

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

October 23, 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 2:07 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Mayor Gussie McRobert, City of Gresham, spoke of the Regional Framework Plan and reviewed the highlights of a memo she placed into the record, reviewing each chapter and the City of Gresham's recommendations. (A copy of her memo may be found in the permanent record of this meeting.)

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. MPAC COMMUNICATION

None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration of Metro Council meeting minutes of October 16, 1997.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt the Metro Council meeting minutes of October 16, 1997.

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

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 1 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor McFarland abstaining.

6. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

6.1 **Ordinance No. 97-711**, For the Purpose of Amending the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Procedures.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 97-711.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** reviewed the Ordinance indicating that this ordinance updated the Code.

Presiding Officer Kvistad noted that Councilor McLain was speaking to the Urban Growth Report rather than to the technical amendments.

Chief Counsel Dan Cooper gave his opinion that the present agenda item properly constituted the amendments to the Urban Growth Procedures.

Councilor McLain stated that Ordinance No. 97-711 would accomplish the following:

Section 1: Saved the legislative urban growth boundary amendments that were allowed by 1997's HB2493 and were hereby added to the Metro 5-Year Urban Growth Boundary review process by adding a new subsection to Metro Code 3.01.020B1 to read as follows: "Consistent with the 3.01.012E, areas included in the legislative amendment of the Urban Growth Boundary shall have completed an urban reserve conceptual plan. If suitable land will be completed, urban reserve plans are not sufficient to meet the identified need, additional legislative amendments of the Urban Growth Boundary may be adopted as urban reserve plans are completed."

Section 2: This section defined the net developable vacant land. It specifically tells and assists Metro in updating the Metro Code to comply with HB2493 which was passed in the last legislature.

Presiding Officer Kvistad summed up Councilor McLain statement by assuring Metro Council that under consideration were the technical amendments that must be made by ordinance because they concerned the existing Metro Code.

Councilor Naito indicated that most of the changes were specific to changes in Oregon law; these were Metro's changes in order to comply with state law. Any areas that were to be included in the Urban Growth Boundary would be required to be master planned.

Councilor Morissette said that although he looked through the ordinance, he did not see to what level was an appropriate amount of planning for each area.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-711. No one came forward. **Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing.

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

7. RESOLUTIONS

7.1 **Resolution No. 97-2546B**, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Traffic Relief Options Task Force Recommendation to Further Evaluate Peak Period Pricing Options.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2546B.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** stated that this legislation had been revised with the Beaverton area which had asked to be removed. Consequently, this legislation returned to JPACT and then back to the Council Transportation Committee.

Councilor Morissette brought up his concerns with some of the study areas that were limiting the potential prior to the study of additional lands' beginning. He asked if they would be looking at increased capacity along with alternative traffic modes?

Councilor Washington stated that this was the case.

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

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

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2550.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** reviewed the Urban Growth Report Variables. Those Variables have been studied by staff; the document was returned to staff last year for additional information.

Variable 1 concerns the forecasting of the total number of jobs and households in the region.

Variable 2 concerns the consideration of unbuildable lands.

Variable 3, "gross to net" concerns the deduction of acreage from buildable lands for schools, parks and public facilities such as streets.

Variable 4 concerns underbuild and the Zell factor concerning the assessment of parcels that are difficult to develop such as small, landlocked lots, steeply sloped lots, etc.

Variable 5 concerns ramp-up: the number of years that it takes jurisdictions to implement the 2040 Growth Concept densities.

Variable 6 concerns itself with redevelopment and infill.

Variable 7 concerns the farm use assessment wherein a percentage of exclusive farm use lands be subtracted from the total number of acres of buildable lands.

Councilor McLain indicated that in the Growth Management Committee considered six amendments at its last meeting. She reported that the amendment to Variable 3 was to adjust to an additional thousand acres from the buildable land inventory for parks. It passed out of committee by a vote of 3-0. The amendment to Variable 4 adjusted the loss of estimated dwelling units from 27% down to 21% and passed out of committee under a vote of 3-0. The amendment to Variable 6 adjusting the redevelopment and infill from a 27.5% infill and redevelopment to 20.5% gain in estimated dwelling units was also passed out of committee with a vote of 3-0.

The following three motions failed to muster sufficient votes to pass at committee level. An amendment to Variable 1 which proposed adjustment to an estimated 72% of the four-county population which would be located inside the Urban Growth Boundary failed on a 0-3 vote. The amendment to Variable 5 which proposed changing the ramp-up time from five years (1994-1999) to seven years (1994-2001) also failed on a 0-3 vote. The amendment to Variable 7 which

proposed an adjustment to the percentage of farm use land inside the Urban Growth Boundary be subtracted from buildable lands failed on a 0-3 vote.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he would take general comments from the councilors first as well as amendments, then, a general discussion would be held and statements by councilors. Prior to a vote on the final version, staff would be asked to give the council the final numbers for the completed "A" version at which time a vote would be taken on the final version of the resolution.

Amend #1: Councilor McLain moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550 concerning Variable 3, subtracting 1000 acres from the buildable land for parks.

Seconded: Councilor Morissette seconded the amendment.

Discussion: Councilor Naito stated that she originally proposed this amendment. It was important to remember livability issues as the council tried to accomplish more density within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. Parks and greenspaces were of vital importance near where people lived.

Councilor McCaig said her understanding was that by setting aside the additional 1000 acres, we did nothing to guarantee that those acres would, in fact, be used for parks and open spaces. All we were doing was adding an additional 1000 acres to the total number of acres we were expanding and those acres could just as easily be used for high-density housing. There was nothing inherent in the amendment which set aside and guaranteed that those 1000 acres would be used for parks and open spaces.

Councilor McLain pointed out in that particular Variable, which was gross to net, this was not an implementing document, but rather a collecting and needs assessment document which estimated how much land should be set aside for parks, schools and roads. We were estimating how much land should be set aside for those particular types of facilities.

Councilor Morissette said this was an example where the facts said we were much too optimistic in how productive we were going to be able to be. The facts said that we wouldn't be able to live with the kinds of density and maintain even the current level of parks set aside that we had.

Councilor Naito said that there was truth in what Councilor McCaig said. We had to ensure that we continued an aggressive policy to set aside land for schools, parks, etc. She was also trying to preserve some farmland within the Urban Growth Boundary for projects such as pumpkin patches. There was utility in having not only open spaces but some ongoing agricultural uses within the existing Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilor McCaig said that ultimately, if one looked at the three amendments, the net increase to the Urban Growth Boundary was approximately 4000 acres. If emphasis was to be kept on redevelopment and infill inside the boundary, as a philosophy and value, she would rather keep the expansion small and keep the emphasis of redevelopment and infill. She was concerned that by adding the 1000 acres which was not dedicated to parks and open spaces, the Council would be simply adding more land to the Urban Growth Boundary and, at the same time, weakening the emphasis on development and infill. She stated her belief that a requirement should be in place that the 1000 acres would be dedicated to open spaces and parks.

Councilor McLain closed by saying that listening to Councilor McCaig's concerns, we were reviewing and gathering information. This was not a policy to set the implementation of this work. She agreed with Councilors McCaig and Naito that it was the Council's responsibility to ensure there were lands appropriated to parks and schools. Supporting this amendment supported setting aside 1000 acres and after looking at the assessment of how much had been set aside for parks, she also felt that this acreage was an important piece of the document under study today. Schools and parks could be combined resources and so there may be some efficiency in how those parks and school sites were set aside. There may be situations where 1000 acres were not needed. Supporting this amendment simply assured that the Council needed to make certain that enough acres had been set aside for public facilities.

Vote to

Amend #1: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to

Amend #2: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550 concerning Variable 4, changing the underbuild factor to 21%.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** explained that Variable 4, underbuild, was important because of what we had required, in the functional plan, for local jurisdictions to go to a 20% underbuild. The records of underbuild in the last few years had demonstrated 21% underbuild over the last several years in this region. Densities of 80% or 79% could be accommodated and it should be kept in mind that this was not a particularly ambitious goal for the future. It was important to recognize that if we were going to be doing density along transit lines or light rail lines, and had good design, more opportunities would be afforded than we had ever had in the past because we had a new west-side light rail line as well as the fact that people were beginning to realize what they could build. She proposed an underbuild factor of 21%.

