

# MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

October 2, 1997

Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent:

**Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad** called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

None

## 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

**Kelly Ross, Home Builders Association**, spoke in support of the Council, the Growth Management Department in reference to the Auditor's report on the Growth Management processes. He felt everyone had done an excellent job.

**Doug Bollam**, PO Box 1944 Lake Oswego, OR 97035 commented on the Auditor's report in reference to the Growth Management Department. He believed that one of the problems lie in the fact that the citizens do not believe the fact that the process was working if they read what was written in the paper. If citizens infuse themselves into the process and understood the process they would recognize that the work that Metro and the Growth Management Department specifically had done both in the past and currently was something that generations to come could be very proud of. He said there were some complex issues, there was not always a right or wrong. Council must make a decision regardless. He felt that Mr. Fregonese had done an excellent job in trying to maintain balance, sometimes erring on the side of caution and doing the right thing. He also felt that the Growth Management Committee and Susan McLain had put endless hours into WRPAC trying to make the watersheds of the area better for all citizens. In his experience the citizens of the region could be proud of the good job that Mr. Fregonese and Mr. Burton had done. The citizens must understand that this was not an easy process. There was always need for improvement, the auditor's report noted some of these recommendations. He felt that the Council had done a very good job, noting Councilor Washington particularly.

**Art Lewellyn, LOTI Designer**, 3205 SE 8th #9, Portland OR 97202 was involved in the light rail planning of this region. He had been promoting an alignment for the north south light rail that reintroduced the functional benefits of including the east bank alignment in the planning process at this time. He had refined the details, the growth patterns and brought these recommendations to Metro. He was convinced that the east bank alignment must be included on the light rail planning and reanalyzed as a significant way to rebuild support for the light rail. He felt that the alignment of the south north plan had ruined the planning process. His plan included putting a electric bus on the mall to preserve the mall and add to it without great cost as well as adding the streetcar across the Hawthorne Bridge the light rail to the central city improving that system. He was a supporter of light rail. He was glad that the process had continued but was not happy that it had

not included the restudy of the east bank alignment. He felt the LOTI Plan was a good way to develop the plan.

### 3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

### 4. URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY PLANNING PROCESSES AND DECISIONS

**Alexis Dow, Metro Auditor**, said she appreciated the opportunity to present her report. She was glad that the report had generated wide spread support for Metro and its planning processes. Those that had worked with her on this report were Joe Gibbons (part of the Auditor's office) and LaMar White (a contract auditor). The report addressed their review of the Growth Management Services Department's planning process which related to Metro's determination of the size of the Urban Growth Boundary. She emphasized, for the purpose of the audit, the focus on staff processes, not Council processes. The review was done as part of the annual audit plan. This was consistent with the Metro Charter requiring the Auditor to make continuous investigations into Metro's operations. They conducted their audit in accordance with general accepted government auditing standards, the standards which regulate their profession. As with all audits Ms Dow performed, she took these audits very seriously, particularly for Growth Management because it was such a sensitive issue at this time. Also obvious was that audits were conducted with a lot of hindsight, true of this audit as well. The auditor's office looked back over what had happened in the last five years, specifically in the development of the two specific growth reports. Because the auditor used hindsight, they must project into the future, the goal was to improve things in the future. She emphasized that the recommendations being made were future oriented, future focused. She noted the press coverage and discussion as to the contents of the report. She noted the Executive Summary which summarized the key points of the report. She focused on her findings and the recommendations built on those findings. Metro's Urban Growth Management effort and accomplishment were the envy of many urban planning organizations, the conceptualizing, developing and implementing of the 2040 Growth Concepts was a unique undertaking. Land use experts regarded Metro's planning efforts and accomplishments as examples of leading edge planning and the most sophisticated of its kind. The planning processes involved arduous work while evaluating conceptual and factual issues. The processes were a complex combination of art, science, professional judgment and policy determination. In the last five years, Metro had made significant strides in its growth planning efforts. The 2040 growth planning model was one of a kind. This model, its related detailed steps, and working with the variable was designed to assist the Council in making UGB and related decisions.

Based on the Auditor's look back at these processes, they had come up with recommendations that would enhance what was currently happening, they were building blocks. The recommendations were 1) peer review groups to review capacity data sources, assumptions, methodologies, and analyses. These peer groups should include people with high degrees of technical abilities and recognized experts in geographic information systems, data collection, land use and economics. It was also important that these individuals be independent and not have a vested interest in the outcome of the UGB decision. 2) When there was a range of accepted uncertainty in the evidence or the projection it should be clearly and fully discussed. The projections, forecasts and assumptions that contained a range of acceptable outcomes should be discussed in terms of their potential outcomes related to the UGB decision. The documentation of the uncertainty, ranges and the discussion should be widely disseminated. The information gathered from these first three steps could be used to help defuse some of the contentiousness that has surrounded this process. One of the steps that would take the Council in this direction was the

use of the Functional Plan performance measures, providing an important feedback loop so the Council could see how well the plan was working. In summary, the Auditor's Office undertook this review with a sincere hope that the processes that were working could be improved for a better all around Metro and Metro area environment.

In the response to this report, the Executive Officer did accept the recommendations and had agreed to implement them. The Auditor believed by implementing these recommendations the process would become that much stronger. They recognized that the decision boiled down to one number and that decision was made by the Metro Council. It was the staff related processes of getting to that number that this audit covered.

**Councilor Naito**, had prepared a memo to the Auditor (a copy of this is included in the permanent record of this meeting) which she passed out to the council. She noted that one of the key issues which she did not accept was the theme that Growth Management Department should do a better job of identifying the stakeholders, that these stakeholders should try to reach consensus and this was the ultimate goal that Metro should be trying to achieve. She felt this was a very dangerous proposal to put forward, which was not to say that consensus was not a great thing. But in terms of stakeholders, those were her constituents, they were all the people that Councilor Naito represented and not just the people that showed up and testified at Metro. She felt that the true stakeholders that Metro was trying to reach was the public. The Growth Management Department had done an incredible job with the survey that had just been completed in soliciting comments, in the workshops, and inviting the public to come and be involved. She added that if they didn't choose to be involved did not mean that they were not interested in the outcome of this process. They might simply inform Councilor Naito about their opinions. She did not want to let it come out that Metro was operating our government in terms of identifying a few key people who had an interest or who were involved, sending them out to reach consensus and that was where Metro was going. This might not be the best possible planning for the region. She felt that it was important to point out who the true stakeholders were, the public.

She came to the defense of the Growth Management Services Department. In all of the time she had been at Metro she had never heard the Growth Management Department present the Urban Growth Report or any other document dealing with projections in anything other way than couching it in terms of, these were our best guess, this was a range. She noted that the report indicated that it clearly specified that there was a range and that those numbers were projections. She felt that the assertion that the Growth Management Department was not doing that was not true. She did not feel that the Auditor's report warranted that conclusion. She felt that the Growth Management Department was doing an excellent job with a difficult issue which was to project the future. She did think that Metro was recognized around the country as doing innovative work with one of the foremost land use planners in the county, John Fregonese. Metro was very fortunate to have him. She also found that staff did an excellent job.

**Ms. Dow** said with respect to two of the points that Councilor Naito made in terms of consensus and stakeholders, she thought that the primary emphasis was that the Auditor believed that there could be a wider range of possibilities discussed and that by discussing that wider range of possibilities it would bring about more consensus. The main point of the report was to look at the processes and to indicate that once these changes were made it would bring about better consensus.

**Councilor McLain** commented, first, it was important to understand that the Council always welcomed the audits and always looked for ways to improve the processes. The staff appreciated any effort made by the auditors to demonstrate or show them something that could improve that

process. Those things that could be garnished out of the recommendations would be implemented. Secondly, it was important in looking at an audit it was helpful that the Council point out to the auditing staff what was not helpful as a councilor. There was a memo from Mike Burton about the audit report on the Urban Growth process, the last part of this letter noted what was not helpful about the audit. What was dismissed was the standards that the Council must go by which was state law and the 2040 Growth Concept which was what built the review of the Urban Growth Boundary. The 2040 Growth Concept and the Future Vision document where the consensus was built was based on what the Council's values were and what they believed were the items that they would not trade off in livability in this region. Those were the values that the Council agreed as a community of 24 cities and three counties to address and go by in any assessment of the Urban Growth Boundary or of the Urban Growth Report. The Executive Officer pointed out that on page 19 of the audit, the Auditor was establishing planning standards after Metro had completed several years of complex Urban Growth Boundary related processes. The audit then listed three standards, uncertainty should be recognized, outcomes with several projections and forecasts should be discussed and interested stakeholders should be heard and their views considered. All of the letters which Councilor McLain had received since the report came out and her own knowledge of seven years worth of this work supported her belief that Metro had done those things. As Mr. Burton said, it was his belief that at the Council's direction, the processes did these things. But for the processes to become a standard, there must be measurable types of standards and the audit did not offer to the degree of certainty what those measurable tools were. Being audited using subjective standards developed after the fact did not assist Metro or the Council. Therefore Mr. Burton made an additional recommendation to those proposed by the auditor regarding the future growth projections, that the audit standards be set before the works started, not after it was completed, that the audit standards should be well publicized and known to the staff members responsible for the work before the start of the project and that the audit standards should be objective, measurable, and not subjective. Councilor McLain felt that if the audit followed the Council's own recommendations for staff that the auditor would find that the Council had more to take from the audit and from the recommendations. In reference to the performance measures that had been being worked on for the Urban Growth Boundary review on how Metro was doing and how they would do in the future, she welcomed the auditor come to those committees because much of what had been recommended in the audit in the way of performance measures was being done. The committees were about six months into the work and it would take about 7 to 8 months more to finish that work.

