

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

September 18, 1997

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer) Ruth McFarland, Susan McLain, Patricia McCaig, Ed Washington, Don Morissette, Lisa Naito

Councilors Absent: None.

Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Presiding Officer Kvistad introduced Jzahnna and Mira, two business students from Kazakhstan.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Art Lewellyn, 2305 SE 8th #9 Portland, OR 97202, L.O.T.I. Plan, reviewed his plan for a street car system. He noted the addition of a loop on the line close to Clackamas Town Center and Milwaukie. He believes his proposal supports land use goals. He showed the difference between AORTA and LOTI. The LOTI plan is more extensive and smoother, and allows Light Rail to move faster. He said the East bank should be part of the planning; and maintained that his proposal could be built using electric buses for the same price as the proposed line.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. WASTE REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAMS

Alexis Dow, Metro Auditor, and Leo Kenyon, Senior Auditor, gave an overview of the Metro Auditor's audit of Waste Reduction Grant Programs at Metro. The audit included investigation of Recycling Business Development Grants, the Thrift Recycling Credit Program, and Annual Waste Reduction Grants. The objectives of the audit were to determine program costs and accomplishments, to evaluate local waste reduction efforts funded with Metro dollars, and to evaluate REM department controls of grant funds. A copy of the auditor's report is included in the meeting record.

Councilor Naito asked how the thrift program works. Ms. Dow said each thrift submits an annual report that discloses the volume of materials brought to recycling centers. Based on that volume, a credit is issued. Mr. Kenyon said tonnage estimates are developed annually, based on previous tonnage volumes. Estimates are used to determine credits against disposal costs. Mr. Kenyon said the amount of \$350,000 is established by the budget process, not by code. Since budgetary considerations exceed \$350,000, REM staff find themselves making sub-adjustments to provide the correct amount of disposal credit to each of the thrifts. He said when the budgeted amount is depleted, credits are no longer given. The credit is an offset against the dumping fee during the first few months of the year. In response to Councilor McLain's question, Mr. Kenyon

said a record is maintained of how much of the credit the thrifts have utilized, and that no actual cash is expended by Metro for these credits.

Councilor McLain asked what Mr. Kenyon meant by his statement that the Code is not being followed. Ms. Dow responded that if the code formula was used, given current volumes, the dollar amount of the credit would exceed the \$350,000 budgeted. She pointed out the code formula is much more generous than what the amount budgeted in recent years. She said it was the Auditor's Office recommendation that there be a more accurate correlation between the budgeted amount and the code formula.

Councilor Naito asked about the program oversight issue, and whether thrifts are actually doing the recycling. She questioned the meaning of the term "little program oversight." Ms. Dow said the program is self-reporting. She said reporting is incomplete, with few records kept by REM staff. Further, she said reporting is not timely or verified. There have been no written agreements between the thrifts and Metro as recommended by the Code. She said that it has only been in the past year that staff has obtained the agreements, and that since its inception in 1992 not much reporting has taken place until recently.

Ms. Dow reported that the levels of recycling among the three thrifts involved had changed dramatically. Two of the thrifts are recycling more and disposing less; therefore receiving less credit. The other thrift is recycling at the same rate, but disposing more, a therefore receiving more of the credit.

Councilor McLain questioned Ms. Dow about the portion of her report that said Metro established performance indicators two or three years ago, and that those performance indicators are not geared toward individual jurisdictional programs, but rather, are based on REM and RSWMP program goals. She asked whether Ms. Dow was suggesting whether Metro's take on RSWMP's goals was the kind of performance indicator she would like Metro to review. Ms. Dow said she did not recommend one over the other.

Ms. Dow said the question asked during the budget process was whether Metro is getting its money's worth out of the program, and whether jurisdictions are using the money as intended. She said the audit report attempted to answer these questions, however, they could not be addressed because there are no performance measures for individual jurisdictions. She said if Council wants answers to these questions, performance measures should be established. However, if Council simply wishes to receive assurance with respect to the activity, the provisions currently in place are sufficient.

Councilor McLain asked Ms. Dow if she had evaluated the RSWMP document itself, or had simply performed the audit on local jurisdiction programs. Ms. Dow said the latter was the case.

5. GROWTH MANAGEMENT SURVEY AND FALL PUBLIC OUTREACH REPORT

John Fregonese, Director of Growth Management Services, gave a report on the Growth Management Survey results. He said the survey was conducted in May. It is similar to the survey that was undertaken in 1994 for the 2040 Growth Concept. A goal of the survey was to obtain the maximum level of public participation; more than could be achieved in a public hearing process. Mr. Fregonese pointed out that 400 people testified about the Urban Reserve decision; and while this is a good number, 17,000 people responded to the 2040 Growth Concept survey.

Mr. Fregonese said approximately 85,000 brochures were printed and distributed to the department's mailing list and through a number of retail outlets. Of the 85,000, almost 12,000 have been returned; an excellent rate of return. He said the results of the survey are interesting, however, there are no big surprises.

Mr. Fregonese pointed out that when surveys are prepared, respondents are not always satisfied with the multiple choice options given them. He said multiple choice questions were used in order to aid in analyzing and coding responses. For each question, an opportunity was provided for individual, handwritten responses. Of the 12,000 responses, 7,000 people gave individual opinions, leading to approximately 12,000 or 13,000 comments to review. Mr. Fregonese said the individual input is invaluable, and that the comments are being coded and sorted in terms of frequency. This analysis will be complete in about two weeks.

Councilor Naito expressed interest in reading the comments from citizens in her district. She asked if the responses could be broken out in this manner. Mr. Fregonese said approximately 50% of the responses came with addresses, and for those responses, it would be possible to provide a breakout. The remaining responses could only be analyzed for their region-wide significance.

Mr. Fregonese reported the survey included four trade-up questions and space for comments. There were three questions pertaining to density vs. expansion of the UGB, as well as questions pertaining to urban stream protection vs. development rights, the management of traffic congestion, and transportation funding issues. The Sunday Oregonian as well as six local newspapers were used, based on a survey in January that said approximately 60% of people get their information on growth management from the Oregonian, and another 30% get their information from local papers. There were radio ads on six local stations that covered a wide variety of audiences, including audiences staff knew would be critical of planning issues. Printed surveys were distributed to Starbucks, Borders, Macheesmo Mouse, libraries, Metro facilities and an updated Metro website.