Councilor Morissette argued against this amendment. He quoted from memos that had been received. "Underbuild is the amount of land that is developed under what it is currently zoned for." We were currently trying to dramatically raise densities throughout this region. He supported the fact that we could use land within the Urban Growth Boundary much more efficiently than we had in the past. These was much higher densities that we currently had. He read from John Fregonese's October 16, 1997 memo: "The percentage of units built for redevelopment and infill may vary from year to year". As noted above, multi-family units were far more likely to be built on land marked as developed in our database than single-family units. The time period that was measured had developed land marked as developed in our database as single family units. The time period that was measured had a higher than average rate of multi-family development; about 45% of all residential units. We expected the long-term rate of the multi-family units to be 35%. There was not a fundamental shift in that comment. We went through ups and downs in this process and we had just gone through an up. We did not think that the difference between the combined redevelopment and infill rates of 27.5% of the dwelling units in 1995 and 19% in 1996 to be significant and cautioned that in the future, we may see annual rates as high as 35% and as low as 20%." He continued to quote from another of Mr. Fregonese's memos, this dating from October 17, 1997: "If the Metro Council adopts the redevelopment rate from 1995-1996, they need to consider whether to adopt 1995-1996 capture rates as well. During the years 1995 and 1996, the region averaged a 72% capture rate, higher than the 70% used in the Urban Growth Report." Washington county was, by far, the biggest growth area in the Portland Urban Growth Boundary. Much more housing was developed in

Washington County than anywhere else in the region. We polled the number of plats that were being recorded in Washington County currently. No statistical information was more current than this. In that review, we estimated that an underbuild currently existed of around 57% if roads were not deducted. This would argue that our current 27% needed to stay exactly where it was, that was current zoning with an underbuild factor of 57%. He argued for the Council to keep the current 27% because we were being too optimistic with the numbers. There had been different articles written in the papers and different publications and different groups talking about what was going on. Was 10,000 a lot? Was 10,000 a little? Which was what he had been advocating for. According to the Growth staff, the current Urban Growth Boundary would have needed an urban reserve of 120,000 acres. Last year, we set aside 20,000 acres, one-sixth. There was no idea here in his opinion that said the same old way was the way it was going to be. One-sixth was set aside. If we kept consuming the land at the current rate, we would be talking about an Urban Growth Boundary expansion of somewhere around 25,000 acres. Not even his proposal was that high. As the Council went through this process, we needed to realize that 10,000 was not a high number. As the Council whittled these numbers down and started figuring this out, we were being imprudent to the economic viability and the ability of people to choose in this region, the very things that people needed as the Council moved forward. He would argue strongly against supporting this amendment.

Councilor Naito said she agreed that this was a very optimistic number. That was the challenge that Metro Council faced on this issue. She supported the amendment. The Council was looking at a regional number and people needed to recognize that we were moving in uncharted waters. We were attempting to do what no other place in the country had done. There was no one to turn to for advice. She based her support of this 21% on the measured years that we did have and the recommendation from MTAC who believed that we could meet this.

Presiding Officer Kvistad spoke against this amendment, stating that he believed this was the density bomb. This was the amendment that tossed the Council's three and one half years of work on this item into jeopardy. For the Council to take this number, which was untested, even though strides had been made, we were, as Councilor Naito stated, in uncharted waters. We did not have a lot of good data on this item. If we had a jurisdiction that could not meet this density, we had a problem. This was the one factor in which Presiding Officer Kvistad urged the Council to stay with the original numbers that had been decided upon one year ago. He stated that he would vote against this amendment.

Councilor Morissette said that most people living in Washington County thought that it was dense at the present time. We were now talking about raising the density there. He stated that affairs were even worse in Clackamas County. Many people didn't want to live in an urban form: They desired a lot and a larger house.

Councilor McLain said we were not looking at Variable 4 in a void. We had just looked at Variable 3 which was gross to net and we adjusted that particular item because we wanted to be certain that it was not a density bomb. We wanted to be certain that there were appropriate facility, appropriates parks, etc. and that the underbuild could reflect that. It was important to remember that we had achieved a 21% underbuild in recent years. It was important to remember that Councilor Naito had indicated that there was close to a 5.6% underbuild in the City of Portland and that there were people who had demonstrated that this could be accomplished in a reasonable fashion. She stated her support for this amendment because it was realistic, practical and also met the needs and requirements of the functional plan.

Vote to

Amend #2: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to

Amend #3: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550 to adjust Variable 6, Redevelopment and Infill to 28.5%.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** reviewed the aspects of Variable 6 which talked about redevelopment and infill. This amendment looked at redevelopment and infill opportunities. It would be design which later made this reasonable density practicable. She stated her belief that 28.5% was reasonable and would be the kind of good density and the kind of good design that was desired in the 2040 Growth Concept. She hoped that the Council would vote 'yes'.

Councilor Washington directed his question to the Chair of Growth Management. He wished to know what this would do to his district.

Councilor McLain said that this was not a maximum, this was what the whole region could do. His district was doing an extraordinary good job with redevelopment and infill. His district was leading the way in the City of Portland.

Councilor Washington said he wanted 30% redevelopment and infill. In his district, he was seeing redevelopment for the first time in about 40 years. He stated that he would support this amendment.

Councilor Morissette said he had already read what the staff had reported regarding redevelopment and infill. He said to Councilor Washington there was a dark side to this proposal, which was the issue of affordable housing. Many people who used to live there could no longer afford to live there because of the dramatic increase in housing prices. The area would continue to gentrify. Renters would continue to suffer because their ability to pay was not going up with the incredible increase in property prices.

Councilor McFarland said she had heard very convincing arguments from Councilor Morissette, McLain and Presiding Officer Kvistad. She stated that the most compelling discussion on this issue was from Mayor Gussie McRobert of Gresham. She tended to accept Mayor McRobert's estimate of how much expansion was needed at this time.

Councilor Washington responded to Councilor Morissette's statement by replying that affordability did not apply in just his district alone but everywhere in this region.

Councilor Morissette challenged Councilor Washington to check where housing prices were rising fastest. It was in northeast and north Portland, Councilor Washington's district.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked where the "dump loads" of money might reside.

Councilor McLain replied that Mr. Reddich indicated that two years ago he was unable to finance some of the projects he was completing on Broadway. Since the Functional Plan and since Metro had looked at some new ways of being creative, that he had secured the funds.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he has not seen too many people in the community with “dump loads” of money.

Councilor Naito commented that she would support this motion thinking that Metro had been performing very well on redevelopment. She had areas of her district, such as Laurelhurst, that were concerned about density and protecting the livability as well. Housing could be placed above existing parking lots or Park-and-Rides.

Councilor Morissette suggested that Council consider backyards in the redevelopment and infill categories. Many people might not want them because of mowing grass, etc., but it was difficult to have a back yard over a parking lot. It was difficult to have a back yard in some of the development forms under consideration by the Council. The lion’s share of new construction was still homes with back yards, even considering the apartments going up in downtown Portland.

Councilor McLain responded to the various comments made by Councilors on this amendment. First, Variable were not being looked at in a void. One of the reasons for adding 1000 acres for parks was because if folks did not have a back yard, could go to a public green space or open space and feel good about that. As far as automobiles were concerned, there were still places where the automobile may be stored for times when the owners wished to travel and were not on public transit. Councilor Naito pointed out many of the creative ideas and the only one not discussed was accessory units. Again, in the Functional Plan, it was indicated that Metro believed that many bootleg accessory units were out there. There was therefore more legitimate types of accessory units that have not been capped. She urged a ‘yes’ vote.

Vote to

Amend #3: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voted nay.

Motion to

Amend #4: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550, in the calculation of Variable 1 of the Urban Growth Report factors called ‘Forecast for Jobs / Housing’ shall be increased to adjust for the actual percentage of dwelling units within Metro boundaries in the last two years. This would increase housing demand in the region by approximately 9000 units; therefore, the capture should be increased.

Councilor Morissette urged a ‘yes’ vote from the members of the Council.

Seconded: **Presiding Officer Kvistad** seconded the amendment.

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said that she wanted Councilor Morissette to know that she never looked at anything in a void. When she reviewed these items, she noted that this variable dealt with both households and jobs. The rate, at 70%, was for residential, 82% was for employment. These could not be separated in this variable because of the way it was calculated and the way it had been expressed in the records that had been kept. When we looked at what we could capture, we needed to take into consideration the different configuration of jobs and residential housing. Infill and redevelopment was a very different factor. The fact that out of that 70%, 28.5% could be infill and redevelopment did not make the comparison between oranges and oranges. Regarding the issue of density, Councilor Morissette and a number of his motions had indicated that the density was too much here and too much there. She believed that anything more than capturing 70% was legitimate. In 1991, it was 67.1%; in 1992, it was 61.6%; in 1993 it was 62.5%; and in 1994, 64.7%.

Councilor Morissette stated that using the first two years, as Councilor McLain did, for one part of the discussion, how was it possible for the last two years? The same information revealed Metro to be better in one area than another. The reality of his amendment spoke just to the fact that, as a majority, Metro Council had chosen to use two years' worth of data but had chosen to ignore two years' of data that did not lead to the conclusion that, he believed, was predetermined in the number of acres. He urged the Council's support of the whole set of information.