**Ms. Dow** responded by saying that Councilor McLain had talked about a disregard for the 2040 Growth Concept and state law, a dissatisfaction with the way the audit progressed and establishing standards for the audit. There were standards for the audit, those were met, there were professional standards. Her own office would be subject to a peer review in accordance with their professional standards, she felt they would pass with flying colors. The auditor did not ignore the 2040 Growth Concept nor state law. They looked at what was happening, they spoke to professional in the field from around the county to say, this was what was happening how could we make it better. What they walked away with were the three recommendations, which there had been no disagreement on. The auditor was happy to facilitate and improve the long term accomplishment of Metro and to work with staff and the Council to fulfill their role as the auditor of doing investigations into the operations here at Metro. It was incumbent upon her in her role as auditor to look into all of the operations. She tried to do this on a cyclical basis. This was the first time she had been in Growth Management, she attempted to look at that item or those areas that she thought were most relevant to the agency at this time. Her goal was to come out with positive recommendations to assist the agency in its work. She believed she had met that goal. She had also gotten the acceptance of the Executive Officer on the recommendation and a commitment

from staff to go forward. If there had been any misunderstanding, hard feelings, or disgruntlement about what happened between when the audit was started and the end result she could only say that she and her staff did their best to do their job and to do it in as amicable fashion as possible. Her office had existed for two and a half years and they had worked very hard to maintain good relations with the auditees. She admitted that she and her staff were human and they were not successful one hundred percent of the time. She heard Councilor McLain's concerns and she would respond likewise in future audits to accommodate any concerns that the Council had.

**Councilor Morissette** felt that the auditors had done a great job. There was a lot of pressure in doing this work, sometimes it was not the most pleasant thing to point out where Metro hadn't done as good as they could have done. He felt that this audit did this and he felt that Ms. Dow and her staff should be commended for that. He suggested that the Council spend time with 2040 Means Business members. When their report came out very few people wanted to spend a whole lot of time talking about the audit. They felt as partners that some of their concerns were not brought forward. Wally Hobson hired by the Executive to go through and check some of Metro's own numbers. Some of the very assumptions were discounted, he did not know what was going on. He felt that the Growth Management Department had worked very hard and were good people. But if someone had been checking his work and told him that he wasn't doing a very good job, he might be a little frustrated or if the conclusion had not gone the way he anticipated he might be concerned. He did not think the audit was an overall condemnation of the Growth Management Department, quite to the contrary. The Auditor had pointed out a lot of good things that had been done and areas that needed to be improved. Councilor Morissette thought that the Auditor's Office had done a good job, he thanked Ms. Dow.

**Councilor McCaig** commented that no one liked to be audited. At the same time, she took to heart the criticism as one of the conclusions that the Auditor reached was the need and the desire to reduce some of the unnecessary controversy and confusion about the process and what Metro was undertaking. She said this was a great goal and the Auditor's recommendations went far in addressing some of these issues. She felt that it was important to note that the Auditor's report did use Metro, Metro staff and Metro official interchangeably, she felt that in the next audit that there was a need for a clearer discussion where the roles and responsibilities of the Executive, the staff and the Council. They were different entities with different responsibilities. In this report those got interwoven in several places which made it somewhat confusing. Secondly, there obviously was some controversy about the audit. She felt that the audit was an important thing to undertake. It was her hope there would be more discussion. On a performance review or audit she suggested that it contain a list of those individuals that were interviewed. She felt that it could add or diminish credibility that there was no awareness of who the auditor talked to. She felt it might be helpful if a list of individuals that were interviewed could be included in the audit. Lastly, the piece that was the most concern to Councilor McCaig was the timing of the audit. She genuinely believed that the auditor's goals were to do this in a manner in which it was productive for the Council, the public and for the department staff to be able to use the results in a way to make the process better with the Urban Growth Report. Having it come out in this time frame the same day that the Urban Growth Report was being discussed, made this difficult. She suggested that it should have been significantly before or after where the direction had been established. It was her hope that the timing would be worked through so it would be more helpful.

**Joe Gibbons**, with the Auditor's Office, said that, on the issue of timing, he would like to give his personal assurance that this was an unhappy coincidence. The rough draft was prepared in July 1997. The Auditor's Office had been working intensely with the Executive and Growth Management trying to understand each others points on these sensitive issues. It had just evolved itself to this particular point but certainly not by intent.

**Councilor McLain** said because this was a performance audit, it was extremely important that if the Auditor's Office was going to audit something again that there be a measurement. For example, on page 28, the report indicated that the Auditor's Office did not attempt to determine if claims were correct. In asking all three of the auditors involved in the audit, Councilor McLain had asked if there was anything wrong with the forecast of population. The auditors had responded no. She had asked if there was anything wrong with the economic factors for the forecasted population. The auditors responded no. Was there an understanding that there had been changes from the Growth Report 1996 to 1997 because the information had been asked for by the Council? She had gotten a response of yes from the auditors. As far as the issue about the range given on the population, if the range that was given was not wide enough, what would be wide enough. Specifically, why not wide enough? The generalities of the report were disturbing because the Council did not get to have the luxury of being general. The Council must take all of those voices, hear them, analyze them and then come up with a vote and decision. She would think if it was going to be a helpful audit, the Council must have a measurement and why generally speaking that there was something wrong. So far, the Council had heard that those that had been quoted in the report did not find anything wrong with the process which was the only thing that the auditors had reported. If the individuals or groups disagreed with staff they felt that they had been heard by staff and had been given a chance to give that full range of ideas. She felt it was important that the Auditor's Office understood that the Council was looking for a helpful audit, measurements and actually finding out whether something was true or not true was going to be something the Council had to do. It seemed only fair that the Auditor's Office would have to do this too.

**Ms. Dow** said that they did not attempt to evaluate the numbers. What the Council was challenged to do in establishing the Urban Growth Boundary was to look into the future 20 years. It was an educated guess. The auditor did not try to say whose guess was more right or wrong, they auditor looked at the processes for developing them. When you talk about processes, Ms. Dow clarified that the auditor was not just talking about the public forums and meetings, the auditor was looking at the whole thing, how the numbers were generated, what steps staff went through to develop those numbers, they had gone through a lot of steps. Some of the discussion could have been broader and had that discussion occurred some of the people who were disagreeing with some of the decisions in the way that things were being handled by Metro wouldn't be able to have that disagreement because the broader range would have been discussed. The purpose for putting those different illustration in the report was merely to illustrate that there was some disagreement about it and obviously the Council knew this from their own discussions.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** welcomed Ms. Dow to the excitement that was the regional growth debate. He appreciated her restatement that it was the staff work processes and not the Council's decision making that she was auditing. He also appreciated the fact that Ms. Dow and Mr. Burton had come to agreement on some of the improvements that were necessary, he felt that was healthy. Nothing about the growth debate was easy, especially when you step in with both feet. He appreciated what the auditor and her staff had done, whether he agreed or not. His job was to try to make better decisions, that was the Council's job. He thanked Ms. Dow and her staff for all of their hard work.

## 5. MPAC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 Consideration of Metro Council meeting minutes of the September 25, 1997.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt the Metro Council meeting minutes of September 25, 1997.

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

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

## 7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 97-712**, To Adopt the Hearings Officer Findings and Recommendation, Approving Urban Growth Boundary Case 97-1; West Linn.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** noted that this was a quasi-judicial discussion. This was a decision about whether or not to make a change in the Urban Growth Boundary. He noted that this was the time for Council deliberation on that change. The issues had been brought forward at the last meeting. At the end of the discussion and debate, the Council would move to accept, deny or postpone to a further meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 97-712.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** said in looking at the findings in the report she thought that the hearings officer was able to demonstrate that this particular locational adjustment met the UGB Metro Code 3.101.35 in specific areas that included the size of the facility, the orderly economic provision of public facilities, the water, sewage, storm drainage, transportation, park and open space, police services, fire and emergency services, public education, and other services necessary in that criteria. She had no questions about the public and hearings officer comments made in the report, she supported the motion.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** commented that he would be supporting this motion in part because it helped the school district. He added that sometimes the treatment that government gets in the growth debate was different than what the citizen would receive and he thought in this particular situation the Council had an adjustment in the Urban Growth Boundary where the jurisdiction requesting that adjustment also stated that they would not accept any adjustment for citizens but they would like this exemption and change for the school and for these government entities. He would like to keep in mind that what was good for government was also good for real people and he thought they should be treated accordingly over a period of time. He noted that the City of Wilsonville and the school district were in his district, he supported the school district. He felt it was a necessary step for the school district and he would be supporting the motion.

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

7.2 **Ordinance No. 97-706A**, For the Purpose of Amending Ordinance No. 95-625A to Amend the 2040 Growth Concept Map Regarding the Wood Village Town Center.