Forty-six percent of respondents say the UGB should not be expanded, and densities should be increased. Most people want the UGB expanded a small amount along with a corresponding moderate increase in densities. Only 13% want a significant expansion of the UGB.

Regarding protection of urban streams, most citizens favor more regulation to limit development. Approximately 25% feel development should be regulated, and property owners should be compensated. The combination of those in favor of some form of regulation is fairly universal.

Regarding management of traffic congestion, most people want new roads, alternatives, and some congestion. Thirty-six percent were in favor of no new roads, but rather investment in maintenance and alternatives. Only 11 % of respondents want to completely eliminate congestion. The majority want to achieve a balance.

Regarding how to spend future transportation funds, there is a split between freeway improvements and light rail, and a split between more bus service and widening streets. The smallest response level calls for more bike paths and sidewalks.

Mr. Fregonese said in this type of survey, you can expect to receive a larger response from people sympathetic to planning ideas, so he is surprised to find the results are similar to the results of the Davis/Hibbits scientific poll of the general public. He said the results appear to be fairly valid, even though the survey was a public participation piece of self-motivated respondents, as opposed to random survey.

Mr. Fregonese said follow-up will occur next. Survey results will be printed in the growth management newsletter to be distributed next week. The report will be published on Metro's website and e-mailed upon request to Internet participants. A summary will be sent to MPAC and local jurisdictions, and coded [or ranked] comments will be sent to councilors before hearings and decision making begin on the Regional Framework Plan, starting in October.

Councilor Morissette said Mr. Fregonese had done a good job, however, he said he would temper the information with the advisory that the survey was mailed to individuals on the Metro mailing list, most of whom are growth management activists. He said he believed that as neighborhoods are faced with the actual reality of physical density increases, the numbers will increase on the side of the desire to increase the UGB.

6. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

7.1 Consideration of Metro Council meeting minutes of the August 8, 1997 and September 11, 1997.

Motion: **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt the Metro Council meeting minutes of August 8, 1997 and September 11, 1997.

Seconded: **Councilor McFarland** seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 **Resolution No. 97-2551**, For the purpose of approving the lease/purchase financing whereby SAWY Leasing Corp. lease/purchase certain equipment to Metro pursuant to a lease/purchase agreement; and authorizing the CFO or her designee to execute the lease/purchase agreement and such other documents and certificates as may be necessary to carry out the transactions contemplated by the aforementioned agreement.

Motion: **Councilor McCaig** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2551.

Seconded: **Councilor Naito** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** reminded the Council that this resolution had been reviewed the previous week when the Council had acted in its capacity as the Finance Committee. She said the resolution would authorize the expenditure of \$205,000 for the lease/purchase agreement, and would provide Metro with the opportunity to obtain low-interest financing. She urged Council approval.

Vote: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Presiding Officer Kvistad spoke about his trip on the Amtrak commuter train to Vancouver. He said it was a great opportunity to see the possibilities of commuter rail. He said people using the train really enjoyed the experience. He said JPACT has a subcommittee on commuter rail, and the public is welcome to sit in on those meetings.

There being no further business before the Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the regular Council Session at 2:55 PM. He advised members of the Council and public that the Council would convene a public hearing at the City of Gresham Council Chamber at 5:30 PM.

10. PUBLIC HEARING

10.1 **Resolution No. 97-2550**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 1997 Urban Growth Report Analysis of Developable Land.

10.2 **Resolution No. 97-2559**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 1997 Housing Needs Analysis.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 97-2550 and Resolution No. 97-2559 at 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Presiding Officer Kvistad, Susan McLain, Lisa Naito, Ed Washington, Ruth McFarland

Members Absent: Don Morissette, Patricia McCaig

Presiding Officer Kvistad reconvened the Metro Council at 5:30 and opened the public hearing on Resolution No. 97-2550 and 97-2559 at 5:40 p.m., introduced the council and asked the public to fill out a public hearing card.

John Fregonese gave an overview of the Urban Growth Report utilizing a presentation format, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record of these resolutions.

Presiding Officer Kvistad explained that the council utilized these public hearings as listening posts, hearing from the public about what their opinion were on where the council should go. If the public wished to testify, they must fill out a testimony card and would be called up to testify. He noted that each testifier would have about 3 minutes. September 25th and October 2nd would be the two council meetings where council would deliberate on the Urban Growth Report and the Housing Needs Analysis. He asked the public to remember that this was not the decision to move the Urban Growth Boundary but rather to talk about housing and the number of acres that would be required, the technical details that would select the number of acres but not which acres would be selected. He asked that written testimony be submitted as was shown on the "Instructions for submitting documents to the Metro Council decision record". He announced that this was the final public hearing on these two resolutions and that written testimony would be accepted into the record until 5:00 p.m. on September 26, 1997. A final decision was projected for October 9, 1997 at the regularly scheduled Council meeting. Following these public hearings, the Council would move into public hearings on the Regional Framework Plan. Those public hearings would be in Beaverton on October 16th and at Metro on October 23rd.

He assured the public that the Council had heard all kinds of recommendations from not expanding the Urban Growth Boundary, to keeping density out of the neighborhoods, to wanting better jobs, to making sure there was affordable housing. As all were well aware there would be

no way the Council could do all of this but they would try and balance out their decisions to make sure that the Council did a good job of preparing for what was to come.

Mary Kyle McCurdy, staff attorney for 1000 Friends of Oregon, 934 S 3rd Suite 300 Portland OR 97204 read her letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record for these resolutions (091897c-05).

Charlene Schweizer, Schweizer Dairy, 16109 SE Hwy. 212, Clackamas OR 97015 read her letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record for these resolutions (091897c-08). Ms. Schweizer also submitted written testimony from 9 neighbors (copies of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record for these resolutions).

Councilor McLain indicated that she had visited the Schweizer Dairy and the issue that Mrs. Schweizer brought to the council tonight was an urban reserve issue. The council had not forgotten their situation, it was still on their list of things to do but Metro was still waiting for the appeal to come back from the State. When this happened, the Schweizer's would be hearing from Metro. She noted a letter that was being sent to the Schweizer's.