Vote to

Amend #4: The vote was 3 aye/ 4 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors McLain, McFarland, Washington and Naito voting nay.

Motion to

Amend #5: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550 to move the calculation for Variable 5, the Urban Growth Report factor called ramp-up, shall be increased to adjust for the gross capacity lost during the time local jurisdictions were revisiting their plans from five years, 1994-1999 to seven years from 1994-2001.

Seconded: **Presiding Officer Kvistad** seconded the amendment.

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** pointed out that she fundamentally disagreed with this motion. She believed that we could already demonstrate that there had been changes to the code and there had been changes that were actually part of what we had already said was the 2040 Growth Concept through the Functional Plan. Accessory unit code changes were already in place in Portland and Forest Grove. The Functional Plan was initiated early to be certain that we could meet the five-year ramp-up.

Councilor Morissette said that for someone who actually built housing, he would argue that we were not even headed towards this density. Rather, we were moving in the other direction.

Vote to

Amend #5: The vote was 2 aye/ 5 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors McLain, McFarland, Washington, Naito and McCaig voting nay.

Motion to

Amend #6: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2550 in order to try to protect farmland in this region. The calculation for Variable 7 of the Urban Growth Report factors called Farm Assessment shall be changed to urban agricultural use; of the 11,715 acres currently inside the Urban Growth Boundary in farm use as of 1996, 20% shall be protected, amounting to 2,340 total acres; a specific policy on urban agricultural use shall be added to the Regional Framework Plan to reflect preservation of some agricultural land inside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilor Morissette said, if the numbers that the Council was presently discussing were reviewed, about 210,000 additional housing units would be seen within the current Urban Growth Boundary if we did not protect some farmland both inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary. Legal Counsel had offered an opinion that this would legally meet the test of state law. No one would want to live in an area that had no Alpenrose or pumpkin patches.

Seconded: **Presiding Officer Kvistad** seconded the amendment.

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** said that although she was interested in supporting farmland in the UGB, she would be voting against this amendment.

Councilor McLain said she appreciated Councilor Morissette's goal on this amendment. She had a similar goal and did not believe that this amendment brought about the proper solution. So long as farmer within the Urban Growth Boundary wanted to farm, he could. The urbanization would cause them to either be farmers or not be farmers. A century farm in Forest Grove was within the city limits at the present time. If it would continue to be a farm for another century, it would depend on what grew up around it.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked Councilor McLain if it was OK in her city and not in his city?

Councilor McLain said the issue was 'where is the farm'. If there was urbanization around the farm they would not continue to farm. There was also Alpenrose. Perhaps the situation was different there in that they could continue to be a working dairy farm.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that while he rarely took exception to these items, what he was hearing in this context was that it was OK to farm your land if there was not urban development next to it and yet we were locking the Urban Growth Boundary to force urban development up against the farms. This, he saw as a direct contradiction.

Councilor McLain indicated that we had a policy in place that could protect farmland anywhere inside the Urban Growth Boundary. That was the purpose of farm tax deferral.

Councilor Morissette closed by saying that Metro had every option to relieve some of the pressure right now. Metro Council was putting enormous amounts of pressure on that farmland today by not adopting this amendment.

Vote to

Amend #6: The vote was 2 aye/ 5 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors McLain, McFarland, Washington, Naito and McCaig voted nay.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved Resolution No. 97-2550A, as amended.

She explained that Resolution No. 97-2550A which incorporated the three amendments that passed at this session. Also included was technical work that must go along with this that would be the replacement pages in the Urban Growth Report that would reflect those three amendments. On the second page of this resolution, the estimated additional households needed with the Urban Growth Report revisions that had just been completed in the Variables and that was listed at 29,350. This was now a completed resolution with the inclusion of the record and the inclusion of that number as it reflected the decisions made on Variables 3, 4, and 6.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** stated that the net impact of the expansion with the three amendments, was 4,900 acres.

Councilor McLain stated it depended upon the efficiency of the land that was chosen. What was there presently was the number of units that actually we needed to find.

Councilor McCaig said that she felt it was important to identify the fact that the materials circulated had a number of acres which were the proposed acres that would be expanded into in order to accommodate these decisions.

Councilor McLain responded that that range was 4,100 to possibly 4,800 acres but this figure would not be found in the resolution which was couched in terms of total housing units.

Councilor McCaig stated that the resolution did say that the amendments said that the total acres were 4,990 acres.

Councilor McLain said this did not reflect the vote that was just taken. She further stated that Councilor McCaig's information was based on a faulty document. The motion before the Council at this moment depended upon the efficiency of the master plan and the acreage that was chosen. The range was 4,100 to 4,800 acres which averaged out to 4,500.

Councilor McCaig asked what changed between yesterday and today.

Councilor McLain replied that the difference was the motions that were just approved.

Councilor McCaig observed that the amendments just adopted were the amendments that were adopted yesterday in the Growth Management Committee.

Councilor McLain stated that what Councilor McCaig was looking at was the growth report minutes report from Michael Morrissey and that this was the incorrect document. The proper document reflected what had been accomplished at today's meeting with all seven variables in place. What was being passed was not an acreage amount but rather a unit amount.

Councilor McCaig said for the purposes of discussion, the unit impact would have an impact upon the number of acres that Metro was expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. The Urban Growth Report helped to determine the number of units which then, extrapolating from that, helped us to understand the number of acres. In the amendments adopted yesterday to the same document, the total number of acres estimated based upon the amendments made, were 4,990.

Councilor Naito noted that she had been handed two different versions of the Urban Growth Report. She asked staff to explain this.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that he wanted to make sure everyone was completely clear on exactly what was being voted on. He called upon John Fregonese and Michael Morrissey to respond to Councilor McCaig's questions.

John Fregonese stated what would be adopted was the number of units which was required by code. What this meant was the average number of Urban Reserves, which was approximately 70% more land to get the proper buildable acreage. This meant that the area, using that average, was approximately 4,800 acres. When Tier One was looked at, it seemed to be a little more efficient. It was therefore better to say a range between 4,100 acres at the best to 4,800 at the worst.

Councilor McLain said Mr. Fregonese had done a beautiful job in explaining this matter.

Councilor McCaig asked Mr. Fregonese how many acres Tier One lands accommodated?

Mr. Fregonese reported that the answer was just under 25,000 units on 4,100 acres.

Councilor McCaig then stated that it might not be possible to accommodate all these units on Tier One lands.

Councilor Morissette asked that the record be left open for Council for seven days in order that he might add some information.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the record would accordingly be kept open for the next seven days.

Councilor McLain said she felt it was extremely important to put this in context. The Regional Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOS) had been accepted by the state and the 2040 Growth Concept had gained a wide acceptance from the 24 cities and three counties that comprised Metro as representative of the way they wanted to grow into the next century. Several years, nearly 25,000 acres were proposed for urban reserve status. This had been chiseled down today to an approximate 4,500 acres. Metro Council was today adopting a vital tool for clean air, clean water, nice vistas and the ability to do better and more compact urban form within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilor Morissette stated that Metro was missing a key element: Metro Council seemed to keep forgetting that people had choices. Metro was making choices for people that they most likely would not make for themselves. Affordable housing was suffering dramatically.

Councilor Naito said that the Metro region had seen a remarkable increase in the cost of housing in our area. One of the key factors was the limited land supply. Costs of housing, however, was high all over this nation in areas that didn't have an Urban Growth Boundary. We were below the San Francisco and Seattle markets about ten years ago. Now, we had caught up with them. She stated that many constituents in her district said to not expand the boundary but she doubted that this was an option secondary to state law. She recognized that this vote was not bound to make too many people happy. The real estate interest said that there was not enough expansion and constituents said that it should not be expanded at all, which was not a real option with the factor of compliance with state law, HB2709. Councilor Naito stated that Metro has adopted aggressive infill and redevelopment numbers and an incredibly aggressive underbuild factor. Our challenge in the next few years was to make sure the local jurisdictions could meet the targets that Metro was setting and everybody would need to take a little more density in their neighborhoods.

Councilor Washington commented that this had not been an easy journey and thanked all staff members for their hard work.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he would not be voting in favor of this resolution.