**Motion:** **Councilor Naito** moved adoption of Ordinance No. 97-706A.

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

**Discussion:**    **Councilor Naito** said this ordinance amended the 2040 Map, it changed 100 acres that was designated as an employment area and made it a mixed use designation identified as the Fairview Wood Village Town Center. There was some dispute between the City of Wood Village and the Multnomah Kennel Club. The parties mediated and resolved the issue. She felt it was a great example of where consensus can allow the Council to move forward and it was also good public policy.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-706A at 2:49 p.m. No one came forward. Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** thanked Councilor McLain, the local jurisdiction and the Metro staff for all of their hard work. They all did a great job.

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

## **8.        COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS**

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

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that invited testimony would be accepted on both Resolution No. 97-2550 and 97-2559.

**Councilor McLain** reviewed that upon discussion of the Council at last week's meeting, the Council had asked for some invited testimony. Mr. John Fregonese, Mr. Kelly Ross, Ms. Mary Kyle McCurdy, and Commissioner Judy Hammerstad were asked to keep their remarks to four minutes. These were people who had brought information to the Council, this was their opportunity to highlight what they wanted the Council to remember about their discussion on the Urban Growth Report. She noted that this was the updated Urban Growth Report that had been brought back to Council by staff. Council had asked staff for particular updates, more information and review. The staff had submitted this update to Council in July 1997, Council was now reviewing the 1997 Urban Growth Report. She said the information the Council should be using was dated 9/9/97, the only difference being Variable 4.

**Mr. John Fregonese**, Growth Management Services Director, said that this document had been discussed for a year and a half with the overall discussion having been over the last five years. This document was the more technical part of it. The Council was within a fairly narrow range of the discussion that was before the Council today in terms of people advocating one point or another. It did not harm us to sit back and look at what they were doing. The forecast for the population of the region was a 40% increase. A 40% increase of the Urban Growth Boundary was 100,000 acres. He spoke in Atlanta recently, which was growing at twice the rate of population growth. Metro was considering between 0 to 10,000 acres, MPAC had recommended 3000 acres, the Business Advisory Committee had recommended 10,000 and the original staff report was at 7,000 acres. It was a fairly narrow range, they were at a fairly high degree of consensus about this range. It was when the final narrow range was focused in on that things could get really exciting. He noted the report that was before Council was very little different than the one before the Council in 1996. The only difference was in estimating the underbuild and Zell factor. There was a slight change that ended up in making about 100 acres in the MPAC recommendation. There was a slight correction in the numbers, the staff had caught an error. He added that it had been a



learning process and he was proud and honored to be the one to be here at the time Metro was doing this process. He thanked many of the critiques because he learned a lot from them, especially Councilor Morissette and Mr. Zell. He felt they had come up with a good process for determining what the best method was. Unfortunately the Council was in the region where analysis would help them no more, they would have to make their decision based on common sense and what sounded right. They had taken it as far as analysis would go. The Council would find arguments on both sides, many times equally probable. From this point on, it would be pure policy.

**Councilor Morissette** asked about the assumption on Variable 7 Farm Assessed Value where we used 100% of the area that we had counted, was it Mr. Fregonese's opinion that we could weight that differently so that at the end of 20 years there would be some farmland inside the boundary?

**Mr. Fregonese** responded that you could make the case that some of that farmland would not develop just as they did that some developed land wouldn't redevelop. They had not done this but he felt it was conceivable.

**Councilor Morissette** asked what was the average rate of acreage consumed over the last few years in the Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary.

**Mr. Fregonese** said that this was in the Urban Growth Report. He thought it was 2000 to 2500 acres the last few years, before 1992 it was up around 2800 acres per year.

**Councilor Morissette** reemphasized that although the Council may be debating about some of the numbers, the Council had all signed on with the votes taken the fact that they were committed to a smaller Urban Growth Boundary expansion than would have been necessary had they continued to consume the land at the rate that it had been being consumed. Mr. Fregonese's comments about the urban reserves would have been at the rate of consumption a couple of years ago somewhere around 120,000 acres was well taken when the Council was talking about 20,000 now over a 20 year period.

**Councilor Naito** said in looking through the data one of the areas that came to mind was that in some of testimony that land was being set aside for parks at about twice the rate contained in the original Urban Growth Report. As a matter of policy, this was a good thing. We should be setting land aside for parks and open spaces. Was this evaluated, was this insignificant in terms of the overall report or was it something that there could be more information on? Where would that fit in? Was that in the underbuild or gross to net?

**Mr. Fregonese** said that would be in gross to net. He thought that in the staff report they mentioned that they noticed for the three years measured, 1992 to 1995, in the rate of buildable land there was twice as much land as expected being put aside as parks. This would include private open spaces and PUDs in subdivisions. He believed that was where a lot of it was occurring, in private parks which were becoming fairly common place especially in the higher density areas. He said Councilor Morissette's subdivision was another good example, Central Park. One of the reactions in design if you had higher density was to put in a park. You got overall higher density but it did require amenities. When the Council reviewed this document in October the Council told the staff to increase the allocation for parks. There was about 1500 acres to start, the Council took this to about 2000 acres. At the rate which we were consuming it we would need about 3000 acres. It had been just three years, it could change in the future, it could go up or down, it might be just three years and may not be long enough to make that forecast but the rate for three years was higher. If the Council wanted to use that rate for the last three years and

use it as a forecast, the Council would need to set aside another 1000 acres in the gross to net for parks.

**Councilor Naito** said part of the reason she asked the question was she felt that all of the Council was committed to a more urban form but she did feel that it had to be balanced for livability sake with open spaces and recreational uses. She asked Mr. Fregonese about farmland within the Urban Growth Boundary, such as the community gardens in her district or Alpenrose Dairy, where was this acreage factored in? What happened to land like this, was this factored into the gross to net?

**Mr. Fregonese** responded that the way the report was structured now it was assumed that the land was all used other than what would be purchased for parks and open spaces. There was the allowance of 3000 acres with 16,000 acres of unbuildable land. Any farmland that was not saved for that was assumed to be available. At the rate it was being consumed it would indeed be gone in 20 years. The market right now as noted in Variable 7 was 19,000 acres in 1990, it dropped to 11,700 acres in 1995. It was being consumed at a rapid enough rate so that if it were to be straight lined, it would be consumed in 20 years.

**Councilor Naito** summarized that the projection would be either that it would consume all the way down to zero or that it would consume down and there would be some places set aside.

**Mr. Fregonese** said that was true and just by making the forecast that it would be consumed did not mean that it would be consumed. Some people got forecast confused with reality.

**Councilor Morissette** added that he thought it was important to note to make the numbers work, to make the acreage of the 7000 acres based on the report work, that counted that property as being consumed in order to make the numbers work. If you didn't have some ability to temper the total numbers of housing units that were short in the overall projection, then in order to make the numbers short without being short at the end of the number they estimated, those areas would have to be developed or there would have to be another place found for those units.

**Judie Hammerstad**, Clackamas County Commissioner and vice chair of MPAC represented the MPAC recommendation. She said the Council had before them the MPAC September 8 vote which addressed the Urban Growth Report. They had spent a number of meetings discussing the variables which had been discussed in the past. The only two that they had commented on were the Zell factor and underbuild as well as Variable 6 on redevelopment and infill. The reason for that was consistency and the market. MPAC was looking at the Functional Plan which mandated that the region established an 80% minimum density standard for residential zoning. Therefore, in order to be consistent with that, it seemed to them that the underbuild should be 20% and could be achievable at that rate in they were in fact requiring it. They could get there with the addition of accessory units being allowed in all zoning areas. They felt that the 20% was probably a realistic factor. On redevelopment and infill MPAC changed that even though it had been set originally at 27.5%, in 1996 the observed rate was 29%. This was not based on what the market would do but in response to what they thought it should do. If they were to allow a smaller redevelopment infill rate they also felt it would encourage the development to go outside the Urban Growth Boundary. They were encouraging both infill and redevelopment under the Functional Plan. There was strong support for having the smallest possible expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary by the local government officials. This was supported in Clackamas County where the largest number of designated urban reserves existed. They would like to have the opportunity to deal with the Tier 1 lands throughout the next five years and do a good job on these lands prior to taking on additional responsibilities.

**Mary Kyle McCurdy**, representing Coalition for Livable Future, said the technical data supported a certain range of policy choices that the Council could make. The Coalition asked the Council to reconsider the vision that had already been determined for the region, a compact urban form, walkable pedestrian friendly environment, natural spaces nearby, economically vital neighborhoods and a healthy agricultural industry. This was a policy already adopted in the RUGGOs and Growth Concept. The Coalition asked the Council to implement this in the technical number chosen to designate for the variable in the Urban Growth Report. It was not just a matter of what that translated to in terms of the UGB expansion more importantly it had an impact on how serious we were on achieving our urban form goals inside the existing Urban Growth Boundary. She felt that sometimes we lost sight of this goal. They believed the Council could readily push farther on two variable than presented in the current Urban Growth Report draft, variable six, the infill and redevelopment. The draft proposed a 27.% infill rate, the actual rate in 1996 was 29% and it had been tending upwards. The infill rate was actually exceeding the number in the draft Urban Growth Report. They recommended that the Council pick a number that was more ambitious than what the region was already achieving. She reminded the Council that they were trying to shape the future for the next 20 years not merely reflect today's numbers. They asked for a number which was greater than 29%. It was not just a matter of whether the UGB expanded or not but whether there was vital neighborhoods and communities. Infill and redevelopment was part of what had been maintaining vitality in the neighborhoods. Variable four was the underbuild factor, the draft had a 27% underbuild factor. The minimum density would change the underbuild factor to a maximum of 20%. Some of the jurisdictions were performing better than 20%, West Linn, Tualatin, and Gresham. 20% was the maximum, the Coalition asked that the Council not adopt this as the region wide average but that the Council adopt something better than the 20%.