Eleanor Clark, Columbia River Region League of Women Voters, 2620 SW Georgian Place Portland, OR 97201 read her letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record for these resolutions (091897c-07).

Jim Worthington, 3232 SE 153rd, Portland, OR 97236 said that his testimony would be short perhaps not so sweet. He lived in mid-Multnomah County which had been confiscated by the City of Portland and the city was now cramming high density down into his area. The City was saying that they must do this because of Metro (he had heard this from city planners) and the city must provide low cost housing. He was not aware of any constitutional area that said that low cost housing must be guaranteed to anyone. He suggested supply and demand. If there was a need for it, there would be low cost housing and high cost housing. He suggesting getting back to the old way of supply and demand. As he had dealt with planners, they gave the impression that they knew what was best for the people, in fact what was better for the people than the people knew for themselves. He felt that the planners were suggesting that the citizens were not very smart. He felt that the citizens knew what they wanted and what they needed. He added that there had been reference this evening to administrative rules being referred to as state laws. This bothered him. If Metro was referring to state law, they should make this clear. If they were referring to administrative rules, this should also be clear. Many of these mandates were administrative rules not state law.

Tony Cargill, Sterling Equities Inc., 13150 SE Winston Rd, Boring OR read his letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting as well as in the decision record of these resolutions (091897c-09). He asked Mr. Fregonese for clarification on his presentation. On page 11 Mr. Fregonese mentioned that there was 494,000 people coming to the area through the year 2017. Were 20% considered children?

Mr. Fregonese responded that this was the full ranges of ages with a breakdown by five year age groups.

Mr. Cargill said what he wondered was if they indicated 20% were children 12 and under that were not employable, that would leave the region with 395,000 adults including the ones who

were 65 and older, which gave the region 476,300 jobs. This meant that there were 81,300 jobs more than adults including the ones of advanced years.

Mr. Fregonese said that Mr. Cargill was correct and that the answer was Clark County. That county tended to provide more housing than jobs. In the Urban Growth Boundary, the region provided 83% of the jobs and 70% of the housing.

Mr. Cargill asked about page 14, the population inside the Urban Growth Boundary was approximately 1.1 million and yet the historical forecast numbers on page 8 showed considerably more than the 1.1 million. Was this a conflict?

Mr. Fregonese responded that it was 1.2 million inside the Urban Growth Boundary. This figure had been corrected. There was about 1.35 million inside the three county area and 1.6 million inside the four county. The forecast was for the four county area, including Clark County. The Urban Growth Boundary forecast included just figures within the UGB. The Metro UGB was 70% of the growth of the four county area.

Mr. Cargill noted page 34, the combined effect of the redevelopment and infill. He said that with the rate of infill that had been proposed, how long would there continue to be infill land available?

Mr. Fregonese said they had estimated redevelopment and infill in the model. They had looked at parcels where the buildings were inexpensive compared to the price of land as well as lots that were more than three times bigger than minimum zoning. There was plenty of land in the category. The limit seemed to be the current rate of infill. He added that the measurement of the rate of infill could vary by several percent. There was a margin of error of at least plus or minus three percent. So the difference between 25% and 35% was beyond their ability to measure any more accurately than that in any one year because they were using a sampling method.

Mr. Cargill said that the 1000 Friends of Oregon testifier indicated that there ought to be a different number for underbuild and a different number for infill. If her suggestion for underbuild was used, would that not diminish the ability to have infill because we would be filling it in in the beginning so there would be diminishing returns.

Mr. Fregonese said, no, these were different things, underbuild would be on land that was current vacant, infill and redevelopment was on land that was currently developed so they probably would not conflict.

Councilor McFarland asked Mr. Fregonese about the infill. Was Metro figuring the infill as even over the course of the 20 years?

Mr. Fregonese said they were making an estimate that on average there would be about thirteen percent of new single family homes every year as infill. It was going to go up and down but it would average out to 13%.

Councilor McFarland said she understood this, but she did not think it would average out in this way, it would not remain the same for 20 years. She believed initially that there would be this infill because they would pick up these places where it was easiest to infill. But by the end of this period of time, she would think those parcels for infill would be very scarce. Why would the infill percentage remain the same for 20 years if people were using the good lots to start with.

Mr. Fregonese said Metro found about 90,000 lots, they were talking about use of only 20,000 lots over the next 20 years. They looked at the composite of these 90,000 lots that could potentially be infilled, then, they took out the houses that were worth \$300,000 or more and they still ended up with about 50,000 lots. He believed there was ample amounts of infill. Twenty years from now, Metro will have expanded the Urban Growth Boundary. There were areas that were outside of the Urban Growth Boundary that they did not count as developable, such as a house on an acre, as the areas around this house developed, there would be new opportunities to infill as the Council expanded the boundary. Also, 20 years from now, some buildings that were current 20 years old would be 40 years old and the stock of buildings that were somewhat undervalued would continually aged. Because this was not dynamic, the Growth Management Department believed it was reasonable to project the 25% rate. This was a fairly conservative assumption.