Vote on

Main Motion

as amended: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Councilor Morissette stated that he did not support the majority because we needed a larger expansion than this would lead to, he supported the urge to try to do this process better. He felt, however, that Metro Council was pushing too hard. Stewardship required leadership and long-term choices. Today's political climate was about short-term choices. Today Metro Council

made a short-term choice. Today the Council made a choice to develop urban farm land. Being a good steward took foresight and creativity. He was disappointed that today's decision lacked both. We have chosen to eliminate farming inside the Urban Growth Boundary. We should have worked harder to protect those farms. This votes said places like Alpenrose and Pumpkin Patch should be developed. We have not solved the problem. We have just pushed an opportunity for creative solutions further away. His hope was that the leaders pushing this political decision were willing to stand up and accept responsibility. Restarting an economy was difficult. Laying people off was terrible. He voted against this expansion to demonstrate his great disappointment in almost a ten-year planning process resulting in an action that did not solve the problem. One of the greatest pleasures he found in his own job was solving problems. He enjoyed finding creative solutions to tough situations. One of the reasons he ran for this Council was to help solve problems and to use his experience. Today the majority of Metro Council had voted to expand the Urban Growth Boundary legislatively for the first time in almost 20 years. Today's vote had taken almost eight years of planning. During that time we had used between 2000 and 2500 acres per year for all types of building purposes. Recognizing the need to expand the Urban Growth Boundary had finally happened. The actual land that we were going to expand on was going to produce much poorer results than the same number of acres selected in the proper rite. We had made a choice to ignore our own staff work, to ignore their recommendation of approximately 7000 acres. A four to five thousand expansion of Tier 1 land represented approximately 2000 acres of usable land in his opinion. This was an eight- to twelve-month supply after eight years of work. As he had said many times because the choices made no sense to me, the result of this vote would be an economic downturn within three years, in addition, an ever-increasing affordable housing problem for middle class families. This vote did not meet state law as he believed it to be as well as the fact that it ignored land use laws requiring that average families had a choice in housing. None but the wealthiest would have a choice in housing. All seven councilors and the Executive Officer had supported a tight boundary. A 10,000 acres expansion was a compromise and a much lower number than required from the way we used land currently.

With this expansion, schools and people would suffer from the same congestion that we all didn't want. If you asked what schools had to do with it, there were still as many school children whether or not they were inside the Urban Growth Boundary. Ask yourselves if the only home you could afford for you family was a row house, would you be happy? For some, the answer would be 'yes' but for many others, the answer would be 'no'. Many Washington County sites would produce more buildable acres. Numerous sites in Washington County had infrastructure on site and easily available including roads. The right Washington County sites could produce opportunities for creative housing including higher density and mixed uses. They were not generally in Tier 1 so those opportunities would be lost. As he stated, our current data showed we would continue to use approximately 1500 to 2000 acres per year. The Tier 1 land we had designated to add would not solve the problems. The vast majority of the Tier 1 land was so parcelized that the net buildable land it produced would result in an extremely small number of dwelling units. This choice stifled the opportunity to allow creative solutions in new types of housing products. In addition, most of the Tier 1 sites were significant distances from existing employment centers. We would increase congestion by having the population live in Damascus and then drive to Washington County. It was crazy. Just to highlight his concerns, as evidenced by his vote, urban farming was not significant, he believed, from our votes today. Affordable housing and housing choices, especially for families was not meaningful. Balancing jobs and housing was not a priority and congestion caused by high density was acceptable. His purpose today was to remind the Council that accountability was part of this decision. A short-term choice had been made. Long-term stewardship was not the choice. He was very disappointed.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that throughout this process he had tried to deal with this process with as much cheerful good humor as he could muster in an area that was dear to his heart and about which he cared deeply. The Presiding Officer Kvistad expressed his concern about what the Council had done. He felt it was a lack of leadership on Metro Council's part. He felt that Metro Council did what was easy and not necessarily what was right. This decision would make it hard for the average family to afford a home. Additionally, this decision would increase inflation in housing prices which may cost those of fixed incomes the ability to keep the homes they currently lived in. The votes Metro Council dealt with today destroyed urban farms and this saddened him greatly. Although we talked a great deal about the American dream, perhaps we should talk more about what was the Oregon Dream and that should be livability, affordability, and protection of both the built and unbuilt environment. It was up to Metro Council to stand firm. He stated that couldn't believe that after 4-3/4 years, he had to vote against a plan which he had been looking forward to working on, a compromise to affect the inflation in housing prices and the issues that were affecting people of the entire region.. Presiding Officer Kvistad stated he respectfully disagreed with other Metro Councilors' choices. Presiding Officer Kvistad expressed concern about how that Metro Council would be able to go forward from this point to build a better region.

7.3 **Resolution No. 97-2567**, For the Purpose of Authorizing an Exemption to Metro Code Chapter 2.04 and Authorizing a Contract with Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

Motion: **Councilor McFarland** moved adoption of Resolution No. 97-2567.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McFarland** said this resolution came to the Regional Facilities Committee, being voted out of committee to full Council on a 2 to 1 vote with Councilor McCaig voting nay. Councilor McCaig recommended an amendment in committee that was voted down 2 to 1. This resolution recognized a commitment that Metro Council made earlier and there indeed were changes in what had happened. The Regional Facilities Committee asked that the city, county and state all make their contributions to this and the state had come forward with theirs, the City of Portland had committed to theirs, but Multnomah County found themselves unable to make their commitment, however, the visitor industry stepped forward and issued a press release immediately saying that they would raise the amount of money that Multnomah County had not been able to find in their budget. This was sufficient to Councilor McFarland to approve the release of Metro funds that were, at this time, already in the budget. In this resolution was incorporated suggestions that were made by Commissioner Tanya Collier when she was trying to get her board to accept this. The three major suggestions were: A) Metro would have a member on the OMSI board; B) Metro would get quarterly reports to the full Metro Council, to the Regional Facilities Committee; C) Arrangements would be made, within three months, making OMSI displays available to people who otherwise would not be able to financially afford OMSI and that would be worked upon in a variety of ways. Councilor McFarland would be the Metro Council member of OMSI board. Councilor McFarland urged an 'aye' vote on this resolution.

Councilor McCaig stated three areas of concern with this resolution: A) She objected to Metro Council giving money to OMSI because Metro had made significant cuts at the Washington Park Zoo; B) In terms of the process, when this resolution passed in the Metro Council Finance Committee, it was clearly stated that two criteria must be followed - the first was that the City of Portland and Multnomah County would also put in their fair share portions; the measure that came before the Regional Facilities Committee did not include the fact that Multnomah County

did not put in their fair share. C) What was before Metro Council now was a different proposal. A non-governmental agency, Portland Oregon Visitors' Association, an agency with no means of accountability or relationship with Metro, was voluntarily going to come forward and meet the \$200,000 accountable to Multnomah County.

Councilor McCaig, at this point, asked to make an amendment which would authorize the Executive Officer to enter into a contract with OMSI in the amount of \$100,000, by making disbursement of Metro funds subject to the requirement that the business community first meet its commitment of \$100,000.

Motion

to Amend: Councilor McCaig moved the amendment to authorize the Executive Officer to enter into a contract with OMSI in the amount of \$100,000, by making disbursement of Metro funds subject to the requirement that the business community first meet its commitment of raising \$200,000.

Seconded: Councilor Morissette seconded the amendment.

Discussion: Councilor Washington stated that he would vote against both the amendment and the resolution. He stated that Metro Council had the obligation to take care of its own house first.

Councilor McCaig closed the issue by stating the cuts made from Metro Washington Park Zoo this year including \$489,000 in fund balance; \$395,000 in vacant positions; \$160,000 in materials and services; \$178,000 in support services and \$50,000 in capital outlay.

Vote to Amend: The vote was 1 aye/ 6 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors McLain, Morissette, McFarland, Washington, Naito and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Councilor Naito stated her agreement with Councilor McCaig that this was a different measure today than the one that was considered in the spring. She still was supportive and willing to move forward on it. At that time Metro Council did not have information as to what the State of Oregon might do on the underlying obligation. Information had also been received that the City of Portland was willing to step forward with their commitment. Even though OMSI was a privately run facility, it was also a regional treasure, if you counted the number of school children who attended throughout the year. It also helped the tourism industry. Inasmuch as Metro had a responsibility to other regional facilities, it would be a loss if OMSI were to go down. Metro needed to do what it could, within reason, to assist the facility to thrive.

Presiding Officer Kvistad opened a public hearing.

Robert Harrison, the current co-chair of OMSI, was here for two reasons. The first was to answer any questions the Council may have of the OMSI board as it related to the OMSI activities and the Council's support of it. Secondly, he wanted to be a spokesman for the OMSI board and the OMSI staff to reflect what they believed was a strong leadership position the Council took in June. It was that leadership position that allowed the group to move forward to rescue one of Portland's and Oregon's jewels, which was OMSI. With the Council's commitment in June, we were able to go to the State of Oregon and the City of Portland and he thought, ultimately, through Multnomah County to accomplish the goal of plugging a financial hole, both now and, they hoped, for the future and therefore preserve OMSI as a shining light of

not only an educational opportunity but a tourism opportunity as well. He thanked, on behalf of the OMSI board and staff, the Portland community for Metro's leadership. He knew it was a tough political decision. It was probably even tougher in June than it was today, given the State of Oregon and City of Portland's support. Metro should be complimented for taking a creative and affirmative stance at a point when OMSI really needed it.