**Kelly Ross**, Homebuilders Association of Portland, noted their September 11th testimony introduced by Ernie Platt. In that presentation they recommended a 10,000 acre expansion of the boundary, focusing on four of the variables to justify that recommendation, variable three, four, five and six. He had brought with his two individuals that had in-depth first hand experience with two of those variables, underbuild as well as infill and redevelopment. He asked Mr. Dennis Derby to speak on infill and redevelopment. He would be followed by Craig Zell speaking on underbuild.

**Dennis Derby**, Homebuilders Association and Metro Business Advisory Committee, was a residential builder and developer living in Lake Oswego. He commented on the redevelopment and infill capacity on the 2040 Urban Growth Report. MPAC recommended that the percent allocation for redevelopment, infill be set at 30%, the Council had previously determined that the appropriate percentage be 27.5%, The Homebuilders and the Business Advisory Committee believed that the realistic assumption should be in the range of 20% to 25% and then adjusted at periodic review if performance indicated a higher percentage was achievable at a sustainable rate. They suggested this because the base data for this variable was collected from September 1994 to September 1995. It included a high activity period in multi-family building on infill sights. Most multi-family builders and developers agreed that the future opportunities for those rates of development was severely limited by the lack of economically viable sites. Additionally, the single family rate was high because of the rapid appreciation in the market from 1989 to 1996 in building lot values. Dormant infill and redevelopment sites previously uneconomic became economically developable. For example, he served on HOST, Home Ownership a Street at a Time, a private non-profit that was building single family homes for low income and first time home owners. HOST mission was to redevelop and create viable neighborhoods in distressed areas. During that period, 1990 to 1995 HOST had great success in building infill in the North

and Northeast and selling homes to buyers with 80% medium income. HOST could no longer find infill sites that met their affordable criteria and now was looking at developing their own lots on land that they were paying as much as \$200,000 an acre. They had as many as 15 to 20 homes under construction a year ago and now they had only three in process. With the completion of those three homes, they may not for the first time in their existence have any work in progress until their development in St. John's has completed the neighborhood legal appeals.

Second, it was also worth noting that the residential redevelopment and infill was distinctly different than industrial and commercial redevelopment. The drivers in commercial and industrial development had a strong relationship to pure business factors and the business environment while residential was driven by consumer preferences, demand, location and choices. For example, the redevelopment of Memorial Coliseum which became obsolete in only thirty years to the Rose Garden facility while a few blocks away there were single family homes 90 years old in use that were not yet redevelopable. Another constraint on residential redevelopment was the political and regulatory environment that it must occur in. There were problems related to rezoning in some areas of the community. He provided the Council with a copy of an article in the Multnomah Village Post that illustrated these issues. In this case one of the City of Portland Senior Planners for the southwest community plan was assuring the Multnomah neighborhood the rezoning to row house zoning, R2.5, would not create the removal of any existing sound housing stock. He agreed with that observation but he felt that the City of Portland was counting that zone density in their infill capacity for 2040. In summary the building industry, both profit and non-profit, would pursue infill and redevelopment. They all agreed that a healthy livable community was measured in part by the investment people could and would make in upgrade their neighborhoods. They also found that the Portland State University analysis and the Leland Consulting Group's work to be credible. They strongly urged the Council to select a moderate redevelopment and infill assumption until performance justified a higher value.

**Councilor Naito** said she would like to hear the presentation from Mr. Zell. She wondered how and why the Zell and underbuild were put together last fall.

**Councilor McFarland** acknowledged that she would also like to hear from Mr. Zell.

**Craig Zell**, citizen of Washington County, was the author of the Zell report which had been adopted by many circles as the underbuild character of land. He shared some observations and what actually came into the approval stage. He was an appraiser by trade, he did a lot of land development appraising. He found a number of examples of underbuild. Clarion was 10.06 acre track with 3.02 acres reserved out for open space. This was a 33% Zell factor, underbuild. Also in this case there were four lots underneath the house that were platted as part of the development. In fact, there was a proposal to buy the four lots underneath the house and the four lots around the house in one package and never build them. That on the ground realistically increasing that underbuild character. Next door, 50% reduction was approved through the City of Portland primarily due to some wetlands at the back of the property. The difficulty of crossing the wetlands into some upland area would not allow this area to be developed. Another example, Cedar Bridge had gross 53 acres, sloping hillside to Johnson Creek, heavily treed ninety one lots were approved, 18 acres were in open space. It was a C zone. In C and P zones the minimum density standards did not apply so there was a factor of underbuild also. Scholls Meadows was an R15 zone, there were 83 lots proposed for town houses on 14 acres where 211 units could have been built. Shadow Spring lost 47%, Star Point had 1.75 density in a R10C zone. Metro parks purchases were doing very well but were taking out some of the buildable inventory that added to the underbuild character. Local tree preservation ordinances also took away buildable land. He had written the Homebuilders a note suggesting that a task force be set up to monitor each

jurisdiction's approval rate. If they had a subdivision allowed for 100 units and they only approved 50 units, then, have the task force monitor that and look at how you work with the 27 jurisdictions, each having different codes. Each had their own idea of density transfer and how much you could get out of wetlands areas. A task force would be very helpful to work with each of the jurisdictions and the densification of the remaining land.

**Councilor McLain** thought of those as independent examples, not calculating what that meant to the overall amount of land that one started with. She wanted to know if Mr. Zell was taking into consideration the unbuildable lands on those sites as being an underbuild factor, a Zell factor or an unbuildable land factor?

**Mr. Zell** said he took gross to net.

**Councilor McLain** asked were these lands all in 1995, 1996, or 1997?

**Mr. Zell** said they were all in 1996 and 1997.

**Commissioner Hammerstad** said that Councilor McLain's questions about whether or not those would be figured in the unbuildable land or in the Zell factor could perhaps be addressed by Mr. Fregonese. There were 16,000 acres assumed unbuildable, obviously, all of the jurisdictions had unbuildable lands that they would like to protect and was good public policy to protect. She thought that Councilor Naito had this in mind as we were densifying and building communities, it was extremely important that we try to protect those lands that were both unbuildable and undesirable to build on for public purposes. She was interested to hear Mr. Fregonese's take on that particular amount of land and why those things were done.

**Mr. Fregonese** said the methodology of the Zell report was to pick 250 parcels at random, take out all of the unbuildable land, and then Mr. Zell went out and tried to use the zoning to see if he could get close to the density that Metro had forecast for that site. The problem that Mr. Zell found was, not the unbuildable land because that had already been taken into account, it was when a stream cut a piece of property in half it was not economic to cross the stream to get to the back side that was nominally buildable but was cut off by the stream. The example of the wetlands was that the wetlands were blocking access to the buildable land on the back of the property. Those situations would exist and they would be exempted from minimum density standards when that occurred. Mr. Zell's point was worth listening to because on buildable land sometimes constrain not only unbuildable land but other parts on the lot that you couldn't get to economically. Many times this did happen and this was why they included the Zell factor in their original report as an additional constraint.

**Councilor Naito** wondered what was the relationship between the gross to net and the underbuild. It seemed that these two factors were being lumped together sometimes.

**Mr. Fregonese** said there were three factors; the wetland would have been considered unbuildable and that would have been taken out, the gross to net was the park, and the underbuild was just practice, it was impossible to attain 100% because it was impossible to make every lot 5000 square feet but in some cases there were other constraints. The point of the Zell factor was that what was remaining in the buildable land inventory inside the Urban Growth Boundary, although the acreage was there, it was in smaller lots, 8 to 25% slope was discounted, less than 2 to 5 acres was discounted and land lock parcels were discounted. All those parcels had situations that Mr. Zell found would have constraints. There were three different factors that were taken into account.

**Councilor Naito** asked what about the idea that there was testimony that new regulations on erosion control, storm water management, might yield a higher underbuild. The rebuttal to this was perhaps density transfers. She asked Mr. Fregonese to explain how this worked on the ground?

**Mr. Fregonese** said there were situations that this new regulations would require additional land set asides, areas for storm water detention, for environmental constraints. On the other hand, there were many codes that made provision for that by density transfers, flexibility and more of those were being adopted all the time in order to comply with the Functional Plan. One of the requirements in the Functional Plan was that they consider those factors first when they calculated their capacity. Secondly, the Plan required density transfers in title 3, if they were going to preserve a wetland that that density couldn't be lost. He thought those things mitigated against one another. As Mr. Zell said, they would not know until they measured it. They had done the best job they could now, they would have to make a good estimate and then measure it in the next couple of years to see what happened.

**Ms. McCurdy** pointed out that Metro had been gathering data on underbuild and that the Metro staff reported from 1990 to 1995 the combined underfill and Zell factor was 21%, that was prior to the requirement in the Functional Plan that all local jurisdictions adopt an 80% minimum density which transferred to a 20% maximum underbuild. The Council would be adopting something that was a region wide average, some pieces of land may not attain 20% but as they knew many pieces were close to 0% underbuild.