Christopher Juniper, 5824 N.E. Flanders, Portland, OR 97213, had been hired by the Coalition for a Livable Future but was testifying only for himself at this meeting. He said his hometown of Denver had to been overrun by sprawl. He was very proud of the Portland community for trying to do something about sprawl. He was an economist by training. He appreciated the difficulty that the council was up against. He believed that Metro could do a lot better than Denver and be as efficient as possible. He referred to a great economist, Kenneth Bolding, who looked at our Gross National Product and said wait a minute, we should not celebrate the GNP going up every year, it was actually the gross national cost of finding happiness. The higher the GNP was, the more people were having to spend to achieve what they wanted. We should be trying to find a lower way of doing that to be most efficient. The business that was sustainable was going to be finding the least costly way of surviving rather than the most costly. To him, the size of the Urban Growth Boundary felt like the economy, the larger it was, the less efficiently we were achieving a quality of life for urban residents. Denver, with its sprawl, did not have any lower housing prices. He felt that the council had a very difficult choice looking at affordable housing but if a lot was \$35,000 in Portland, it would be a lot more affordable for five people to live on it density housing than one. The land prices which would not be greatly effected by whether we had an Urban Growth Boundary and expanded it, would be most effected by how we used the land within the UGB. He urged the council to be conservative in the sense of conserving our urban growth reserves that were already designated. He agreed with Mary Kyle McCurdy and Eleanor Clark that we needed to conserve those resources. He suggested allowing, if needed, an MPAC recommendation of 3000 acres but going as slow as we could because necessity was the mother of invention. His own house now had five adults in it. It had two when he bought it two years ago. He had found a great joy in having other adult roommates, this was the kind of infill that could occur and had occurred in other areas. He added, when we look at sustainability for the future and affordability for people, housing costs would be one of the most difficult components of living in Portland because we were a very nice place to live. We did not want to become less of a nice place to live so housing costs would go down. John Warner, a state economist, showed him a chart which predicted that in 10 years Oregon's per capita income would increase up to the national average. He also predicted that the housing costs would be twice the national average. How can we have housing cost at twice the national average with wages at the national average? This was clearly not sustainable, the only way people could make it was if they could reduce their total life cost. The more we expanded outward the less they would be able to reduce their total life cost. We could not afford the transportation infrastructure required to continuing expanding out. We could not afford this as a society. We could not afford to have people sprawl outward. He suggested doing the best we could over the next five year with no expansion or a very small expansion.

Susan Lester, Oregon Horsepark Foundation, P.O. Box 539, Boring, OR 97009 read her letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting and in the decision record of these resolutions (091897c-06). She had written questions, which she responded to orally. These were as follows: 1) How many acres in the proposed expansion are farms and farmable lands? She responded, that all the Metro staff had done was to look at taxing tables for EFU categories, this was not the truth of that statistic. 2) How many acres in the proposed expansion areas are forested lands? She responded that she knew that Metro staff did not know this answer because she had met with them several hours over a year ago and they could not separate the forest figure from the farm figure. 3) How much revenue will be lost to the region by urbanizing those farm land acres, now and 20 years in the future? She responded that there was plenty of data to show what it costs when you plow up an acre of farmland, what it costs in the cost of living index and the cost to the economy. These figures are available to the council. 4) What are the demographics of the people who would be displaced from those lands and what will that cost the region? She responded that she had seen no interest from staff in the demographics of the kind of people, what they do for a living, what their patterns are, why they are living there in these rural area that Metro was proposing to change. She would like to see these statistics, she felt that this was an important cost factor.

Steven Foster, 3705 SE Raymond, Portland, OR 97202 said he was a new comer to the Portland area. He, his wife and young child had recently moved here from Phoenix Arizona because of jobs. He understood about urban growth because he was from Phoenix. This was one place where growth was out of control. The Urban Growth Boundary was a great idea and he felt it was working for the region. It would be correct for him to say that one of the reasons this boundary had been implemented was for quality of life. He felt affordable housing was a key part of quality of life. He understood that one of the biggest saving instrument for a family today was the equity in their house. In order for young families today to plan ahead, to have emergency funds, they needed to have equity in their house. There were three indicators which showed him that the Urban Growth Boundary needed to be adjusted, to be expanded, to be brought back in line into balance. These three indicators were that the region had the second least affordable housing in the nation, a statistic created by taking the difference between the average income and the average price of a home. The second indicator showed that these houses were 22% overvalued. The third indicator was his personal experience looking for housing. It was very difficult to find something that was affordable for someone who was just starting out. He and his wife knew that one of the best safety nets in the future was the equity in a house. How many times had people had to draw on the equity in their house to take care of themselves? He said he was not against the Urban Growth Boundary, the constriction of the boundary was a big contribution to the high cost of housing. In the presentation, he had not seen anything about housing costs in the variables. He wanted the council to consider affordable housing.

Presiding Officer Kvistad thanked Mr. Foster and noted that part of what was under consideration was the Housing Needs Analysis.

Howard Erlich, Regional Affordable Housing Advocate as well as Emergency Services Director of the William Temple House, 2023 NW Hoyt, Portland, OR 97209 testified on both a professional and personal basis. He had worked at his job for the past seven years, his colleagues and he had dealt with many of the problems of lower income people, the two biggest problems were specifically employment opportunities and affordable housing. In his seven years in working in northwest Portland he had seen the housing cost spiraled. Seniors and lower income people who used to live in this neighborhood could no longer afford to live there. They had moved out, the area had become upscale, and there were not many affordable places for people of lower income to live. It was very frustrating when one was constantly dealing with people who

couldn't afford housing and couldn't get stable and had no where else to go. It used to be that there were a lot more resources to help people with these problems. A lot of these resources had dried up. The private agencies didn't have the funds to deal with these problems. Many of their clients constantly struggled, lost their homes because they couldn't afford them and became homeless because they were not stable. He strongly encouraged the council to consider options like the inclusionary zoning because he believed builders needed to have an obligation to make sure there was affordable housing when they built. He was not suggesting that the council must limit the urban growth, there needed to be growth opportunities but he felt there should be an obligation to make sure there was affordable housing in a community. In a community you had people in retail and other types of jobs that did not pay well but they needed to be there to serve the community and the neighborhoods. It was a critical tool to make sure that housing stayed affordable. On a personal note he had been in the process of purchasing his first home. He was sorry to say that he had to move to Vancouver because he could not afford to live in Oregon, he was able to find much better housing values in Clark County. There were others who had experienced the same kind of situation. He asked the council to keep this in mind when they decided what was best for the region and the community.

Councilor McLain said that Metro did think a lot about affordable housing. There were three councilors who had been working on affordable housing issues and seminars. On September 29th from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon this seminar would be continuing. She encouraged everyone to join the seminar. She noted that there was a \$15.00 fee but she would be offering five scholarships for the seminar.