Councilor McCaig asked for an update from Mr. Harrison as to the status of fund-raising.

Mr. Harrison replied that OMSI was excited since the State of Oregon committed \$750,000 and the City of Portland came forward with \$300,000. They believed that Multnomah County, with the help of POVA, would feel strong about a \$200,000 commitment and therefore, with Metro's \$100,000, OMSI would show a surplus this year in its operating budget which was running securely at this time. Memberships had risen from 9,000 to 19,000 in the last six months. Much could be attributed to the 'Giants of the Gobi' exhibit. The financial forecasting was very positive. OMSI had shared a business plan with the Council that gave many details. He thought that if the Council was to go back a couple years, you would see the kinds of data that would support and reflect strong community support for what OMSI was doing as well as a strong financial position in terms of moving forwards. Obviously, the public support was critical. Without it, the lights would probably be out.

Councilor McCaig stated that Mr. Harrison had said that OMSI was successful in obtaining additional funding from the State of Oregon and the City of Portland after Metro went forward with \$100,000 in funding back in June. She stated that Metro had a responsibility to the entire financial package and assured that it unfolded properly. She stated that she believed that OMSI will be back again, just as she found out that that occurs with a variety of enterprises that Metro has funded. She asked whom she could turn to in order to ascertain where the \$200,000 was that Multnomah County has turned over to POVA to raise and how close were we in seeing that money raised?

Judd Alesandro spoke, representing a coalition of hospitality, lodging, arts and tourism interests in the community who felt that OMSI was important to Portland. OMSI was important not as a visitor attraction but rather as an educational and cultural institution for the community. The Coalition came forward in a very proactive way, a very Oregonian way of saying, "Let's roll up our sleeves and figure out a way to help an institution that we treasure that needs our help right now." It was rare to see the variety of businesses that came together on the plan to do this. They had had several meetings in the past month to develop the plan. They developed a good structure immediately. The plan was divided into three phases. He clarified, it was not POVA that was doing this but it was a coalition of interests, a variety of groups. The Coalition had a plan that was dividing certain tasks up to various sectors: Lodging, restaurants, arts and hospitality. They would have their first fund-raiser Friday, November 7, 1997 at the opening of the new Portland Steak and Chop House in the new Embassy Suites Multnomah Hotel downtown. That would be a lunch with all the proceeds going to OMSI. They were talking about doing an event in February and a series of activities that would lead to their goal of \$200,000.

Councilor McCaig asked if it would be appropriate for a quarterly report to Metro Council?

Mr. Alesandro stated that was possible because the coalition and OMSI were a partnership.

Councilor McCaig asked who was on the coalition.

Mr. d'Alesandro replied that the coalition was not an organization with bylaws. All organizations and businesses were here in the community of Portland to stay. It was a commitment that all members felt strongly about.

Roy Jay stated that it was important for all members of the coalition to show up collectively. This was important because many of the business people had risen to the occasion of how much money was to be concerned. Up to \$200,000 was to come from private industry, not tax dollars. It was a compliment to the business community that they do this. POVA and some of the rest of the groups would be the lead points. This would be a slow process. The money was not at the table yet. It was going to be a collective effort of getting that money there and the coalition intended to do that through fund-raisers and whatever else was needed. If money could be raised for Keiko, money could be raised for something in our own back yard.

Presiding Officer Kvistad joked that all would look forward to those free OMSI T-shirts.

Scott West representing the Tri-County Lodging Association stated that his organization was one of the partners spoken of by Mr. d'Alessandro today. They supported OMSI and always had. Their board and members were involved in this process and were very supportive of the effort. They were a full partner. He thanked the Council for their efforts on the behalf of OMSI today.

Councilor Naito submitted to the record a letter that was hand-delivered from the Clackamas County Commission.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the letter would be regarded as received and entered into the public testimony phase of the process.

Councilor Naito stated that, for the records, all three Clackamas County commissioners were in opposition to funding OMSI. They believe it was a valuable community asset, but in light of the responsibility of Metro and the other budget priorities, they did not feel that this proposal should move forward.

Ed Gronke stated that he had been uncomfortable with this issue. He wished to make a statement into the record. He thought the Council's commitment to OMSI was laudable. He supported OMSI and his family supported OMSI. He really thought, however, that Metro should not be doing this. He thought it was outside the scope of the charter. He didn't think the Council had the funds to do it. He would much rather see the \$100,000 spent on planning and other needs of the urban area. He respected the Council's principles, the reasons they were doing it. He had wrestled with this subject himself since it first came up. He was sorry the Council disagreed on it but he wanted to let the Council know the way he felt.

Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

Councilor McFarland urged an aye vote on this resolution.

**Vote on
the Main**

Motion: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilors McCaig and Washington voting nay.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Presiding Officer Kvistad reminded members of the Metro Council of the Regional Framework Plan public hearing at 5:30 p.m.

9. REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN PUBLIC HEARING

9.1 Ordinance No. 97-715, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Framework Plan.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-715.

Mr. John Fregonese, Director of Growth Management Services, presented the Regional Framework Plan and its nine elements: land use, transportation, parks/open spaces/recreation, water, regional natural hazards, Clark County, environmental education, management, and implementation. He stated that final recommendations would be available at the November 13 final hearing. (A copy of his slides are included in the permanent record of this meeting).

Aleta Woodruff, 2143 NE 95th Place, Portland, OR 97220, Vice Chair of MCCI, read a letter which stated in part that MCCI had been given the responsibility of advising the Metro Council on issues of citizen involvement. She felt that there were alarming omissions of citizen involvement and requested that Council ensure that citizen involvement be included in the entire Regional Framework Plan. MCCI suggested moving the decision on the RFP back 3-4 weeks to give opportunities for additional public hearings due to the complex issues. (a copy of her letter may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Jenny Holmes, Chair of Interfaith Network for Earth Concerns, a program of Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon, 2325 NE 44th Ave., Portland, OR 97213, reaffirmed the resolution submitted by the Ecumenical Ministries last February. She urged people to be frugal and wise stewards of the land entrusted to us, to strengthen our communities and to strive for justice for all people, particularly those most in need. She stated the best way to measure this would be to look at opportunities for the poor and disadvantaged. She urged a strong Regional Framework Plan to ensure all neighborhoods had affordable housing. She said housing needs were not being met in all parts of the region at this time. She urged careful master planning of what was already inside the boundaries before adding more land.

Joseph Tam, was member of the Portland School District, but testifying on his own behalf, 4628 SE 31st Ave, Portland, OR, 97202. He spoke of schools and the needs of children and families as related to regional planning. He urged Metro to 1) recognize and affirm its role in the planning of siting of schools and the corresponding capital costs; 2) urged Metro to support the proposed RFP Chapter 8 which addressed need for establishing a RFP implementation fund to formulate and adopt methods for funding public expenditures; and 3) urged Metro to identify tools at a regional level for addressing region's needs for living wage jobs and affordable housing measures.

Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon, Coalition for a Livable Future, 534 SW 3rd Suite 300 Portland, OR 97204, testified as part of a panel consisting of herself and the following 4 citizens. She stated that many regional policies would be implemented through the RFP and functional plans. She urged Council to make sure they would actually achieve significant affordable housing goals and not merely give lip service to the plan in order to achieve other ends. She urged Council to provide a transportation system which included all modes and not just automobiles.