**Councilor Morissette** commented that as he progressed through his trade he had not found, because of current zoning, that there was a lot of ability for up zoning because it was already very high to meet the market even before some of the plans would be implemented. This applied to not all communities but certainly the areas he worked in. He suggested that as land became more difficult to obtain as opposed to going down, the amount of land set aside would be going up even with fairly creative high density projects.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that this was not the final vote today. Today was Council deliberations and discussion, additions, corrections and amendments could be handled today. He added that that were three volumes of public testimony that were available to the Councilors for review.

**Councilor McCaig** asked if amendments were appropriate today and next week?

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** responded that amendments could be taken at any time that this item was on the agenda.

**Councilor Naito** asked if in the MPAC discussion had they looked at the parks issue in terms of additional acreage being set aside for parks than was originally projected.

**Commissioner Hammerstad** responded that Parks had come to MPAC as far as the Regional Framework Plan. MPAC had recommended at this point that "X" number of acres be required to be set aside for parks. She thought they would be able to tighten that up at the next MPAC meeting. They did not look at that in connection with what would be required of individual jurisdictions. This amount that was set aside by Parks was what was currently in the region. MPAC did not have any other information than that.

**Councilor McCaig** said that the Council had directed Mr. Fregonese to add 940 acres which added about 410 more acres for parks. This was different than Councilor Naito's question about an additional 1000 acres necessary for parks.

**Mr. Fregonese** said, that was correct.

**Councilor McCaig** said that MPAC was at the 940 acres for parks, that was reflected in the proposal which concluded that the region needed 7000 acres.

**Mr. Fregonese** said, that was correct, the 7000 acre conclusion did not include the addition of 1000 acres of park.

**Councilor McLain** said she would be bringing up some amendments at this meeting.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** suggested that if amendments were being brought forward that all members of the Council be in attendance. He would prefer that the members of the Council bring forward their amendments at this meeting.

**Councilor Naito** said she would hope that next week would be an appropriate time for amendments as well. She viewed this meeting as a general discussion to listen to policy issues and technical data. She would like to study these first and look at doing amendments next week.

**Councilor McLain** said she felt it was important that all members of the Council be at the meeting when amendments were brought forward. It was her understanding that there would not be a full compliment of the Council until October 23rd. She suggested a phone vote if necessary.

**Councilor McCaig** asked if Councilor McLain was referring to her not being at the next week's Council meeting.

**Councilor McLain** said no.

**Councilor McFarland** said in three minutes she would not be at this meeting.

**Councilor McLain** suggested that Councilor McFarland vote by phone next week. If that was not the case, she still felt it was important that all seven of the Council be available to vote on the amendments and the document.

**Councilor Washington** asked Councilor McLain if the Council could vote on these items on October 23rd. He would like to study some of this information, he would prefer to vote on October 23rd when all of the Councilors were available.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that the intent of this discussion was to allow the Council the amount of time to reach a thoughtful decision and conclusion. He noted that this document was one of the major decisions being made by the Council in the tenure.

**Councilor Morissette** said he was ready for the deliberations rather than talk about procedures.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** would schedule the final vote for October 23rd.

**Councilor McLain** reviewed each variable. On variable one, Forecast of Jobs and Households, the report said on capacity analysis, it assumed that for residential growth 70% of the 4 county

area growth would locate in the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and there would be 82% for employment. On variable 2, unbuildable lands, a total of 16,000 acres was assumed to be unbuildable under these assumptions. On variable 3, which was gross to net, (this was the parks one the Council had just discussed) at this present time, the earlier report increased from the early report to this report, we did increase 940 acres so there would be 490 acres for schools, 110 acres for parks and 340 acres for regional parks for a total of 13,650 acres. Variable 4, the underbuild and Zell factor discussed previously, at this point there had been a recommendation from MPAC to use the 20% underbuild, which was the goal of the Functional Plan. At present, underbuild was at 27%. She said she would bring forward an amendment for the 20% when the Council was ready. Variable 5, ramp up, there had been no change or discussion on this variable. Variable 6, redevelopment and infill, MPAC had recommended a rate of 30%, and she would bring an amendment of 28.5%, which was one percentage more than the current Growth Report had. Variable 7 was the farm use assessment, at this time, it was 100% counted. The only discussion had been, realistically, legally, we had to count 100%. Was there a need for further discussion about what that meant? Councilor McLain said, her good friend, Council Morissette, had been waiting for three and a half weeks, maybe closer to 3 1/2 years, to present his ideas and concepts about the variables in the Growth Report, and she said she looked forward to hearing them.

**Councilor Morissette** said, "I am worried about the decision we are facing. When I get worried I go back to the basics and review the steps in my decision process. I hope the Council will indulge me for a short time. I try not to speak much unless I believe it really matters. This is one of those times. I support an expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary by 10,000 acres. I have said this many times before. Let me give you the four primary reasons I support this position: affordability, economic impacts, choice without sprawl and livability.

1) Affordability: Affordable Housing for middle and low income residents has gone the way of the dinosaur as shown in articles printed in the: Oregonian from Foster Church "...*The change in Portland's ranking has been stunning. In 1991, It (Portland) was the 55th most affordable market in the United States. By the first quarter of 1993, it had dropped to 116th.*" Currently we are the 2nd least affordable city in the United States.

The Business Journal, August 16, 1996 said that Downtown Portland is the most expensive place to build in the state. Homebuilders News of July 1995 indicated "*each time the cost of \$2,500 is added to the cost of a \$100,000 home 16,303 households are priced out of buying.*"

The August 27, 1996 Oregonian quoting pollster Tim Hibbitts said, "*Voters who've been solid middle class in the past feel they are slipping or not getting ahead. They're afraid of where we're going, If people begin believing they have not hope of climbing out of their condition while an elite at the top widens the distances between itself and everyone else, it sets the stage for God knows what. Its absolutely frightening. Politically, the widening gap between haves and have-nots creates a nervous electorate ready to grasp at extreme solutions*".

The February 1994 Ken Hamburg of the Oregonian reported that as much as two-thirds of the overall increase in Portland-area prices in late 1993 came from a 3.3. percent increase in the cost of housing.

The August 1996 issue of the Corridor Comments Newsletter of the Sunset Corridor Association noted that, "*Affordable housing has been targeted as a high priority subject of the Sunset Corridor Association., It isn't merely a question of compassion-an empathy for those who want a slice of the American dream-it's also knowing that when employees are priced out of the home market within a reasonable commuting distance, they either find another job or they decide to*



*spend more time on the road. Depending on the distance and/or traffic congestion, commuting employees are more likely to be dissatisfied with their daily lot in life."*

A March 29, 1996 Business Journal article quotes PSU Economics professor Jerry Mildner as saying, *"the UGB is one of the 'major suspect' behind Portland's spiraling housing prices."*

A Oregonian Editorial headline reads *"Affordable housing on the table"* The article went on to describe *"low income housing needs"* Councilor Morissette emphasized, affordable housing is not just for low income housing, middle income housing is also hurting.

The September 1996 Daily Journal of Commerce article by Bruce Solberg headline states *Portland housing prices skyrocket during August.* Councilor Morissette continued, "our most affordable neighborhoods are being redeveloped. Many of the new housing units are not as affordable as what was demolished or remodeled. Ask yourself if you were starting your family today would you be able to afford a home? Expansion will not lower prices, but will stabilize the market and bring supply more in balance with demand. Expansion areas must be well planned."

2) Economic Impacts: Councilor Morissette said, "I am a homebuilder and I'm proud of that. I'm also an expert in housing. I have built homes for more than 23 years in this region. I have seen good times, slow times and recession times. I enjoy a good economy, my business can and has adapted to slow times, but a recession hurts more than just me. My employees and friends, very hard working people, are without jobs. I do not want to tell them I have to lay them off.

If we as Metro Councilors do not make the right decisions, the potential for a significant economic downturn is real for our region. Nike is one example of a company with their world headquarters in our region. They have experienced complications in expanding their operations in our region. Which company is next and what message does that send to potential employers? The following articles are signaling the potential for economic trouble."