Jessica Glenn, Coalition for a Livable Future, 1001 SW Baseline, Hillsboro, OR said that in the context of the Housing Needs Analysis she urged the council to commit itself to improving the affordable housing situation in the region not preventing it from getting any worse. One step in addressing that issue was, when looking at need projections, to include the current need as well as the future need. She urged the council to implement a fair share approach, to take a serious look at the jobs housing balance throughout the region and incorporating an analysis of projected incomes for jobs. It was not enough to look at just what jobs would be available but also to look at how much those jobs were going to be paying and therefore how much people could afford to pay for housing. Additionally, she urged the council to look at the actual need rather than relying on current development patterns. If all projections for the future were based on current development patterns, it would do nothing to reduce traffic congestion or to address current housing inequities between jurisdictions. In talking about a fair share of affordable housing, we needed to remember that we were talking about housing for people who provided a real services to our communities, nurses, teachers, bus drivers. She noted the changes occurring in the neighborhoods, appreciating the fear of change in the character of ones neighborhood but also felt that it was really important to realize that we were talking about people who provided vital services to us. Without them, our communities could not function, therefore, those people had a right to live in the communities where they worked and contributed much of their life and energy. In regards to discussion about the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary, the argument that if we brought more land in, housing prices would go down, she had a concern about that. There were absolutely no guarantees that the housing that was built on that additional land would be affordable. In regards to that, she urged the council to put policies in place that would assure that there was affordable housing built on that land. Inclusionary zoning and a wide range of tools could be implemented to support affordable housing. She felt it was critical to put policies in place that ensured that affordable housing would be developed not just relying on the fact that if we had more land there would be obviously more affordable housing. We could not just rely on the fact that if we had more land, there would be more affordable housing. We needed to guarantee that affordable housing happened. If we brought a great deal of land in at this point we

would not be encouraging communities to focus on redevelopment. Therefore, this would continue patterns where additional land would need to be brought in in the future. She urged the council to keep a compact area so that we could focus on reinvestment in existing neighborhoods. She reminded the council of the tools that the Coalition was proposing, the inclusionary zoning, the replacement ordinance and the permanent affordability. All of these could make a significant difference in the region. She believed that the council had a unique opportunity to make a significant contribution to affordable housing in this region. She urged the council to do this. She also submitted written testimony on behalf of Leon Laptook, the Deputy Director of the Community Action Organization. His comments were in support of the work of the Coalition. She commended the council on all of the work they were doing.

Shanna Eller, Regional Affordable Housing Advocates, 434 SW 3rd Suite 300 Portland, OR asked what was the capacity inside the Urban Growth Boundary, a critical issue was to determine our ability to adequately house all members of our community within that area. She was here representing a group of individuals and organizations known as the Regional Affordable Housing Advocates who believe that a very small if any amount of additional land would be necessary if affordable well designed housing was ensured throughout the region. They believed that three broad strategies must be pursued in order to improve the match between the housing stock and the needs of the community. First, existing affordable housing must be preserved. Second, the private market must be encouraged to serve a larger segment of our community numbers. Third, housing developed with public subsidies must be permanently affordable. Metro had the opportunity now to increase not only the capacity of the land currently within the Urban Growth Boundary but increase the livability of our region by adopting strong multifaceted housing policies in the upcoming Regional Framework Plan that ensured a match both in terms of cost and location between our housing, people, the places they work, live and play.

Kate Bowie, Regional Affordable Housing Advocates 3860 SE Woodward #2, Portland, OR 97202. She was also a social worker by profession working with homeless and low income families in southwest Portland. The lack of affordable housing in our region had made her caseload very heavy. It was the greatest obstacle she believed that her clients faced. She urged the council to understand the need for affordable housing on a regional level. She urged the council to adopt policies that would ensure affordable housing on a regional level including inclusionary zoning as many had mentioned. Inclusionary zoning had worked very well in places as diverse as Maryland and California. Mandatory inclusionary zoning would create stable mixed income communities. Inclusionary zoning asked private housing developers to step up and build housing for moderate income families. It also included permanent affordability in exchange for public subsidies. She felt this was very important, she saw this every day. The lack of federal dollars had been a big strain on her agency and she thought that we should ensure that any money that was brought on the table was made permanent. The Affordable Housing Advocates wanted to make sure that there was enough affordable housing for all citizens in the region. She also asked the council to consider a replacement housing ordinance because the region couldn't afford to lose anymore affordable housing units. Developers and landlords must help replace any affordable housing units lost due to their activities. She urged the council not to assume that the expansion of the UGB meant an automatic increase of affordable housing. There was no guarantee that developers would not continue to build large houses that were unaffordable to many people. She asked Council to please be careful when expanding the UGB.

Denny Krause, East Metro Association of Realtors, 1550 NW Eastman Parkway Suite 200, Gresham, OR 97030 asked if the councilors who did not attend, would they be reviewing the testimony? He thanked those councilors that were at the public hearing for attending. Primarily the Realtors Association wished to speak to the area of affordability and how some of the

calculations in some of the areas effected that issue. First, realtors more than any other group of people with the exception of doctors and social workers, knew everything about the people that they came in contact with that they served as clients and customers. They knew about finances and family situations. One of the things that was important for the public and the council to know was that as a realtor community in the east county, there were very few people that wanted to be able to be on small properties or row houses. Most of the public that the realtors served wanted to be able to escape a bit from that, to escape from the higher densities, to be able to have an opportunity to be more than four feet away from the next house. He wanted the council to understand that while there may be many who look for the higher density, many don't want this. He could not remember the last time he had been asked about a small lot with some exceptions such as seniors. The realtors also had to turn away a lot of people because of the inaffordability of housing. The statistics that his coalition had put together noted that about 50% of the population was looking for about 2% of the housing. In the Gresham area, the percentage was 50% looking for about 3 to 4% of the housing. The realtors were unable to help. He underscored that the people the realtors work with such as the builders and developers would like to earn money too. For the most part, his experience had been that the builders and developers were making much less than they had in the past simply because they had to make a product that would be bought. It was hard to do this with the prices of land as they existed today. Trying to make a \$100,000 house work included \$50,000 for the lot, \$10,000 on permit and system development fees, leaving about \$40,000 for the cost of materials. This would build about an 800 square foot house. There was no profit left over for the builder. They felt that the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary should be at least at the level that the Business Advisory Group mentioned. If there was error in anyway, it should be on that side. The realtors felt that the market would make up for any mistakes that may have been made. There would not be any more affordable land by keeping in the direction that the Council was going. If the Council expanded the boundary, it may not help the affordable housing issue but it certainly could not hurt it. They also wanted to indicate that there was a difference between subsidized housing and affordable housing and they wished to do anything they could to help both issues. They believed that affordable housing was being addressed not subsidized housing. They would be there to help and look for solutions. He asked those realtors who were at the public hearing to stand to show their support.