Tasha Harmon, Community Development Network, 2627 NE Martin Luther King Blvd., #202, Portland, OR 97212, read her letter into the record. She stated this was a historic time for the

region and there was a need to guide development and establish a set of patterns for the bases. She urged that affordable housing must be central to this. She stated that a monitoring process and penalties for not meeting the goals were needed. She pointed out that housing advocates had modified the proposals speaking to issues of local flexibility. Another important piece was a replacement ordinance so housing did not disappear. She stated that the proposal in front of Council was not an exaction, it was a zoning policy and urged approval. (a copy of her letter may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Mike Houck, Natural Resource Group of Coalition for Livable Future, Audobon Society of Portland, 5151 NW Cornell Rd. Portland, OR 97210 read his letter into the record. He emphasized very good substantive changes had been made to his thick packet based on earlier recommendations made to staff and committees. He said the packet was thick because of some review of changes made. He mentioned good changes had been made during the process of drafting the RFP. He reminded Council that Title III was not done yet. (a copy of this letter and packet may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Leslie Kochan, Coalition for a Livable Future, 534 SW 3rd, Suite 306, Portland, OR 97204 spoke about new proposed language addressing the Regional Framework Plan recommended adoption of MPAC member Jim Zehren's draft Chapter 8 of the Framework Plan and additions included in her letter. (She read her letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Meeky Blizzard, Sensible Transportation Options for People, 15405 SW 116th Ave #202-B, Tigard, OR 97224 from the transportation reform working group. She said chapter 2 on transportation already included some excellent transportation policies that would go a long way to achieving the growth management effort we were trying to undertake. She believed these had a lot of public support. She highlighted areas her group supported, the high standards of transit service, the road standards which were vital to good growth management, the regional guidelines for street designs, and the jobs/housing balance. She mentioned areas where a little more work could be done, street connectivity and street design. (A copy of the letter may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Alan Hipolito, Director of Environmental Programs at the Urban League and Coalition for a Livable Future, 10 N Russell, Portland, OR 97227 home address 4005 SW Reuger, Portland, OR. acknowledged that this process involved difficult choices and decisions and would require some members of the public to make sacrifices. The time had come for others to make compromises so north and northeast Portland might finally benefit from growth changes that would occur. He respectfully disagreed that the market was the only appropriate mechanism for managing the region's growth. He firmly believed weaknesses could be confidently identified. It lacks capacity to address realities like lack of affordable housing, gentrification that displaced long time residents, lack of employment opportunities within the community, lack of efficient and reliable transportation to jobs outside of the community, limited access to a healthy and clean environment, and limited community focused investment. (He read his letter into the record. A copy may be found with the permanent record of this meeting).

Mr. Houck asked a number of individuals to stand in support. Members of various organizations wearing stickers to identify themselves stood.

Councilor McFarland acknowledged that there was a lot people in support of this issue.

Councilor Washington commented to Meeky Blizzard about supporting ideals of all of the organizations whose pins and stickers she was wearing.

Councilor Naito said while she supported the policies with respect to transportation, she had continuing difficulty with some of the terminology used, connectivity, intermodal, etc., and asked for speakers to clarify unfamiliar or confusing terms. She asked Mr. Hipolito if there was any more specific kind of targeted economic sharing throughout the region?

Mr. Hipolito responded he was just speaking in a general way to some of the issues he had seen at the Urban League.

Ms. Kochan said her written testimony addressed tax based sharing, developers covering the full cost of infrastructure development, and some other additional language they proposed adding to the Chapter 8 draft.

Councilor McCaig gave feedback about economic vitality. She worried about its relationship to the rest of the testimony. Given the overwhelming nature of the decisions to be made in the next year, she asked what would Metro not do in order to address the economic vitality and to put the resources into it, not that it was not important?

Ms. Kochan said a lot of the economic pieces already fit into the language already in RUGGOs. Housing/jobs mix and linkage to transportation were also part of it. She said there was a potential of finding partners throughout the region. We wanted to get placeholder language that was general enough to look at what was possible over the next few months.

Mr. Houck suggested there was a model for doing this in the Greenspaces Program. He said there was an opportunity to raise funds for this showcase model.

Diane Rosenbaum was not present when called to the microphone.

Barbara Willer, 30 NE 59th Portland, OR 97213 read her letter into the record which included growing economic polarization in our region, how it affected Metro's goals of livability within the Portland region. She showed that homelessness was on the rise, the number of children living in poverty was increasing, 1990 census found 2 tracts of extreme poverty, downtown and inner northeast. She added it was increasingly difficult to find affordable housing. She urged the Council to adopt economic development, community revitalization and concentrations of poverty as areas of regional concern through the Framework Plan. (A copy of this letter may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Jamie Partridge Rainbow Coalition, 1816 SE Salmon Portland, OR 97214 said his testimony concurred with the previous speakers. He talked about living wage jobs and trying to integrate placeholder language to allow further development of ordinances for specific implementation to build living wage jobs in the region. He was concerned that living wage jobs were leaving the inner city and being replaced by lower wage and poverty jobs and that people were being forced out of affordable housing, not only in the inner city but in poverty pockets all over the region. A solution would be when dealing with business in contract form and subsidies, to insist on responsible corporate behavior, first and foremost a livable wage.

Steve Weiss, Community Alliance of Tenants, 2727 SE 16th Ave, Portland, OR 97202. He read his letter into the record, a copy of which may be found in the permanent record of this meeting. He urged language that would clearly affirm affordable housing goals. He endorsed Coalition for

a Livable Future proposals. He urged strong language for actual progress, not just a plan, including performance measures.

Julie Mickelson was not present when called to the podium.

Brian Bannison, Board Member of Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition, 415 NE 65th Ave, Portland, OR 97213 talked about concerns regarding affordable housing. Metro must take an active role in making sure housing stays affordable through actual concrete steps and goals such as inclusionary zoning. He spoke about neighborhood parks being elevated to the level of transportation and land use planning as neighborhoods become denser. He said Metro should take the lead to insure public involvement was important as the basis to which everything was done.

Deb Lippoldt, 2540 NE Riverside Way, Portland, OR 97211, home 2833 SW Upper Drive, commuting nutritionist with Oregon Food Bank, was in attendance to support Metro's role in addressing economic opportunity through regional economic development, community revitalization and elimination of concentrations of poverty. She shared some experiences she had working with low income people. She said she dealt with chronic ongoing need now rather than emergencies like a few years ago. Affordable daycare and transportation, employers who allowed learning on the job were some things low income people would need.

Bruce Sternberg 7134 SE 34th Ave Portland, OR 97205 testified about mandatory inclusionary zoning. He said he had been involved in affordable housing with non-profit and for profit agencies as well as acting as a developer. Affordable housing was an issue because the market had not been capable of addressing it. Free market in this case was not doing its job. Efficiencies of processing were already rather high in this area. Problem with not having mandatory inclusionary zoning was that you would not get fair and equitable distribution of affordable housing throughout the region. Inclusionary zoning design was completely possible. He noted Council's commitment to the community and ability to make strong decisions.

Harry Bruton, Commission on the Aging, Portland Building, 5th Floor, Portland, OR 97204 residence 1515 SW 12th Avenue, Portland, endorsed the affordable housing tools. He voiced his support of the previous speakers and added the importance of permanent affordability. He read his statement into the record. (A copy of this statement may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Peter Wright, 12923 SW Goodall Rd, Lake Oswego, OR 97036, applauded the Council on difficult decisions. He brought up the issue of the Urban Growth Boundary. He suggested looking closely at the consequences of actions taken now. Permanent boundaries needed to be recognized. Growth could not grow forever.

Bill Atherton, was not here again when called to the microphone.

Gordon Strong, Oxford House Inc., 3645 SE Gladstone St Portland OR 97202 representing this non-profit organization whose primary purpose was providing affordable housing in the form of individual houses throughout the region for people coming out of corrections, off the streets, or coming from drug rehab. The purpose was for these people to transition back into the community after saving a little bit of money. His recent experience was these people could not afford to leave these houses. That keeps others in need from using the services of these houses.

John LaCavalier, Clackamas Community College, 1622 SE 55th, Portland OR spoke to education issue as Executive Director of the John Inskeep Environmental Learning Center at

Clackamas Community College. He said Chapter 7 could not be dropped from the RFP. Without that Chapter status elevating education to the same level as water and transportation, we were going to miss out. The Chapter was clearly not adequate. He urged Council to find out about those issues before making a decision. He supported comments coming from the Audobon group. (A copy of this written testimony is available with the permanent records of this meeting.)

Diane Meisenhelter, Director of Sabin Community Development, 2517 NE Alberts, Portland, OR 97211, home 1905 NE Going. She recognized the fine work Council had done on Greenspaces and Transportation, but she felt the region would not continue to be livable without addressing the crisis of increasing economic polarization. She felt the guidelines should be set regionally and include clear placeholder language around economic development and community revitalization. She urged a strong proactive stance from the Council.

Wayne Cordrey, Mental Health Services West, residential developer for chronically mentally ill persons asked Council to remember that \$286 a month was what chronically mentally ill people lived on. That was the total amount including housing. These people didn't write letters or attend Metro meetings, but the impact of land use planning had a disproportionate effect on their lives. When land use planning policies gave away density without requiring affordability, public benefit was transferred away from the very low income to those who could afford market rate housing. He asked that Metro tie density to affordability.

Kendra Smith was not available when called to testify.

Ray Polani, Citizens for Better Transit, 6110 SE Ankeny St, Portland, OR 97215 summarized his written testimony including 3 articles from the Oregonian to share with Council. He urged Council to ask voters to allow use of taxes for buses and trains, not just roads for most efficient use of money for region. (A copy of this written testimony may be found with the permanent record of this meeting).

