrich, said that they all lived on property that was at one time farmland. All of them had violated their best interest to preserve farmland by purchasing in the Canby area.

Robert Baller, said that they had seen a lot of different development in the City. He did not want them to continue to take farmland outside the City limits when they had a piece of property that was completely surrounded by houses and had numerous service connections. This was the time it should be brought into the Urban Growth Boundary.

Rex Samples, said that it made more sense to build houses on this than on the property that used to be the City dump. He used to ride a motorcycle on this property and received a complaint about the noise and dust.

Ron Yarbrough, said that his comments were directed at his former position as Canby Fire Marshall. The area would be better served by connecting the water supply and for emergency management access. This was the only piece of property that they could potentially get for a north side fire station. Mayor Thompson asked if it was a crisis to have residential growth on that side of town without a fire station near it. Mr. Yarbrough said in the event of a major disaster, they would have response from two areas potentially.

Mayor Thompson recessed the meeting for a short break at 9 p.m. and reconvened at 9:08 p.m.

Andy Hein, said that this property was a liability as a farming entity. He turned down the opportunity to buy it in the past because he could see that it wasn't going to be a viable option. His insurance carrier would not insure him to farm this property. He preferred that they build houses on this property and let him continue to farm on his land.

Councilor Harris asked what crops he would have raised if he was farming the property or if there were crops that did not require chemicals. Mr. Hein said that organic farming was not a viable option for the world. It was not a special interest property from the standpoint of agriculture.

OPPONENTS: Will Newman, said that he lived on a 20 acre organic farm. He agreed that there were a number of farm operations that would not work on that land, but he knew of other farmers that would like to farm it. Organic farming was the fastest growing segment of agriculture in the United States. It was a farmable piece of property under current situations and economically feasible. The fact that it was surrounded by residences made it more productive and valuable because the highest area of growth was locally, naturally grown agricultural products. Agricultural land paid more in taxes than it cost to service it. That part of the valley represented 2% of the most productive agricultural land in the world.

Jack Pendleton, said that there had been major disagreements over this for a long time. They were talking about a political decision. He did not think they needed a vote of the citizens as a survey was done that said 91% of the people wanted to preserve agricultural land. All of the annexations had recently failed because people did not want to see large scale developments like this. At least 40 neighbors had taken the City to Court over this the last time. He wanted people to think about some type of compromise.

Jerry Buchanan, said that they had heard that schools were going to benefit from this change and he did not believe that. More students meant they would have to build more schools, which they would be paying for. Moving this piece of property into the Urban Growth Boundary resulted in increased stress on the infrastructure. The improvement cost far exceeded any development cost paid by the new comers. The true result of the Urban Growth Boundary changes would be huge money for the developer, a less livable community, higher property taxes, and bad roads.

Mariah Stuart, said that this decision was large and if a land use change was up to the Council then issues of the fire station and services to the north side should be up to them. All of the services were being used by those that already lived on the streets; they were not put there for the future. She did not think it was irrevocably committed by those services being there. This was a big decision.

Paul Satter, said that this had been a long journey. He did not know what irrevocably committed to urbanization meant. They had not heard how the residents would be affected. There would be more traffic and it would take away the view. Each year more farmland was lost and many crops were grown in urban areas. If the City did not take more aggressive steps to save agricultural land, they were going to be dependent on foreign countries for food. Canby was at a crossroads.

Did it want to be known as the garden spot of the state or have no identity. People of Canby wanted managed growth. Many times cities continued to build houses without taking care of the infrastructure. He encouraged the Council to vote no on this issue.

Lee Whitcomb, said that he had noted the problem of the train separating half of the town from the fire station. Fire and medical service should be available within four minutes. There should not be anymore development on the north side until this problem was corrected. The north side of town had no east/west access to the fire protection area. He thought Canby had a great Fire Department but needed help to overcome the handicap that had been imposed on them. This was a terrible responsibility for the Council.