Wendie Kellington, spoke on behalf of Halton Company and Ted and Boni Halton, 1211 SW 5th #1700, Portland, OR 97204. Metro had done a very hard and good job of coming up with a report of the amount of land that the region as a whole would need in order to meet its various and confusing state laws as well as local laws in which it operated. Ms. Kellington had lingering concerns about an additional factor that they would like to see in the Urban Growth Report and the Housing Needs Analysis, some sort of a measure that took a look not just how much housing and land the region needed as a whole but also where it needed it. The goal 10 question, the needed housing question and the RUGGOs question were where do we need the land in order to create housing that was near jobs, that allowed the workers at the carpet store in downtown Lake Oswego to live near their homes instead of having to commute long distances. One of the fastest growing transportation corridors in the region was between McMinnville and Portland. She felt that we needed to be mindful of that RUGGOs requirements that we take a hard look at where we were driving the growth. Were we really providing growth in our Urban Growth Report and Housing Needs Analysis in the places where it was needed the greatest. She urged the council to think about if the council had the luxury of being conservative in their estimates of Urban Growth Boundary areas then they were also sending a bit of a message about what was really important. While it may be true that there were some jurisdictions that were working very hard on increasing their densities, there were a whole lot of jurisdictions that weren't working on this. The majority of jurisdictions were not working on density. It was not fair to ask the cities of Beaverton and Gresham to take the growth of cities who had refused to increase their densities and were just

about out of land and were unable to do so. It was just not fair. It asked the average wage earner and the jurisdiction of Gresham and otherwise to bear a higher cost for the region than their fair share in terms of public infrastructure. It asked the region not to utilize existing infrastructure that was planned for higher density that was being underutilized. It was a poor amortization of public investment.

She also urged the council to be careful about the people who would ask the council to have arbitrary reduction in factors that make a political statement about holding the line. She suggested the council make a political statement that the council would provide an adequate quantum of land to provide for a variety of housing types and income ranges for a variety of people to support a compact urban form and allow those people to live and work in their same communities. This would err on the side of having performance measures that directed growth in particular areas where it was needed the greatest. She also urged caution in talking about potential double counting of land. She noted the comment earlier that the land in the UGB that would come in at 10 units per acre would also be potentially available for redevelopment. She suggested that if it had already come in at 10 units per acre one could not assume it would redevelop further and to do so would err on the side of making the political statement that was nice to make but not very achievable. In closing, she really agreed with the livable objectives, the compact urban form objectives, the objectives of living close to where you work, but she thought that in order to get there it had to be realistic. Stable housing prices needed to be provided and that had to be somewhat responsive to supply and demand. Not even the Lincoln Policy Institute would say that an urban growth boundary had nothing to do with housing prices. It recognized that it did. The way to avoid problems with that would be to have said it in a manner that assured higher densities within that urban growth boundary. The problem was that we already set out boundary 20 years ago and we had run up against it. Consequently, the region had what she thought the Lincoln Study would predict, high prices. Next time when the boundary was expanded, there ought to be enough room on areas that were able to be master planned, large enough parcels of land, in order to do it right this time. She thought we could but thought Metro would have to go out and go out a ways, probably more than what was being discussed. She did not know if this was political feasible but she felt it was the right thing to do given the land use context in which this particular State operated.

Tad Everhart, 4416 SE Morrison, Portland, OR 97215 said that he owned a small construction company. In the last five years he and his brother had built about 35 homes, about half had been on 5000 square foot lots or smaller, about half had been on 2500 square foot lots or smaller. They had gone out, driven around neighborhoods and found lots and developed them. They specialized in infill lots. He said that he wanted to be on the record as one builder who believed that the council should go very slowly in expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. His company had made excellent profits in buying raw land and developing it. He was sure that developers and builder earned their keeps and that everyone needed to earn a living. However, he believed in the past with very cheap raw land some builders and developers had made what he believed to be obscene profits. He thought that we could not let huge obscene profits detract from the livability of the areas that was already part of the Urban Growth Boundary. Another reason for going slowly was that the region's economy was in a boom cycle now. Living in Oregon we knew that would not always be the case. We could not ever go back from expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. Once the UGB was opened up there would be houses there. The forecast that the Council was basing their decision about the boundary on may be wrong or the economy may not expand nearly as fast as the forecast reasonably assumed that it would. This was the best argument for going slowly. Waiting two to three years before enlarging the boundary more than 3000 to 4000 acres. He cautioned and asked the council as a citizen, builder and developer to go slowly. This nation, especially on the east coast, was covered with urban areas with burned out, deserted,

underutilized hearts with huge suburbs that ring them almost like a castle with a rotted core. In the City of Portland, we saw this already happening, there were some fairly thriving areas such as West Linn, Lake Oswego, Tigard, cities that did not even exist 20 to 30 years ago. And yet, some of the oldest neighborhoods desperately needed the pressure of the Urban Growth Boundary to make them affordable. He had often thought that north Portland would be a wonderful place not to yuppify but to redevelop with more low, medium and high cost housing in the neighborhoods. As a builder and developer, he saw large lots, often times half a lot was vacant. If the Urban Growth Boundary was opened up all the ingenuity and creativity that had builders and developers had been forced to employ to deal with the relative scarcity of land would go out the window. They would go for the easy fast developable land that the council would be providing with expansion of the UGB. By putting pressure on developers and builders the council was making them be creative and making them go into the neighborhoods to see what could be done to make a product that was affordable and fit with the neighborhoods. He encouraged the council to go slowly.