Jose Padin, 2424 NE 23rd, Portland, OR, a professor at Portland State University, was concerned about having a livable future in Portland where everyone could continue sending children to good high quality public schools. He mentioned trends that should teach lessons about problems that could happen if not considered. He said understanding the regional basis of contemporary economies and strengthening their ability to act regionally was crucial. We could learn from other communities the best way to plan for a strong regional framework. We should continue to upgrade education and limit economic disparity.

Patricia Ryan 2320 N Kilpatrick, Portland, OR 97217, a habitat for humanity homeowner testified that taking out mandatory inclusionary zoning was a mistake. She said it was mandatory because low income people and the working poor would be homeless. They could not afford to live anywhere.

When Ms. Ryan became upset and unable to testify, **Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland** synopsised Ms. Ryan was trying to say she was not earning a living wage and would like Council to add some inclusionary affordable housing for all working poor.

Ms. Ryan said yes, that was true. It was very important and permanent affordability was necessary.

Councilor Naito thanked all of the speakers that came tonight and for the profound testimony that had been given. She wanted the record to reflect Metro was dealing with difficult social

problems that were not entirely of their making, like food stamps and other social issues that Councilors cared deeply about. She said there were also larger social issues for everyone to work together on.

Tom Cropper, Citizen Interested in Bull Run, Inc, PO Box 18025, Portland, OR 97218 wanted to hold the UGB to 0 but too many people were coming in. He spoke to affordable housing and growth issues.

Carolyn Palmer, Special Concerns Ministry, 1112 SE Tacoma, #7 Portland, OR 97202. She spoke about her written testimony and related some situations regarding residents. She spoke about people who lived in low income housing or they would be homeless. She related each personal story to illustrate the need for affordable housing. She urged Metro to include mandatory inclusionary zoning, mandatory replacement ordinance and mandatory permanent affordability. (A copy of her written testimony can be found with the permanent record of this meeting).

Bruce Watts, Coalition for Black Men, PO Box 11771, Portland, OR 97211, home 5913 NE Mallory, Portland, OR, addressed family wage employment. There had been substantial job growth in the region. The low wage service area had grown the most and would continue to grow the most. He suggested Metro address the construction industry as a place for family wage jobs to be found. He explained the sheltered market program that could help create direct jobs.

Vivian Richardson, Community Alliance Tenants Group, 315 N Alberta #3 Portland, OR 97217 affordable housing. Read testimony for the Saben and Vernon Neighborhood Inner City Low Income Housing areas. (A copy of which can be found in the permanent record of this meeting.) She gave illustrations of people who had been evicted from long time homes whose landlords had decided to upgrade and sell. She spoke of her own story as a resident of her apartment for over 21 years, but the owner had decided not to repay the mortgage on the property so he could charge the amount of rent that he wished to. This had caused great stress and apprehension because he would only renew year to year, especially for low income people or older people. Another physical and mental stress factor was when he required residents to move all their belongings except kitchen appliances to the basement when he painted and would not offer alternate housing. She urged Council to approve livable and affordable housing.

Tim Nesbitt was not present when called to the microphone.

Louise Weidlich, Neighborhood Protective Association, PO Box 19224, Portland, OR 97219 read her testimony onto the record. She said implementation of the 2040 plan growth concept should not be allowed because it was being put in without the full knowledge of the people who have to live within the UGB. She said land use planning by bureaucrats reversed the concept of freedom of choice and private ownership of property. She enclosed a copy of the bill of rights for Council to see and further explained her testimony. She mentioned articles from the paper and said it was not fair that people did not know about this. (A copy of this testimony may be found in the permanent record of this meeting).

Ruthie Culver, 1503 NE Holman, Portland, OR 97211 Habitat for Humanity and Director at a neighborhood health clinic. She told her story about needing Habitat for Humanity housing and a second chance after leaving an abusive marriage. She expressed a need for affordable housing and inclusionary zoning, and affordable permanent housing in the RFP.

Laurie King 8728 N Edison, Portland OR 97203 Portland Jobs With Justice spoke to issues of tax fairness and economic equity. She explained division of taxation and unfairness to individuals

as opposed to businesses. She urged Council to support James Zehren's Framework Plan Chapter 8. She also asked Council to support the Coalition for a Livable Future's additions to Chapter 9 which included support for tax and fee justice for Metro residents by having new development pay its own way. She also asked for support for research for other tax equity measures which could be addressed at a regional level.

Jeanette Robinson and daughter Alexis Lawrence, spoke in support of Habitat for Humanity, 5254 NE 26th Portland OR. She felt she had to come to express her thankfulness for Habitat for Humanity's help in getting her a home. She said she had 6 kids and works at Emanuel Hospital. She said she got a second chance because of this program. She worked and got food stamps and could not have a chance to be a homeowner without it.

Rick Williams, Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition, 3400 NE 36th Portland OR 97212 thanked Council for their efforts and time in this process. He spoke in support of the fair share strategy as outline in the framework plan and all the goals and objectives that have been stated. He said they were comfortable with the current language. He spoke as a private citizen/homeowner and felt there was a community responsibility and priority to have affordable housing. There needed to be continuing dialogue to ease this problem.

Russ Dondero, 1506 Limpus Lane Forest Grove, OR 97116 professor of politics and government at Pacific University, spoke as an advocate for affordable housing and mandatory inclusionary zoning. He specifically wanted to advocate for mandatory inclusionary zoning. Without strong language to mandate some goals it would not be affective. Affordability was a statewide issue. We needed to continue to assure a strategy that encourages local government officials to face this problem directly with their citizens. That was why he liked the mandatory inclusionary wording.

Kendra Smith 7145 N Delaware Portland OR, urged very strong planning for urban boundaries that were approved today. In looking at the design of the urban environment, when you had less space you had a tendency to be more creative. She voiced support of Title III strongly.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland closed the public hearing.

10. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland adjourned the meeting at 7:59 p.m.

Prepared by,

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
102397c-01	10/23/97	News Release concerning Urban Growth Report decision	TO: Press FROM: Beth Anne Steele, Council Outreach	Resolution No. 97-2550A
102397-02	10/23/97	Resolution No. 97-2550A	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Resolution No. 97-2550A
102397c-03	10/23/97	Resolution No. 97-2550A Exhibit A	TO: Metro Council FROM: Growth Management Dept.	Resolution No. 97-2550A
102397c-04	10/23/97	Growth Management Committee Report on Resolution No. 97-2550A	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michael Morissey	Resolution No. 97-2550A
102397c-05	10/23/97	Letter supporting OMSI	TO: Metro Council FROM: Robert Harrison Co-Chair, OMSI Board of Trustees 1945 SE Water Ave Portland OR 97214	Resolution No. 97-2567
102397c-06	10/22/97	Letter supporting OMSI	TO: Metro Council FROM: Roy Jay President and CEO Oregon Convention Center and Visitor Services Network 9045 SE Barbur Blvd Suite 3 Portland OR 97219	Resolution No. 97-2567
102397c-07	10/17/97	Letter concerning OMSI	TO: Metro Council FROM: Clackamas County Commissioners	Resolution No. 97-2567

			906 Main St Oregon City OR 97045	
102397c-08	10/23/97	Amendment concerning Resolution No. 97-2567	TO: Metro Council FROM: Patricia McCaig	Resolution No. 97-2567
102397crfp-01	12/21/94	IN MY OPINION - Growth plan downplays mass transit (article from Oregonian)	Author: R. J. Polani	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-02	06/17/90	Articles to the Oregonian editor submitted by various people	FROM: Tom Cropper, PO Box 18025, Portland, OR 97218-0025	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-03	09/97	Metro - Growth Management Services Department - Urban Growth Boundary Planning Processes and Decisions Can Be More Credible	FROM: Alexis Dow, CPA	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-04	9/29/97	Objection to the use of land included in the Urban Reserve Map Unit #26	TO: Metro Council, Growth Mgt. FROM: Thomas D. Farr, 22385 S. Dans ct., Beaver creek, OR 97004	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-05	10/14/97	Interum Design Regulations for Infill Development	TO: David C. Knowles, Director, Portland Planning Comm. FROM: Mrs. Louise Weidlich, Dir., Neighborhoods Protective Assoc., PO Box 19224, Portland, OR 97219	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-06	10/15/97	Elements of housing & schools to the Regional Framework Plan, and affordable housing from MTAC (10/8/97 mtg.)	TO: Officer Kvistad FROM: Rob Drake, Chair, Metro Policy Advisory Committee	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-07	10/16/97	Regional Framework Plan - A Summary		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-08	10/17/97	SW neighborhood	TO: Mayor Katz	Ordinance No. 97-715