Lloyd Mendenhall, said this land was purchased for nursery use. He had talked with several farmers who did not have a problem with farming that land. People were forgetting about the revenue that came off the land. He urged the Council to deny the application.

Joyce Satter, said that this application was not made on the basis of need. Their decision should not be made on that. When you laid down the pavement it was irrevocably committed. It was not a question of whether it should be farmed; there was value in green space. The Council represented the citizens of Canby, and she urged the Council to not irrevocably commit this property until the time citizens would want that.

Dave Stearns, president of IFA Nurseries, said they farmed right up to the back of neighbors houses for many years and had been doing so successfully. They found they had more complaints in rural areas from the neighbors than inside the city. People enjoyed farming inside the City. He had recently made an offer to purchase a portion of the property. They had made an offer of \$50,000 per acre. For a commitment to farm it for 20 years they would donate it to the City. This was a national monument in the ground and they needed to preserve it.

Councilor Daniels asked if there was a period of time where they did not farm it. Mr. Stearns said they gave up the lease in 1999/2000, but the demand was there and they wanted to move production of a bare root nursery which would also increase employment. Mr. Stearns said they had no problem with pesticides.

Councilor Carson asked if they would be willing to look at market value for it. Mr. Stearns said it was more than market value for agricultural land.

Bob Backstrom, said he used to be a school principal and school staff quivered every time a new development came into the school's boundaries. Canby had a building boom over the last several years and the schools were overloaded, streets were horrible, they had a water crisis, infrastructure crisis and more of the same was not going to solve their problems. They had to be more creative in managing their growth. The owners had let the property go to weed and had to be cited to mow it. This was a political issue. Every single neighbor adjacent to this property said they would prefer agriculture to development. They needed to think about this on a personal level. The infrastructure was not in place. They should make the decision based on what they knew was right for the people of Canby.

Mayor Thompson asked if growth impacts were not the issue would farmland still be an issue. Mr. Backstrom thought it would still be an issue. There were people who wanted to farm the land, and the neighbors wanted it farmed. It was not irrevocably committed.

Jan Milne, said that the applicants had not proven that this land was irrevocably committed to development. They had not gotten many complaints when it was farmed. She had been told by many farmers that the chemicals they used to spray their crops were less toxic than chemicals homeowners spread on their lawns. The Council was being asked to set aside land use regulations that served citizens well and they justified it for the owners' financial dreams to come true. There was a high priority to reserve farmland and since 2003 voters had turned down all annexation measures of five acres or larger. Amending the City's Comprehensive Plan and ignoring the statewide planning goals should not be undertaken lightly. Just punching the streets through and building the houses did not make it right. They wanted growth that made sense and respected Canby's agricultural heritage. It did not make sense to tear up 30 acres of farmland when there was a surplus of buildable land in the UGB already zoned for residential. Could they deny the offer by Mr. Stearns. This land was not irrevocably committed until they decided. Their decision would dramatically affect the north side of Canby and impact the whole city.

Ralph Luchterhand, said that this was not irrevocably committed when they had people willing to farm the land. If that was the only issue, the decision was easy. He said decisions they made to bring additional housing impacted those who lived in the rural areas because they funded the schools.

Dave Stearns, said that the argument was not that the property was irrevocably committed to urbanization but irrevocably committed to agriculture. None of the ground should be covered up. They needed to preserve it and they were willing to step up to farm it. They would take care of the liability and complaints.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Greenfield said that IFA's offer was not new, and Northwood would not sell it to them. They did not offer anywhere near the market value and IFA did not buy it when it was on the market for two years. Mr. Greenfield had been told by Mr. Tatone that IFA had testified in favor of the Dodd annexation. Why didn't they protect farmland that was on the outskirts instead of farmland that was surrounded by the City. They did not think they were speaking in good faith. All of the land surrounding Canby was agricultural land. And if they wanted managed growth, where was the first place growth should go. It should go here because it was committed and there was so much that could not be done to it. They heard most of the testimony from the neighbors because they did not want change right next to them. This made the most sense. They needed to provide more housing especially with the new industrial park.