Abby Kennedy, 1226 NE 73rd, Portland, OR was resident of Portland for the last three years, prior to this she lived in Benton County in Corvallis for sixteen years, a county which had greenbelt areas. Prior to that she spent most of her life on the east coast in New Jersey. She came to Portland because she had a good job. She had a goal of having a house. She was a program director for Senior Services. She felt that she had a pretty good job, when she came to the region she looked for a home in the Gresham area. She could not find a home to buy in Gresham but found a home in Portland, a 1912 vintage home, fixer upper for \$86,000 on a 200 square foot lot. It would be impossible to buy now and it had only been two years since she purchased this home. It concerned her that she paid over 50% of her monthly income on housing costs. That scared her. It made her feel like she did not make enough money to live when really the housing costs were too much. That was a goal she set, to have a home, something she could leave to her kids and to have some stability. She felt it was an American right to have a home if you could afford one. It made her scared to think that the people in their twenties could not have a home and may always have to move and not have a neighborhood. Right now her neighborhood included a senior couple, a grandmother raising her grandchild, a family with three kids, a couple of fifty year olds. It was a great neighborhood. This would not exist anymore if we didn't do something about making neighborhoods affordable for all people, all ages, all incomes. The best goals we could give each other was the ability to interrelate with mixed income people, mixed races and mixed professions. She felt so blessed that she found that kind of house in that kind of neighborhood. She was very concerned that the quality life, where you knew your neighbors, would be lost. Did this exist in the suburbs. She only had three miles to go to work, she could use public transit if needed. Sometimes we got caught up in goals and measure but forgot what we were really doing, we were talking about people, all different people that still needed a roof over their head, whether it be a 3000 square foot home where they spend 2 hours commuting or a home such as hers. We needed to look at everyone's needs and make it work for everyone. She asked the council to think about this question, how many of those in this room paid 30% of our income for housing and utilities, 50% of our income for housing and utilities or 80% of income for housing and utilities. She said if you think about someone spending 80% of their income on housing and utilities there was something wrong here.

Councilor McLain said that there were times where you ask questions that the council would like to answer, however, due to the forum of the listening posts style, they did not want to break in. If anyone had questions, she encouraged them to call the council or the staff.

Councilor Washington thanked the public for being at the public hearing. He was one of those councilors who had been working on the issue of affordable housing. For him there was an

interrelation that had to happen. It had to be between those who were advocating, you must relate to the builders, the realtors and they to you. The Council sets the policy but this would be the only way that this issue would be resolved. He did not have an answer but we needed everyone around the table together to resolve the affordable housing issue, it was all of our responsibility to talk to and with each other.

Councilor Naito thanked all who had participated. She commended all of the speakers at these public hearings. The level of discussion had been a very civil one. As a public official she really appreciated that level of discussion.

Presiding Officer Kvistad thanked John Donovan, Carol Krigger and John Fregonese from the Growth Management Department as well as Jeff Stone, Chris Billington, Suzanne Myers, Beth Anne Steele, Emily Kaplan and Lee Wernsing.

Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

11. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
091897c-01	9/1/97	Urban Growth Report and Urban Reserves	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bruce Powell President Beavercreek CPO P O Box 587 Beavercreek OR 97004	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897-02	9/11/97	Urban Growth Report and Urban Reserves	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michael and Cynthia Kruger 17424 SE McKinley Portland OR 97236	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-03	9/13/97	Council ad to Oregonian concerning	TO: Oregonian FROM: Council	Resolution No. 97-2550

091897c-04	9/5/97	notice of public hearings Letter to Council on urban growth boundary	Outreach Office TO: Metro Councilor FROM: Dale Richards and Heather Adams 12655 SW North Dakota Tigard OR 97223	Resolution No. 97-2559 Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-05	9/18/97	Letter to Council on Urban Growth Report - no expansion of the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mary Kyle McCurdy Staff Attorney 1000 Friends of Oregon 534 SW Third Ave Suite 300 Portland OR 97204	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-06	no date	Letter titled Citizen Testimony to Metro by Susan Lester	TO: Metro Council FROM: Susan Lester P O Box 539 Boring, OR 97009	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-07	9/18/97	Letter on Affordable Housing	TO: Metro Council FROM: Leeanne MacColl, President, League of Women Voters of the Columbia River Region	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-08	9/18/97	Letter on Urban Growth Report and Housing Needs Analysis	TO: Metro Council FROM: Schweizer Dairy Lee and Charlene Schweizer 16109 SE Highway 212 Clackamas OR 97015	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-09	9/18/97	Letter from Tony Cargill concerning Urban Growth Report and Housing Needs	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tony Cargill Sterling	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559

		Analysis	Equities Inc 13150 SE Winston Rd Boring OR 97009	
091897c-10	9/18/97	Housing Needs Analysis letter	TO: Metro Council FROM: Leon Laptook, Deputy Director Community Action Organization 1001 SW Baseline St Hillsboro OR 97123	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-11	9/16/97	letter requesting reconsideration of allowing 162nd and Hwy 212 to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mike Newcomb 14500 SE 162nd Ave Portland OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-12	9/18/97	Urban Growth Report statistics	TO: Metro Council FROM: M. Scott Jones 3508 SE Madison Portland OR 97214	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-13	9/16/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Don and Dena Bowlin 14850 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-14	9/17/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: R.D. Austin 14400 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-15	9/18/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: K.F. and Sherry Huck 14401 SE 162nd	Urban Reserves

091897c-16	9/17/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	Clackamas OR 97015 TO: Metro Council FROM: R. Tim and Dixie Lincoln 14788 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-17	9/17/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Don and Ellen Scamster 14816 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-18	9/17/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Nick and Judy Watson 14770 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-19	9/17/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Betty Gerhardus 14941 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-20	9/18/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council From: M. Harrington 15020 SE 162nd Clackamas OR 97015	Urban Reserves
091897c-21	9/18/97	Letter requesting reconsideration of Hwy 212 and 162nd to be Tier 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Donal and Janet Pedersen 15951 SE Hwy 212 Clackamas OR 97012	Urban Reserves
091897c-22	9/22/97	Article from Daily Journal of Commerce concerning Ag group wants to hold land-use	TO: Metro Council FROM: Linda Lanham Daily	Urban growth boundary