		residents furious over zoning plan (Oregonian article by Janet Christ)	FROM: Mrs. Louise Weidlich, Dir., Neighborhoods Protective Assoc., PO Box 19224, Portland, OR 97219	
102397crfp-09	10/17/97	Support for Recommended Language for the Regional Framework Plan (RFP)	TO: Mike Burton, Metro Councilors FROM: Steven M. Ladd, Ed. D., Assistant Superintendent, Beaverton School Dist., 16550 SW Merlo Rd., Beaverton, OR 97006-5152	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-10	10/20/97	Regarding the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mr. John Hilton, 15151 S. Greentree Dr., Oregon City, OR 97045	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-11	10/20/97	UGB needs to be kept as is; affordable housing must receive a prioty; etc.	TO: Metro Regional Ctr. FROM: Sara W. Baker, 2738 SW 2nd Ave., Portland, OR 97201	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-12	10/20/97	Framework Plan	TO: Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer FROM: Ed Murphy, Ed Murphy & Associates, 9875 SW Murdock St., Tigard, OR 97224	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-13	10/20/97	Fax list, and ltr. regarding proposed text on parks (chapter 3); alternative to GTAC recommendation	TO: Members of MPAC FROM: James Zehren, Stoel Rives, Standard Insurance Ctr., 900 SW Fifth Ave., Ste. 2300, Portland, OR	Ordinance No. 97-715

102397crfp-14	10/20/97	UGB Decision	97204-1268 TO: Metro Council FROM: Lynora Saunders, M.S., 13790 SW Knaus Rd., Lake Oswego, OR 97034	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-15	10/21/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: MPAC (via Fax) FROM: Mayor Gussie McRobert, MSD Admin.	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-16	10/22/97	Funding of OMSI	TO: Metro Regional Government FROM: Roy Jay, President & Chief Executive Officer, Oregon Convention & Visitor Services Network, Inc., Office of the President, 9045 SW Barbur Blvd., Ste 3, Portland, OR 97219-4094	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-17	10/22/97	Comments on Chapter 7, Regional Framework Plan Draft	TO: Metro Council FROM: John LeCavalier, Executive Director	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-18	10/22/97	Comments on 10/22/97 MPAC meeting	TO: Presiding Officer Kvistad FROM: Rob Drake, Chair, Metro Policy Advisory Committee	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-19	10/22/97	Comments on Chapter 7, Regional Framework Plan Draft	TO: Metro Council FROM: John LeCavalier, Executive Director	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-20	10/23/97	Protection of urban natural resources	TO: Councilor McLain FROM: Donna and Kahler Martinson, 10875 NW Rainmont Rd., Portland, OR	Ordinance No. 97-715

102397crfp-21	10/23/97	Boundary Vote	97229 TO: Jon Kvistad and other Metro councilors FROM: Brenda Adams, 7200 SW 68th Ave., Portland, OR 97223	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-22	10/23/97	Oxford House - Guidelines For the New Resident (pamphlet)		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-23	10/23/97	Regional Framework Plan		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-24	10/23/97	Framework Plan - Metro's growth management survey		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-25	10/23/97	Poverty and homelessness	TO: Metro Council FROM: Barbara Willer, 39NE 59th, Portland, OR 97213	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-26	10/23/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Mecky Blizzard, Executive Dir., Sensible Transportation Options for People	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-27	10/23/97	Regional Framework Plan Comments	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Rex Burkholder, State Prog. Mgr., Bicycle Transportation Alliance, PO Box 9072, Portland, OR 97207-9072	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-28	10/23/97	Affordable housing	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tasha Harmon, 802 SE 27th Ave., Portland, OR 97214	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-29	10/23/97	Metro's Regional Framework Plan and Economic Development and	TO: Metro Council FROM: Leslie Kochan, 282-2911, on	Ordinance No. 97-715

		Community Revitalization	behalf of the Coalition for a Livable Future	
102397crfp-30	10/23/97	Response to the May draft of the Regional Framework Plan and to recommendations of the Greenspaces Tech. Advisory Comm., etc.	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Mike Houck, Urban Naturalist, Audubon Society of Portland, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., Portland, OR 97210	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-31	10/23/97	The Regional Framework Plan - Affordable Housing and the UGB	TO: Metro Council FROM: Peter A. Keyes, Assoc. Professor, University of Oregon, University of Oregon Portland Ctr., 722 SW 2nd Ave., Portland, OR 97204-3127	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-32	10/23/97	Packet containing testimony on the draft Regional Framework Plan from the Coalition for a Livable Future, approved at the Sept. 2, 1997 full Colition metting	TO: Presiding Officer Kvistad and Members of the Metro Council FROM: Zachary Semke, Prog. Coordinator, Coalition for a Livable Future, 534 SW 3rd Ave., Ste. 300, Portland, OR 97204	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-33	10/23/97	Metro Council Testimony	FROM: Steve Weiss, Board Pres. of the Community Alliance of Tenants (no address)	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-34	10/23/97	Regional Framework Plan (Brochure)		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-35	10/23/97	Transportation	TO: Transportation, Metro FROM: John Beckman, 9960 SW Sattler St., Tigard, OR 97224	Ordinance No. 97-715

Metro Council Meeting

October 23, 1997

Page 31

102397crfp-36	10/23/97	Talking Points for Growth Report Issues	TO: Molly Cafferty FROM: Richard Ross, MSD, Admin	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-37	10/23/97	Affordable Housing	TO: Metro Council FROM: Harry Bruton, Portland/Multnomah Comm. on Aging, 1515 SW 12th Ave., #605, Portland, OR 97201 (224-2039)	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-38	10/23/97	Metro's Regional Framework Plan	FROM: Jim Howell, 3325 NE 45th Ave., Portland, OR 97213 (284-7182)	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-39	10/23/97	Framework Plan - Office of Metro Council - Metro's growth management survey		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-40	10/21/97	Maintenance of the Urban Growth Boundary	TO: Jon Kvistad, Dist. 3 Councilor FROM: John B. Munson, 2237 NE Hancock St., Portland, OR 97212	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-41	10/23/97	Written Testimony to Metro	FROM: Topaz Faulkner, AICP, 234 NE 24th Ave., Portland, OR 97232-3111	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-42	10/23/97	Opposition to expanding the UGB	TO: Metro, Board of Commissioners FROM: Karen Roberti, 5040 SE Insley, Portland, OR 97206	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-43	10/23/97	Comments on the Transportation Element (Chapter 2)	FROM: Karen Wagner, member of STOP, Coalition for a Livable Future, 2724 SE 37th Ave., Portland, OR (234-9313)	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-44	10/23/97	Difficulties facing	TO: Metro	Ordinance No. 97-715

		elderly, disabled, single parents and low-income working families	Council FROM: Carolyn R. Palmer, Special Concerns, 1112 SE Tacoma, #7, Portland, OR 97202	
102397crfp-45	10/23/97	Summary of Public Feedback from Survey Comments	TO: Metro Council FROM: John Fregonese, Growth Mgt. Serv.	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-46	10/23/97	Affordable Housing Element - Draft Metro Framework Plan (October, 1997)	TO: Hon. Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer FROM: Gordon Faber, Mayor, City of Hillsboro, 123 West Main St., Hillsboro, OR 97123-3999	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-47	10/23/97	Regional Framework Plan Open House Questionnaire Summary	TO: Metro Council FROM: John Fregonese, Growth Management Serv.	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-48	10/23/97	Citizen Involvement	TO: Metro Council FROM: Aleta Woodruff, Vice Chair, Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-49	10/23/97	Draft Metro Framework Plan (October, 1997)	TO: Hon. Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer and Metro Councilors FROM: Gordon Faber, Mayor, City of Hillsboro, 123 West Main St., Hillsboro, OR 97123-3999	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-50	10/23/97	Metro being developed as a branch of the United Nations; and copy of the Bill of Rights	TO: Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer, and Metro Commissioners FROM: Louise Weidlich, Director,	Ordinance No. 97-715

102397crfp-51	10/23/97	2040 Testimonial	Neighborhood Protective Assoc., PO Box 19224, Portland, OR 97219 TO: Webmaster, Metro FROM: Brian D. Bergler, 16350 SE Sager Rd., Portland, OR 97236	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-52	10/23/97	Metro Council Regular Meeting Agenda		Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-53	10/23/97	"I urge you to NOT expand the UGB"	TO: Metro FROM: Nancy Den Dooven, 5727 NE 27th, Portland, OR 97211	Ordinance No. 97-715
102397crfp-54	10/24/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: billingtonc@metr o.dst.or.us FROM: Marc Abrams, Member, Portland Public Schools, Board of Education (no address given)	Ordinance No. 97-715