An Oregonian's September 15, 1997 headline read, *"But executives caution the shortage of housing, office and factory space threaten to scuttle their initiative. What we're beginning to hear is that Oregon is no longer at a significant competitive advantage in relation to the Bay Area."*

A September 1997 Homebuilders News headline read, *"Factors leading to a slowing in state's growth."* The article went on to say *"The decline in housing affordability represents a fading of an advantage that Oregon had earlier in the decade and will be one factor among others leading to a slowing in the state's growth rate."*

The June 7, 1996 headline of the Business Journal read. *"Metro committee warns of self-induced recession."* The article continued, *"The 2040 Business Committee, composed of corporate and real estate executives stated a 4 percent (increase) to accommodate a 50 percent population increase. If, on the other hand, housing and labor costs escalate due to the no-growth movement and cause a self-imposed recession, it could take years to recover."* Further on in the article, *"Failure to expand the boundary will lead to hyper-inflation of housing prices and other economic dislocation, the committee warns."*

Greg Nokes article in the Business section of the September 14, 1997 issue of the Oregonian said, *"There is no argument among Portland analysts that housing prices are too high, but they are widely blamed on a shortage of land caused by the Portland area's urban growth boundary, which is designed to protect farmland and forestland from urban development."* The article continues, Ingo Winzer from a Wellesly Massachusetts research firm said *"His calculations show*

*that the median Portland-area home price of \$147,500 in the first quarter of 1997 is more than two times the area's median family income of \$67,100, That's up from 1.5 times income in 1990."* Later in the article Pat Ritz of Oregon Title stated, *"Price resistance among potential buyers is reflected in complaints from some employers that their workers earning \$40,000 to \$60,000 a year are having trouble finding housing they like, with some even requesting transfers to less costly markets. This is where high prices can slow job growth and eventually the economy."*

This view was echoed by John Mitchell, chief economist for US Bank, *"I've had calls that (say) we can't get people to move to Portland anymore: We're having trouble because of housing prices. To me, that's the process that will go on. High-tech employers, in particular, are finding it more difficult to recruit highly skilled workers to Portland. Affordability and the type of housing was a great attraction for Portland-area technology companies a few years ago, said James Moon of Protocol Systems, Inc. in Beaverton. That attraction is eroding very quickly."* Mr. Mitchell continued, *"the Portland area's planning process has been a primary contributor to higher prices. We have made it public policy to push up land prices, and housing prices Throughout the urban boundary."* Winzer continued later in the article *"It's really the land. Other costs, such as materials, labor and profit margins are much less likely to be overvalued."*

Councilor Morissette continued, Greg's words could have been taken from Expanding Horizon's I produced in 1995. *"The executive summary states: The only way to legally stop growth is to allow land prices to escalate so high that no one can afford a home. In this situation, all but the most wealthy are priced out of the market, This leads to innumerable social and economic problems, including 1980's-style recession or depressions, homelessness, high crime, unmanageable leapfrog development in surrounding communities and ultimately the demise of progressive policies for protecting our natural resources. We must not be so myopic as to forget that our ability to bring about positive change depends very heavily on the economic stability of the bulk of our residents."*

Councilor Morissette reiterated, "a healthy economy is important to continue support of the planning process. If this region experiences a recession because of too restrictive a land supply, I am concerned that land use laws could be jeopardized. We could experience a backlash in planning to generate a economic renewal."

3) Housing Choice Without Sprawl. Councilor Morissette continued by saying, "I support land use planning. I also support the state land use laws. Goal 10 requires cities and counties to provide '...Buildable lands for residential use shall be inventoried and plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capacities of Oregon household and allow for flexibility of housing location type and density.' A flat rate of infill for 20 years doesn't make sense. Infill opportunities will decline as lots are used up. In addition, the densities proposed are much higher than existing densities. Average citizens deserve a choice in the type of housing they want not just the wealthiest citizens. State Land Use Goal 10: Housing, Goal 10 requires cities and counties to provide housing needs of citizens of the state as noted in the Clackamas Review. Councilor Morissette pointed out that, A) Infill is much more difficult than we think. The Oregonian Greg Nokes article about Multnomah Village and their fight to defeat rezoning of the neighborhood for high-density row houses said, *"A crowd of 350 turned out at a community meeting a year ago after Martie Suced and other volunteers went door-to-door alerting residents to the proposed zoning. Several angry confrontations with city officials have occurred; signs opposing the zoning have sprouted throughout the neighborhood"*.

Councilor Morissette continued, B) density is harder than we think. An Oregonian headline read, *"The St. John's Host project is still in the appeal process."* C) Infill is harder than we think. The June 12, 1996 Oregonian article said Diane Schaub of Clackamas was planning to develop 19 homes on lots ranging in size from 12,000 to 19,200 square feet where the minimum size required is 10,000 square feet. *"Pressures to build on undeveloped land within the urban growth boundary are increasing as the debate rages over whether to expand it. What some people thought were quiet sanctuaries could be converted to housing stock to meet the demand."*

Councilor Morissette's fourth point was D) Density and infill are much more difficult than we think. The Oregonian article of June 13, 1996 examines the density problems in Lake Oswego's Waluga Triangle. Foster Church examined the rental market, *"Portland's hot economy shrinks the rental market and raises rents across the board."* The Apartment Data Center study shows that low-end rents for smaller apartments have risen rapidly. Leon Laptook, a housing specialist for the Community Action Organization in Washington County said, *"It clearly means that all of the projections about growth in the metro areas are coming to pass. An already difficult housing market for low-income people will be much worse in terms of affordability and availability."* Church continues in his article, *"Over the last four years the price of developable land has doubled. Two years ago, the land costs for each new apartment unit averaged \$4,500 to \$6,000 a unit. Now they are approaching \$8,000 to \$10,000 a unit. Analysts say the rental market is going to get tighter and more expensive in the next five years. This is true even at a time when apartment construction is booming. Dean McGregor of McGregor Millette sees an even steeper rise. Rents for new apartments, he thinks, could increase 40 percent over the next four years."*

The June 23, 1996 Oregonian article headlined, *Back yards are still important.* In a Forum feature homeowner Stephen Potter of Southwest Portland said, *"What I'm concerned with is creating a place for ritual. Tradition and ritual are what make a family cohesive. I want my son to have memories of spending time in the back yard. A backyard refuge offers other positives: a connection to the earth and a realization of our place in the natural scheme of things; the therapeutic value of contemplation and quiet; the deeply satisfying feeling that comes from creating a place of beauty."* Kenneth Helphand, a landscape architecture professor at the University of Oregon reports, *"It is absolutely a manifestation of the American Dream, You have your own plot of land and do with it what you want."* Linda Westfall of Northeast Portland said, *"This is where I get away from the world. It's my private sanctuary."*

Councilor Morissette summarized, "Sprawl, the very thing we all say we want to stop is happening. Take a few minutes and ask yourself, with the exploding growth happening in Sandy, Canby, North Plains, Newberg, all near prime agricultural areas, where do they work? Our roads are filling up with commuters driving to Portland area to their jobs each morning and returning home each evening thus raising the region's VMT's. We are creating sprawl by ignoring the need for housing choices currently and it will only get worse."

On the subject of Livability, Councilor Morissette said, "We have used approximately more than 1000 acres since the last report was issued. The Urban Growth Report (UGR) substantiates a 7,000 acre expansion, I support a 10,000 acre expansion because I believe we must encourage and maintain some of the land inside the existing boundary for additional parks and open space. The requirement to use all of the farmland inside the boundary will cause a decline in livability. The Urban Growth Report (UGR) reveals that we underestimated the need for parks by 1,000 acres. From my experience building higher density housing we should add 1,000 more acres so parks can be added to higher density developments. Reducing the underbuild and infill factor from October 1996 resolution is not based on what I see in the field. Infill projects are required to have detention ponds. That requirement reduces the number of lots by at least one and sometimes two

depending on the topography. Open space and parks are important in new neighborhoods. Infill is much more difficult that this plan allows. I have many examples of why currently it's not working, i.e., 2 lots one detention pond on a small lot partition in Washington County."

In closing Councilor Morissette reviewed, "My position might seem like just a builder talking, no way. My land is inside the boundary. Keeping a tight boundary benefits me. I'm worried about your and my children and the 35% of renters in the region.

During my campaign and when I first took office as a Metro Councilor, I told you that I wanted to use my experience to bring a "real world" perspective to our decisions. Don't ignore the experts in the business community. The Metro Business Council recommended a 10,000 acre expansion, as have the Real Estate Association and the Builders Association. These are the folks who work with the people buying goods, services and homes.

I have done the research needed, I have walked the talk and I hope you as fellow councilors will support a 4% expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary because it meets state law, preserves livability, maintains economic vigor and stabilizes land and housing price increases. I request of each of you to do the right thing not the politically correct. In summary, my concern is that ordinary citizens are not aware of the profound changes in lifestyle, choices and opportunities. Thank you."

**Councilor McLain** said she wanted to do two things today. First, she thanked Councilor Morissette for reviewing the values and issues that the Council hold together. She said she believed that all seven Councilors were committed to making sure that we were dealing with real people, with real issues, that we were looking for ways to make sure that this region again would have affordable housing. We were trying to make sure that we were remembering those other issues of watershed planning, the parks that we needed for livable communities and neighborhoods, that we did care about connecting transportation and land use, and that we were working very hard to make sure that people had choices and a variety of housing stock to choose from. We also wanted to protect that farmland and forest land and we wanted to understand that in protecting that farm and forest land, like in every other industry, there was a critical mass of actual land that had to be used in that industry to be able to produce their product. She thought the Council all well knew that that was what the debate was about and had been about for years. Now the Council came to the hard part and the hard part as we first looked at this Growth Report and the variables here was dealing with first, timing.

In looking at this report, it was important to remember that one of the things that Councilor Morissette said, which she completely agreed with, was that sometimes a flat or specific number for any variable, whether it be the farm use assessment, or whether it be infill and redevelopment. If it was going to be a flat line that would be until Christ came again, or until there was something else happening that was major, that it was a situation where we were going to be having to review this every two to five years. The Growth Report basically was not going to be a static report; it would be reviewed again. We reviewed it in the last eighteen months because of changes that had occurred in just those eighteen months. Again, it was important to realize that even though we had worked on it for over five years, and even though we would review this information and information like it every five years, and we had actually made a commitment in our performance measure conversation to review it every two years, to make sure we actually had the information that we needed in hand, and that we had actually collected it and we could adjust whatever that adjustment meant, that we were going to be doing it on a regular basis. So the decisions that the Council made on this Growth Report and this freeze frame that we created in the next month was

not something that would be here in five, ten, fifteen or twenty years, because we may find that something had changed in two or less years.