Mayor Thompson closed the public hearing at 10:14 p.m.

DISCUSSION:

Mayor Thompson asked if there was a definition of irrevocably committed. Mr. Williams said the Oregon Administrative Rules said that in order to define it as such, they needed to look at the factors.

Councilor Daniels said it was a Priority A property, and the question was did the priority system have precedence over agricultural use. Many people complained about the chemicals and he did not think it could be used as a nursery forever because the market could change. It was nice to have green space. This was one area they had been working on, managed growth. He thought this was destined to be developed.

Councilor Harris said periodically the Urban Growth Boundary was up for review and expansion. He asked when they would review it next. Mr. Williams said it would be at least five years. Councilor Harris said he wanted to be clear on the issue they were deliberating to vote on. Was this irrevocably committed to development or not. Mr. Williams said there were two issues and there was criteria to judge them on. In order to approve the application they would need to agree there were exceptions to the planning goals, which could only be justified if they found an irrevocable commitment. Once that had been done the application could be approved.

Councilor Harris said he was stuck on the commitment, and there was differing opinions on whether it was agriculturally viable. There was a legitimate agricultural business that was convinced it was viable. In looking at the community on what should be developed, this was an island inside the City and should be developed. If anything was going to be developed it seemed like this should be it. The key point was whether or not this was irrevocably committed to urban development.

Councilor Carson said this was already in the City limits and the roads were all plumbed with sewer, water, electrical, etc. He thought it had been planned to be developed when the time was right. It was completely surrounded, and farming it was not viable. He thought it met the irrevocably committed designation. It was inside the City boundary and was committed to urban levels of development. He believed it met the exceptions and should be allowed to come in.

Councilor Harris said the historical element that staff had provided to them in their report said probably from the beginning in City planning this was designed to be developed. The question was when to develop it.

Councilor Newton said that it met the criteria for irrevocably committed to urban development. She respected the right for people to do what they wanted with their property as long as it complied with the rules.

Councilor Daniels said it would be two to three years before houses would be available.

Councilor Blackwell said there were farmers who wanted to farm the land. The services were there. She had to weigh in with what the neighbors who lived around it felt with the farming, and they did not have a problem with it. She did not know if right now was the time. She was concerned about the master planning process. She trusted the developers to work with the

neighbors. She was leaning to agree it was irrevocably committed, but not to approve it at this time.

Mayor Thompson said as she looked through the impact questions, there were impacts. The community was concerned about growth. State and local law provided an opportunity for land owners to ask the question. The Council was required to look at the Statute and pass it on to the citizens to vote on. In regard to schools, they were asked by the School District not to take it into consideration. The School's mandate was to provide an education to every pupil that came through the door. She thought they made a case that it could be farmed. It was probably irrevocably committed, but the Council had the opportunity to say that didn't matter. It was still in the Council's purview.

Councilor Carson said that one of the items that several citizens brought up was that there needs to be a fire station on the north side of town. He encouraged them to talk with the Fire Board. The roads in the area were going to need work one way or the other. The whole town needed roads and they needed to put money into it. The water, electric and sewer systems were all adequate for the next ten to twenty years.

****Councilor Carson moved to approve CPA 03-02/ZC03-02 as modified in the 2005 application. Motion was seconded by Councilor Daniels.**

Councilor Harris thought it was viable farmland. Councilor Blackwell said her vote came with the highest respect for everyone who voiced their opinion at the meeting, but she struggled with the irrevocably committed.

Motion passed 3-2 with Councilor Harris and Blackwell opposed.

Mayor Thompson recessed for a short break at 10:40 p.m. and reconvened at 10:52 p.m.

COUNCILOR COMMENTS & LIAISON REPORTS: Councilor Daniels said that they needed to plan a goal setting session in August. Mr. Adcock said that he had met with Councilors Daniels and Carson and had talked about taking a look at the goals so that staff had a better idea of Council expectations.