		line	Journal of Commerce	
091897c-23	9/22/97	Article from Daily Journal of Commerce concerning Metro Survey: Keep Growth Boundary Intact	TO: Metro Council FROM: Linda Lanham Daily Journal of Commerce	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-24	9/22/97	Letter to council concerning holding the urban growth boundary and affordable housing	TO: Metro Council FROM: Nick Sauvie Executive Director Rose Community Development Corp 7211 SE 62nd Ave Portland OR 97206	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-25	9/18/97	Memo to council from John Fregonese concerning Growth Managemen Survey results	TO: Metro Council FROM: John Fregonese Director of Growth Management Services	Growth Management Survey
091897c-26	9/18/97	Copies of slide presentation on Metro's Growth management survey 1997 Public Involvement Outreach Effort	TO: Metro Council FROM: Growth Management Services Department	Growth Management Survey
091897c-27	7/14/96	LOTI	TO: Oregonian FROM: Art Lewellyn 2305 SE 8th #9 Portland, OR 97202	
091897-28	9/22/97	Letter to council recommending - do not expand the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Elizabeth A Graser-Lindsey 21341 S Ferguson Rd Beavercreek OR 97004	Urban Reserves and Urban Growth Boundary
091897c-29	9/19/97	Letter to Councilor	TO: Councilor	Resolution No.

		McLain concerning affordable housing	Susan McLain FROM: Norma Day 715 SW Viewmont Dr. Portland OR 97225	97-2559
091897c-30	9/22/97	Letter to Council density, UGB.	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dave Moses no address listed	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-31	9/24/97	Letter to Council concerning expansion of the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Beaverton Chamber of Commerce 4800 SW Griffith Dr. Suite 100 Beaverton OR 97005	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-32	9/22/97	Letter to Council from Portland Representative's to MPAC concerning adoption of the Urban Growth Report	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jim Francesconi and Charlie Hales Commissioners City of Portland Bureau of Planning 1120 SW 5th Room 1002 Portland OR 97204	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-33	9/18/97	Letter concerning including more land in the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jill Fuglister no address listed FAX 235-5614 Phone 235-3962	
091897c-34	9/20/97	Oregonian ad noticing the council deliberations on Res. No. 97-2550 and Res. No. 97-2559	TO: Oregonian FROM: Metro Council Outreach	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-35	9/27/97	Oregonian ad noticing the council deliberations on Res. No. 97-2550 and Res.	TO: Oregonian FROM: Metro Council Outreach	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559

091897c-36	9/25/97	No. 97-2559 Memo concerning M. Scott Jones Editorial and Letter	TO: Jon Kvistad and Metro Council FROM: John Fregonese Director Growth Management	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-37	9/24/97	Memo concerning response to written testimony from 1,000 Friends of Oregon	TO: Jon Kvistad and Metro Council FROM: John Fregonese Director Growth Management	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-38	9/26/97	Letter concerning Urban Growth Report and preferred outcome for the urban growth boundary expansion decision	TO: Jon Kvistad and Metro Council FROM: Mary Tobias President and CEO Tualatin Valley Economic Development Corp 10200 SW Nimbus Ave Suite G3 Tigard OR 97223	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-39	9/25/97	Letter on affordable housing policies in the regional framework plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Peter Keyes Associate Professor University of Oregon School of Architecture and Allied Arts 722 SW 2nd Ave Portland OR 97204	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-40	9/25/97	Letter on urban growth boundary action	TO: Metro Council FROM: Steven R Schell Chairman Growth Management Committee Office of Mayor City of Portland 1220 SW 5th	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559

091897c-41	9/25/97	letter concerning housing needs analysis and fair share approach	Ave Rm 303 Portland OR 97204 TO: Metro Council FROM: Anita Rodgers Co-Director Community Alliance of Tenants 2710 NE 14th Ave Portland OR 97212	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-42	9/26/97	Letter concerning urban growth report	TO: Metro Council FROM: Christopher Juniper 5824 NE Flanders St Portland OR 97213	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-43	9/26/97	Letter concerning Urban Growth Report and Housing Needs Analysis	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mark Whitlow Bogle and Gates 1400 KOIN Center 222 SW Columbia Portland OR 97201	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-44	9/26/97	comments on urban growth report and housing needs analysis	TO: Metro Council FROM: Wendie Kellington Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt no address listed	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-45	9/26/97	Urban Growth Report - error, page BL-32	TO: Chris Billington, Clerk of the Council FROM: Carol Krigger, Growth Management Services	Resolution No. 97-2550

091897c-46	9/26/97	2040 Growth Management Hotline: Metro's Growth Management Survey May to mid-September 1997	TO: Metro Council FROM: 2040 Growth Management Hotline	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-47	9/26/97	2040 Growth Management Hotline: 9/15/97 - 9/17/97	TO: Metro Council FROM: 2040 Growth Management Hotline	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-48	9/26/97	Growth Management Hotline 9/17 - 9/19/97	TO: Metro Council FROM: 2040 Growth Management Hotline	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-49	9/26/97	Growth Management Hotline 9/17 - 9/23/97	TO: Metro Council FROM: 2040 Growth Management Hotline	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897c-50	9/26/97	Letter supporting 10,000 acre expansion of UGB	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Robin O. White, CAE, CREEC, 1211 SW 5th, Portland, OR 97204	Resolution No. 97-2550
091897C-51	9/25/97	Letter concerning Urban Growth Report Housing Needs Analysis and Urban Growth Boundary expansion	TO: Jon Kvistad and Metro Council FROM: Edward Halton and Mark Fahey The Halton Company Presiding Officer Box 3377 Portland OR 97208	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-52	9/26/97	Letter in support of adopting the Urban Growth Report	TO: Metro Council FROM: Loretta Pickerell President Sensible Transportation	Resolution No. 97-2550

091897c-53	9/26/97	Growth Management Hotline Responses to Homebuilders Realtors Campaign	Options for People 1504 SW 116th #202B Tigard OR 97224 TO: Mike Burton Executive Officer FROM: John Fregonese Growth Management Services Dept	Resolution No. 97-2559
091897c-54	9/25/97	Urban Growth Boundary Planning and Processes and Decision Can Be More Credible September 1997 Office of the Auditor	TO: Metro Council FROM: Alexis Dow Metro Auditor	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559