Another important element was the fact that we needed to remember what we had passed as a Council. As a Council, we had passed the Functional Plan. The Council gave directions, requirements, goals and targets, and in dealing with those particular items, she thought it was important to recognize that if we say we wanted the communities to try those, that until we gave them an opportunity and the time to try those, that we could not really assess what had been done. She then reviewed two variables for which she would be putting amendments on the table today (a copy of these may be found in the permanent record of this meeting). She then provided copies to the Council, because she believed that the information on the table was different than it was five months ago, twelve months ago, or eighteen months ago.

The first amendment dealt with the first variable mentioned by MPAC, which was the underbuild factor. We had given a goal in the Functional Plan of 20%. At the present time in the Growth Report, we said that the reality possibly was 27%. Again, remembering that the flat number for infill and redevelopment was not as helpful as it could be if we didn't continue to review the reality on the ground. In looking at the reality on the ground, you would see that we had actually gotten a much lower average on underbuild in the last two to three years. In 1994 the average was quoted as being 21%. One of the things she thought was important was that Mr. Zell and some others may come up and pull out a folder that indicated that there were some areas where there was a larger underbuild, but we had to look at those areas as examples. They were examples, and we had to see if they were mainstream, and we had to see what the actual average of underbuild was in different communities and in different areas. Those who have tried to put forward the Functional Plan and the goals that the Council gave it and those who had not, and we had to look at the factor of why they had or had not. She agreed with Councilor Morissette that looking at just the acreage or just some of the other factors in these variables for the future was not going to work. The Council made a commitment in the Functional Plan to also look at regulations, and she thought again in the affordable housing conversation that the Council had had, that it had been very clear that when we were looking at regulations, at government and private issues, at market and at the different elements as far as how did you relate affordable housing to the rest of the market for that middle class that Councilor Morissette talked about today that it took in more that just the consideration of how much land you had. Her amendments included moving the underbuild in Variable 4 to 20%, and the effect of this change would be a net increase in the dwelling unit capacity within the UGB of 13,040 approximate units.

The second motion that she would be bringing forward was Variable 6 redevelopment and infill, that it be calculated at 28.5% rather than at 27.5%, as used in the draft report. She believed this was warranted due to the actual measured rates for the years of 1995 and 1996 which was 27.5% and 29%, respectively. The effect of this change would be a net increase in dwelling unit capacity within the UGB of about 8,250 units. She also pointed out here that the circumstance and the review of this would be continuous. We had to the west stationary planning, most of which was just finally being approved, where we had some opportunities on the west side that we did not have in the last 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 years on the east side with the light rail. We also had an opportunity because of the Functional Plan where we had actually given goals to jurisdictions that we might not have had in the last five or ten years. In reviewing these amendments, she hoped that the Council would remember the goal, as the Council looked at the Growth Report, and as we look at the 7 factors and variables in front of Council today, that we were not looking at a number of acreage. We were supposed to be looking at factors which basically would bring about information for the Council that could help us with the goals of the 2040 growth concept and the future vision. It was important to mention that even though MPAC did not talk about the 1,000

acres of park land that they would have an opportunity to bring to the Council, since the Council would not be voting on this until October 23, a calculation of what they considered that reality for park lands to be. She agreed that, if there was a motion or an amendment from any of the other councilors that included something for park land, that would be something that she would be more than willing to look at. Those were the three areas of concern and interest that she had in the variables, and she thought it was extremely important for the Council to review them thoroughly. She expressed interest in hearing the rest of the conversation from the Council.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** thanked Councilor McLain, and said he thought it was a good thing for the Councilors to go through and put their positions on the table and speak to them.

**Councilor McCaig** told Councilor McLain that she respected her comment about not concentrating on acres, but the reality was she was working in acres as well as in factors, so what was the net impact in gross acres of Councilor McLain's proposal?

**Councilor McLain** said she did not come up with that number. She said staff could do that quickly. She said it was a net increase of a dwelling unit capacity of 13,040. The other amendment was a net increase of a capacity of 8,250. She asked Mark Turpel to calculate that figure.

**Councilor McCaig** said the information would be helpful in framing the amendments. MPAC's recommendation was 3,100, this would, she assumed, take it up to about 4,000, the staff recommendation was 7,000, and she would also be interested in knowing what the 1,000 acres for the parks would do, if that amendment to Variable 3 was on the table.

**Councilor McLain** commented that the 1,000 acres for parks was not in the conversation with MPAC. There were those who believed that as part of the 16,000 acres of unbuildable land that there were probably some of those pieces that, through donations or other elements, would be part of that 1,000 park figure.

**Councilor McCaig** said she translated her comment to mean that 1,000 was a number to get a reaction to, but it might not be the necessity. She said she was curious to find out what the ball park figure would be. Secondly, she said she had been very critical about the process and the timing. She said Councilor McLain went to an incredible effort to put a calendar in place to adhere to. In June 1997, the Council established October 9 as a decision date for this particular part of the process. She understood if there were extenuating circumstances where the Council would want to delay this, but in fact, it had been a good process, the Council moved through the discussion, they had had everything in a timely manner, and she thought it was important for public credibility to try to meet these deadlines which the Council established for public purposes. She said she hoped they could accommodate Councilor McFarland. Councilor McCaig had made sure she would be here for that day and she thought it was important to try to push through, and unless there was some major issue, not delay the vote another week. She said she did not see the benefit of a delay.

**Councilor McLain** said she was happy to try to figure out a way to vote on October 9. She did not know until recently that one councilor would be absent.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** called for additional discussion and debate.

**Councilor Naito** said she was still working on a lot of the issues and she appreciated the MPAC report. In regard to Variable One, there was no real discussion about that, but in terms of what

Councilor Morissette brought up, in terms of sprawl, she thought one of the interesting things was that she had been concerned about people moving out to Scappoose or Clark County, but what had been interesting about the data in terms of what we were measuring, was that the percentage of growth within the Metro boundary had been increasing -- in 1996 we went up to 71%, and in 1995 to 72%. So while those areas may also be growing, it did appear that we were keeping a lot of the population within the UGB. That could only occur, though, if we looked carefully at some of the livability issues, otherwise we would start declining. On the unbuildable lands issue, that was one where she still wanted to do more work, she had heard the argument that the Functional Plan required an 80% minimum density, and that codes had been changed, the accessory units required in the Functional Plan would allow greater opportunity for density. On the other hand, she had heard testimony that not all of the zones had 80% classification, and she needed more information on that. In fact, the high density zones did not have an 80%. She had a concern that some of the counties and she didn't know if it all averaged out to 20%, if Washington County's at a 60% underbuild, even though Gresham or somewhere else may be at a 15%. She hadn't really seen the data in terms of what the region average had been. She was concerned about the issue of declining land quality, in terms of some of the property may not be on a steep slope, and yet there was a declining amount you could build on if it was a gradual slope.

On Variable three, gross to net, she said the Council needed to take a look at the amount of land being set aside for schools and parks, and maybe adjust the number, if this was the appropriate place to put it because livability would be a key factor to having a more dense environment. There would be some farmland that we did not wish to develop on, such as pumpkin patches and the Alpenrose Dairy. These places were in farm use now, and a lot of people would like to see them stay in farm use. Variable five on the ramp up: there was some testimony to do a seven year phase in. She thought most of the testimony said we would in fact comply in five years. On the redevelopment and refill, Variable 6, this was a very difficult area because the numbers of 27.5 and 29 could suggest a trend, but on the other hand there had been testimony that during this time, apartments were more than 50% of the total units, and it may have just been a spike, in terms of the apartment cycle was a cyclical one. The numbers may not indicate a trend. The Council did want to promote redevelopment, but may want to move the number from where it was now in the draft report. On the first cut of these numbers the Council probably had a very difficult time last fall. Now it was getting more fine tuned in terms of reaching better measurement. Two years from now there would probably be very good data that we have to argue for one position or another. The Council was still at the cutting edge of these numbers. She applauded the Council for the work done last fall.