RESOLUTIONS & ORDINANCES:

Ordinance 1180 – ****Councilor Blackwell moved to approve Ordinance 1180, AN ORDINANCE DECLARING THE CITY'S ELECTION TO RECEIVE STATE REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006. Motion was seconded by Councilor Carson and passed 5-0 by roll call vote.**

Ordinance 1181 – Mr. Williams said they wanted to improve the rest of Ivy Street from 6th to 10th Avenues. This would be a change order for \$175,000 to do that.

****Councilor Daniels moved to approve Ordinance 1181, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A**

CHANGE ORDER NUMBER 7 WITH PARKER NORTHWEST PAVING COMPANY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SEQUOIA PARKWAY ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS STAGE III; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY to come up for second reading on July 20, 2005. Motion was seconded by Councilor Harris and passed 5-0.

Ordinance 1182 – Margaret Yochem, Transit & General Services Director, said this was part of the master plan of the transit center in Cutsforth's parking lot. They were purchasing it from Recreation Resource with posts made out of brick.

****Councilor Harris moved to approve Ordinance 1182, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR THE ACQUISITION OF A PRE-FABRICATED GAZEBO FOR THE CANBY TRANSIT SYSTEM to come up for second reading on July 20, 2005. Motion was seconded by Councilor Blackwell.**

****Councilor Newton moved to amend the main motion to say "that the cost was not to exceed \$23,526". Motion to amend was seconded by Councilor Harris and passed 5-0.**

Main motion to approve Ordinance 1182 passed 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S BUSINESS & STAFF REPORTS: None.

CITIZEN INPUT: Charles Blackwell said that General Canby Days was very successful. They were looking for more volunteers. Safeway donated water and they added music to the fireworks.

ACTION REVIEW:

1. Approving the consent agenda.
2. Approving CPA 03-02/ZC 03-02 and bringing back findings on August 3, 2005.
3. Approving Ordinance 1180 on second reading.
4. Approving Ordinance 1181 to come up for second reading on July 20, 2005.
5. Approving Ordinance 1182 to come up for second reading on July 20, 2005.
6. Outlining and framing issues for a goal setting review.

There was no Executive Session.

Mayor Thompson adjourned the regular meeting at 11:04 p.m.



Kimberly Scheafer
City Recorder Pro Tem



Melody Thompson
Mayor

Assisted in Preparation of Minutes – Susan Wood



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Proclamation

“Recreation and Parks Month”

WHEREAS, July is being recognized nationally by the National Recreation & Parks Association as Recreation and Parks Month, and

WHEREAS, parks, recreation activities, and leisure experiences provide opportunities for young people to live, grow, and develop into contributing members of society, and

WHEREAS, parks and recreation create lifelines and continued life experiences for older members of our community, and

WHEREAS, generating opportunities for people to come together and experience a sense of community through fun recreational pursuits, and

WHEREAS, park and recreation agencies and organizations provide outlets for physical activities, socialization, and stress reducing experiences, and

WHEREAS, parks, playgrounds, nature trails, open spaces, community and cultural centers, and historic sites make a community attractive and desirable places to live, work, play, and visit to contribute to our ongoing economic vitality, and

WHEREAS, parks, greenways, and open spaces provide a welcome respite from our fast paced, high-tech lifestyles while protecting and preserving our natural environment and,

WHEREAS, park and recreation agencies and organizations touch the lives of individuals, families, groups, and the entire community by having a positive impact upon the social, economic, health, and environmental quality of our community,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Melody Thompson, by virtue of the authority vested in me as the Mayor of the City of Canby, proclaim July as Recreation and Parks Month in the City of Canby and encourage all citizens to celebrate by participating in their choice of pleasurable activities, whether provided by the City of Canby Parks Department, the Canby Swim Center, Canby Kids sports activities, Canby Community Education classes and activities, Canby Public Library programs, Canby Adult Center programs and activities, various festivals and events provided by local organizations, or through private fitness and sports businesses in the community to find refreshment, health, and mental benefits through leisure.

Given unto my hand this 6th day of July 2005.

**Melody Thompson
Mayor**