**Councilor Washington** said there were four parts of the report that he would like to do more work on, and perhaps even offer an amendment. He said he needed to review and do more work on variables two, three, four and six, particularly infill and redevelopment.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that this was a very interesting thing for the Council to get to, for those Councilors who were with Metro during the development of 2040 and had been here for the last three or four years. It was interesting to him to see that again the Council had reached another one of these pinnacles of decision points in a very quiet manner, this was one of the major decisions that the Council was going to make, because it would require the Council to make a movement in the area of the UGB. It would be wonderful both personally and politically not to expand the UGB and to be able to stand up and wave the flag about livability and all of the things that the Council heard here, but the mixed messages that he had heard consistently were, don't move the UGB, but don't put any new housing in my neighborhood. He also heard, I want a good job that's going to take care of my family, but I don't want new industry because it brings new people. Diametrically opposed positions coming from people who he liked, respected and

knew quite well. It was a very difficult thing to be put in a position where the Council knew that the decision we were going to make was going to affect the edge, and was going to affect the UGB, whether it be 20,000 acres or whether it be 0. There were livability issues at stake. In 1994, when the Council finished 2040, the raw numbers showed that we would need, if we were to implement it, approximately 8,000 acres of UGB expansion in the coming year. We knew that 3 1/2 years ago; he had been operating with that in the back of his mind, pretty much watching to see where our numbers would pan out over a period of time. Here the Council was, 3 1/2 years later, looking at a Growth Report that told them 00 acres. Quite frankly, it was a Growth Report that we had already pre-massaged and changed to lower that number of acres. He said that Councilor Morissette had spoken to that. These weren't fresh numbers that we had never dealt with before. These were numbers that had been changed to reduce the number of acres that would be needed. We were now facing another round of what could the Council do to change these numbers. Some had a very clear sense and a deep belief that the numbers should be lower to get to an edge growth based on their philosophical view. For those individuals, he fully respected that fact that that was what they believed. For others of us, and he would put himself in this category, he believed that the numbers, should they be changed any lower, would do a disservice to the long-term health of this community, and he wouldn't support it personally with his vote. If the majority of the Council decided to go another direction, that was necessarily how the political system worked, and he didn't necessarily have to like it, but that was the way the Council operated. He was really concerned that where we were now in terms of the Growth Report and the discussion about the edge was that we had spent so much time worrying about that line around the UGB, we had forgotten about the real people who were inside. We had forgotten about the families that were being priced out of homes and the housing market. We had lost sight of the fact that an economy, to be healthy, must sustain a certain rate of growth, and that meant affordable housing and it also meant people who were there for the most modest income of jobs. He was not sure whether or not some of our decisions would be helpful there. He had heard discussions about sprawl; the most offensive sprawl to him was rural sprawl, where we've watched those who can afford it move outside of the UGB, purchase whatever it was that they wanted, be able to put a house there depending on their income, or sprawl into the small communities around the edge. He was not talking simply about Canby and Newburg but Wilamena, Carlton, Estacada and Beavercreek, where we had watched people flee this area in order to find a place to buy and to own for themselves and their family. It was scary to him that for people in this community that worked at modest income jobs, that they no longer could live here. And so his votes on these issues were ones that weren't necessarily fun to make, but they were ones that he thought were necessary for the long-term health of this community. His personal view was and his votes would be cast accordingly, that a modest expansion of the UGB was not necessary but was critical. He would be watching closely to see what that number was. It was his hope that we stick with the report that was before us with no amendments, because the Council had already made amendments that lowered this number. To go much lower was unhealthy, and he thought would hurt our long-term ability to sustain our economy.

**Councilor McLain** said that in looking at the Growth Report, the comment that was just made about reviewing the numbers, she thought that in her estimation, the reason she was proposing these two amendments was because in asking the staff to come back with additional information she wasn't asking for them to do the analysis, she was asking for herself to be able to have some facts and some numbers that she didn't have before that she could use in doing her analysis. No one massaged her numbers, it was a situation where it was a Growth Report, it was not static, it continued to be added to as we knew more about infill, redevelopment, and other factors. She did believe that as we reviewed reports of this nature, that there would be changes made. Sometimes there would not be changes made, because as we reviewed the reports we felt that the original information was adequate. Therefore she respectfully disagreed, and she knew we would, but



that was OK, that was part of democracy, right? And so the Council was here today, and she would bring her amendments up if the Council so wished. She thought we were going to vote on the amendments next week, but at this time she was ready to make those amendments if the Council wanted her to. Otherwise she would prefer to wait until all seven members of Council either connected by phone or were actually physically here.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said Councilor McFarland had stated that she would not be here for the next two Metro Council meetings. Councilor McLain was fully within her right to bring up amendments either today; if it was the will of the body to have this on the schedule for next week for further amendments, it was his understanding that Councilor McFarland had stated that she declined to call in because of where she would be in rural Oklahoma. She was not sure whether that would be an option for her. So he didn't know where the Council wanted to go with this. Councilor McCaig had said that she would like to have final action on this next week, and there was a request to hold till October 23. So he needed to ask for a consensus of the Council as to when the final date would be. We had announced that it would be on the ninth, but one Councilor had a requested for a different date.

**Councilor McCaig** asked if it was important to Councilor McFarland to be registered on this vote. Because if it was, then she thought the Council had a different question. If she was comfortable with the Council going ahead with the deliberations without her, which in some cases we all were, so part of the question ought to be put to her as well.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he could not answer that question, other than to say that Councilor McFarland had come into his office to say that she would not be back until October 23rd.

**Councilor Naito** said she was perfectly willing to move forward on amendments and discussions and decisions next week, however she would be voting no on anything this week, because she simply would like some more information in the next week.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** suggested that in terms of the amendments, Councilor McLain had amendments that she had given to the Council to study over the week. The Council would have this as an agenda item at the next Council meeting on the ninth. He did want a consensus of the body that remained as to whether or not they would like final action on October 23, or on October 9. Councilors McCaig and Naito preferred action on October 9. Councilors Washington, Morissette, McLain and Kvistad preferred October 23. The decision was four to two in favor of October 23 for final action. The item would be on the agenda for October 9 as an action and discussion item. The Council would the final vote on the adoption of the report on October 23, but could deal with amendments at next week's meeting.

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

**Councilor McLain** asked Mr. Fregonese to give a status report on the work staff was requested to finish. She said that as always, when we were in a process and when we always did listen to every single voice that came in and they had a good idea, even if it came in at the last hour, we say, well wait a minute, OK, we'll do additional work. She thought this time it was a very good decision, because she thought the housing needs analysis was a better document for that extra two to three weeks of work. Mr. Fregonese was here to update the Council on that work, and allow the Council an opportunity to ask questions.

**Mr. Fregonese** updated the Council on the Housing Needs Analysis. He said that in his prior experience, the Housing Needs Analysis had been a fairly innocuous and routine document -- how many housing units, and it followed very routinely on the Urban Growth Report type, because that told you what the capacity was, and this told you then what kind of housing units you needed. This had become much more than that, it had become the basis for a vehicle of policies on affordable housing that the Council would be dealing with. He recommended postponement of the Housing Needs Analysis until after Urban Growth Report was adopted, because the final adoption of the Urban Growth Report would affect how much housing we had and the kind of housing we had, somewhat.

Secondly, he thought that this had become a vehicle for a lot of policy discussions that needed to be settled before we could really put this document to rest in terms of a resolution. Those policy discussions would come to a head when the Council looked at the Framework Plan. This should be adopted before the end of the year, but in terms of policy, there was not a lot in the document, this was really a supportive document to the Urban Growth Report, this simply said how much housing you needed, how much assistance, and so forth. It had a lot of background data, but it was not a major policy document. There had been a lot of comment by MPAC, MTAC, members of the public, and housing professionals on this; we had received that comment and issued a second draft which expanded and revised the Housing Needs Analysis. We also had a memo, mainly to the community development network, that went through the revisions. They were informational, they were not policy based, but those were there. He recommended that this document be allowed more time for comments from local governments and MPAC, and since it did not have major consequences at this time on major issues, certainly not on the UGB, that it be done either concurrently with the Regional Framework Plan or the first meeting after the Council was finished with the Regional Framework Plan. We would be able to then modify this document to be consistent with the decisions the Council made up to that point.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he recommended that the Housing Needs Analysis be reviewed October 23, and then set a date for final adoption.

## **9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

**Councilor Naito** said our public outreach coordinator has arranged a series of dates for a presentation for some of our local government partners, the county commissions and some of the city councils, inviting their participation in the framework plan. We have a lot of local officials who were involved with MPAC, but there were a great number who may not be as familiar with the work we were doing here, and we wanted to invite their participation as well. She invited everyone on the Council to come. She said she planned on attending most of the presentations. She said they would also send a letter out to all the other elected officials around the region inviting their participation in the framework plan.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** thanked everyone who participated in the Washington County Clean & Green with SOLV, and all the member of the community that got involved. He thanked Jack McGowen and the people of Intel for their hard work and effort in organizing the project.

## **10. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
 Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
100297c-01	September 1997	Urban Growth Boundary Processes and Decisions Can be More Credible	TO: Metro Council FROM: Alexis Dow, Metro Auditor	
100297c-02	9/25/97	Response to Audit of UGB Decision Process	TO: Alexis Dow, Auditor FROM: Mike Burton, Executive Officer	
100297c-03	10/2/97	September 1997 Report on Urban Growth Boundary Planning Process	TO: Alexis Dow, Auditor FROM: Lisa Naito, Councilor	
100297c-04	9/8/97	MPAC letter to Council on Urban Growth Report	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Rob Drake Chair of MPAC	Resolution No. 97-2550
100297c-05	October 1996	Article from Multnomah Village Post concerning housing density	TO: Metro Council FROM: Dennis Derby Homebuilders Association	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559
100297c-06	10/1/97	Memo concerning adjustment to the Housing Needs Analysis in Response to the Community Development Network's Comments on the Housing Needs Analysis Revised Discussion Draft of May 1997	TO: Tasha Harmon, Community Development Network FROM: John Fregonese	Resolution No. 97-2559
100297c-07	no date	Assessment of Affordable Housing Tools	TO: Metro Council FROM:	Resolution No. 97-2559

100297c-08	September 1997	Housing Needs Analysis Revised Discussion Draft 2	Coalition for a Livable Future and Metro TO: Metro Council FROM: Growth Management Services Department	Resolution No. 97-2559
100297c-09	no date	Newspaper article concerning housing supporting Councilor Morissette's above mentioned remarks	TO: Metro Council FROM: Don Morissette	Resolution No. 97-2550 Resolution No. 97-2559